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ABSTRACT

This thesis takes an in-depth look at the Hawaiian cultural history of the ‘ili kūpono of Piʻopiʻo located in the ahupuaʻa of Waiākea, Hilo, Hawaiʻi. This research draws from ethnohistorical accounts written in both the Hawaiian and the English languages. These narratives are employed as a means to understand the function of the ‘ili kūpono land division and its association to Hawaiʻi Island’s chiefly class. Nineteenth-century Māhele records and Boundary Commission Testimonies offer a glimpse into the life of the makaʻāinana (commoners) who utilized both land and marine resources for their survival. Although anchored in the distant past, this study also demonstrates historical continuity by employing an Indigenous framework to begin the process of rebuilding a community—one that advocates for the preservation of Piʻopiʻo’s heritage. Through community outreach efforts, the ethnohistorical record is complimented with aspects of oral history and archaeology as a way to enhance our understanding and connection to this unassuming place we know as Piʻopiʻo.
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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Pi’opi’o, an area comprised of land and marine resources sits inconspicuously along the eastern portion of Hilo Bay in the ahupua’a of Waiākea, Hilo, Hawai’i. Following the reign of the high chief ‘Umialiloa, Pi’opi’o was designated as an ʻili kūpono land division and served as a political nexus for Hawai’i Island royalty until the 19th century. Following ‘Umialiloa’s reign, efforts to intensify food production resulted in the transformation of both land and marine resources, which made Pi’opi’o a major food production center for east Hawai’i. Throughout the 19th and 20th centuries many individuals, particularly ‘Ōiwi (Indigenous people of Hawai’i), have documented the history and their personal connection to this area through an extensive nexus of local narratives that have until now remained unexplored. The objectives of this thesis are two-fold, first is the recovery of Pi’opi’o’s ‘Ōiwi history—a history that has been nearly erased from the landscape and the memory of our community. Second, to revitalize and reconnect our community to the area’s ‘Ōiwi history through educational and capacity building opportunities. To begin the process of recovery, this thesis draws primarily from Hawaiian language and some English ethnohistorical accounts, oral history, and archaeology as a means to understand how ‘Ōiwi conceptualized and utilized this area. Before we can understand the ‘Ōiwi history and plan for the future of the area we must be cognizant of how the events from the historical era altered Pi’opi’o’s natural and cultural landscape.

In the 20th century, two major tsunamis effectively wiped out much of Hilo’s coastal area and resulted in the displacement of long-standing communities like Pi’opi’o. Today,
this area is public lands and is managed by the Department of Land and Natural Resources State Parks Division. Given the displacement of community and near erasure of this area’s ‘Ōiwi history, this thesis is also oriented toward rallying community and building community capacity to ensure long-term stewardship of this forgotten area. The idea of rallying our community to ensure long-term stewardship was spurred by my former students at Waiākea High School.

In the Fall of 2014, while teaching a course titled Piko Hawai‘i at Hawai‘i Community College, I took a group of students from Waiākea High School to learn about some of Hilo’s wahi pana (legendary places). We found ourselves stopped at the base of Hilo’s Kamehameha statue where we discussed the history of the area known as Pi‘opi‘o. The students expressed sincere concern for the decrepit conditions of the area and the lack of publicly accessible historical information. The conversations with these students prompted me to start this research and begin the process of rebuilding a community. More importantly, these conversations helped me to realize that our community was receptive and supportive of this undertaking.

Although the findings from this research are anchored in our distant past, I strive to connect this history to the present and future generations through a community-based approach. To theoretically ground this research, I have framed it within the Indigenous archaeology and Indigenous theory frameworks. Indigenous theory, particularly the “triple piko” framework serves as the foundation for my community engagement efforts. To begin my community engagement process, I have returned to the very source of inspiration — the students of Waiākea High School. I began partnerships with multiple local organizations
and government agencies to run the 2016 Wahi Kupuna Internship Program in Piʻopiʻo. The Wahi Kupuna Internship Program prepares Native Hawaiian (Indigenous inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands or their descendants) and kamaʻāina (an individual who is acquainted with the place they were born, but is not of Hawaiian ancestry) undergraduates to work in the field of Cultural Resource Management by providing them with scientific and Hawaiian cultural training and mentorship (see Chapter IV for a detailed explanation of the program). Four interns from Waiākea High School participated in the program and assisted with the ethnohistorical research, oral history, and archaeology. The knowledge gained through this study is meant to ensure current and future generations continue to recall Piʻopiʻo’s ʻŌiwi history and begin to take steps to properly care for the area.

Roadmap

This thesis begins by taking a reverse look at Piʻopiʻo’s history. I provide a brief background of some of the 20th-century keystones that have contributed to the displacement of people from the area and how that has effectively shaped Piʻopiʻo into the place we see and experience today. Chapter II focuses on the theoretical framework, particularly the Indigenous archaeology movement and Indigenous theory. Chapters III, IV and V are dedicated to detailing Piʻopiʻo’s ʻŌiwi history. Chapter III expounds on ʻŌiwi narratives and traditions associated with Piʻopiʻo such as legends, place names, and historical narratives associated with Hawaiʻi’s chiefly class. The historical narratives serve as a proxy for estimating when Piʻopiʻo was formalized as an ʻili kūpono and to understand the function of this land division by examining land use patterns. To understand how the ʻŌiwi tenants conceptualized and utilized Piʻopiʻo, I draw upon the plethora of Māhele
‘Āina records. Chapter IV contextualizes the Māhele ‘Āina of 1848, a land reform based on the capitalistic model that resulted in the award of alodial titles to land to the mōʻi (crown), aupuni (government), aliʻi (chiefs), and native tenants. As result of this land tenure reform, a large number of documents were generated which details place-based ‘Ōiwi land use knowledge. Chapter V is dedicated to examining the various Māhele ‘Āina documents for both the chiefs Mataio Kekūanaoʻa, and his daughter Victoria Kamāmalu, as well as hoaʻāina (native tenants) of Piʻopiʻo. Chapter VI details the community engagement efforts I have employed as a means to rebuild community and perpetuate Piʻopiʻo’s ‘Ōiwi cultural history. I close this thesis in Chapter VII by summarizing the key points of this study with considerations for future research and projections.

A Note On Language

While this thesis strives to improve our understanding of Piʻopiʻo’s ‘Ōiwi history, I also emphasize the importance of letting Piʻopiʻo’s story be told by nā kūpuna (the ancestors) who lived and toiled these lands. Readers will find that I use many Hawaiian words, phrases, and concepts throughout this thesis, as a way to literally bring the voices of nā kūpuna to the forefront. This is the story about a specific place in Hawaiʻi, during a time when the Hawaiian language was the primary language of the Hawaiian Kingdom Government. I advocate for understanding the history of this place through the Indigenous language of these islands. Hawaiian words are not italicized out of my respect and dedication to perpetuating ‘Ōlelo Hawaiʻi (Hawaiian language). However, italicized words are maintained in direct quotes. Many of the documents used in this research originated in the 19th and 20th centuries when diacritics were not consistently used. Thus, when
presenting these sources, I have chosen to honor the writings of the authors by presenting them in their original form, which sometimes lacks diacritics. Additionally, preserving the authors’ form of writing also allows for kaona (nuanced or multiple meanings) to be understood, which is a hallmark of the ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i.

Readers will find that I refrain from using English pluralizers for Hawaiian words (e.g., ahupua‘as, mokus, palenas) as this is a culturally inappropriate use of ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i. Through the context of the sentence, readers will be able to decipher whether the Hawaiian word is presented in a plural or singular form. Readers will find that I use the word ‘Ōiwi when referring to the Indigenous inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands and the word Hawaiian when referring to language. As an Indigenous inhabitant of these islands, we often refer to ourselves as ‘Ōiwi, Kanaka ‘Ōiwi, Kanaka, Kanaka Maoli, Hawaiian or simply Hawai‘i. Some sections of this thesis warrant a more detailed explanation regarding language and terminology and I provide such explanations in their respective chapters.

**Location and Natural Features**

Located on the east side of the Island of Hawai‘i in the moku (district) of Hilo along the western coast of the Waiākea ahupua‘a (a land division typically extending from the uplands to sea) is the ‘ili kūpono of Pi‘opi‘o. In brief, ‘ili kūpono is a traditional land division designation that was located within a specific ahupua‘a. However, lands designated as ‘ili kūpono operated independently of the ahupua‘a in which they were located, and were held by direct grant of the ali‘i nui (high chief) (see Chapter IV for a detailed explanation of the ‘ili kūpono land division). Pi‘opi‘o is comprised of both land and marine resources, as it is situated along the eastern end of Hilo Bay and runs inland following the western margin
of the Wailoa River and Waiākea fishponds. Two fishponds, Hō‘akimau and Mohouli are also included in the Pi‘opi‘o land holdings. Today, most of the landed area of Pi‘opi‘o is a large grassy lawn interspersed with private businesses, canoe clubs, government offices, a small boat landing, an art center, parking lots, and roads (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1. 2013 Google aerial image of Pi‘opi‘o. Note the major highway and businesses interspersed with greenspace.](image)

The elevation change is minimal, starting at sea level and rising approximately ten feet above mean sea level (see Figure 2). After the 1960 tsunami, a 40-acre elevated plateau was created as part of the Kaiko‘o Redevelopment Project, which raised the southwest portion of Pi‘opi‘o an additional 26 feet above sea level (Hawai‘i Redevelopment Agency 1960:11).
The Waiākea River provides the largest source of groundwater feeding into the Waiākea ponds and empties into the eastern end of Hilo Bay via the Wailoa River (Dept. of the Army U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 2009:3). Between 1915 and 1917, a canal was constructed for the purpose of draining freshwater from the Alenaio River, located approximately 0.85 kilometers (0.53 miles) to the west, into the Wailoa River (see Figure 3). During the daily high tides, both the Wailoa River and the Alenaio canal experience a backflow of sea water, and during low tides, Hilo Bay experiences an output of freshwater via the Wailoa River. Approximately 1.8 million cubic meters of groundwater enters annually into Hilo Bay via the Wailoa River through a large basal compound spring (Dept.
of the Army U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 2009:3). The mixture of fresh and saltwater creates a rich estuary, which serves as a vital component of our island’s ecosystem and provides the necessary habitat for many fish, shellfish and aquatic plant species (Glendon-Baclig 2007:1).

![Figure 3. Waiākea ahupua’a with surface streams.](image_url)

Pi’opi’o is situated on the slopes of Maunaloa, which is one of two active shield-stage volcanoes on the Island of Hawai’i (Wolfe & Morris 1996:1). The north half of Pi’opi’o is comprised of surficial deposits dating to the late Pleistocene and Holocene periods, while the south half is comprised of Maunaloa lava flows that are part of the Ka’ū basalt series dating to 5-10 thousand years B.P. (Wolfe & Morris 1996:11). The soil in this area has been characterized as part of the Hilo Series and consists of well-drained silty clay loams (see
Figure 4). This type of soil is found near sea level and extends to the 800-foot elevation and receives an annual rainfall of 120-180 inches per year (USDA Soil Conservation Service 1973:17).

![Soil map of Waiākea ahupua`a.](image)

**Figure 4. Soil map of Waiākea ahupua`a.**

**Brief Historical Overview**

Today, Pi`opi`o is a part of the Wailoa State Recreational Area (Wailoa SRA), and is managed by the Department of Land and Natural Resources, State Parks Division. Ideas for a public park were initiated as early as 1919, when Executive Order 65 set aside a portion of land along the eastern end of the Wailoa River to formally establish the Wailoa River Park (Executive Order 64, 1919). Subsequent Executive Orders added adjacent parcels to expand the park, established the baitfish and fisheries facility as well as improved
infrastructure to mitigate flood threats (see Table 1). The landed areas of Piʻopiʻo in addition to Mohouli and Hōʻakimau fishponds were added to the park area in 1973 via Executive Order 2658. Visitors can walk the park or enjoy a variety of marine recreation activities like fishing and kayaking. Over the past one hundred fifty years, Piʻopiʻo and the surrounding area has experienced major economic, social and environmental change.

Table 1. List of Executive Orders to establish and expand the public park known as the Wailoa River SRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Order Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>August 12, 1919</td>
<td>Establishing a public park to be known as the “Wailoa River Park”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>November 1, 1954</td>
<td>For Wailoa River Park and Hawaiian Village Site, to be under the control and management of the Board of Commissioners of Agriculture and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2125</td>
<td>June 22, 1964</td>
<td>For Wailoa River and its Tributaries Flood Control Project, to be under the control and management of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Hawaiʻi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2201</td>
<td>May 6, 1965</td>
<td>For additions to Wailoa River Park to be under the control and management of the Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of State Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2658</td>
<td>March 20, 1973</td>
<td>For additions to the Wailoa River State Park to be under the control and management of the Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of State Parks, inclusion of Piopio, Grant 4777 and lands from the Waiākea Mill Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2921</td>
<td>June 27, 1978</td>
<td>For State Park Purposes to be under the control and management of the Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of State Parks, Outdoor Recreation, and Historic Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3561</td>
<td>July 28, 1992</td>
<td>For the withdraw of a portion of the Wailoa River State Park to establish the baitfish and fisheries facilities that shall be under the control and management of the Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of Aquatic Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the late 19th and throughout the 20th century, Waiākea’s economy was based largely on fishing, stevedoring, sugar, railroad, and service industries (Nakamura & Kobayashi 1999:19). As early as 1879, the Waiākea area experienced its first major
industrial boom with the establishment of the Waiākea Mill Company (1879-1947), and later, the Hawaiian Cane Products Company (Canec Plant) (1928-1965) (Rechtman & Lang 2009:21; Nakamura & Kobayashi 1999:19). Both the Waiākea Mill Company and the Canec Plant were built along the southeast banks of the Waiākea Pond (see Figure 5). The Waiākea Pond and Wailoa River served as the main route for transporting cane and other supplies in and out of Hilo. The Waiākea Mill Company was a major driving force for development in the area shaping both the natural and cultural landscape. Although continuously occupied for several centuries prior, the small town of Shinmachi was established around 1900 (Rechtman & Lang 2009:24). Shinmachi was a small close-knit, predominantly Japanese community that housed various locally owned and operated businesses (Sekido & Nakashima nd:1). Through the early 20th century the coastal area of Waiākea continued to grow with homes, religious temples, recreational clubs, schools, and businesses. Economic growth came to a halt in 1946 due to a destructive tsunami that took 159 lives and caused several million dollars in damage (see Figure 6). Although there was significant damage to many homes and businesses along the coastal area of Waiākea, many people from the community remained to rebuild their homes and businesses (Muffler 2015:17).
Figure 5. Aerial view of Walākea Sugar Mill, Canec Plant and Wailoa River, 1932. Photographed by Roscoe C. Wriston. Lyman Memorial Museum.

Figure 6. Aftermath of the 1946 tsunami in Pūʻopō. Hōʻakimau fishpond at top left and Wailoa River at the top right Army Air Forces. National Archives Catalog.
On May 23, 1960, another major tsunami hit Hilo killing 61 people and injuring many others. Hundreds of homes, businesses, and infrastructure were destroyed by this tsunami (Muffler 2015:67). Within a week of the tsunami, the Hawai‘i Redevelopment Agency was established by the County of Hawai‘i, with the goal of economic recovery. In addition to economic recovery, the County of Hawai‘i sought to establish a tsunami buffer zone to prevent further personal and economic loss. The Hawai‘i Redevelopment Agency was faced with two important decisions: 1) allow tsunami victims to return and rebuild their damaged or destroyed homes and businesses, or 2) relocate tsunami victims to safer grounds (Hawai‘i Redevelopment Agency 1960:11). The Hawai‘i Redevelopment Agency knew the latter option would certainly bring about resistance, and even bitterness, from the residents. However, given Hilo’s tsunami history, the County of Hawai‘i decided to relocate families and businesses outside of the tsunami zone.

Hilo’s history is incomplete without mentioning the many tsunami that have transformed the cultural and natural landscape. Over the years, great efforts have been made to narrate and recount Hilo’s tsunami history, culminating in the opening of the Pacific Tsunami Museum in 1998 to share this history with a broader audience (Pacific Tsunami Museum 2013). The destructive and unpredictable nature of tsunami has undoubtedly affected the way the community of Hilo approaches development, particularly along the coastal areas. The lasting impacts of the tsunamis have in one way altered the cultural and natural landscape, but in another light, it has also been a major factor that has limited development in the area. Hilo’s extensive tsunami history is one of the main reasons there is such an expansive greenspace along the coast (Muffler 2015:9).
While this greenspace has affected people’s relationship with this area, it has also helped to maintain the area as an open space. Understanding some of the historical keystones of the 20th century is important to help the reader understand the current status of the area as well as fill in the historical gap inherent in studies dealing with ‘Ōiwi history. In the following chapter, I explore the theoretical implications as well as the methodological approaches used in this study.
CHAPTER II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

To meet the objectives of this research, I draw from two major theoretical approaches. First is the Indigenous archaeology movement that emerged out of postmodern and postcolonial frameworks and Indigenous theory (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2012:317). Scholars continue to actively define and problematize Indigenous archaeology. Joe Watkins (2005:430-432) noted the importance of defining the term Indigenous because as Martin Wobst (2010:19) states, “the word indigenous is fraught with many meanings” and “few of those meanings are neutral, uncontested or problem free.” Linda Tuhiwai Smith points out that the term Indigenous represents many “distinct populations whose experiences under imperialism have been vastly different” (2012:6). Although Indigenous groups differ in many ways, they do share some similarities, one of which is their struggle against dominant colonial regimes, which for many Indigenous groups, and to varying degrees, have left them landless, as well as politically and economically marginalized (Watkins 2005:430). The struggle of Indigenous groups to maintain their rightful place in contemporary society also requires scholars today to re-write history in ways that honor Indigenous peoples role and their historical contributions.

To acknowledge the struggle of Indigenous peoples’ rights to self-determination, sovereignty, and respect, I have chosen to capitalize the word Indigenous. Although written in a singular form, the term Indigenous archaeology does not represent a singular approach to research with all Indigenous peoples. Wobst (2010:18) reminds scholars to be sensitive of how the historical context of an Indigenous group has affected the way people
relate to their heritage and past. To put it succinctly, approaches used in this thesis may or may not be appropriate for other Indigenous groups around the world. I utilize Nicholas’s definition of Indigenous archaeology. Nicholas states:

Indigenous archaeology is an expression of archaeological theory and practice in which the discipline intersects with Indigenous values, knowledge, practices, ethics, and sensibilities, and through collaborative and community-originated or -directed projects, and related critical perspectives (Nicholas 2008:1660).

Academic research is one way contemporary ‘Ōiwi are reclaiming their heritage while cultivating and strengthening our ‘ano Hawai’i (Hawaiian disposition), pilina kula‘iwi (connection to our homeland), and lāhui (Hawaiian nation) (Olivera-Wright 2016:x). Indigenous scholars seeking to reclaim their history from complete erasure must realize the value of being fluent in their native language, in this case ‘Ōlelo Hawai’i and the many forms in which it exists (i.e., spoken, written, chants, poems). ‘Ōiwi scholar Noenoe Silva (2009:44) believes that our ability to read and understand the published works of our ancestors is the beginning of re-establishing our connection to our intellectual history. Although Western accounts have contributed to our knowledge of life and culture in Hawai‘i, relying solely on them does not necessarily reflect an ‘Ōiwi worldview. Nor do Western accounts get at the depth of knowledge held by ‘Ōiwi as it concerns our understanding and relationship to the ‘āina (land), kai (ocean) and all of the lifeforms these domains sustain. As David Harrison writes, “what people pay attention to in the world, and what they name in the landscape, may be deeply influenced by the language they speak...

This knowledge is often accumulated over many centuries, and so geographic terms can represent an ancient layer of cultural knowledge encoded in language” (2007:115).
Indigenous Archaeology and Cultural Revitalization Movements

The Indigenous archaeology movement is linked to the rise in political and social resistance, Indigenous land claims, cultural revitalizations, and the rise of historic preservation laws in the United States in the mid 20th century. Nicholas and Watkins (2014:3779) note that “[t]he development of Indigenous archaeology must also be viewed in relation to Indigenous values, histories, worldviews, and ontologies.” In the mid 20th century, minority and Indigenous groups in the United States began to challenge the social and political oppression brought on by colonialism. The Red Power movement was one of many Civil Rights movements to occur during that era. This movement served as the catalyst for Native American activism. As Bradley Shreve (2011:3) asserts, “[t]hey [Native American Youth Council students] believed in the cornerstone principles of tribal sovereignty, treaty rights, self-determination, and cultural preservation.” Civil Rights movements would spread across the Pacific and propel a cultural revitalization in Hawai‘i.

The 1970s marked a major push to revitalize Ōiwi arts, language, music, navigation, hula, political advocacy and activism (Kanahele 1982). Kathleen Kawelu and Donald Pakele (2014:63) add that during this time, Ōiwi began to critically look at the field of archaeology and the protection of Hawaiian cultural sites. The tension between Ōiwi and archaeologists nearly hit a breaking point when Hawaiian scholar and activist Haunani-Kay Trask (1993:172) requested “a moratorium on studying, unearthing, slicing, crushing and analyzing” all Ōiwi, living and deceased. While some Ōiwi scholars argued for a complete halt on the research of Ōiwi, others like Kēhaunani Cachola-Abad and Halealoha Ayau (1999) argued for more collaboration and dialogue between archaeologists and the Ōiwi
community. Since the late 1990s, major strides have been made to involve and train more Ōiwi in scientific methods coupled with a Hawaiian cultural foundation (Uyeoka 2013:33). As Margaret Bruchac (2010:11) notes, “[a]rchaeological theories grounded on colonial relations can have real-world implications that continue to affect the sovereignty and human rights of contemporary Indigenous populations.” Although not the first to highlight the importance of developing an epistemological basis for Indigenous theory and methods, Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s book Decolonizing Methodologies (2012.ix) has challenged scholars today to consider the “context in which research problems are conceptualized” and more importantly “the implications of research for its participants and their communities.” If practicing archaeologists seek to accomplish their research goals, they must be cognizant of the colonial history as well as the current state of political affairs of the communities in which they work.

The writing of Watkins (2000) is foundational because he illustrates how the proliferation of U.S. historic preservation laws in the mid to late 1900s and the shift in the practice of archaeology has much to do with Indigenous peoples around the globe asserting their rights to protect, manage and define their own heritage. Since Watkins’ (2000) publication, a number of scholars (Atalay 2006; Bruchac et al. 2010; Nicholas 2010; Silliman 2008; Smith and Wobst 2005) have dedicated entire books to untangling the history, politics, laws, ethics, methods, theories and practice of Indigenous archaeology.

The movement to indigenize archaeology has not advanced without critique. In 2008, Robert McGhee published Aboriginalism and the Problems of Indigenous Archaeology. Although McGhee acknowledged some of the benefits Indigenous
involvement have brought to the field of archaeology, he ultimately questions those who “accede to claims of Aboriginal exceptionalism and incorporate such assumptions into archaeological practice” (2008:580). McGhee was met with criticism (Silliman 2010; Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010), nonetheless, the respondents recognized the underlying value of critiquing this emerging field. McGhee’s critique sparked much-needed discussions, and scholars continue to address challenges and highlight the many benefits of Indigenous archaeology. As Colwell-Chanthaphonh (2012:447) writes: “[i]n the end, success for this paradigm may depend less on the development of a perfect approach, and more on pushing the larger field toward new inclusive methods and theories.”

Both Nicholas and Watkins (2014) have identified four primary categories within which Indigenous archaeology is currently operating. The first category identified is the reactive category, where the participation of Indigenous peoples in archaeology can be viewed as a reaction against Western science and the limitations of traditional archaeological methods. The second category is defined as interpretive, where Indigenous peoples strive for the congruence of oral histories and ethnohistorical sources in the interpretation of the archaeological record (Nicholas & Watkins 2014:3782). The third category is reflexive, where archaeologists seek to engage with descendant communities and incorporate Indigenous values, ethics and culturally appropriate behavior throughout the research process. The fourth is the transformative category, where archaeologists provide concepts and tools relevant to Indigenous communities that can assist them in identifying, protecting and promoting aspects of their heritage (Nicholas & Watkins 2014:3783).
Collectively, the involvement of Indigenous perspectives in the discipline has not only challenged the long-standing colonial legacy of scientific inquiry but it has also driven change that aims to make archaeology more inclusive and responsible to the people with whom we work (Nicholas and Watkins 2014:3783). Margaret Kovach (2009:11) notes, "young people are attracted to Indigenous approaches as well because, I believe, it has to do with a generation seeking ways to understand the world without harming it." Using Indigenous archaeology allows me to critically reflect on my role as a researcher and community member. Although I received my formal archaeological training in a public university system, I also carry with me the values and practices of my ‘ohana (family), my kumu (teachers) and my kaiāulu (community). In this sense, I am not an "outsider" studying a foreign culture, which I have no connection to, but I am studying the past of the very community that has raised me and shaped who I am today. This personal example illustrates how the application of Indigenous methodology and theory will be shaped by place and the researcher. Recognizing the role of community in my personal and academic rearing has greatly influenced my research, especially in a place like Pi‘opi‘o where all permanent residents have been removed from the physical landscape. This reality has brought me to create a framework that would help to begin the process of rebuilding community to help with the long-term stewardship of the area. For this, I have employed the “triple-piko” framework.

“Triple-Piko”- A Theoretical Concept for Rebuilding Community

The triple-piko concept documented by Pukui et al. (1972) describes how ‘Ōiwi perceive ourselves as a link between our past, personified through our connection with
our ancestors, and our future, personified through our descendants. The “triple piko” is not merely a philosophical concept, but one that was ritualized and took a physical form manifested on the human body. The first piko is the fontanel. It is revered and cared for as it is where the benevolent ancestral spirits reside (Pukui et al 1972:182). The umbilical cord is the second piko and includes, the placenta as these serve as the physical link between an individual, the mother, and other living relatives. Special care is paid to an infant’s umbilical cord, and disposal of the dried stump often followed specific family protocols. The genitals are the third piko as they not only brings great pleasure but they transform each person into a progenitor, a creative link in the long chain of human creation (Pukui et al 1972:183). Although the triple-piko concept is often applied to ‘Ōiwi child-rearing practices and rituals, it is also relevant to the protection and care of places.

The triple-piko concept emphasizes both the thought process and actions that venerate not just the present, but also the past and future. It therefore promotes thinking and actions that encourage multi-generational engagement and the concept ensures that plans and actions are anchored simultaneously to the past, present, and future. This type of framework decenters the individual’s goals and instead puts the preservation of place at the center. This framework emphasizes the preservation of place, given that place will outlast current generations as it has outlasted past generations.

In applying the triple-piko concept, I have sought to rebuild a community that is dedicated to the preservation of Pi’opi’o’s history. My definition of community is not one based solely on geographical location, gender, class or age, but one that prioritizes the preservation of place-based knowledge specific to Pi’opi’o. I sought to involve
knowledgeable kūpuna (elders), mākua (parents), ʻōpio (youth) and keiki (children). Engaging multiple generations within our community is not only a long-standing ʻŌiwi method of transmitting knowledge, but it is a vital step in preserving place-based knowledge, and perpetuating a living culture (Kawelu 2014:31).

Collectively, these two theoretical frameworks demonstrate how the value and history of a place can be enhanced when the ethnohistorical record is fused with archaeology and guided by community values. This approach also offers community members an opportunity to take an active role in the representation and management of their heritage. Additionally, given the limited time afforded for this study, this approach has structured my efforts in a way that allows me to continue my work at Piʻopiʻo beyond the scope and timeline of this thesis.

**Methods**

In addition to Nicholas’s (2008) definition of Indigenous archaeology, I draw from specific aspects of Nicholas and Watkins’ (2014) categories of Indigenous archaeology, particularly the interpretive, reflexive and transformative approaches. I combined traditional archaeological and ethnohistorical research techniques with ʻŌiwi protocols. The protocols used in this study were adapted from protocols taught to me by my kumu and by community members with whom I have worked with on past research projects. The implementation of protocols throughout this study follow ʻŌiwi practices such as: noi (asking permission to enter a space), offering pule (prayers) at the onset and end of each workday, connecting and talking with descendants who lived in Piʻopiʻo, giving hoʻokupu (offering) to the ʻāina (land), giving makana (gifts) when meeting community members, use
of low impact and non-destructive archaeological methods and the sharing of research findings with the community throughout the research process. These methods have not only guided my research, but I taught them to the four Wahi Kupuna interns during the Summer 2016 field season.

Given the near erasure of Piʻopiʻo’s ʻŌiwi history, I have deliberately chosen to bring the ʻŌiwi voice to the forefront of this study through the use of Hawaiian language newspaper articles, moʻolelo (stories, history), kaʻao (legendary stories) and Hawaiian Kingdom era land documents and maps. Given the limited number of Hawaiian language resources found during historical research, especially for the Hilo area, I hope the materials presented in this study will serve as a resource for future research efforts. I drew from 19th and 20th-century historical documents accessed at the Hawaiʻi State Archives, Lyman Memorial Museum, Bishop Museum Library & Archives, Hawaiian Mission Houses Archives, the University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa Hamilton Library and the University of Hawaiʻi at Hilo Moʻokini Library. I also utilized online repositories such as the Office of Hawaiian Affair’s Papakilo Database, specifically for their Māhele Records and Hawaiian language newspapers, as well as the State of Hawaiʻi Department of Accounting and General Services’ Land Survey Division’s Registered Maps database. The bulk of the archival research was conducted by myself, however the Wahi Kupuna interns were also trained in archival research.

One oral history interview was conducted with Leslie Lang, the great-great-great granddaughter of the late Henry B. Nalimu. Mr. Nalimu was a respected community leader that resided in Piʻopiʻo during the 19th century. During his later years, Mr. Nalimu helped
to record many place names for the Hilo area. The purpose of the interview was to gather more information about Mr. Nalimu, his family and their relationship to Piʻopiʻo. Although the interview was conducted by myself, the Wahi Kupuna interns assisted with the audio and video recording. Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was obtained through the University of Hawaiʻi and the interview was conducted at Piʻopiʻo in a semi-structured format. A complete transcript was made and sent to the interviewee for review and approval. Portions of the interview are included in Chapter III.

Archaeological pedestrian and aquatic surveys were conducted between June 13-15, 2016. A Special Use Permit was obtained and approved by the Department of Land and Natural Resources, State Parks Division prior to the start of the project. Permit stipulations did not allow subsurface excavations or the removal of any archaeological or cultural deposits. The purpose of these surveys was to document any remaining surface sites in Piʻopiʻo and to train the Wahi Kupuna interns in archaeological survey and site documentation techniques. The pedestrian survey was conducted on the Piʻopiʻo portion of the Wailoa River State Recreational Area. No pedestrian survey was conducted on the sandy, coastal portion of Piʻopiʻo. Given that the majority of the park is a grassy field, interspersed with a few trees, more time was spent investigating the pond margins. All identified features were documented with a Nohopapa Hawaiʻi LLC. Feature Form, GPS points were taken, and the site was photographed. One day was spent completing the aquatic survey using three kayaks and a paddleboard. I assisted with the aquatic survey along with three Wahi Kupuna interns and Kalā Mossman, a long-time resident of Waiākea and fishpond expert, assisted with the aquatic survey. Unfortunately, due to severe rain,
stormy conditions, and limited space on the kayaks, we were not able to take all surveying equipment with us, such as a digital camera, photographic scale, and feature forms. Only a GPS unit was used along with two GoPro waterproof cameras. The challenging weather conditions made the water color extremely dark and difficult to see below the surface. Thus, our attempt to locate underwater sites was thwarted. Due to time constraints and availability of resources, we were not able to conduct another aquatic survey. Only select findings from the archaeological surveys will be included in this research. Detailed findings from the survey have been published and available in Brandt et al. (2016).

I utilized the “triple-piko” framework to guide my community engagement efforts. This framework calls for the inclusion and engagement with multiple generations. Various ‘ōpio (youth), mākua (adult), and kūpuna (elders) assisted with and participated in various components of the research process. Given the impacts of the 1960 tsunami and subsequent relocation of families from the area, a big part of my effort has been identifying former community members or their descendants and creating opportunities for all community members to participate and contribute to this research. Much of the community engagement efforts have focused on sharing the ‘Ōiwi history with a broader audience in both formal and informal settings. Details about the various types of community engagement efforts are discussed in Chapter VI.
CHAPTER III. ʻŌIWI NARRATIVES

ʻŌiwi narratives are a key entry point to understanding ʻŌiwi history, land use and, in the case of Piʻopiʻo, can deepen our understanding of traditional land divisions. I begin this chapter by expounding on the variety and value of ʻŌiwi narratives. Several examples will be presented and discussed in terms of their relevance to the study area. ʻŌiwi narratives take many forms, from moʻokūʻauhau (genealogy), inoa ʻāina (place names), mele and oli (songs and chants), nane (riddles), ʻōlelo noʻeau (proverbs), moʻolelo (stories) and kaʻao (legends) (Kikiloi 2010:78). ʻŌiwi narratives are expansive, detailed, and are sometimes interconnected through particular characters or events. Prior to these narratives being inscribed in textual form, the primary means of transmitting this knowledge was through rote memorization and oral traditions. I emphasize the use of ʻŌiwi oral traditions because they are nuanced with ʻike kūpuna (ancestral knowledge) and perspectives that remain relevant to a living culture. ʻŌiwi scholar, Kekuewa Kikiloi (2012:5) contends that ʻŌiwi narratives also track important social changes.

In his book Mai Paʻa I Ka Leo, ʻŌiwi scholar Puakea Nogelmeier (2010:1) uses the term “discourse of sufficiency” to describe the long-standing use of a small selection of Hawaiian language sources that have been translated into English, to explain Hawaiian culture and history. Nogelmeier (2010:31) refers to this small pool of sources as the “Hawaiian canon” and it includes the writings of 19th and 20th-century historians and scholars such as Samuel M. Kamakau, John Papa ʻĪi, David Malo, Z. Kepelino, Abraham Fornander, and Martha Beckwith. Nogelmeier encourages scholars today to draw from
other sources, like the Hawaiian language newspapers, books, and manuscripts, as a way to broaden our understanding of ‘Ōiwi history and culture.

‘Ōiwi narratives in their many forms function as powerful tools for transmitting multi-generational knowledge and wisdom (Kanahele 1986; Oliveira & Wright 2016). These narratives continue to tie our communities to the distant past by creating a foundation of cultural continuity (Kovach 2009:94). Although these narratives are often centered on the human experience, it is nearly impossible to decontextualize people from a place as each one breathes life and meaning into the other. In this context, the ‘āina serves as a repository layered with human experiences, knowledge, history and serves as the perennial reference point liking each generation to the next (Kikiloi:2010:78). As a result, the naming of a space encapsulates and commemorates the long-remembered history of a place. What names we use when referring to a place reflects important political, social and ideological changes that continue to influence public memory (Alderman 1988:196).

Reclaiming ‘Ōiwi place names for Pi‘opi‘o is an important step in recovering ‘Ōiwi history, memory, and language. This chapter focuses specifically on ka‘ao, mo‘olelo, and inoa ‘āina as a way to understand the formation of Pi‘opi‘o as an ‘ili küpono, and to reveal land use patterns. Since most mo‘olelo and ka‘ao documented the life of the ali‘i, naturally the emphasis is on the various ali‘i who visited or resided in Pi‘opi‘o.

Three mo‘olelo in the form of ka‘ao or mo‘olelo ka‘ao were identified as relating to Pi‘opi‘o (see Table 2). A synopsis of the ka‘ao and mo‘olelo are presented below along with a brief summary of the findings. The stories identified are He Mo‘olelo Ka‘ao no Keaomelemele, Ke Ka‘ao Ho‘oniua Pu‘uwai no Ka-miki and Ka Mo‘olelo O
*Hi‘iakaikapoliopele.* These stories show a direct connection to Pi‘opi‘o via the use of place names within Pi‘opi‘o but never through the name itself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Publication Year</th>
<th>Original place of Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keaomelemele</td>
<td>Moses Manu</td>
<td>Mo‘olelo ka‘ao</td>
<td>9/6/1884-6/27/1885</td>
<td>Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka-Miki</td>
<td>John Wise &amp; John W.H.I Kihe</td>
<td>Ka‘ao</td>
<td>1/8/1914-12/6/1917</td>
<td>Ka Hōkū O Hawai‘i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi‘iakaikapoliopele</td>
<td>Ho‘oulemāhihiehie Bush &amp; Pa‘aluhi</td>
<td>Mo‘olelo Mo‘olelo</td>
<td>1905-1906 1893</td>
<td>Ka Na‘i Aupuni Ka Leo O Ka Lāhui</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special methodologies are used to ensure historical accuracy for orally transmitted knowledge. I utilize Kikiloi’s (2010:80) five criteria for determining the reliability of oral traditions: 1) the researcher should have an emic understanding of cultural context, meaning, and metaphor, 2) the researcher should be fluent in ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i, 3) the researcher should be familiar with the ‘āina as it is a critical point of reference for legitimizing an interpretation, 4) preference should be given to testimonies that were recorded in ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i, 5) preference should be given to testimonies written by ‘Ōiwi. Kikiloi (2010:79) uses the term “fixed text” to describe texts that are reproduced under strict protocols such as mele, oli, and ‘ōlelo no‘eau. These texts are typically memorized verbatim, thus leaving little room for the transmitter to significantly alter the original form. The term free text is used to describe flexible narratives such as mo‘olelo and ka‘ao because they often have “fewer controls that govern their learning and transmission” (Kikiloi 2010:79). Kikiloi points out that historically, academics grounded in the historical method noted that free text often resulted in multiple variations of a story. The implication
is that variations of a story represented inconsistencies, contradictions and ultimately a false account. However, Kikiloi (2010:80) contends that variation in oral traditions enhances the established core traditions and highlights the range of memories preserved within a community. Olivera (2014:23) adds that ‘Ōiwi oral traditions provides contemporary scholars with insight into ancestral culture by revealing the connection that ‘Ōiwi had with their environment. Therefore, as we read through these ‘Ōiwi narratives, we begin the process of understanding Pi’opi’o as our kūpuna did and can then take steps to rekindle our connection to this ‘āina.

**Mo’olelo, Ka’ao, and Mo’oka’ao Defined**

‘Ōiwi narratives, particularly those of the “story” type have been classified by their respective authors into three broad and somewhat loosely defined categories: mo’olelo, ka’ao, and mo’oka’ao (sometimes written as mo’olelo ka’ao). The term mo’olelo, literally translated as “succession of talk,” is a much broader term used to describe any story, tale, myth, history, tradition, literature, or legend (Pukui & Elbert 1986:254). Given the all-encompassing definition of the word mo’olelo, I sometimes use this term when making general reference to all story types. The term ka’ao differs from a mo’olelo in that it is defined as a fanciful legend, or tale (Pukui & Elbert 1986:108). Andrews (1922:231) adds that ka’ao is also a tale of ancient times and is derived from the word ka’a (Andrews 1922:229), which is translated as “to radiate, revolve or to express a continuous or protracted state”. The term mo’oka’ao or mo’olelo ka’ao is also a part of the repertoire of ‘Ōiwi narratives and has been translated as a historical legend (Andrews 1922:441). As oral histories were written down starting in the early 19th century (Nogelmeier 2010:8), ‘Ōiwi
writers often ascribed one of the three types to the stories they authored. In categorizing the narratives (see Table 2) for this study, I have utilized the categories ascribed by their respective authors. Mo‘olelo, especially in the form of ka‘ao and mo‘olelo ka‘ao are timeless narratives embedded with various literary devices such as metaphors and similes (elaborate figurative language), symbolism and poetic allusions (expressions from nature), hyperbole (highly embellished descriptions), and humor (Elbert 1951:345; Kikiloi 2010:79). Defining the various types of mo‘olelo helps us to understand the nature of the composition and more importantly, keeps us critical of its application and interpretation.

He Mo‘olelo Ka‘ao no Keaomelemel

He Mo‘olelo Ka‘ao no Keaomelemel (Ka Nūpepa Kū’oko’a 1884-1885; Manu 2002) describes many ‘Ōiwi traditions like hula, medicine, cloud observations, romance, infidelity and child-rearing. This mo‘olelo ka‘ao also speaks of geographical formations and the establishment of mo‘o (general name for reptiles) throughout Hawai‘i as guardians of wet places (Pukui & Elbert 1986:253). In He Mo‘olelo Ka‘ao no Keaomelemel, the handsome lad Kūkuluokahiki arrives at Kaipalaoa in Hilo One (sandy region of Hilo). News of Kūkuluokahiki’s presence and beauty spreads quickly throughout Hilo. A female named ‘Ohele catches a glimpse of Kūkuluokahiki at Kaipalaoa and she immediately desires to be with him. ‘Ohele returns to her home at the coast of Waiākea and requests that her brother Kanukuokamanu befriend and invite Kūkuluokahiki to her home. Kanukuokamanu departs his sister’s home and walks across the sands of Mauaua and crosses the Waiolama River and heads towards Kaipalaoa. After greeting Kūkuluokahiki, Kanukuokamanu extends the invitation to his new friend and invites him to his sister’s home. The new companions travel
along the coast of Waiākea toward ‘Ohele’s home (Figure 7). After arriving at her home, Kūkuluokahiki shows no interest in ‘Ohele and later departs towards Hilo Palikū and Hāmākua (Manu 2002:28-29).

Figure 7. Route taken by Kūkuluokahiki in the story of Keaomelele. Enhanced portion of Registered Map No. 1561, by Baldwin & Monsarrat ca. 1891
State of Hawai‘i, Department of Accounting and General Services.

Ke Ka‘ao Ho‘oniua Pu‘uwai no Ka-miki

*Ke Ka‘ao Ho‘oniua Pu‘uwai no Ka-miki* (Ka Hōkū O Hawai‘i 1914-1917) is a story of two brothers, Kamiki and Maka’iole who travel around the Island of Hawai‘i. The brothers are guided and empowered by their grandmother Kauluhenuihihikoloiuka to challenge the
island’s most skilled ‘ōlohe (skilled fighters) and kāhuna (priest or experts) in the art of ho‘opāpā (a contest of wit and strength). After defeating the ‘ōlohe and kāhuna from the moku of Puna, the brothers along with another companion named Keahialaka, are encouraged to challenge the ‘ōlohe of Hilo. Chapter XII of this ka‘ao details the brothers’ journey through Hilo. The ali‘i, Waiākeanuikumuhonua sends his runner, Ku‘uahohiloloa around Hilo to announce the holding of an ‘aha mokomoko (fighting competition) at Kalepulepo (see Figure 8 & 9). Īpēloa arrives at Kalepulepo prepared to battle with the brothers. Īpēloa sought to defeat Kamiki through the use of the stroke known as “Ka piko o Wākea”. However, Kamiki’s swift moves thwart Īpēloa’s ability to deliver the killing blow. In addition to defeating Īpēloa, the brothers go on to defeat the ‘ōlohe Kalanakāma‘a, Ka‘ūmana, and Hilo Hanakahī (Maly 1992).
Figure 8. Area of Kalepolepo. Enhanced portion of Registered Map No. 1561, by Baldwin & Monsarrat ca. 1891
State of Hawai‘i, Department of Accounting and General Services.
Ka Moʻolelo O Hiʻiakaikapiopele

Ka Moʻolelo O Hiʻiakaikapiopele (Ka Leo O Ka Lāhui 1893; Hoʻouluumāhiehie 2006) details the journey of Hiʻiakaikapiopele, the youngest sibling of the Pele clan. In this story, Pelehonuamea, the elder sister of Hiʻiakaikapiopele enters into a deep sleep which causes her spirit to temporarily leave her body. Pele’s spirit is captivated by the sound of a pahu (drum). The beat of the pahu takes her spirit to the Island of Kauaʻi where she meets a man named Lohiʻau. Not able to remain with Lohiʻau on Kauaʻi, Pele’s spirit returns to the Island of Hawaiʻi and is reunited with her body. In her desire to seek Lohiʻau, Pele requests the help of her siblings to find Lohiʻau and bring him to her on Hawaiʻi Island.
Hiʻiakaikapoliopoele is the only sibling to accept the task of seeking Lohiʻau. While en route to Kauaʻi, Hiʻiaka departs Puna and heads towards Hilo. Here Hiʻiakaikapoliopoele and her two companions, Wahineʻōmaʻo and Pāʻūopalaʻā arrive at a placed called ‘Ohele. Here the women meet a young female named Papanuiolaka (Bush & Paʻaluhi 1893) and her father named ‘Ohele. Papanuiolaka hears about Hiʻiakaikapoliopoele’s journey and desires to join her party. Hiʻiakaikapoliopoele makes clear to Papanuiolaka that this journey is unlike others, and should she commit to the journey, she cannot turn back and return home. In the story, Hiʻiakaikapoliopoele, with her companions Wahineʻōmaʻo, Pāʻūopalaʻā, and Papanuiolaka, cross the stream of Wailoa and reach the peninsula known as Kanukuokamanu (see Figure 10).

Figure 10. Mouth of Wailoa River with Kanukuokamanu in the foreground and Piʻopiʻo in background. Photo taken from ‘Ohele. Photo by Lokelani Brandt.
Here the women meet a man named Paikaka. Paikaka was known for wearing a malo (loincloth), each side dyed with a different color. Upon seeing the women at Kanukuokamanu, Paikaka lifts his malo and exposes his underside to them. Paikaka's roguish act makes Papanuiolaka reconsider her desire to travel with the women. Papanuiolaka turns to Hiʿiaikaikapoliopele and informs her that she cannot proceed with the journey and will return home. Papanuiolaka crosses the Wailoa River once again, and as she nears her home at ‘Ohele, she transforms into a mound of pāhoehoe (a smooth unbroken type of lava). Hiʿiaikaikapoliopele mourns the loss of her friend by offering the following chant:

**Hawaiian Language**
(Hoʿouluumāhiahie 2006:74)
Nā maha puʻu o Hālaʻi
Hoaka ka lae ʻo Paikaka
Pā ʻia i ke iʻe kuku kua, huaʻi ka ipu wai ʻalaeā

**English Translation**
By Lokelani Brandt
Reposed are the hills of Hālaʻi
An apparition appears at Paikaka
Struck by the tapa-beater, the gourd filled with red ochre dye breaks forth

Hiʿiaikaikapoliopele and her two companions proceed with their journey, passing along the "kai o Waiākea" (coast of Waiākea) heading toward Waiolama (see Figure 11). The women arrive at Waiolama and encounter the "poʻe ʻeʻepa o Waiolama" (extraordinary people of Waiolama). Here they battle with the poʻe ʻeʻepa who take the form of the makani puahiohio (whirlwind). After defeating the extraordinary people of Waiolama, Hiʿiaikaikapoliopele and her companions continue on toward Hilo Palikū (area of Hilo characterized by its cliffs).

This snippet from *Ka Moʻolelo O Hiʿiaikaikapoliopele* suggests that for Hiʿiaka and her companions to travel from ‘Ohele toward Waiolama via the coastal area of Waiākea,
they would have passed through or near the area known today as Pi‘opi‘o. Although the name Pi‘opi‘o is not used in this story, other place names such as Kanukuokamanu, Wailoa, and Waiolama allows us to reconstruct their route.

Figure 11. Route of Hi‘iaka and her companions. Enhanced portion of Registered Map No. 1561, by Baldwin & Monsarrat ca. 1891. State of Hawai‘i, Department of Accounting and General Services.

Summary of Kaʻao

Analyzing the various kaʻao helps to illuminate land use patterns that sometimes predate historical narratives. In He Moʻolelo Kaʻao no Keaomelemele, the characters ʻOhele and her brother Kanukuokamanu, are now preserved and perpetuated as place names. Ke Kaʻao Hoʻoniua Puʻuwai no Ka-miki is famed for associating inoa ʻāina with people and
historic events. We also get a glimpse into the competitive and bellicose nature of Hilo’s ‘ōlohe. This ka‘ao also reveals a number of place names, some which have been maintained into contemporary times, and some not. In this section of the story, the area of Kalepolepo is described as Waiākeanuikumuhonua’s kahua mokomoko (fighting arena). Reference to Kalepolepo as a landed area appears on Registered Map No. 1561, ca. 1891 (see Figure 9) as the area adjacent to the northwest boundary of Pi‘opi‘o. Although referenced in this story as a fighting stroke, the name “Ka piko o Wākea” has also been referenced by Theodore Kelsey (1925b) as the name of the deepest part of the Waiākea fishpond. It is likely that the depression in the middle of the Waiākea pond may have been caused by Úpēloa’s mighty strength during his battle with Kamiki, or that the place name commemorates the battle, given its proximity.

In Ka Mo‘olelo O Hi‘iaikapoliopelo we learn of geologic formations and the qualities of places like ‘Ohele and Wailolama. Although the name Pi‘opi‘o is never used to reference this area, this story references the named waterways and offers an explanation of geologic features. These mo‘olelo emphasize the importance of intimately knowing the landscape as well as the traditional names of prominent landscape features. The bounty of place names recorded by nā kūpuna indicates that they carefully defined spaces and that these names were normalized through repetitive historical recollection. This reminds us that merely relying on the popular names of places will only limit our understanding of a place. Since most of these places remain relatively intact and visible today, we can continue to look at these places and recall their stories. To ensure the persistence of ‘Ōiwi
narratives, it is critical that we maintain the natural environment, as these places serve as the repository of traditional knowledge and experiences.

**Historical Narratives: Piʻopiʻo, He ʻĀina Aliʻi Mai Kahiko Mai**

Between the years 1920-1924, Stephen L. Desha published a series of articles in the *Ka Hōkū O Hawaiʻi*, a Hawaiian language newspaper, about the life of a famous warrior named Kekūhaupiʻo. Not only did Desha provide detailed accounts of Kekūhaupiʻo's life and the lives of other aliʻi, he wrote extensively about a number of events and the places where the events occurred. In describing Piʻopiʻo, Desha (1996:114) writes, "...Piʻopiʻo, a he wahi i noho ʻia nō hoʻi e nā aliʻi mai kahiko mai" (Piʻopiʻo, a dwelling place of chiefs since ancient times). Desha's remarks prompted my interest in understanding which aliʻi resided or visited the area, and how this illustrates the significance of Piʻopiʻo. The following section chronicles the many aliʻi that resided in or visited Piʻopiʻo. Since the purpose of this section is to demonstrate that the area was a chiefly center, I have attempted to include context that is most relevant to the account. However, one of the main challenges with this approach is the loss of detailed historical context. Readers who are interested in more detailed accounts should refer to the cited sources.

ʻUmi & Kulukuluʻa

Samuel Mānaiakalani Kamakau provides the earliest documented account of ruling chiefs arriving and settling in the vicinity of Piʻopiʻo. In the first account, Kamakau (1992) describes the paramount district chiefs ʻUmialiloa, Kulukuluʻa, and his daughter, whose name is never mentioned. Utilizing a 20 year per generation model, ʻUmi’s reign has been estimated to be around the early 1600s (Cordy 2000:205). After defeating his brother
Hākau, ‘Umi travels to Hilo in secrecy to meet and plot a rebellion against Kulukulu’a, the chief of Hilo. Kamakau describes a celebration taking place at Kanukuokamanu (Figure 12), where ‘Umi meets and begins to court the daughter of chief Kulukulu’a (1992:15).

![Figure 12. Kanukuokamanu, gathering place for Hilo’s ali‘i. Enhanced portion of Registered Map No. 1561, by Baldwin & Monsarrat ca. 1891. State of Hawai‘i, Department of Accounting and General Services.](image_url)

At Kanukuokamanu, ‘Umi notices Kulukulu’a’s daughter adorned in feathers and wearing a necklace. Later, ‘Umi approaches the woman and inquires about her necklace:

He ['Umi] asked for the necklace and when she gave it to him, he said, "Is this your necklace of chieftainship?" The woman answered, "Yes, it is. Commoners are not allowed to wear one." ['Umi replied] "This is commonly worn by children and from them up to old women. The pendants (palaoa) of our chiefs
are made of ivory, the teeth of whales. They are fastened to strands of braided human hair." ‘Umi then broke her wiliwili pendant (Kamakau 1992:15).

Upset about the situation, the woman reported the incident to her father, Kulukulu’a. Kulukulu’a ordered his men to capture and bind ‘Umi and his men with ropes. Pi‘imaiwa’a, a companion of ‘Umi, was sent to Waipiʻo and ordered to secure a lei niho palaoa (ivory pendant) within a day, lest ‘Umi and his men be murdered. That day, Pi‘imaiwa’a returned to Hilo with the lei niho palaoa named Nanikoki. It is said that this lei belonged to ‘Umi's father, Līloa. Seeing his father's lei niho palaoa given to the chiefs of Hilo piqued ‘Umi and he vowed to have Nanikoki once again (Kamakau 1992:16). ‘Umi and his men were released. They returned to Waipiʻo and began plotting a war against the chiefs of Hilo. Prepared for battle, ‘Umi and his men trekked from Waipiʻo through the uplands on the slopes of Maunakea and made their way down to Hilo. ‘Umi and his men arrived at the chief’s residence and killed Kulukulu’a, but spared the life of his daughter. ‘Umi managed to obtain his father's lei niho palaoa and gained control over the moku of Hilo (Kamakau 1992:17).

The location of the initial meeting between ‘Umi and chief Kulukulu’a's daughter is described as Kanukuokamanu. Kanukuokamanu is the western peninsula at the mouth of the Wailoa River and is a part of Piʻopiʻo. It is noted that after gaining control over the Island of Hawai‘i, ‘Umi formalized the various land boundaries and separated the various classes of chiefs, priests, and laborers (Beamer 2014:35; Cordy 2000:218; Kamakau 1992:19; Kameʻeleihiwa 1992:27). Although ‘Umi is attributed with formalizing the various land boundaries on the island of Hawai‘i, the name Piʻopiʻo is not mentioned in accounts
predating his reign. This pattern suggest that ‘Umi may have been responsible for formalizing Pi‘opi‘o and giving it the ‘ili kūpono desgination.

**Keli‘ikōloaa‘umi, Keawenuia‘umi and the Rise of the Ī chiefs in Hilo**

After ‘Umialiloa's death, Hawai‘i island fell under the control of ‘Umialiloa’s eldest son, Keli‘ikōlooa‘umi (Cordy 2000:221). Although Keli‘ikōlooa‘umi cared for his gods, priests, and prophets, his reign is often characterized by his mistreatment of the lesser ali‘i and maka‘āinana, something his father ‘Umialiloa had advised against. His cruel acts were the main reason his people rebelled, which eventually led to his death (Kamakau 1992:35). Both Kamakau (1992) and Fornander (1880) offer different versions regarding the succession of the kingdom after the death of Keli‘ikōlooa‘umi (Cordy 2000:224). Nonetheless, his brother Keawenuia‘umi became the sole ruler of the Island of Hawai‘i and later established Hilo as one of his chiefly residences. However, it is unclear from the account exactly where in Hilo he established his chiefly residence. Keawenuia‘umi also took steps to consolidate his power by replacing Keli‘ikōlooa‘umi’s chiefs with a new line of district chiefs (Cordy 2000:222). For the moku (district) of Hilo, Keawenuia‘umi appointed his half-brother Kumalae, which effectively established the Ī genealogy as the ruling chiefs of Hilo, and eventually, much of east Hawai‘i. The lineage of ruling chiefs for the Island of Hawai‘i was thus essentially reset. In addition to appointing new chiefs, Keawenuia‘umi continued to consolidate this power through marrying and mating with other high ranking chiefesses, and ensuring his children did the same. Keawenuia‘umi wisely married one of his daughters to the chief Makua, who was the son of his half-brother Kumalae (Cordy 2000:222). This marriage solidly connected Keawenuia‘umi’s genealogy to the Ī genealogy.
Although these accounts are not explicit about Pi‘opi‘o’s role in the rise of the ‘ī chiefs, we do know that the reign of these chiefs marked an important shift, which transformed Hilo into a political nexus.

**Lonoma‘aikānaka**

Kamakau mentions an account of the chiefess Lonoma‘aikānaka visiting Kanukuokamanu. Lonoma‘aikānaka was the daughter of Ahua‘ī, a high ranking ‘ī chief (Fornander 1880:129). She was also the wife of ali‘i nui (paramount chief) Keawe‘ikekahiali‘iokamoku, the son of Kanaloakapulehu and grandson to Keawenuia‘umi. To them was born the high chief Kalaninui‘iamamao, for whom the Kumulipo chant was composed, and father of Kalani‘ōpu‘u, Keōuakalanikupuapāikalaninui and Keawema‘uhili (Kamakau 1992:76). According to Kamakau, Lonoma‘aikānaka lived in secrecy for a short time in the uplands of ʻŌla‘a, Puna. She had been living on pohole, kikawaiō (native varieties of ferns) and greens from the pōpolo (*Solanum americanum*) plant. Although she had been living on ferns and greens, she craved fish. Having heard of the abundance of fish available at the coast of Hilo, she and her companions traveled to Waiākea and "passed close to Ka-nuku-o-ka-manō, where the royal residences of Moku and his chiefs were."

Kamakau continues "... Lono-ma‘a-i-kānaka, had been living in Hilo together with most of the chiefs who had the *kapu pūlo‘ulo‘u*” (Kamakau 1991:155).

The spelling of the name Kanukuokamanu varies on maps and in written documents. In some instances, the name is spelled Kanukuokamanu (the-beak-of-the-bird) and Kanukuokamanō (the-snout-of-the-shark). In either case, the descriptions that accompany both place names match the area where Wailoa River meets Hilo Bay.
Piʻopiʻo served as an important political center from the reign of the high chiefs Alapaʻinuiakaua (ca. 1740-1760) down to Kamehameha I (ca. 1740-1819), approximately four or five generations (Cachola-Abad 2000:168; Cordy 2000:278). Alapaʻinui was the son of the chiefess Kalanikauleleiaiwi who was a descendant of Keawenuiaʻumi. During the reign of these chiefs, the name Piʻopiʻo is consistently used to describe this area. Following the death of the aliʻi nui, Keaweikekahialiʻiokamoku (ca. 1740), it is said the Island of Hawaiʻi was in a state of warfare (Cordy 2000:260). Within a generation after Keaweikekahialiʻiokamoku’s death, the Island of Hawaiʻi eventually fell under the control of the aliʻi nui Alapaʻi. Alapaʻi requested that a young Kalaniʻōpuʻu and Keouakalanikupuapāikalaninui join his royal court. Alapaʻinui began training his two nephews in warfare and leadership, however, his nephews knew that Alapaʻinui held little regard for them (ʻĪʻī 1959:3; Kamakau 1992:66). Although Alapaʻinui continuously shifted locations for his royal residence, as was custom, he did establish Waiolama as the main center for his retinue, which is less than a half a mile to the west of Piʻopiʻo (Cordy 2000:278).

During the reign of Alapaʻinui, Paiʻea (Kamehameha I) was born in Kohala to his mother Kekuʻiapōiwa II. There are varying accounts of who Kamehameha’s biological father was, as it was believed that both Kahekili, chief of Maui, and Keouakalanikupuapāikalaninui were his fathers (Fornander 1880:136; Kamakau 1992:66). The term poʻolua (two heads) refers to “double parenthood” and is often used generally to describe multiple potential fathers, which is a common characterization of
Kamehameha's paternal lineage (Handy & Pukui 1998:54). Keawemaʻuhili along with the other high chiefs did not react kindly to the birth of Kamehameha, and it is said that he uttered the words, "[e] ʻōʻū i ka maka o ka wauke oi ʻōpiopio" (nip off the leaf bud of the wauke plant while it is tender) (Desha 1996:44), which suggests killing the infant, lest he grows to overpower the older chiefs. The chiefs then ordered their warriors to seek out the newborn and kill him, however, their plans were unsuccessful (Desha 1996:44; Pukui 1983:37). As a child, Kamehameha remained in the protection of his guardians, and later he joined the army of Alapaʻinui.

Some time later, while Alapaʻinui was stationed at Waiolama, a sick Keōuakalanikupuapāikalaninui was taken to Piʻopio where he eventually died (ca. 1752). Prior to his death, he requested his half-brother Kalaniʻōpuʻu join him to discuss the political affairs of the island. Keōua warned Kalaniʻōpuʻu about their uncle Alapaʻinui, saying "[t]ake heed, for Alapaʻi has no regard for you or for me, whom he has reared" (Kamakau 1992:75). Aware of Alapaʻinui’s political standing, Keōuakalanikupuapāikalaninui advised Kalaniʻōpuʻu to take Kamehameha from Alapaʻinui's court and continue his training, for he "would have no father to care for him" (ʻĪʻī 1959:3) and that Kalaniʻōpuʻu would flourish because of Kamehameha's abilities. Keōua eventually died at Piʻopio. Many chiefs were present at this death, including, Keaweʻōpala, son of Alapaʻinui, Kameʻeiamoku, Kamanawa, Keʻeaumoku, and Keaweʻheulu. Shortly after Keōua's passing, Kalaniʻōpuʻu situated a war canoe between Piʻopio and Kalepolepo, where he then attempted to capture Kamehameha from Alapaʻinui (Kamakau 1922:72). Kalaniʻōpuʻu was unsuccessful, and he barely escaped with the help of a canoe that had been made ready.
by a chief and warrior named Puna. Although Kalaniʻōpuʻu escaped, this was seen as an act of rebellion against Alapaʻinui (Kamakau 1992:76). It wasn't until the end of Alapaʻinui's reign that Kalaniʻōpuʻu gained control over the districts of Kaʻū and Puna (Abad 2000:168).

Upon Alapaʻinui's passing, his son Keaweʻōpala reigned as aliʻi nui of the Island of Hawaiʻi along with Kalaniʻōpuʻu. Keaweʻōpala's rule was brief, as he was killed in a battle with Kalaniʻōpuʻu's army (ʻĪi 1959:6). This left the Island of Hawaiʻi under the sole leadership of Kalaniʻōpuʻu. Kamehameha was then sent to live with his uncle Kalaniʻōpuʻu, and his cousin Kīwalaʻō (son of Kalaniʻōpuʻu), in Kaʻū. Upon Kalaniʻōpuʻu's passing, his chiefdom was split between his sons, Kīwalaʻō and Keōuakūʻahuʻula, and his nephew Kamehameha. In following the traditional kālaiʻāina process (redistribution of the land), Kīwalaʻō redistributed the lands of Kalaniʻōpuʻu to his chiefs, however, some chiefs were dissatisfied with the result. In addition to other lands, Keōuakūʻahuʻula requested to have the ahupuaʻa of Waiākea and Keaʻau, as these ahupuaʻa were described as places abundant with food (ʻĪi 1959:14; Kamakau 1992:120). However, Keōuakūʻahuʻula's request was denied, and he returned home to Kaʻū to prepare for battle. Kīwalaʻō was eventually killed in the battle of Mokuʻōhai in Keʻei, Kona, which left Kamehameha, Keawemaʻuhili, and Keōuakūʻahuʻula as the last standing chiefs of the island. It has also been recorded that during this time Keawemaʻuhili and his wife Ululani established themselves at Piʻopiʻo (Desha 2000:76).

Kamehameha I

Keōuakūʻahuʻula and Keawemaʻuhili would be the remaining aliʻi ʻai moku (district chiefs) on the Island of Hawaiʻi next to Kamehameha. Kamehameha managed to gain the
support of the Kona and Kohala chiefs, however, he sought to expand his kingdom to include all of Hawai‘i. Kamehameha started his war campaign on the neighbor islands and had even received support from Keawema‘uhili during a raid on Maui against Kahekili. Sensing a potentially dangerous alliance, Keōuakūʻahuʻula made war on Keawema‘uhili and killed him at ‘Alae in Hilo. Keōua's victory allowed him to gain control over Hilo and all of its resources (Kamakau 1992:151). Hearing the news of Keawema‘uhili’s death, Kamehameha returned to the Island of Hawai‘i to make war with Keōua. This resulted in the arduous battle known as Koapāpa’a, which took place in east Hāmākua. Neither was victorious in this battle, and both sides retreated to their lands. It is said that Keōua returned to Hilo and that "the fat mullet of Waiākea and Piʻopiʻo became theirs" (Kamakau 1992:152). While en route to Kaʻū, Keōua and his men were nearing Kapāpala when Kīlauea erupted explosively in an event named Keoneheleleʻi (ca. 1790), leaving much of his army decimated from the ashfall (Moniz-Nakamura 2003:1). After this incident, a prophet told Keōua that Pele decimated his army because he had failed to give the mullet of Waiākea as offerings to Pele and her sister Hiʻiaikaikapiopele (Kamakau 1992:152).

Kamehameha would meet his cousin in their final battle at Kawaihae. Upon the completion of Puʻukoholā heiau (ca. 1791), Kamehameha invited his cousin Keōua to the dedication of the heiau. Upon reaching the shores of Pelekāne Bay, Keōua was killed and offered up on the heiau of Puʻukoholā (Kamakau 1992:157). The victory over Keōua left Kamehameha as the sole ruler of the Island of Hawai‘i (ʻĪi 1959:15). After 1791, Kamehameha established Hilo as his capital and claimed Piʻopiʻo for himself, where he thereby gave Piʻopiʻo to his wife Kaʻahumanu (Cordy 2000:355).
With each successive battle (not all have been mentioned here), Kamehameha continued to refine his war tactics, strategies, and equipment. Realizing the power of being well equipped, especially with canoes, Kamehameha sought his aunt, the chiefess Ululani. Ululani was the wife of Hilo ali‘i Keawema‘uhili. Kamehameha requested her permission to utilize the resources of Hilo to help with the construction of his fleet of war canoes, known as the Peleleu (Desha 2000:301). It is said that Kamehameha stationed himself at Waiākea while some 800 canoes were under construction (Yent 1998:6). According to Kamakau (1992:187), the Peleleu fleet consisted of some 800 canoes that were made up of two single hulled canoes lashed and joined together with a platform at the stern. These canoes were also outfitted with a sail and mast rig that allowed for swift travel across the ocean.

Kaʻahumanu, Kapʻolani & the First Christian Mission Station

In 1823, Reverend William Ellis and his exploring party arrived in Hilo in search of a suitable location to establish their second Christian mission station. After several months of traveling around the Island of Hawaiʻi, the exploring party identified Waiākea as a suitable place for establishing their station (Ellis 1917). While visiting Waiākea, Ellis and party were hosted by Maaro (Maʻalo), the chief of Waiākea (Ellis 1917:225).

Through the efforts of Kaʻahumanu (one of Kamehameha I wives), a large traditional thatched house was constructed near the present Hilo Iron Works building. This building served as the first structure for Hilo’s missionaries and the resulting Haili Church congregation. The building was dedicated on May 19, 1824, and accommodated approximately 2,000 people. The structure was built with posts set in the ground. The rafters were lashed with cordage made from coconut and then thatched with sugar cane
leaves and pili grass (*Heteropogon contortus*), and edged with ferns. It was also noted that Waiākea was a favorable place for procuring timbers, as the forest was within three or four miles of the station (Lyman 1942:4). During November of 1824, after receiving complaints from the missionaries that some of the Hilo chiefs were not helpful to their efforts, the high chiefess Kapi‘olani (daughter of Hilo chief Keawema‘uhili) paid a visit to the Waiākea mission station to investigate the matter (Lyman 1942:6). During this same trip, Kapi‘olani traveled to Kīlauea where she boldly professed her new faith in front of the deity Pele honuamea.

Although the missionaries found Waiākea to be a suitable location, they were met with opposition from some of the Hilo chiefs, in particular, Ma‘alo and Pi‘opi‘o. This is the first mention of Pi‘opi‘o as a chiefess, however, little information is documented about her life. According to Kamakau (1992:284), Ma‘alo and his wife Pi‘opi‘o were two ali‘i noted for being reserved with granting land. In particular, while visiting Hilo, Kauikeaouli and his council of chiefs were hosted by Ma‘alo and Pi‘opi‘o who offered them only food, but no land, as custom required (Kamakau 1992:284; Kame‘elehiwa 1992:88). On June 22, 1827, Reverend Samuel Ruggles reportedly had a dispute with Ma‘alo and Pi‘opi‘o over land boundaries. According to Levi Chamberlain (1822-1849a:31), Ma‘alo reportedly claimed that Mr. Ruggles’ land extended onto his property and thus prevented their use of several kalo plots. Levi Chamberlain, the mission’s secular agent, complained of Pi‘opi‘o’s opposition to the mission noting “[i]t is evident from this that the business of learning is becoming to the natives an irksome business. Piopio the head woman is thought to be an opposer to that which is good” (Chamberlain 1822-1849b:2).
The growing congregation prompted the missionaries to begin looking for a second station location. Meanwhile, the Waiākea mission station continued to be used for meetings until the structure collapsed in 1828 (Lyman 1942:7). As the church congregation grew in size, it attracted many Hawaiian families one of which was Henry B. Nalimu and his family. In 1840, the Nalimu family relocated from their family home in Kihalani, Laupāhoehoe to Piʻopio. At the time of the family’s relocation to Hilo, Mr. Nalimu was only five years old (Ke Alaka‘i O Hawai‘i 1931; Lang 2016). Henry Nalimu was a descendant of the famed ʻĪ chief who served as one of Kamehameha’s generals. ʻĪ was noted for his efforts in leading Kamehameha’s army of ʻĪ to victory. In 1857, Henry Nalimu became the assistant reverend for the church ʻEkalesia o Hilo and worked under Reverend Titus Coan. In 1871, Nalimu and William B. Kapu traveled to the Gilbert Islands to assist and further the mission work already taking place there (Ke Alaka‘i o Hawai‘i 1931). After his return from the Gilbert Islands, Henry Nalimu spent the remainder of his life at Piʻopio. One of Nalimu’s great contributions was his documentation of inoa ʻāina and moʻolelo specific to Hilo. Nalimu often spent many hours with Hawaiian culture and language enthusiast and photographer Theodore Kelsey (Lang 2016). Together, they documented many inoa ʻāina and their associated stories. Kelsey and Nalimu’s work will be presented in the Inoa ʻĀina section of this chapter.

Ruth Keʻelikōlani

Historical documents also show that the high chiefess Ruth Keʻelikōlani had a residence in Piʻopio. Her compound was documented on Registered Map No. 1561, ca. 1891 (Figure 13 & 14) and has also been referenced in the Boundary Commission
Testimony given by Kapu in 1874 (see Boundary Commission Testimony section). Her compound was situated along the northwest boundary of Pi‘opi‘o and was located near the Waiolama River.

Figure 13. Home of Governess Ruth Ke‘elikōlani. Enhanced portion of Registered Map No. 1561, by Baldwin & Monsarrat ca. 1891. State of Hawai‘i, Department of Accounting and General Services.
Figure 14. Close up of Keʻelikōlani’s compound on enhanced portion of Registered Map No. 1561, ca. 1891. State of Hawai‘i, Department of Accounting and General Services.

The caption attached to the photograph from the Bishop Museum indicate this compound was named Waiolama and, based on Kapu’s 1874 Boundary Commission testimony contained a large home, a smoke house and the property was marked with a grove of bamboo. Two historical photographs were located, one at the Bishop Museum (see Figure 15) showing both the home and the bamboo grove located behind the home, and another at the Lyman Museum (see Figure 16) showing the Governess’ home with Waiolama River in the foreground. A notice published in the Hawaiian language newspaper Ka Nūpepa Kūʻokoʻa on May 26, 1877, describes the impact of a tsunami on the governess’s home. The notice reads:

Mawaena o na hale i komohia e ke kai hoee o Hilo o ka hale kekahi o ke Alii R. Keelikolani, a ua pulumi pu ia me na lako o loko.

(A tsunami filled the homes, one of which belonged to the Aliʻi R. Keʻelikōlani, and the contents within were swept out.)

Today, all surface remains of Ruth Keʻelikōlani’s home have been erased.

Figure 16. Keʻelikōlani's home with Waiolama River in foreground. Photographer unknown, n.d. Lyman Museum.
**Historical Narrative Summary**

A review of both ‘Ōiwi and historical narratives indicate the Pi’opi’o area was an important political center, especially after the reign of ‘Umi. Prior to ‘Umi’s reign, we see specific locations, like Kanukuokamanu, identified as a gathering area for Hilo’s chiefly class. The absence of the name Pi’opi’o from historical narratives predating ‘Umi’s reign suggests that a land division occurred there during or after his reign. ‘Umi’s ability to divide the land and stratify the various classes of people resulted in the transformation and intensification of land and aquatic resources. Pi’opi’o continued to be occupied, and functioned as an ʻili kūpono after ‘Umi’s reign and well into the 1800s. The rise of Pi’opi’o as an ʻili kūpono also coincides with the rise of the ʻĪ lineage of chiefs and the expansion of their domain from Kaʻū, Puna, into the moku of Hilo and Hāmākua. Several ʻōlelo noʻeau characterizes the ʻĪ chiefs as fierce and steadfast and notes their autonomous nature (Pukui 1983:31, 190). Keawenuiaʻumi’s efforts to consolidate his power would begin to fuse the Keawe lineages of Kona with the ʻĪ lineage of Hilo, Puna, and Kaʻū (Cordy 2000:244). By the time, Kamehameha I rose to power in the late 1700s, the ruling lineages had shifted again, and the ʻĪ lineage was severely threatened, especially after the death of one of the few remaining ʻĪ chiefs, Keōuakūʻahuʻula at Puʻukoholā heiau (ca. 1791) (Kamakau 1992:158). The ʻōlelo noʻeau “He hālau loa na ʻĪ” or “A longhouse belonging to ʻĪ” (Pukui 1983:65) describes the wise and generous chief named ʻĪ who took up residence in Hilo. ʻĪ was noted for having a hālau (longhouse) in Hilo called ‘Īhālau and a fish station in the sea called ‘Īko’a (Pukui 1983:65).
Pi’opi’o is also well-described during the reign of Kamehameha I as being an important center during his mission to conquer and unify all Hawai’i under his rule. Without permission from his aunt Ululani and her husband Keawema’uhili to harvest timbers from the uplands of Waiākea, and to solicit the skill of Hilo’s canoe carvers, Kamehameha’s story of conquest may have had a different outcome. The fishponds in this area were also an important food resource that fed his retinue while his fleet of peleleu canoes were under construction.

The ability of Hilo’s ali’i to maintain the sanctity of this area appears to have been challenged with the arrival of the first missionaries. Land disputes over access to kalo plots and the lack of ali’i assistance to establish the mission suggest that the ali’i of Hilo did not easily assimilate to the new Christian ways. Had Queen Ka’ahumanu and Queen Kapi’olani not intervened in the matter, the establishment of Pi’opi’o as the first Christian mission post in East Hawai’i would have been foiled. Examining historical narratives has been useful in highlighting major social and political changes in Pi’opi’o and Hilo.

Inoa ʻĀina: Place Names

The study of inoa ʻāina offers another opportunity to understand ʻŌiwi history. Just as physical places act as repositories of human experiences and knowledge, inoa ʻāina are the vessels that carry the history of a place from one generation to the next. Inoa ʻāina serve as a mnemonic device as they trigger the recollection of history, and they embody spiritual and environmental knowledge. Inoa ʻāina are also deeply connected to ʻŌiwi identity, because a personal introduction also includes your connection to a given place. The detailed manner in which ʻŌiwi characterized and named the naturally formed as well
as the built environment is staggering. However useful place names may be, they are also contested. Inoa ‘āina are sometimes intentionally or unintentionally forgotten, misspelled, omitted from maps, or changed altogether. Although the focus of this thesis is not to discuss the contested nature of inoa ‘āina, it is important to remain critical of the rhetoric of contested landscapes and its association with place names. The following section expands on the place names located in and around Pi‘opi‘o.

We begin this section by expanding on the meaning of the place name of Waiākea, the name of the ahupua‘a in which Pi‘opi‘o is situated. In its most literal form, the name Waiākea has been translated as “broad waters” (Pukui et al. 1974:220). Waiākea is also the name of a kalo variety (Pukui & Elbert 1986:377). According to the story of Ka-miki (1914-1917), the ahupua‘a of Waiākea received its name from the chief Waiākea-nui-kumu-honua. In my visits to Pi‘opi‘o in both the wet and dry seasons, freshwater is ever-present, filling in large depressions and attracting a variety of life. During the wet months, approximately November through April, the rivers, ponds, and streams are swollen and sometimes cause serious flooding. During the dry months, approximately May through October, water is still present in the main waterways, however, it also floats thickly in the air in the form of humidity. The continuous presence of freshwater in the area is certainly embodied in the name Waiākea.

The name Pi‘opi‘o also warrants a detailed explanation. The word pi‘o has been defined by Elbert & Pukui (1986:331) as an arc, bend or curve. However, it is also a reference to chiefly rank that resulted when a child was born to a full blooded aristocratic true brother and sister who possessed the kapu moe (taboo requiring complete
prostration). Offspring born under these strict and sacred aristocratic mating practices were referred to as nī’aupi’o (looped coconut midrib). If a brother and sister of nī’aupi’o rank came together and bore a child, their mating and the child was considered a pi’o, as it represented the bending of the genealogy back onto itself (Davenport 1994:22). The pi’o child’s rank was superior to his parents who were of nī’aupi’o rank (Davenport 1994:23).

To emphasize or stress the meaning of a word, it is common in the ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i for words to be repeated twice, as in the name Pi’opi’o. Esoterically, the name can refer to the arched shape of the land division. However, on that level, the name implies the area’s chiefly occupation.

In addition to the name Pi’opi’o, additional inoa ‘āina were recorded in and around the Pi’opi’o area in 1925 by Hawaiian culture and language enthusiast and photographer, Theodore Kelsey. On June 25, 1925, Mr. Kelsey ventured around Hilo with Mrs. Mary Kaoulionalani Pahio and her brother Kahauolopua of Keaukaha (Kelsey 1925a). Starting at the junction of Lihiwai Street and Kamehameha Avenue, the party recorded many inoa ‘āina along the Waiākea peninsula, Mokuola, and the Keaukaha coastline. Mr. Kelsey and Mrs. Pahio went on to record more inoa ‘āina around the Wailoa river, the Waiākea fishponds and Pi’opi’o. The notes generated from this visit indicate that Mr. Kelsey spoke to Henry B. Nalimu (see Figure 17), a descendant of ‘Ī, and long-time resident of Pi’opi’o (Ke Alaka‘i O Hawai‘i 1931). According to Leslie Lang (2016), the great-great-great granddaughter of Mr. Nalimu, in 1840 the family relocated to Pi’opi’o because they had family already residing in the area.
Mr. Kelsey produced two separate documents with place name information. These documents have been transcribed and included below. The first document (1925a) describes the trip Mr. Kelsey took with Mrs. Pahio, and the second document (1925b) is a list of place names with some descriptions. It appears that Mr. Kelsey then recorded Mr. Nalimu’s thoughts on the place names collected during his trip with Mrs. Pahio, as Mr. Nalimu’s notes were handwritten onto the typed document. The notes by Mr. Nalimu have been italicized for clarification. Within the brackets are my own translations and notes.
Specific place names have been bolded and underlined for emphasis. Table 3 through 6 contains a transcription of Mr. Kelsey’s notes.

Kaouli took dinner with me and then we went to learn the names about the Waiakea Pond, starting in on the E. side of the Wailoa River going up as far as the Filipino Strike Camp and finishing our names from there. Niu-ulā is a cave in back of the mauka side of the rear of Hilo Iron Works, about the middle of the stream, in front of a small promontory. From here to the RR bridge the land is Niu-ulā.

Ki’o-pua (pond for raising fish-fry (pua) till they are lau ‘alo 2 or 3 in. long) where Iron Works is. A little pond mauka of the I.W. [Iron Works] is the boundary of Ki’opua and Kaholoina which extends to Po’oke’oke’o (burial place) makai [seaward]. Nalimu: Aia ma waho o ka loko o Waiakea oia ma laila na ki’o pua kahi e ho’oholo ai i ka pua ‘anae a nuni a hokomo i ka loko o Waifakea. ‘O ko’u mau kaikuaana o Kuahopu a me Niihau o laua na konohiki o Waiakea. [Nalimu: Located outside of the Waiakea fishpond are the stock ponds where the mullet fry run and raised until big, where they are then placed into the Waiakea Pond. My older brothers Kuahopu and Niihau are both the konohiki of Waiakea.]

Kioloa (where people went ashore after wading Kaholoina, the crossing some people were tall, loa, which perhaps explains name) promontory and cove. Niu’ula he ulu nui mauka aku o Kaholoina. Mauka mai o Kaholoina, Kalaeoku’ihili. [At Niu’ula is a large breadfruit grove located upland of Kaholoina. Upland from Kaholoina is Kalaeoku’ihili.]

Hanakahi (name of chief from which Hilo is called Hilo Hanakahi) a little elevation on Waiakea side of Kioloa, Hanakahi lived there. Across road by big mango. Makai aku o Niu’ula aia o Hanakahi. (Seaward of Niu’ula is Hanakahi) (Kelsey 1925a).

Once at the Wailoa and Waiakea fishpond area, Kelsey continued to document more place names. Table 3 through 6 are Kelsey’s (1925b) descriptions for inoa ‘āina recorded around the Wailoa River and Waiakea fishponds.

Table 3. Inoa ‘Āina for Wailoa River and Waiakea Fishponds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inoa ‘Āina</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kuahua</td>
<td>A stone in the river near the end of a sampan building shed. Kuahua was sometimes a woman and sometimes a shark. Her human body was buried between two coconut-trees on the opposite side of the sampan building shed. If anyone goes there with red clothes he faints and dreams of the woman. He will revive directly if someone chews up a bit of mau’u ‘aki’aki [‘aki’aki grass], which may be obtained on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the little promontory of Ku‘ihili, just downstream. You mustn’t bath [bathe] in the river with red clothes until you are beyond Ku‘ihili. At low tide when the top of the stone was above water the shark’s feed [fed], ‘awa, sugarcane, bananas, etc. was set on top of the stone. This kupua shark woman was killed by Pele as were other akus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ka-lae-Ku‘ihili</td>
<td>The first promontory on Waiakea side below the sluicegate (mākāhā) known as Umi, for King Umi a Liloa. Hili kukui [kukui bark] for staining nets and kapa red was pounded there. There was a little pond there, now dug away. In the stream, there are two unnamed holes filled with anae, aholehole and other fish on mauka side. O ka makaha mua oia o Umi (2) Pi‘ikea (3) Hua-a (4) Halauwai (5) Ka-ohio. [The first sluice gate is named ‘Umi (2) Pi‘ikea (3) Hua-a (4) Halauwai (5) Ka ‘Ōhi‘a].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanukuokamanu</td>
<td>Same name as peninsula on Hilo side of mouth of Wailoa River, promontory across from Kuahua. The pond of Wai‘eli, dug for raising fish-fry is on the land of Kanukuokamanu. Aole lohe o Nalimu. [Not heard by Nalimu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laukapalili</td>
<td>The next promontory. There is a hole in the water at the end of this point. By camp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka-lahu</td>
<td>Promontory beyond Laukapalili. Stayed at camp and got names.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paepae</td>
<td>Long cove beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lae O Kaohe</td>
<td>Pāhoehoe promontory beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lae O Nanahu</td>
<td>Rocky point-- pāhoehoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka-lima-alae</td>
<td>Spring by Waiakea warehouse. The stumps of ancient coconut trees may still be seen in the water there, showing how the land has sunk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka-puna-kea</td>
<td>Long pond of spring-water (also name of spring) by Waiakea Mill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wai-ahole</td>
<td>Pond, where we saw a little unpainted Chinese house from Camp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohouli</td>
<td>Pond. Ulu o Namu breadfruit grove at lower end of Mohouli pond where now are fig and banana trees seen from Camp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane-kapa</td>
<td>Land by big red house and two mango trees. Kahī e pilī ana i ke ka‘e kai oia o Kanekapa a ma luna aku oia wahi oia o Kaipalaoa kahi ho‘olulu ka‘aahi. Kane-kapa, he kanoa kahi e kapala ia ai ke kapa. [Place adjoining the water’s edge is Kanekapa, and above that place is Kaipalaoa, the meeting place for the trains. Kane-kapa is a hollow where tapa was stamped]. Aia ke pilī la ma waho o ka loko o Waiakea. Kanekapa aia i Hilo kahi hoolulu kaaahi. [Located adjacent to the outside of Waiakea. Kanekapa is located in Hilo where the trains meet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka-puka-wai</td>
<td>Mouth of Waiakea Pond.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hua’i-niu  A long lake that runs to Ka-ohia, the other mouth of Waiakea pond. Ka-ohia (hoomoo ia ka makaha me ke kua ohia) [mākāhā fitted with hewed ʻōhiʻa] is the fifth and last makaha, named for a wife of Umi as are the others, Piikea, the large second makaha, lock with a gate at each end, Hua-a (moho, bird; a, ua hoʻohāiike ka ūʻi me ka ʻāʻana o ke ahi) [and whose beauty was compared to the blaze of the fire], Halau-wai (hale no ka lokomaikaʻi) [house for the generous], 4th makaha. Men were summoned to cut the timbers for these makahas. When the timbers were laid there was a feast.

Makole  Where Umi and his son Maalo lived just on makai side of Piikea. There is a fish box there called Umi.

Hau-maka-puu  Where red house by mango tree is a little below Dranga Camp on other side. The servants and lake guards (kiaʻi loko) lived here. There are some stone piles (puu pohaku) here.

Luʻae  A squid-stone near three coconut trees and a red house across from Dranga Camp.

Piko O Wakea  Spring in the middle of the upper part of Waiakea pond.

Ka-imu-ki  A fish-house made of a pile of stones in a deep place in the river by Puka-wai, now filled with mud perhaps. When you dive for fish here you see a rainbow in the water.

Ka-iʻa-nui  Cave of a black shark of this name has hale [house] on E. side of river across from Iron Works perhaps about 50 yards from the RR [Railroad] bridge beyond the landing. This shark was related to the Namauʻu family who lived where Matson house is, south of tracks on Waiakea side of street. Aole lua mano ma Kalepolepo, he mau puaʻi wai wale no. Nalimu. Aole paha hanai o Kuhaimoana malaila. Mai Keaau mai ka makuahine o Ka-ouli. [There is no shark hole at Kalepolepo, just springs. Nalimu. Kuhaimoana was not likely raised there. Ka-ouli’s mother is from Keaau.]

Table 4. Inoa ʻāina specific to Mohouli fishpond.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inoa ‘Āina</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ka-imu-ki</td>
<td>He puai wai loko o Mohouli. [a freshwater spring in Mohouli]. A lua moo [reptile pit] in front of La-la-kea’s (formerly Wise’s) house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka-lihi-wai</td>
<td>A hole in the land by Korean shoemaker’s, on opp. side, from La-la-kea’s, now filled perhaps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opae-nui</td>
<td>A large hole between Waiahole and Mohouli ponds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Inoa ʻāina specific to Waiahole fishpond.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inoa ‘Āina</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiʻo-pua</td>
<td>Pond on east side of Waiahole where Chinese raises gold-fish.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lua-ko’ako’a  Where the shark Ku-hai-moana came into the pond. He was reared in Kalepolepo pond, from which he made his way to other ponds through underground passages and went to the island of Ka-ʻula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inoa ʻĀina</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ku-hai-moana</td>
<td>Hole where the shark of that name was born in front of the two mango trees on the Puna side of Kalepolepo pond.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the list of inoa ʻāina generated by Kelsey (1925a; 1925b), I’ve attempted to relocate these places (see Figure 18). Given the drastic changes in landscape as well as the removal of landmarks mentioned in the descriptions, not all names listed above have been relocated and therefore have not been included in this map. Relocating all of the place names mentioned in Kelsey’s (1925a and 1925b) documents requires further research.
Figure 18. Enhanced portion of Registered Map No. 1561, by Baldwin & Monsarrat ca. 1891 showing inoa 'āina listed by Kelsey (1925a and 1925b). State of Hawai‘i, Department of Accounting and General Services. Place names generated by Lokelani Brandt, 2017.
CHAPTER IV. MĀHELE ‘ĀINA

The Māhele ‘Āina, or simply Māhele, refers to the transformation of Hawai‘i’s traditional land tenure system to one based on the capitalistic model that resulted in the award of alodial titles to land to the mō‘ī (crown), aupuni (government), ali‘i/konohiki (chiefs) and native tenants (Hommon 2013:17; Kelly 1980:57, Kuykendall 1938:269; Preza 2010:66). Carlos Andrade (2008:70) notes that Western historians, many of whom defined and interpreted Hawaiian society based on their own history and experiences, often use the term feudal to describe the traditional land tenure. However, ‘Ōiwi scholars like Jonathan Osorio (2002:48) and Lilikalā Kame‘elehiwa (1992:30-31) contend that there are fundamental differences. Kame‘elehiwa writes:

In practical terms, the makaʻāinana fed and clothed the Ali‘i Nui, who provided the organization required to produce enough food to sustain an ever-increasing population. Should a makaʻāinana fail to cultivate or mālama his portion of ʻĀina, that was grounds for dismissal. By the same token, should a konohiki fail in proper direction of the makaʻāinana, he too would be dismissed—for his own failure to mālama. The Ali‘i Nui were no better off in this respect, for if any famine affected the ʻĀina, they could be ousted for failing to mālama their religious duties. Hence, to Mālama ʻĀina was by extension to care for the makaʻāinana and the Ali‘i, for in the Hawaiian metaphor, these three components are mystically one and the same (Kame‘elehiwa 1992:30-31).

These are important distinctions to make, because unlike the serfs of European feudal societies, the makaʻāinana were neither bound to the land, nor were they considered to be property of the ali‘i. If the living conditions under a particular ali‘i or place were unsuitable, the makaʻāinana could move freely in pursuit of favorable living conditions (Lam 1985:105). These descriptions indicate that political and social checks and balances existed under the traditional land tenure system. This ensured the ali‘i cared for
the well-being of the maka`āinana and the overall productivity of the land, lest the ali`i lose the loyalty of the maka`āinana.

For several decades, scholars have analyzed, critiqued, and speculated on both the intent and the results of the Māhele. Several `Ōiwi scholars have identified the Māhele as the event that singlehandedly fractured the core of Hawaiian society through subversion and disruption of the socio-political fabric (Osorio 2002; Kame`eleihiwa 1992). More recently, `Ōiwi scholars like Kamana Beamer (2014) are using the Māhele to counter some of past narratives by choosing to demonstrate `Ōiwi agency. Beamer (2014:8) contends the Māhele was a strategy that allowed the ali`i to modify their traditional land forms and governance while maintaining a unique `Ōiwi identity. While I agree that the Māhele contributed to the demise of Hawaiian society, 19th-century `Ōiwi were also faced with a declining population ravaged by foreign disease and a shifting political economy. Despite the ongoing debate, one of the most Stirring outcomes from the Māhele process has been the generation of thousands of documents that capture very specific place-based knowledge. It is these documents that are integral to understanding `Ōiwi land use in Pi`opi`o. In hindsight, this amassing of Māhele-related scholarship is our generational attempt to understand the intent and consequences of that massive land transformation.

I have chosen to demonstrate how Māhele documents can empower `Ōiwi today by reconnecting us to the ʻāina, our genealogies, and history, in ways that are culturally grounded. In moving forward, I am advocating continued debate of the Māhele while at the same time utilizing the vast pool of knowledge inscribed onto these documents. The information gathered through the Māhele records for Pi`opi`o can further our
understanding of the ‘ili kūpono land division and likely yield new insights into its
functionality. It is important to note that the documents and maps generated throughout
the Māhele process represent a snapshot of life in Pi‘opi‘o during the mid-1800s. These
records are an invaluable asset to scholars who seek a ‘Ōiwi perspective of Hawai‘i’s land
tenure system.

Before diving into the Māhele documents for Pi‘opi‘o, it is important to
contextualize the Māhele process and define some of the terminologies. I first expound on
the Hawaiian terms used to divide the land, with specific emphasis on the ‘ili kūpono land
division. This is followed by a discussion of the formation of the “Board of Commissioners
to Quiet Land Titles” and the Māhele, for both the mō‘ī and ali‘i/konohiki. The final section
discusses the various land documents that were produced as a result of the land claims
process via the Kuleana Act of 1850.

**Land Divisions Defined**

The land tenure system that existed in Hawai‘i prior to the Māhele of 1848 was
founded on a complex set of land divisions that encouraged a degree of self-sufficiency
and interdependency (Beamer 2014:41; Garavoy 2005:525). The complex nature of the
land tenure system was also mirrored in the islands’ political system. The land divisions
accounted for every bit of land in Hawai‘i, from small house lots and garden plots to entire
districts. Additionally, marine resources and fisheries were critical components of this
intricate system and were thereby included under the traditional land tenure system. The
various land divisions were inextricably linked to the chiefly class and to the political
system. To understand how this ancient system was modified through the Māhele ‘Āina of
1848 and the subsequent Kuleana Act of 1850, examining Hawaiian land concepts is essential.

David Malo (1951:16-18) was one of the first Hawaiian scholars to define the human-imposed palena (boundaries) throughout Hawai‘i. Although each island has its own unique geographical peculiarities, human-imposed boundaries across the archipelago followed general patterns. Beamer (2014:32) notes the importance of palena, stating “palena creates places–spaces of attachment and access to both the metaphysical and physical worlds.”

The term palena is often equated with the Euro-American concept of boundary, limit, or border, and emphasizes the notion of inclusion and exclusion. Lorrin Andrew (1922:523) offers a different take on this term, noting that the term palena is derived from the words ‘pale’ and ‘ana’. Pukui & Elbert (1986:311 & 23) translated the term ‘pale’ as defend, shield, protect, and ‘ana’ meaning to measure, survey and evaluate. Palena that were set forth i ka wā māmua (the time before) reflect the idea of evaluating the quality and characteristics of a place as a means of protecting the resources within a given area. From this exposition, the emphasis is placed on protecting and caring for the resources of an area, and not on exclusionary conditions. Although palena were modified throughout time to accommodate a growing population, Kelly (1956:10) notes that at the time Malo and other historians documented the land divisions in the 1830s-40s, the structure and nature of the old land division system essentially the same.

Human-imposed palena often followed the natural features of the land and typically included access to wai (fresh water), kai (coastal/marine resources) and uka
(upland resources - plants, hardwoods, animals, stones, minerals) (Canelora 1974:2). As Kelly (1956:20) notes, access to these resources provided the maka‘āinana with a degree of economic independence. However, Beamer (2014:41) points out that in some instances this system of boundary-making and ahupua’a formalization also encouraged interdependence between ahupua’a. In most cases, palena were established along rational lines, following mountain ridges, rivers or ravines, however, Jon Chinen (1958:1) reminds us that “oftentimes only the line of growth of a certain type of tree or grass marked a boundary; and sometimes only a stone determined the corner of a division.”

To summarize Malo’s (1951:16) descriptions of the human-imposed boundaries, a single island is referred to as a mokupuni, moku or ‘āina. Collectively, the islands are referred to as a pae ‘āina (see Figure 19). Each mokupuni was typically controlled by an ali‘i nui (paramount chief) or several ali‘i ‘ai moku (district chiefs).
Each mokupuni (island) was then divided into interior districts known as moku (Malo 1951:16). Cannelora (1974:2) notes that the moku are “geographical subdivisions only, and had no reference to rights in land.” The ancient moku of the Island of Hawai‘i are Hilo, Puna, Ka‘ū, Kona, Kohala and Hāmākua (Kelly 1956:13) (see Figure 20). Each moku was controlled by an ali‘i ‘ai moku. Cannelora (1974:2) notes that the moku subdivision is important because they serve as points of reference and sometimes indicate a particular area of an island. This is an important note especially as it relates to Māhele records because often the names of moku are used in place of cardinal directions. Examples of this will be presented in Chapter V.
The principle land division that functioned for both taxation purposes and furnished the basic necessities for survival was the ahupua’a. According to Pukui and Elbert (1986:9), the ahupua’a was a vertical land division typically extending from the uplands to the sea. Canelora (1974:2) notes that the nature of this division afforded access to resources in both the uplands and coast, however, he makes an important point that the nature of the ahupua’a “had numerous exceptions,” because they varied in shape and size. Just like the moku, each ahupua’a was named and controlled by an ali‘i ‘ai ahupua’a (ahupua’a chief), and served as a taxable land division during the annual Makahiki procession (Kelly 1956:20). Makahiki is an ancient festival that commences with the rising of the
constellation Makali‘i (Pleiades) at sunset (approximately November based on the Gregorian calendar) and lasting roughly four months. In the past, only ceremonies connected with the Makahiki festival were observed (Malo 1951:36). During Makahiki season the ali‘i nui sent select members of his retinue to collect tribute and products from each ahupua‘a. The maka‘āinana brought their share of tribute to an ahu (altar) that was symbolically marked with the image of a pua‘a (pig) (Pukui and Elbert 1986:225). The collected tribute supported the ali‘i and the akua (gods) (Cordy 2000:61).

Some ahupua‘a, particularly larger ones, were divided into smaller land units known as ‘ili. Curtis J. Lyons provides the most comprehensive description about ‘ili and their subtypes since they are thought to be one of the more complex land units. William D. Alexander (1882) also wrote extensively about land units, however much of his writing is based on Lyons descriptions. According to Lyons (1875:118), the word ‘ili is “used to designate [a] surface, and in latter times, area.” The most general form was the ‘ili ‘āina, sometimes referred to as ‘ili pa‘a or ‘ili o ka ahupua‘a (Cannelora 1974:3; Kelly 1956:22; Malo 1951:16). According to Cannelora (1974:3), the ‘ili ‘āina in its most basic form is a subdivision of an ahupua‘a for the convenience of the ahupua‘a chief. Lyons (1875:118) notes that the konohiki (headman of the ahupua‘a) were agents of the chief, and all revenues of the land went directly to the ali‘i ‘ai ahupua‘a. The ‘ili ‘āina thereby linked individuals or families to Hawai‘i’s traditional socio-political system. Handy, Handy and Pukui (1991:49) note that it “seems likely that the right to continue to use and cultivate ‘ili stayed with the ‘ohana (extended families) dwelling thereon, regardless of any transfer of title to the ahupua‘a in which they were located.” This idea of continued transfer within
the ‘ohana is also reflected in the term ili (spelled without the ‘okina), as Pukui and Elbert 
(1986:97) define this as an inheritance or to transfer. This suggests the ‘ili was not just a 
type of land division, but a unit of land that was successively maintained within a family, 
but never owned as in a capitalistic model.

Lyon (1875:118) notes that there are specific types of ‘ili: the ‘ili lele and ‘ili kū. The 
term ‘ili lele, or jumping ‘ili, is used to refer to ‘ili that were discontinuous and were 
comprised of several distinct sections separated by space; one plot could be located near 
the coast, while others located inland (Lyons 1875:118). The other feature type is the ‘ili 
kūpono, sometimes called the ‘ili kū (Lyons 1875:119). This study is most concerned with 
‘ili kūpono, as this was the designation for Pi’opi’o at the time of the Māhele (see Figure 
21).
Malo, unfortunately, did not expound on the distinction or functionality of the ‘ili kūpono. Details about the nature and purpose of the ‘ili kūpono are more widespread during the mid to late 19th century as land disputes were being settled in the land courts. ‘Ili kūpono are unique in that they were independent of the ahupua’a in which they were situated (Cannelora 1974:3). According to Lyons (1875:119), “transfer of the ahupuaa to a new chief did not carry with it the transfer of the ʻili kupono contained within its limits. The chiefs previously holding the ili kupono continued to hold them, whatever the change in the ahupuaa chief.” Cannelora (1974:3) writes, “the chiefs, or konohikis in charge of ili kupono held their ili by direct grant of the King; paid their tribute to him; and were entirely
independent of the chief of the ahupuāa in which their ʻili kupono were situated.” Kelly (1956:23) adds that ʻili kūpono parcels were awarded by the aliʻi nui to a loyal follower or for his/her extraordinary service. Handy, Handy and Pukui (1991:49) note that some ʻili kūpono permanently belonged to families and that “the ʻili ku ʻono, of all divisions and varieties of land rights, seems to have carried the only form of title that was permanent.” These provisions are atypical because it granted the hoaʻāina living within the ʻili kūpono boundaries a level of independence not found in any other land division. In referring to ʻili kūpono found on the island of Kauaʻi, Arthur C. Alexander (1920:2) comments that in some instances, “the ili kuponos are of more importance than the ahupuāa itself.” Alexander’s comment likely reflects the idea that ʻili kūpono lands were the choice and or highly productive lands. An important component of the ʻili kūpono was the required taxes, paid primarily in the form of labor and goods to the higher classes of chiefs. According to Lyons (1875:119) “slight tribute or work [was] due to the ahupuāa chief; sometimes one or two days in a month; sometimes even less, or only on certain days in the year.”

The smallest land units were the cultivated tracts. One land unit Malo (1951:16) discusses is the moʻo ʻāina, which Pukui & Elbert (1986:253) translate as a “narrow path, track; raised surface extending lengthwise between irrigation streamlets.” Malo (1951:16) also lists the paukū ʻāina, defined as a land section smaller than a moʻo ʻāina (Pukui & Elbert 1986:320). Paukū ʻāina were subdivided into cultivated patches or small farms called kīhāpai (Malo 1951:16; Pukui & Elbert 1986:147).

The detailed nature of this land division system ensured all lands were administered by someone with ties to the chiefly class, thus linking both the aliʻi and the
makaʻāinana into the socio-political system. This system of land organization developed on each island at different times throughout history. The aliʻi Māʻilikūkahi is credited with establishing or modifying the older system of land division on the Island of Oʻahu (Gonschor & Beamer 2014:55). On the Island of Hawaiʻi ʻUmi (ca. 1600s) is noted for establishing the various land divisions, and reorganizing the social structure to house specialized craftsmen (Beamer 2014:35; Cordy 2000: 216; Kamakau 2014:19, 54).

**Hoaʻāina, Konohiki, and Kuleana Defined**

Although not a land division, the term hoaʻāina frequently appears in Māhele records and is used to refer to those individuals or families that received lands by grant of the konohiki (headman of an ahupuaʻa) (Sahlins 1992:178). The term hoaʻāina has been defined as a tenant or caretaker of a kuleana parcel (Pukui & Elbert 1986:73). Lorrin Andrews (1865:165) adds that the term hoaʻāina is a person to whom a konohiki commits the care of his land. The term konohiki often appears in Māhele records and on maps. Lucas (1995:57) describes two ways in which this term is often used. When used as a noun, the term konohiki refers to a head man serving under a chief who was charged with managing various aspects of an ahupuaʻa such as the land, water, and fishing rights. However, when used as an adjective, it denotes land that is privately owned in contradistinction to aupuni (government) lands.

Another important term to consider when looking at individual or familial association to land, is kuleana. The term carries many meanings, however in the context of land, it means a small piece of property within an ahupuaʻa. However, kuleana also means right, privilege, jurisdiction, and responsibility (Pukui & Elbert 1986:179). A hoaʻāina
may have kuleana over several ‘ili ʻāina within an ahupua’a. When an ‘ili was granted to an
individual or family, they assumed the kuleana to care for and contribute to the larger
socio-political body (Handy, Handy & Pukui 1991:49). Although the terms hoaʻāina,
konohiki, and kuleana are closely connected, they all carry distinct meanings that must be
clarified.

*Formation of the Board of Commissioners to Quiet Land Titles*

In response to the growing tension between ʻŌiwi and foreign residents over land,
the mōʻī (monarch) Kauikeaouli along with his Privy Council appointed a five-member
board known as the Board of Commissioners to Quiet Land Titles (also known as the Board
of Commissioners). The Board of Commissioners was established on On December 10,
1845, with the purpose of investigating, verifying or rejecting land claims brought before
the board (Chinen 1958:8). After a detailed study of the existing land system, the Board
adopted seven principles that outlined several important matters such as the nature of the
inquiries, the commutation fees to be paid to the government, as well as the deadlines to
submit a claim (Chinen 1958:12). In their study, the Board also concluded that there were
only three classes of persons having vested rights to the lands in Hawaiʻi. First, the
government by means of mōʻī, second, the aliʻi/konohiki, and finally, the makaʻāinana
(Chinen 1958:9). Although the Board was tasked with verifying the land claims presented
before them, they had no authority to divide out the interest of the mōʻī and the
aliʻi/konohiki. Before any makaʻāinana could make claims to the land they lived on or
cultivated, the mōʻī and aliʻi/konohiki came together to divide out their interest in the land.
In this division, only ahupua’a and ʻili kūpono land divisions were claimed. The land division
that occurred between the mōʻi and aliʻi/konohiki is known as the Māhele (Chinen 1958:12).

**Buke Māhele**

The matter of dividing out the interest of the mōʻi and aliʻi/konohiki was a long-debated issue, and took them over a year to decide on a course of action. Within that time the mōʻi and aliʻi agreed that a land tenure reform was a way to address the Kingdom’s failing economy, and to deal with growing foreign interest in Hawaiian lands from both missionaries and businessmen. On December 18, 1847, the Privy Council helped to create a committee that would assist the mōʻi, aliʻi, and konohiki in dividing out their interests (Chinen 1958:15). The committee, along with the mōʻi, and aliʻi, agreed to a set of guidelines that aided them in dividing out their interests:

1) The king was to retain all of his private lands as his own individual property, subject only to the rights of the tenants.

2) One third of the remaining lands was to be for the Hawaiian Government; one third for the chiefs and konohikis; and one third to be set aside for the tenants, the actual possessors and cultivators of the soil.

3) The division between the chiefs and konohikis and their tenants under Rule 2 was to take place whenever any chief, konohiki, or tenant desired such a division, subject only to confirmation by the king in privy council.

4) The tenants of the king’s private lands were entitled to a fee simple title to one third of the lands possessed and cultivated by them, which was to be set off for the tenants in fee simple, whenever the king or any of the tenants desired such a division.

5) The divisions prescribed in the foregoing rules were not to interfere with any lands that may have been granted in fee simple by the king or his predecessors.

6) The chiefs and konohikis were authorized to satisfy the commutation by either the setting aside of one third of the unimproved value of their lands.
7) The lands of King Kamehameha III were to be recorded in the same book as all other allodial titles, and the only separate book was to be that listing the government lands (Chinen 1958:15-16).

The book referenced in the seventh guideline is the ‘Buke Kakau Paa no ka Mahele Aina’, also known as the Buke Māhele (Kauikeaouli 1848) (see Figure 22), which contains a listing of all lands claimed by the mōʻī and some 252 aliʻi and konohiki (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992:14). Lands awarded to the aliʻi and kohohiki are sometimes referred to as Konohiki lands (Chinen 1958:20).

The lands recorded in the Buke Māhele were claimed mainly as entire ahupuaʻa or ʻili kūpono. Although the process of redistributing the lands upon the succession of a new paramount chieft was a key component of the traditional political system, the Māhele would be the final distribution of land between the aliʻi, thus putting an end to this age-old practice known as the kālaiʻāina (Beamer 2014:19). Due to the lack of surveyors at the time of the Māhele, the aliʻi/konohiki land claims were executed without formal surveys to define the metes and bounds. The process of surveying the lands claimed by the mōʻī and aliʻi/konohiki was carried out by the Hawaiian Government Survey after the completion of the Māhele and was recorded in the Boundary Commission Testimonies. In the case of Piʻopiʻo, the Boundary Commission survey was not conducted until 1874, nearly two decades after the Māhele (Boundary Commission Testimony 1874, Vol. 1-3:1).
In the Buke Māhele, the ahupua’a of Waiākea was relinquished by the chief Kaunuohua on February 4, 1848, to the mōʻī Kauikeaouli (see Figure 23). Kauikeaouli thereby retained the ahupua’a of Waiākea as part of his personal land holdings. After an 1865 statute that made such lands inalienable, the mōʻī’s personal lands became known as Crown Lands (Preza 2010:94). Three ‘ili kūpono within the ahupua’a of Waiākea were
also claimed and recorded in the Buke Māhele. The ‘ili kūpono of Pi’opi’o and Honohononui were claimed and retained by the ali’i wahine (chiefess) Victoria Kamāmalu on January 27, 1848 (see Figure 24). The ‘ili kūpono of Makaokū was relinquished by the ali’i wahine Miriam Kekauʻōnohi to Kauikeaouli who then turned those lands over to the government. They were then included as part of the Government land holdings. Figure 25 shows Registered Map No. 0672, ca. 1851 that depicts the three ‘ili kūpono located within the Waiākea ahupua’a. A note on this map also indicates that a portion of the woods located upland was a part of Pi’opi’o (see Figure 26). Access to the uplands of Waiākea gave the residents of Pi’opi’o the right of acquiring important forest resources like timber, birds, and plants.
Figure 23. Kaunuohua relinquishing the ahupua’a of Waiākea to the mō‘ī Kauikeouli as recorded in the Buke Māhele.
Figure 24. V. Kamāmalu claims Piʻopiʻo and Honohononui as part of her land holdings as recorded in the Buke Mahele.
Figure 25. Registered Map No. 0672, ca. 1851 by Webster showing three 'ili küpono within the Waiākea ahupua’a.

Figure 26. Close up of notes listed on Registered Map No. 0672, ca. 1851 by Webster.
Chinen (1958:25) notes that even before the Māhele, Kauikeaouli sought to protect his dominion by dividing out a portion of his personal lands to create Government lands. Since Government lands were held in the public domain they were also subject to confiscation in the event of political conquest. In addition, by turning over a portion of his personal lands to the Government, Kauikeaouli absolved his duty to pay the required commutation fee. Unlike the aliʻi/konohiki, Kauikeaouli was not required to present his claims before the Board of Commissioners because he held clear title to his lands (Chinen 1958:27). According to Chinen (1958:20) ʻili kūpono and ahupuaʻa were the only land divisions to be recognized in the Māhele, and all other ʻili ʻāina were absorbed into the ahupuaʻa in which they were located. As a result, ʻili kūpono lands like Piʻopiʻo were preserved and maintained well into the 20th century. This highlights the significance ʻili kūpono lands held for both the aliʻi and the residents. Although formal surveys could not be made on all ahupuaʻa at the time of the Māhele, surveys were required for ʻili kūpono, since these land divisions existed within the boundaries of a given ahupuaʻa (Chinen 1958:21).

All land deeds granted during the Māhele contained a special clause stating, “Ua koe ke kuleana o na kanaka,” which has been interpreted by Hawaiʻi courts as “subject to the rights of the native tenants” (Lucas 1991:213). Jocelyn Garovoy (2005:527) clarifies the implications of this clause, stating it was intended for the “continuation of the reserved tenancies which characterized the traditional Hawaiian land tenure system,” part of which protected access and gathering rights of the people. This clause would be integral to the
makaʻāinana as they sought to protect their landed property and continue to exercise their right to gather and access resources crucial to their survival.

**Documents Involved in the Land Claims Process**

The Buke Māhele only recorded the lands quitclaimed by either the mōʻī, aliʻi or konohiki. It did not convey any title to land. All persons involved in the Māhele were required to present their claims before the Board of Commissioners to obtain an award. The Board of Commissioners traveled to the main towns on the various islands to hear the claims of both the aliʻi and makaʻāinana (Chinen 1958:13). All persons presenting their claims before the Board of Commissioners were required to submit a specific sequence of documents.

The first document to be submitted was either a Native Register (NR) or Foreign Register (FR). The purpose of the Native and Foreign Registers was to register the claimant with the Board of Commissioners. Both the Native and Foreign Register fulfilled the same purpose, however, the difference was that the Native Registers were recorded in Hawaiian and the Foreign Registers were recorded in English. According to Dorothy Barrère (1994:iii), many, if not most Foreign Registers were “on-the-spot” translations of the Native Registers. In examining the content detailed in both the Native and Foreign Registers for Piʻopiʻo, the claimants typically introduced themselves, their place of residence, which included the ahupuaʻa and ʻili name, and gave a general description of their property. However, there is variation in these documents, as some contain more or fewer details about the property itself.
The next document following the Native and/or Foreign Register was the Native Testimony (NT) or Foreign Testimony (FT). All claimants were required to secure testimony from two other individuals to help confirm their claim to the land. Most of the testimony in the Piʻopiʻo documents appear to be given by neighbors. The Native and Foreign Testimonies are often rich with information since each plot, whether a house or an agricultural plot, was sometimes described in great detail. In these documents, plots are referred to as apana (spelled today as ‘āpana) which translates to piece, lot, land parcel (Pukui & Elbert 1986:28). Sometimes a claimant may have had one or more ‘āpana scattered throughout an area. In some cases, a claimant’s ‘āpana may cross into neighboring ahupua‘a, which supports the descriptions given by early historians about the makaʻāinana’s ability to move across political boundaries (Lam 1985:105).

Upon review of the claimants’ Register and Testimonies, the Board of Commissioners then issued a Land Commission Award (LCAw) to individuals whose claims they legitimated. Any claim that the Board found illegitimate was rejected. Land Commission Awards were often issued several years after the submission of the Register and Testimony. In order for a claimant to obtain a Land Commission Award, they were required to pay for all aspects of the land claims process, which included the cost to advertise in the newspaper, the survey, and any copies required by the Board of Commissioners. It is critical to note that in many cases, not all ‘āpana described in the Testimony were awarded and in some cases, several ‘āpana may have been combined to form the parcel depicted in the Land Commission Award. The Board of Commissioners determined which ‘āpana were awarded to the claimant and thereby conferred the nature
of the title as either allodial (fee-simple, owned without obligation to any superior), or leasehold (use of land for a fixed term of years) (Chinen 1958:13). The Land Claim Award typically contained a brief description of the land acquisition, followed by a metes and bounds survey, and a sketch map of the property. The Land Claim Award granted the claimant a title that was less than allodial since the Government retained the right to collect a commutation fee. The commutation fee was determined by assessing one-third of the value of the unimproved lands based on the date of the award and could be paid in cash or through the return of land of equal value (Chinen 1958:13). However, the commutation fee for house lots in the port cities of Honolulu, Lahaina and Hilo were set at one-fourth of the value of the unimproved lands at the date of the award (Chinen 1958:14).

The final document to be issued through the Māhele process was the Royal Patent Grant (RPG). A Royal Patent was received when a claimant paid the commutation fee to the government. The Minister of Interior issued a Royal Patent that unlike the Land Claim Award, did not confer title, rather it quitclaimed the government’s interest in the land. The documents described above, with the exception of the Royal Patent Grants, is the subject of analysis for this study and will be discussed in Chapter V.

**Kuleana Act of 1850**

The completion of the Māhele ʻĀina between the mōʻi, aliʻi/konohiki raised many questions regarding the rights of the makaʻāinana. After several months of deliberation, the Privy Council and legislature via the Kuleana Act of 1850, authorized the Board of Commissioners to award allodial titles to ʻŌiwi “tenants who occupied and improved any portion of Crown, Government or Aliʻi lands” (Chinen 1958:29) Like the aliʻi, the
makaʻāinana were required to present their claims before the Board, secure testimony and pay for a government surveyor to survey their land. However, unlike the aliʻi, the makaʻāinana were not required to pay the government commutation fee, since that responsibility was left to the holder of the ahupuaʻa or ʻili kūpono. Now that I have contextualized the Māhele as well as the documents produced as a result of such process, the following chapter will discuss Māhele documents for both the aliʻi/konohiki and the hoaʻāina of Piʻopiʻo.
CHAPTER V. KULEANA AWARDS FOR PI’OPI’O

Māhele ‘Āina documents are a unique and invaluable resource that scholars today can draw upon to deepen our understanding of ‘Ōiwi land use. The Māhele process produced a compendium of documents that captured a wealth of place-based knowledge including inoа ‘āina and horticultural practices. ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i was an official language of the Hawaiian Kingdom government, therefore court records conveying, selling or leasing property were often drafted in ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i (Lucas 1995.ix; Nogelmeier 2010:10). Although these documents are available in archives, the fact that they were written in ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i has limited their use and incorporation into contemporary scholarship. Today, as the number of ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i speakers continues to grow, so does scholarship utilizing ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i sources. It is imperative that we continue to theorize and contextualize the Māhele in its entirety if we hope to understand how this complex process transformed Hawaiian society. However, sifting through individual pages allows us to understand how nā kūpuna utilized and related to the ‘āina.

In this chapter, I review and analyze the various Māhele documents specific to Pi‘opi’o beginning with the ali‘i land claims of Victoria Kamāmalu, followed by the eight hoa‘āina who were awarded lands through the Kuleana Act of 1850 (see Table 7 and Figure 27). The Native Testimony (NT), Native Register (NR) and Land Claim Award (LCAw.) are the primary documents discussed and analyzed in this chapter since they are rich in specific land use information. The documents for each awardee are presented in the following order: 1) transcription of the original ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i document, and 2) an English translation.
based on the ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i transcription. Although reading the text as a whole provides useful information, I have chosen to focus on specific keywords within these documents that highlight land use information. These keywords are underlined and bolded for emphasis. These keywords are analyzed and expounded upon at the end of this chapter. Another set of related documents presented and discussed in this chapter are the Boundary Commission Testimonies. Although the Boundary Commission operated as a separate entity from the Board of Commissioners to Quiet Land Titles, their duties overlapped because the Boundary Commission settled land disputes resulting from the privatization of land.

Table 7. List of Land Claim Awards for Pi‘opi‘o

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awardee</th>
<th>Land Claim Award Number</th>
<th>Awarded Via</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kamāmalu, Victoria</td>
<td>7713</td>
<td>Māhele 1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halai, Halona</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>Kuleana Act 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahienui</td>
<td>11050B</td>
<td>Kuleana Act 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalua</td>
<td>8854</td>
<td>Kuleana Act 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamano(nu)haka</td>
<td>8803</td>
<td>Kuleana Act 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapu</td>
<td>1F</td>
<td>Kuleana Act 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leoi/Lewi</td>
<td>9982</td>
<td>Kuleana Act 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahinenohoihilo</td>
<td>10004</td>
<td>Kuleana Act 1850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Māhele documents were retrieved from the Papakilo online database (http://www.papakilodatabase.com/). Once the documents were downloaded, I reviewed each document for legibility. While some original documents (viewed as electronic scans) were easy to read, others were not due to either the quality of the scan or the quality of the original document itself. I compiled a list of defective scans in order to view the originals on microfilm at the Hawai‘i State Archives. Each document was transcribed and translated. No diacritical marks were added in the transcriptions. Testimonies given in the Native language served as the primary documents for analysis, however, in the case of Kapu (LCAw. 1F) only a Foreign record was located and was therefore utilized. Persons
interested in reviewing the original documents should refer to the Papakilo database or the Hawai‘i State Archives.

**A Note On Language & Translations**

Translating literature written in ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i to English comes with challenges, one of which is the loss of meaning or misinterpretation of words. Anyone familiar with ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i knows that Hawaiian words often have more than one meaning. This can fill the translating process with endless negotiations. To mitigate this, I included transcriptions of the original documents written in ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i, and tried to use the most appropriate English translations to best convey meaning. I have, however, chosen to retain certain words in ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i, such as kuleana, konohiki, māhele ‘āina, as well as land division terms, because a simple English translation may distort the true meaning and cause more confusion (see Chapter IV). Again, I have refrained from including diacritical marks in my transcriptions, unless they were present in the original. Bracketed words were added for clarity and include diacritical marks.

In many of the Native Testimonies, district names are used in place of cardinal directions. I have chosen to retain the district names in the translations because it demonstrates an ‘Ōiwi orientation to space. The district name of ‘Hāmākua’ appears in the testimonies and references a northerly direction, whereas ‘Puna’ references a southerly direction. The word ‘mauka’ is commonly used to describe an upland direction, in this case toward Maunakea, whereas ‘makai’ is describing the direction of the ocean, or the opposite of the mauka direction. The use of Hāmākua, Puna, mauka, and makai should not be confused with true north, south, west, and east. The word ‘anana’ has also been
retained. Pukui & Elbert (1986:24) define anana as “fathom: formerly the distance between tips of longest fingers of a man, measured with arms extended on each side.”

**Victoria Kamāmalu- LCAw 7713**

Born to Kīna’u (mother) and Mataio Kekūanao’a (father) in 1838, Victoria Kamāmalu was the granddaughter of Kamehameha I and his wife Kaheiheimālie (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992:101,126). Kamāmalu’s genealogy linked her to some of the most politically powerful ali’i of that time, especially her birth mother who served as Kuhina Nui for the Kingdom of Hawai’i. The Kuhina Nui was a high-ranking political official during the monarchy, who essentially shared executive power with the king (Pukui & Elbert 1986:173). Four months after Kamāmalu’s birth, her birth mother died. She remained in her father’s guardianship but was cared for by her kahu (guardian) John Papa ʻĪi and his wife Sarai Hiwauli (ʻĪi 1959:164; Kameʻeleihiwa 1992:123). Kamāmalu was educated at the Royal School where she was prepared to assume the position of Kuhina Nui. Not only would Kamāmalu inherit her mother’s political role, but also the lands passed down from the former Kuhina Nui, Kaʻahumanu (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992:207). Because of Kamāmalu’s young age, the role of Kuhina Nui was passed first to her aunt Kekāuluohi followed by Keoni Ana (1992:176, 288). At the time of the Māhele, Kamāmalu was but ten years old and her father Kekūanao’a took the liberty of claiming lands for his daughter (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992:207). Therefore, in the Māhele records for Kamāmalu, one often sees her father’s name.

Within the ahupua’a of Waiākea, Kekūanao’a, on behalf of Victoria Kamāmalu, claimed two of the three ‘ili kūpono: Piʻopiʻo, and Honohononui. In examining the Native Register for Kamāmalu, Kekūanao’a writes:
M. Kekuanaoa  
Papu o Honolulu, January 4, 1848

Aloha oukou e na Luna Hoona Kumu Kuleana Aina elike me na kanawai a me na olelo poloa a oukou malaila ke waiho aku nei au i na aina o na ’lii keiki au o Victoria Kamamalu a me Lota Kapuaiwa a me Mose Kekuaiwa a me ko Keelikolani a me ko’u no hoi a me ka’u wahine o Kaloloahilani. O na aina nei o lakou i koe mai mai ka Mahele ana o ka Moi. Aia i loko o keia mau aina he kuleana ko na ‘lii a’u, a he kuleana ko na Luna a’u i hoonoho ai ona ko maua mau aina nei, a he kuleana ko na makaainana. Aia a hiki mai ka la a oukou e manao ai e hana, e hele aku no au. Ina ma Kauai, e hele aku no au e hana pu me na Konohiki au, me na makaainana e noho ana ma keia mau aina, i hai ia ma keia Buke, a pela no ko Oahu nei a me ko Maui a me ko Hawaii.

O wau no me ke aloha ko ou hoakaua

M. Kekuanaoa

---

M. Kekuanaoa  
Fort of Honolulu, January 4, 1848

Greetings to the Board of Commissioners. As stated in the laws and your proclamations, I am presenting the claims of my chiefly children, Victoria Kamamalu, Lota Kapuaiwa, Mose Kekuaiwa, Keelikolani’s, my own and my wife Kaloloahilani. Their lands are those remaining from the Mahele of the King. Within these lands are the kuleana of my chiefly ones, my headmen that have been placed on these lands, as well as kuleana of the commoners. Until the day comes where the Board anticipates its work, I will go. If that is on Kauai, I will go and work with my Konohiki and the commoners residing on the lands stated in this Buke [Māhele]. And the same for Oahu, Maui and Hawaii.

With gratitude, your fellow soldier

M. Kekuanaoa

---

No records obtained that were specific to Pi’opi’o

---

Helu 7713 V. Kamamalu  
Apana 16

Ua koi mai oia no kona Iliaina o Piopio iloko o Waiakea ma Hilo ma ka Mokupuni o Hawaii no ka mea ua loa iaia keia aina no ka Moi Kamehameha III mai i ka M.H 1848 i ka Mahele aina ana, a ua noho keakea oleia a hiki i keia manawa.

Oia ka makou e hooko nei no V. Kamamalu, he kuleana no kona malalo iho o ke ano Alodio. Ina e uku mai oia i ko ke Aupuni hapa, alaila ua kūpono iaia ka Palapala Sila Alodio. Aka koe nae na kuleana o na kanaka maloko.
She has summoned for her Ili aina of Piopio in Waiakea, Hilo, island of Hawaii because she received this land from King Kamehameha III in the year 1848 during his Mahele aina, and had occupied it since without objection.

This is what we are fulfilling for V. Kamamalu, she has kuleana less than Allodial. If she pays for the Government’s half, then she will have a right to a Royal Patent. However, reserving the rights of the tenants within.

She must also pay for the cost of the investigation and the adjudication, as follows:

- W.L. Lee: For the room and printing the notice in the Newspaper
- G.M. Robertson: For copying the claim
- J. Kekaulahao: For the map
- J.H. Smith: For the day services
  - For copying the words of the witness
  - For the survey
  - For the copying
  - For the adjudication on the 7 day of April 1854
  - $5

We have fulfilled this Kuleana because of the laws passed on the 19th day of June 1852, regarding the Konohiki.

---

**Halai, Halona - LCAw 1279**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Register</th>
<th>Halai 1279</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td>Halai, Kalona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Na ka poe i mahaloia. Aloha oukou e ka poe hoona ina kumu kuleana aina ka poe hoi a na kumu kanawai o ke aupuni i hoono ho ai i ka poe hooko noia oihana.

O wau o ka mea nona ka inoa malalo iho nei ke hoike aku nei au a ke hai aku nei hoi ia oukou i kou kuleana a me ko’u wahi apana aina. Aia noia ma Waiakea ma kahi i kapaia o Kolea. Eia no kona kiʻi malalo nei, o kona mau aoao ka loa a me ka laula. Ua hoomaopopoia malaila.

Translation

Halai, Kalona

Hawaii

Punahoa, Hilo 4 December 1847

To the esteemed. Greetings to Board of Commissioners, the people put in place by the laws of the government to fulfill the duties of such agency.

I, the one whose name is listed below, am declaring and testifying to you my kuleana and my parcel of land. It is located in Waiakea at a place named Kolea. Below is the illustration, its sides are the same length as its width. That has been made clear there.

Native Testimony

Halai 1279

Transcription

Halai

Kolona Lee K

Nov. 9

Hoohikiia o Kaneakakini. Ua ike no au aia ma ke ahupuaa o Waiakea ma ka ili aina o Kolea Hilo Hawaii Apana aina mauka ko Kahienui hale, ma Hamakua aina waiho wale, makai he kahakai, ma kai ko Kekuanaoa pa mahiai.

Ua paa no i ka pa, aole hale maloko. No Kapuaakuni mai kona 1847. Aole mea keakea.

Hoohikiia o Kahienui a olelo mai la. Ua ike no au i keia aina e like me ka Kaneakakini i hai iho nei.

Translation

Kaneakakini sworn. I have seen in the ahupuaa of Waiakea on the ili aina of Kolea, Hilo, Hawaii a parcel of land mauka of Kahienui’s house, on the Hamakua side fallow land, Makai is the shore and Kekuanaoa’s cultivated enclosure.

It is bounded by a fence, no house within. It was received from Kapuaakuni in 1847. No one has objected.

Kahienui sworn in and testified. My knowledge of this land is the same as Kaneakakini’s testimony.

Land Commission Award

Halai 1279

Transcription

Helu 1279 L.K. Halai
Ua koi mai oia no kona wahi ma **Kolea** i Waiakea, ma Hilo ma ka mokupuni o Hawaii no ka mea ua loaa iaia keia wahi no **Kapuaakuni** mai i ka M.H. 1847 a ua noho keakea oleia a hiki i keia manawa.

Oi aka makou e hooko nei no L.K. Halai, he kuleana hoi kona malalo iho o ke Ano Alodio. Ina e uku mai oia i ko ke Aupuni hapaha, alaila ua kupono iaia ka Palapala Sila Alodio.

Pono nae iaia ke uku no ka hookolokolo ame ka hooholo mai ka olelo penei.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Fee Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W.L. Lee</td>
<td>No ka rumi ame ke pai ana i ka olelo ma ka Nupepa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.M. Robertsons</td>
<td>No ke kope ana i ka olelo koina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Kekaulahao</td>
<td>No ka palapala kii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.H. Smith</td>
<td>No hana ana i ka la 9 o Nowemaba 1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No ke kope ana i ka olelo o na hoihe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No ke ana ana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No ka kope ana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No ka hooholo ana i ka olelo i ka la 1 o November 1852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$3

Anaia e F.S. Lyman

Eia na palena

E hoomaka ana ma kekahī pohaku ma ke kī Akau komohana a e holo ana

Hem. (illegible) i kahi pahu. Alaila Hem 85½ Hik. 2.28 kaul. i kahi pahu hou. Alaila Ak. 4½ Hik. 2.63 kaul. i kahi kumu (illegible). Hem 86½ Kom. 2.52 kaul a hiki ma ka pohaku i hoomaka'ī.

Maloko o keia 6/10 eka

---

**Translation**

He has summoned for his place at Kolea in Waiakea, in Hilo on the island of Hawaii because he received this place from Kapuaakuni in the year 1847 and has occupied it since without objection.

This is what we are fulfilling for L.K. Halai, he has kuleana less than Allodial. If he pays for the Governments one-fourth, then he will have a right to a Royal Patent.

He must also pay for the cost of the investigation and the adjudication, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Fee Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W.L. Lee</td>
<td>For the room and printing the notice in the Newspaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.M. Robertsons</td>
<td>For copying the claim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Kekaulahao</td>
<td>For the map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.H. Smith</td>
<td>For the day services on the 9 day of November 1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For copying the words of the witness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the copying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the adjudication on the 1 day of November 1852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$3

Surveyed by F.S. Lyman

Here are the boundaries
Starting at a rock on the northwest, running south (illegible) to a stake. Then south 85 ¾ East 2.28 chains to another stake. Then north 4 ½ east 2.63 chains to a tree (illegible). South 86 ½ west 2.25 chains until the point of commencement.

Within this 6/10 acre

**Kaihenui- LCAw. 11050B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Register</th>
<th>Kaihenui 11050B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Native Register located on Papakilo or Hawai‘i State Archives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Testimony</th>
<th>Kaihenui 11050B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaihenui</td>
<td>28 Nov.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hoohikiia o Namahoe a olelo maila ua ike au aia i ka ili aina o **Kolea**, ahupuaa Waiakea **elu a apana kihapai**.

Mauka Konohiki, Ma Hamakua ko Barenaba. Makai kakahai. Ma Puna ko Halai aina, aole pa, **4 ona hale**.


Hookahi kihapai ua mahiia, aole nae he pa. Hookahi ona hale noho no Kapapa mai kona 1843. Aole mea keakea.

Hoohiki ia o Nainoa a olelo mai la ua ike no au i keia aina e like loa me ka Namahoe hai ana mai nei.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaihenui</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Namahoe sworn deposed he knows on the ili aina of Kolea, ahupuaa of Waiakea, two cultivated lots.

Parcel 1- Mauka belongs to the Konohiki, on the Hamakua is Barenaba, Makai is the shore, on Puna is Halai’s land. Not fenced, four houses.

Parcel 2- Mauka belongs to Barenaba, on the Hamakua is Kuahopu, Makai belongs to the Konohiki, on Puna is a road.

One cultivated lot, not fenced. One house dwelling house from Kapapa in 1843. No one has objected.

Nainoa sworn in and testified that his knowledge of this land is the same as Namahoe’s testimony.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaihenui</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Namahoe sworn deposed he knows on the ili aina of Kolea, ahupuaa of Waiakea, two cultivated lots.

Parcel 1- Mauka belongs to the Konohiki, on the Hamakua is Barenaba, Makai is the shore, on Puna is Halai’s land. Not fenced, four houses.

Parcel 2- Mauka belongs to Barenaba, on the Hamakua is Kuahopu, Makai belongs to the Konohiki, on Puna is a road.

One cultivated lot, not fenced. One house dwelling house from Kapapa in 1843. No one has objected.

Nainoa sworn in and testified that his knowledge of this land is the same as Namahoe’s testimony.
**Land Claim Award**  
*Kaihenui 11050B*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Helu 11050B Kaihenui**  
Ua koi mai oia no kona mau wahi ma Waiakea ma Hilo ma ka mokupuni o Hawaii no ka mea ua loa iaia keia wahi no **Kapapa** mai i ka M.H. 1843 a ua lohi loa kona noho ana ma keia mau wahi, a ua noho keakea oleia a hiki i keia manawa. | **He has summoned for his place at Waiakea in Hilo on the island of Hawaii because he received this place from Kapapa in the year 1843, and he has lived at these places for a very long time, and he has occupied it since without objection.** |
| Oi aka makou e hooho nei no Kaihenui, he kuleana hoi kona malalo iho o ke Ano Alodio. Ina e uku mai oia i ko ke Aupuni hapaha, alaila ua kupono ia ka Palapala Sila Alodio. |  
| Pono nae iaia ke uku no ka hookolokolo ame ka hooholo mai ka oelelo penei. |  
| W.L. Lee No ka rumi ame ke pai ana i ka oelelo ma ka Nupepa  
G.M. Robertson No ke kope ana i ka oelelo koina  
J. Kekaulahao No ka palapala kii  
J.H. Smith No hana ana i ka la 28 o Nowemaba 1848  
No ke kope ana i ka oelelo o na hoike  
No ke ana ana i ka la 16 Sept 1852  
No ka kope ana  
No ka hooholo ana i ka oelelo Dekemaba 16, 1852 $8 | Anaia e F.S. Lyman |
| Eia na palena  
Waiakea, Hilo, Hawaii  
Apana 1- E hoomaka keia ma kahi ahupohaku ma ke kihi mauka o keia, a e holo Ak 76½ Hik 3.00 kaul. a hiki i ka palena o Piopio, alaila e holo ma ia palena Ak. 6½ Kom. 3.14 kaul. & Ak. 4¾ Kom. 10.14 kaul. Alaila e holo Ak. 75½ Kom. 3.56 kaul. Alaila e holo iuka Hem. 3¾ Hik. 4.60 kaul. & Hem 5¾ Hik. 4.96 kaul. a hiki i kahi kumu ulu. Alaila e holo hou Hem. 9½ Hik 3.07 kaul. & Hem 4½ Hik. 2.30 kaul. a hiki i hoomaka ‘i. Maloko o keia apana 4 59/100 eka. |  
| Apana 2- **Piopio**, Waiakea, Hilo, Hawaii.  
E hoomaka keia makahi kumu ulu ma ke kihi makai o keia ma ka **iwi** o **Piopio** ma Waiakea, a e holo ma ka palena o ke kuleana o Kuahopu. Hem 5° Hik. 3.19 kaul. & Hem 79¾ Hik. 0.71 kaul. & Hema 3.83 kaul. & Akau 73 ½ Kom. 1.60 kaul. i ke kihi makai o ka Apana 1 ma ka palena o **Piopio**, alaila ma ia palena Ak. 4¾ Hik. 6.65 kaul. a hiki i hoomaka’i. Maloko o keia apana 6/10 o ka eka |  
| **Translation** | **Number 11050B Kaihenui**  
He has summoned for his place at Waiakea in Hilo on the island of Hawaii because he received this place from Kapapa in the year 1843, and he has lived at these places for a very long time, and he has occupied it since without objection. |
This is what we are fulfilling for Kaihenui, he has kuleana less than Allodial. If he pays for the Governments one fourth, then he will have a right to a Royal Patent.

He must also pay for the cost of the investigation and the adjudication, as follows:

W.L. Lee       For the room and printing the notice in the Newspaper
G.M. Robertson For copying the claim
J. Kekaulahao  For the map
J.H. Smith     For the day services on the 28 day of November 1848
                      For copying the words of the witness
                      For the survey on the 16 day of September 1852
                      For the copying
                      For the adjudication on December 16, 1852
                      $8
                      Surveyed by F.S. Lyman

Here are the boundaries

Parcel 1- Commencing at the mound of stones at the corner upland of this, and running north 76 ½ east 3.00 chains until the boundary of Piopio, then running on the aforementioned boundary north 6 ½ west 3.14 chains & north 4 ¼ west 10.14 chains. Then running north 75 ½ west 3.56 chains. Then running upland south 3 ¾ east 4.60 chains & south 5 ¾ east 4.96 chains until the breadfruit tree. Then running again, south 9 ½ east 3.07 chains & south 4 ¼ east 2.30 chains until the point of commencement.

Within this parcel 4.59/100 acres

Parcel 2- Piopio, Waiakea, Hilo, Hawaii

Commencing at the breadfruit tree at the corner seaward of the stone or earth ridge, marking the boundary of Piopio at Waiakea and running on the boundary of Kuahopu’s kuleana. South 5° east 3.19 chains & south 79 ¾ east 0.71 chains & south 3.83 chains & north 73 ½ west 1.60 chains until the coastal corner of parcel 1 at the boundary of Piopio, then at the aforementioned boundary north 4 ¾ east 6.65 chains until the point of commencement.

Within this parcel 6/10 of an acre

Kalua- LCAw. 8854

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Native Register</th>
<th>Kalua 8854</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kalua</td>
<td>Hilo Waiakea Feb. 5, 1848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloha oukou e na luna kuleana hoona aina. Owau o Kalua no Piopio, ke hai aku nei i ko’u kuleana ia oukou na aina kuleana hoona aina. He pahale ko’u 44 anana ka loa, aole like na aoao me ka laula, o kahi 25 anana, o kahi aoao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>20 anana, he kuleana mai ko’u mau kupuna mai, a hiki mai i na makua, a ia’u mai hoi.</td>
<td>Na Kalua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Kalua Hilo Waiakea Feb. 5, 1848 Greetings to the Board of Commissioners. I am Kalua of Piopio, testifying my kuleana before the Board of Commissioners. I have a house lot 44 anana is the length, but the sides are not equal in width, one is 25 anana and the other side is 20 anana. This is a kuleana from my ancestors, to my parents and now to me.</td>
<td>Kalua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Leoi sworn in and deposed, I know this to be on the ili aina Piopio, Waiakea, Hilo, Hawaii. There are five parcels of this land. Parcel 1- A house lot mauka of Kauhi’s, on Hamakua side is the land of Kauhi. Makai is Kamanuhaka’s, on the Puna side is the Mohouli pond. One lot, one house. Half is enclosed. Parcel 2- Mauka is a road belonging to Kekuanaoa, on the Hamakua and makai belongs to the Konohiki. On the Puna side is Kaihenui’s. One cultivated lot, not enclosed. Parcel 3- Mauka is Niihau’s land, on the Hamakua side is Koieamo, the makai side is Kuahopu’s and to the Puna side is the Konohiki’s.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parcel 4- Mauka is Kuahopu’s as is the Hamakua side. The makai side is Kauhi. On the Puna side is Kanamo’s. Three partially cultivated lots.

These are ancient lands handed down from his ancestors during the time of Kamehameha I. No one has objected.

Kuahopu sworn in and testified that his knowledge of this land is the same as Leoi’s testimony.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Land Commission Award</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kalua 8854</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transcription**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helu 8854 Kalua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ua koi mai oia no kona wahi ma Waiakea, ma Hilo ma ka mokupuni o Hawaii no ka mea ua loaa iaia keia wahi no kona makua mai i ka manawa o Kamehameha I, a ua noho keakea oleia a hiki i keia manawa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oi aka makou e hooko nei no Kalua, he kuleana hoi kona malalo iho o ke Ano Alodio. Ina e uku mai oia i ko ke Aupuni hapaha, alaila ua kūpono iaia ka Palapala Sila Alodio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pono nae iaia ke uku no ka hookolokolo ame ka hooholo mai ka olelo penei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.L. Lee  No ka rumi ame ke pai ana i ka olelo ma ka Nupepa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.M. Robertson No ke kope ana i ka olelo koina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Kekaulahao  No ka palapala kii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.H. Smith  No hana ana i ka la 17 o Nowemaba 1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ke kope ana i ka olelo o na hoi ke ½ aoao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ke ana ana i ka la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ka kope ana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ka hooholo ana i ka olelo i ka la Decemaba 16, 1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaia e F.S. Lyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eia na palena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiakea, Hilo, Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E hoomaka keia ma ke kihi mauka o ke kuleana o Kuahopu e pili ana me ke alanui, a e holo ma ia palena Akau 80° Hik. 4.89 kaul. a hiki i ke kihi komohana o ke kuleana o Kapu. Alaila e holo ma ia kuleana Hem 8¾ Hik. 6.86 kaul. a hiki i ka loko ia i laila mai hapo o ka loko Hem 47° Kom. 1.75 kaul. alaila e holo Ak 27° Kom. 2.60 kaul. alaila Hem 57° Kom. 1.17 kaul. alaila Hem. 40 ½ Kom. 3.01 kaul. alila e holo Ak. 3½ Kom. 7.60 kaul. a hiki ma kahi e hoomaka’i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maloko o keia 3 4/10 eka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number 8854 Kalua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He has summoned for his place at Waiakea at Hilo on the island of Hawaii because he received this place from his parents in the time of Kamehameha I, and has occupied it since without objection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is what we are fulfilling for Kalua, a kuleana less than Allodial. If he pays for the Governments one fourth, then he will have a right to a Royal Patent.

He must also pay for the cost of the investigation and the adjudication, as follows:

W.L. Lee For the room and printing the notice in the Newspaper
G.M. Robertson For copying the claim
J. Kekaulahao For the map
J.H. Smith For the day services on 17 of November 1848
For copying the words of the witness ½ page
For the survey
For the copying
For the adjudication on the December 16, 1852
$6

Surveyed by F.S. Lyman

Here are the boundaries
Waiakea, Hilo, Hawaii
Commencing at the mauka corner of the kuleana of Kuahopu that adjoins the road, and running on the aforementioned boundary north 80˚ east 4.89 chains until the western corner of Kapu’s kuleana. Then running at the aforementioned kuleana south 8 ¾ east 6.86 chains until the fish pond, then from half of the fishpond south 47˚ west 1.75 chains then running north 27˚ west 2.60 chains, then south 57˚ west 1.17 chains then south 40 ½ west 3.01 chains then running north 3 ½ west 7.60 chains until the point of commencement.

Within this 3 4/10 acre

Kamano(nu)haka- LCAw. 8803

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kamanohaka Hilo, Waiakea Feb. 5, 1848</td>
<td>Greetings to the Board of Commissioners. I am Kamanohaka of Waiakea, Piopio. I am testifying before you for my kuleana land here in Piopio. The east and west is one chain, north is three chains, south is two chains. My land is an irregular square. This land came into my possession in the year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1845, and this is my fourth year living on this land with the good thoughts of the konohiki.

Kamanohaka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Testimony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kamano(nu)haka 8803</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kamanohaka Nov. 17 Hoohikiia o Levi a olelo mai la, Ua ike au ia i ka ili aina i <strong>Piopio</strong> ahupuaa Waiakea Hilo ma Hawaii. Apana aina, mauka ko Kauhi. Ma Hamakua ko Kuahopu. Makai ko‘u. Ma Puna he loko Waiakea. 3 <strong>kihapai</strong> ua mahi hapaia, me na hale no Kahula mai kona loa 1843. Aole mea keakea. Hoohiki o Kalua, a olelo maila, ua ike no au i keia aina e like loa me na olelo a pau a Levi i hai iho nei.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kamanohaka Nov. 17 Levi sworn in and testifies, I know this to be on the ili aina of Piopio, ahupuaa Waiakea, Hilo on Hawaii a parcel of land, situated mauka is Kauhi’s, Hamakua side is Kuahopu, makai is mine and Puna side is the Waiakea pond. Three partially cultivated lots, with houses from Kahula who received it in 1843. No one had objected. Kalua sworn in and testified that his knowledge of this land is the same as Levi’s testimony.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Commission Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kamano(nu)haka 8803</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helu 8803 Kamanuhaka Waikea Hilo, Hawaii E hoomaka me ke kiki Hema o keia pili ana me ka aina o Konohiki a me Kuahopu a me (illegible) ma kapa <strong>fish pond</strong> a e holo ana Ak. 28’ Kom 118 kap. ala’ila H 75˚ kom. 125 kap. ala’ila Hema 1˚ Kom 48 kap. ala’ila Hema 41˚ 45’ Kom. 136 kap. Alaila Hema 37˚46˚ H. 132 kap. Alaila Ak. 62˚15˚ Hi 253 kapuai a hiki i kahi i hoomaka’i. Ma ia apana 1246 57/100 Uku pau loa $4.00 G.M. Robertson (illegible) W.L. Lee J.H. Smith J. Kekaulahao Honolulu, June 25 1854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number 8803 Kamanuhaka Waikea Hilo, Hawaii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commencing at the south corner adjacent to the Konohiki land and Kuahopu and (illegible) at the edge of the fishpond and running north 28° west 118 feet, then east 75° west 125 feet, then south 1° west 48 feet, then south 41'45' west 136 feet, then south 37°46' east 132 feet, then north 62°15' east 253 feet until the point of commencement. At this parcel 1246 57/100

Total paid $4.00

G.M. Robertson
(illegible)
W.L. Lee
J.H. Smith
J. Kekaulahao

Honolulu, June 25 1854

**Kapu- LCAw. 1F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Kapu 1F</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Native Register located on Papakilo or Hawai‘i State Archives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foreign Testimony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Kapu 1F</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoe Punini sworn knows this place to be sent. Mahoe sworn deposed knows this place to be in the ahupuaa of Waiakea on land of <a href="#">Plipio</a> -- 2 lots, 1 field- North is Kaulu’s land--east Kamanukaha’s, south waste land of Kohohiki, west lot of Kalua- no house, partly fenced. 1 cultivated-- has descended to claimant from his ancestors, and knows of no difficulty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punini sworn depose to be truth of the above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Commission Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Kapu 1F</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helu 1F Kapu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ua koi mai oia no kona wahi ma Waiakea, ma Hilo ma ka mokupuni o Hawaii no ka mea ua loaa iaia keia wahi no kona kupuna mai, a ua noho keakea oleia a hiki i keia manawa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oi aka makou e hooko nei no Kapu, he kuleana hoi kona malalo iho o ke Ano Alodio. Ina e uku mai oia i ko ke Aupuni hapaha, alaila ua kupono iaia ka Palapala Sila Alodio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pono nae iaia ke uku no ka hookolokolo ame ka hooholo mai ka olelo penei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.L. Lee No ka rumi ame ke pai ana i ka olelo ma ka Nupepa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.M. Robertson No ke kope ana i ka olelo koina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Kekaulahao No ka palapala kii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| J.H. Smith | No hana ana i ka la 5 o Aperila 1848  
No ke kope ana i ka olelo o na hoike ½ aaoa  
No ke ana ana i ka la  
No ka kope ana  
No ka hooholo ana i ka olelo i ka la Decemaba 16, 1852 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anaia e F.S. Lyman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eia na palena  
Waiakea, Hilo, Hawaii  
E homaka keia ma ke kihi Hema Hikina o ke kuleana o Kuahopu a e holo ma ia kuleana Hema 80˚ Kom. 1.17 kaul. a hiki i ke kuleana ana o Kalua, alaila e holo ma ia kuleana Hem. 8¼ Hik. 6.86 kaul. a hiki i ka loko ia. Alaila ma kapa o ka loko Ak. 74% Hik. 2.58 kaul. a hiki i ka papohaku mawaena o na loko.  
Alaila e holo Ak. 14½ Hik. 1.00 kaul. i ke kumu ulu, alaila e holo Ak. 20% Kom. 5.78 kaul. ma ke kuleana o Punini a hiki ma kahi e homaka’i.  
Maloko o keia 1 6/10 eka  

| Number 1F Kapu |  
|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| He has summoned for his place at Waiakea, in Hilo on the island of Hawaii because he received this place from his ancestors, and has occupied it since without objection. |
| This is what we are fulfilling for Kapu, he has kuleana less than Allodial. If he pays for the Governments one fourth, then he will have a right to a Royal Patent. |
| He must also pay for the cost of the investigation and the adjudication, as follows: |
| W.L. Lee | For the room and printing the notice in the Newspaper |
| G.M. Robertson | For copying the claim |
| J. Kekaulahao | For the map |
| J.H. Smith | For the day services on the 5 day of April 1848  
For copying the words of the witness ½ page  
For the survey  
For the copying  
For the adjudication on December 16, 1852 |
|             | $5                                                                                                   |
|             | Surveyed by F.S. Lyman                                                                              |

Here are the boundaries  
Commencing at the southeast corner of Kuahopu’s kuleana and running along the aforementioned kuleana south 80˚ west 1.17 chains until the kuleana of Kalua, then running along the aforementioned kuleana south 8¼ east 6.86 chains until the fishpond. Then at the edge of the pond north 74% east 2.58 chains until the rockwall in the middle of the ponds. Then running north 14 ½ east 1.00 chains to the breadfruit tree, then running north 20% west 5.78 chains on the kuleana of Punini until the point of commencement.  
Within this 1 6/10 acre.
### Native Register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kuahopu</th>
<th>January 17, 1848</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aloha oukou e na luna kuleana hoona aina. O wau o Kuahopu no Waiakea, he wahi kuleana aina ko’u ma <strong>Piopio</strong>, 47 anana ka loa, pela no ka laula, oia kahi i ku ai ko’u <strong>hale</strong>. He mau wahi <strong>kihapai</strong> e ae no, o kekah i 41 anana ka loa, 22 anana ka laula. O kekah i 11 anana ka loa, 8 anana ka laula. O kekah i 11 anana ka loa, pela no ka laula. O kahi aina o’u, eono <strong>kipi</strong> maloko o ka loko, he apana aina e aku.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kuahopu</th>
<th>January 17, 1848</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greetings to the Board of Commissioners. I am Kuahopu of Waiakea. I have a kuleana at Piopio, 47 ananas in length as is the width, this is where my house stands. I have additional lots, one is 41 ananas in length, 22 ananas in width. Another is 11 ananas in length, by 8 ananas in width. Another is 11 ananas in length as is the width. Another land of mine contains six kipi within, this is another land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Native Testimony

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kuahopu</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoohikiia'o Nakai aolelo mai la ua ike au aia i ke ili aina i <strong>Piopio</strong> ahupuaa o Waiakea, Hilo, Hawaii. Eono nae apana.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Apana I mauka ko Kalua. Ma Hamakua o Kolea he aina. Makai ko Kahihe. Ma Puna ko Niihau. Aole keia aina i paia, **elua nae ona hale** malaila, **eha kihapai** ua mahi hapaia. |


| Apana ekolu. Mauka ko Kane. Ma Hamakua ko Niihau. **1 kihapai kipi** aole i mahiia. |


| Apana 5- Mauka o Alenoho he ili aina. Ma Hamakua aina wale. Makai he aina waiho wale no. Ma Puna ko Samuela aina. **Hookahi kihapai** aole i mahi ia, aole hale. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Hoomiki o Levi a olelo mai la ua ike no au i keia aina e like me ka Nakai hana mai.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hooohiki o Levi a olelo mai la ua ike no au i keia aina e like me ka Nakai hana mai.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kuahopu</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nakai sworn in and testifies that I know this land to be on the ili aina of Piopio, ahupuaa of Waiakea, Hilo, Hawaii. Contains six parcels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Parcel 1</strong> - Mauka is Kalua’s, Hamakua side is Kolea a land, makai is Kainhenui’s, Puna side is Nihau’s. This land is not enclosed, however he has two houses there, four lots that has been partially cultivated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Parcel 2</strong> - Mauka is Kainhenui’s, Hamakua side is the planting lot of Kekuanaoa, makai is Kaiana’s enclosure, Puna side is Kaihe’s land. One cultivated lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Parcel 3</strong> - Mauka is Kane’s, Hamakua side is Nihau’s. One uncultivated mound taro patch lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Parcel 4</strong> - Mauka is Kaiana’s, Hamakua side is Kane’s, makai for the Konohiki and Kauhi’s. Six cultivated mound taro patch lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Parcel 5</strong> - Mauka is Alenoho, an ili aina, Hamakua is just land, makai is just abandoned land, Puna side is Samuela’s land. One uncultivated lot, no house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Parcel 6</strong> - Mauka is abandoned land, Hamakua side is Kahalelau’s land, makai is Kainhenui’s, Puna side is Samuela’s land. Two cultivated lots, no houses. His lot is from Samuela at Kolea in 1840. The four parcels for Piopio. It’s an ancient land from the time of Kamehameha I. No one has objected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levi sworn in and testified that his knowledge of this land is the same as Nakai’s testimony.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Commission Award</th>
<th><strong>Kuahopu 5157</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transcription</strong></td>
<td><strong>Helu 5157 Kuahopu</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ua koi mai oia no kona wahi ma Piopio, Waiakea, ma Hilo ma ka mokupuni o Hawaii no ka mea ua loa ia iaia keia wahi no kona mau kupuna mai ka Apana 1, 2, 3, 4 a no Pea mai ka Apana 5, 6 i ka makahiki 1840, a ua noho keakea oleia a hiki i keia manawa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oi aka makou e hooko nei no Kuahopu, he kuleana hoi kona malalo iho o ke Ano Alodio. Ina e uku mai oia i ko ke Aupuni hapaha, alaila ua kupono iaia ka Palapala Sila Alodio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pono nae iaia ke uku no ka hookolokolo ame ka hooholo mai ka olelo penei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W.L. Lee No ka rumi ame ke pai ana i ka olelo ma ka Nupepa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G.M. Robertson No ke kope ana i ka olelo koina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Kekaulahao No ka palapala kii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| J.H. Smith | No hana ana i ka la 17 o Nowemapa 1848  
            | No ke kope ana i ka olelo o na hoike ½ aoao  
            | No ke ana ana i ka la  
            | No ka kope ana  
            | No ka hooholo ana i ka olelo Decemaba 16, 1852 |
|------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Anaia e H.M Lyman |
| Eia na palena |
| Piopio, Waiakea, Hilo, Hawaii |
| Apana 1- E hoomaka ana ma ke kumu ulu ma ka palena o Kaihenui a e holo  
  Ak 73½ Hik. 4.80 kaul. a hiki i kahi kumu niu, alaila Akau 73¼ kom. 5.85 kaul.  
  a hiki i ke kuleana o Kaihenui, alaila Hem 1° Hik. 3.22 kaul. alaila Ak. 86° Hik  
  0.96 kaul. a hiki ma kahi e hoomaka’i. Maloko o keia apana 94/100 o ka eka.  
Apana 2- E hoomaka keia ma kahi ahupohaku ma kapa o ka alanui ma ke kahi  
Hema o keia, a e holo ikai Ak. 8° Hik 6.66 kaul. alaila Ak. 12° Hik. 5.43 kaul.  
alaila Ak. 57½ Hik. 4.55 kaul. alaila e holo Ak. 20¾ Kom. 6.18 kaul. a hiki i ka  
loko, alaila e holo ma ka loko Hem 83° Kom. 6.17 kaul. alaila e holo hema 3°  
Hik. 1.55 kaul. & hema 86¼ Kom. 3.75 kaul. a hiki i ke kuleana o Kaihenui,  
alaila e holo ma ka palena o ia kuleana Hem. ½° Hik. 3.83 kaul. & Ak. 74¾  
Kom. 1.60 kaul. i ke alanui, alaila e holo ania alanui hema 6¾ Hik. 8.50 kaul.  
a hiki ma kahi e hoomaka’i.  
Maloko o keia apana 12 3/10 eka |

| Translation |
| Number 5157 Kuahopu |
| He has summoned for his place at Piopio, Waiakea, in Hilo on the island of  
Hawaii because he received this place from his ancestors parcel 1,2,3,4 and  
from Pea parcels 5,6 in the year 1840, and has occupied it since without  
objection.  
This is what we are fulfilling for Kuahopu, he has kuleana less than Allodial. If  
he pays for the Governments one fourth, then he will have a right to a Royal  
Patent.  
He must also pay for the cost of the investigation and the adjudication, as  
follows:  
W.L. Lee For the room and printing the notice in the Newspaper  
G.M. Robertson For copying the claim  
J. Kekaulahao For the map  
J.H. Smith For the day services on the 5 day of April 1848  
For copying the words of the witness ½ page  
For the survey  
For the copying  
For the adjudication on December 16, 1852 |
| $12 |
| Surveyed by H.M. Lyman |
| Here are the boundaries |
Piopio, Waiakea, Hilo, Hawaii

Parcel 1- Commencing at the breadfruit tree on the boundary of Kaihenui and running north 73½ east 4.80 chains until the coconut tree, then north 73¾ west 5.85 chains, until the kuleana of Kaihenui, then south 1° east 3.22 chains, then north 86° east 0.96 chains until the point of commencement. Within this parcel 94/100 of an acre.

Parcel 2- Commencing at the rockmound as the edge of the road at the south corner of this, and running toward the sea north 8° east 6.66 chains, then north 12° east 5.43 chains, then north 57½ east 4.55 chains, then running north 20¼ west 6.18 chains until the pond, then running along the pond south 83° west 6.17 chains then running south 3° east 1.55 chains and south 86¼ west 3.75 chains until the kuleana of Kaihenui, then running along the boundary of that aforementioned kuleana south ½° east 3.83 chains and north 74¾ west 1.60 chains to the road, then running along the road south 6¾ east 8.50 chains until the point of commencement. Within this parcel 12 3/10 acres.

Leoi/Lewi- LCAw. 9982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Native Register</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levi</td>
<td>Waiakea Hilo Feb. 5 1848</td>
<td>Levi, Waiakea, Hilo February 5, 1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloha oukou e na luna kuleana hooina aina. O wau o Levi no Waiakea. Ke hai aku nei au i ko’u mau kuleana apana aina ma Waiakea nei. 4 apana, he mau kihapai ke ano. 6 kekahi aina o’u, o ka loa 62 anana, o ka laula 20 anana. o ka loa o ka apana aina o ka loa 45 anana, o ka laula 13 anana. O ke kolu, aole like na aoao, o kahi aoao 25 anana, o kahi 21 anana o ka laula 14 anana. O ka ha o na apana aina, aole no he like o na aoao, o kahi aoao 16 anana, kahi 14 anana, o kahi 13 anana o kahi 20 anana. Oia ko’u mau kuleana i ka mahāhiki 1840, oia ko’u wa i malama ai i keia kuleana a’u, a hiki mai i keia wa au e hai aku nei ia oukou e na luna hoona kuleana aina.</td>
<td>Greeting to the Board of Commissioners. I am Levi of Waiakea. I am testifying all my kuleana lands here in Waiakea. Four parcels, that are of the cultivated patch type. Six is another land of mine, whose length is 62 anana, and the width is 20 anana. The length of the parcel of land is 45 anana and the width is 13 anana. For the third lot, the sides are not the same, one side is 25 anana, another size is 21 anana, the width is 14 anana. For the fourth of the parcels of land, the sides are not the same, one side is 16 anana, another side is 14 anana, another size is 13 anana, and another side is 20 anana. These are my kuleana lands since the year 1840, which is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
when I began to care for these kuleana of mine, up until today. This is my testimony to you the Board of Commissioners.

Levi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Testimony</th>
<th>Lewi 9982</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lewi</td>
<td>17 Nov.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lewi</strong></td>
<td>17 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamanohaka sworn in and testifies that I know this land to be on the ili aina of Paeaahu. West is my land, north is Apua’s, east is Niihau’s, south is Kamahiai’s. Parcel 1- In Paeaahu. One partially cultivated lot, he has no house there. Parcel 2- Mauka is Apua’s, makai is Niihau’s, Puna side is Kamahiai’s. One partially cultivated lot. Parcel 3- Mauka is the ili aina of Piopio. Hamakua side is Apua’s, makai is Niihau’s. One partially cultivated lot. Parcel 4- Mauka is Piopio, Hamakua side is Apua’s, makai is Konohiki’, Puna side is the pond. One lot, no house, and is not cultivated. I received it from Kawahinenohohilo. No one has objected. Kawahinenohohilo sworn in and testified that his knowledge of this land is the same as Kamanohaka’s testimony. And his land is from me, and he is currently occupying it. I do not object his testimony.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lewi</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawahinenohohilo sworn in and testifed that his knowledge of this land is the same as Kamanohaka’s testimony. And his land is from me, and he is currently occupying it. I do not object his testimony.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Claim Award</th>
<th>Lewi 9982</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lewi</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helu 9982 Lewi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiakea H.H.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Translation

Number 9982 Lewi Waiakea, Hilo, Hawaii
Commencing at the south corner of this land, adjoining the land of Peahu, Konohiki and Kueha and running north 52° east 191 feet, then north 22° west 136 feet, then south 58°15' west 249 feet, then south 45°30' east 159 feet until the point of commencement.
In this parcel 268 17/100 fathoms

James Dillon
30th Apr 1851
Uku pau loa $4.00

(illegible)
G.M. Robertson
W. L. Lee
J.H. Smith
J. Kekaulahao
Honolulu, June 25, 1851

Wahinenohoihilo- LCAw. 10004

Native Register
Wahinenohoihilo 10004

| Transcription | Aloha oukou e na hoona kuleana aina. Ke aloha aku nei au ia oukou, he wahi aina ko’u na kuleana loa mai a Kalaniopuu mai, aia ma Hilo i Waiakea, O Paeahu, he wahi ili aina no nae o Paeahu, o ke kuleana ia wa mai a Kalaniopuu mai, a hiki mai ia Kamehameha akahi, a hiki mai ia Kamehameha alua, a hiki mai ia Kamehameha III, a no laila la na kuleana loa ia Kalaniopuu, o ko’u kupuna no ka mea nana i noho ma wahi ili aina nei o Paeahu, 5 kupuna o’u i make, a loaa mai ia’u. Eia na hoike o Kuahopu, o Nakai, o Niihau, o Lewi, me kekahi mau hoike e ae, eia |
Greetings to the Board of Commissioners. I am expressing my aloha you. I have an ancient kuleana from Kalaniopuu that is in Hilo in Waiakea. It is Paeaahu. Paeaahu is an ili aina. This kuleana was from the time of Kalaniopuu, down to Kamehameha I, to Kamehameha II, and now to Kamehameha III. Therefore, this is an ancient kuleana from Kalaniopuu and it was my ancestors that lived on this ili aina of Paeaahu, five ancestors of mine has died and now it is with me. Here are the testimonies of Kuahopu, Nakai, Niihau, Lewi and other testimonies, here it is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Native Testimony

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Wahinenohoihilo

Nov 17

Hoohiki o Kuahopu a olelo mai la ua ike no au aia i ka ili aina i Paeaahu Waiakea.


3 kihapai ua mahi hapaia. 1 ona hale me kona poe, he aina kahiko keia maia Kalaniopuu mai. Aole mea keakea.

Hoohiki o Nakai a olelo mai la ua ike no au i keia aina e like loa me ka Kuahopu i hai iho nei.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Land Claim Award

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Helu 10004 Wahinenohoihilo

Waikea, Hilo, H

E hoomaka ma ke hihi hikina o keia pili ma kapa fish pond pili ana ma ka aina o Konohiki a me Lewi a me Kamahiai. A e holo ana Hema 48˚ Kom 238 kap. Alaila Ak. 45˚ 30' Kom. 63 kap. Alaila Ak. 18˚ Kom. 244 kap. Alaila Ak. 54˚ 192 kap. Alaila H. 31˚ Hi 274 kap. a hiki i kahi i hoomaka'i. Ma ia apana 2154 fathoms

James Dillon

29th Apl 1851

Uku pau loa $5.00

(illegible)
Translation

Number 10004 Wahinenohoiholo
Waiakea, Hilo, Hawai‘i
Commencing at the eastern corner of this land adjoining at the edge of the fishpond, adjoining the Konohiki lands, Lewi and Kamahiai. And running south 48˚ west 238 feet, then north 45˚ 30’ west 63 feet, then north 18˚ west 244 feet, then north 54˚ 192 feet, then south 31˚ east 274 feet until the point of commencement. In this parcel 2154 fathoms.

James Dillon
29th April 1851

Total paid
$5.00

(illegible)
G.M. Robertson
W. L. Lee
J.H. Smith
J. Kekaulahao
Honolulu, June 25, 1851

Boundary Commission Testimonies

In 1862, the Hawaiian Kingdom legislature created the Commission of Boundaries (Boundary Commission) to legally settle the boundaries for all ahupua‘a and ‘ili kūpono (Alexander 1891:117). The lands claimed by the ali‘i and konohiki during the 1848 Māhele were awarded by name only, which resulted in a number of land disputes by both the ‘Ōiwi and foreign populations (Kelly 1980:68). To help settle the growing number of disputes, the Boundary Commission required all ahupua‘a and ‘ili owners to file an application with the Boundary Commission to have their boundaries lawfully settled. The Boundary Commission required testifiers, who were typically knowledgeable kama‘āina (an individual who is acquainted with the place they were born) to “state the name of the land, the names of the adjoining lands, and the names of the owners of the same, where
known” (Alexander 1891:117; Pukui & Elbert 1986: 124). In addition to the oral testimony, a formal survey was required to establish the boundaries. Relying on oral testimony to precisely identify land boundaries was problematic and often disputed by other testifiers. Testifiers presented their claims before the board and it was the duty of the Boundary Commission to hear all testimony and render a final decision. For some areas, the oral testimony is several pages long, indicating the number of testimonies received by the Boundary Commission. However, with Pi’opi’o this is not the case. In 1873, Kapu, a long time resident, gave his testimony detailing the boundaries of Pi’opi’o. Kapu’s Testimony reads:

The Ahupuaa of Piopio, District of Hilo
Island of Hawaii 3rd J.C.

On this the 16th day of December A.D. 1873 the Commissioner of Boundaries for the Island of Hawaii 3rd j.c. [judicial court] met at the court house in Hilo Hawaii on the application of J.O. Dominis administration of the Estate of H. Kekuanaoa for the settlement of the boundaries of Piopio situated in the District of Hilo, Island of Hawaii. Notice of hearing served by publication in the Hawaiian Gazette of and the Kuokoa of 1873 and [illegible] notice personally served on owners or agents of adjoining lands as far as known. President G. Hitchcock for applicants, and crown commissioner.
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Kapu sworn,
I am a kamaaina of Waiakea and know the boundaries of Piopio as I was born on that land. I know that Webster surveyed it as I went with him.

Commencing at the sea beach at the point of land just on this west side of the Wailoa river then mauka along the river to the fishpond called Hoakimau, at the side of Waialoa [Wailoa] river said pond belonging to Piopio. Thence leaving the wall of the fish pond, the boundary runs across the land to Kuahopu’s kuleana on the land of Piopio bordering on the Kipi of Peaahu. Thence between the kuleana of Kapu on Piopio and Punini on Waiakea to fish pond called Moholi [Mohouli]. Thence between the fish pond of Moholi [Mohouli]. Thence between the fish pond of Moholi [Mohouli] belonging to Piopio and Waiakea fish pond belonging to Waiakea along a stone wall which is between them to Waiaholi [Waiahole] fish pond, belonging to Waiakea thence the boundary turns and runs mauka along this pond to a corner
of the stone wall of the old pond. Thence to the government road leading to Olaa to an old
stone wall which is the makai boundary of a fish pond called Kalepolepo belonging to Waiakea
touching the wall on the Puna corner the boundary runs between the pond to near where the
church now stands where the pond ceases. Thence along Moholi [Mohoulī] pond near to
Paele’s house thence to the door on the makai side of Kaaua’s house, there the boundary turns
and runs back to the road leading to the beach past the Governess's place. From Kaaua’s house
to the road the boundary follows an old foot path. Thence to where the old foot path leading
to Waikaa [Waiakea] pond crosses the Government road: Thence in a northerly direction along
the Government road and across the bridge to the breadfruit trees, to on the mauka side and
one on the makai side of the road, between the foot path leading to Kuahopu’s house and
Nalimu’s house. Thence it crosses to the road and runs makai to a grove of bamboo [bamboo]
in the Governess’s yard. Thence passing on the Hilo side of the large house and Puna end of a
smoke house on the Governess's premises to the sea shore thence along the shore to the
mouth of Waialoa [Wailoa] river.
Before reaching Punini’s and my kuleana the boundary runs between Kuahopu’s and Levi’s
kuleana. Kuahopu’s kuleana is on Piopio, Levi’s is on Waiakea. My ancestors (now dead)
showed me the boundaries. Kalolohe was one, Kaheana was another, Kalua also and Nihau
now living showed them to me. The dryland above the bridge belongs to Piopio and the rushes
to Waiakea. Wherever there is water in the river it is on Waiakea and the dryland in on Piopio.
Kaihenui’s mauka piece of land projects into Piopio.

Testimony closed
R.A. Lyman
Commissioner of Boundaries 3rd j.c.

Decision
Given at Hilo, February the 19th A.D 1874.
The boundaries of Piopio are decided by as given in the evidence of witnesses and notes of
survey by W. Webster. E.G. Hitchcock is ordered to set a stone marked PW firmly in the ground
at the place where the stump of the coconut tree used to stand, on the northern boundary of
Piopio, previous to the issuing of the certificate of boundary.

R.A. Lyman
Commissioner of Boundaries 3rd j.c. q

Following Kapu’s testimony, W. Webster completed the survey for Pi’opi’o. In 1874,
the Commissioner of Boundaries for the island of Hawaii’i 3rd Judicial Court, Rufus A. Lyman,
certified the boundaries. The survey and certificate read:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Boundary Commission</th>
<th>no. 29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii 3rd j.c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certificate of the Boundaries of Piopio
District of Hilo, Island of Hawaii 3rd j.c.
Upon the application of J.O. Dominis, administrator of the Estate of H.H.M. Kekuanaoa and by the virtue of the authority vested in me by law, as sole Commissioner of Land Boundaries for the island of Hawaii 3rd j.c. [judicial court] thereby decide and certify the boundaries of the Iliaina Piopio, District of Hilo, Island of Hawaii, to be as hereinafter set forth.

Given under my hand at Hilo
This nineteenth day of February
A.D. 1874
R.A. Lyman
Commissioner of Boundaries 3rd j.c.

**Boundaries of Piopio**

Commencing at the north-west angle of Piopio, at high water mark, opposite a stone marked PW, thence around this land along boundary of Waiakea south 1°25' west 418 feet. South 4°20' east 131 feet. South 4°0' east 150 feet. South 3°0' east 229 feet. South 1°0' east 312 feet to old wall on the north side of road from beach to Kalepolepo. Thence along wall south 8°35' east 444 feet. Thence along wall south 3°0' East 129 feet. Thence along foot path south 71°20' west 11 feet. Thence along old wall south 33°16' east 115 feet. South 33°0' west 17 feet and south 24°50' East 56 feet to south side of road. Thence south 26°40' east 180 feet to side of fish pond called Mohouli. Thence along side of fish pond north 31°50' west 240 feet to Government road to Olaa and Kilauea. Thence along road on the wall between Mohouli and Kalepolepo fish pond south 37°0' east 85 feet. Thence leaving road and running south 87°30' east 260 feet. Thence along wall of Mohouli fish pond north 53°50' west 157 feet. North 5°46' west 214 feet along between Mohouli and the large Waiakea fish pond. Thence north 8°15' west 143 feet. North 16°0' west 186 feet. North 27°10' west 162 feet. Thence along line of breadfruit trees north 15°48' west 264 feet. North 32°15' east 66 feet. West 183 feet to breadfruit tree. Thence north 32°15' east 66 feet. Thence north 62°42' east 613 feet. Thence in the bent line along wall of fish pond called Hoakimau adjoining Wailoa Stream. North 7°8' east 211 feet. Thence along north side of Wailoa in a north easterly direction 870 feet. Thence along side of hard land north 74°0' east 198 feet. North 87°0' east 138 feet. North 70°54' east 142 feet. North 26°30' east 150 feet and north 13°30' east 170 feet to bridge over Wailoa, thence along side of Wailoa to sea shore, thence along sea shore in a westerly direction to the place of commencement, and containing an area of 44.15 acres.

R.A. Lyman
Commissioner of Boundaries 3rd j.c.

Surveyed by W. Webster
Cost in full $17.25

**Analysis of Kuleana Awards**

A review of the Kuleana documents for Pi’opi’o has yielded information useful in conceptualizing how ‘Ōiwi utilized and related to the marine and landed areas of Pi’opi’o.
More interesting are the subtle notes for place names, fishponds, boundary markers, and horticultural techniques. Today, visitors to this area will see little tangible evidence of this time period. Therefore, it is even more critical that we formulate our understanding of the area based on knowledge documented and preserved by those who lived and cultivated this area. In the following section, I analyze information from both the Boundary Commission and Kuleana awards, specifically ʻili names, aliʻi affiliation, horticultural techniques and the allocation of fishponds.
Table 8. Summary of Kuleana Awards for Piʻopiʻo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCAw.</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Year Awarded</th>
<th>Inheritance Relationship</th>
<th>‘Ili Name</th>
<th># Apana</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Natural Resources</th>
<th>Royal Patent #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7713</td>
<td>V. Kamāmalu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kīnaʻu</td>
<td>Piʻopiʻo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279</td>
<td>K. Halai</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>Kapuaakuni</td>
<td>Kolea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kekūanaoʻa pā mahiʻai</td>
<td></td>
<td>8191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11050B</td>
<td>Kaihenui</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Kapapa</td>
<td>Kolea</td>
<td>Piʻopiʻo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 kihāpai 4 houses</td>
<td>4365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 dwelling house iwi- stone wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8854</td>
<td>Kalua</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kupuna during the time of Kam. I</td>
<td>Piʻopiʻo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>house lot 5 kihāpai house alanui na Kekūanaoʻa</td>
<td>pond</td>
<td>1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8803</td>
<td>Kamano(nu)haka</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Konohiki</td>
<td>Piʻopiʻo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 kihāpai houses</td>
<td>fishpond</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1F</td>
<td>Kapu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kupuna</td>
<td>Piʻopiʻo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5157</td>
<td>Kuahopu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parcels 1-4 from kupuna since the time of Kam. I</td>
<td>Piʻopiʻo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 houses 8 kihāpai pā kanu o Kekūanaoʻa 7 kihāpai kipi</td>
<td></td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9982</td>
<td>Lewi</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Kawahinenohoihilo</td>
<td>Paeʻaʻahu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 kihāpai</td>
<td></td>
<td>1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10004</td>
<td>Wahinenohoihilo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kupuna during time of Kalaniʻōpuʻu</td>
<td>Paeʻaʻahu</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 kihāpai 1 hale</td>
<td>fishpond</td>
<td>2768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Boundaries and ‘Ili Names

Based on the summary of Kuleana awards (see Table 8), three different ‘ili names are recorded: Kolea, Pi‘opi‘o and Pae‘a‘ahu. At first glance, the examined Kuleana awards appear to be within the ‘ili kūpono of Pi‘opi‘o, however through the analysis of the Kuleana awards it is clear that Pae‘a‘ahu and Kolea were smaller ‘ili ‘āina that were subsumed within the land holdings for the Waiākea ahupua‘a and were not considered a part of Pi‘opi‘o. Figure 28 details the various ‘ili names documented around the area of Pi‘opi‘o. Because ‘ili boundaries were not surveyed, the exact location of these ‘ili remains unknown. Therefore, the ‘ili depicted in Figure 28 are approximate locations that were established using Māhele records and ethnohistorical references.


Figure 28. Enhanced portion of Registered Map No. 1561, by Baldwin & Monsarrat ca. 1891 showing the approximate location of ‘ili ‘āina. State of Hawai‘i, Department of Accounting and General Services.

**Ali‘i Affiliation**

The Kuleana documents also confirm a relationship between the ali‘i Kekūanao‘a and several tenants. The testimony given by Kalua references the “alanui na Kekuanaoa” or “Kekūanao‘a’s road.” Registered Map No. 1561 (see Figure 29) depicts the road labeled as “Piopio Road.” It is likely this road was considered to be the property of Kekūanao‘a as it was not claimed by any tenants. Additionally, this route was the main artery that provided residents with mauka-makai access. Both Halai (1279) and Kuahopu (5157) also
give reference to planting fields or plots (pā kanu and pā mahi’ai) belonging to Kekūanao’a. As Apple and Kikuchi (1975:2) note, these royal gardens were important not just for the ali‘i, but also the maka‘āinana, in that it ensured less demand on the maka‘āinana’s food production resources. This demonstrates that the ali‘i did not tax the maka‘āinana’s personal gardens, rather the maka‘āinana set aside and maintained specific garden plots for the ali‘i.

It appears that at the time of the Māhele and Kuleana claims process, Pi‘opi‘o was held under and passed through the possession of several Kuhina Nui, ending with Kamāmalu. Given that ʻili kūpono land divisions are historically described to be held only by the mōi, the Māhele records suggest that during the monarchy era, ʻili kūpono could also be held by and passed through succeeding Kuhina Nui.
Horticulture in Piʻopiʻo

The earliest map located for the Hilo area showing kalo cultivation was produced by Lieutenant Malden in 1824 (see Figure 30). The map depicts vast tracts of agricultural fields extending from the Wailuku River all the way to the Wailoa River. Agricultural fields are also noted within the Piʻopiʻo area.
Figure 30. Enlarged portion of Registered Map No. 833 by Lieutenant Malden ca. 1825, shows agricultural fields along the coast of Hilo Bay. State of Hawai‘i, Department of Accounting and General Services.

References to several types of horticultural practices are also described in several Kuleana documents for Pi‘opi‘o. The most commonly referenced is the ‘kihāpai’ and ‘kipi’ styles of horticulture. According to Lucas (1995:53), a kihāpai is a cultivated patch, garden, orchard, field or even small farm, and was for the exclusive use of the tenant. The Kuleana documents, however, do not describe these kihāpai in greater detail.

The second method referenced is the kipi or kihāpai kipi. In the 1930s, E.S. Craighill and Elizabeth Green Handy along with Mary Kawena Pukui recorded Ōiwi horticultural practices across Hawai‘i. In their study, they report the kipi style of planting as being specific to the swampy areas of Waiākea. Handy, Handy & Pukui (1991:91) write:

At Hilo, Hawaii, in the swamps of Waiakea another method of wet planting, termed kipi kalo, was developed. It reportedly consisted of heaping up, above the surface of the water, long mounds (kipi or kikipipi) of soil upon the tops and sides of which the cuttings were planted. This method of planting is now abandoned at Hilo...
Kuahopu (LCAw 5157) is the only hoa‘āina from Pi‘opi‘o to report this style of cultivation in his Native Testimony. Another Kuleana awardee named Nakai (LCAw 4785) also noted kipi planting. Although Nakai’s parcel was located on a different ‘ili ‘āina, it indicates that the method of kanu kipi was practiced at the water’s edge. In Figure 31, the land to the east of Kuahopu’s second parcel, adjacent to Wailoa River, is marked as marshlands and it is likely that these kipi were located in this area. Aerial photos (see Figure 32 & 33) taken in 1925 shows agricultural fields that match the kipi method descriptions.

The kipi method of kalo (taro) cultivation is a highly specialized horticultural practice that maximized marshlands for food production. Given the area’s proximity to the ocean, these kipi mounds likely utilized natural groundwater springs to prevent soil salination, and was designed to ensure proper water circulation to prevent stagnation, and to filter any water or soil impurities that would affect the growth of the kalo (Konanui, Jerry. 2016. Personal communication to author, July 2).
Figure 31. Enhanced portion of Registered Map No. 1561, by Baldwin & Monsarrat ca. 1891 show kuleana noted for having kipi planting mounds. State of Hawai‘i, Department of Accounting and General Services.
Figure 32. Aerial photo of Wailoa River with agricultural fields at top right corner. 1929. National Archives and Records Administration.

Figure 33. Close up of aerial photo showing agricultural mounds. 1929. National Archives and Records Administration.
**Fishpond Resources**

The Boundary Commission testimony that was given by Kapu also indicates that the loko i’a (fishponds) of Hō’akimau and Mohouli were included in the Pi’opi’o land holdings, while the loko i’a of Waiākea, Waiāhole and Kalepolepo were part of the Waiākea land holdings (see Figure 34). This level of detail sheds light on the allocation of fishpond resources between Pi’opi’o and the larger Waiākea ahupua’a. In addition to resource allocation, this perhaps was a way the ali’i managed some of the risk inherent in aquaculture.

![Google aerial image of Pi’opi’o showing kuleana award in Pi’opi’o along with Ho’akimau and Mohouli fishponds](image)

*Figure 34. Google aerial image of Pi’opi’o showing kuleana award in Pi’opi’o along with Ho’akimau and Mohouli fishponds*
CHAPTER VI. A CRITICAL APPROACH TO REBUILDING COMMUNITY

This study, in large part, was undertaken to enhance our understanding of Pi’opi’o’s ‘Ōiwi history, but more importantly to seek a critical approach in rebuilding a community that will have an active role in revitalizing the area. Community building is a complex, protracted, and sometimes ill-defined process. Cultural researchers are often tasked with engaging with a ‘community’ as if it were a one-dimensional construct unfettered by politics, history, ethnicity, class, age or other social parameters. As Waterton (2015:55) points out, the term community is “one of the most ambiguous words in sociological literature.” Although we value and celebrate successful community-based initiatives, it is imperative that we remain critical of the process and the outcomes (Waterton and Watson 2011:13). The purpose of this chapter is threefold: 1) to define my notion of community, 2) detail the various community engagement efforts conducted in this study, and 3) critically discuss the value of this approach.

Throughout this research process, I have employed an Indigenous theory, more specifically the “triple-piko” framework (see Chapter II) to guide my community engagement efforts. Conceptualizing this framework at the onset of this study allowed me to thoughtfully think though the various stages of community rebuilding. Like most community-based endeavors, time is abstract and success is an ongoing process that hinges on creating and maintaining successful relationships with all stakeholders.

Defining Community

Rebuilding a community in Pi’opi’o required reflection on the area’s historical and contemporary aspects, all while projecting for an improved future. As previously
mentioned (see Chapter II), my definition of community is any individual that believes in promoting or advocating for the preservation of place-based knowledge specific to Pi’opi’o. While advocacy and preservation are what unifies this community, connecting with lineal descendants is a high priority, especially here in Hawaiʻi. In Hawaiʻi, the notion of continuity between the past and present is both acknowledged and challenged in public and political forums. Given the cultural history of the area and current status as a public park, I opted to take an open-door approach by rebuilding a community that is unified by a passion for preserving Pi’opi’o’s history, rather than one bound by ethnicity, age, geographical region, race or class. Through the ethnohistorical records, I have been able to successfully seek out community members with direct genealogical links to Pi’opi’o. Connecting with individuals with such ties to the area is vital to my community outreach efforts because those connections are the physical manifestations of historical continuity. Here, the imaginary boundaries of the past and present are blurred and the present is realized as a condition of the past (Waterton and Watson 2011:15). In addition to connecting with lineal descendants, my public outreach efforts have also focused on creating opportunities for both descendants, kamaʻāina (locally born), and malihini (foreigners) to participate in learning about Piʻopiʻo’s history and contribute to revitalizing the area.

**Community Engagement Efforts**

Community engagement efforts started in the Fall of 2015 as I began conceptualizing a summer program that would engage students from Waiʻakea High School in Piʻopiʻo’s history. Because they were students, I felt it necessary to create opportunities
for them to be able to understand and help preserve the area’s cultural history. Involving our ‘ōpio (youth) in this research endeavors is critical when considering long-term restoration and preservation initiatives. Our ‘ōpio have helped to generate enthusiasm about the area’s history and are seen as key advocates essential for effecting positive change. Additionally, involving ‘ōpio pivots on the notion of realizing historical continuity by having them act as the link between the present and the future.

With the proper permits secured from the Department of Land and Natural Resources, State Parks Division, I partnered with the non-profit organization Huliauapa’a, Nohopapa Hawai’i LLC., the Queen Lili’uokalani Children’s Center, Kamehameha Schools, Wailoa Center and Waiākea High School to host the 2016 Wahi Kupuna Internship Program (WKIP). Four high school students participated in the five-week long WKIP and a number of community members assisted with various components of the program. The main goal of the 2016 WKIP was to improve our understanding and physical connection to Pi’opi’o through cultural, academic, and technical training. Providing the interns with rigorous professional and academic training has helped to build community capacity while encouraging them to pursue higher education and engage in future community-based research. Throughout the program, the interns and WKIP staff were able to meet and build relationships with stakeholders and descendants. Additionally, the interns assisted with archival research, archaeological surveys, documenting remaining cultural sites and an oral history interview.

One of the most significant archaeological finds came during the aquatic survey of Mohouli fishpond. One June 14, 2016, three interns along with myself and Kalā Mossman,
conducted an aquatic survey of the various fishponds. Most of our time was spent in the Waiākea and Mohouli fishponds since access to these ponds is a little more difficult given that they are overgrown with an invasive grass. Although we experienced a torrential downpour which affected visibility, we did managed to relocate a portion of the Mohouli fishpond walls that measured approximately 3 meters wide (see Error! Reference source not found.). Although the walls are still intact, they are badly overgrown with para grass (Urochloa mutica) and a species of palm, milo (Thespesia populnea), and honohono grass (Commelina diffusa). Further investigations of the walls are required to determine their extent, condition, and to possibly secure datable material.

Figure 35. Community member Kalā Mossman pulls back foliage covering Mohouli fishpond walls

The interns also assisted with conducting an oral history interview of Leslie Lang (2016), the great-great-great-grandaughter of the late Henry B. Nalimu. Although I
assumed the primary responsibility for coordinating and conducting the interview, the interns were able to observe and assist with the audio and video recording as well as ensuring that our interviewee was comfortable during the interview.

Each intern was responsible for carrying out and presenting an independent research project. The project topics ranged from traditional agricultural methods, arsenic and invasive species, to historical reconstruction through the use of historical photographs, and the development of potential interpretive signs. I, along with the interns, successfully completed three presentations to different sets of stakeholders. The first informative talk was given to the administration of the Department of Land and Natural Resources in Honolulu, O‘ahu (see Figure 36). The second, a public presentation was held at the end of the five-week program, on July 7, 2016, at the Wailoa Center in Pi‘opi‘o (see Figure 37). This presentation was attended by friends and family of the interns, as well as descendants of families who once resided in Pi‘opi‘o. The last talk was held at the Lyman Memorial Museum on September 26, 2016, in Hilo, and was attended by the broader Hilo community interested in the heritage of Pi‘opi‘o (see Figure 38). For a detailed description of the Wahi Kupuna Internship Program refer to Brandt et al. (2016).
Figure 36. 2016 Wahi Kupuna Interns and Administrators of the Department of Land and Natural Resources. From left to right: Lokelani Brandt (WKIP staff), Aoloa Santos (WKIP staff), Suzanne Case (DLNR Chairperson), Curt Cottrell (Administrator of State Parks, Alan Carpenter (Assistant Administrator of State Parks), Holly McEldowney (State Parks Archaeologist), Alohilani Maiava (2015 WKIP Intern), Tusie`ana Berrios (2016 WKIP Intern), Natalie Keawekane (2016 WKIP Intern), Caleb Akau (2016 WKIP Intern), Craig Okahara-Olsen (2016 WKIP Intern). Back row right to left: Kekoa Kaluhiwa (DLNR First Deputy), Alan Downer (Administrator, State Historic Preservation Officer), Halena Kapuni-Reynolds (WKIP staff). Photo by the Wahi Kupuna Internship Program.

Figure 37. WKIP intern Natalie Keawekane presents her research on traditional agricultural methods at the community Hō’ike at the Wailoa Center. Photo by the Wahl Kupuna Internship Program.
After the 2016 Wahi Kupuna Internship Program was completed, I have continued to independently host educational site visits with local schools and programs for students ranging in ages from elementary school to college. The group visits typically last between one to three hours and consist of a walking tour and sometimes a service-learning component. In addition to the three presentations with the WKIP interns, I independently hosted two additional presentations, one at the Lyman Museum on November 7, 2016, and another at the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo’s Mo‘okini Library on November 18, 2016. The purpose of these public presentations was to create opportunities for our Hilo community to come together and learn about Pi‘opi‘o’s history, and to create opportunities to dialogue with the community throughout the research process. This approach was pivotal to this thesis because it counters the traditional academic research
protocol that often promotes an individualistic research agenda and limited distribution of knowledge back to the community. By hosting multiple community presentations throughout the research process the community is given multiple opportunities to comment on the project and help to shape future projections.

The implementation of this method has also come with some challenges. My ability to make such an investment of time in this project was certainly one that I could not have completed without the help of trusted and reliable colleagues. They willingly dedicated their time and resources to assist me in rebuilding community and caring for Pi’opi’o. Additionally, the two-year time frame which graduate students in the Heritage Management Program at the University of Hawai’i at Hilo are allowed to complete their work is much too short for conducting detailed community-based research. Knowing that I only had two years to complete the MA Heritage Management Program, I wanted to structure my thesis in a way so that I could continue my work after the completion of this thesis. Given the minor challenges faced, overall, the triple-piko framework has successfully guided my community rebuilding efforts. Based on the outcomes of this research, I believe the triple-piko framework can be applied to other community-based research initiatives, especially those that prioritize the preservation of place and strives to rebuild a community.

**The Value of Rebuilding Community**

Trying to rebuild a community merely based on geographical, social or cultural constructs often is problematic and is ethically unsound (Waterton 2015:58). The approach used in this research allows descendants to exercise their right to reconnect to their
heritage, all while creating a space for another generation of descendants, kama‘āina, and new comers to build relationships to Pi‘opi‘o. This approach has shifted my research out of the exploitative realm, where community members are seen as data sources, subject to knowledge exploitation, to a reciprocal one, where there is creative give-back to the people and the place (Waterton 2015:59). If there is one thing this research has taught me it is that people play a critical role in enhancing the value of a place through direct and indirect actions.

Contemporary cultural researchers are often faced with working in dispersed communities that have, through time, experienced a complex layering of history. In the case of Pi‘opi‘o, we are now left with a landscape devoid of permanent residents. With its designation as a public park, individuals are metaphysically transformed into park users with no obligation to reciprocate respect, compassion, or sensitivity for the physical or intangible remains of culture. Park managers and maintenance workers are seen as the primary caretakers of this public space. Over time, the lack of continuous reciprocity and meaningful engagement by the greater public has led to serious issues such as aging infrastructure, vandalism, homelessness, and illegal activities. While this research is not going to immediately change how the greater community uses or interacts with Pi‘opi‘o, it is imperative that we begin to enhance peoples historical understanding of the area. By educating our community about the area’s history, we can affect how they perceive and relate to Pi‘opi‘o. To truly impact the public’s perception of the area, opportunities for engagement must be ongoing and multi-faceted. The value of a place is only realized when
people understand the place’s history and make the conscious decision to make positive and healthy contributions towards its perservation and perpetuation.
CHAPTER VII. CONCLUSION

In this thesis, I have explored the ‘Ōiwi cultural history of Pi’opi’o through the use of Hawaiian language and English ethnohistorical sources, oral history and archaeology, all while bringing this history to the forefront of our community. Chapter One has outlined the motivation and purpose of this study, while Chapter Two expounds on the theoretical framework and methods. Chapters Three, Four, and Five takes an in-depth look at ‘Ōiwi narratives and Māhele documents that highlight the importance of Pi’opi’o for both chiefs of the Island of Hawai’i and the hoa‘āina who resided in Pi’opi’o. From these accounts, we have improved our understanding of when Pi’opi’o was formalized as an ‘ili kūpono and how many generations of ‘Ōiwi have utilized this area for food production, political, and domestic purposes. Chapter Six demonstrates how understanding ‘Ōiwi cultural history has acted as a catalyst to rebuild community and to improve current efforts to care for the area.

This thesis has improved our understanding of the traditional ‘Ōiwi land tenure system by highlighting the value and autonomy of the ‘ili kūpono land division. Drawing from traditional mo‘olelo and ka‘ao we have explored the mythical aspects of Pi’opi’o as a place visited by many gods, goddesses, and cultural heroes. The abundance of historical narratives has helped to establish a temporal order of chiefs and chiefesses who visited or resided in Pi’opi’o. These narratives have shed light on the importance of ‘ili kūpono lands, which I suggest were vital to the rise of Hawai’i island chiefdoms. ‘Ili kūpono lands allowed the ali‘i nui to allocate specific resources to the growing class of chiefs by giving them
unfettered access to important food centers. This would have theoretically lessened the taxes paid by the maka‘āinana to support the growing number of chiefs. Given that ‘ili kūpono lands like Pi‘opi‘o were held by direct grant of the ali‘i nui, this essentially prevented any secondary or tertiary ali‘i from asserting their power or imposing additional taxes onto hoa‘āina. This allowed the ali‘i nui to strategically place preferred individuals in control, who in return ensured continued productivity of the land and marine resources. While this appears to be the case for Pi‘opi‘o, more comparative studies of ‘ili kūpono lands would help to refine this hypothesis. Through the Māhele ‘Āina records we have improved our understanding of how nā kūpuna maximized wetlands like Pi‘opi‘o to produce protein-based foods using fishponds, as well as staple crops like kalo through place-based horticultural methods like kanu kipi.

Although this thesis is focused on the recovery of buried narratives, I believe that I have also demonstrated the idea of cultural continuity by reconnecting with the descendants of the land and creating opportunities to affect public memory about Pi‘opi‘o’s ‘Ōiwi history. In particular, connecting with modern day descendants of the ‘Ī lineage such as those of Henry B. Nalimu is a frank reminder that this study is not just set in the past, but it is intimately connected with a living culture. Increasingly, many people in Hawai‘i, particularly ‘Ōiwi, are seeking meaningful and practical ways to care for the physical and metaphysical remains of our ancestors. Understanding the macro and micro history of places like Pi‘opi‘o through the combined use of Hawaiian language and English ethnohistorical sources, oral history, and archaeology is an important step in maintaining our ‘Ōiwi heritage. When these methods are combined with the goal of rebuilding a
community, they can be a powerful tool in uncovering the significance and value of a place, as well as broadening community identity. As Schofield (2015:198) notes, “[p]laces are central to defining human experience, just as routeways are significant in connecting those places, supporting narratives of a journey made or generating connectivity across [the] landscape. People feel attached to places, and everyone feels this attachment to some degree.”

Another important element that has brought a new degree of richness to this study is my fluency in the Hawaiian language and my ability to use Hawaiian language sources. This is a technical skill that is necessary if we hope to forge past the “Hawaiian canon” and do in-depth ethnohistorical research. Fluency in ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i broadens a researcher’s pool of resources enabling a richer understanding of the history of Hawai‘i and her residents. Fluency in the language greatly affects how we conceptualize, relate to, and understand a culture and its people.

Given there has been no study of this nature for Pi‘opi‘o, it is my hope that this work provides a foundation that will ground future efforts to preserve and perpetuate Pi‘opiʻo’s history. If there is one lesson Piʻopiʻo has taught me, it is that the potential for change is always looming on the horizon. There have been many waves, both figuratively and literally, that have swept through Piʻopiʻo causing great loss and destruction. While we cannot always predict when change will arrive, we do have the ability to be steadfast and grow our efforts by creating opportunities for our community to contribute to learning and adding to the moʻolelo of Piʻopiʻo. Just as the aliʻi and kūpuna like Henry Nālimu, Theodore Kelsey, Mrs. Kaʻai Pahio, Kuahopu, Kalua, Kapu, Kaihenui, and Kamanuhaka left their
moʻolelo for us to trace, I humbly offer this moʻolelo to my community and future generations.

**He pūkoʻa kani ʻāina**
A coral reef that grows into an island.
A person beginning in a small way gains steadily until he/she becomes firmly established (Pukui 1983:100).
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