

## ‘O ‘Oe nō Paha Ia e ka Lau o ke Aloha

*An Essay by Kīhei de Silva*

*Haku mele:* Unknown.

*Date:* Circa 1860s.

*Source:* Nathaniel Emerson, *Unwritten Literature of Hawai‘i*, 82-84.

*Our text:* Emerson, 82. Orthographic editing and translation: Kīhei de Silva.

This mele was first brought to our attention in 1980 by Muriel Seto, director and founding member of the Kawainui Heritage Foundation, past historical chair of the Congress of the Hawaiian People, and past cultural chair of Hawai‘i’s Thousand Friends. Muriel had been collecting oral histories of Kailua’s kūpuna since the 1960s, and some of these elders<sup>1</sup> were not pleased after they had reviewed, at her request, Nathaniel Emerson’s discussion of “‘O ‘Oe nō Paha Ia,” a chant in which the Kawainui Fishpond of Kailua, O‘ahu, is the geographical focus.

Emerson interprets the mele as: “the soliloquy of a lover estranged from his mistress. Imagination is alive in eye and ear to everything that may bring tidings of her, even of her un hoped-for return.”<sup>2</sup> But Muriel’s hoā kūpuna felt that Emerson had missed the boat – or that he had done little more than paddle, in typically overconfident fashion, across the mele’s deceptive surface.

The chant, they told her, is actually a lament for the departure from Kawainui of the mo‘o-guardian Hauwahine. It was she who brought prosperity to Kailua: plenty of fat fish in the pond, and field after field of healthy kalo spreading inland from its well-watered banks. It was she who made this simple covenant with her people: If they lived in pono, she would look after them. If they fell from pono – from harmony with each other, their land, and their akua – then she would leave, and everything would fall apart.

The chant, the kūpuna explained, is voiced by a man who speaks for all of Kailua’s ‘ōiwi. He catches a glimpse of what might be Hauwahine – or at least of the yellowing leaf tips that are a sign of her presence. But it can’t be her. The pond is clogged with limu, its banks are littered with ‘ōpala ‘ai (edible trash: rice, not kalo), and we surviving Hawaiians are but husks of our former selves. And if she were to return, who among us would recognize her. Who would cry in greeting? Who would wail in sorrow?

Yes, the kūpuna explained, “‘O ‘Oe nō Paha Ia” is about estrangement, but estrangement on a much larger and more distressing scale than that of a man and his mistress. It is about how Kailua has been lost to us. Then they asked Muriel about the new hula teacher who lived up the street from Jiro Tanabe in Lanikai – *Māpuana something, the Howell girl who graduated from Maiki. Hasn’t she started looking into the old mele about Ulupō and the Mākālei? Maybe she would be interested in this one.*

We presented “‘O ‘Oe nō Paha Ia e ka Lau o ke Aloha” a year-and-a-half later – at the Merrie Monarch Festival of 1982. It is time we did it again; in fact, we are overdue. Our

thinking then, and now, is something we cleared 28 years ago with Muriel and her circle of feisty kūpuna: we offer the mele in hope, not despair. We work for the return of Hauwahine and her pono. We are among those who would still recognize her and cry out in greeting and joy.

What follows below is a slightly re-edited version of the “O ‘Oe nō Paha Ia” section of our 1982 MM fact sheet when, at the urging of a now-departed generation of Kailua elders, we first accepted responsibility for a voice that transcends their lives and ours.

---

In selecting a second mele to present in tandem with the chant assigned to us in this year’s competition, we have tried to emulate the learned perspective and synthesizing ability of the haku mele responsible for composing “O ‘Oe Ia Ku‘u Ipo Pehi Hīnano.” That poet succeeds in transforming Ha‘inakolo (the much-beleagured, ‘ōhelo-eating woman of Waipi‘o Valley) into a symbol of rejuvenation for the devotees of hula. And the application of this symbol to our own time adds a further dimension to Ha‘inakolo’s significance: she comes to serve as a guardian spirit of the renaissance of our culture. The chant “O ‘Oe Ia Ku‘u Ipo Pehi Hīnano” is one of supplication; it calls on Ha‘inakolo to return to well-being, and it prays, at the same time, for the inspiration and renewal of poet and people.

“O ‘Oe nō Paha Ia e ka Lau o ke Aloha,” the chant with which we pair Ha‘inakolo’s mele, is also the composition of a devotee. It is the expression of an individual’s grief over the absence of a benevolent guardian. As with “O ‘Oe Ia Ku‘u Ipo Pehi Hīnano,” this chant has considerable significance to our own time – to the need of our people, culture, and land for restoration and renewal. Unlike “O ‘Oe Ia Ku‘u Ipo Pehi Hīnano,” however, this chant does not deliver the same uplifting message. But, as we will explain shortly, the fact that we understand “O ‘Oe nō Paha Ia e ka Lau o ke Aloha,” and perform it after a century-and-a-half of neglect, is at least the first step in investing the dance with a positive meaning.

Nathaniel Emerson records “O ‘Oe nō Paha Ia e ka Lau o ke Aloha” in *Unwritten Literature*, 82-83. In the discussion that accompanies his text and translation, he offers the following points of interpretation:

- The song almost explains itself.
- It is the soliloquy of a lover estranged from his mistress.
- The poet is alive to everything that reminds him of her.
- The poet shifts point of view: sometimes he addresses his absent mistress, sometimes he talks to himself, and sometimes he takes the part of an outsider who comments on the situation.
- The poet suffers from his memory of past “vexation and anguish,” but he gives up his old love and his “old selves” for a new attachment just discovered in the “deep waters of love.”

- The poet describes the “wealth of comfort and opulence” that surrounds him at Kawainui, Kailua, O‘ahu, the home of the fish-attracting tree named Mākālei.
- Swarming fish and waving moss (limu) are symbols of the opulence of Kawainui Pond.
- In spite of his new-found peace and prosperity, “there is still a lonely corner” in the poet’s heart for his former lover.

We cannot agree with Emerson’s first statement; the chant is not so simple or transparent that it almost explains itself. Nor – with the exception of his analysis of the poet’s shifting point of view – can we agree completely with anything else that Emerson has to offer. “‘O ‘Oe nō Paha Ia e ka Lau o ke Aloha” is, on its surface, the song of a sensitive lover whose beloved has left him, but we find little in the text to convince us that this lover has set aside his sorrow for someone new, or that he dwells in a place whose peace and prosperity reflect his new-found, almost unassailable tranquility.

Our study of the legends and history of our home, particularly of Kawainui, prompts us to offer the following alternative to Emerson’s interpretation: “‘O ‘Oe nō Paha Ia e ka Lau o ke Aloha” was composed for the mo‘o woman Hauwahine, the benevolent guardian of the Kawainui and Ka‘elepulu ponds. The chant laments Hauwahine’s absence, describes the subsequent neglect of the pond, and expresses the anguish of one who must live through the demise of a sacred relationship and a traditional way of life. In order to support this assertion, we provide brief summaries of the Hauwahine tradition and of the ancient significance and modern decline of Kawainui. We follow these summaries with a careful reinterpretation of the chant.

In the past, most Hawaiian fishponds were guarded by “mo‘o kia‘i.”<sup>3</sup> These keepers, according to Kamakau, protected “the health and welfare of the people” and guaranteed that “they would have enough fish for their needs. They “had extremely long and terrifying bodies ... lay in the water from two to five anana in length ... [and] were black in color.” They were often seen ... at such places as Maunalua, Kawainui, and Ihukoko at Ukoa...”<sup>4</sup> Hauwahine lived with another mo‘o in the two large Kailua ponds; according to an anonymous source cited by Sterling and Summers in *Sites of O‘ahu*, they:

... have come up here and that is why the grass and rush in the water are yellowish. This is a sign of these mo‘o women. Everything they come in contact with turns yellow and that is why we see the yellow hue of the grass and rush in the stream. The natives of this place know the signs of these mo‘o women.<sup>5</sup>

Pukui and Elbert, in their “Glossary of Hawaiian Gods,” add the following description of Hauwahine, most of it based on information supplied by Martha Beckwith’s *Hawaiian Mythology*:<sup>6</sup>

A beneficent *mo‘o* goddess living in Ka-wai-nui and Ka-‘ele-pulu ponds ... She “slept on ‘uki‘uki leaves” (*moe i ka lau o ka ‘uki‘uki*) and yellowed their leaves. She brought an abundance of fish, punished the pond owners if they oppressed the poor, and warded off sickness (HM 126). *Lit.*, female ruler.<sup>7</sup>

Finally, we learn from a 1906 nūpepa version of *Ka Moolelo o Hiiakaikapoliopole* that Hauwahine and an unnamed mo‘o companion took the form of beautiful women bathing on the banks of the stream near Kawainui:

Wahineoma‘o noticed [them] ... and remarked to Hiiaka, “See those beautiful women?” “Those are not real women, but lizards,” replied Hiiaka. Because of Wahineoma‘o’s disbelief, she said, “I will chant and if they remain as they are, then they are human, but if they vanish, they are lizards.” ... When the lizard-women heard her voice, they glanced at each other as if startled and disappeared ... Hiiaka explained, “One [of them], Hau-wahine, belongs up here in Ka-wai-nui and is its guardian ... when she returns, the leaves of the uki grass and bulrushes in the water turn yellow too. This is a sign of the presence of a lizard [mo‘o]. The plants round about take a yellowish hue.”<sup>8</sup>

Whether we attribute the wealth of Kawainui to Hauwahine, to the fish-attracting Mākālei tree, to good fortune, or to the careful stocking and upkeep performed by the pond’s konohiki, it is quite clear that Kawainui was, in ancient times, a site of great material prosperity and cultural significance. The Bishop Museum Report 80-3, *Kawainui Marsh, O‘ahu: Historical and Archaeological Sites*, explains the pond’s food-producing value to the area, its historical links to a number of important chiefs (including Kākuhihewa, Kūali‘i, Kahekili, Kamehameha I, and Queen Kalama), its close association with at least three important heiau (Ulupō, Pahukini, and Holomakani), and its place as a “central referent” in several Hawaiian cultural traditions (including those of Hauwahine, Mākālei, Olomana, Olopana, Haumea, and the edible mud called “lepo ‘ai ‘ia”).<sup>9</sup>

In this same report, Marion Kelly traces the decline of the traditional significance of Kawainui to the 1860s when wetland taro areas next to the pond were gradually appropriated, enlarged, plowed under, and re-terraced – all in the interest of rice cultivation. By the turn of the century, rice farming had taken over everything but a small portion of the east end of the pond. By the second decade of the century, even this area ceased to be maintained as a fishpond, and maps of the period were already labeling Kawainui as “swamp.” After the 1920s, rice cultivation dwindled and most of the area became overrun with cattle and California grass. In the ‘40s and again in the ‘50s, the Army “landscaped” part of Kawainui, altering significantly the pattern of water flow from marsh to sea. By the ‘50s, all farming had ceased entirely. In the last thirty years, the once proud fishpond has fended off shopping center and subdivision developers while suffering from the ravages of a quarry, junkyard, drive-in theater, model airplane park, municipal dump, landfill, and four sewage treatment plants. Once a 450-acre pond, “The Great Water” today consists of less than 12 acres of open water.<sup>10</sup>

Nathaniel Emerson collected his material for *Unwritten Literature* during the close of the 19th century. Although he does not identify our mele’s author, origin, or circumstances of composition – except to say that Kawainui is the geographical focus of “‘O ‘Oe nō Paha Ia e ka Lau o ke Aloha” – there is much in the mele itself that fixes it in a time not many decades previous to Emerson’s compilation. As we have all-too-briefly sketched in the preceding pages, the history of Kawainui is one of ancient worth and contemporary

abuse. It is one of glorious fishpond turned rice paddy, cow pasture, marsh, and flood-control project. The chant, with its echoes of mourning and despair and its description of vanished days, rubbish food, and clogged limu, obviously belongs to a time of transition when Kawainui had lost its vitality – but when that vitality was still clearly and poignantly remembered by the last of Hauwahine’s people.

We are all too familiar with the horrifying statistics that mark the decline of the Hawaiian population in the half-century following Cook’s arrival. We are also familiar with the effects of a Mahele that took traditional stewardship of the land away from the Hawaiian and introduced, in its stead, the unfamiliar and ruinous concept of private property. Both the decimation of the Hawaiian population and the undoing of aloha ‘āina had serious consequences to Kawainui, and the pond’s decline was evident as early as the 1860s when measles, small-pox, and despair left fewer than 50 resident kalo farmers to work its surrounding fields.<sup>11</sup>

One of these kupa ‘āina, in testimony before the 1895 Water Rights Commission, looked back on these days of decline from an even more depressed point of view. She remembers when Maunawili was covered in lo‘i kalo. Bananas and cane were planted on the banks of each patch, and bulrushes and ‘uki grew on the fringes of a well-watered Kawainui. She remembers Pālāwai (the lowland on the Olomana side of what is now Maunawili Community Park) as “the place where kalo was planted most and that was the kalo that supplied the chiefs when they called for hookupu...” She then tries to make the point that the lo‘i kalo of the few remaining native farmers of 1895 would soon suffer from the water shortage that Irwin’s ditch to Waimānalo had already begun to cause. But under the often-demeaning cross-examination of Irwin’s attorney, W.A. Kinney, she comes apart, loses her train of thought, and retreats into stubborn confusion. At one point in the proceedings, she concedes that, “I am weak and old and feeble, and I forget some things.” And when asked if anyone can corroborate her increasingly fuzzy testimony, she says: “No, there is none of these old folks living. They are all dead excepting myself and my foster mother, the person who took care of me, she is so old she can’t walk, she has to crawl... There is no one living who is related to [these old folks], all dead.”<sup>12</sup>

It took several hundred people – all strong in their sense of responsibility to the pond, its konohiki, and its guardian – to keep Kawainui clean and to arrest the natural process by which pond eventually becomes marsh and meadow. With a dwindling population and an imported land-ownership policy that cut to the heart of traditional concepts of land use, it must have been increasingly difficult – and then impossible – for these residents to maintain Kawainui in the ancient manner. With the rise of the sugar industry in the 1850s and ‘60s, came a population of rice-eating immigrant workers, and we find, in 1864, the first record of rice farming on the edge of the pond.<sup>13</sup> Surely it was heartbreaking for Kailua’s remaining Hawaiians to watch Kawainui falter, change, and lose its way. Their thoughts must have turned to the Mākālei tree and to the mo‘o kia‘i Hauwahine. Both the tree and mo‘o were responsible for bringing a wealth of food to the pond – and for taking that wealth away when the pond was misused, the food distributed unfairly, and the ancient rituals of respect ignored.

Our chant for Kawainui seems to spring from this context of “minamina” – grief over the loss of something of great value – and strikes us as having been composed in response to heart-rending evidence of Kawainui’s neglect and decline. “‘O ‘Oe nō Paha Ia e ka Lau o ke Aloha,” in the guise of a love song for an absent woman, is actually the lament of a man who remembers. He mourns the departure of Hauwahine, the pond’s guardian. He mourns, by extension, the loss of the pond and people whose welfare she had overseen.

The mele opens with an enigmatic address: “Might this be you, O leaf of love? / She for whom these memories are suddenly stirring.” It is obvious that something has triggered the poet’s memory and released a flood of nostalgic affection. The exact nature of this something is considerably less obvious. Lau o ke aloha. Leaf of love? Dragnet of love? Grassy bundle of love? Multitude of love? Thatched hut of love? Tip of love? Our reading of the phrase (which is actually that suggested to us by Muriel Seto at the urging of a group of Kailua elders whose oral histories she is compiling<sup>14</sup>) is based on the hō’ailona lau lena of Hauwahine as recounted in *Ka Moolelo o Hiakaikapoliopole*:

A ua hoi mai nei laua a uka nei o Kawainui ke ike aku la oe i ka olena mai o ka lau o ke uki ame ka naku oloko ia wai. *O ka hoailona iho la no keia o ka moo. He lena na mea apau e pili aku ai lakou.*

When the [two mo‘o women] return inland to Kawainui, you will see the yellowing of the leaves of the sedges and bulrushes in the water. *This is the unmistakable sign of [Hauwahine and her companion]. Everything they come into contact with takes on a yellow hue.”<sup>15</sup>*

So our poet visits the pond, sees a yellowing leaf or leaf-tips, and is immediately consumed by fond memories of Hauwahine (“wahine ‘ē”) and thoughts of her possible return. His excitement, however, quickly gives way to doubt and dismay: if she does return, who will know her? Who is left to remember the old ways? Who will respond appropriately? Who will recognize her as the guardian of this place? Who will wail; who will cry out in greeting? Your day (he tells or himself) is gone. So, too, (he tells himself) is your understanding of her.<sup>16</sup>

‘O ‘oe nō paha ia, e ka lau o ke aloha  
‘O ia nō paha ia ke kau mai nei ka hali‘a  
Ke hali‘ali‘a mai nei ka maka  
Mana‘o hiki mai nō paha auane‘i  
Hiki mai nō lā ia, na wai e uē aku  
Ua pau kāu lā, kāu ‘ike iāia.

Might this be you, O leaf of love?  
She for whom these memories are suddenly stirring  
The eyes are fondly remembering  
Thinking she might soon appear  
But if she were to return, who would cry out?  
Your day is over, gone is your knowing her.

With his realization of the passing of Hauwahine's day and the coming of a time when no understanding will be shared between the mo'o and those who dwell next to her pond, the poet is thrown into an agony of loss which is very similar to the madness that comes over Ha'inakolo when she discovers that her son is missing. The Kawainui poet is consumed by regret. His feelings gnaw at him from within, and he is swallowed in an ocean of anger and turmoil:

Ka manawa 'oi e 'ai ka mana'o i loko  
Ua lu'u iho nei au i ke kai nui

The feeling is intense, desire gnaws within  
I have now plunged into the great ocean

It is difficult to accept Emerson's interpretation of the second line above as indicative of the poet's newly-discovered happiness "in the waters of love." "Kai nui," in Hawaiian metaphor, is far more suggestive of turmoil, change, and even death, than it is of happy love. The poet's description of his turmoil continues with references to the anger and strife tearing at his na'au, and with the explanation this wrenching is the result of his great love. He sees Hauwahine as the absent guardian ("wahine 'ē"), and he sees himself as her estranged subject ("kanaka 'ē). Both are "different, peculiar, a way off, elsewhere" They are strangers in what should be their own land. They are but shells of their former selves; they have been torn, like husks, from lives of purpose and meaning.

Nui ka ukiuki, paio ka na'au  
'A'ohe kanaka 'eha 'ole i ke aloha  
A wahine 'ē 'oe, kanaka 'ē au  
He mau alualu kā ha'i e lawe

Great is my turmoil, my soul is in strife  
No man goes unhurt by love  
You are the absent woman, I the estranged man  
We are husks for others to bear

In the third and final section of the chant (we neglected to say that the chant seems to divide itself into three sections: one of memory, one of grief, and one of observation) the poet:

- takes stock of the "kula i'a" of Kawainui ("kula i'a" refers to a fish container, trap, or source; it is hard to go along with Emerson's picture of "swarming fish at the weir"),
- details the neglect and misuse that greet him (contrary to Emerson's translation, "'ōpala 'ai" and "limu pae hewa" are not appropriate terms for a well-maintained fishpond: the first refers to "rubbish vegetable-food," probably rice; the second can be translated "limu coming ashore improperly/excessively" and gives the picture of an algae-clogged pond),

- bemoans the separation of guardian from pond (“wahine” from “kāne,” Hauwahine from the waters of Kāne),<sup>17</sup>
- and closes with the refrain, “Who will know and greet her if she does return?”

‘Ike aku i ke kula i‘a o Kawainui  
 Nui ka ‘ōpala ‘ai o Mokulana  
 Lana ka limu pae hewa o Maka‘uwahine  
 ‘O ka wahine nō ‘oe, ‘o ke kāne nō ia  
 Hiki mai nō lā ia, na wai e uē aku  
 Ho‘i mai nō la ia, aia wai e uē aku

Look at the fish-container of Kawainui  
 There so much rubbish-food at Mokulana  
 Maka‘uwahine is afloat with limu pae hewa  
 You are the woman, he is the man  
 If she were to appear, who would cry out?  
 If she were to return, who would know enough to greet her?

A passage from Samuel Keko‘owai’s description of pond cleaning at Kawainui will further illuminate the chant’s final section:

...the men, women, and children of Maunawili, Kailua, and Waimanalo ... went into the pond, and with their hands broke the limu loose, piling it up and twisting it under as it was gathered ... [this] breaking of the limu was continued until the pond was clean and “the food of the fish clean,” which for Kawainui Pond required 3 days.<sup>18</sup>

Emerson chooses to translate the lines, “Nui ka ‘ōpala ‘ai o Mokulana / Lana ka limu pae hewa o Maka‘uwahine” as descriptive of the opulence of the district, “The feeding grounds on the reef / Are waving with mosses abundant,” but abundant limu growth is detrimental to the proper functioning of a fishpond and is, in fact, a sign of neglect:

The accumulation of algae prevented the nets that were used for catching the fish from reaching the bottom of the pond. The fish were then able to escape the nets.<sup>19</sup>

Furthermore, when abundant limu and plant-growth block clear access from ocean to pond, and from pond to upland stream, the reproductive cycle of migratory freshwater fish such as the ‘o‘opu is threatened.<sup>20</sup> As for “‘ōpala ‘ai,” we have already indicated that the phrase translates to vegetable-food rubbish, and that, in all likelihood, this is not a reference to the abundance of fish swarming at Kawainui but a scornful acknowledgment of the rice fields that overran the pond and contributed to the termination of its traditional use. The poet looks around him and sees the decline of the land he loves. His sorrow is compounded by the fear that, in time, there will be no one to recognize the love he shared with the pond and its guardian. If she were to return, “na wai e uē aku?”

It is thus our contention that “‘O ‘Oe nō Paha Ia e ka Lau o ke Aloha” is far more than an expression of regret by a nostalgic lover for an absent mistress. The meaning of the chant, in its fullest dimension, runs considerably deeper than Emerson’s facile interpretation. The chant speaks of the loss of a mo‘o kia‘i, the loss of a fishpond, the loss of knowledge and reverence, and the loss of a culture’s focal point and orientation. It is song inspired by memory and composed in vexation.

In many of its elements, it is also a song that bears considerable resemblance to “Ha‘inakolo.” Both deal with the anguish of loss, both have a symbolic significance that extends well beyond the times of their composition. “Ha‘inakolo,” however, ends with prayer and uplift. The song for Hauwahine does not, in itself, escape the despair of the mo‘o’s departure. Ha‘inakolo recovers, and in her new life, we students of hula find our own rejuvenation (“E ola i ka leo, e ola i ka loa‘a mai / E ola iā mākou i nā haumāna hula”). The poet of Kawainui has no such assurance. He can only end his song with the query: “Who will remember?”

We feel, however, that our revival, understanding, and performance of his chant places it in a context as positive as that of Ha‘inakolo’s and answers the anguish of the poet with an affirmation that he had no reason to expect. If we have estimated correctly, the chant is probably a century-and-a-half old. After all those years, we find ourselves responding to its impassioned yet despairing question. A question that, to our knowledge, has been buried in Emerson since the time of its publication. And our response is quite simple: we remember Hauwahine; we will remember her to those who witness our performance of this chant; and we will – regardless of times and turmoil – cling to and pass on those older values of pono that Hauwahine and her pond still symbolize. With Ha‘inakolo and Hauwahine, the guardian women of the two mele we present this year, we call on and affirm our strength as ēwe hānau o ka ‘āina. Together the chants inspire a return to life.

### **‘O ‘Oe nō Paha Ia e ka Lau o ke Aloha**

‘O ‘oe nō paha ia, e ka lau o ke aloha  
‘O ia nō paha ia ke kau mai nei ka hali‘a  
Ke hāli‘ali‘a mai nei ka maka  
Mana‘o hiki mai nō paha auane‘i  
Hiki mai nō la ia, na wai e uē aku?  
Ua pau kāu lā, kāu ‘ike iāia.  
Ka manawa ‘oi e ‘ai ka mana‘o i loko  
Ua lu‘u iho nei au i ke kai nui  
Nui ka ukiuki paio o ka na‘au  
‘A‘ohe kanaka ‘eha ‘ole i ke aloha  
A wahine ‘ē ‘oe, kanaka ‘ē au  
He mau alualu kā ha‘i e lawe  
‘Ike aku i ke kula i‘a o Kawainui  
Nui ka ‘ōpala ‘ai o Mokulana<sup>21</sup>  
Lana ka limu pae hewa o Maka‘uwahine  
‘O ka wahine nō ‘oe, ‘o ke kāne nō ia

Hiki mai nō lā ia, na wai e uē aku?  
Ho‘i mai nō la ia, aia wai e uē aku?

Might this be you, O leaf of love?  
She for whom these memories are suddenly stirring  
The eyes remember with great affection  
Thinking she might soon appear  
But if she were to return, who would cry out?  
Your day is over, gone is your knowing her.  
The feeling is intense, desire gnaws within  
I have just plunged into the great ocean  
Great is the conflict and turmoil of my heart  
No man goes unhurt by love  
You are the absent woman, I the estranged man  
We are but husks for others to bear  
Look at the fish-container of Kawainui  
Rubbish-food abounds at Mokulana  
Maka‘uwahine<sup>22</sup> is afloat with limu pae hewa  
You are the woman, he is the man  
If she were to appear, who would cry out?  
If she were to return, who would know enough to greet her?

Notes:

1. Among them: Anna Ahau, Thelma Bugbee, Solo Mahoe, Pilahi Paki, Mrs. Pi‘imauna, and Silver Piliwale.
2. Nathaniel Emerson, *Unwritten Literature of Hawaii*, 84.
3. Literally, guardian-mo‘o. Also called “akua mo‘o” – mo‘o god. “Mo‘o” is frequently glossed as “lizard” or “dragon,” but these are translations of convenience, not accuracy.
4. Samuel Kamakau, *Ka Po‘e Kahiko: The People of Old*; 82-83. Cited by Marion Kelly, *Kawainui Marsh, O‘ahu*, 7. An “anana” is a fathom: 6 feet.
5. Elspeth Sterling and Catherine Summers, *Sites of O‘ahu*, 125.
6. Martha Beckwith, *Hawaiian Mythology*, 126.
7. Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel Elbert, *Hawaiian Dictionary*, Supplement B, 1970, 382.
8. *Ka Nai Aupuni*, January 22, 1906. Translated by Sterling and Summers in *Sites of Oahu*, 231.
9. Marion Kelly and Jeffery T. Clark, *Kawainui Marsh, O‘ahu: Historical and Archaeological Studies*, Bishop Museum Report 80-3, September 1980; 3-12.
10. *Ibid.*, 20-27.

11. Tax assessor's records cited by Marion Kelly and Barry Nakamura, *Historical Study of Kawainui Marsh Area, Island of O'ahu*, Prepared for the Department of Planning and Economic Development, State of Hawai'i, November 1981, 38.
12. "Testimony of Hikaalani before the Commissioner of Private Ways and Water Rights for the District of Koolaupoko, Island of Oahu," *Wong Leong et al. vs. W.G. Irwin*, June 10, 1895, 47-48 and 54-55. Hiikaalani testified in Hawaiian; we only have the commission's English translation of her words.
13. Kelly and Nakamura, 40.
14. Muriel Seto, Personal Communication, October 1980.
15. *Ka Nai Aupuni*, January 22, 1906, emphasis mine.
16. The rapidly shifting point of view in the opening section of the chant – first the poet addresses Hauwahine directly, then he speaks (to us? to himself?) about her, and then he talks to himself about himself – conveys a sense of disorientation that was said to have been typical of "delirious" men who had been enthralled by mo'o wahine. Diane Drigot, *Ho'ona'auao No Kawai Nui: Educating About Kawai Nui*, 85, 98n22.
17. This interpretation was shared with us by Mrs. Muriel Seto who recorded it in an oral history session with Pilahi Paki (Personal Communication, October 1980).
18. Catherine Summers, *Hawaiian Fishponds*, 22.
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid., 27.
21. The place name *Mokulana* survives only in the old poetry of Kailua. Its actual nature and location have long been lost to us although its literal meaning, "buoyant island," and regular association with neki and 'uki place it somewhere on the fringes of Kawainui Pond. It shows up in a half-dozen or more mele for Kailua, always in the context of beauty and tranquility. Nothing at all is known about the location or nature of the place name *Maka'uwahine* in the next line of the mele.
22. Like Mokulana, the specific location of Maka'uwahine is lost to us.

---

© Kīhei de Silva 2017. All rights reserved.

This essay was first published in Hālau Mōhala 'Ilima's 2010 Merrie Monarch Fact Sheet. It is offered here in revised and updated form.