

Proof Delivery Form

Journal and Article number: ANT 2010-0197

Number of colour figures: Figures 2 and 3

Number of pages (not including this page): 15

Antiquity

Please print out your proof, mark any corrections needed, and return it, together with the offprint order form and signed copyright transfer form either:

- Scanned and saved as a PDF attachment to assistant@antiquity.ac.uk
- As hard copy by post to *Antiquity*, King's Manor, York YO1 7EP, UK
- By fax to +44 (0) 1904 433994

Please ensure that the paperwork is returned no later than 10 days after receipt.

Queries raised by the sub-editor are listed below; the text to which the queries refer is flagged in the margins of the proof. Please ensure that you answer these queries.

- You are responsible for correcting your proofs! Errors not found may appear in the published journal.
- The proof is sent to you for correction of typographical errors only. Revision of the substance of the text is not permitted.
- Please answer carefully any queries from the sub-editor.
- A new copy of a figure must be provided if correction is required.

Notes: 1. The quality of half-tone and colour will be checked by the Editorial Office.

2. If you have any queries, please contact the Editorial Office by email (assistant@antiquity.ac.uk) or by telephone on 01904 433 994 (+44 1904 433 994 from outside the UK).
-

Queries for author:

Queries for *Antiquity* Editorial Office:

Please return this form with your proof

Order for Offprints for *Antiquity*

Article number

Number of pages

You will receive a PDF of your paper which you can print and distribute to friends and colleagues as much as you like. You may also order paper offprints (minimum order 25 copies or multiples thereof) at £0.75 each.

Please complete and return this form, if you require offprints, with the proofs of your article to **The Editorial Office, *Antiquity*, University of York, King's Manor, York YO1 7EP, UK (fax +44(0)1904 433 994).**

Offprints must be ordered using this form. If an official order form from your organisation is required, it may be sent on later (please quote the article number above), but it will be assumed that any such order received is not an additional order. Offprints cannot be supplied after publication.

Offprints are despatched by surface mail about 2 weeks after publication (allow up to 6 months for delivery). If you wish them to be despatched by airmail please mark section 2 below and add 40% to the indicated price.

Title of paper

1 I wish to purchase (minimum 25 or multiples thereof) offprints of my article at £0.75 (pounds sterling per offprint)

2 Please send my offprints by airmail (add 40% to cost)

We accept payment in:

- pound sterling drawn on UK banks
- US dollars drawn on US or UK banks
- Euro cheques drawn on EU banks
- most credit and debit cards (not Diners Club)

For payment in \$US or Euros, please convert the charges (add 40% for airmail, if requested) at the current rate of exchange and add £15 for bank charges.

3 I enclose a remittance for payable to Antiquity Publications Limited.

Please invoice me at the address in section 4 (offprints will not be despatched until payment is received).

I wish to pay by credit card. Payments may be made by Access, Eurocard, Mastercard or Visa Card.

Card

Account number

Expires

Cardholder's name

(as on card)

Cardholder's address

Signature

4. Name and address

*To which offprints
should be sent*

ANTIQUITY

ANTIQUITY, King's Manor, York YO1 7EP, UK

Assignment of copyright

For the good reasons explained in the Notes below, we ask contributors to assign their copyright in their contribution to Antiquity Publications Ltd by completing, signing and returning this form, keeping a copy for your files.

ARTICLE TITLE (BLOCK CAPITALS):

ARTICLE AUTHOR(S) (BLOCK CAPITALS):

A To be completed if the copyright belongs to the contributor (as is usually the case)

In consideration of the publication of the contribution, I hereby assign as beneficial owner to Antiquity Publications Ltd the entire copyright throughout the world. In doing so, I retain the rights as listed in notes 2 and 3 below:

Signature _____

Date _____

(and on behalf of all co-authors)

B To be completed if the copyright does not belong to the contributor (usually because the contribution has been written in the course of employment)

As an authorized representative of the copyright holder, I hereby grant Antiquity Publications Ltd non-exclusive rights to deal with requests from third parties in the manner specified in Note 4.

Signature _____

Date _____

(and on behalf of all co-authors) Name: _____

King's Manor, York YO1 7EP, United Kingdom

Editor Professor Martin Carver Reviews Editor Madeleine Hummler Editorial Manager Jo Tozer

Tel/Fax: (+44) (0) 1904 433994 Email: editor@antiquity.ac.uk

Website: <http://antiquity.ac.uk>

Assignment of copyright: notes for authors

We start from the expectation that contributors would like their work to be widely available, provided its use is fair.

1. There are advantages for contributors in ownership of the copyright being centralised in Antiquity Publications Ltd. It enables the copyright-holder to watch for infringement. It will ensure that requests by third parties to reprint an article, or part of it, are handled efficiently and consistently. It will allow the publication to benefit from co-operative licensing schemes, e.g. the Copyright Clearance Center scheme in the USA (see Note 5 below), without impeding the dissemination of knowledge.

2. In assigning copyright in this way, contributors are not forfeiting their right to use their contribution elsewhere. It remains your work, and you are always free to re-use or reprint it in printed form as you wish. When you do that, we ask you to acknowledge ANTIQUITY as the place of first publication. A copy of the published version of an article may be placed in an author's institutional e-repository provided copyright and source are acknowledged and a link is provided to the original.

3. Antiquity Publications Ltd will normally give a third party permission to reprint the contribution in whole or in part if the third party obtains permission from you also. If you refuse, we refuse. If payment is made, we ask that the income is divided equally between the contributor and Antiquity Publications Ltd, in recognition of the roles of contributor and of ANTIQUITY in publishing the material.

4. When copyright is held by the contributor's employer, Antiquity Publications Ltd needs non-exclusive permission to deal with requests from third parties, on the understanding that the contributor's wishes will be followed, as described in Note 3.

5. ANTIQUITY is registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (USA) and the Copyright Licensing Authority (UK), non-profit-making organisations which offer centralised licensing arrangements for photocopying. Other similar licensing schemes may be entered into.

6. Antiquity Publications Ltd may make arrangements with others to deal with some aspects of copyright and licensing.

ANTIQUITY 84 (2010)

King's Manor, York YO1 7EP, United Kingdom


Editor Professor Martin Carver **Reviews Editor** Madeleine Hummler **Editorial Manager** Jo Tozer

Tel/Fax: (+44) (0) 1904 433994 **Email:** editor@antiquity.ac.uk

Website: <http://antiquity.ac.uk>

Strategies for constructing religious authority in ancient Hawai‘i

Mark D. McCoy¹, Thegn N. Ladefoged², Michael W. Graves³ & Jesse W. Stephen⁴



Through intensive archaeological investigation of the temples in Hawai‘i, the authors reveal a sequence of religious strategies for creating and maintaining authority that has application to prehistoric sequences everywhere. Expressed in the orientation and layout of the temples and their place in the landscape, these strategies develop in four stages over the course of a few hundred years, from the fifteenth to nineteenth century AD, from local shrines associated with agriculture to the development of a centralising priesthood serving the larger political economy.

Keywords: Hawai‘i, pre-contact, power, religion, temples, territories

Introduction

Temples, monuments, shrines and religious precincts are among our most valuable material markers of how authority was constructed and dispatched in the rise of hierarchical societies. The way archaeologists view these structures has in large part changed from one in which they are seen as ‘*passive measures. . . of political developments*’ to gateways for understanding ‘*how ritual action functioned to define, empower, divide and transform*’ social actors

¹ Department of Anthropology, University of Otago, P.O. Box 56, Dunedin 9054, New Zealand (Author for correspondence; email: mark.mccoy@otago.ac.nz)

² Department of Anthropology, Level 7, Human Sciences Building, 10 Symonds St., University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand (Email: t.ladefoged@auckland.ac.nz)

³ Department of Anthropology, MSC01 – 1040, Anthropology 1, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque NM 87131, USA (Email: mu Graves@unm.edu)

⁴ Department of Anthropology, University of Hawai‘i, 2424 Maile Way, Saunders Hall 346, Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96822–2223, USA (Email: jstephen@hawaii.edu)

Received: 19 August 2010; Accepted: 21 September 2010; Revised: 10 November 2010

ANTIQUITY 85 (2011): 1–15

<http://antiquity.ac.uk/ant/085/ant0850001.htm>




Figure 1. Location of the Leeward Kohala Field System (LKFS), Hawaiian Islands.

(Swenson 2006: 256). This insight does not negate earlier work, such as the classic observation that the size of religious buildings can be linked to the rise of state societies. Rather, it reflects how different communities use symbols and monumentality to create and maintain a hierarchical social order, so enhancing the understanding of political economy. By the time of European contact in 1778, Hawai'i had undergone a fundamental shift from small chiefdoms to several large independent polities with a shared state religion and an archaic state society distinct from the rest of Polynesia (Figure 1; Kirch 2010). Kolb (2006: 657) notes that Hawai'ian temples (*heiau*) were part of a 'network to provide the proper infrastructure for expressing the ideology of kingship, feudalizing land tenure practices, imposing ritual taboos on labor and production, and engaging in internecine warfare over territory'. The political elites commissioned the construction of temples and this was overseen by members of formal priestly classes (Malo 1951; Kamakau 1961, 1976). In Hawai'i the question of how different strategies were employed to create religious authority has proved challenging. There is wide stylistic variation in Hawai'ian temples that resists straightforward classification (Kirch 1985: 257–65; Cachola-Abad 1996), and there is some question as to when on the path to political unification the greatest effort was invested in the creation of monumental scaled structures (Kirch & Sharp 2005; Kolb 2006). Archaeologists have tried to infer changes in strategies by analysing architectural elements, layout and the size of temples (Table 1). Here we expand on the earlier work of Mulrooney and Ladefoged

Table 1. Strategies employed at sites of ritual to create and maintain religious power in Hawai'i. This list is not exhaustive, but demonstrates the wide range of social strategies evident in ethnohistory and archaeology.

Strategy/goal	Examples of architectural elements and activities	Sources
Unusual architectural elements to signal locations as sacred (elaboration).	Placement of stones in upright position in fashion similar to upright carved wooden images (<i>ki'i</i>).	Kirch 1985
Symbolic reference to sacred direction or location to link ceremonies to mythic tradition (membership).	Purposeful orientation of structures to reference a direction associated with a particular god or mythic tradition. Making distinctive style of temple layout that is 'notched' in plan view to highlight a direction, usually north-east.	Kolb 1992, 1994; Kirch 2004
Use of offerings to signify sanctity of locations, people, and objects.	Waterworn stones, coral, flora and fauna ritually deposited at sites.	Kolb 1992; Kirch & Sharp 2005; McCoy <i>et al.</i> 2009
Use of size and/or height to visually impress (monumentality).	The elevation of focal points with platforms and terraces.	Kirch 1985
Use of boundaries to divide ritual practitioners from other participants to distinguish social tiers (exclusion).	The construction of massive multi-tiered structures. The construction of walls to set off interior space, or courtyard, as exclusive to ritual practitioners.	Kolb 1992, 1994
Feasting to signal higher status of locations and people.	Over-consumption of high-status foods.	Kolb 1992, 1994; Kirch 1985

(2005) which investigated a sample of eight temples within the Leeward Kohala Field System (LKFS) on Hawai'i Island, and present the results of an analysis of a larger dataset of 19 temples and 15 radiocarbon dates. We define when strategies such as exclusion, elaboration, symbols of priestly order membership and monumentality were executed, and delineate how this sequence of temple development provides insights into a priestly class who are well attested through ethnohistory (Kirch *et al.* 2010).

Hawai'ian religion and temples

Ritual authority in ancient Hawai'i was divided among several classes: the political elite (*ali'i* or chiefs), the formal priests and other experts (*kahuna*), and informal part-time ritual practitioners (Valeri 1985). The chiefs, who inherited their status, held authority over the initiation of new architectural projects such as temple construction but the size of these structures was dictated by the participating chief's level in the political hierarchy. The priests and other experts held wide-ranging authority over temple design and location as

well as officiating at ceremonies before, during and after construction. There were a number of religious sects, including an order of the war god Kū and an order of Lono, a major god associated with agriculture and other activities (Malo 1951: 159). Informal ritual specialists also existed and were associated with a kind of religious authority not necessarily sanctioned by the formal priestly class.

Locating and interpreting archaeological sites as *heiau* or other ritual structures has relied heavily on ethnohistorical information and surface architecture. Surveys were completed over much of the Hawai'ian Islands within about 100 years of the abolition of traditional Hawai'ian religion by royal decree in 1819 (Walker 1930; Bennett 1931; Stokes 1991). Modern studies of Hawai'ian temples were initiated in the 1960s and 1970s with excavations that showed progressively larger and more elaborate structures over time (for a recent review see McCoy 2008: 263–4). Archaeologists have worked to build chronologies of Hawai'ian temple construction through direct dating (^{14}C , ^{230}Ur), architectural seriation, oral traditions and, when appropriate, a combination of all three lines of evidence (Ladd 1969, 1973; Green 1980; Weisler & Kirch 1985; Kirch 1990, 2004; Kolb 1991, 1992, 1994, 1997, 2006; Graves & Cachola-Abad 1996; McCoy 1999; Cordy 2000; Kirch & Sharp 2005; Mulrooney & Ladefoged 2005; McCoy 2006, 2008; McCoy *et al.* 2009). These chronologies have proved useful in tracking the scale of investment in ritual sites (Kolb 1994, 1997; Mulrooney *et al.* 2005), the subdivision of land units as marked by temple construction (Kolb 1997; Mulrooney & Ladefoged 2005; McCoy 2008) and identifying stylistic elements used by architects to establish temples as sacred spaces (Kolb 1994; Ruggles 2001; Kirch 2004; McCoy 2008).

Kolb's excavations (1992, 1994) at eight Maui *heiau* and a survey of temples across the island documented significant changes in architectural form. He interpreted the shift from '*open courts to elevated platforms and enclosures*' as a means '*to limit public participation*' (Kolb 1994: 532). He has also highlighted other markers of change in religious authority, including the spread of the notched style of temple layout, a drop in investment in temple construction and an increase in evidence of domesticated animal tribute such as pig (Kolb 1992, 1994, 2006: 663). The architectural shifts were taken as indicators of a greater exclusion of commoners from ceremonies and a local Maui Island stylistic innovation. Kolb (1997, 2006) has also defined a tripartite scheme based on the size of temples. He suggests small-sized structures ($\sim 200\text{m}^2$) were built by the pooled labour of a family group, medium community shrines ($\sim 65\text{m}^2$) were constructed with the co-operation of a single community and larger polity temples ($\sim 2000\text{m}^2$) were built by major corvée labour.

Kirch (2004) and Ruggles (2001) note that temple orientations show close associations between compass directions and specific deities, and Kirch & Sharp (2005) have used ^{230}Ur dating of corals to identify an episode of intense temple construction between AD 1580–1640. However, Kolb's (2006: 657) recent ^{14}C dating of 41 Maui temples from six political districts suggests four peak periods of construction (A D 1240–60, AD 1360–80, AD 1540–60 and AD 1800–20) which he interprets as '*distinct periods of political tension*' and both Weisler *et al.* (2006) and Kolb (2006) have suggested coral offerings were collected and placed on built structures rather than marking the construction event.



Figure 2. The southern LKFS, Hawai'i Island (photograph: M.D. McCoy).

Temples of the Leeward Kohala Field System (LKFS)

The LKFS, a 60km² zone of former rain-fed agricultural fields, houses and ritual sites (Ladefoged & Graves 2000, 2008), is among the best preserved archaeological landscapes in Polynesia (Figure 2). Temples in the upland fields would have required only a small labour force to construct and at most would have accommodated only groups of a few dozen people at ceremonies. Their regular placement at the centre and boundaries of community scaled territories (*abupua'a*) recorded in the mid nineteenth century denotes their importance in the social-religious landscape. Ethnohistoric sources on Hawaiian religion suggest that many of the upland *heiau* were likely dedicated to the god Lono who is strongly associated with dryland planting. Further, nearly all structures are oriented to the north-east; an architectural choice interpreted by Kirch (2004: 111–2) as consistent with Lono worship.

Mulrooney & Ladefoged (2005) used the variation in ritual architecture in the LKFS to develop an architectural seriation ordering of eight *heiau* (H1–H8) in four periods. These periods were then matched to an existing relative chronology of land unit subdivision that had been developed by Ladefoged & Graves (2006). The land unit seriation was based on the relationship of boundary lines one to another and to land unit names. At the time of Mulrooney & Ladefoged's (2005) research, the only evidence that was available to place this dual seriation in time was a single late prehistoric era date that put the latest relative period after AD 1650. Our current research builds on these observations by increasing the sample of temples (n = 19), providing reliable *terminus post quem* (TPQ) dates for seven temples and making the interpretive link between stylistic changes, social strategies such as exclusion, elaboration, symbols of priestly sect membership and monumentality, and the development of the priestly sect of Lono.

Methods

In 2008 we initiated a project to extend the temple construction sequence in the LKFS and bracket this chronology using absolute radiocarbon dates (McCoy & Stephen 2008). We designed this investigation to be minimally invasive. Nineteen *heiau* were recorded in terms of their size, location and architectural style. Temples were mapped with tape and compass, and locations and associations with territorial boundaries were recorded with Trimble GeoXT GPS units. The area (m²) of each temple was calculated from digitising field maps. We defined a set of architectural traits useful for seriation based on the previous work of Graves & Cachola-Abad (1996: 23) and Mulrooney & Ladefoged (2005: tab. 2). Basic formal traits include the presence or absence of a *platform*: a raised freestanding surface; a *courtyard*: a central open area defined by a continuous architectural element such as a wall; a *terrace*: a surface created by cutting and filling with two or three freestanding sides; a *notch*: indenting a corner; and *upright stones*: stones purposefully placed in an unnatural position usually with length perpendicular to the ground. These attributes are slightly different than those used by Mulrooney & Ladefoged (2005) and are more useful for ordering a larger group of LKFS temples.

Minimal excavation was done at each *heiau*, with small 0.25 × 0.25m test pits dug under the basal course of foundation stones (Figure 3). Charcoal was collected *in situ* using simple flotation, and was sorted into short-lived wood taxa identified on the basis of anatomical features. Wood identification was determined by Gail Murakami using fresh fractured transverse facets and an American Optical Stereoscan dissecting microscope with maximum 40x magnification. Based on archaeological context and taxa present, the charcoal is likely to have come from agricultural clearing prior to construction.

A total of 15 AMS radiocarbon dates from 11 *heiau* were obtained (Table 2). For this study, our aim was to establish TPQ as indicated by the latest radiocarbon date from under the foundation stones. The earliest end of the calibrated age range (2σ, Calib 5.0) allows us to identify a point in time after which the site was constructed. For each *heiau* we have selected the earliest TPQ radiocarbon determination, resulting in 11 TPQ dates that generally meet the expected ordering based on our seriation (Table 2). TPQ dates from three sites (MKI-122, KOL-2, KH2-2) are clear reversals in the general trend and yielded dates beyond the extreme earliest and latest dates found: before the earliest temple or after the latest temple. These results are attributed to the introduction of material from bioturbation or refurbishing of temples over their lifetime of use, and are thus rejected. There is one additional TPQ reversal (MKI-125) but it is unlike the other cases in that it is nearly identical to the next dated site (KH1-3). So while it is rejected, this TPQ generally supports the chronology presented.

Results

Seriation of temples

We refined the seriation of Mulrooney & Ladefoged (2005) to classify the 19 *heiau* into four styles: A) temples with a platform, some of which include additional traits such as courtyard, terrace and upright stones (n = 3); B) temples with a courtyard, terrace and upright stones

Table 2. Seriation of temple sites, southern Leeward Kohala Field System (LKFS), Hawai'i Island. AMS ^{14}C dates are on charcoal from short-lived plant taxa and selected from a battery of 15 total dates on material excavated from under foundation stones. In sum, seven dates (**bold**) were accepted as securely pre-dating construction.

	Site	Platform	Upright stones	Terrace	Courtyard	Notch	Earliest construction (TPQ)	Radiocarbon date*
Style D post-1680	KOL-1		x					
	KH1-4		x					
	PHH-1		x					
	KAL-24		x				1680	125±25 BP, OS-0809-9
Style C post-1647	PHK-1		x	x				
	KH2-2		x	x			1470	335±125, OS-0809-11; 300±30, Beta-250428
	MKI-123 (H5)		x	x	x	x	1664	255±30, OS-0809-4; 160±30 BP, OS-0809-5
	KOL-2		x	x	x	x	1691	65±30, OS-0809-14
	KH1-7		x	x	x	x		
	MKI-130		x	x	x	x		
	KH1-3 (H1)		x	x	x	x	1647	200±30 BP, OS-0809-10
Style B post-1522	MKI-125		x	x	x		1648	195±30, OS-0808-6
	MKI-124 (H8)		x	x	x		1530	210±40 BP, Beta-250426
	MKI-122 (H6)		x	x	x		1694	60±25, OS-0809-2; 455±130, OS-0809-3
	KHO-1		x	x	x		1522	275±30, OS-0809-13; 250±30 BP, OS-0809-12
Style A post-1474	KH1-6	x	x	x	x			
	KAL-27		x	x	x		1476	305±40 BP, OS-0809-7
	KAL-26 (H3)		x				1474	300±40 BP, Beta-250427

* Labs: Beta Analytic, Inc. (Beta); National Oceanic Sciences Accelerator Mass Spectrometry (OS).

(n = 5); C) temples with a courtyard and terrace some of which include upright stones and notching (n = 7); D) temples with a terrace (n = 4) (Figure 4). Styles B and D are uniform in terms of the attributes present, while the members of Style A are diverse but are nonetheless grouped together since they include a unique early feature, the focal platform. The temples included in the later part of Style C do not have two key attributes, notch and upright stones, but again these are included with Style C, rather than Style D, since these sites have courtyards, an attribute that drops out of use in the last phase.

There are two key differences between the groups defined in the previous seriation of Mulrooney & Ladefoged (2005) and the styles presented here. First, the *heiau* in Mulrooney



COLOUR

Figure 3. Excavation location at Style A temple (heiau), KAL-27. A small excavation was placed on the outside of the main structure near the southern corner to obtain datable samples from under foundation stones (photograph: M.D. McCoy).

& Ladefoged's (2005) final group (Group 4), labelled KAL-25 (H4) and MKI-122 (H6), were originally defined simply by the presence of a wall. These are now classified as earlier Style B temples on the basis of the presence of upright stones, the use of courtyards and the presence of a terrace. Second, while these *heiau* were reclassified, other temples not originally considered in the previous seriation have come to occupy that latest phase of Style D. Thus, reclassification of the Group 4 *heiau* and the identification of this new group of *heiau* results in a new ordering.

We note that the average size of temples changes little over the sequence; however, the maximum end of the range increases in Style C and D. According to Kolb's (1997) size classes the change in size would represent the introduction of polity scaled temples (Figure 5).

Absolute dates of temple styles

The architectural seriation suggests a relative order of the four styles identified (A to B to C to D), and using radiocarbon dating it is possible to bracket the construction of temples in absolute time. The radiocarbon date from KAL-26 indicates that Style A can be no earlier than AD 1474 (2σ), and the date from KHO-1 indicates that Style B can be no earlier than AD 1522 (2σ). Therefore, we can bracket Style A to between AD 1474–1522 with




Figure 4. Temple style seriation. Note elaboration of north-eastern corners (an architectural trait associated with worship of the god Lono) via various architectural elements including a terrace, upright stones and high stone facing. Examples of Styles A and D have historic period burial cairns built on top of them.




Figure 5. Size of temples. Note the increase in maximum size in Styles C and D. Estimated average size of temples important at the family, community and polity scale after Kolb (2006).

the caveat that the actual date range of construction will be later than these dates in direct proportion to the amount of time that passed between the dated events — the death of the short-lived plant taxa, for example — and laying down the stone foundations of the temples. The latest Style B temple (MKI-122) appears to have been built after AD 1647, marking the earliest possible date for the Style B to Style C transition. Thus, Style B can be bracketed to AD 1522–1647 with the same caveat that this range represents the earliest possible construction period.

The latest dates from Styles C and D allow us to bracket them in time to AD 1647–1680 and post-AD 1680 respectively. Given that temple construction probably ceased around the time of the official end of Hawai'ian religion by royal decree in AD 1819, we can further bracket Style D to AD 1680–1819. Again, we should note that these are rough approximations and we are not able to eliminate the possibility that Style D represents a post-contact innovation. But, as we will discuss below, we believe that Style D was probably the current style of temple construction at the time of contact. To be clear, these age ranges (A = AD 1474–1522; B = AD 1522–1647; C = AD 1647–1680; D = AD 1680–1819) are somewhat misleading in their precision since we have chosen not to round dates; these are simply our best approximation for the age in which these styles were popular.

Evolution of social boundaries

The spatial distribution of each of the four temple styles matches our relative construction sequence of territorial boundary construction (Ladefoged & Graves 2006) (Figure 6). Style A temples (AD 1474–1522) appear to have been constructed in the centre of two large

territorial units with Style B temples (AD 1522–1647) built between these temples when the area was divided into at least four territorial units. The construction of Style C temples (AD 1647–1680) continues this infilling process and probably represents the creation of the study area's 11 territories recorded in the early historic period. Style D temples (AD 1680–1819), which represent a break with earlier temple building traditions in style and size, appear to have been built with relatively regular spacing across the field system within established territories. Overall, these spatial patterns fit what was found in the previous study with the caveat that the reassignment of *heiau* yields a slightly different placement of temples relative to boundaries; specifically more matched temples were built on either side of boundaries as opposed to having been built in the centre of territories or on the edge without a matching temple on the opposite side.

Discussion

Changes in temple style, size and location in the LKFS give us insight into the strategies employed by ritual specialists and political elites to generate and maintain religious authority. Initially, sometime late in the fifteenth century or early in the sixteenth, there were small sized temples with platforms as well as a range of other features (Style A). These were located in the centres of two broad territorial units that divided an area that had probably been a zone of sweet potato gardening for about a century (Ladefoged *et al.* 2005). This is not the only sign that formalisation of rituals had become intertwined with industry in the fifteenth century on Hawai'i Island. The ²³⁰Ur dates from shrines found at the summit of Mauna Kea show clear evidence of use from the beginning of the fourteenth century (1398±13) and were probably concurrent with the first large-scale use of what would become the region's largest adze quarry (McCoy *et al.* 2009).

It is hard to say if these early LKFS temples mark the start of what Malo (1951) and others would later call '*the cult of Lono*'. But the onset of religious ceremonies in this upland location does fit what we would expect for Lono-centred worship. The religious authority of ritual specialists at this stage was gained in the immediate sense from participation in rituals focused on platforms, and some temples were relatively elaborate incorporating a number of different architectural elements such as upright stones. In addition, the earliest courtyard dates to this phase. But while we do see signs of elaboration and exclusion, we do not see obvious signs in religious architecture of authority having been derived from other strategies, such as membership in a larger priestly class or the use of monumentality. Thus, if the priestly class did exist, it may have been in its infancy and the local political hierarchy could have consisted of as few as one or two chiefs. But, more importantly, this suggests the rise of the priestly class may have been part of a new arrangement of land tenure and management in which commoners were alienated from land holding.

The second style, courtyards (Style B), shows a more concerted effort in all temples to use exclusion to create authority through ritual. At this stage in the sixteenth to mid seventeenth century, subdivision doubled the number of land units with a concurrent increase in the number of new temple sites. However, temples are still small in size showing that the strategy of monumentality remained unused in this portion of the landscape. This is not to say that




Figure 6. Divisions of land units marked by temple construction.

monumentality was not in regular use in other environmental or social contexts, such as on Maui (Kirch & Sharp 2005; Kolb 2006; Weisler *et al.* 2006).

The third style, notched courtyards (Style C), shows a continuation in the seventeenth century of the previous style with the addition of notches: a symbol found on at least two other islands, Maui and Moloka'i (Weisler & Kirch 1985; Kolb 1994; McCoy 2006), that was especially prevalent in dry districts of Maui (Kolb 1992). We interpret this as a sign that additional religious authority was being drawn from membership in a cross-polity sect of priests dedicated to Lono. However, we would stop short of equating the notch style exclusively with the sect of Lono, or argue that the onset of this style marks the creation of the sect. Equally important, the number of political territorial units (*ahupua'a*) in that area of the LKFS more than doubled suggesting the influence of the elite class continued to grow as does the number of temples. Interestingly, this is the first real jump in the size of temples and may indicate the beginning of a greater dominance of the political elite over religious authority.

Late in the seventeenth century courtyards are abandoned for large terraces (Style D), there is a sharp increase in the upper range of temple sizes and there is a simplification of style. This simplification of architectural style and increase in size is suggestive of a shift to an emphasis on authority derived from monumentality, at the expense of strategies that hinge on exclusion, elaboration or membership in a priestly sect. This shift would suggest that the inter-island religious system represented by notched *heiau* might have become de-emphasised. It might also suggest that individual *ahupua'a* administrative units were being collapsed or re-integrated into slightly larger inter-*ahupua'a* administrative units. This late period increase in size does correspond to increased wars of consolidation on Hawai'i Island (Cordy 2000), and suggests that in some areas of the archipelago the scale of ritual architecture continued to increase up to, and possibly after, European contact.

Conclusion

The remarkable degree of variation in temple architecture found in Hawai'i can in part be attributed to overlapping controlling strategies expressed by the priestly and political ruling classes through ritual architecture. It seems likely that the priestly classes formed as part of a shift in land tenure and management strategies in the late fifteenth century. While priests were probably always an embedded part of the larger ruling class, it may not have been until the century before European contact that religious authority was fully dominated by the political elite as monumentality became pervasive at the expense of other strategies. This marks a key turning point in the rise of complex societies in which the political elite succeeded in not just incorporating but completely subsuming religious authority.

Acknowledgements

We received valuable support for this project from San Jose State University, the University of New Mexico, and the University of Auckland. Special thanks to Pono Von Holt and PonoHolo Ranch for their continued support of our work. We also want to acknowledge Jonathan Carpenter, Robin Connors, Jenny DeJongh, Emily Engan, Julie Field, Rosemary Joyce, Kekuewa Kikiloi, Pat Kirch, Helen O'Brien, Mark Oxley, Mara Mulrooney, Gail Murakami, Lilie Richards, David Stephen and all the field schools students who participated in the 2008

Monumental Architecture Field School. Thanks also to reviewers and the journal's editor Martin Carver for all their helpful comments.

References

- BENNETT, W.C. 1931. *Archaeology of Kauai* (Bernice P. Bishop Museum Bulletin 80). Honolulu (HI): Bernice P. Bishop Museum Press.
- CACHOLA-ABAD, C.K. 1996. The significance of *heiau* diversity in site evaluations. *Cultural Resource Management* 8: 11–16.
- CORDY, R.H. 2000. *Exalted sits the chief: the ancient history of Hawai'i Island*. Honolulu (HI): Mutual Publishing.
- GRAVES, M.W. & C.K. CACHOLA-ABAD. 1996. Seriation as a method of chronologically ordering architectural design traits: an example from Hawai'i. *Archaeology in Oceania* 31: 19–32.
- GREEN, R.C. (ed) 1980. *Makaha before 1880 AD* (Pacific Anthropological Records 31). Honolulu (HI): Bernice P. Bishop Museum Press.
- KAMAKAU, S.M. 1961. *Ruling chiefs of Hawai'i*. Honolulu (HI): Kamehameha Schools Press.
- 1976. *The works of the people of old* (Bernice P. Bishop Museum special publication 61). Honolulu (HI): Bernice P. Bishop Museum Press.
- KIRCH, P.V. 1985. *Feathered gods and fishhooks: an introduction to Hawaiian archaeology and prehistory*. Honolulu (HI): University of Hawai'i Press.
- 1990. Monumental architecture and power in Polynesian chiefdoms: a comparison of Tonga and Hawai'i. *World Archaeology* 22(2): 206–222.
- 2004. Temple sites in Kahikinui, Maui, Hawaiian Islands: their orientations decoded. *Antiquity* 78: 102–114.
- 2010. *How chiefs became kings: divine kingship and the rise of archaic states in ancient Hawai'i*. Berkeley (CA): University of California Press.
- KIRCH, P.V., S. MILLERSTROM, S. JONES & M.D. MCCOY. 2010. Dwelling among the gods: a late pre-contact priest's house in Kahikinui, Maui, Hawaiian Islands. *Journal of Pacific Archaeology* 1(2): 145–60.
- KIRCH, P.V. & W.D. SHARP. 2005. Coral ²³⁰Th dating of the imposition of a ritual control hierarchy in pre-contact Hawai'i. *Science* 307: 102–104.
- KOLB, M.J. 1991. Social power, chiefly authority, and ceremonial architecture in an island polity, Maui, Hawai'i. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- 1992. Diachronic design changes in *heiau* temple architecture from the Island of Maui, Hawai'i. *Asian Perspectives* 31(1): 9–37.
- 1994. Monumentality and the rise of religious authority in pre-contact Hawai'i. *Current Anthropology* 35(5): 521–47.
- 1997. Labor, ethnohistory and the archaeology of community in Hawai'i. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 4(3): 265–85.
- 2006. The origins of monumental architecture in ancient Hawai'i. *Current Anthropology* 46(4): 657–64.
- LADD, E.J. 1969. Alealea temple site, Honaunau: salvage report, in R.J. Pearson (ed.) *Archaeology on the island of Hawai'i* (Asian and Pacific Archaeology series 3): 95–130. Honolulu (HI): Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawai'i.
- 1973. Kaneaki temple site: an excavation report, in E.J. Ladd (ed.) *Makaha Valley historical project: interim report 4* (Pacific Anthropological Records 19): 1–30. Honolulu (HI): Bernice P. Bishop Museum Press.
- LADEFOGED, T.N. & M.W. GRAVES. 2000. Evolutionary theory and the historical development of dry-land agriculture in North Kohala, Hawai'i. *American Antiquity* 65: 423–48.
- 2006. The formation of Hawaiian community boundaries, in I. Lilley (ed.) *Archaeology of Oceania: Australia and the Pacific Islands*: 259–83. London: Blackwell.
- 2008. Variable development of dryland agriculture in Hawai'i: a fine-grained chronology from the Kohala Field System, Hawai'i Island. *Current Anthropology* 49(5): 771–802.
- LADEFOGED, T.N., M.W. GRAVES & J. COIL. 2005. Early sweet potato production in Hawai'i. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 114(4): 359–73.
- MALO, D. 1951. *Hawaiian antiquities, Moolelo Hawai'i* (Bernice P. Bishop Museum special publication 2). Honolulu (HI): Bernice P. Bishop Museum Press.
- MCCOY, M.D. 2006. Landscape, social memory and society: an ethnohistoric-archaeological study of three Hawaiian communities. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- 2008. Life outside the temple: reconstructing traditional Hawaiian ritual and religion through ritualized practices, in L. Fogelin (ed.) *Religion, archaeology and the material world* (Occasional paper 36). Carbondale (IL): Center for Archaeological Investigations, Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

- MCCOY, M.D. & J.W. STEPHEN. 2008. Examining the ritual landscape of North Kohala: a report on the 2008 monumental architecture field school. Report on file with the Hawai'i State Historic Preservation Division, Kapolei.
- MCCOY, P.C. 1999. Neither here nor there: a rites of passage site on the eastern fringes of the Mauna Kea adze quarry, Hawai'i. *Hawaiian Archaeology* 7: 11–34.
- MCCOY, P.C., M.I. WEISLER, J. ZHAO & Y. FENG. 2009. ²³⁰Th dates for dedicatory corals from a remote alpine desert adze quarry on Mauna Kea, Hawai'i. *Antiquity* 83: 445–57.
- MULROONEY, M.A. & T.N. LADEFOGED. 2005. Hawaiian *beiau* and agricultural production in the Kohala dryland field system. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 114(1): 45–67.
- MULROONEY, M.A., T.N. LADEFOGED, R. GIBB & D. MCCURDY. 2005. Eight million points per day: archaeological implications of laser scanning and three-dimensional modeling of Pu'ukohola Heiau, Hawai'i Island. *Hawaiian Archaeology* 10: 18–28.
- RUGGLES, C.L.N. 2001. *Heiau* orientations and alignments on Kaua'i. *Archaeoastronomy* 16: 46–82.
- STOKES, J.F.G. 1991. *Heiau of the island of Hawai'i: a historic survey of native Hawaiian temple sites*; edited and introduced by T.S. Dye (Bishop Museum bulletin in anthropology 2). Honolulu (HI): Bernice P. Bishop Museum Press.
- SWENSON, E. 2006. Adaptive strategies or ideological innovations? Interpreting sociopolitical developments in the Jequetepeque Valley of Peru during the Late Moche Period. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 26: 253–82.
- VALERI, V. 1985. *Kingship and sacrifice: ritual and society in ancient Hawai'i*. Chicago (IL): University of Chicago Press.
- WALKER, W.M. ms. [1930]. Archaeology of Maui. Typescript in the archives, Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu.
- WEISLER, M.I. & P.V. KIRCH. 1985. The structure of settlement space in a Polynesian chiefdom: Kawela, Molokai, Hawaiian Islands. *New Zealand Journal of Archaeology* 7: 129–58.
- WEISLER, M.I., K. COLLERSON, Y-X FENG, J-X ZHAO & K-F YU. 2006. Thorium-230 coral chronology of a late prehistoric Hawaiian chiefdom. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 33(2): 273–82.