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Abstract

This thesis discusses the influence of the Wesleyan Methodists on the three primary institutions of Fijian identity. These institutions are Bau, the turaga bale and land. It examines how the Wesleyans provided moral authority for Bau’s ascendancy in Fijian politics, and also, for the turaga bale to rule Fiji, thirty-nine years before the cession of these islands to Great Britain in 1874. As a further consequence of this influence, the turaga bale took on additional responsibility as the institution of Fijian identity. This responsibility was later reflected in the Deed of Cession and ensuing legislation on native land. The Wesleyan Methodists had a profound influence on the Fiji comparative mythology. In this area, the Native Land Commission followed the tradition of mythology that the Wesleyan Methodists worked on before and after Cession to schematicize the Tukutuku Raraba. This standardization resulted in the development of a Fiji-wide pantheon, where all the yavusa deities were linked to a pantheon headed by Degei. Degei’s supremacy, I argue, was a political necessity. The turaga bale institution, which emerged under Banuve’s reign over Bau, failed to obtain any moral authority from the kalou ni valu. Addressing this particular political need through their classical interest in Fijian history, the Wesleyans modeled a comparative Fijian mythology. This Fiji-wide mythology provided the moral authority for Bau’s ascendancy and for the turaga bale institution to rule the islands of Fiji and its yavusa. In constructing this thesis, I relied most on the archival material kept in the Native Land Commission Archives in Suva, and the Methodist Church Overseas Mission Collection in the Mitchell Library in Sydney. I am examining the Wesleyan Methodist missionaries’ influence on the Fijian comparative mythology, and through mythology, on the primary institutions of Fijian identity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fijian Term</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a i sevu</td>
<td>first fruit offering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bau</td>
<td>the Vunivalu and Tui Kaba’s home island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buli</td>
<td>government district chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bure</td>
<td>a small thatched house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bure kalou</td>
<td>center of religion, village meetings and visitor’s lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalou</td>
<td>god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalou ni valu</td>
<td>war god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalou vu</td>
<td>patriarchal ancestor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kato ni tabua</td>
<td>casket of whale’s teeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kato ni vola</td>
<td>casket of letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liga qaga</td>
<td>strong handed, industriousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lewa</td>
<td>sovereignty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lewa vakaturaga</td>
<td>decisions made by chiefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mataqali</td>
<td>herald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mataqali</td>
<td>sons of the kalou vu and landholding unit of Fijian society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matanitu</td>
<td>a number of yavusa under the leadership of a turaga bale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gele</td>
<td>land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sau</td>
<td>Fijian divinity, spiritual authority of a turaga bale to command respect and obedience from his people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roko</td>
<td>chiefly titles of Rewa and Lau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tadravu</td>
<td>hearth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tui</td>
<td>chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turaga bale</td>
<td>A titled chief of a matanitu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turaga i taukei</td>
<td>chief of a yavusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tokatoka</td>
<td>sub-units of the mataqali, consisting of families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukutuku Raraba</td>
<td>General Report of the Native Land Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaka-Papalagi</td>
<td>in the European custom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaka-Viti</td>
<td>in the Fijian manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vakaturaga</td>
<td>chiefly customs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yavusa</td>
<td>a number of yavusa under the rule of a chief or turaga i taukei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yavusa</td>
<td>lands tributaries of a major political power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yavu</td>
<td>the descendant of a kalou vu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yavu ni bula</td>
<td>house site or mound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wasawasa</td>
<td>numeral for one hundred canoes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Titles of the Fijian Turaga Bale by *Matanitu*

**Matanitu of Kubuna**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vunivalu, Tui Kaba</td>
<td>High Chief of the <em>Matanitu</em> of Bau and Tui Viti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roko Tui Bau</td>
<td>Spiritual and Former Ruler of Bau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tora ni Bau</td>
<td>High Chief of Batiki Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takala-i-Gau</td>
<td>High Chief of Sawaieke, Gau Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tui Levuka</td>
<td>High Chief of Levuka, Ovalau Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratu mai Verata</td>
<td>High Chief of Verata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qaranivalu</td>
<td>High Chief of Naitasiri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Matanitu of Burebasaga**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roko Tui Dreketi</td>
<td>High Chief of Rewa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka Levu</td>
<td>High Chief of Nadroga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tui Vuda</td>
<td>High Chief of Vuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vunivalu</td>
<td>High Chief of Serua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tui Ba</td>
<td>High Chief of Nailaga, Ba.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tui Tavuki</td>
<td>High Chief of Tavuki, Kadavu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Matanitu of Tovata**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tui Cakau</td>
<td>High Chief of Cakaudrove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tui Nayau</td>
<td>High Chief of Lakeba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tui Lau</td>
<td>High Chief of Lau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tui Bua</td>
<td>High Chief of Bua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tui Macuata</td>
<td>High Chief of Macuata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbreviations

A. J. C. P. Australian Joint Copying Project.
E. B. Evidence Book.
C. O. Colonial Office.
F. D. M. M. R. Feejee District Meeting, Minutes and Reports.
J. S. M. P. Joji Sereiwa Mate Papers, Suva.
N. L. A National Library of Australia, Canberra.
N. A. F National Archives of Fiji, Suva.
N. L. C. A. Native Land Commission Archives, Suva.
N. L. C. Native Land Commission
T. C. Tippett’s Collection, Saint Marks National Theological Center, Canberra.
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Introduction

This thesis discusses the influence of the Wesleyan Methodists on the development of primary institutions of Fijian identity. There are three primary institutions of Fijian identity. They are the *matanitu* of Bau, the *turaga bale* and land. I argue that the Wesleyans, thirty-nine years before the cession of Fiji to Great Britain in 1874, had a profound influence on these institutions, and through them, on Fijian identity. The Wesleyans used their motto, *Rerevaka na Kalou ka Doka na Tui*, or *Fear God and Honour the King*, to provide moral authority to the *turaga bale* institution, and while introducing monotheism, fortified the ascendancy of Bau in the Fijian chiefly system during the nineteenth and twentieth century. I will examine the Wesleyans' influence on four generations of Bauan *turaga bale*, that is, from Ratu Banuve to Ratu Josefa Lalabalavu Vanayaliyali Sukuna.

Specifically, this is an examination of the influence of the Wesleyan Methodists on Sukuna's *Tukutuku Raraba*. I argue that the introduction of Wesleyan Methodism, as the *lotu i Na Vunivalu*, or religion of the Vunivalu, played an influential role in the ascendancy of Bau and the emergence of the *turaga bale* institution. Sukuna later asserted the ascendancy of Bau and the *turaga bale* by using them as the principles of systematising the *Tukutuku Raraba* of all the *yavusa*. In doing so, Bau, the *turaga bale* institution and land became the face and quintessence of Fijian identity.

I will be using the term Wesleyans to refer to the Wesleyan Methodists. It is important to understand that Fijian Wesleyan Methodism is rooted in British Wesleyanism, which
branched into two in England in the eighteenth century. The first, who followed John and Charles Wesley, was known as Armenian or Wesleyan Methodism, and the second, those who followed George Whitfield, called Calvinistic Methodism.\(^1\) I refer specifically to the Wesleyan Methodists, who first arrived in Fiji on the 12 October 1835, at an opportune time for the *turaga bale*. The *turaga bale* institution urgently needed a moral infrastructure, for their rule over Fiji, to replace an unworkable religious system of *kalou ni valu* or war gods. While establishing themselves, the Wesleyans introduced a new religious system, much to the *turaga bale*’s benefit. They also established a system of church government called the connexional system, to govern, under religious authority, their interests, doctrines and practices in Fiji.

This thesis was conceived when I came across the information that the pioneering Wesleyan missionaries studied Classics at Hoxton and Richmond Theological Institute in England. Influenced by the philosophy of their theological education, which emphasised rational divinity, the Wesleyans introduced Classics to be taught alongside Theology. The emphasis placed on Classics was as much as that on Theology, because the Wesleyan Methodist Conference did not want their ‘trained ordained ministry’ to be incapable of defending what they believed in.\(^3\)

This education philosophy became apparent in the works that former Hoxton and Richmond students published after their appointments in Fiji. Thomas Williams’ *Fiji and* [Footnotes](#)


\(^3\) ‘Religious Intelligence, Report of the Wesleyan Theological Institution from September 1\(^{st}\), 1834, to December 31\(^{st}\), 1835’, *Methodist Magazine, Volume LIX from Commencement*, 1836, (pp. 207 – 211).
The Fijians Volume I The Island and Its Inhabitants had been acclaimed as a classic on Fiji. The other two, John Hunt’s and James Calvert’s, were works on Theology and Christian mission. John Hannah, former tutor in Theology at Hoxton, posthumously published John Hunt’s Entire Sanctification. James Calvert’s Mission History also attracted the same audience as Williams’ book. Putting Williams’ and Calvert’s work side by side shows this particular influence of the Hoxton philosophy of ‘rational divinity’. Ensuing research further revealed that Hunt and Williams applied their studies in Classics to their work in Fijian history and mythology.

The application of Classic models on Fijian history and mythology turned into a tradition that continued in the Theological Institute of the Methodist Church for more than a century. In spite of the fact that he did not attend Hoxton or Richmond, Richard B. Lyth kept this tradition when he took over the Institute from Hunt.

---


9 His collection is kept as MSS in Fijian, M. O. M. 164 CY POS 509, M. L.

10 See especially Lorimer Fison, Land Tenure in Fiji, Government Printing Press, 1903; and also Lorimer Fison, Tales of Old Fiji, Alexander Moring, London, 1904.
Wallace Deane¹¹ and Ronald A. Derrick¹² continued to maintain this tradition through their work in the Institute. In addition to his book on Fiji’s history, Derrick published a textbook on Civics for his students at Davuilevu.¹³ This tradition attracted my attention, resulting in my questioning the influence of Classics on mythology and the institutions of Fijian identity.

I will be using mythology and legends as historical data in this thesis. This is inevitable for two reasons. First, mythology is an important nature of Fijian identity. The first generation of Wesleyan missionaries to Fiji recognised this particular nature of Fijian politics and allowed the continued use of mythology and legends in the chiefly system. Second, the Native Land Commission, through Sukuna, used mythology to formulate the Tukutuku Raraba. Mythology has to justify the identity of a yavusa. The Tukututuku Raraba is the testament of Fijian identity, most of which Sukuna compiled from the data supplied by Fijian informants. The volumes covering the fourteen provinces of Fiji are kept in the N. L. C. Archives in Suva. These texts reflect a national and unified Fijian identity. The concept of identity was embodied in their land claim stories, which are in the form of mythology, and recorded as the Tukutuku Raraba, or testament of identity.¹⁴ Further, Fijians understand and define the reality of their relationship with land through mythology and legends. This reality emphasized land as heritage to be inherited rather than property to be owned.

¹⁴ There are 1,379 yavusa, 5,657 mataqali and 10,644 tokatoka in Fiji. See List of Fijian Communal Units, J. S. M. P.
The heritage texts are kept in the N. L. C. Archives, where I did most of my research. With an introductory letter from the Methodist Church in Fiji, I was granted unrestricted access to this Archive. I witnessed the blessing of the new N. L. C. office space on the fourth floor of Suvavou House, after relocating from the Native Land Trust Board Building. I went through the original documents, especially David Wilkinson’s and George V. Maxwell’s Evidence Books and Sukuna’s *Tukutuku Raraba*. I have relied mostly on the data gathered from this Archive, though a considerable portion of Wilkinson’s and Maxwell’s reports are kept as Legislative Council Papers in the National Archives of Fiji. The N. L. C. maintained a strict policy on the authority of the documents in their custody against those kept at the N. A. F. For this reason, I depended mostly on the data from the N. L. C. to shape my thesis. I also came across the late Joji Sereiwai Mate’s papers, bound together after his death and kept in his Suva home. Mate was a former Chairman of the N. L. C. and his papers provided important clues to Sukuna’s work and thoughts on native land. Apart from the material kept in the N. L. C. Archives, I also used the Methodist Church Overseas Mission Collection at the Mitchell Library in Sydney. Of all the papers kept in this Collection, I relied mostly on materials relating to William Cross’s, John Hunt’s and the vernacular writings that Jesse Carey collected in the 1860s. This collection consisted of writings by Fijian teachers and assistant missionaries. The Saint Marks National Theological Centre in Canberra also contains some vernacular writings that the Rev. Alan R. Tippett gathered while serving in the Methodist Church in Fiji. These papers are now called Tippett’s Collection. I also relied on the Methodist Church in Fiji Collection kept at the N. A. F., where the continuation of the Fiji District Meeting minute book is kept. The 1838-1852 minute book is kept at the Mitchell Library, and the 1853 – 1901 minute book is at the N. A. F. I have tried to highlight the Fijian
sources, especially the thoughts and the experiences behind those sources, to guide this thesis along.

There is a need in writing Fiji’s history for an insider examination of the Fijian people. This research is intended to fill the gap left behind after earlier researchers had published their work. While they named a few eminent Fijians, most Fijians have appeared in their own history as generalised Fijians. It is important to write of particular people in particular communities and at particular places. The specific names are essential to arguments about variations in customs and histories from time to time, and from place to place, across the Fiji Islands.

In retrospect, secondary literature on Fiji’s history had examined the problems arising from having two sets of laws applied to the Fijian society. Oscar H. K. Spate called this the two Fijian worlds. They are the customary and the economic world. Fijians called these two worlds vaka-Viti and vaka-Peritania. Deryck Scarr even added the phrase, Man of Two Worlds, in the title of his book on Sukuna. However, in this thesis, I will focus on another Fijian world. This is the religious world. Fijians understand themselves and their society on three major cosmos, or yavu ni hula, as they call it. Yavu ni hula, literally speaking, is life foundation. They are the vanua, lotu and matanitu. To them, politics and economy are experienced and understood within the context of the matanitu; and they take the cession of Fiji to Great Britain in 1874 as the beginning of their modern matanitu.

experience. The second cosmos, the vanua, is experienced through customs. This cosmos is very powerful as evident in the Great Council of Chiefs. The third life foundation is the lotu. This foundation is also another world of its own, very much related to the vanua. This thesis examines this cosmos, especially how it influenced the second cosmos, where the primary institutions of Fijian identity are located. These primary institutions of identity are in fact vanua institutions. One of them, the turaga bale, ceded Fiji to Queen Victoria, resulting in the introduction of the British form of matanitu in Fiji.

In a political situation where identity is now a critical subject, this thesis is limited only to examine the Fijian identity. It is an identity that belongs to only a section of the population. That section comprises fifty four percent of the total population. But the current political situation has brought this identity into a status of national importance. The Great Council of Chiefs, land and Bau’s ascendancy have become sensitive and critical issues for Fiji’s political and economic stability. The heart of the G. C. C. is the turaga bale an institution. Since this institution predated cession and colonial legislation, the problem arises as to why it was still used as the institution of authority during Fiji’s political crisis in 1987 and 2000. It became the institutions of political authority, despite the existence of a constitutional parliamentary system government. Since identity is rooted in the turaga bale institution, it became a huge national issue after the 1987 military coups. It may be a simple issue in the villages; however, at the national level, identity is shrouded with political overtones, turning it into a critical and sensitive political issue. It is sensitive because of its function in Fiji’s land issues.

My experiences in the field, as a Methodist minister, and as a Pacific Church historian, will be used in my analysis of Fijian history. Being involved in the field, especially with the
Vuanirewa chiefs of Lakeba and the people of the four villages on the island of Vulaga in the Lau Islands; together with the yavusa Naulunivuaka on Koro Island, together with the chiefs and people of Gau, Batiki and Nairai Islands, all in the province of Lomaiviti, led to a close appreciative understanding of Bauan politics. Moreover, the thesis is about the identity with which I identify myself. I worked within the academic tradition highlighted in this thesis for three years while teaching Church History at the Methodist Davuilevu Theological College. I am well aware of the risks involved, similar to those Sione Latukefu encountered. Latukefu defended his objectivity, saying that:

the forthright expressions of deeply felt nationalistic, anti-colonial sentiments, are inevitable, but they should not interfere with the critical and analytical craft of the trained historian.

Latukefu has a point. Pacific Islanders who become professional historians must be objective in their approach. On the other hand, this objectivity must not deprive the historian of his or her ‘island personality’. Since I am a participant in the Wesleyan tradition discussed in this thesis, there is no other alternative but to be reflexive in this analysis of Fijian identity.

This thesis asserts an original thesis and relies on unused or little used documents. There are a few directly relevant secondary literatures in the area of this particular third Fijian world. I will devote most space to the examination of the problem and keep the engagement with published literature to the minimum amount allowed for a doctoral research. Since the influence of the Wesleyans on Fijian identity commands a huge gap in

---


Fijian historiography, I intend to allocate more space in this thesis analyzing it. However, efforts to illuminate Fiji’s history had to be acknowledged, especially in reference to this gap in historiography, which is clearly visible in secondary literatures. Take for instance John D. Legge’s claim of ‘unified control’ in 1958. Legge, who was studying Sir Arthur Gordon’s work in Fiji, claimed that

From the outset, village, district, and provincial organization were brought into the framework of a unified control far exceeding anything which even the Cakobau Government had been able to develop. 20

The creation of Fiji as a district of the British Wesleyan Methodist Conference in 1838 also had similar impact on Fijian political organizations, from village to *matanitu* level.

This gap is also evident in Peter France’s article and book. In his article, he argued that the Wesleyan missionaries ‘conceived’ Fiji’s comparative mythology, which the N. L. C. adopted in its inquiries. 21 He argued that Fijian mythology seems to be a product of acculturation and the growing Fijian national consciousness rather than an indigenous tradition, and is significant to the needs rather the history of the society which produced and accepted it. 22

In his argument therefore, the growing Fijian national consciousness was a consequence of government policies and legislation. This growing national consciousness grew out of the work of the N. L. C, when its clerks sought mythological and historical evidence of occupation. A new national consciousness, conceived through colonialism, gave the Fijian legends a ‘new significance’. 23 The gap in Fijian historiography is further evident in his

---


book, where he argued that Sir Arthur Gordon, the first substantive Governor of the Colony of Fiji, invented the Fijian identity through his protectionist native policy. This policy was based on the anthropological ‘unilinear evolutionary theories’, which Gordon shared with Lorimer Fison.24 It was a confusing theory, according to France, for the ancient Fijian institutions and customs were, by 1874, ‘overlaid with corruption’ as a result of ‘cultural degeneracy resulting from contact with the white race’.25 Gordon went on to create a policy of land inalienability on this false assumption of virgin custom, not knowing that it was impossible to recover such a novel past. It was an application of a disillusioned anthropological conclusion, used to lock Fiji’s native land for good in a policy of inalienability.

However, I argue that what France observed was just the reflection of the real experience of national consciousness that took place in the 1830s. Fijian identity and consciousness had a pre-cession origin, developing from the ascendancy of Bau beginning at the end of the eighteenth century, the establishment of the turaga bale institution in 1836 and the creation of the Wesleyan connexional government in 1838. France missed the simple fact that the title of Vunivalu at Bau had been there for more than two centuries prior to European contact. He focused on legislation and government policies in his attempt to find a native land rationale, while this thesis delves into the turaga bale institution, arguing that it was the rationale of native land ownership and tenure. Further, the claim that the true ancient custom of land tenure was irrecoverable, after being suppressed under different layers of government policies, 26 was a premature conclusion. Sukuna’s work in the N. L.


25 ibid.

C. was excluded in his study. Taking into account that John S. Thomson declared closed the work of the N. L. C. in 1966, the year he began his research, France probably did not read Sukuna’s contribution to the N. L. C. Any study of native land will only be complete when Sukuna’s work in that area is included. France left Sukuna out, maybe, because of the fifty-year rule on historical manuscripts.

D. T. Lloyd further stressed the importance of land in the issues of identity. Unfortunately, he agreed with France on the concept of invented identity and land custom. He studied how land policy and land-related institutions and practices have played a central role ‘in the formation of the national personality of a small multicultural independent developing nation’. But in general, I think, the emphasis on legislation as the origin of Fiji’s national personality is a secondary part of the issue. There is more to identity and land than colonial legislation. Taking into account how land shouldered a nation’s economy, Lloyd was able to address the issue of a ‘one nation outlook’. But considering the unbalanced distribution of land ownership, with more than half of the population not owning any land, the concept of national personality in relation to land was an imperfect assessment of the situation on the ground. Yet, land related institutions had a huge influence in how national identity is shaped in Fiji.

Deryck Scarr was more cautious in approaching the issue of Fijian identity. In ‘A Roko

---

27 D. T. Lloyd, Land Policy in Fiji, Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge, Occasional Paper Number 14, 1982, Abstract. Lloyd spent twelve years, from 1954 to 1966, in Fiji, during which he became Director of Land, Member of the Legislative Council, Chairman of the Native Land Trust Board and Visiting Lecturer of the Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge.

Tui’, 29 he discussed how Gordon successfully enacted the Colony’s native policy, against some opinions in London.30 He concluded that when legislation was placed against tradition, the latter seemed to win. He concluded, and admitted, that the ‘hereditary principle had – though not for ever – come out on top’. 31 He also discussed the relationship between the two most powerful chiefs in Fiji during the second half of the nineteenth century in his article ‘Cakobau and Ma’afu’. 32 The contest between these chiefs remained a sensitive issue at Lakeba, for Cakobau brought Roko Tevita Uluilakeba, rather than Tui Nayau and Tui Lau, closer to his hierarchy.

Scarr, apart from Legge who studied focussed on Gordon, took Sir John Bates Thurston, or Coseni to Fijians, as his main character for study. He revealed how Thurston was instrumental in establishing the Commission that led to the successful cession of Fiji to Great Britain in 1874. In his book, Viceroy of the Pacific, 33 Scarr scrutinised the turaga bale’s concern for the two concepts, vaka – Viti and vaka – Peritania. On the question of Gordon’s native policy, Scarr relied on an 1883 version of native regulation. 34 William K. Allardyce presented an original version in his 1902 pamphlet, but was unused since it was in vernacular. 35 He saw the Fijians as a sovereign people 36 and Gordon’s native policy as a


30 See also J. D. Legge, Britain, p. 228f.


35 William K Allardyce, Ai Vola ni Lawa i Taukei ka Vakatekivu e nai Vakatekivu ni Yabaki 1877 ka
powerful historical determinant of Fijian identity. However, in a section of his book, *Fiji, A Short History*, Scarr said that Degei is put to shame. He was referring to how the Fijians changed their gods after the arrival of Christianity. I am interested in the contrary, how the Wesleyans accentuated Degei’s position as head of Fiji’s pantheistic mythology through their interest in history.

Andrew Wainright Thornley, who recently published two books on the history of Fiji Methodism, also made attempts to cover the area I am interested in. He first wrote his thesis on the emergence of a national Fijian church from 1874 to 1975, where he examined the evolution of Methodism in Fiji from the time when Christianity was nominally accepted by a majority of Fijians to the point at which the church was self-supporting and its independence a matter for gradual negotiation.

In his ‘Prologue’, Thornley said from 1835 to 1874, about eighty percent of the Fijians became Wesleyans, one fifth of which were serious and the rest nominal. He dedicated most of his attention to the colonial period, where the concept of ‘national church’ could be soundly examined. Later, through his two bilingual publications, *Mai Kea ki Vei* and *The

---


Inheritance of Hope,

Thornley turned his attention to post-cession Fijian Methodist history. I agree with him in that the Methodist Church had much to do with Fijian history, a point he admitted,

and in my own case – very happily- and that the sheer fascination that John Hunt’s life hold’s for every church scholar who explores the pathways of Fijian history.

John Hunt’s career as a missionary in Fiji will feature prominently in this thesis, especially his record of Degei and the Twins, an account of which, Thornley attached as an appendix. His latest book, Exodus of the Taukei, was probably written under much pressure. He has very good data, but with an indefinite argument, amounts to nothing more than a reproduction of the original diary contents. Thornley focuses on the Church, but I am interested in the influences of the Church on society. On the other hand, I argue that the root of the Fijian ‘national church’ is to be found in the establishment of the Fiji District Meting and its connexional government in 1838. As seen from his Exodus, he understands the existence of this gap I am referring to in this thesis and the need to study it in depth.

Apart from that published literature, there is another set that has significant bearing on this thesis. This set is important because Wesleyan missionaries and a former Chairman of the N. L. C wrote these publications. Since I am studying a problem that involved the N. L. C and the Wesleyans, these books are source and academic literature as well. In their capacity as academic literature, some of their arguments can be questioned. Take for


43 A. W. Thornley, The Inheritance, p. xi.


45 Andrew Wainright Thornley, Exodus of the Taukei, Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the
instance Lorimer Fison’s paper, titled *Land Tenure in Fiji,* that was delivered as a lecture at Levuka to evaluate the Land Claim Commission’s work. Fison did not agree with the way in which the Deed of Cession was constructed. He argued that, after weighing the commoner’s and chief’s rights to land, the rights were equal. Every inch of land had an owner and those ownership rights were inalienable. The strength of his argument lay in his analysis of communal ownership, when he stressed the importance of the *mataqali*’s function in relation to the *yavu,* or house site, *gele ni teitei* or garden lands, and *veikau,* or forest. But the weakness in his argument lay in his conclusion, where he directed his argument against the Deed of Cession. To him, that the chiefs did not have the land titles in their hands when they ceded Fiji to Queen Victoria in October 1874. On that ground, he said, the 1874 Deed of Cession was a cession of land management, not ownership. Cakobau later defended their action, saying that they owned neither, the people and land, but ruled both. Contrary to Fison’s argument, this thesis maintains that ancient customs justified the chiefs doing what they did in 1874.

The second Wesleyan academic to examine identity was Wallace Deane, who wrote his thesis at the beginning of the twentieth century. From his Chapter titled *Kalou Vu,* he was probably responding to Sir Basil Home Thomson’s views on the same subject.  

---


47 L. Fison, *Land Tenure,* p. 32.


49 L. Fison, *Land Tenure,* p. 34.

50 Wallace Deane, *Fijian Society or the Sociology and Psychology of the Fijians,* Macmillan and Co. Limited, London, 1921. Dean was the head master of the Davuilevu Teachers College and studied for his M.A. in Professor Anderson’s Philosophy Class at Sydney University in 1921.

made contrary assertions about Fijian society by asking two questions. First, was there ever an Olympus in Fiji and second, how did Degei come to be classed as the supreme god of Fiji? He answered them saying that tribal gods existed in Fiji because there were tribes; but there were no national gods because there was no nation. He used Thomas Williams as his authority against Degei's supremacy in pantheistic mythology, stretching the concept that only a few mataqali or yavusa worshipped Degei. Those living around Nakauvadra made no offering to him, and his power was insignificant compared to their own kalou vu.

Deane argued that Degei's popularity increased for two reasons. First, he was 'the first in time amongst kalou vu'. Second, he was closest to the most powerful tribe. Deane said that as various new tribes were formed, they slowly broke away from their interest in the parent tribe, and made new interest often antagonistic to it; and so Degei correspondingly lost his power over them.

Degei could have been Zeus of the Fijian Olympiad if further tribal integration had occurred under a Fijian Napoleon. No such personality had arisen up to the time of the introduction of Christianity. Cakobau was the closest to such a conqueror, but he exercised merely nominal authority over those tribes that were immediately near him.

I disagree with Deane's assertion regarding the kalou vu. According to him, there was no pantheistic hierarchy. He simplified Waterhouse's hierarchy of 'gods most widely known',

---

1908, p. 112.

52 W. Deane, Fijian Society, p. 63f. For a contrast, St Julian earlier said that Fijians have always been a nation. See C. St Julian, The International Status of Fiji, p. 5.

53 T. Williams, Fiji, p. 217.
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which, to him, meant a structure of pantheistic equality. Similar to my view on France's work, Dean's conclusion was also premature, like France's, for Sukuna had not completed, even begun, his work in the N. L. C., where he schematised the *Tikutuku Raraba* to affirm Degei's supremacy in the pantheistic hierarchy. Sukuna cast the Fijian Olympiad in ink and paper as he harmonized Fiji's mythology to a common pantheistic origin at Nakauvadra. On Cakobau's authority, I argue that Deanes' 'missing personality' was actually present in the *turaga bale* institution. In harmony with my hypothesis, Deane concluded his chapter on the *kalou vu* by saying that Degei, in some respects, resembled Zeus. Both were gods of thunder and earthquake. Further, Degei was embodied in a snake, similar to those Greek divinities. Being one of those Wesleyans who had an academic interest in Fijian history, Deane could have been more inclined to highlight the state of Fijian comparative mythology before Williams' study.

Mythology was an important aspect of Fijian identity. Alas, Sir Basil Home Thomson did not apply his understanding of mythology to the question of land when he was Chairman of the NLC. He thought that mythology was irrelevant to the question of native land ownership. It was apparent, from his notes in the Tailevu and Rewa General Reports that mythology had nothing to do with land tenure. It was easier for him to see the relation between the chiefs and land tenure, as in Rewa. Comparing the 1892 and 1895 articles, the three General Reports and his book, *The Fijians*, it is evident that Thomson placed


56 W. Deane, *Fijian Society*, p. 64.


mythology in his literary work, rather than in his General Report he left with the N. L. C. In his article titled *The Kalou Vu*, he confessed that Nakauvadra was the Fijian Olympus and Degei was the Fijian Zeus.

In his book, Thomson argued that custom and religion were not relevant principles of land tenure in Fiji. Even though he believed in the humanity of the gods, he saw them as irrelevant to modern progress. He raised doubts about the use of custom as the principle of land legislation, for custom barred progress. Based on the data collected for the 1903 Commission on the decrease of the native population, he questioned the appropriateness of custom as a principle for land claims. Customs could not uphold the institutions of modern government, so why use it as the principle of settling land claims? He identified religion as custom’s sister. Fijian religion, as he saw it, was so inter-woven with social polity that it was impossible to tear one away without lacerating the other. That was his drawback. Thomson misunderstood the relationship between chiefs and religion by separating the chiefs from the ancestors. Such a differentiation did not exist in the institution of *turaga bale*. When a *turaga bale* was installed into his hereditary office, he was the representation of their ancestors, to the point of becoming the ancestor himself.

Thomson was misled into believing that

---


63 B. H. Thomson, *The Fijians*, p. x

it was unreasonable for the people to continue to reverence their chiefs when they had ceased to believe in the Ancestor-gods, from whom they were descended.65

Thomson knew mythology but sadly, he preferred a more rational approach to the question of land ownership. His theories could not work in a traditional Fijian setting.

The use of pre-cession institutions to buttress legislation led to the manipulation of practice against legislation, as Rusiate Nayacakalou highlighted in his book.66 In addition, R. Gerard Ward cautioned against this dislocation of custom and legislation as a risky discrepancy because it complicated the near-impossible task of constructing pre-contact land tenure.67 New customs often emerged after legislation, forcing practice to divorce from orthodoxy. He found this not only to be a Fiji problem, but practices in relation to customary land are changing in the Pacific Islands.68 It follows that land, as an institution of identity, has a spiritual nature that could not be totally domesticated by legislation.

This thesis has nine chapters. In Chapter 1, *Waituruturu once ruled the Vama*, and Chapter 2, *I am a god!*, I will discuss the emergence of the Bauan turaga bale institution from a number of earlier systems of government emanating from Verata, the former political capital of Fiji. I argue that once the turaga bale institution emerged, Waituruturu, the bure kalou of Verata, lost its national significance. Bau ascended to become the capital

65 ibid.


of Fijian traditional politics. In Chapter 3, *The Vanua has lotu*, and Chapter 4, *It is a kalou*, I will discuss the influence of Wesleyan Methodism on the development of a common Fijian identity, from 1835 to 1852, focusing on the concept of Viti Raraba, political harmony and identity. In Chapter 5, *Degei is the greatest vu in Fiji*, I will discuss how the pioneering Wesleyans missionaries remodelled the Fijian comparative mythology to moralise the *turaga bale* institution. This guided later generations of Wesleyans to be involved in comparative mythology, where they established Degei’s supremacy in the Fijian pantheon. In Chapter 6, *Born a Chief! Die a Chief!* I will discuss how the *turaga bale* institution increased using their *lewa vakaturaga* to govern Fiji from 1853 to 1874. In Chapter 7, *We have only the one God*, I will explain how the *turaga bale* institution harmonised land policy through adopting the *mataqali* as the unit of land registration. This was a political and religious unit, recognised by the Great Council of Chiefs in 1878 to be the Fijian land holding unit. In Chapter 8, *Not on the same footing*, I will examine the Wesleyans’ intervention to prevent the institutions of identity being ripped apart by legislative amendment. In Chapter 9, *Nakauvadra now rules the Vanua*, I will discuss how the NLC documented the various *yavusa* and *mataqali*’s testaments of identity. In this section, I will highlight the Wesleyans’ influence on those testaments as Degei’s supremacy at Nakauvadra in Fiji’s pantheistic mythology to secure Bau’s ascendancy and how the *turaga bale* institution became inherent in the *Tukutuku Raraba*.

Originally, Verata ruled Fiji through Waituruturu’s religious authority. With the emergence of the *turaga bale* institution at Bau, Verata’s political authority practically diminished throughout the group. I argue in this thesis that the Wesleyans’ academic background in Classics, led them to influence a political and religious system so that Bau, through Nakauvadra, ruled Fiji.
Chapter 1

Waituruturu once ruled the *Vanua*

Fijian primary institutions, concepts and texts of identity were cradled in the period of history when Verata was the political and religious capital of Fiji. At Ucunivanua, the capital village, there was a *bure kalou*, built on the sacred *yavu* called Waituruturu. Waituruturu belonged to Roko Mautu, the patriarch of Verata. It was the practice in this period for a *vanua* or *matanitu* to have a patriarch, or matriarch, whose role was to legitimise their political authority. Waituruturu provided moral authority to Verata’s position as political capital hence the title *Waituruturu once ruled the Vanua*. ¹ In orbit around Verata were a number of *vanua* and *matanitu*, each with their own political practice. The pull of gravity towards the centre was more religious than political, calling for critical examination of the type of capital Verata was in eighteenth century Fiji. This Chapter focuses on Verata, examining how the Fijian chiefly system, the key institution of identity, was founded on Verata’s patriarchal authority.

This study of Fijian identity will begin from Verata and not from Fiji’s antiquity. There is no other starting point more logical than Verata because of the form in which Sukuna constructed the *Tukutuku Raraba*. The institution of Fijian identity, Bau and the *turaga bale* institution, emerged out of the political system practised at Verata before the middle of the eighteenth century. Sukuna asserted the supremacy of Bau and the *turaga bale* ¹

¹ *Waituruturu* was the religious shrine at Verata, where, according to local legend, the patriarchal god Roko Mautu lived in the form of a short red snake. See Jone Kaloudigibeci, in Wilkinson, E. B. Tailevu. 1905. N. L. C. A.
institution while ruling on the dispute between Bau and Verata over political ascendancy over Fiji. On 9 September 1933, Sukuna met the two matanitus’ representatives at Naimasimasi village in the District of Vugalei. In spite of his acknowledging the fact that the leading chiefs of Fiji came from Verata, he expected an easy ruling. Both parties had settled the controversial topics before Sukuna delivered his ruling. In the preamble of that ruling, Sukuna affirmed:

It is evident that Verata was once the largest matanitu; and all who are now high chiefs in Fiji came from Verata, even Vueti, the patriarchal god of Bau, was descended from the youngest of the chiefs of Verata.²

Sukuna’s ruling stressed the importance of this period of Fijian history when Verata once ruled the vanua. It cradled the underlying political authority and practice on which the turaga bale institution was to build, hence the starting point of this study.

The current institutions of Fijian identity, therefore, and their present texts, originated from the period of Verata’s ascendancy. This institutional and textual origin does not necessarily mean that the concepts of Fijian identity also originate from this period. Other scholarly constructions, through linguistic, anthropological and archaeological investigations, produced concepts of identity beyond Verata’s ascendancy. But the texts, accepted and recorded by the N. L. C., began from Verata, with minimal reference to the period before Verata’s ascendancy. Certainly, Fiji had aboriginal inhabitants, but how they influenced modern Fijian identity, or conceived it, could not be covered in this study.

For that reason I will not delve into Fiji’s history before Verata’s rule, even though earlier

readings of Fijian history interposed antiquities with Verata's ascendancy. In discussing
the origins of the Fijian people, Derrick used D. Macdonald's findings in 1907\(^3\) to say that
the Fijians are part of the 'Oceanic Negroid peoples, who occupy the area extending from
Madagascar, through Indonesia, ...to the farthest islands of the Pacific'.\(^4\) He agreed with
the idea that Fijians had traces of all Pacific Island cultures, namely Melanesian,\(^5\)
Polynesian\(^6\) and Micronesian.\(^7\) France concluded, on Fijian origin, racial composition and
cultural affinities, that the 'traits which these various sub-cultures possess in common are
more numerous than those which they share with the inhabitants of neighbouring island
groups...'.\(^8\) Scarr also began from antiquity, dating the settlement of Fiji, by migrants
making a canoe voyage, in the fifteenth or sixteenth century before Christ.\(^9\) In rounding
up his argument on Fijian origin, Routledge raised the issue of the uniqueness of 'the
heterogeneity of the Fijian people and their culture'.\(^10\) It might be of help to share the
experience, on this question of origin, of the Fijian ethnic group at the Pacific Theological
College in Suva. When students were grouped into the three major Pacific ethnic groups,
the Fijian students belonged to neither Polynesian, nor Micronesian, nor Melanesia. The
Polynesians, from Tonga to Tahiti, the Melanesians form Vanuatu to Irian Jaya, and the

\(^3\) Daniel Macdonald, *Oceanic Languages: Their Vocabulary, Grammar and Origin*, Henry Frowde,
London, 1907.


\(^5\) ibid.

\(^6\) ibid.

\(^7\) ibid.

\(^8\) P. France, *The Charter*, p. 8f.


\(^10\) David Routledge, *Matanitu, The Struggle for Power in Early Fiji*, Institute of Pacific Studies,
University of the South Pacific, Suva, 1985, p. 27.
Micronesians, would normally congregate as ‘wantoks’ during official ethnic groupings, leaving the Fijians standing alone.

Basil H. Thomson and David Wilkinson’s interest on Fijian antiquity were kept separate from their official policies as heads of the N. L. C. They indulged in the subject in their capacity as members of societies outside the N. L. C., from where they published their views on the origin of the Fijian people. Thomson’s ‘The Land of our Origin’ was a translation of Jonacani Dabea’s account of this subject. In that article, he emphasised the concept of ‘drifters’ as the ancestors of the Fijian race. Wilkinson also discussed this subject in an article, where he found accounts of drifters as ancestors, as in the island of Waya in the Yasawa group. But this was a singular drift and not as significant as the one that landed at Vuda. Jonacani Dabea did not mention the east African connection in his story, ‘A Vanua eda Vu mai Kina’, that Thomson translated. Three years later, Thomson revealed sections of Fijian antiquity ‘never before…published in England’, reiterating that the Fijians originated from ‘a distant land to the far-west’. Wilkinson confessed that part of the tradition which names Africa and the shores of Lake Tanganyika is altogether untenable. It probably had its origin in some native mind who had learned something of geography and was attracted by the similarity of the name of the lake to a Fijian mode of fishing, and his imagination did the rest.

---


Wilkinson thought that those Fijians who studied geography under the missionaries began the tradition of the African connection while France argued that it was the Wesleyan missionaries.\textsuperscript{17}

The examination of the patriarchal foundation of the Fijian chiefly system had to be done within the context of political practice. I will examine the political practices and patriarchal authority that granted the moral authority to those practices, most of which were practiced at Verata, Batiki, Bau, Lomaiviti, Bua, Lakeba, Rewa, Nadroga, Vuda, Nadi, Ba and Cakaudrove. The aim of this examination is to demonstrate the type of ascendancy Verata had up to the middle of the seventeenth century. I will use mythology extensively as historical data, for the patriarchal system is accessed through mythology. The patriarchs were the authority of political practice. Through mythology, Lutunasobasoba, who had invested his authority on Roko Mautu at Verata, headed the Fijian pantheon.

The most popular political system in Fiji, was called the \textit{qali}, and it was practised at Verata. Encircling Verata were a number of \textit{vanua} federated into a \textit{qali}. These \textit{vanua} were called \textit{qali vaka}-Verata, each led by a chief whose hereditary title was the Ratu, similar to that which ruled at Verata. Those who remained close to Ucunivanua village, on the eastern part of Viti Levu and adjacent islands, formed four \textit{qali}. They were \textit{qali vaka}-Verata, \textit{qali vaka}-Batiki, \textit{qali vaka}-Bau and the \textit{qali vaka}-Waimaro. The first two, Verata and Batiki, were the major \textit{qali}, but Bau later subdued them to become the strongest \textit{qali}. Verata and Bau divided Waimaro, even though Waimaro was itself a \textit{qali}.

\textsuperscript{17} P. France, 'The Kaunitoni', p. 112.
These qali used the patriarchs to moralise their chiefly dynasties. Verata’s chronicler, Ratu Tevita Bolobolo, insisted that Lutunasobasoba, the first Ratu of Verata and head of the vusa Ratu, came on the canoes Kaunitoni and Duiyabaki. He had four sons and a daughter, Roko Mautu, Tuinayavu, Ro Melasiga and Daunisai and their sister Buisavulu. The voyagers settled at Nakauvadra, in the northern coast of Viti Levu, and after a while Lutunasobasoba and Roko Mautu migrated to Verata, leaving Degei and Waicalanavanua at Nakauvadra. Waicalanavanua married Adi Sovanatabua and the twins, Cirikaumoli and Nakausabaria were born to them. Lutunasobasoba, according to tradition, selected a successor through a race. The athletes were Lutumailagi, Matawalu, Nakorovatu, Tomanisau, Koyanaduna, Qilukeisawa, Tuivanuakula, Vusoga, Lavetabua, Koyanasaudina, Urukicakau, Vueti, Cabekovuga, Soqonacagi, Nakauvadra, Tabakauwale and Batiwaitui. Tui Vanuakula, Rovarovaivalu’s son, won the race, but the result and the prize were questioned.

This dispute resulted in a gradual patriarchal migration out of Verata. This exodus caused the later variations of customs, which in the end had a tremendous influence on the varied expressions of identity. Generation after generation of living in new localities outside Verata saw new forms of identity emerged in Kadavu, Beqa, Cakaudrove and the Yasawa; in spite of the fact that patriarchs migrated from Verata. The first to leave were Tui Vanuakula, now renamed Kubuavanua, and Rovarovaivalu, for the islands of Moala and Totoya. Others followed to settle the islands of Vanua Levu, Kadavu and those in the Lomaiviti group. According to Epeli Rokowaqa, Qionituacoko, Tovitovi, Vulalo,

20 E. Rokowaqa, Ai Tukutuku, p. 61.
Cegulevu, Ramuaniwaqa, Duiqele, Ramasi, Rawaka, Komainacunaisala, Labalaba, Quma, Tuivatumudre, Qala, Matawalu, Ramailevu, Vaduguna, Teiteiciwa, Vakamino and Koroisavuka settled the southeast coast of Vanua Levu. The rest, Buatavatava, Adi Savusavu, Adi Samanunu, Damudamu, Wakanisau settled in the northwest part of the same island. On the western end of Viti Levu and Kadavu, tradition said that Sagavulu remained at Vuda, Tuirevurevu occupied Malolo, Leweniqila travelled north to Yasawa and nine of them, Tanovo, Tuivulevule, Ratuvacake, Tuinaikasi, Tuinukunawa, Sosoivau, Tautaumolau, Borotulevu and Ratulevuinakura went to Kadavu. Rarauqali, Wakanivonolevu and Tuinaiviqalita took up the nearby island of Beqa. Nakumilevu came to Naigani Island off the coast of Verata and Rakavono continued to Lovoni, in the mountains of the island of Ovalau. Even Lutunasobasoba's immediate family left Verata. Paula, Buisavulu's son at Bureta on the island of Ovalau, migrated to Moturiki after marrying Bunonitokalau, Roko Mautu's daughter. Their son Vueti was the leading chief of Kubuna that Sukuna referred to in his ruling at Naimasimasi. Daunisai, one of Lutunasobasoba's sons, went to Kabara in the southern Lau group, Ratu Maivuniwi, went to Wailevu on the southern coast of Vanua Levu, Ratu Muanivawa to Wainunu, and Ramasiyarayara to Solevu, Bua, which is west of Wailevu. Nakumilevu, Matanabalavu and Rakavono settled nearby Naigani and Ovalau, while Tui Nayavu continued to Batiki. Ro Melasiga went south of Verata and settled the delta to Rewa to be its patriarch. These patriarchs founded the ruling dynasty on the islands and vanua they established, and legitimised the ensuing political practice. They were used to sanction political authority and decide between candidates to the title when disputes occurred.

A few yavusa, which became vanua, remained with Ratu at Verata, to look after the vuniyavu. These included the yavusa Macoi, Buretu, Vatusawa, Yatusawa, Yasa, Naikasakasa, Daviko, Qalibure and Kabatia in the six villages of Ucunivanua, Naloto, Naivuruvuru, Kumi, Navunimono and Sawa. Another yavusa, Nacula, which was quite large and found in a number of villages, was also related to the Ratu at Verata. Legend said that Tuinariba, the yavusa Nacula’s vu, brought Roko Mautu’s drink wrapped in dalo leaves, which was pierced by the hair comb, hence the name Nacula. 22 Outside the circle of six villages, which had become the vanua of Verata, were other vanua in the larger qali vaka-Waimaro. These were, and still are, the vanua of Namalata, Tai, Dawasamu and Nawainovo, and were related, some as qali, to Verata.

Second to Verata was Batiki. From the historical angle, if one looked at Verata’s status from Batiki, the second largest qali to Verata, there arose a few interesting issues in regard to Verata’s ascendancy. There are two leading titles at Batiki, the Tora ni Bau, which seemed to have close affinities with Bau and the Koya mai Vunivesi, which was closely linked to Verata. Both the Tora ni Bau and Koya mai Vunivesi drew authority from Tuinayavu. For the sake of convenience, I will use Tora ni Bau in my discussion as this does not divest Koya mai Vunivesi of his authority and legacy. Even though Tora ni Bau exercised a large degree of independence, he also originated from Verata. The patriarch of Batiki, Tuinayavu, according to legend, was also Lutunasobasoba’s son. Tradition says he left Verata for Lau with his brother, Daunisai, but returned to Batiki and named the white sandy beach located on the east of the island as Cakolau.

There was another chief, apart from Tui Nayavu, who once ruled Batiki. His name was Raduna and his sau had turned him into a deity before death, casting spells on his people to do extraordinary feats. A chief’s sau was measured by his people’s obedience; the greater the obedience, the greater the measure of the sau. As an example, he ordered his people to seek a particular little dove, qiqi that had littered in his path to be cooked in an oven. When a qiqi was found, Raduna said ‘Yes, this was the one that messed on or near me! Let one village fetch firewood, and one fetch stones - each stone enough for four men to carry’. In another incident, he ordered his men to look for his yam peelings at Davetalevu, the reef passage near the island of Moturiki. They searched for two nights until they found similar yam peelings floating on the sea, calming Raduna’s sau.

Raduna’s legend, especially that of his sau, was important because it was through him that Batiki drew many vanua to itself. A chief would only be recognised if he was sau; and Raduna was sau. Because of Raduna’s sau, there was an ambitious claim that Batiki had the most qali, compared to Bau and Verata. It included Nakelo, Namara and Cawa in Koro Island. On the mainland Viti Levu, the vanua of Dravo, Buretu, Kuku, Kiua, Namara, Nadabi and Nakorolevu were aligned to Tora ni Bau in Batiki. Half of the nearby islands of Ovalau, Gau and Koro were also qali to Batiki, while Bau ruled the other half. The villages of Nabuna and Vatulele on the island of Koro were qali to Koya mai Vunivesi, claiming ancestry from Tuinayavu as well. Even though Tuinayavu originated from Verata, his qali grew larger than Verata’s.

Bau had four patriarchs, Degei, Vueti, Matawalu and Kibuavanua, none a son of

23 Filipe Suna, Na i Tukutuku kei na Veimatanitu, MSS in Fijian, M. O. M. 164 CY POS 509, M. L., frames 341f.
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Lutunasobasoba, yet all had association with Verata. These were the patriarchs whose descendants will be the major subjects of study in this thesis. The purpose of mentioning them now is to explain the fact that they originate from Verata. They were called the *yavusa* Kubuna, once ranked after Verata and Batiki. This *yavusa* later made their home on the island of Bau in the middle of the eighteenth century. Before this historical development, the *yavusa* was living at Namuka on the mouth of the Namata River.

Bau’s mythology originated from Degei’s decree; that Vueti be given the title Roko Tui Bau for bravery during the civil war in Nakauvadra. He was also to have political precedence over Verata and Rewa, as Degei decreed. Vueti then led his *yavusa*, named by Degei as Kubuna, down the Wainibuka River to Nayavu, with four other chiefs and their *mataqali*. They were Rasari of the Sauturaga, Lewanavanua of the Tui Kaba, under Ra Balabala of the Vusa Radave and Lekaliu with the Matanivanua. Vueti went on to Verata but his *mataqali*, the Vusa Ratu, which was the leading *mataqali* of the *yavusa* Kubuna, remained intact when the tribes began dispersing at Nayavu.

After the mythological Vueti, Tauriwau and Lele were the first two historical Roko Tui Bau. They reigned as Roko Tui Bau at Namuka on the mouth of the Namata River. Both belonged to the *tokatoka* Vuanivi of the *mataqali* Vusa Ratu, while another *tokatoka* of Vusa Ratu, Nacokadi, remained at Sawanimosi. Tauriwau was harsh on the people and eventually the Matanivanua clubbed him to death. Lele replaced him as Roko Tui Bau.

---
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Roko Tui Bau's authority flourished when the various mataqali who were scattered on the Tailevu coast, began assembling at Namuka. These included the mataqali Sauturaga from Mataibau and Naqeledretaki, the Matanivanua from Bonanakaikoso, and the Masau from Savai and Malomalo. The mataqali Vusa Radave, which included the tokatoka Nadakeke, Navitimaiwaqa and Rokiwiri, joined Roko Tui Bau.

The title of Vunivalu of Bau began from the legends of Matawalu, Maseinawa's son from Verata. Matawalu's six sons, Manakilagi, Naboutuiloma, Raivalita, Raikidoka, Dauwala and Koli, later became the chiefs of the Dewala people in Ra. The younger of the brothers, Raivalita, Dauwala and Koli rebelled against their elder brother Manakilagi. Naboutuiloma defended his elder brother's stature and expelled his rebel brothers from Verata. Dauwala sought refuge with a related tribe, the Dewala and Korolevu people of Ra, and became their leader. He later had two sons, Durucoko and Rabici. When Dauwala died, his son Durucoko replaced him as leader of the Dewala people. He killed all the other chiefs of Dewala to eliminate any possible contest. Vakatobai, another qaqa of Dewala, could not tolerate such cruelty and revolted against Durucoko. Durucoko killed him and left Nakorotubu on the advice of Nacamavuto, who consequently conveyed Durucoko to Roko Tui Bau. He presented a whale's tooth as his i tikotiko with Roko Tui Bau. Tauriwa, who was probably holding the office of Roko Tui Bau, gave him the government of Bau with the title Vunivalu. This tradition fell in line with the normal political practice of the period, where a Roko Tui had to have a Vunivalu, as was the case in Verata and Rewa.

The other leading Bauan title, Tui Kaba, was incorporated as part of Roko Tui Bau's government when Ratu Tanoa came to Levuka near Namuka. Being the original Tui Kaba
and descendant of Kubunavanua, he wanted to be closer to his relatives, the descendants of Vueti and Matawalu. He married Adi Samanunu from the Dewala people, and their son, Nailatikau, became the second Tui Kaba at Bau. Since Nailatikau's mother was a high-ranking Dewala lady, he was awarded their title, that of the Vunivalu to the Roko Tui Bau. This award led to the merging of two very different titles, the Vunivalu and Tui Kaba, to be held by one chief.

Bau and Cakaudrove shaped the history of Macuata. A group of Bauan migrants reached Namuka in Macuata, linking Macuata's history to Bau. The title of Tui Macuata began from Roko Mamaca. Internal rivalry between the candidates for the title Tui Macuata filled the history of this northern state. Another tradition said that Roko Rabeka united the various yavusa in Macuata and conquered Udu.

Bau later manipulated the services of the qali vaka-Waimaro, which was led by the Qaranivalu of Naitasiri. The origins of the qali vaka-Waimaro began with the two brothers, Dauwala and Rabici. Rabici left his elder brother out of fear for his life. Three chiefly families emerged from him, the Matanikutu of Naitasiri, the sons of Savou and the Rokodurucoko. Some parts of the qali vaka-Waimaro had allegiance to Verata and some parts were aligned with Bau. Waqanibau said that their turaga, the Vusaibaleni, led them from Nakauvadra through Nabaitavo. They were part of a group called the Yatu Naiwainovo, which included Kuku, Verata Wailevu, Deladamanu, Vuna, Nanamu,
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Nadabi, Tubalevu and Levukana in Namara. They were formerly *qali vaka*-Verata but are now under Naitasiri.

Similar to Verata and Bau, the *kalou vu* regulated political leadership on the island of Gau. The *qali* on Gau, especially Sawaieke, Gau and Narocake, had strong links with Verata. Radikedike, Sawaieke’s *kalou vu*, migrated from Verata. But Tui Lovu, a great and able warrior from the village of Lovu, was the original leader of the island. Also, Lovu headed a sub-*qali* called the *qali vaka*-Narocake. On the north is Vanuaso, whose chief also came from Verata. Cakobau was born here, for his mother Adi Savusavu was a *marama* from Roko Tui Bau’s *mataqali*. Even though Vanuaso was now *qali vaka*-Bau, its chief was titled Ratu, similar to the Navukailagi village chief, who was closely related to Roko Tui Bau. But Verata’s direct influence in Gau commenced when the *yavusa* Sawaieke invited Naicegulevu, a warrior from the Roko Tui Tai in Naisaumua, to help sack Tui Gau’s town. Naicegulevu refused. On the second invitation, they used native cloth to wrap fruit bearing tree branches, fishing baskets and all the best agricultural products, but not *qe le*, which would have meant surrender. He agreed, came with his father Ravula and conquered Tui Gau, who consequently presented the *soro qele* to Sawaieke.

Naicegulevu took advantage of his success and harassed the *yavusa* Sawaieke. The Raitena, chief of Sawaieke, waged war on Naicegulevu and Ravula, and burnt their villages at Drakidakuna and Lomaivuna. After conquering them, he dismembered both the bodies of Naicegulevu and Ravula and distributed the pieces to the various *mataqalis* of Gau.

---

31 The meaning of the name Gau, as the current Takala-i-Gau, Ratu Marika Uluinadawa, once told me, is *gau ni ka kece, gau ni ka vinoka, gau ni ka ca, gau* for all, *gau* for the best, *gau* for the worst.

32 Maciu Raitaukala, MSS in Fijian, frames 353f.
Sawaieke. As they were about to roast Ravula's head in the oven, it spoke out saying, 'Do not eat me, but bury me so you can be the high chief in Gau forever!' They did exactly that and Sawaieke became the head village of Gau. There was a lot of contention to this claim, especially from Nukuloa, a village whose traditional name is Gau.

Raitena afterwards ceded his authority to the Takala-i-Gau, who started a dynasty that harmonised the Verata and the Bauan political system on the island of Gau. Takala-i-Gau came from Kaba and was closely related to the Tui Kaba. Naicegulevu was a Ratu chief; being part of the Vusa Ratu chiefs of Verata and his victory at Gau was a Vusa Ratu victory. Raitena's cession joined the political system of Bau and Verata at Sawaieke. The vanua of Sawaieke enjoyed a Ratu power base, from a chief who was closely related Bau. This political and religious combination was a preview of the Bauan political reform, soon to flourish over Fiji.

Ovalau and Koro islands practised both the qali and matanitu systems of government. Due to their being subjected to Bau, Batiki and Verata, the two islands were divided into sub-qalis. Bau normally levied these yavusa, qali and matanitu heavily after militarily suppressing the once prominent vanua into political dependence. At Ovalau, patriarchal mythology determined the island's boundary. Though Rakavono, who was part of the Verata pantheon, was recognised as island's patriarch, Ovalau was divided into five major political divisions or matanitu, namely the qali vaka-Bau, Lovoni, Levuka, Bureta and Cawaci. Originally, religion authorised Cawaci's political independence from Tui
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Levuka. Cawaci had a special customary relationship with the Levuka god, Baituiselala. This special relationship dictated the custom whereby the men of Cawaci were to build only Baituiselala’s bure kalou and not Tui Levuka’s residence. Two islands east of Levuka, Makogai and Wakaya, were part of the *matanitu* of Levuka. Even though Bula consistently used the term *matanitu*, which was related to the Rewa system of government, Ovalau had some chiefs whose titles signified Verata as its origin. There were Roko Tui Ovalau, Roko Tui Vouma and the Ratu mai Bureta, disclosing Waituruturu’s imprint on those Ovalau chiefly titles.

East of Ovalau, the island of Koro formed various political links with Verata, Cakaudrove, Bau and Batiki. The island is divided into two *qali*, *qali vaka-Batiki* and *qali Vaka-Bau*. The *qali vaka-Bau* consisted of three sub-*qali* that were local in nature, *qali vaka-Bau*, *qali-vaka* Narocake and *qali vaka-Loto*. The *qali vaka-Bau* and the *qali vaka-Narocake* had special links with Bau. A strong dual political affiliation, to Bau and to Vuna in Taveuni, could be found in the *qali vaka-Loto*. The village name of Nacamaki was abbreviated to *na veicamayaki, cama ki Vuna cama ki Bau*, denoting its strong customary relationship with Vuna and Bau. The *qali vaka-Batiki* consisted of two distinct *vanua*, Cawa and Nabuna, situated in the west part of the island. Within Cawa was the village of Vovo, which tradition says came with Buatavatava. Buatavatava’s canoe spent the night at Nola point, between Nabuna and Nabasovi village. Nabuna was closely related to Koya mai Vunivesi of Yavu village in Batiki, while Tui Naigani of Nabasovi was traditionally linked to the Toranibau, of Mua village also in Batiki. Three *yavusa*, led by Tui Nako of Nakodu, Ratu ni Cawa of Tavua and Tui Nadakeke of Sinuvaca village, had a political patriarchal relationship through mythology. Tui Nako had links with Roko Tui Bau through the *yavusa*’s patriarch Mautu. Tui Nako had then become part of the *qali vaka-*
Bau, with the Mata ni Mudu and Tunidau ni Bau of Naulunivuaka, who had political links directly with the Vunivalu of Bau. The yavusa Naulunivuaka originally settled the island of Bau, before Nailatikau took possession of it as residence for the chiefs of Bau.

The sau of Ratu at Verata and Roko Tui Bau at Bau were acknowledged by most of the vanua in the eastern half of the island of Viti Levu for they were part of their qali. On the islands to the east, Ratu at Moturiki, Tora ni Bau at Batiki and Takala i Gau at Sawaieke stood out as prominent migrants from Verata. Due to their proximity to Verata, they retained traditional relationship through continual regal visits, unlike those who migrated to Vanua Levu and Lau.

The patriarchs who migrated as far as Bua in Vanua Levu and Lau did not take the qali political system with them. It was not practised at Bua, even though its chiefs came from Verata. Here the matanitu incorporated the vanua system of government in its political practice. But still, patriarchal influence on traditional politics was strong, for the vanua began from Buatavatatava and Adi Vukiavanua, who originated also from Verata. According to mythology, Buatavatatava, Roko Mautu’s eldest son, broke custom when he received the first fruit offerings meant for his father. He was expelled to Bua, where he had five children, Donuavanua, Soqona, Sevuka, Katakata and Ravuravu. These mythological figures formed the vanua of Bua, a name that included two other vanuas, Wainunu and Vuya. These three vanua later formed the vanua, and later matanitu, of Bua. Beginning from Nagagavoka, legends and war drew the political map of Bua, where the position of Tui Bua was consolidated in the greater matanitu of Bua. The first war was the Veisere ko Bua or Divider of Bua, between Nagagavoka and Ra Tuimoru, and the

36 Ilai Tinani, Tukutuku Raraba. Bua Province, 1927, N. L. C. A.
second that divided Bua was the War of Religion on Daviko at Uluimatua and Korotolutolu. At Korotolutolu, Ra Masima, who replaced Nagavoka as Tui Bua, built his fortress at Loa against the insurgents.

As long as the Waituruturu chiefs led the *vanua*, the patriarch’s influence on politics was strong and defined. Though not all the *vanua* in Bua recognised Buatavatava, his mortal representative, the Tui Bua, held the *matanitu* of Bua together. The *vanua* of Raviravi maintained that Tabuulu and Duavokavoka, who established the chiefly title of Buli Raviravi, were their political patriarchs. Ro Qoro and Ra Gasau established another *vanua*, Solevu. Solevu was dragged into the war at Ulumatua, when Ratu Peni, the Tui Vuya, Ratu Senibici, Tui Raviravi and Ra Tagivetaua of Rukuruku followed Tui Bua to the war that separated Buli Nadi, who belonged to the same family as the Tui Bua, and Buli Wainunu. Ra Vakasalakabu and Ratu Ravulolo established the Tui Kubulau title. Lalavanua, the Tui Wainunu also participated in the Solevu war. In Navakasiga, Sabelobelo from Navotua established the chiefly titles on the northern coast of Bua. Even though the political developments at Bua had grown independently of Verata because of the distance and the sea, the title Tui Bua remained with Buatavatava’s descendants.

Kubuavanua, Rovarovaivalu and his younger brother Dromunitabua left Verata for Moala and Totoya in the Lau group. Their migration was distinct from the one Daunisai, one of Lutunasobasoba’s sons, made to Kabara, also in Lau. Niumataiwalu, progeny of the former three, fathered the Vuanirewa chiefs who became the chiefs of Lau and resided at Lakeba. Lakeba did not have a king but instead the word of the priests was the law. This was the only theocratic government in Fiji.37

---

37 Solomone Dranivia, Na i Tukutuku mai na Gauna Makawa, MSS in Fijian, frames 345f.
The mythology in Lau is interwoven; with that of Kubuavanua, Rovarovaivalu and Dromunitabua on one part and that of Daunisai on the other. This interweaving of mythology moulded the political system at Kabara, Lakeba and Vulaga, islands where descendants of those two migrations met. At Kabara, Tokalau village is associated with Kubuavanua and Naikelya with Daunisai. Both also met at Lakeba, where Tui Naosara’s legacy, weaved its way into the earlier traditions to enrich Lakeba’s mythological background. One of Daunisai’s grand daughters, Vavanua with her husband Baleiolo, settled at Toka on the island of Vulaga. The *yavusa* Tinitini came with Dromunitabua to Narocake also in Vulaga, to establish Waituruturu’s farthest eastern outpost. But the pantheistic genealogy that Laura Thomson gathered from Kabara differed from that maintained at Lakeba.\(^{38}\) The Kabara version maintained that Daunisai and his wife Vuavakavitu had two sons, Qilaiso and Wetasau. Niumataiwalu, according to this tradition, was the descendant of Qilaiso.\(^{39}\) But the Nayau and Totoya traditions contradicted that point, linking him to Tui Naosara, Kubuavanua and Rovarovaivalu.

Due to his love of sailing, Niumataiwalu left his legacy on a huge area of Fiji, especially in the east. If ever Lutunasobasoba’s promise to relinquish his *sau* to the winning athlete was to take effect, then Niumataiwalu had the right to claim such prestige. He stayed for a while at Somosomo in Taveuni, where he married and moved to Nairai Island. There, he met the Vunivalu Nailatikau, who brought him to Bau. He kept the custom of living and sleeping on his canoe while at Bau, where he could not control his prurience when the supposed maid from the Vunivalu’s kitchen came regularly every evening to pour the dinner’s refuse out to sea, beside the canoe. Davila, the Radi Levuka, afterwards had a


\(^{39}\) Qilaiso was known at Ono-i-Lau as the creator of the *vamua*. See Peni, *Na i Vola me kau vei Misi Kere Na i Talatala ni Kalou*. Rewa. MSS in Fijian, frame 260.
son, who was called Banuve. Fearing for his life, he sailed to Moala and then to Totoya, where he collected an army and conquered Lakeba to avenge his father’s death. On conquering Lakeba, he was installed Tui Nayau and Sau. But the Vunivalu never forgot insults. He sent a *tabua*, through Bakeiburotu of Matokona village in Ono-i-Lau, after Niumataiwalu. When Niumataiwalu finally came to Ono, Bakeiburotu taught his grandchild to bring his club, hidden in a folded *vudi* leaf. The little boy, as instructed, bravely brought death folded in the *vudi* leaf. As the Tui Nayau drank the royal draught of *yaqona*, unsuspectingly, Bakeiburotu clubbed him.\(^{40}\)

Niumataiwalu had two sons, Uluilakeba and Lubajilakeba.\(^{41}\) Uluilakeba wanted the title of Tui Nayau. To convince the *vanua*, he built a huge house called Nautuutu, but the *vanua* was not amazed. Unfortunately, Lubajilakeba murdered him. His four sons, Dausiga, Nayacatabu, Kolimatua and Rasolo, survived the massacre by fleeing to Nayau.

\(^{42}\)The *yavusa* Delai invaded Lubaji and ruled Lakeba, after which, Uluilakeba’s sons formed an army from Vanua Balavu and Moala and conquered the *yavusa* Delai. Lakeba once and for good, became the home of the Vuanirewa chiefs, led by the Tui Nayau.

Verata’s political ascendancy mattered little at Rewa, apart from the salutation, *Mai Vu ni Yavu!* Normally when a Verata and Rewa man meet, they would address each other with *Mai Vuniyavu!* The greeting means you are from our root *yavu*, Verata being the home *yavu* from which the chiefs of Rewa migrated. In fact, the political system on the island of Viti Levu was divided between the Verata *qali* and the Rewan *matanitu*. Rewa did not

\(^{40}\) Kolinio Vakaloloma, Tukutuku Raraba ni Yavusa ko Matokana, Ono-i-Lau, N. L. C. A.


practice the *qali* system but the *matanitu* and *bati*. Roko Tui Dreketi of Rewa practised this type of government, and was recognised by the various *matanitu* and *vanua* throughout southern Viti Levu and the adjacent islands to the southwest, namely Beqa, Kadavu and Vatulele. Verata and Rewa divided the main island of Viti Levu, with those *vanua qali* to Bau wedged in between. Though the *matanitu* was different from the *qali*, mythology regulated the customs that Rewans had to observe when dealing with Verata.

In Rewan history, religion and politics were symbiotic in the person of the Roko Tui Dreketi, who was both chief and god to his immediate subjects. The answer to Thomson’s question on the origin of the state of Rewa could be found in Jesse Carey’s collection at the Mitchell Library in Sydney. 43 A man from Vanua Levu, the *qali tabu*, by the name of Tunikalou, invited Ra Walai, who was the Roko Tui Dreketi at Burebasaga, to drink *yaqona*, which was to be gathered from Namoka. 44 During the *yaqona* session, Tunikalou asked for a bow and some arrows to shoot chicken for the *wase ni yaqona*. Failing to find a chicken, he shot a rat, which turned into a mullet after falling from the roof, and he gave the fish to Radi ni Dreketi. As she scaled the fish, scales flew and stuck on her forehead. She removed them, held them in front of Roko Tui Dreketi and proclaimed, ‘Burebasaga! She is to be your *qali* and not your *bati*, or she will one day usurp the your title and be chief of Dreketi’. 45 She scaled again and the scales flew to her cheek. She removed them and declared, ‘This is Noco!’ She scaled again and the scales came again to her other cheek. She shouted, ‘Aha! This is Toga!’ Scaling again, she declared, ‘This is Nuku! Your warrior, all other spears belonging to other warriors will either fall down or lean on
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to the spears of the warriors of Nuku!’ She scaled again, ‘Aha! Naselai, your rourou will fetched!’ She scaled again, ‘This is Tokatoka! Your warrior! Tokatoka shall be free from being levied for food, except for war!’ She scaled again. Two scales came loose but were entwined. She warned Roko Tui Dreketi, ‘This is Nakelo! If you are strong, it shall be yours, but if you are weak, it will go to Bau. Nakelo shall be a warrior for you!’ Another legend was composed to guarantee the sanctity and supremacy of Rewa against Burebasaga.46 Burebasaga was the original seat of the Roko Tui Dreketi, and Rewa was empty, being used only as garden for the chiefs. An old matanivanna from Nadoi enticed the chiefs at Dreketi with vudi, crabs and fish to come to Rewa.

The vassal states, or bati, took up a military format in Rewa’s defence. The first defence enclosure consisted of the vanua Burebasaga, Tokatoka, Naselai, Toga and Nakailomaivuna. Their various functions were also assigned; some became warriors and others were farmers. These roles regulated dietary rules, especially the way turtles were eaten. The second enclosure of defence included the affiliated matanitu comprising Noco and Nakelo. Rewa could still count on Kadavu, Beqa, Serua, Vatulele and Nadroga,47 if ever the need for military assistance arose.

Mythology also had a profound influence on Nadroga’s political system. Nadroga is the largest matanitu in the western part of Viti Levu, also known to the Fijians as Yasayasa Vaka–Ra.48 It began from the legendary Wakanimolikula, the first Ka Levu to be traditionally installed or buli. He was recognised by two villages, Cuvu, the main village
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47 Rokowaqa said that Rewa asked Banuve to wage its war on Nadroga, and for that reason, Nadroga came under Rewa. See E. Rokowaqa, Ai Tukutuku, p. 73.
48 There are two yasayasa in Fiji, Ra and Moala in the western part of the Lau Group. Yasayasa,
of Nadroga, and Nasigatoka, as their patriarch. Apart from Wakanimolikula, Nadroga recognised two other mythological figures, Nalimolevu of Vatulele and Keasuma from Nakauvadra. These three patriarchs formed the matanitu of Nadroga, which included the vanuas of Yavuasuna, Nabatinivanua, Natabanivonoira, Natabanivonoicolo, Nasesevia, Vatulele and Nalola. 49 Nabekanisiga conquered Malolo and released Vatulele from Rewa to be part of his matanitu.

Each chief in Fiji had his own coat of arms. For the Ka Levu of Nadroga, it was the iri masei and the war club. These symbols owed their origin to Nabekanisiga's injury in the war at Narara. A certain warrior, Nalewavisei, led the bati balavu in carrying Nabekanisiga to Cuvu. He gave a palm fan, or iri masei, to Naleka the chief of the Leweinadroga, to cool the wounded chief while his warriors carried him. Nalewavisei explained the significance of the iri masei, saying it was his commission to shade the vanua from trouble. 'You hold the iri masei to shade the vanua while I hold the club, guarding it!' 50 Whenever a Ka Levu was installed, the club and the fan would be used to symbolise not only the sacredness of the title but also peace and security in governance.

The Ka Levu fanned his military peace along the coast as far as Vuda, on the very western end of Viti Levu. There existed between Vuda and Nadroga a number of independent tribes occupying the Nadi valley. The histories of these tribes were shaped by the political relationship between Nadroga and Vuda. North of Vuda were the tribes occupying the banks of the Ba River, who, in many ways, resembled the Nadi valley tribes in political
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independence. The difficulty in finding their proper place within the turaga bale institution had contributed to their neglect in Fijian historiography.

Within Rewa’s ambit is Vuda, a vanua that claimed the same ancestry as Verata. This claim was corroborated with legends from Verata, confirming that Lutunasobasoba landed at Vuda before making his way to Verata through Nakauvadra.\(^51\) Local legends at Vuda maintained that they descended from Sagavulu, Lutunasobasoba’s eldest son.\(^52\) According to Osea Matakorovatu, Lutunasobasoba came on the Kaunitoni, Nakumilevu on the Kaunitera and Kubunavanua on the Duiyabaki. They quarrelled over a huge fish eaten on the Kaunitera, which resulted in their dispersal. The Duiyabaki left and arrived at Lomaloma in Lau. Lutunasobasoba, leaving the Kaunitera, followed in the Kaunitoni to Vuda.

It was a patriarchal practice to name land according to a migration experience hence the name Vuda, our origin, where the Kaunitoni landed. Other names included Muainavula, Nalamu, Naikorokoro, Dreketi, Kasanatabua, and Kabekokira.\(^53\) Each name had its story. Lutunasobasoba and his party were opposite Muainavula when the moon rose; the Kaunitoni touched the reef at Nalamu and was beached at Naikorokoro, where his people carried him ashore towards Kabekokira. Leaving the Kaunitoni at Ucuinaikorokoro, they carried Lutunasobasoba across the Dreketi creek. Once on land, Lutunasobasoba found the kato ni tabua, had fallen overboard at Nalamu, therefore the place was named

\(^{51}\) T. Bolobolo, Tukutuku Raraba.

\(^{52}\) Ratu Osea Matakorovatu, J. S. M. P. Matakorovatu had four manuscripts in the J. S. M. P., first, Oqo na waqa ka ra vodo mai kina na noda Vu, 1. Kaunitoni, 2. Kaunitera, 3. Duiyabaki; second, Na i Tukutuku kei Sabeto e na gauna e liu; third, Na lewa nei Lutunasobasoba; and forth, Na i Tukutuku kei Viseisei – Vuda, 1 Januari 1913.

\(^{53}\) ibid.
Kasanatabua. They moved further on and came to Vuda, where the *Kaunitoni*’s hull planks were resewn with sinnet. Lutunasobasoba asked Degei to sail on the *Kaunitoni* and look for the *kato ni vola*. The search was futile. They returned to Vuda and more quarrels ensured, resulting in Degei’s expulsion from Vuda.

Lutunasobasoba, his eldest son Sagavulu and their *matanivavana*, Erovu, stayed at Vuda. Erovu had a daughter, Uqetanavanua, who later married Sagavulu. Lutunasobasoba renamed the village Veiseisei, meaning splintering community, built his house named Ciriyawa, meaning far adrift or cast away, while his youngest son, Roko Mautu stayed at Vatubasabasaga. The house’s name was symbolic, for Lutunasobasoba’s heart was divided over his lost casket and people. Degei, Rokola and Waqabalabala had travelled inland from Vuda to Nakauvadra.

After a while at Nakauvadra, Degei invited Lutunasobasoba to come to him. On that invitation, Lutunasobasoba accepted the invitation, on the condition that his house was to be ready on his arrival. Leaving Sagavulu at Vuda, Lutunasobasoba went to Nakauvadra, setting off from Ucuiedromu, and followed the Tualeita to Nakauvadra. The Tualeita was an old path across Viti Levu, from Vuda in the west to Verata in the east. Some of his people scouted ahead, breaking branches to make way for Lutunasobasoba. On reaching Naisauniwaqa, Lutunasobasoba pronounced, ‘Let us name our place Viti’. Sadly the patriarch became weak and did not reach Nakauvadra. Calling his sons together, he made his death wish, ‘Do not go to Nakauvadra. Disperse and look for your own lands!’ 54 He died and was buried on a mountain called Naweicavu, in Cabutanagodrogodro or Magodro.

54 ibid.
At the border of Rewa political authority, and between Nadroga and Vuda, was Nadi. Nadi won its independent political identity through intermittent skirmishes, guided by Nasorowale of Vuda and Nabekanisiga of Nadroga.\textsuperscript{55} In the first attempt, according to mythology, Mudunatua of Nadi challenged Rasaqa of Sabeto. Mudunatua stood on one side of the Sabeto River and scolded Rasaqa, ‘You are not the ocean trevally but a river trevally! You were born in the \textit{subu sewa}, when the tide began to ebb!’\textsuperscript{56} Rasaqa was deeply offended and sought Mataitoga’s help who solicited military help from Vuda, where their mother came from. They presented Tui Vuda a huge \textit{tabua} called Tunasovasova. But Tui Vuda was reluctant to help, for Nadi was still under Nadroga’s rule. In the second attempt, Atanitoga, another Nadi chief, came with ten whale’s teeth to Vuda for O to be killed. But Leivunamoli had joined forces with the \textit{kai} Naibati in support of O. The two sides met and fought at Navatulevu where Naisoro, Atanitoga’s son, was shot. When Atanitoga reached Vuda, he was mad on behalf of Naisoro, and presented more \textit{tabua}, this time for the burning of Nadi. The chiefs of Vuda told him, ‘Return! We will deal with it later. Do you not know the coconut that was tied to another was Naibati?’\textsuperscript{57} It was a political metaphor, ‘the coconut that was tied’, meaning that the \textit{kai} Naibati and Vuda were related, similar to two coconuts tied together.

The third and final attempt by Nadi to gain independence was through a war called the Vitimi, which the \textit{kai} Naibati started. During the war, Natukamakama, a Vuda chief, was accidentally killed, breaking Vuda’s patience with Nadi. Natukamakama was caught in a skirmish between the \textit{kai} Naibati and an army from Rakiraki, Ra at Lauwaki. Lauwaki
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\textsuperscript{57} ibid. In Fijian it reads, \textit{Ko sega beka ni kila na niu sa buki?}
was the village of the Kabo people from Tuva in Nadroga. Natukamakama went to Lauwaki at night and slept there, intending to return to Vuda in the morning. But early that morning, the kai Nabati and the kai Rakiraki attacked the Kabo, with prisoners taken to Nadi. The Kabo refugees scattered to Saru and some of their descendants are now at Namoli in Vuda. The kai Naibati killed Natukumakuma, and dismembered and divided his body at Nadi. But Natukamakama’s sau showed up, even in death. When they were dismembering his body, the bamboo knife broke. The butcher poisoned his tongue as he bit the bamboo to slice flesh with. When they knew it was Natukumakuma, they gave the body to the kai Yavusania. But the Yavusania people folded the body in a mat and took it to Vuda for burial, knowing that death was the penalty if they ate such flesh. In return, the Vuda chiefs presented them the yau ni mate. Tui Vuda told them, ‘Natukumakuma has untied the coconut that was tied at both ends. When the war comes, do pull out from Yavusania and come to Vuda!’ At last, Vuda consented to Nadi’s destruction. They sent Nawaqavanua, Natavuke and Vanitu to present the tagitagi i valu to Nabekanisiga. Once in Cuvu, Nabekanisiga told them their seeing one another meant more to him than the tabua that they presented for the tagitagi valu. He agreed to burn Nadi on Tui Vuda’s behalf, doing so in a war called the Valu ni Tola or War of the Mudcrab, for dead men were like mud crabs. Nabekanisiga found it hard to burn Nadi, for Nadi was now under Vuda. The Nadi people had been defending their fortress at Korovusa. Nabekanisiga led the warriors against Vuakoro, after besieging Korovusa, and dispersed the defiant tribes of Nadi. Some kai Nadi fled to the interior, Colo, of Viti Levu, Vuda, Sabeto and Lomolomo. The kai Yavusania fled to Basewa and the kai Ua sought refuge at Nataqiri near Sabeto. After the war, Nabekanisiga came to Vuda for the qusi ni loaloa, where Atanitoga and Mataitoga presented him with a whales tooth called the Tuinasavusavu.
The kai Nadi remained subdued at Vuda, while Naloku, the first Tui Nadi, returned to Vagadra. His house, named Durulidegei, meaning that nobody should ever pull that house or village down, was built.\textsuperscript{59} The kai Nabati and the Yavusania were not happy, for only Naloku’s house and village was built and not theirs as well. In defiance, they planted a stick of sugar cane at Maqalevu as a sign of their sau. This practice was unique in Vuda and Nadi. Whenever an inferior chief rebelled against his superior, he would plant a stem of sugar cane, dovu, as declaration of independence and war. The kai Naibati and Yavusania further formed an army to fight Naloku and Atanitoga, but Tui Nadi sought assistance from Nawaka and Ua, and successfully subdued the rebellion.

As an anticlimax to the Vuda and Nadroga military campaigns in the Nadi area, they resolved an internal unrest when Vuluma revolted at Navo in Sabeto. Vuluma planted a stem of sugar cane, similar to the one at Maqalevu, bringing Tui Nawaka’s wrath upon him. Tui Nawaka destroyed Navo, whose inhabitants fled and rebuilt their real village, Nakorowaiwai, which they defended with the kai Yavusania and the kai Naibati. Nakorowaiwai was again besieged and the Navo refugees fled to Nadroga. They regrouped at Vitogotogo, where Tui Vuda’s army entered their fortress and took all as the captives to Vagadra, to be declared defeated in the cibi. Ordered to remain with their chiefs in their respective villages, they became vassals of Vuda.

Verata did not influence the political system in Ba, north of Vuda, where loosely connected yavusa, satisfying the standards of being neither a vanua nor a matanitu, were found.\textsuperscript{60} Koronubu, as Ba was traditionally addressed, for instance, consisted of the kai
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Tio, kai Namacuku, kai Navoli, kai Tacinivunivau, kai Votua and the kai Ketenavu. These *yavusa* were independent of one another, united only for military defence. On the north bank of the Ba River other *yavusa*, including the kai Taubera, kai Batiri, kai Nasolu, kai Bautau and the kai Sarava, established their settlements. Ba had its own history, but it was later included as part of Bau in the *Ai Valu ni Lotu*, between Tawake of Koronubu and Nabea of Bulu. Nadakaibitu of Yakete joined Tawake and reinforcement later came from Bau. Nailaga, Tawake's village, was recognised as the capital village of Ba and a special relationship was forged between Koronubu and Bau. On the other hand, Bulu aligned itself with Rewa.

Beyond Bauan intrusion into Ba, the political practices in Ba and Nadi have never been studied in detail. The political structure in Ba allowed the existence of a variety of independent *yavusa*. Military powers, like Yakete, could not impose their political authority over other *yavusa*, which it had neither conquered nor displaced. It was clear that the function of religion as a uniting force in politics remained weak for two reasons, the absence of aristocratic hierarchy and the mobility of the *yavusa*. For this same reason, the *yavusa* were scattered and unorganised, leaving them vulnerable to the religious superiority of Bau and Rewa.

The third system of government, apart from the *qali* and *matanitu*, was the *Tui* or monarchy, and practised at Cakaudrove. Similar to the *qali* and the *matanitu*, mythology also sanctified the monarchical system of government in Cakaudrove. But Cakaudrove had developed into a powerful and independent *matanitu*, providing its mythology with a structure that was more inherent in political practice than in Verata and Bau. In Cakaudrove, mythology was embodied in the *yaqona* ceremony to invest the title Tui
Cakau. Cakaudrove’s aristocracy began from Naulumatua, a patriarchal figure from Sawanimosi, opposite Cakaudroveiwai. Naulumatua began the yavusa called the Ai Sokula. He was living with another yavusa called the kai Cakaudrove, whose chief was Mai Nakamakama. If one became the chief of both groups, he was called Vunivalu.61 The myth says that Cakaudrove once waged war against Nagigi. Naulumatua followed them to war at Nagigi, where he got a wife as spoils of war. From their union, a son, Ro Kevu, was born, whom Mai Kavula, an influential and powerful Cakaudrove chief, looked after. During the ritual yaqona ceremony, a Mataikoro chief was about to drink the yaqona, but Mai Kavula taught Ro Kevu to drink it. Ro Kevu, who was sitting behind those preparing the chiefly brew, drank and became the first Tui Cakau. The Mataikoro chiefs then became the sauturaga, with the special function of upholding the rule of the installed Tui Cakau. Koya mai Mataikoro had to make sure that Tui Cakau was served as a high and sacred chief. Ro Kevu’s house was built and called Lalagavesi.

Political survival was costly in Cakaudrove. The title was often contested between brothers and cousins, demonstrated in the War of the Brothers, between Ra Tavo and Ratu Ralulu. Cakaudroveiwai and Vunisavisavi followed Ra Tavo and Mataikoro, Delaidaku and the Kai Korocau followed Ratu Ralulu. A plot was forged, forcing the kai Korocau to kill their allies. Ratu Ralulu took refuge at Welagi, where Nawiriwiritola, the Tui Somosomo, looked after him. During Ra Tavo’s reign, Heimoana, a Tongan chief from Velitoa, arrived and settled in Somosomo. Some of his followers went to Wainikeli, reinforcing Polynesian presence in Cakaudrove. When Ratu Vakamino became the Tui Cakau, Ratu Lalabalavu and Ratu Rabici, the vasu ki Bau, rebelled and went to Vuna, taking their sister, Adi Talatoka, who was supposed to marry Vavanua of Natewa. During
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this time, the Matai Toga arrived. Aristocratic schism continued into Ratu Naiqama and Ratu Yavala’s terms as Tui Cakau. They were installed at different ceremonies, resulting in two Tui Cakau at the same time. Ratu Naiqama was installed at Buca, earning the name Ratu Tawakecolati, for his flag was raised on land when he was carried over to Vunisavisavi.

Mythology legitimised the patriarchal genesis of the *vanua* in other parts of Cakaudrove as well. Mainavatudromu and his wife Adi Maisavanikoro from Nakauvadra established the aristocracy of the *yavusau* Somosomo. Their sons were Mainawavico of Valelevu, Botowai of Vusamudu and Melinibua of Vione. Another patriarch, Ulalou, founded Benau, Tui Cakau’s fishers of men. The religious relationship of Ulalou’s people and Dakuwaqa, their god of war, began when the Benau people, on their way from Vusasivo to Cakaudrove, saw a tree trunk they normally used as canoe rollers to drag canoes from the beach to the sea. The tree spoke, ‘You rolled the canoe on my back. Stop it and call me Dakuwaqa. I am to be your god of war!’ They sailed and a shark followed them. They went to Mai Benau and worked with the *kai* Nakoro. After killing Taqaivanola, the owner of Benau Island, they claimed the island as theirs. On the north east of Taveuni Island, Rawaka established the *vanua* of Wainikeli. His sons included Ratu Rewa, who established Savuna, Cavusaya to Qalau, Matirilevu to Narewa, Maisavuti to Waima, Ravuravu to Korovatu and Qorovula to Naqasia. Mainauluwaisole, who came from Cakaudrove, established Laucala, another island *vanua* on the eastern coast of Taveuni.

Two other legendary figures Sigarara and Di Mai Benau from Vunisavisavi in Cakaudrove established the *vanua* of Tunuloa. Their sons were Mainawi, Mainavatu, Ravosai and Mainasigasiga.
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Even though Cakaudrove itself had a different independent religious shrine from Waituruturu, Verata’s influence was evident. Some migrants from Verata founded *vanua* in Cakaudrove. These included Mainaqaraqara of Natewa, Rokovukelevu of Tawake and Waqavatu of Saqani, who came with Matawalu and landed at Korolevu in Navatu. Lele and Liliwalevu of Koroalau came with Buatavatava, and Roko Liga, who also came from Verata through Naicobocobo, established Vaturova. Another patriarch, Vosaira went to Naweni. Mythology maintains that three Verata patriarchs founded the *vanua* of Nasavusavu. The first was Dianikoila, who came with Buatavatata, second, Mainakorolevu who came with Ratu Livanisiga from Batiki, and third, Ratu Siguaraurua. Dumusoqo from Bua, Rakanadovidovi, Radakualevu, Maqarusa and Rabulevu established the *vanua* of Wailevu. Closely related to Verata was Moturiki, where Vunivanu and Tuiwai from Nasauvuki came to Taveuni and founded the state of Vuna. Another patriarch, Tuiwai, later left Vuna with Waqanawanawa and Uluilakeba. The two latter patriarchs travelled further east and settled Lakeba in the Lau Group.

It is difficult indeed to describe Verata’s political status, especially the type of ascendancy it had, from data available. The assessment was made easy by the existence of the political practices like the *qali, matanitu, tui* and theocratic systems of government. I have examined only the major ones, from where the powerful chiefs ruled their part of the country before Bau, through the influence of the Wesleyan Methodists, harmonised the political system. As demonstrated in this Chapter, the religious, political and mythological origin of Fijian identity took shape in the period when Waituruturu ruled the *vanua*. Verata’s influence stretched from Vuda and Bua in the western part of Fiji to Vulaga, in the eastern part of the group. The various *vanua, qali* and *matanitu* around Fiji recognised
Verata's prominence in mythology and the political practice that framed those mythologies. Mythology, in this context, was a political tool, used to legitimise the chiefly system. As a tool, it could be engineered to suit certain political ends. For this reason, a gap existed between mythology and history. This gap existed between mythological Roko Mautu and historical Maqala of Verata, Ro Melasiga and Ra Walai of Rewa, Tuinayavu and Raduna of Batiki, Vueti and Tauriwau of Bau, Buatavatava and Nagagavoka of Bua. This gap also existed between mythology and history in the western part of Viti, between Sagavulu and Nasorowale in Vuda, Wakanimolikula, and Nabekanisiga in Nadroga. The existence of this gap allowed the chiefly system to use mythology to legitimise itself.

Through mythology, most of the chiefs cited in this Chapter were kalou vu of the yavusa that established the qali, matanitu and vanua. Verata's ascendancy was there and assessable through mythology. Mythology legitimised Verata's political prominence until the Bauan turaga bale subdued Verata by liga qaqa to become the most powerful political matanitu. The new political regime that emerged at the end of the eighteenth century manipulated this gap to find morality in mythology. The concept of liga qaqa had to comply with divine right, and mythology was the only way to go about it. To do it, one had to become a god while he was still living.
Chapter 2

I am a god!

Verata once ruled Fiji by divine right. The Ratu mai Verata, held the sacred position of Lutunasobasoba’s representative on earth. Across the bay to the southeast were Roko Tui Bau and his Vunivalu, on the sacred island of Bau. This island was also known as Yanuyanu Kalou, or island of gods. At the end of the eighteenth century, a new dynasty was born to the Vunivalu at Bau. This new dynasty confronted the very foundation of Fijian society, unsettling the concept of divine right to rule. The concept of divine right, considered as Verata’s advantage, was confronted by the idea of *liga qaqa*, strong handed, which was to be the unique feature of the new Vunivalu dynasty. But, after realizing that the Verata-oriented mythology could not be suppressed, by military might alone to justify their quest for political power, the Bauan *turaga bale* took their struggle to another front. War gods, *kalou ni valu*, were created to give moral strength to the Bauan *turaga bale*. Through this system, one does not necessarily have to be dead to qualify as a god.

This Chapter has two interrelated subjects, both of which are institutions of Fijian identity. They are the ascendancy of Bau and the establishment of the *turaga bale* institution, and the examination of these two subject covers the period from the end of the eighteenth century to 1852. A new political order had emerged, governed by a select and elite number of chiefs, all of whom held the highest titles in their *vanua*, *qali* and *matanitu*. They were called the *turaga bale* of Fiji. These *turaga bale* were gods to their people, forming a triune institution of Kubuna, Burebasaga and Tovata, to govern the people of Fiji. At the apex of
this institution was the Vunivalu of Bau. Tanoa declared I am a god, after his successful return to power from the 1832 coup d'état, hence the title of this Chapter.1 I will discuss how the new Bauan political order subdued Verata’s political supremacy in order to highlight the need for a comparative mythology. In this situation, the revision of mythology, as the legitimising authority, was a political necessity. A new political order needed mythology to legitimise it, and this was where the Wesleyans’ comparative mythology came in strongly. Ancient customs depended on the turaga bale to be relevant. On the other hand, mythology legitimised and sanctified the turaga bale. I argue that the Wesleyans’ influence was evident in the ascendancy of Bau and the establishment of the turaga bale institution through pantheistic mythology, affecting Fijian identity. This identity was rooted in the rise of Banuve and his sons to political prominence in Bau and in Fiji.

Banuve was a man of vision and industry, liga qaqa as it was termed in Bau. Because of those qualifications, the NLC identified him as the father of the modern matanitu of Bau.2 The concept of liga qaqa meant that a chief must have plenty of food and material wealth to cater for his vanua, especially whale’s tooth, to cater for ceremonies of all types and sizes. Above all, he had to be a qaqa, successful warrior, commanding the respect and confidence of men in both war and peace. Banuve qualified as a liga qaqa and became the Vunivalu of Bau after Nailatikau at the end of the eighteenth century.

Banuve’s birth was contemporaneous with Niumataiwalu’s murder at Ono-i-Lau. Versions of his origin existed in Lau but Bau was silent on the subject. Raivalita was sceptical when
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he said that he did not know any tradition relating to Banuve’s father. Yet, Vakaloloma of Matokana in Ono-i-Lau explained why Bakeiburotu murdered Niumataiwalu while he drank yaqona at Ono. Traditions from Nayau and Lakeba corroborate Vakaloloma’s story that Nailatikau, the Vunivalu of Bau, invoked Niumataiwalu’s death. In 1917, Gustuv Mara Hennings published this incident in his article, ‘The Murder of the First Tui Nayau’. Twenty years later Adolf B. Brewster exposed Niumataiwalu’s imprudence in the legend of a black whale’s tooth. This became common knowledge to academics, in spite of the fact that one should never openly discuss this point at Bau. Born on the island of Bau, Banuve represented the first generation of the yavusa Kubuna who grew up on the island. The open horizon of Bau Island was full of promises and opportunities that an enterprising mind could hardly miss. The proximity of Bau to Viti Levu also strengthened Banuve’s political and military options which no other chief had the luxury of utilising. The sea environment changed the very nature of the yavusa Kubuna, from a land-oriented into a sea-minded yavusa. Political and religious relationships were developed with other sea powers like Cakaudrove, Batiki, Lau and Kadavu. Any matanitu, which had a wasawasa, could rule the sea. With the ancient political system maintained by the kindred yavusa in Tailevu and Ra, forming a background to her political visions, Banuve had the open sea to expand Bau’s political boundaries.
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As Vunivalu and Tui Kaba, Banuve held the secular authority, as political executive, probably to Naqicatabau, the first Roko Tui Bau on Bau Island. He was the religious and sacred king of Bau, so holy that the government was left to his Vunivalu. In his capacity as secular king, Banuve designed various strategic military and naval programs that he later turned to his advantage. Apart from this daring navigational feat, he waged wars on other matainitu and vanua. Legends at Bau describe him as the first Vunivalu to circumnavigate the island of Viti Levu. His first war was against the fortress at Kedekede in Lakeba, with the help of an army from Ra called the Puaka Loa, Black Pigs. Returning from Lakeba, he assaulted Vurayagi near Nagigi on the southern coast of Vanua Levu, where some Dewala men remained behind to continue the traditional relationship with Cakaudrove. Banuve even reached Nadroga during his war expeditions where the name Loaloakubou was formed to commemorate this adventure. This was Rewa’s war, which brought Nadroga under Rewan rule. In an engineering feat to honour his wife, Rokolewasau, and ease travelling and communication, Banuve dug a canal from Bau to Rewa.

BANUVE ESTABLISHED POLITICAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH CHIEFS HE WAGED WAR WITH, WHETHER SUCCESSFUL OR NOT. AMBASSADORS AND SOME TAUVAU RELATIONSHIPS WERE FORMED, WITH FORMER FOES BECOMING THEIR MATAINITU OR VANUA’S MATAI KI BAU. Normally, after every war,
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traditional customary practices would seal these political ties, like the special relationship Bau had with the village of Nagigi in Cakaudrove. Customs of *soro*, in the form of a basket of earth or females, increased political mileage, tying the two chiefly families, conqueror and conquered, together. In the end, the stature of the Vunivalu developed to be politically stronger and materially richer than Roko Tui Bau.

Banuve became the model *liga qaqa* for his sons. The massive accumulation of the Vunivalu’s wealth and traditional relationship unbalanced the structure of political power between the sacred and the secular king. It was not clear as to who really was Banuve’s Roko Tui Bau, Naqicatabua or Raiwalui. Raiwalui was the Roko Tui Bau when Naulivou, Banuve’s son, became Vunivalu. The executive authority’s *liga qaqa* had now taken its toll on the sacred king’s *liga malumatumu*. Banuve stood out as a chief of chiefs. He was the *turaga bale*. With Rokolewasau, he found a new direction in which Bau could become a *matanitu*. The system of government had to overhauled and restructured in this newborn political order. Bau needed change. The sacred authority of Roko Tui Bau, head of the *qali vaka*-Bau, gradually diminished as the Vunivalu’s authority grew, reorganising the political and religious foundation of Bau. Bau threw out the Verata model of governance, which it was practising under Roko Tui Bau and developed its own *matanitu*, a political practice from Rewa, probably due to Rokolewasau’s influence on Bauan politics. Rokolewasau was the Radi Levuka, the Vunivalu’s *watina bau*.¹⁵

Religion had to sanctify political reform. Banuve’s dynasty had to find a way around this doctrine. The new *matanitu* of Bau needed religious legitimation that Verata found
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impossible to provide. Abandoning the Verata model of government and subduing the sacred authority of Bau could not succeed unless the gods said so. In addition, the patriarchal god of Bau, Vueti, came from Verata. Also, the title Vunivalu emerged from Matawalu of Verata and the Dewala people in Ra. Religion and patriarchal mythology became a political problem. If Verata could not provide the moral authority for Bau’s ascendancy, then Banuve would find a solution to his political problem. What he needed was a separate religion for his wars and wealth. Breaking from normal political regulations, he formed a new religious system of war gods. He selected Cagawalu, a legendary hero whose mother was from Batiki, as his own war god. The rest of Bau followed him. Each mataqali and tokatoka selected its deity and built its own bure kalou; each mentally prepared for war. Roko Tui Bau’s temple, Na Vatanitawake, was converted into Cagawalu’s shrine. Other minor bure belonging to mataqali and tokatoka were built, crowding the island. They were Drekeiselesele, Qilai, Naveibeiyaki, Naronabati, Naisoroniika, Nabuliveivava, Nadruguca, Naduruvesi, UCuna, Nadali, Naococumu, Naveikilaisautu, Verata, Vunivau, Vunikura, Nasokiovo, Navakalalaqo, Naisogolaca, Burelailai, and Narairaikiwasa. Bau had now become, through practice, Yanuyanu Kalou. Once all the mataqali had a war god, Banuve united them under his god, which became the deity of the matanitu. Banuve’s matanitu was by now politically and religious independent from Verata and Roko Tui Bau’s system of government and religion.

The resurgence of divine right over liga qaqa became inevitable when Naulivou replaced his father as Vunivalu in 1803. Naulivou knew that his future depended on the maintenance of his father’s expansionist policies. Further, he forecast trouble from within the ranks of Bauan chiefs due to the nature of the Vunivalu office his father left behind.

16 E. T. Wainiu, Na Nodra Lako Mai.
Aided by his younger brother, Tanoa, Naulivou took advantage of his father’s popular political success and confronted Roko Tui Bau in war. Well before their reign, signs of a fatal confrontation between the Vunivalu and the Roko Tui Bau had begun, but were calmly controlled. The people of Kedekede had unsuccessfully sent Tagive, a Bauan who was at Lakeba, to seek the Vusa Ratu’s help against Banuve, who in the end sacked Kedekede. War between the sacred and the secular finally erupted when the Vunaniivi Roko Tui Bau, Ratu Raiwalui, plotted to kill Naulivou’s guests from Somosomo. Raiwalui’s wife, Adi Saulaca, had a brother called Baleikasavu, who was murdered at Somosomo. Adi Saulaca and Roko Tui Bau picked Naulivou’s guests as payback for their loss. Roko Tui Bau led his sons, Ravulo, Niu and Waqatabu, who were incited by their mother’s advice, to murder the men of Cakaudrove while they dragged a canoe to the sea. Naulivou heard of the plot and warned the chiefs of Cakaudrove not to go as asked by the Vunaniivi. War broke out, forcing the Vunaniivi to leave Bau in two canoes, the Bulileka and the Kadavulevu. Naulivou then sent his younger brother, Ratu Tanoa, on two other canoes, the Vakatawanakalou and the Vusatagane, catching them at Vanua Balavu. At Dranivesi reef, Tanoa killed Roko Tui Bau. The rest of the Vunaniivi killed at sea were buried at Navavaoa on the outskirts of Lomaloma village. At the death of the Ratu Raiwalui, Naulivou became the supreme ruler of Bau. The office of Roko Tui Bau was restored to Ratu Ira Babakobau, of the mataqali Nacokadi, but to a lesser status. Nacokadi was the original mataqali of the Roko Tui Bau. The elimination of the office of sacred king of Bau forced the dualistic existence of politics and religion into a symbiotic nature in the person of the Naulivou, the Vunivalu of Bau.
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Naulivou was invested with the title Vunivalu in 1803. Consistent with the reform begun by his father, Naulivou was a patron of Koroinavunivalu, a Swede, whose original name was Charles Savage. Savage introduced muskets and gunpowder into the Vunivalu’s war. Naulivou then entrusted Koroinavunivalu with the duty of leading his army. Using muskets, Koroinavunivalu frightened foes with the explosion of gunpowder. Naulivou used him in the war on Kasavu and Verata. In another war, called Naqiriqalita, Naulivou and Savage waged war on Nakelo. Politically, Koroinavunivalu was instrumental in the consolidation of Naulivou position as highest chief in Tailevu, by subduing political foes like Verata and Nakelo through musket power. Once Verata and Nakelo were conquered, the chances of a resurgence of the former political system died out. Bau, through Naulivou, imposed it turaga bale order, with the Vunivalu as head.

When Koroinavunivalu died after being drowned by the men of Wailea in 1823, Naulivou’s wars for the new political order were not over yet. Naulivou used the Tausara, an army from Serua, in the war against the kai Nailavoci in Sawaieke on the island of Gau. This war was remembered as ba qeteqete, or hand palm fence, in which the Nailavoci men declared that they would defend their fort with the palms of their hands and not clubs. Continuing his efforts in the Lomaiviti islands, he conquered the eastern part of Koro and the matanitu of Levuka on Ovalau.

18 E. Rokowaqa, *Ai Tukutuku*, p. 73
Naulivou’s political and military successes, similar to those outside the geographical borders of his matanitu, continued at Bau, when rival contenders to the title of Vunivalu contested their claims by means of arms. The sons of Savou, an older branch of the Dewala people, raised their claim on the title. Naulivou fought and conquered them. The disturbing connotation of this war was an echo from the past, dividing what Nailatikau had united, as discussed in the last Chapter. There was more than one contender to the title of Vunivalu. It was a troubling possibility for which mythology had to find a remedy.

The conflict between the heirs to the title Vunivalu did not end with the defeat of the sons of Savou by Naulivou. Tanoa bore the brunt of this chiefly conflict in 1830. As the new Vunivalu after his brother Naulivou, he took Bau for granted. He was in Lakeba in 1829 when the Bauan chiefs selected him as Vunivalu. In 1832, some disgruntled chiefs rebelled and tried to kill him. They were Caucau, a half brother, Ratumaimuri or Anglo Shark, Naborisi or Mara Senior, and Namosimalua. They three Bauan chiefs promised Namosimalua that he could marry Vatea, Caucau’s daughter, and six whales teeth, if he killed the Vunivalu.

There were varying reasons of this plot. One source said that the Bauan chiefs were jealous of Tanoa’s owning three yavusa, Valebasaga, Mateiwelagi and Muaidule. Another said Tanoa was reckless with wealth normally brought from Rewa, which was supposed to be distributed to the chiefs of Bau. But the hasty induction of Veikoso, from the mataqali

---

22 Richard Burdsall Lyth, Notebook, CY Reel 344 B552, M. L. frame 362; and also E. Rokowaqa, Ai Tukutuku, p. 71f.
23 William Cross, No. 25, September 1838, Extract, frame 399.
24 T. Raivalita, Tukutuku Raraba.
25 W. Cross, Extract, frame 396.
Nukurua, to be the new Vunivalu signalled the eruption of old in-house rivalry between the Vunivalu-Tui Kaba families. Bau, especially Dewala, wanted one of its own to inherit the title originally considered as theirs. Tanoa went to Taveuni after his son Seru warned him that Namosimalua was coming to kill him. When Namosimalua followed the Vunivalu to Somosomo, Tui Kilakila confronted him at the beach, ordering Naqarase Namosimalua back to Viwa. The two 'Ulukalala brothers from Vava'u in Tonga, Tupou Toutai and Viliame Lasike, joined arms with the chiefs of Cakaudrove to provide an elite personal security force for Tanoa. They brought him to Rewa and Ro Tabaiwalu, the Roko Tui Dreketi, entertained the exiled monarch with pride.

Tanoa and Tui Cakau spent about a year at Rewa, preparing for an assault on Bau. They sent a pig and a whale’s tooth to Koroivuki at Bau to obtain intelligence regarding their enemies. Further, Ro Tabaiwalu promised the men of Lasakau some canoes if they helped Tanoa return to office. These gifts were successful with Tutekovuya, the Tunidaunibau and head of the Lasakau fishermen. Secretly, he planned the overthrow of Veikoso with Seru, Tanoa’s son, who remained inconspicuously at Bau. Seru was alone at Bau after Veikoso’s supporters exiled his father. In addition, the Bauan rebel chiefs murdered his elder brother, Tubuanakoro. They tripped his feet at Naduruvesi, forcing him to fall under a canoe they were dragging out to sea. Out of this politically hopeless situation, a son of a deposed monarch, Seru turned, first to the gods of Bau and secondly to the fishing communities of Lasakau and Viwa, to give him a political future. He played his cards tightly, for in Bau, religion legitimated the political right to rule. Political right and

---

27 W. Cross, Extract, frame 398; and J. Waterhouse, The King, p. 61.
28 J. Waterhouse, The King, p. 64.
religious authority were symbiotic at Bau. Undetected, Seru invoked the gods of Bau. Obviously, Seru knew that religion was on his side, for the gods were offended with the installation of Veikoso. A poem, composed to commemorate Tanoa’s return, opened with the words:

Kalou ni Bau e ra loma nene  The gods of Bau are jealous,
E ra bose ki Drekeiselelele  They met at Drekeiselelele.29

These gods, including Cagawalu, of the Tui Kaba, Butakoivalu of Lasakau, Raico of Vusaradave, Daucina of Soso, Bativudi of the Roko Tui Bau and Korokasa of the Tunitoga met at Butakoivalu’s sanctuary. They were angry when the chiefs who installed Veikoso breached the sacred customs of investing authority on the Vunivalu. The standard rituals for installing the Vunivalu and Tui Kaba were observed when Tanoa was unanimously elected by the chiefs of Bau to be the Vunivalu. According to the poem, all the gods were not happy with the dethronement of Tanoa, an act the deities of Bau had authorised in 1829. His exile had disturbed the gods, who continuously met at Drekeiselelele, so said the poet.

Seru drew political confidence from the fact that his father was installed, through custom and religion, to be the Vunivalu. He was standing for what was right. He encouraged the priests to invoke Butakoivalu for the death of Caucau, who masterminded Tanoa’s exile and the consequent installation of his uncle Veikoso.30 On his way to Drekeiselelele, the Tui Kaba’s sanctuary, Seru would pass through Lasakau. The sanctuary was built beside a shallow gentle ravine falling off from Delanikoro to the Lasakau side of the mountain.

29 A Meke kei Cakobau, in J. Waterhouse, The King, p. 64; and see p. 432 for the vernacular version.
30 A Meke kei Cakobau, ibid.
What went on at Lasakau stood a very good chance of not being detected from the main domain of Bau. Seru was free to roam around the island but Veikoso was stuck inside his house at Qaranikula, beside the Vatanitawake, near the centre of the island. Confirming that Butakoivalu’s priest had Caucau’s death in his cup of *yaqona*, Seru assembled his military friends from Viwa, who were very able sailors. As usual with his love of sailing, Seru sportingly sailed out from Bau and made good friends with Ravisa, a young chief of Viwa, on the Bauan waters. Ravisa received his name from his mischievous burning of the *L'Amiable Josephine* at Viwa in 1832, during the height of the revolt against Tanoa. After that event, he was renamed Varani. Caucau thought that only military strategy could successfully see his coup d’etat through. Little did he know that the gods of Bau had been invoked to secure his death. Seru began from the sanctuary at Lasakau and Drekeiselesele and with a religious front, elusively planned his political comeback.

Veikoso’s supporters did not detect the plot. It was hidden under religion, canoes and a fish fence prepared by the men of Dravo. Traditions kept at Lasakau say that the fence belonged to Tutekovuya, the Tunidaunibau and chief of the Lasakau fishermen. Seru employed himself on the beach, rebinding his canoe, the *Tui Nayau*, spending most of his time on the *tawake*. These banners symbolised the authority a chief and normally the *Tui Nayau*, according to the customs of Bau, would fly nine streamers from the lower sail boom. The current political situation had threatened the dignity of the nine banners of the *Tui Nayau*. Her master was exiled from the Bauan throne. Undeterred by the tremendous

---

31 This was the religious practice associated with warfare. The *kalou ni valu* were invoked for moral and religious support and they would communicate through the priests. The priest would give the oracle that he had been appeased and guaranteed the death the enemies. This oracle would come in the form of *yaqona*, mixed and drunk for that ritual. The priest of Lasakau performed this ritual to ensure Caucau’s death.
political odds against him, Seru began from the *tawake* of the Tui Nayau, and symbolically sewed the torn *matanitu* of Bau together.

With a combined force from Lasakau, Viwa and Namara, Seru burned the villages of Bau, Vusaradave and Soso. At dusk, Namosimalua detected the movement of the fishermen taking up an offensive position. He knew straight away that Seru and Tutekovuya were up to something terrible. He also saw Varani with them, but it was all too late. According to the composer of *A Meke kei Cakobau*, the slaughter began at midnight, after the cracking sound of flames ran amok through thatched roofed houses. Half awake, stunned and confused chiefs, princes and princesses, old men, women and children, fled their burning homes to the safety of the open air, only to face the brutal clubs, axes and guns of Seru's allies. They fled to the sea, with nothing else but the clothes on their bodies. The Lasakau fishermen were ruthless. They waded after them, clubbing chiefs and drowning women and children. Customs, which had been the friend of old chiefs, became their foe that fateful dawn. Those who fled to Namara were clubbed as they reached the village to seek refuge. Those who survived warned others to turn in the opposite direction, towards Vatoa, Waicoka and Namata, only to be followed by death, which had taken the form of Cakobau’s club, *Uvinisiga*. Bau went through a ritual political cleansing. Koya mai Naua, a chief friendly to Seru, at last declared, ‘This is to end all political plots against the Vunivalu! Today the sun set at noon on Bau’.
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32 The present Roko Tui Viwa, Namosimalua’s direct descendant, supplied this version of the story.

33 *A Meke kei Cakobau*, ibid.

34 *A Meke kei Cakobau*, ibid.
After the Cakobau, Lasakau, Viwa and Namara victory over Bau, word was sent to Rewa for Tanoa to return. In style the chiefs of Rewa, Cakaudrove and the 'Ulukalala brothers brought Tanoa from Rewa to Bau. As a symbol of his turaga levu, the warriors of Rewa carried Tanoa on their shoulders and re-installed him as Vunivalu in the Vatanitawake. Veikoso and his supporters, while on their knees, bowed to Tanoa as they offered their official surrender. In the solemn ritual ceremony of reconciliation and peace making, Roko Tui Bau, Ratu Ira Babakobau, presented a matanigasau on the death of Tubuanakoro. In his presentation, Roko Tui Bau made an important transfer of authority, in which he ritually installed Tanoa, as Vunivalu and Tui Kaba, as the highest chief in Bau, lowering his own rank to be the sauturaga to the title of Vunivalu. He declared this in the presence of Roko Tui Dreketi and Tui Cakau, and reciprocally, Tanoa, presented himself anew to Bau. He presented five whale's teeth to Ratu Babakobau, as a sign of peace. He stamped his rank by reminding the meeting, 'as to myself, I am not as a man, but as one with god, or god's fellow.' Divinity gave the turaga bale its unique feature. Consistent efforts by three Vunivalu resulted in the unanimous decision that Tanoa was truly and undisputedly the Vunivalu of Bau. Ratu Ira Babakobau, as sacred chief and Roko Tui Bau, gave the turaga bale his absolute blessing. Through this ritual, Ratu Ira surrendered his sacred authority to his Vunivalu, Tanoa Visawaqa, to be the only turaga bale. The ancient glory of the office which the Roko Tui Bau once represented was now gone and the former divine ruler of Bau was now in the service of the Vunivalu. Religion regulated the victory celebrations at Lasakau. Tutekovuya performed all the necessary rituals and further renamed Seru as Cakobau. But other Bauans who fled alive from the fire ridiculed him as

35 W. Cross, No. 26, Extract, frame 400.  
36 W. Cross, Extract, frame 401.  
37 See footnote 1.
Cikinovu, meaning cunning and sly like a centipede. Another name, Bi, meaning ten turtles in the Fijian numerals, was probably given to him by friends, because it signified the abundance of human flesh ready for his feasts.

Tanoa's restoration and second coronation as Vunivalu strengthened the *turaga bale* institution as the foundation of ancient custom. This was what Banuve's *matanitu* needed to ensure its future. The sacred king, Ratu Babakobau, ceded supreme authority over Bau to Tanoa, and Tanoa, once the secular authority, now assumed executive divinity and authority over Bau. Due to this special event, Bau's history and mythology were forced into a process of reform. All the political and religious history of Bau culminated in Tanoa's second coronation, restoring Rokolewasau's *turaga bale* as the ultimate and reformed authority of Bau. It was not that only. There was another development of considerable importance to Fiji as a whole in this ceremony of reconciliation, apart from the ascendancy of the Vunivalu over the Roko Tui Bau. Bau's reformed political authority became the foundation of a Fiji wide institution. Roko Tui Bau was not alone in the formation of this extended authority. Tabaiwalu, the Roko Tui Dreketi, and Yavalanavanua, the Tui Cakau, both acknowledged Tanoa's political supremacy during his second coronation. The *turaga bale* unity was formed traditionally and united the three *matanitu*, Bau, Rewa and Cakaudrove. Out of this unity, the Vunivalu of Bau established the institution of *turaga bale*, the authority of which was traditionally recognized throughout the group. Ro Tabaiwalu then addressed the chiefs of Bau saying, 'If Bau is at peace, all will be at peace, but if Bau is at war, all will be evil.'

Tanoa had subdued the Roko Tui Bau, representative of the older political order, and gained Rewa's and

---

38 W. Cross, No. 26, Extract, frame 401.
Cakaudrove's recognition as the highest chief in Fiji. Through this recognition, the Bauan turaga bale became a national institution for political leadership, security and peace.

Peace was achieved only between Tanoa, Ratu Baba and Veikoso. After the meeting, Tanoa rebuked his cousin as Vunivalu Ra Vuaka or Vunivalu Davodavo, saying he was too fat, spending time lying around eating and drinking, and compared him to a pig. Ro Tabaiwalu then asked the chiefs of Bau to return and build their homes. Veikoso retired to Viwa and lived there. As soon as Tabaiwalu and Yavalanavanua left Bau, Tanoa began to eliminate those who rebelled, or might rebel, against his authority. He killed and ate Caucau and Ratumaimuri. Mara Senior, or Naborisi, fled to Namata, but Roko Tui Namata gave him up to Seru. Most of those in the Vatanitawake were astounded when Tanoa spared Namosimalua, not knowing how Namosimalua forewarned Tanoa of imminent danger at Koro. Tanoa then built his residence at Cakaulailai where he demanded the livers of other Bauan rebel chiefs for breakfast. He did this to eliminate all other contenders to the title of Vunivalu, leaving him and his family as the only suitable and qualified candidate from among whom future Vunivalu would be selected. Veikoso retired to Viwa where shortly after he became a Wesleyan.

The succeeding generation of chiefs that were to succeed Tanoa, Tabaiwalu and Yavalanavua, were not yet turaga bale while their fathers were still alive. Cakobau, Mara, Kania, Tuikilakila, Vuetaasau and Ma'afu represented that second generation of chiefs. And they were restless. Cakobau tested his father's authority during the war with Verata in 1842. He wanted to burn Verata but Tanoa decided otherwise. When Cakobau insisted,
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39 W. Cross, Extract, frame 403.
40 J. Calvert, Fiji, p. 243f.
Tanoa told him to wait till he became the Vunivalu and then decide whatever his course of action would be. He further warned that he could take all the chiefs of Bau to another island, denying him the traditional and sacred infrastructure to govern the matanitu of Bau. Tanoa was the turaga bale and Cakobau was not, until he became the Vunivalu. Sadly, Tuikilakila of Cakaudrove and Koroitamana of Rewa lacked the respect Cakobau had for the Vunivalu. The two aging turaga bale received the same fate when they suffered gruesome deaths at the hands of their sons. Koroitamana, Tabaiwalu’s eldest son, murdered his father in his sleep in 1836, and Tuikilakila, the Crown Prince of Cakaudrove, buried his father alive at Welagi in 1844.

After killing their fathers, they turned on each other. Cakobau, Tuikilakila and Ro Kania began to challenge each other’s authority, strength and wealth. They waged war on each other, especially Cakobau and Tuikilakila. But to Cakobau’s advantage, the Naulunivuaka sailors from Koro persuaded Tuikilakila to acknowledge Bau’s political supremacy. As i soro, Tuikilakila presented his pride, the canoe Ra Marama, to Cakobau. It was brutal between Cakobau and Ro Kania. Ro Kania mismanaged Tanoa’s rights and privileges as Rewa’s great vasu. Earlier, Tanoa had refrained from intruding in Rewan politics. Ro Kania had earlier approached Tanoa to wage war on his brother Bativudi, who had committed adultery with Qoliwasawasa, the Radi ni Dreketi. Tanoa did not intervene. He remained patient, even when the chiefs of Rewa burnt Suva, a village whose chief was Tanoa’s grandson. The Vunivalu of Bau did not yield to war until Qereitoga, one of his wives and mother of Tanoa, Cecere, Babakola, Doviverata and Raivalita, ran away to

---

Rewa. Instead of observing custom and returning the wife of their *vasu levu*, the chiefs of Rewa shared the Bauan ladies who came with Qereitoga, amongst themselves as wives. It was a direct insult to the Vunivalu. When Cakobau returned from Lau, Tanoa called his Council of War. He had now made up his mind. ‘Oh that I am insulted by my relatives and I have no one to avenge my cause! Oh! That I would have a son to punish Rewa for the insults that they have offered me! But I have no son to love me and punish my enemies.’ Rewa tried to present their *i soro*, but Tanoa’s decision had been made. To withdraw was not chiefly! A messenger was sent to Rewa to present the *tatau*, a significant ritual, suspending political ties during the declaration of war. Cakobau, at the head of the Bauan army, stood up successfully for the rule and authority of his father. He killed Ro Kania and brought his sister, Qoliwasawasa, back to Bau in October 1845. Rewa was burnt to ashes and the saying goes that Rewa was no more! Oral tradition about the fire said that one of the *matanivanua* had been bribed by Bau to burn the town from within once the Bauan fleet appeared. The Bauans would afterwards say that the Rewans destroyed themselves.

Rewa was forced to acknowledge Bau’s supremacy after the 1845 war. The defeat of the capital drew the whole *matanitu* of Rewa to recognise Bau’s prominence. Whenever a *matanitu* such as Rewa was defeated, all her vassal *matanitu* and *vanua* were also subdued as well. They retained their *matanitu* and all its customs, but on an inferior level to the conquering chief. In this condition, Nadroga, Kadavu and Serua followed Rewa to its position within the ambience of Bauan politics. Bau, on the other hand, did not impose her customs on Rewa, but Rewa acknowledged Bau’s unquestionable political supremacy in

---

42 J. Hunt, Private Journal, p. 91.
44 J. Hunt, Private Journal, p. 300.
Fiji. Bau would go ahead with any reforms it wanted without worrying about Rewa’s political opinion.

Rewa’s defeat in October 1845 had a tremendous political impact on the *turaga bale* institution. Tanoa had now no equal, being a much higher chief, when Rewa, the next powerful *matanitu*, was militarily and politically subdued. If Tanoa’s peaceful re-investiture as Vunivalu in 1836 was not reason enough for his political supremacy, then the killing of Ro Kania and the surrender of Tuikilakila sealed Bau’s supremacy. It affected the political system on the island of Viti Levu, as all the *vanua* and *matanitu* now acknowledged the supremacy of the Vunivalu of Bau. Tanoa, the *turaga bale* Vunivalu and Tui Kaba died in 1852, peerless, sacred and supreme in Bau and in Fiji.

Unlike Tanoa, Cakobau, did not rule Bau with Cagawalu. He became a Wesleyan on 30 April 1854, a year after his coronation. Before he could settle down properly to rule Cakobau was confronted with critical political and religious issues of how to run the *matanitu* of Bau as a Christian Vunivalu at Bau. The title Vunivalu and Tui Kaba were more ancient than the man who now inherited the titles. He did not have time to find an answer for war came knocking on his doors at Mataiwelagi.

The situation at Bau was very serious as war became inevitable. Kamisese Kapaiwai Mara was the son of Vuibureta, Banuve’s son with Ufia of Kedekede, Lakeba. That made Vuibureta a brother to Tanoa, making Mara a brother to Cakobau. Local traditions also say that Mara had more wealth than the Vunivalu. He had accumulated all his wealth from his journeys to his mother’s *vanua*, Lakeba and Moala. The movements of Bauan chiefs,
especially those of Vusaradave, it showed that they were siding with Mara.\textsuperscript{45} The wounds of the 1832 coup d'état had not healed by 1853. The sons and daughters of those whom Tanoa and Cakobau killed were still at Bau, now with their own children. One of them, Caucau's daughter, Adi Vatea, later married Koroiravulo when Namosimalua died.\textsuperscript{46} Koroiravulo was one of Mara's supporters.\textsuperscript{47}

The situation worsened when Mara's powerful allies from outside Bau joined the dispute. Ro Qaraniqio, who was by now the Roko Tui Dreketi, Tui Levuka and Tui Nakelo sided with Mara because of their dislike of Cakobau. At Bau, Koroiravulo of the Vusaradave sided with Mara, and raised an army from Sawakasa and Namena. But Nagalu of Namena left him, weakening his campaign against Cakobau. Once again, Bau disowned another son. Mara, who could no longer remain on the island of his birth, sought the safety of the open sea and relatives in distant lands, first with his grandmother's people at Lakeba, and at Ovalau, where his mother was buried. He came to Levuka on the invitation of the white settlers, who had openly refuted Cakobau's authority.\textsuperscript{48} Without hesitation, Tui Levuka deserted him and joined Cakobau when the situation was not that favorable towards his interests.\textsuperscript{49}

The worship of Cagawalu finally ceased to be part of war and the chiefly system before the final siege of Kaba in April 1855. In March 1854, after the first unsuccessful siege on


\textsuperscript{46} J. Waterhouse, \textit{Vatah}, p. 71.

\textsuperscript{47} J. Waterhouse, \textit{Vatah}, p. 85f.

\textsuperscript{48} J. Waterhouse, \textit{The King}, p. 152.

\textsuperscript{49} J. Waterhouse, \textit{The King}, p. 161.
Kaba, Cakobau raised another army of fifteen hundred men, for another assault of Kaba. On 15 March, the ritual of *cibi* took place, where Cakobau reviewed his troops, and a week later, on 22 March, the priests began to invoke Cagawalu. In this once important ritual of war, Koroitukana, the Roko Tui Bau, was leading the chants. 50 Roko Tui Bau was invoking the gods of Bau on behalf of the Vunivalu! A year later, Cakobau lost faith in Cagawalu, the oracles predicting that ‘the gods were going to leave Bau!’. 51 Cakobau summoned all the priests of Bau in early 1855 and told them he did not believe in their craft any more. 52 On the 7 April 1855, the fortress at Kaba was sacked, but Mara had fled. From a political angle, Cakobau confirmed that this was serious case and peace would only happen when either he or Mara died. Mara finally surrendered to Cakobau in July 1859 and was publicly hanged at Bau in August the same year. 53 His death concluded the long struggle between Cakobau and close kinships from Bau, Cakaudrove and Rewa.

Tanoa’s second coronation was not only Bau’s political rebirth, but also a Fijian political regeneration. 54 As the principal party to Tanoa’s second coronation, Ro Tabaiwalu, in his capacity as Roko Tui Dreketi and head of the supreme *matanitu* of Burebasaga, had acknowledged Tanoa’s supremacy. Likewise, Yavalanavanua, who was Tui Cakau and Tui Vanua Levu, also acknowledged the supremacy of the Vunivalu of Bau. These three *turaga bale* established the spirit, customs and traditions of aristocratic unity, by bringing their titles and *matanitu* together. Out of this *turaga bale* unity, a common identity, known as

50 J. Waterhouse, *The King*, p. 163.
53 Thomas Baker, Diary, 4 August 1859, M. O. M. 128 CY 2414, M. L.
54 T. Raivalita, Tukutuku Raraba. In his submission to the N. L. C., Raivalita made reference to this event, saying that the chiefs of Cakaudrove installed Tanoa at Rewa.
Viti, was formed. This chiefly political settlement united all the *matanitu, qali, vanua* and *yavusa* under the *turaga bale* institution, with Bau as the head and link. Bau now led Viti.

Bau secured this Fiji-wide or Viti Raraba, *turaga bale* unity after it sacked Verata. Verata’s demise as a political power began when Naulivou defeated it in war. He used the Yatu Mabua in this first successful campaign against Verata. From Rokowaqa’s description, Cakobau led Bau’s army consisting of the Bau, Lasakau, Soso, Yatu Mabua and Waimaro. Lasakau and the army from Waimaro, called the Dritabua, led the assault, with the rest of the army following. Once Verata was burnt, the white cowries from Ratu’s *yavu*, Sobasoba, were untied and divided amongst the invading *yavusa*. After Verata was defeated, Bau imposed her political values over all the *vanua* that were qali vaka-Verata.

I have attempted in this chapter to examine how Bau reformed the political system by developing the *turaga bale* institution. So far, in my examination of the development of the *turaga bale* and its hierarchical unity, I have explained how Banuve, Naulivou, Tanoa and Cakobau had strengthened and reformed the office of Vunivalu of Bau to be the political and religious foundation of the *turaga bale* institution. They had defeated an older political system, bringing Verata and Rewa under the new Bauan political order. They eliminated all other contending family branches, and through their *liga qaqa*, extended the political boundaries of Bau.

Bau further imposed her political values on conquered *vanua*. Political responsibility was very important in the government of lesser *matanitu* and *vanua*, which Bau was careful in
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55 E. Rokowaqa, *Ai Tukutuku*, p. 72. He was from Mokani village, one of the three villages of the Yatu Mabua.
managing. On the main island of Viti Levu and the Lomaiviti islands, the political boundaries became settled and centred on Bau after Cakobau became the unquestioned supreme executive in August 1859. His direct rule, by right to lala, was acknowledged in Verata, Nakelo, Ra and the Lomaiviti islands of Koro, Gau, Nairai and Ovalau. On the southern coast of the island, Rewa continued as a matanitu, but had been politically subjugated to Bau. Its political demotion affected the standing of all those matanitu who acknowledged its supremacy, including Serua and Nadroga. Naitasiri, which was a powerful matanitu between Bau and Rewa, had been Cakobau’s military allies, giving them a special status in its political relationship with Bau. Cakobau had always counted on the ferocious Dritabua army from Naitasiri when he fought his battles against Verata. He also used them in his military expeditions later in Bua and Macuata, assisting his political friends in their domestic struggles. Once victorious, custom and tradition politically bound those vanua and matanitu to Bau. Likewise, the states of Nakorotubu, Nalawa, Saivou and Rakiraki on the north coast were considered as military allies of Bau.

Lomaiviti was not a Fijian political group, but later formed by Bau to ease governance of its larger matanitu. The various vanua, independent yavusa and the matanitu of Batiki comprising this central group of islands belonged to migrants from the former political system from the Tailevu coast. Their political relationship with Bau emerged through war, when Bau conquered them. In Ovalau, Bau conquered Levuka and Lovoni in war, and settled some of its chiefs at Nasinu. Bureta, which had a close traditional tie with Moturiki, was linked strongly to Roko Tui Bau. Moturiki itself was divided into two, with Uluibau village a part of the island of Bau. The Ratu of Moturiki belonged to the same family as the Roko Tui Bau and Takala-i-Gau of Sawaieke traced his roots to Lewanavanua, the

56 ibid.
founding ancestor of the Tui Kaba title. The Ratu of Navukailagi belonged to Roko Tui Bau's family and Cakobau was born in Vanuaso in Gau. Tui Vanuaso looked after the little boy when his mother died at childbirth, feeding the infant with coconut milk. This incident led Vanuaso to reside at Mataiwelagi, the royal residence in Bau, each time they come to Bau. Bauans were settled at Nairai, in the two leading villages of Natauloa and Tovulailai. In Koro, migrants from Bau settled the villages of Namacu, Nakodu, Mudu, Sinuvaca and Naqaidamu.

Bau built a strong federation with Batiki, the only matanitu left unchallenged within its reaches, strengthening their political and religious relationship with marriages. The political relationship with the qali vaka-Batiki drew the western part of the island of Koro and the villages of Nabuna, Vatulele, Nabasovi, Tavua, Navaga and Kade to the hierarchical unity of Bau. They were part of the matanitu of Batiki, but the Toranibau, the chief of Batiki, had joined Bau.

It became apparent that those chiefs who joined the unity to uphold Bauan supremacy had experienced the same type of political reform and progress in their matanitu. Allied matanitu began to expand and unite the smaller vanua around them, developing an aristocratic hierarchical unity, especially in Cakaudrove and Lau. Tui Cakau later became Tui Vanua Levu. His immediate authority was recognised by both Natewa and Wailevu, two powerful matanitu covering the south coast of the island. Even Macuata and Bua recognised Tui Cakau's supremacy. Tui Cakau's direct participation in Bauan politics was during Tanoa's exile, yet Yavalanavanua did not take advantage of it. One of the major problems was the confusion in the selection of who should be the Tui Cakau, something Banuve and his sons made sure was safe in their hands. After the death of Yavalanavanua,
whom his son buried alive at Welagi, \(^{57}\) Ralulu became the Tui Cakau. But Tuikilakila Lalabalavu, Yavalanavanua's son, also wanted the throne and was also installed in traditional manner. Raivalita ruled Cakaudrove after Lalabalavu and Ralulu. When he died, Goleanavanua became the Tui Cakau. While Cakaudrove's kings changed and changed, Seru ruled Bau continuously.

Cakaudrove could have taken political leadership over Fiji due to its numerous military and naval resources, but the authority of religion and mythology over politics denied her the privilege of leading the *turaga bale* institution. Mythology upheld Bau's prominence over Cakaudrove. Qurai sailed to Bau to see how things were in that island. He was a Cakaudrove god, and he came in the form of a rat in a canoe made of yam.\(^{58}\) His food ran out and he ate his yam canoe, after which he swam the rest of the way to Bau. After getting washed up wet and cold at Mataisavai on Bau island, a Masau woman saw and brought him home, placing the rats near the fireplace to get warm and well. Therefore, whenever a delegation from Cakaudrove crossed the ground at Bau, two shivering white haired old ladies would lead the procession, with their hands held together in front, symbolizing wet cold Qurai. The Bauans would call out in admiration, 'Isa! Sa sa ko Qurai!' meaning 'Oh! Qurai walks about!' Religious relationship was further consolidated by gender when daughters of the Cakaudrove aristocrats married Bauan chiefs. Adi Talatoka, who was supposed to marry Vavanua of Natewa, ended up in the Vunivalu's harem. So was Adi Vulaono, a *vasu* to Bau, who became one of Tanoa’s wives. Adi Samanunu, the principal wife of Naulivou, also became Tanoa’s principal wife when he became Vunivalu. This strengthened the political association between Bau and Cakaudrove.

Bau's political relationship with Lau, especially Lakeba, was constructed in similar fashion to that of Cakaudrove. In Lau, the turaga bale unity was achieved through the efforts of Tui Nayau and the Tui Lau, Enele Ma'afu'out'itonga. Roko Taliai Tupou became the Tui Nayau in 1832 and ruled Lau for more than fifty years. Lau's respect for Bau to this stage had been unquestioned. In a ceremony of presentation of gifts to Bau at Lakeba, Tui Nayau interceded on behalf of Lau, requesting kindness from Bau. The political supremacy of Bau was taken for granted at Lakeba. The presence of former Bauan residents, the yavusa Delai, further strengthened the political ties between the two. But the greatest link between Bau and Lau was Kamisese Kapaiwai Mara, the grandson of Ufia of Kedekede. Mara was a constant visitor to Lau, often levying the islands of Lau heavily. The relationship between Lakeba and Bau was strengthened when Tagici, Tui Nayau's young daughter, was brought to be one of Tanoa's wives. Enele Ma'afu'otuitonga strengthened the political ties between Cakaudrove and Lau. Ma'afu came to Lakeba and stayed with Vuetaasau, the son of Roko Malani, in 1847. He began to wage wars in western Lau, sacking Navucunimasi in Moala and Nakorotoka in Matuku. When Vuetaasau died at sea in 1853, he was alone at Lakeba, with Seruvatu and Loganimoce too young to match Ma'afu's wisdom. He soon became Tui Nayau's right hand. In fact, Roko Taliai had requested Ma'afu from his father, Aleamotua, to help him govern Lau. But Tui Nayau's vision of government was much wider than the political boundaries of Lau. Ma'afu later made his home at Lomaloma in Vanua Balavu and from there, conquered Mualevu, the northern end of the island. His relationship with Golea made him the owner

58 J. Waterhouse, *The King*, pp. 16f.
60 J. Yavala, *Tukutuku Raraba.*
of the island of Vanua Balavu, which was included within the political boundary of the
matanitu of Lakeba.

Ma’afu’s popularity grew when Tupou I of Tonga arrived at Lau in 1855. Tui Tonga, Tui
Nayau and Ma’afu reached Bau at an opportune time, when Cakobau was alone without
any powerful military ally. Everyone had sided with Mara. But when Tui Nayau arrived
with Tui Tonga and went to see Cakobau, Mara’s destiny was written on the walls of his
fortress at Kaba. As soon as Tupou I returned to Tonga in December that same year,
Ma’afu established the government of Lau. He united the eastern island of Fiji into the
matanitu of Lau and from there intruded into the domestic affairs of other matanitu. At
Macuata, he intervened in the struggle between Ritova and Bete. Ritova murdered Roko
Mamacaiyaya, Ra Obe’s father. Ma’afu and Tui Bua intervened and installed Ra Obe or
Bete as Tui Macuata. They expelled Ritova who fled from Korolevu to Rokolase and then
to Navave. Ritova continued to escape, reaching Tinalevu, at Uliummatua; and then to
Solevu when Uliummatua was destroyed. He was later caught and expatriated to Wainikeli.
The political relationship between Lau and Cakaudrove became strained when Wainiqolo
and Semisi Fifita declared war on Goleavanua, the Tui Cakau. Unfortunately for the
Tongans, Rakuro shot Wainiqolo, ending the war on the shore at Wairiki in Taveuni, and
then surrendered traditionally at Waisasa. Ma’afu was in Tonga and could not be
implicated in this incident.

In the former furthest outpost of Waituruturu, a similar development occurred, when Luke
Camakacu, the Tui Vulaga, turned and led Lau towards Lakeba.① Earlier, Ravasu of Ogea
wanted an independent matanitu for himself, but Tui Vulaga conquered him in war,

① Emosi Maau, Tukutuku Raraba ni Yavusa ko Vulaga, N. L. C. A.
subduing the last of the Lauan chiefs to the service and acknowledgment of Tui Nayau’s authority. The rest of the Lauan chiefs, Tui Ono, Ramasi of Moce and Tui Vatoa, came from Lakeba.

The Bauan *turaga bale* found a new platform for political unity through their daughters, who were strategically married to chiefly houses in other *matanitu*. A common proverb says that the wealth of Bau is its daughters. This strategy equalled, if not superseded, the political consequences of the patriarchal migration from Verata discussed in the last Chapter. As a result, the new generations of chiefs who were born to Bauan women of rank had a strong allegiance to Bau. Cakobau’s eldest daughter, Adi Litia, eloped with Ratu Vakaruru of Naitasiri, strengthening the political relationship between Bau and Naitasiri. Adi Kakua married Ratu Tevita Uluilakeba, Vuetaasa’s son. A number of Bauan women of rank were married to strengthen the political ties with Cakaudrove, Nadroga and Rewa. The *yavusa* Suva is another good example. It began with Adi Lewatu, who was married to Rokokaseta at Nauluvatu and bore two sons, Batilekaleka and Ravulo Tabakaucoro. After Rokokaseta abandoned Adi Lewatu, the latter left with her two sons for Vatuwaqa where the *yavusa* Suva lived. From there, she complained to the chiefs of Rewa of what Rokokaseta did to her. According to custom, the Rewan chiefs killed Roko Kaseta of Nauluvatu in the 1841 siege of Suva. Adi Lewatu then went to Lakeba, taking Batilekaleka with her. Batilekaleka returned to Vatuwaqa, at the time the *yavusa* Suva was establishing a new village on the peninsula. In the siege of Suva in 1841, the Rewans killed Batilekaleka and burnt the village to the ground. The *yavusa* Suva installed Ravulo as the next Roko Tui Suva. Ravulo’s people moved from Nauluvatu to Narairaiwaqa, then to Vatuwaqa, fearing that the *kai* Lomaivuna would attack, and finally settled at Soloira.

---

62 Kaminieli Roqo, Seruveveli Dakai, Amenesitai Waqadau, J. S. M. P.
The chiefs of Bau sent word to Nakuliyameyame of Naitasiri to take Ravulo to Navuso, where he remained until the war with Rewa broke out. Nakuliyameyame and Ravulo burnt the Rewan towns of Nakasi and Lokia as part of the Bauan war effort. After the war, the yavusa Suva went again to Bau and asked for Adi Mila as wife to Roko Tui Suva. Ravulo then left Navusa after the war and re-established Suva.

A communication network, called veimataki, necessary for the management of the turaga bale supremacy, was developed. The other matanitu had a family or mataqali whose customary role was communication with Bau, and were called Mata ki Bau. During Naulivou's time as Vunivalu, David Whippy was Mata ki Bau from Levuka. In Bau, a certain family or tokatoka would be assigned to be ambassadors to the major political powers. This network of political relationships and communications were like a web with Bau at the center. Messages from or to Bau were given priority. The road from Bau, through the designated families to various matanitu, was called gaunisala vakavanua, paths of the land. The Masau of Bau were traditional katuba, for Bau's relationship with Tui Cakau, Tora ni Bau, Qaranivalu of Naitasiri, Tunidau ni Bau of Namacu and the Roko Tui Veikau of Korolevu. Whenever a message from Bau had to be taken to Namacu in Koro, Koya mai Sinu, from Vusa Radave would be the messenger. He had to take the tukutuku, message, from Bau to Mata ki Bau in Namacu, who was also the traditional ambassador of Naulunivuaka to Bau. Whenever Masau came to Namacu in Koro, he would belong to the tokatoka Bete in the mataqali Taurisau, Mata ki Bau's mataqali. In Lakeba, the Mata ki Bau was from the mataqali Narewadamu. They established this relationship from

---

63 They were still in Suva when Cakobau told them that the Colonial government wanted its new capital on the peninsular. They obediently vacated Suva and moved to Narikoso, their old village taken over to be the site for the next Government House. See also R. A. Derrick, 'The Removal of the Capital to Suva', Transaction of the Fiji Society, 19 July 1943, (pp. 203-209).

Banuve's siege of Kedekede. No other matanitu in Fiji had this complete veiwekani vakavanua, in which all the major matanitu were catered for. Through this system, the turaga bale institution held Fiji together.

Cakobau applied the veiwekani vakavanua in his dealings with foreign authorities and representatives, whether political, naval, commercial or evangelical. Each chief was allowed to rule his own vanua and matanitu. But all acknowledged the turaga bale institution as the authority over all the islands, especially when dealing with foreign authorities. It was not chiefly for any other chief to negotiate or represent the hierarchy in dealing with foreigners. The Vunivalu of Bau did not covet the authority of aristocracy by mere presumption, but through his liga qaqa, as evident in how they transformed the political system in Fiji. Cakobau's political base was already established when he began to represent the Fijian turaga bale institution on an international level.

The turaga bale had two major flaws. First, it had a narrow religious basis. In this context, religion could not be separated from the turaga bale institution. Religion and mythology had to legitimise the political system, for religion legitimised political rights. It was for this reason that Roko Tui Bau's kalou ni valu was evicted from Vatanitawake to a minor sanctuary called Nabuliveivava. He was further forced to divorce Vueti, the supreme god of Bau, to worship an insignificant Bativudi. The Vunivalu brought his new war god, Cagawalu, to be worshiped as the state god of Bau, instead of Vueti, at the Vatanitawake. It would be fateful for the turaga bale to neglect the function of religion in governance. The club could not forever control the will of the people. This unity had to have a religious footing otherwise it was bound to fail. The legends were designed to support the rights of chiefs to be chiefs, but the emergent turaga bale unity did not have any legend to warrant
its structure. All the existing legends had supported the former political system, which Banuve, the Vunivalu of Bau, and his sons had defeated and abandoned. Second, as it became a Fiji wide institution, the turaga bale did not have a corresponding religion. All the cults developed in conjunction with the conception of the turaga bale were local, belonging only to each matanitu, vanua, yavusa and mataqali. Viti Raraba had no god. Well, not yet, not until the Wesleyans arrived on 12 October 1835.
Chapter 3

The Vanua has Lotu

David Cargill and William Cross were the first Wesleyan Methodist missionaries to arrive in 1835. They introduced Christianity, a religion, which, when compared with the local ones, was new and inclusive. It was to be locally called lotu. The matanitu of Bau, Rewa, Cakaudrove and Lakeba, who had their own kalou ni valu and kalou vu, found it possible to have a common religious footing when the Wesleyans introduced Christian monotheism. Wesleyanism provided the turaga bale an alternative religious system, superior to what the kalou ni valu, Cagawalu, Koyamainatavasara, Roko Mautu and Tokairabe, could deliver. These war gods also failed to legitimize the rights of the turaga bale institution through mythology, especially at Bau. The turaga bale institution patronised the Wesleyans and through that, experienced a very different and powerful religion, and as early as 1838, Ro Kania of Rewa declared that Christianity had taken over the land hence the title of this Chapter.¹

This chapter examines how the turaga bale and Wesleyanism contributed to each other’s establishment, not only as Fijian institutions, but also as the international face of Fijian identity. I will focus on the contacts between the two that went on from 1835 to 1852. The reason for these dates is that Tanoa had secured the future of the turaga bale institution in 1836 and he died in 1852. I will demonstrate in this Chapter that this was the most critical

¹ W. Cross, Diary kept in Fiji, 28 December 1837 – 10 October 1842, M. O. M. 336 – 8, CY Reel
period when the Wesleyans influenced the ascendancy of Bau and the *turaga bale* institution. I will examine the interaction between these two institutions in two parts, first, the *turaga bale* 's initiative in establishing Wesleyanism within the *matanitu*, and secondly, the establishment of the Wesleyan *connexion*al government and its impact on the institutions of Fijian identity. The common ground in this interaction was the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society motto, *Fear God and Honour the King*. This motto not only dictated the way in which the missionaries interacted with the *turaga bale* institution, but also moralized the *turaga bale* institution.

I argue that the Wesleyans first legitimized the *turaga bale* institution and later replaced the priests to provide the *turaga bale* with a superior and, not only Fiji-wide, but universal religious system. The British Wesleyan Methodist Conference had a number of mission districts around the world by 1835. From these districts, missionaries were sent to begin new mission stations in new places. In the South Pacific, the first such districts were New Zealand and Tonga, both established in 1822.² Tonga was granted a district status in order to set up further stations in the nearby Pacific Islands. Out of the Tonga, new stations were established in Samoa and Fiji.³

The Wesleyans arrived in Fiji when the veneration of the *kalou ni valu* was at its height. In reminiscence, the first generation Fijian Wesleyans explained that the 'atrocities of the

---


³ See the Friendly Islands District Accounts with Wesleyan Missionary Society, June 1822-March 1849, MS E 100, and the Journal of the Friendly Islands District, 1850, Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga (S. U. T. T.) Archive, Nuku' alofa, Tonga for the resolution and accounts to establish the Samoa and Fiji stations.
Recent times as altogether new, and far surpassing the deeds of cruelty which they witnessed fifty years ago. This period was called *ai yala ni bogi*, night’s end. *Ai yala ni bogi* was a maritime term referring to the short deep darkness before the rising of the morning star. Thomas Williams used this term analogically to describe the sudden surge in cruelty, bloodshed, human sacrifices, and cannibalism that preceded the Wesleyans’ arrival. In the last Chapter, I discussed the introduction of the religious practice of *kalou ni valu*, further arguing that their demise was the direct result of the Wesleyans’ efforts in converting the chiefs to Christianity.

Roko Taliai Tupou, the Tui Nayau, set the precedent for the *turaga bale* institution to be directly involved in the establishment of Wesleyanism as the religion of the *matanitu*. Roko Taliai advised the Wesleyans that their future in Fiji depended on the converting of Tanoa to Christianity. On arrival at Lakeba, they were advised that they could not succeed in Fiji unless Tanoa of Bau was converted to Christianity. Roko Taliai explained the political situation to Cargill and Cross, telling them that Tanoa was the political leader of all the chiefs in Fiji. He was the *turaga levu duadua* in Fiji. The advice sounded confusing, since Tanoa was still exiled at Rewa, or perhaps Tui Nayau was optimistic of Tanoa’s political recovery. Moreover, it did not deter the Wesleyans that the Vunivalu was worshipping his war god, Cagawalu, when Taliai Tupou gave this advice. Cross arrived on 3 January 1837 at Kiuva in Tailevu and went straight to Bau, only to be stunned at the sight of a thinly populated island, charcoal-coated house posts and ash filled *yavu*. From Roko

---

4 T. Williams, *Fiji*, p. 119


6 W. Cross, Diary, M. L., 5 January 1837, frames 6f.
Taliai's advice, Cross believed he was in the court of the Tui Viti.

Tui Viti was a missionary title which came out of Cross' pen. Practically, Cross needed a patron of his mission in Tailevu as spelt out in the Instructions to Missionaries, to protect Wesleyan interests. Since Tanoa was the highest chief, turaga levu duadua e Viti, Cross came up with the idea that Tanoa was the Tui Viti. Cross could have been informed before leaving Lakeba in December 1837 that Tanoa had recovered his authority at Bau. Mateinaniu, whom they sent in December 1835, may have told them of Tanoa's exile at Rewa, and probably informed his superiors at Lakeba that Tui Cakau and Roko Tui Dreketi had helped him recover his rule over Bau. In addition, Tui Nayau's constant reference to Bau placed weight on Mateinaniu's intelligence on the political process that saw Tanoa's return to power at Bau. This political process created the title Tui Viti. On 20 August 1838, Cross wrote that a missionary at Bau would have 'a great and good influence on all other tribes in Fiji.' A later Wesleyan missionary, Joseph Waterhouse, said the title Tui Viti was entirely English in origin. He said this without referring to the Peace Conference between Tanoa and Roko Tui Bau in 1836 that Cross outlined in his Extracts.
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7 See Instructions To Missionaries, Supplementary No.


9 Rev. W. Cross, Sheet 20, 22 and 26, Extracts; and also J. Calvert, Fiji, p. 323.

10 W. Cross to WMS, Rewa Feejee, 20 August 1838, Sheet 20, Extracts.

11 J. Waterhouse, The King, p. 280f.

12 J. Waterhouse, The King, p. 62.
With Tui Viti as their patron, the Wesleyans introduced a system of ecclesiastical administration known as the connexional government. In this connexion, all governing bodies, or *Bose*, at all levels were connected. In the Wesleyan Methodist connexional system, the basic unit was the *society*. At the top of the Fiji *connexion* was the *Bose ko Viti*, or Fiji District Meeting. The District Meeting had a humble beginning as a *society* of the Friendly Islands *district*. A *society* was a group consisting of not more than twelve Wesleyans, who were called *members*. They had to be fully convinced of their sins before God and met weekly to assess the spiritual salvation of their souls. *Members* of the *society* were classified into two, *members on trial* and *confirmed members*. *Members on trial* were those beginning their journey of faith while *confirmed members* were those with proven religious experience. When *societies* grew numerically, they could form a *circuit*, and request a resident missionary to look after them. As *circuits* grew in number, a *district* could be formed, depending on the views of the British Wesleyan Methodist Conference. A *Chairman* headed a Wesleyan *district*, and the *districts* came under the jurisdiction of the Conference, which a *President* chaired. The Society also meant the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society in England that sent the missionaries to the Pacific. When in operation, the Wesleyan network was called the connexional system, where the authority of a *society*, *circuit* and *district* depended on each other.

The Wesleyans, Williams Cross and David Cargill, in fact, had prepared themselves for the *turaga bale* institution before they left Tonga. They recruited Josua Mateinaniu as guide into Fiji.\(^\text{13}\) Mateinaniu’s role was created after the Wesleyans were aware of the difference in language and customs between Fiji and Tonga. Even though the Tongan language and

\(^{13}\text{David Cargill, }\textit{Memoir of Margaret Cargill,}\text{ John Mason, London, 1841, p. 126.}\)
customs were familiar in Lakeba, Cargill was still not taking any chances. Mateinaniu, the son of Rorovakabelo, was teaching Fijian dances in Tonga when the Christian Pentecost revival of 1834 broke out, converting him to Christianity at Vava’u. Mateinaniu’s younger brother, Roko Labaji, was the first Tui Vulaga, a new title that combined the three 
\textit{yavusa} on the island of Vulaga.\textsuperscript{14} Rorovakabelo, who was originally from Nasaqalau in Lakeba came to Moce, where his son, Mataeinaniu, was born to Dauyalo from the \textit{matanivamua} at Kamali. Mateinaniu grew up in Moce and went to Tonga, after which he came with Cargill to Lakeba in 1835, to establish Christianity with Tui Nayau.

Lakeba, in 1835, had consolidated its position as the political head of the Lau islands. Each of these islands, known as the \textit{vakataukata ki Lakeba}, had their \textit{wakolo vakavanua}, traditional paths, to approach Roko Taliai. The Vuanirewa chiefs were divided into four \textit{tokatoka}, Vatuwaqa, Matailakeba, Naivi and Navutoka. Vatuwaqa and Matailakeba descended from Roko Rasolo, the last Tui Nayau at Bayau and the first Tui Nayau on Lakeba. Rasolo’s two sons, Malani and Taliai, were both Tui Nayau, with Taliai reigning when Mateinaniu arrived with Cargill and Cross. Normally when the \textit{vakataukata} came to Lakeba, Vulaga and Moce would reside at Vatuwaqa. There had to be a reason behind this linkage, other than war, like Ono-i-Lau’s residence at Naivi and Matuku’s at Matailakeba. Tui Nayau’s relationship with Tui Vulaga began from the latter’s Lakeba origin.\textsuperscript{15} Tui Nayau’s eldest son, Seruvatu, even left Lakeba and resided at Vulaga.\textsuperscript{16} Therefore, in his capacity as Tui Vulaga’s brother, Mateinaniu had traditional links with Tui Nayau.

\textsuperscript{14} E. Mauro, Tukutuku Raraba.
\textsuperscript{15} E. Mauro, ibid.
\textsuperscript{16} Information from Roko Jope Vulaono, Ratu Seruvatu’s descendant now residing at Muanaira village, Vulaga, Lau.
Whenever he arrived at Lakeba, custom dictated that he visited Roko Taliai before doing any further business.

Apart from the direct involvement of the *turaga bale*, using Mateinaniu was significant in another aspect, the role of gender in mission. The presence at Tubou of Mele and Moqei, who was later baptised as Salote, helped the introduction of the Wesleyans' into the *turaga bale* institution. Mele was Mateinaniu's daughter and a wife to the Tui Nayau, while Moqei, the daughter of Roko Rakaisau from Nasaqalau, was Vuetaasau's wife. Vuetaasau was by now head of the *tokatoka* Matailakeba after the death of his father, Malani, the former Tui Nayau. Salote was later instrumental in the surrender of Roko Yaroi from Matuku when these matriarchal links were politically manipulated.

With all these customary relationships between Tui Nayau and Mateinaniu, it was not hard for the Vuanirewa to make the political decisions resulting in the establishment of the Wesleyan station at Bucainabua. Cargill said that they were conducted to the principal *koro* or chiefly city of the island and introduced to the King and his principal chiefs. His Majesty received us with respect and kindness and promised to listen to instruction. He offered us a house within the *koro* as a temporary residence but we declined his offer for several prudential reasons. 17

Cross confirmed Cargill's story regarding Tui Nayau's kindness in his letter to London, eight days after their arrival, that

Tui Nayau received us very kindly, has promised to listen to what we have to say about our God and his word and further he will build us houses and use his influence for our protection among his people...

Tui Nayau, acting on his executive authority, granted a piece of land called Bucainabua to be the missionaries’ residence, after Cargill declined the royal offer to stay inside the moat village. Tui Nayau’s land grant, protection and religious liberty set a precedent for the turaga bale to patronize Methodism.

By 1849, the matanitu of Lakeba had experienced the political effects of religious uniformity, when Wesleyanism became established in all the islands of Lau. The Vuanirewa’s sovereignty was strengthened as Wesleyan societies became established within the various yavusa and island vana within the matanitu of Lakeba and its Vakataukata. It became easy to manage the state under the condition of the common religious disposition prevailing throughout these islands. The yavusa and vana in Lau forsook their gods and worshiped Roko Talai’s new God. It was now the God of the Vuanirewa. The religious reform provided the Vuanirewa with an inclusive religion where it could identify with other vana and yavusa within its government.

Acting at their discretion as sovereigns, and based on their political independence, the turaga bale institution enforced the decision to establish another station outside Lakeba. Cargill and Cross, who were still members of the Tonga district, under the authority of its Chairman, were to receive orders of expansion from Tonga. But Tonga did not have any authority in Rewa, political or ecclesiastical. Personal initiative was an invaluable asset. With this confusing situation confronting them, where necessity confronted authority,
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18 William Cross to Fathers and Brethren, Lakeba, 20 October, 1835, Letters, Vol. 1, ML Ref. 2809,
Cross and Cargill weighed the political and ecclesiastical authorities to see which would benefit from the survival of their mission. Obviously, Fijian political authority had precedence over ecclesiastical authority, swaying the decision in favour of relying on the political security provided by the *turaga bale* institution. Acting out of their enthusiasm and backed by the political protection of the chiefs, Cargill sent Mateinaniu to Tanoa in December 1835, to scout the possibility of establishing Wesleyanism at Bau.

Mateinaniu used the customary path to approach Tanoa at Bau. To Mateinaniu’s advantage, Tui Cakau and the Ulukalala brothers, Tupou Toutai and Lasike, were looking after Tanoa.19 It can be safely inferred that Mateinaniu not only had an audience with Tanoa, but was also granted permission to preach at Rewa, for when Cross later arrived in January 1838, he found eleven surviving members of Mateinaniu’s Christian community.20 Mateinaniu came to Rewa as a Wesleyan representative, and succeeded under its political and religious context, to form a small Wesleyan church. The information about the political structure and situation in Tailevu he provided on arrival at Lakeba led to the establishment of Rewa as the next Wesleyan station.

Ro Kania, who replaced his father as Roko Tui Dreketi, enthusiastically embraced Wesleyanism as the religion of the *matanitu* of Rewa and invited William Cross to remain with him at Rewa in January 1838.21 Out of this interaction, missionary records noted the
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20 W. Cross, No. 18. Extracts, CY Reel 334. Cross reported that there were thirty four Christians, eight of whom were members of the society. See also D. Cargill, *The Memoir*, p. 125.
21 W. Cross, Diary, 5 January 1837.
genealogy and history of the Rewan royal family in a very important phase in history. Cross referred to Kania, as a brother of Qaraniqio, in his diaries as Roko Tui Dreketi. Relating his arrival in January 1838 to the end of the civil war in Bau in late 1837, his diary showed that Ro Koroitamana murdered Ro Tabaiwalu, sometime in late 1837. Tabaiwalu and Yavalanavanua restored Tanoa’s authority at Bau. When Hunt arrived in 1838, Kania gave him a house, which he later said was the grave of his late father. Kania seemed close to Ro Tabaiwalu, for he told Hunt he only wished his father were still alive to receive Christianity. Unsurprisingly, Cross and Hunt never mentioned Ro Tabaiwalu. But Cross saw the ashes at Bau and Cakobau had told them that he would lotu after killing all his enemies.

Authorisation for the establishment of new mission stations had to come from John Thomas, the Wesleyan Chairman based in Nuku’alofa, Tonga, but instead, Cross and Cargill decided in 1836 to set a new station in Tailevu. Here, Ro Kania’s political authority seemed to overshadow John Thomas’. The Wesleyans acted first and legalised their action later, through the Fiji District Meeting, which was to be established in the end of 1838. Their progress in Lau was understandable, but creating new stations in Rewa, Viwa and Somosomo needed the authority of the Tonga District Meeting. They established the Rewa station following their 1836 Society Meeting resolution. Since decisions of this magnitude required money and trade goods, the two missionaries stretched not only their funds and stores to the limit, also placed their lives on the line. Cross later justified their 1836 decision to establish Rewa when he said that ‘those are mistaken who think that to
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secure Tonga, success at Fiji will be certain. Tonga has no influence over Fiji, beyond Lakeba and very little there. 24

Ro Kania, at the head of the most advanced political system in Fiji, saw Christianity from the point of view of agriculture and political prosperity. He convened a state security council to decide on the future of Rewa when its chiefs began raising political issues about the new religion. On 7 October 1838, Roko Tui Dreketi and some other high chiefs of Rewa discussed Christianity and other matters of the state. 25 Ro Kania suggested that they should become Christians, but the other chiefs of Rewa were obstinate in their opposition to the new religion. He eased the tension within the Council by referring to the planting of *vudi* amidst the *were*, yam plots, a prohibited agricultural custom in Rewa. On 10 September 1838, Ro Kania blasphemed against the gods of Rewa by attending the Christian worship held in Koroiwainiu's residence. The news shook Rewa. In defence, Ro Kania said that 'Christianity had taken hold of the land and we cannot send it away or stop it, it progresses and now would attend to it. But at present I wait for Tanoa and his son'. 26

Ro Kania argued that the gods of Fiji, like those of Tonga, were not true gods. He was defending his decision in bringing Cross to Rewa, from questions which the *bete*, or priests, raised regarding their future. Roko Tui Dreketi saw a bright future in Christianity, cautioning that

If I say let the land should serve the Lord Jehovah, who will say no? Do not think that the missionaries shall be sent away. He did not come here as

24 W. Cross, Diary, 9 January 1838, in No. 17, Extract, frame 373.
25 W. Cross, Diary, 7 October 1838, frame 25.
26 W. Cross, Diary, 11 September 1838, frame 26.
one [by himself]. You know he visited Bau...He came and consulted me. I said come to my land, it is good to me that you should come. Come and I will build you a house and you know it was my wish his house should have been built close to mine, but he preferred going on the other side of the river. But he came by my consent. His coming was agreeable to me and he shall not be sent away or hindered.  

The decision to wait for Tanoa and Cakobau did not stop Cross or the Rewans from continuing with Christianity, by pursuing scriptural holiness through Wesleyanism. They had been politically accommodated by the Ro Kania’s proclamation of royal assent, which was welcomed under the Wesleyan motto of honouring secular governors. The *matanitu* of Rewa had opened itself up for a new religion.

It was not so in Cakaudrove, for Tui Cakau needed both, Koyamainatavasara and Christianity. The Wesleyans found it difficult at first to displace Koyamainatavasara. But Yavalanavanua took the initiative to set up a Wesleyan station, and began by ordering the *vanua* to cut bamboos for the parsonage. In 1837, he invited the missionaries at Lakeba to come to Somosomo. The missionaries told London that

Tui Cakau and his sons, the Chiefs of Somosomo, a place already recommended to your notice, have urgently requested one of us to commence a mission for them as soon as possible. But we have not been able to let down the Gospel net in any of these promising places because we have been confined to a narrow circle, and prevented from launching out into the deep. And while we present to you our earnest petitions for help, we fervently pray to God that the day may not be remote, when we shall be enabled to take possession of other places in Feejee in the Name of King Jesus, and then we shall see the people flying to the standard, 'as the doves to their windows.'

Viliami Lasike told Cargill and Tui Nayau in 1837 that the bamboos for the mission house in Somosomo had rotted. He stressed the observation came with an analogy of enthusiasm,
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similar to the one that Ro Kania resounded in 1838, that Christianity was conquering the vanua.

A year later, the first Wesleyan missionaries landed at Somosomo. Tuikilakila personally supervised the landing of mission properties on his canoe when Lyth and Hunt arrived in July 1839.29 His old father, Yavalanavanua, the Tui Cakau, gave Nasima a royal residence for the missionaries to use.30 True to his role as patron, Yavalanavanua took some native Wesleyan teachers on a tour of his matanitu, showing the chiefs of Cakaudrove that he had a new religion with him. After two years at Nasima, Yavalanavanua gave another piece of land, beside a stream outside the village and close to the shore, called Navatu.31

It took time for the divine mustard seeds to sprout into life at Bau, where the establishment of the mission station was prolonged due to political disturbances. In 1837, Tanoa had invited Cross to stay with him at Muaidule, one of the Vunivalu’s residences. When pressured to accept Christianity, Tanoa and his son Cakobau protested that they were still engaged in war and would only convert if all their enemies were dead. Being new to Fiji, the missionaries did not grasp the full import of that reasoning. Little did they know that they arrived at a time when Tanoa was reasserting his political authority over Bau. And in this situation, nothing less than the death of his political enemies would safely guarantee his future and that of his son, to inherit the Vunivalu title. When Cross did not remain at

30 ibid.
31 See A. W. Thornley, The Inheritance, Chapter 3, for a detailed discussion of Lyth and Hunt’s arrival in Cakaudrove.
Bau, Tanoa said that he would wait for another missionary, which was David Cargill, in 1839, on his way to Rewa. Tanoa was eager to have Cargill with him, offering him the only hill at Bau to set up his station. But Cargill declined the offer of settling at Bau, for he was not sure of his safety for the time being.

Cross was transferred from Rewa to Viwa when Namosimalua, the Roko Tui Viwa, wanted to embrace Christianity. When the French burnt Viwa in 1838 to avenge the burning of the _L' Amiable Josephine_, he relied on Koyamaimataidigo to protect the village from gunfire. To his dismay, the village was burnt, and he abandoned Koyamaimataidigo. Consequently, Namosimalua sent Koroilogavatu to Rewa, with the excuse of begging for whale’s tooth, but in truth, to ask for a Wesleyan teacher. Instead of a teacher, Namosimalua received a Wesleyan missionary, who was trying to get access to Tanoa. Namosimalua provided that opportunity. After the stationing of missionaries in the 1838 District Meeting, Cross was transferred to Viwa, and took up his appointment in the middle of 1839. He arrived at Viwa and took up residence in the house that had been built for Drodrovakawai, Namosimalua’s former principal wife.

The chiefs of Viwa provided the Wesleyans access to the sanctum of the _turaga bale_ institution at Bau. Namosimalua was closely affiliated with Tanoa and Cakobau and from 1838 to his death in 1850, Cakobau remained passive towards the new religious direction that Viwa had taken. This remained the case until Varani’s death at Lovoni in Ovalau. Cakobau, now Vunivalu, understood Varani participated on his behalf in the establishment
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of Wesleyan stations, and was unhappy because of the misunderstanding missionaries had regarding his procrastination. He had allowed Varani to accompany them wherever they preferred to go, knowing well that the Lago Levu, his double war canoe, was always now available solely for mission work.

Tanoa maintained an open religious policy in his matanitu. He traditionally welcomed the introduction of Christianity to his matanitu, even though he himself did not become a Christian. The Vunivalu was not so happy when Cross said he would move to Rewa. Tanoa then said that he would wait for another missionary before becoming a Christian. Cargill arrived in July 1839, and Tanoa invited him to stay at Muaidule, one of his yavu. He further gave the hill at Bau for a future missionary residence, permitting the Wesleyans to set up their stations wherever they preferred within his matanitu. As he opened his matanitu, he knew very well that he had to provide some sort of military protection for the missionaries, especially for the native Fijian teachers. Under Tanoa, mission stations were established in Tailevu, Ra, Ba, Lomaiviti, Kadavu, Nadroga and in Bua. Before he died in 1852, Wesleyanism was a profound political force.

Cakobau knew the strength and advantages of Christianity when he became Vunivalu. He satisfied the standards of both, matanitu and Christianity, during the first few months in office. He could not resist Christianity. His converting to Christianity was a family affair. The two Adi Litia, Samanunu and Vatea, persuaded him effectively to take such a step for conversion. He organized a number of matanitu and family meetings, mainly to inform
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his four wives that their marriage would soon be terminated. This divorce required the sanction of the *matanitu* of Bau, before he could return his other wives to their *mataqali* and *tokatoka*. This was done with gifts and property to appease and explain why he breached marriage customs that were bound with religious rituals. An example was Adi mai Naikasakasa, Cakobau’s second wife. The *matanitu* of Bau had authority in these cases, for the heir and successor to the Vunivalu’s office was selected only from Cakobau’s family. Caution was needed because war could easily erupt from disgracing noble women brought as wife to the Vunivalu for political purposes.

On 27 April, Cakobau had a private interview with Joseph Waterhouse. The next day, there was full council for the *matanitu* of Bau. In this Council, Roko Tui Veikau of Namara, Ratu Isikeli Tabakaucoro of Viwa, Tudrau of Dravo, Komaimataiovea of Namata, Koroirivalita of Buretu, Roko Tui Kiuva of Kiuka Koroikoyanamalo of Cautata, Koroikaiyanuyanu of Lasakau, Ra Seru the Tunitoga Koroitukana the Roko Tui Bau, were present. The next day, Saturday, the *mataqali* Tui Kaba and other principal chiefs of Bau continued to discuss the political implications of Cakobau’s decision to become Wesleyan Methodist Christian. They included Veikoso, Koroiwainui, the Tunitoga and the two brothers Nailatikau and Tavanavanua. A relative remarked to remind Cakobau that ‘he himself was the only man troubling Fiji; and if he resolved to become a Christian, the whole country would rejoice.’ On Sunday, 30 April 1854, the family priest of
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Drekeiselesele, preceded Cakobau and three hundred chiefs, women and attendants and children, for Christian worship at Naulunivuaka. 

The Wesleyans formed their connexional government in 1838, after being recognised by the British Wesleyan Methodist Conference as large enough to be so. In becoming a district of the British Wesleyan Methodist Conference, the *turaga bale* institution was recognised internationally as a national identity. The *turaga bale*, undoubtedly, were instrumental in the formation of Fiji as a district. The *Bose ko Viti* did not exist by itself, but with close collaboration with the *vanua*. It was created mainly for the Fijians, symbolising the British Wesleyan Methodism's recognition of the Fijian's independence and sovereignty over their islands. And this recognition became a political breakthrough for the chiefs and their people, as their identity as a people was internationally recognised. After only three years as a circuit of the Tonga district, the British Conference separated and established Fiji as one of its districts. This inaugural event introduced the Fijians into a wider international field, linking them directly with London.

The *turaga bale* had a very strong religious component, whereby the *bete* or priest functioned as king makers, advisers and prophets. The function of the *bete* became crucial to the success of the *turaga bale* institution, for political systems had to be justified by religion. The *bete* were to change the religious doctrines to uphold the new aristocrats, who had emerged through their *liga qaqa* in war. These *bete* also looked after the sanctuaries of worship, where most of the oracles were heard and kept. I will examine the significance of this religious office in Chapter 6, when I study the *mataqali* as the
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landholding unit. I am highlighting this religious office now because there was a religious renewal, which saw the decline of the bete’s hold on the mataqali and yavusa’s religious life. The turaga bale allowed the Wesleyans to establish not only their station, but their connexional system as well, unsettling the political arrangement which had given the bete their mandate to validate the turaga bale institution. To the bewilderment of the bete, the Wesleyans arrived to be accommodated and patronised by the aristocrats.

The Wesleyans used methods, not only of converting people, but also of how they were to approach their task, as outlined in the *Instructions to Missionaries*. *Instructions* was published on 20 February 1825 as a guide to Wesleyans working overseas.\(^43\) It had nine articles; addressing personal piety, mental improvement, unity, identity, obedience to lawful authority, good behaviour towards governors, a special reminder to those going to the West Indies, journals and prohibition of following trade. Articles IV and V of the *Instructions* referred specifically to the approach missionaries should be taking towards secular governors. The *Instructions* emphasized the relationship between missionaries and political leaders. The Articles said,

\begin{quote}
V. We cannot omit, without neglecting our duty, to warn you against meddling with political parties, or secular disputes. You are teachers of Religion; and that alone should be kept in view. It is however, as part of your duties as Ministers, to enforce, by precept and example, a cheerful obedience to lawful authority. You know that the venerable WESLEY was always distinguished by his love to his country, by his conscientious loyalty, and his attachment to that illustrious family that had filled the throne of Great Britain. You know that your Brethren at home are actuated by the same principles, and walk by the same rule: and we have confidence in you that you will preserve the same character of religious regard to good order and submission "to the powers that be" - in which we glory. Our motto is "FEAR GOD AND HONOR THE KING"; and we recollect who hath said,
\end{quote}

\(^{43}\) See Supplementary No.
"Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work.

VI You will, on foreign station, find yourselves in circumstances very different from those in which you are at home, with regard to those who are in authority under our gracious Sovereign. It is probable you will frequently come under their immediate notice and observation. We are, however, persuaded that while you demean yourselves, as you ought, you will be generally favoured with protection. On your arrival at your stations, you will be instructed as to what steps to take, in order to obtain the protection of the local Governments: and we trust that your subsequent good behaviour towards Governors and all who are in authority; will be such as shall secure to you the enjoyment of liberty to instruct and promote the salvation of those to whom you are sent. 44

These provisions directed the Wesleyans to strengthen the turaga bale’s authority and unity. Further, they offered the missionaries sound and practical guidelines in relating with political leaders. Their motto, Fear God and Honour the King led them through the maze of customs and rituals to win the turaga bale’s favour. The command ‘to demean them’ expedited their crossing the cultural bridge into the world of the chiefs. To a large extent, the Instructions regulated their thoughts to live as one of those whom they were sent to evangelise.

Through their native policy, the Wesleyans did not totally condemn Fijian customs and laws. They had some reservations, made compromises, even assimilation and adoption in some of these cases. What made this encounter interesting was the Wesleyans’ law of political participation, ‘Fear God and Honour the King,’ as outlined in the Instructions to Missionaries. In another similar area, that of Christian practices, the Wesleyans not only introduced British and Polynesian Christian practices, but also assimilated some Fijian divine practices to form the essence of Fijian Wesleyan practice. They first used the term
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*lewe ni soro* to identify those who had shown serious interest in becoming Christians. This term, originally from Kadavu, meant participants who congregate in the *bure kalou* to witness the priest performing his sacred duty. 45

My investigation into the Wesleyans’ influence on native land claims in Fiji was interested in those missionaries who went through theological training at Hoxton and Richmond Theological Institute in England before coming to Fiji. These missionaries laid the foundation of Fiji’s Wesleyanism, based on theological attitudes that were congruent with the chiefly system during Tanoa’s reign. This harmony could be attributed to the type of theological education the leading pioneering missionaries received at Hoxton and Richmond Theological Institute. At Hoxton, Theology and Classics formed the major components of education. Classics, I argue, influenced the Wesleyans to acknowledge and embrace Fijian legends and histories as an integral component of the conversion process. Three students, John Hunt, Thomas Williams and James Calvert, were sent to Fiji. I will concentrate on Hunt and Williams’ contribution to the Fijian comparative mythology in this thesis.

John Hunt’s policies with regard to Fijian traditions and customs shaped Fijian Christianity during Tanoa’s reign. Those Wesleyan missionaries from England who came from 1835 to 1850 adopted a Fijian mindset, a direction made possible through their classical education in Hoxton. This approach confirmed the Fijian’s awareness of their tribal traditions as being accepted within the scope of Christianity. They could freely pursue and retain tribal traditions in the context of their work as Christian missionaries. Not only did his Hoxton
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background justify his direction of research, the frontier situation justified this direction. Hunt did not let the confrontation of cultural values in a frontier situation impair the reception of the gospel of salvation. What he did and recorded after three years at Viwa laid the foundation of Fijian identity in a Christian setting.

Hunt had three responsibilities that gave him tremendous authority over Wesleyanism as an emerging Fijian religion. The first was the office of the Chairman of the Fiji District, second, that of the Superintendent of the Theological Academy and third, that of the Chairman of the Language and Translation Committee. The printing press was placed directly under the jurisdiction of the Chairman of that Committee. With all those responsibilities, Hunt became the most influential of the first four Hoxton students in Fiji before 1850. From 1842, he was the Chairman of the Fiji District, Superintendent of the Feejee Islands Wesleyan Academy and Chairman of the Fiji Bible Translation Committee.

In regards to Fiji field experience, he arrived ahead of Calvert and Jaggar.

The *turaga bale* guided Hunt to think as a Fijian. He became involved as a participant and the effect of participation in Bauan daily life became reflected in his thoughts and expressions. As reflected in the beginning of his diary, the charisma of Lincolnshire Methodism and Rev. Joseph Entwistle’s pastoral philosophies stood out significantly and brightly, portraying the man as a one sided spiritualist against the background of the most challenging Wesleyan mission district in the world. However, in the last three years of his career in Viwa, subject changes appeared in his writing. He began to draw similarities between Fijian history and what he had learnt from Samuel Jones’ Classics at Hoxton. In doing so, he extended the boundaries of the Wesleyan philosophy of mission, which stated that people were to be accepted and converted within their cultural context, into new depths
and areas of Fijian society. Hunt conceived a new missionary legacy as the Bauan converted him into thinking and talking like a Fijian chief.

In the last three years of his life, Hunt inquired seriously into the *yavusa* and *matanitu* histories. He significantly changed his subject of interest, showing signs of a changing and an affectionate attitude towards society. In his conclusion, he emphasised that the Fijians knew no other race except those to the wind-wards, the Tongans, Samoans and the Uveans, and also no other race to the west of Yasawa. Such a conclusion began from a frustration in the beginning of his historical inquiries. After his first year at Viwa, he said on 24 October 1843 that the Fijians have no particular interest in their country's welfare and hence they know next to nothing of the past. Their origin and history are both profound and secret to them.

> Ah to no dark oblivion all's confined,  
> No vestiges of truth are left behind  
> No poet's genius their past state declares  
> Or tell how life flourished here.

They have sunk so low that they have lost the materials needful to form a free people. Nothing but the church can raise them. 46

It was clear, from the conclusion of his initial observation quoted above, that Hunt had found the chiefly cosmos that Cross was referring to while at Rewa. He described the approach to this cosmos as simply 'profound and secret'. As a Christian missionary, he wanted the Fijians to be a free people, similar to the English. But the profundity and secrecy of their history and origin distanced liberty and prevented progress. From his point of view, only the church could deliver political survival to the Fijians. His chance to extend his inquiries into their history and origins came after he had consolidated his ministry at Viwa and it was now time to visit the rest of the district.

46 J. Hunt, Private Journal, 24 October 1843, frame 358.
Hunt sailed on the *Lago Levu*, Varani's canoe, on his visits to his outstations in 1845. After visiting Bua, he came to Nakorotubu on the northern coast of Viti Levu, where he found and recorded the story of Nakauvadra. He found the story at Kavula, which was part of the Nakorotubu town. This was the earliest record of the Nakauvadra saga. This is critical for my research due to the function of Nakauvadra in the work of the Native Land Commission. In fact, Hunt's interest in the Nakauvadra legend began a long and continuous association between the Wesleyan Methodists and Fijian history, apart from Cargill's linguistic interests. I will deal with this specific discovery in Chapter 7 when I examine legends.

Hunt did not condemn the story but treasured it as a new discovery that answered his quest for Fijian origin and history. In 1847, he came across Reed's Advancement. The subject of the book was the conversion of natives from 'heathenism as a system to Christianity as a system'. When he applied it to his work, he added that 'those among the heathen will be saved who would have accepted the gospel had it been properly proposed to them'. As the Superintendent of the Institute received and justified the stories that Degei was the head of the pantheon, it gradually changed into doctrine through the students who came into the Institute.

He further elaborated his disagreement with the idea that Christian conversion could be effectively carried out by mechanics. Mechanics were too materialistic to 'improve' the
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standard of living among the heathens. A missionary, according to Hunt, had to evade that approach towards native societies. He must leave their politics and society alone by concentrating in the ‘work of the Lord’, that is calling people to repentance. Hunt’s theological position therefore provided for the gospel ahead of civilisation. Conversion belonged to the heart and not to a system of civilisation. A new civilisation had to be the result of a converted man, separating Fijian conversion and European civilisation.

Hunt’s position, as an authority on Wesleyanism in Fiji, was derived from the fact that he held three very prominent and influential offices at the same time. He was, first, the Chairman of the Fiji District or Qase Levu, secondly, Chairman of the Translation Committee and finally Superintendent of the Theological Academy. His thoughts were authoritative and standard to the work of Wesleyans from 1842 to 1848. Whatever he acknowledged, especially in civilisation and history, would be validated within the context of Christianity. With Hunt as the authority, the Fijians were provided with a new understanding of themselves, their society and their new religion.

The nature of classics from Hoxton was also explicitly shown in the works of another graduate, Thomas William of Horncastle, Lincolnshire in England. Williams also studied under Hannah and Jones. He came to Fiji in 1840 and returned to the Victorian gold fields in 1853. His uncle, Thomas Jackson, was the President of the Conference and later replaced Rev. Dr. John Hannah as Tutor at Hoxton. He started serving at Lakeba from 1840 to 1842 before being transferred to Somosomo. He was in Somosomo until 1848, closing the Cakaudrove station and moving to Bua until 1853.

William’s study is a reflection of the Wesleyan Methodist missionary policy regarding
society in relation to Christianity as Hunt had maintained. But his failure to capture any traditional information on origin could be explained by the fact that he remained in the peripheral political centers of Fiji. Even though he highlighted Verata’s supremacy in eighteenth century Fiji, he did not have the chance to work in Verata, Viwa or Bau, where he could have gleaned some information on the question of Fijian origin. Even his reading list showed classical taste, especially in the years 1841, 1851 and 1852. Like Williams, Thomas Jaggar, another Hoxton graduate who came to Fiji before 1840, did not become the Chairman of the Fiji District. Another, John Spiney, who came and returned in 1838, was a missionary of little significance to this study. He returned to Sydney and died there on 10 February 1840.

With his medical background, Richard Burdsall Lyth was, basically, a scientist. He came to Fiji in 1839 from Tonga and was asked to go with John Hunt to Somosomo. He replaced John Hunt as Chairman of the Fiji District and tutor of the Theological Institute until 1855. He was at Viwa from 1848 to 1853 before returning to Lakeba, leaving Fiji in 1855.

Wesleyanism became a Fijian religion when it developed its authority and government through the *turaga bale* institution. Even though Tanoa did not convert to Christianity, his tolerant religious policy led to the establishment of the *Bose ko Viti* in 1838. Aligning itself with Bau, the *Bose ko Viti* utilized this customary acknowledgment of Bauan supremacy to
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its advantage. On the other side, Wesleyanism, through its *Bose ko Viti*, solidified Bau’s ascendancy, directly influencing how native land was later to be claimed.

Unlike the *turaga bale* institution, which developed its hierarchy by assembling existing *matanitu*, the *Bose ko Viti* grew from small cell groups the Wesleyans formed at at Lakeba, Rewa and Viwa. The *Bose ko Viti* offered another alternative form of government by uniting and governing the people in religion. It was a forum where the welfare of common Fijians was discussed and addressed directly and on a national level.

Wesleyanism gradually filled the religious vacuum created by the sudden converting of chiefs to Christianity. The Wesleyan missionaries replaced the priests, who suddenly found themselves not only unemployed, but socially displaced as well. This revolutionary transition was politically cushioned by the presence of the *soro taro* amidst local villagers. On a national level, the missionaries’ scientific and classical background resourced them to delve into history and religion, balancing most of the unnecessary ambiguities about true Christianity. The missionaries’ affection for the people of Fiji led them to constructively systematize divinity, to uphold the chiefly system, when the original religious system was removed.

The Methodist doctrine on Christian conversion states that conversion can be achieved on its own, without any reference to customs and culture. This meant that local society was left alone, and not considered a priority in the process of conversion. Such doctrine had a huge impact, not only on the type of Fijian Methodist church which emerged during this
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period, but also on the conversion of the missionaries into Fijian thinkers, giving Fijian Methodism its unique identity.

The *turaga bale* had to approve new mission stations before the Wesleyans could proceed with their work. Being new to Fiji, Cargill and Cross could not comprehend the significance of the political approval to establish their mission station within the state of Lakeba, leading to Cargill’s frustration. Their diaries and reports showed these disappointments and pessimism, despite the political protection offered by Tui Nayau. They interpreted Tui Nayau’s procrastination as a stumbling block to their mission, not knowing the customary reasons of Tui Nayau’s *veivakaturagataki*, or chiefly reverence, towards Tanoa, the Vunivalu of Bau. Whether from phobia of failure or from Methodist enthusiasm, Cargill said that the 200,000 souls in Fiji had to be converted or Wesleyan Methodism would become derelict, like the LMS at Oneata, on the shore of Lakeba. More stations had to be established outside the state of Lakeba.

Last year we made arrangements for commencing a mission in another part of Fiji, in January of the current year; that meant being the time when the vessel with our supplies was expected in the islands. But as no vessel has yet reached us, we have been prevented from carrying our plans into effect and from demonstrating the words of truth in a wider field. The Chief of this Island, though of respectable rank, is destitute of power. Nor has he sufficient magnanimity of soul to qualify or even depose him, to lead the van of nearly 200,000 Feejeeans in coming over to the standard of truth. Hence we have all being convinced that in all human probability, the success of the mission cannot be effectually promoted until we shall be able to commence operations under the auspices of a more enterprising and influential chief.\(^5\)

Operating from the station at Bucainabua in Lakeba, Cargill and Cross began to convert men and women, organising them into a society. These members became the founders of

\(^5\) Report of the Society for 1837, 15 October 1837, Lakemba, F. D. M. M. R.
the Fiji district, which grew from a society, or soro, made up of men and women from different international countries. In their first report, they said that

The number of the members on this station is twelve. It is rather remarkable that though they are so few, they are of from different nations and languages; namely 4 [four] Fijians whom we brought with us from Tonga Isles, together with three Tongese; three others we found at Feejee who had been members of our Society at Tonga, two of whom were natives of Tonga the other of Samoa; and our wives. 

They also experienced, as witnessed from the report, the type of religious awakening similar to British Methodism. The orthodox mark of a Methodist was scriptural knowledge and holiness, and from the beginning, the members of the Lakeba society expressed these qualities. These observations are more than enough to contradict any accusation of syncretism and assimilation. Methodism became Fijian through the religious and scriptural holiness experienced by the members of the Lakeba society.

All the members profess to have faith in God as a sin pardoning God, and that they are seeking to be made all that he would have them be and to do all his will. Though having not seen Christ, yet believing in him, they rejoice and have confidence in that he will save them to the uttermost—that through him they will escape punishment they deserve and live for ever in heaven. With some of them, we are much pleased and I know that they are making progress in the scriptural knowledge and holiness; and tho' we cannot speak equally favourably of all, we have cause to be thankful that they maintain their ground, notwithstanding they are exercised with many temptations.

Furthermore, the society grew in numbers as more were attracted to join after two months at Lakeba.

We have thirty-five persons meeting in our classes, receiving weekly instructions as candidates for baptism; with many of these we are much grateful. The grace of God in the heart is manifested in their conduct, so
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great is the change produced within three months that they are not like the same people. They are very attentive to the means of grace and we believe are earnestly seeking the favour and image of God. Some of them have given up those they lived with, determining to remain single until they met with suitable partners and others who have been living as heathens are proud to be married Sunday next. That day having been fixed upon, being the first Sunday of the New Year. 58

The society report showed the emergence of a common forum never before experienced in Lakeba, whereby the affairs of men could be addressed together in a religious forum. This turned into a positive revolution when Fijians and their chiefs took the initiative to participate in the affairs of this new religion.

As Methodism grew, its impact on political unity was experienced first at Lakeba and its Vakataukata, or floater states, as it is known in Lau, to her south. Travel and communication between the islands had Christianity as their common and serious agenda. After its establishment at Bucainabua with the Vuanirewa chiefs, Christianity spread to other villages in Lakeba and its satellite island vanua. The Report of the Society at the Lakeba Station for the Year 1838 highlighted that Wesleyan native teachers had been stationed in four settlements in Lakeba, namely, Waciwaci, Waitabu, Narocake and Nukunuku, and on four other islands in this group, which were Oneata, Moce, Namuka and Ono. 59 At Waciwaci village, the first Methodist came from Ha’apai in Tonga. He was alone for two years until he won friends and the whole village over to the new religion. In Waitabu, Tui Nayau took a direct hand in the restoration of the little Christian community when he granted permission for the persecuted Methodists to return home after eight

58 William Cross and David Cargill to the Secretaries of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, 77 Hatton Garden, London, F. D. M. M. R.

59 Reports of the Society at the Lakeba Station for the Year 1838, Minutes of the First District Meeting of the Feejee District Begun at Lakemba, Thursday 27 December 1838, F. D. M. M. R.
months in exile and build their chapel. The society at Narocake grew from the efforts of an old Tongan. A few Fijians later joined him and their numbers were reinforced by the arrival of Joeli Bulu. Suliasi Naulivou, Tausa’ahau’s cousin, went to revive the little society at Nukunuku. There was a rumour of resistance to his coming but when he arrived, he ‘was kindly received ... and soon after his arrival the majority of the inhabitants of the village renounced heathenism’. 60 Three Tahitian missionaries established the society at Oneata in 1830. 61 Cargill said that about twenty inhabitants of Oneata had renounced their gods. The Tahitians had fashioned a rudimentary Christian creed in the Oneata dialect for they had difficulty with the language. They taught that ‘there is only one God, and Jehovah is his name’. 62 But this doctrine was enough to convince the people of Oneata to renounce their island gods. Ioane Mafi was sent to look after the society at Oneata, but an irretrievable working relationship with the Tahitians forced his recall to Lakeba, to be replaced by Josua Mateinaniu, who had just returned from an intelligence tour of Rewa and Cakaudrove. By 1838, more than half of the population of Oneata was professing Christians and even the non-society members were observing the Sabbath as a day of rest. In Moce, two teachers were employed, with ‘many fair blossoms but little fruit’. 63 Namuka, another island south of Moce, had converted their heathen temple into a ‘Bethel of the King of Glory and they express their determination to present their souls and bodies a living sacrifice unto God. May their sacrifices be holy and acceptable’. 64 Sailosi Fa’one was sent to look after the society at Ono where about two hundred persons declared their
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membership of the society. A decade later, Cicia, Nayau, Kabara and Vulaga were added to the Lakeba Circuit, completing the evangelization of Lau.

After the Wesleyans consolidated their position as the Lau circuit, the British Wesleyan Methodist Conference constituted Fiji as a district. In its first sitting in 1838 at Lakeba, the District Meeting sanctioned the establishment of further mission stations. In Question 33 of the meeting’s agenda, it asked, ‘Are there any new stations to be recommended to the attention of the Committee?’ The answer clearly showed the vision to cover Viti Raraba:

- **Somosomo**: About two years ago, the chief of that island and his two sons visited Lakemba, and were very urgent in their entreaties to obtain a missionary to reside among them. Within a few days after their return to Somosomo, they selected a spot of ground for the Missionary to reside on, and caused their people to cut wood for a mission house and fence.

- **Bau**: The rebel chiefs who raised the calamitous war in Feejee, have been subdued, peace has been restored, and Tanoa the King of Bau, is very desirous to have a Missionary.

- **Moala**: Some of the inhabitants of this, and the adjacent islands say that Christianity is a good thing because it destroys anger and produces love in the heart. The reason, which they assign for not abandoning heathenism, is that they have no Missionary to reside with them.

- **Mathuata**: This is a populous district and the chief of it is favourably disposed to Christianity.

- **Bua**: The natives inform us that some of the inhabitants of Bua have abandoned heathenism, without having seen a Missionary. And we have reason to believe that there are other places in Feejee, where the labours of a Missionary would be useful.

Tanoa’s aristocratic unity was further strengthened by the presence of the Chairman of the Fiji District at Viwa since 1842. When John Hunt became the Chairman of the Fiji District
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in 1842, he was stationed at Viwa. The Wesleyan Methodist connexion developed under Hunt from Viwa as local auxiliaries established new stations. Even the remote island of Rotuma came under the Chairman at Viwa. The growth of the Wesleyan Methodism in the 1840s coincided with the period in which Bau was waging wars all over Fiji. It was also during this period that the Wesleyan Academy promoted the doctrine of Degei as head of the national pantheon. Kania and Yavalanavanua died in 1845, Hunt in 1848 and Tanoa the following year. Unity of the vanua, in corroborated with the doctrine of Degei as the head of the national pantheon and the establishment of the Fiji District under the leadership of the resident missionary at Viwa, had all been successfully woven together. Ba, Nakorotubu and Vanuabalavu were recommended as mission stations in 1848. The Viwa Circuit included Bau, Kaba and Naivuruvuru, Nakorotubu Rakiraki and Ba. Calls had been made to go to Nadroga, Ovalau and Kadavu. The district of Bua had included Tiliva, Dama, and Tavulomo and the Nadi circuit included Solevu and Nasavusavu.

In general, the turaga bales were multi-religious in their political policies, but they changed to a monotheist religious policy. Wesleyanism introduced monotheism and polytheism was vigorously prohibited. Religious confrontation with the state deity of Lakeba began with the priests of Tokairabe, who strengthened their hold on Soroaqali, Tui Nayau's other brother. On 29 September 1849, Roko Taliai Tupou, the Tui Nayau, finally became a Christian, changing the religion of the matanitu of Lakeba. At Somosomo, Komainatavasara delayed the conversion of Yavalanavanua and Tuikilakila.

67 The Report of the Vewa Circuit, 1848, Minutes of the Eleventh, F. D. M. M. R.
68 ibid
The tolerant religious policy by the Fijian chiefs resulted in the successful establishment of stations in Lakeba, Rewa, Bau and Cakaudrove. These chiefs, though having their own religion, sanctioned Christianity’s introduction into their vanua. This open religious policy separated the idea of the chiefs personally becoming Christian and the religion of the vanua.

The concept of taukei became religiously inclined, away from its political origins, when Methodism replaced the pantheistic state religions that shouldered the sanctity of the states in Fiji, giving the independent sovereign chiefs of Fiji a common ground for political unity. They now worshipped the same God and had the same religion. This religious transformation began during Tanoa’s reign as Vunivalu of Bau. The introduction of Wesleyan Methodism to Bau stabilised the political development of the chiefly hierarchy.

Wesleyanism emphasized not only the political relevance but personal conversion of ordinary Fijians as well. This personal influence affected identity on the same scale as the political influence of conversion. It directly changed customs, most directly related to land tenure. In his A Vakatusa ni Lotu, or Christian Doctrines, John Hunt emphasized in his concluding chapters the concept of kai Viti, meaning people of Fijian origin and the idea of ‘global village’, sa vaka na koro e dua bau ko vuravura. The unifying salutation, kai Viti, or Fijian, was a clear deviation from territorial identities such as a kai Rewa, kai Bau or a kai Cakaudrove.
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The hierarchy of the Fijians chiefs orbiting Bau grew stronger as various independent and sovereign chiefs joined the Soro Taro or Methodist Societies after their baptism. Fijian unity, before the establishment of the Colony of Fiji, was a Bauan and Methodist unity. The Wesleyan Methodists directly influenced the formation of a new identity in the Ai Vakavuvuli ki na Tamata Soro Taro, an article containing the doctrines of the new religion to be practised by new Methodist converts. The name was adopted from the religious terminologies of Rewa. The lewe ni soro, or members of the cult, were those whose villagers who occasionally assembled at a priest’s sanctuary for religious practices. Taro refers to the practice of catechizing whereby students of the Christian religion were taught by questions and answers. Another article, also published at Rewa in 1841, titled Taro ka Kanaka, Questions and Answers, was published to teach new converts in reading and Theology. The Ai Vakavuvuli ki na Tamata Soro Taro was memorized to be read and recited every week by the Soro Taro or members of the Wesleyan society. The article had two parts, the first dealing with divinity and the second with how this divinity was to be practiced in Fiji. This was the part on practical divinity, demanding that

Those who want to be members of the society must show that they have turned away from all sins. They must not profane the name of God in trade, not to drink yagona, to be drunk, not to box nor wrestle, or argue, or gossip, or swear, or bargain, or lie or steal. They must not bury the coconut, or practice sorcery, or black magic, or tuki, or repay bad for bad: They must not burn their skins, shave their hairs in mourning, or liga tabu, or pasa balu, or strangle their women, cut their finger, or spoil their bodies, not to mourn as heathens, or tattoo, or adultery, or polygamy; divorce or force any marriage. They must not play reed throwing, dog fighting, rooster fighting, laziness, or i na vagaigai singing, dancing and other forms of entertainments. They must respect their Chiefs and Ministers, they must obey their Chiefs, and be obedient to the teachings of the Missionary. They must not do to others what they do not like to be done to themselves. They must not sing songs of the world; or heap wealth of this world, borrow without paying back; Jesus our Lord does not like this. Those who want to be a Society member must show his diligence in earnestly doing good. A Methodist is a friend of all and enemy of none. They should look after the naked, the sick and all that need help. They must also do good to the souls of men, by
The Wesleyans further prohibited customs that regulated land tenure. The sanctions that the Wesleyans introduced focused on customs they perceived to be inhumane. The ceremonies of *yaqona* drinking, boxing, wrestling, reed throwing and rooster fighting were activities associated with the agricultural year. Strangling women and cutting off little fingers constantly appeared in the NLC records as customs whereby land could be alienated from one *mataqali* to another. *Pasa balu*, using the *balaka*, was common in Wainunu in Bua. In this custom, a wooden spike is driven a through the cheeks of a dead woman. The sanctions on singing, dancing and other forms of entertainment had a direct effect on custom.

Methodism affected chronology and agriculture. Sanctuaries were either levelled or surrendered as Christian chapels. At Viwa, the temple of Mataidigo, where the god Koyamaimataidigo was worshipped, was turned into a Christian chapel. The great Strangers House called Naulunivuka in Bau, became the regal chapel. In other places like Lakeba, the chapel at Bucainabua commanded the village skyline. When the priestly class gradually became politically defunct, missionaries became advisers to the *turaga bale*. The observance of Sabbath as different from other days began to be part of Fijian custom. Beginning from the Sabbath, Fiji ‘time’ bowed to a new chronological master - the Christian calendar. Fiji time consisted only of agricultural moons or *vula*, measured by nature. Days did not have any name; it was either a good day or a bad day! The introduction of Sunday measured Fiji time into systematic periods, making a day more
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meaningful to society in general. Days were named: Sunday was called *Siga Tabu* or Holy Day, Saturday was *Vakarauleka*, Short Day for Preparing the Sunday, Friday was *Vakaraubalavu*, Long Day for preparing the Sunday, Thursday became *Siga Dakuna*, Back of the Week and Wednesday was called *Siga Tuiloma*, Middleday. Once Sunday had successfully organised village life to its rhythm, the Monthly Meeting easily sanctioned the month; and the Quarterly Meeting of the circuit divided the year into quarters. The *Bose ko Viti* at last became the crown of chronology. The Wesleyan *Bose ko Viti* and missionaries now determined the year, which was always determined in the past by nature and agriculture.

The Wesleyans’ interaction with the *turaga bale* institution fortified the Vunivalu’s position as head of the *turaga bale* institution. Through their motto, *Fear God and Honor the King*, the Wesleyans humbled themselves before the *turaga bale* and won their favours and military protection. Wesleyanism became the religion of the *turaga bale, na nodra lotu na turaga*. Under the political authority of the *turaga bale*, stations were established, island villagers converted, societies grew, circuits emerged and finally Fiji became a district of the British Wesleyan Methodist Conference. This interaction also had profound political impact. The *matanitu* and *vanua* changed from being polytheist to monotheist, the Christian God now the god of the *matanitu, vanua* and *yavusa*. For the first time in history, the various *matanitu* worshipped the same deity. The conversion of the Vunivalu of Bau in 1854 reformed the religious component of the *matanitu*, uniting the *turaga bale* under the Wesleyan connexional system. Monotheism contributed directly towards the *turaga bale*’s political unity as the Wesleyans placed the Chairman of the District Meeting at Viwa and Bau. The Wesleyan connexion government provided for the *turaga bale* institution a new and common national identity. However, the examination of how the *turaga bale* and
Wesleyanism contributed to each other’s establishment from 1835 to 1852 is seen not only in the areas of politics and religion. It could also be seen in the area of education, language and liturgical literature. Through these areas, the Wesleyans influenced the ‘village’ face and quintessence of Fijian identity.
Three years after its establishment, the Wesleyan mission was reinvigorated by the arrival of a printing press. The Fijians at Lakeba who first saw the machine exclaimed it was a *kalou*,¹ hence the title. This machine revolutionized the progress of Wesleyanism and influenced the way it reached the ordinary islands and mountain villagers. The District Meeting governed the Wesleyan doctrines that nourished the heart while the printing press fed the minds with its publications. The Wesleyans organized two evangelistic programs, the first was education, and the second consisted of language and translation. Education was conducted in chapels, which also served as classrooms, since the new Christian converts were scholars themselves. There was no difference between the convert and the student in the Wesleyan education program. Schools formed an important part of the larger mission focus where education had its place in the nurturing of converts to grow in Christianity. Balancing their emphasis on the human mind as well as the heart, the Wesleyans applied their ‘rational divinity’ ideology to influence the emergence of a new and common Fijian identity through religion and education.

The subject of this Chapter is the common Fijian identity that emerged out of the Wesleyans’ education and literature programs. I will discuss how the Wesleyans developed this identity through two key areas in their interaction with the *turaga bale*. The

¹ The term had a number of meanings, but here it meant god. In the end *kalou* was taken exclusively to mean god in Wesleyan literature.
first was village education and the second, was the use of Bauan dialect in liturgical language and literature. The aim of this discussion is to continue from where I left off in the last Chapter, which demonstrated how the Wesleyans strengthened the position of the Vunivalu of Bau over the turaga bale institution during Tanoa’s reign. It focuses on the Wesleyans’ work on the last years of Tanoa’s life, examining how the Wesleyans propagated Bauan values over its circuits and its village schools. These subject areas are selected to illustrate the argument that the Wesleyans contributed to unifying the major mata 11itu under Vunivalu of Bau before 1853.

The Wesleyans established the Language and Translation Department to supervise the publication of liturgical and educational literature, which helped develop a common and inclusive identity. The ascendancy of Bau and the turaga bale were entrenched as institutions of identity when Wesleyans used the Bauan dialect as the dialect of the Church. It was a gradual process culminating in the 1844 Fiji District Meeting resolution for a single dialect policy.

This progress in the work of the Language and Translation Department came at a time when the Bauan military campaign for political ascendancy over Fiji was at its peak. The selection of the Bauan dialect in 1844 as the ‘dialect of the Church’ in Fiji directly related the Bauan dialect with common Greek, the language of the New Testament. Aligning themselves with the Language and Translation Department, the Wesleyan Day Schools emerged as the institution primarily responsible for the development of the Fijian intellect. In this area, Hellenism influenced Fijian history when the original Greek text of the New Testament was used for the translation of the New Testament into Fijian. Both Cargill and the Hoxton graduates, Hunt, Jaggar, Calvert and Williams, had taken courses in Greek
before embarking for Fiji. The New Testament was written in common Greek and Cargill, Lyth and Hunt were working straight from the Greek text in their translation of the Bible into Fijian. While still in Tonga, Cargill had asked John Hobbs, the mission printer, to cast him some Greek thetas. The educational system focused on the Fijian mind while the classes, or societies, trained the heart in the metaphysical qualities of the Christian religion. Both, the school and society had the printing press in common.

The Language and Translation Committee's priority was to acquire and operate a printing press. The Wesleyans developed a practice whereby the Chairman of the District Meeting be responsible for both the Chairmanship of the District Meeting and the Language and Translation Committee. From 1839 until his departure in 1841, Cargill held both.

Originally, the dialect of Bau was not the Wesleyan mission dialect. The adoption of new dialects used in translation arose out the successful establishment of mission stations in other major political centres in Fiji, and the Bauan dialect ranked equally with the Lakeba, Rewa and the Somosomo dialect. David Cargill, as Chairman of the Language and Translation Committee, maintained a circuit dialect policy whereby each missionary should work on the dialects of their stations. In his diary entry, he envisioned that 'a translation of the Bible into the various dialects of Feejee, is a subject with which my mind dwells with ardour and delight; and I hope that I shall see such work accomplished'. Other missionaries, too, should be concerned about translation because question 24 of the 1838 District Meeting Agenda asked whether the missionaries were making diligent application to acquire the language of the people among whom they are sent to minister. Cargill also
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maintained a tight supervision of the translation of the Fijian language. The first District Meeting on 27 December 1838 decided that:

No Brethren shall be at liberty to introduce a foreign word into the language, unless in cases of obvious necessity; for example, when the native language does not furnish a word or phrase to express the idea. But in case of indispensable necessity every Brother shall have a discretionary power to introduce words from any language that may seem to him most suitable to the genius of this language, subject however to the instructions in the translation department, received from the Committee in the General Letter dated April 9th 1838.  

Optimistic that a press would soon arrive, Cargill prepared for publication of a Grammar and Vocabulary of the Lakeba language. He proceeded with a translation of the four gospels, Saint John’s Epistle, the Book of Genesis, the Acts of the Apostles and other detached portions of Scripture into the Lakeba dialect throughout 1838. The arrival of the press in 1839 coincided with the establishment of the Bau and Somosomo stations. Cargill’s Grammar and Dictionary, which he had revised, were by now in the hands of the new arrivals in 1839, to help them learn the Fijian language. William Cross, who had spent two years at Rewa, had ‘been diligently employed in translating various elementary books and portions of the Psalms into the dialect of Rewa’. Furthermore, the 1839 Language and Translation Department reported that the first part of the Conference Catechism and the first twelve pages of Mark’s Gospel had been printed. The second twelve pages of that Gospel were still with the press when the District Meeting took place. The successful stationing of Cross in Vewa and Richard Burdsall Lyth with John Hunt at Somosomo led
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the meeting to think of publishing a ‘few elementary books in the dialects of Rewa, Somosomo and Bau’.  

William Cross did not reform the circuit dialect policy when Cargill left Fiji. Even though he was in charge as the most senior missionary in Fiji, Cross’s handicap was that he had not received confirmation of his appointment as Chairman of the Fiji District. Still, the Language and Translation Department kept thriving in literature production during Cross’s two and half years as Acting Chairman of the Feejee District. By 1841, the press was at its maximum production, producing all kinds of translated material. There were approved drafts, printed materials and proposed translations to be made. The Department’s report said that it had received some translated pieces of Scripture to be published. These included Cross’s first nine chapters of the Book of Genesis, Cargill’s first seven chapters of the Gospel of Saint Matthew, Lyth’s first six chapters of St. Mark’s Gospel and Hunt’s first six chapters of Saint Luke’s Gospel in the Somosomo dialect. The Department approved all these translations with a few minor changes. In addition to the approved drafts in 1841, the Department published other materials as well. These included two thousand copies of the Rules of Society in the Lakeba dialect, one thousand copies of the second part of the First Conference Catechism in the Somosomo dialect and one thousand copies of the first half sheet of the Second Conference Catechism in the Bau dialect.

The missionaries distributed the workload among themselves for the ensuing year. Calvert and Williams were assigned to translate the Second Conference Catechism, and Lyth and
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Hunt the *Gospel of Saint John*, in addition to the translations of *Saint Mark* and *Saint Luke*, which they were currently working on. Cross was to translate the first twenty chapters of the *Book of Acts* and Jaggar to complete the remaining eight chapters of *Acts* in the Rewa dialect. After Cargill left Fiji in 1841, John Waterhouse, the President of the Australasian Conference based in Sydney, appointed Hunt to look after the Language and Translation Department and the Native Academy for the Training of Native Teachers. Together with Lyth, his colleague at Somosomo, Hunt screened, approved and recommended all the translated material to the District Meeting, before the manuscripts were sent to the press. Hunt was stationed with Cross at Rewa in 1838 before he went to Somosomo with Lyth in July 1839 to Somosomo. Cross later joined Lyth in Cakaudrove.

The problem of many dialects became obvious when the District Meeting considered the necessity of translating the New Testament. It was unorthodox to have a different dialect for each of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament. But the Meeting did not change Cargill's policy of circuit dialects. It resolved that

> elementary books be prepared in each of the Dialects as well as the portions of Scripture needed for the Schools and that a translation of the Scriptures be commenced which shall embrace as many Dialects as possible.

Cross, who took over as Chairman of both the District Meeting and the Language Department, not only continued Cargill's multi-dialect policy, but also increased literature production. By 1842, he began translating the *Acts of the Apostles*, the *Book of Psalms* and
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the *Gospel of Matthew* in the Bauan dialect.\textsuperscript{13} As Chairman, he had allowed Lyth and Hunt
to work on the *Gospel of St. John*, revise the other Gospels and also translate an abstract of
the liturgy into the Somosomo dialect. Jaggar continued with another version of the first
eight chapters of the *Book of Acts* in the Rewa dialect while Calvert patiently translated the
*Second Conference Catechism* in the Lakeba dialect.\textsuperscript{14} The Department further approved
Cross’ portion of the *Second Conference Catechism*, and the whole of the *Second
Conference Catechism* by Calvert and a sheet of the *Gospel of St. Luke* by Hunt for
publication. In addition, the first few chapters of the *Book of Genesis* in the Bau dialect,
one thousand and five hundred copies of *Luke’s Gospel* in the Somosomo dialect, one
thousand five hundred copies of *Luke’s Gospel* and *St Matthew* in the Rewa dialect and
two thousand copies of a *Book of Lessons* in the Bau dialect, were also printed.\textsuperscript{15} The
Department further assigned Hunt the task of translating the *Epistle to the Romans* and an
Abstract from the liturgy of the Church of England. In addition, Williams was also asked
to translate the *Epistle to the Galatians* in the Lakeba Dialect, Jaggar to work on the *Epistle
to the Ephesians* in the Rewa dialect and Lyth to translate the *Epistle of Saint Paul to the
Corinthians* and the *Philippians* in the Somosomo dialect.\textsuperscript{16} Apart from those
assignments, two thousand copies each of the *Second Conference Catechism and Appendix*
in the Lakeba and the Bauan dialect were ready to be printed.\textsuperscript{17}

Cross’s deteriorating health opened the way for Hunt to be responsible for both the
Academy and the Language Department in 1841. After vacating Viwa to be near medical
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help at Somosomo, Hunt replaced Cross at the metropolis of Fijian politics, only to be appointed Chairman of the Fiji District when Cross died in October 1842.

Under Hunt’s leadership, Wesleyan education and literature adopted Bauan values and dialect. He began by a gradual reform of Cargill’s multi-dialect policy. In 1843, Hunt translated the *Epistle to the Ephesians* and the *Second Conference Catechism* into the dialect and allowed Jaggar to translate the same two books into the Rewa dialect, while Lyth continued with the Second *Epistle to the Corinthians* in the Somosomo dialect.\(^{18}\)

Hunt’s first step towards a one-dialect policy began with a plan to translate a multi-dialect, and complete *New Testament*. The resolution of the District Meeting said:

> that the works of translating the New Testament throughout be continued but conforming to the following plan in order to secure in each dialect, as soon as possible, such portions of the Word of God, as are necessary for the furtherance of our people both in faith and practice.\(^{19}\)

In this plan, translations into the Somosomo, Rewa and Lakeba dialects were to stop. The last batch of translations under this policy included the *Gospel of Mark*, the *Epistle to the Romans*, the *First Epistles to the Corinthians, First Thessalonians, Second Timothy, Jude* and the *Third Epistle of John* in the Lakeba dialect; the *Gospel of Saint John, Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, Ephesians, First Epistle to Timothy, Second Epistle of Peter* and *Philemon* would be in the Rewa dialect; the *Gospel of Saint Matthew, the Book of Acts, the Epistle to the Hebrews, Epistle of James* and *Revelations* in the Bauan dialect; and the *Gospel of Saint Luke, Second Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians, Philippians*, the
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Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, the Epistle of Paul to Titus, First and Second Epistle of Saint John and the First Epistle of Saint Peter in the Somosomo dialect. Furthermore, the Department authorised the preparation of an Abridgement of the Liturgy in the Lakeba, Rewa and Bau dialects, an Abstract of Hunt's Lectures, hymn books in the Somosomo, Lakeba, Rewa and Bauan dialect and the District Quarterly Tickets for the next three years.  

Finally, in 1844, Hunt amended the Language and Translation Department's multi-dialect policy. He required all the missionaries to translate the New Testament, according to the 1843 plan, into the Bauan dialect. But first, he had to collect for printing those translated works that were still with his colleagues. Those materials included his own collection of hymns and Short Sermons, Calvert's Abstract of the Liturgy into the Lakeba dialect, a collection of hymns in the Rewa dialect, the Twenty-Three Short Sermons and the Epistles to the Hebrews into the Bauan dialect.  

Lyth, who was still at Somosomo, translated Hunt's collection of Short Sermons and hymns into the Lakeba dialect. In addition, two thousand copies of the Short Sermon, which was a forty-page document, a twelve-page hymn-book in the Bau dialect, three thousand copies of a twelve-page Abstract of the Liturgy in the Lakeba dialect, and eight thousand eight hundred tickets were printed.  

Further, when the Department planned for further translation work on the New Testament, the District Meeting resolved that

The work of translating the New Testament throughout shall be continued conforming to the plan adopted last year, but in order to secure as soon as possible a complete translation for recommendation to the British and Foreign

---

20 Miscellaneous 4, op cit.
21 Miscellaneous 1:1, Minutes of the Seventh, F. D. M. M. R.
22 Miscellaneous 2, op cit.
Bible Society in one of the principal dialects of Feejee, the Brethren in the various circuits shall translate to the Bau Dialect.\footnote{Resolution 3, Miscellaneous, Minutes of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Feejee District at Vewa on Wednesday the 14 of August 1844, F. D. M. M. R.}

This resolution finally led to the successful publication of the first single dialect and complete version of the New Testament in the Bauan dialect in 1847. Later reports of the Language and Translation Department in 1851 and 1852, when Lyth took over as Chairman, showed that the single dialect policy over Fijian translation and mission literature had become the official policy. In 1851, the only deviation from this policy was the printing of the *Catechism* and a first book in the Rotuman language. The Language and Translation Department injected its publications into the schools that had been established alongside the mission stations. Without the press, the schools would have been ineffective. The single dialect policy turned all the printed materials into the Bauan dialect. Though circuits had their own cultures and dialects, the Bauan dialect was imposed over them through the Wesleyan printed Bible, hymns, catechisms and liturgical abstracts. I argue that the transition from a multi-dialect policy of school language and church translation to a single dialect policy in favour of the Bauan dialect contributed directly to Bau’s ascendancy during Tanoa’s reign. Once the Bauan dialect became the dialect of Wesleyan literature, the schools in the various *matanitu* and *vanua* around Fiji began to speak, spell, read and pray in Bauan.

The press and its release of publications gave the schools a new lease of life. Reports from schools showed that they were using the *Second Catechism* in 1842,\footnote{Lakeba School Report, Minutes of the Fifth, F. D. M. M. R.} the newly printed
New Testament and the *Taro Lekaleka* or *Short Catechism*. Scholars on Ono-i-Lau acquired copies and were reading them fluently at the end of 1848. In Rewa, the introduction of the Second Conference Catechism into the School has given a stimulus to the scholars. Several already can read with tolerable ease & correctness & are getting fixed in their memories. Several portions of the Scripture & the First and Second Conference Catechism and some elementary books and often speak of them as their riches: this is a ...[Christian] circumstance and is a cause of encouragement to the teachers. Many of the scholars can read and spell well and commit to memories what they read. They are on the ...and getting on in their learning: some are remarkably quick: others by application

The *Spelling Book*, *Catechisms* and hymns printed in the Rewa dialect provided stimulus for scholars and converts at Rewa. In Viwa, the *Second Conference Catechism* also boosted the quality of services provided by the school, while scholar-converts in Nadi and Bua welcomed the printed books with anticipation and enthusiasm. The school reports said that several adults have learned to read the *New Testament*, and some of the older scholars have improved in their reading and prize the sacred volume. The children have been very attentive to our instruction, and have improved very much in cleanliness; many repeat the whole of the first Catechism and several chapters in the *New Testament*, the Commandments, several *Psalms* and some of the *Short Sermons*. Some of the children are under serious impressions and have been formed into the Catechism Classes, and we trust many of them will early become acquainted with the Saviour, and made useful in his Church.

---

25 Lakeba School Report, Minutes of the Eleventh, F. D. M. M. R.
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The impact of the printing of the whole *New Testament* in the Bauan dialect was felt throughout Fiji. It gave a solid academic foundation to schools in Ono-i-Lau, Viwa\(^{30}\) and Lakeba. There were two Bible Classes in the Lakeba Girls School and one in the Children’s Class. John Malvern was optimistic of the scholars’ academic and religious future when he said

> While we see the need of instructing them in other matters we deem of great importance to put into their hands the Bible and to persevere in teaching them to read it correctly. We think we cannot furnish them with a more deadly weapon against error of every kind than the word of God. During the past year we have had great opportunities of witnessing its power against the “man of sin”. We have been surprised and delighted to behold the simple Feejeean with a mere quotation from the sacred volume foil the Jesuit and completely vanquished the foul enemy of God and man. May the Lord fill the minds & hearts of the children and the people in his truth which will enable them to repel every assailment of Satan, and may he make it the power of God unto their Salvation.\(^{31}\)

The Wesleyan education system in Fiji balanced its mission philosophy by providing Fijians with a visible representation of unseen religious realities. The strict missionary supervision over the schools and societies facilitated the advancement of the Fijians’ intellectual and spiritual development in a single sweep. So far in this Chapter, I am highlighting the correlation of the mind and the heart, the intellect and the spirit, pietism and knowledge, Methodist enthusiasm and scholarship. My arguments regarding the Wesleyan Methodists’ influence over Fijian land claims is based on the Wesleyan’s influence on the development of the common Fijian intellect, common in the sense that it included everybody in the island villages, males, females, adults and even the infants. This common Fijian intellect emerged and developed during the period from 1835 to 1852. Tui Cakau and Roko Tui Dreketi reinstalled Tanoa as the Vunivalu of Bau in 1836. He reigned

---

\(^{30}\) The Vewa Circuit School Report for 1848, Minutes of the Eleventh, op cit.

\(^{31}\) Lakeba School Report, Minutes of the Thirteenth, op cit.
until 1852. During this period also, Bauan hierarchical development, incorporating the whole of Fiji through its liga qaqqa, reached its climax. From the press at Navau on the island of Viwa, the Wesleyan Language and Translation Department printed Christian literature in the Bauan dialect, feeding the schools in Lau, Rewa, Cakaudrove, Bua, Kadavu and the whole of Viti Levu.

The first Wesleyan school in Fiji opened on Sunday 30 October 1835 at Bucainabua, Lakeba. It had only one student, Roko Taliai Tupou, the Tui Nayau. Cargill took out what was to be the standard text of Wesleyan education, the Conference Catechism, or Taro ka Kaya, and read it to Roko Taliai. After hearing the reading, Roko Taliai 'expressed a desire to be able to read, & [and] the willingness to receive instructions.' On Monday 9 November, Cargill admitted ten new scholars into the Tongan female school. In all there were about fifty students learning to read under the shade of the mango trees. By the end of November, Cargill reorganized his routine, holding the female school at half past five in the morning, where seventy were present. In the afternoon, he opened the male Tongan school. This was their normal program, until they baptised 32 adults on 20 March 1836, as 'the first fruits of the Gospel in Feejee'. From 1835 to 1838, they operated the Week-Day Schools at Lakeba. Sundays were only for worship and education filled the rest of the six days of the week.

---

32 David Cargill, Diary of Rev. David Cargill, A. M., Graduate of Kings College, Old Aberdeen, Volume 1, M. O. M. CY 344 A 1817, M. L., frame 567.
33 A. J. Schutz, The Diaries, p. 69f.
34 D. Cargill, Diary, frame 580.
35 Question 11, Minutes of the Fourth, F. D. M. M. R.
The attraction of reading and writing as much as the fear of the wrath of God upon their sins, led forty Lakebans to go school. And they did well, showing pleasure in attendance, reading and writing. Those Lauans whom the missionaries brought from Tonga helped them as teachers in the school at Bucainabua and at Oneata. Ioane Mafi and Josua Mateinaniu were sent to Oneata in December and February of 1836 respectively. Cargill gave them additional instruction in teaching, so they could be 'better qualified for the discharge of their duties as teachers.' Classes normally began and concluded with hymns and prayers.

Even though they were doing well, students at the Lakeba schools experienced hardship through persecution from the Vuanirewa chiefs, who temporarily closed the school at Waitabu village. School attendance was also affected at Rewa in 1838 'due to want of schoolhouses, partly by distance of place and partly by being engaged about the King's business'. To the political advantage of the school at Rewa, a young chief, one of Tanoa's grandsons, embraced Christianity. He went through the Spelling Book and read the hymns with little assistance. Some of his attendants imitated his example and regularly attended school. But when Cargill took over the Rewa Circuit from Cross, he was not proud of the progress of the school. He noted that

[they have shown] as yet but little desire for reading. Some of them are old and probably can never be taught to read without much difficulty & perseverance. Others though younger in years have not sufficiently enlarged
or accurate idea of the advantage of an alphabet to read; and therefore do not exert themselves to acquire proficiency. Their attendance at school is irregular. Any unimportant engagement or slight indisposition of body causes them to absent themselves. The want of diligence in the scholars is equally conspicuous. Some of them when they returned from school put away their books and do not look at them again until next morning. Their inattention retards their progress and grieves our mind. 41

When Cross began at Rewa, he also employed some of his scholars to help him teach reading and writing. 42

The press and the printed books attracted people to Christianity and education. Early, the Lau schools managed to survive on materials published in Tonga before Cargill’s arrival in Fiji. The schools were using a Spelling Book of four pages, and two other books of twelve pages each, containing the first eleven Chapters of St Matthew’s Gospel that had been printed in the Fijian language. 43 Even without the teachers and the missionaries, the books themselves were not only an attraction for more scholars, but for teachers as well. The luxury of owning a book raised the prestige of a villager above others. Books were purchased and circulated, fostering a ‘spirit of inquiry, and some of the most apt scholars have read and re-read them, and are anxiously waiting for more’. 44

The news of the arrival of a printing press at Lakeba raised the hopes of a fortified educational program. At Rewa, Cross experienced the need for books in 1839. 45 Nothing had been printed in the Rewa dialect for the schools, and they found it difficult to learn in

41 School Report, Rewa Minutes of the Third District Meeting of the Feejee District held in Rewa, on Wednesday June 24th 1840, F. D. M. M. R.
42 School Report, Lakemba, Minutes of the Second, op cit.
43 School Report, Lakemba, Minutes of the First, op cit.
44 Ibid.
the Lakeba dialect. The press finally arrived in 1839 and its influence on the schools in this circuit was powerful and beneficial.\textsuperscript{46} There was a complete turnaround in the attitude at Lau towards Christianity as a whole. School attendance, which was irregular, increased and became regular. Reading became very popular, even on the remote island of Ono, 'we learn that the burden of the cry of the people to the devoted native teachers who are resident among them is Send for books Send for books'.\textsuperscript{47}

The spirit of inquiry, stirred by the press, was also felt at Rewa, where scholars gradually learnt the art of writing and reading as books gained wider circulation. According to Cargill,

\begin{quote}
The books, which have been circulated among the people during the past year, cannot fail ultimately to enlighten this dark place of the earth and excite a spirit of enquiry among the people. This effect has already in some measure been produced.\textsuperscript{48}
\end{quote}

By the end of 1839, there were eight schools in Lakeba, namely in Bucainabua, Waciwaci, Waitabu, Narocake, Nukunuku and on adjacent islands of Oneata, Moce, Namuka and Ono. In the Rewa Circuit, there were two schools, one at Rewa and the other at Suva. The school at Bau was established at the end of 1839, when William Cross moved to the island of Viwa. He reported that he had two schools, five teachers and a hundred and twenty scholars under his supervision at Viwa.\textsuperscript{49} In the schools the books, especially the Bible, and the language policy came together to strengthen the ascendancy of Bau.

\textsuperscript{46} School Report, Lakeba, 1839, op cit.

\textsuperscript{47} ibid.

\textsuperscript{48} Report of the Schools in the Rewa Circuit for the Year 1839 - 1840, Minutes of the Third, F. D. M. M. R.

\textsuperscript{49} School Report, Viwa, Minutes of the Third, F. D. M. M. R.
The need to have teaching as a separate ministry was seriously addressed by the 1841 District Meeting. The Fiji schools needed someone to devote his whole ministry in preparing teachers. They requested London to send someone thoroughly schooled in the best system of education on religious principles for the purpose of training Native Teachers, male and female, for this Group of Islands, and resolves that the following Rules of Regulation be adopted for the schools in this District for the present.\(^{50}\)

A standard education policy for Wesleyan schools was formulated in 1841. The representative at the meeting, after full consideration of the state of the Schools and the claims of the rising generation, are fully persuaded that some more efficient plan ought to be adopted. They are fully impressed with the wants and the claims of children & adult population, but the engagements of the Missionaries are so numerous as to preclude the possibility of devoting that attention to them which their necessities call for.\(^{51}\)

The education policy was set down under the title *General Rules and Regulations* for the Wesleyan Schools in the Feejee Islands and covered all schools in the Lakeba, Rewa, Bau and Somosomo circuits:

1. These schools shall be under the management of a Committee, Visitors, Superintendents & Teachers
2. The Committee to consist of the Missionaries, Visitors & Superintendents.
3. The Committee shall meet once a month, at such a time and place as the Missionaries shall think proper.
4. Each school shall be opened and concluded by the Superintendent with singing and prayer.
5. A register of the schools shall be carefully kept, the Superintendent shall call over & mark the names of the teachers daily, & every Teacher shall call and mark the names of his scholars.
6. That those scholars who shall be absent from school without leave, shall be reported by the teachers to the Visitors of the schools, and to

\(^{50}\) ibid.

\(^{51}\) Resolution 4, Miscellaneous, Minutes of the Fourth, F. D. M. M. R.
the Committee at the monthly meeting, and they shall determine what is to be done.

7. That any Teacher absenting himself or herself from the school without a sufficient cause shall be reported at the monthly meeting of the committee.

8. That the Superintendent shall be authorised to administer reproof and corrections during school hours.

9. That the Visitors or Visitor shall be required to visit the school at least once a week, in order to examine them in their departments and they shall be at liberty to give any instructions which they may deem necessary to all the Teachers and Scholars.

10. That the repeated absence of any scholar from School or his found guilty of swearing, lying, pilfering, or any other kind of gross immorality of persisted in shall be excluded from the benefit of school.

11. A public and careful examination of each school shall take place at least once in the year, the school ... belonging to the place where the Annual District Meeting is held, shall hold its annual examination during the District Meeting when any Missionary shall be at liberty to examine the schools.52

The introduction of this policy consolidated the education management. It was applied at a time when both the political situation in Fiji and the Wesleyan mission’s structural adjustments were being oriented towards Bau. The national education policy, against the circuit oriented policy, provided for Tanoa a hierarchical development that military might could not achieve – the enlightenment of the mind through education, which was in the hands of the Wesleyan Methodists through their schools. By 1852, the Wesleyans had established their mission schools within the leading Fijian matanitu, namely Bau, Rewa, Cakaudrove Bua, Lau, Nadroga, Ra, Ba and also the islands of Lomaiviti.

The Wesleyan national education policy produced, enjoined and nurtured the identity of a Fijian as a convert and scholar. This dualistic identity reflected the pietistic and

52 General Rules and Regulations for the Wesleyan Schools in the Feejee Islands, Miscellaneous, Minutes of the Fourth. op cit.
rationalistic Wesleyan mission philosophy. Religious enthusiasm was as important as knowledge. In Lakeba, scholars were those who had

renounced the worship of false gods [and] are desirous of instruction in reading and writing. The progress of the [gospel] ... small yet many of the Feejeeans & Tongans who attend our Schools have made considerable progress.\textsuperscript{53}

Not only boys but also girls were included in this observation on progress. Most of the Lakeba girls who were scholars had been admitted into the Society.\textsuperscript{54} John Malvern, the missionary in charge of the Lakeba circuit, confirmed that the girls in his school ‘profess to be the disciples of the Lord Jesus, and in several instances, there is proof that they are his genuine followers.’\textsuperscript{55} Malvern’s wife attended to the girls’ school, teaching reading, writing and sewing. The Wesleyans regarded the girls’ conversion to Christianity as important as their progress in learning to read and write. Their report about the Lakeba female scholars said

They have made considerable progress in reading & writing, sewing and other things they have been instructed [in], and what is very cheering, the unusual condition of the children appears to be very much improved and many we believe have become genuine Christians.\textsuperscript{56}

In 1851, five boys in Malvern’s school at Lakeba were meeting in class. He was training them so that they could become helpers in the Wesleyan mission. In 1852, the number of the boys meeting in class rose to eight. On the island of Viwa and also on Ono-i-Lau, all those who professed Christianity considered themselves scholars. John Hunt reported in

\textsuperscript{53} Reports of the Schools, Lakeba Station, op cit.

\textsuperscript{54} Lakeba School Report, Minutes of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Feejee District commenced at Vewa on Monday the 21\textsuperscript{st} June 1852, and ended on Tuesday June 29 1852, F. D. M. M. R.

\textsuperscript{55} ibid.

\textsuperscript{56} Lakeba, School Report for 1851, Minutes of the Thirteenth, op cit.
August 14 1844, that 'as soon as they have bowed the knee to Jehovah, they come to enquire for an alphabet & spelling books'.

The difference between a scholar and a convert was hard to tell. On Ono-i-Lau, scholars attended school every day of the week, except Saturday. The same scholars packed the services for worship on Sunday, 'so that our scholars may be said to include all the people in Ono, from four years old to fourscore.57 Even before the establishment of the stations, effort was being made to bring professing Christians under instruction in Bua and Nadi, on the southwestern coast of Vanua Levu.58 Even at Rewa, Jaggar confirmed that all who renounced heathenism attended the Wesleyan schools.59 The attitude towards education in Cakaudrove was that it went together with conversion. Lyth and Hunt found it hard to teach students for 'they seem to have no relish for it until they embrace Christianity'.60 In Somosomo, the attempt to bring the children of non-Christians under instruction failed, until the parents themselves turned to the Lord.61

Consistent and strict supervision of the schools by the missionaries was a major concern in the 1841 General Rules and Guidelines. Calvert and Williams focused their attention on the 750 teachers and 757 scholars on the island of Lakeba,62 and Malvern visited those other schools in outer islands but part of the Lakeba Circuit. Malvern managed and taught

58 Report of the Schools in the Vewa Circuit for the Year ending August 14 1844, Minutes of the Seventh, op cit.
59 Report of the Rewa Schools for the Year, 1841, Minutes of the Fourth, op cit.
60 The Report of the Sunday and Week- Day Schools in the Somosomo Circuit for the Year 1842, Minutes of the Fifth, op cit.
61 The Somosomo School Report for 1843, Minutes of the Sixth, op cit.
62 Reports of the Schools, Lakeba Station, 1841, Minutes of the Fourth, op cit.
in two schools, four days a week near the Mission premises, and assembled infants and adults for examination in his weekly visits to the outer villages of Lakeba. In Viwa, Hunt also established a school for the European children to learn English. This school was first established by Cross at Levuka, but Hunt moved it to Viwa. It operated alongside the native school. This school was a response to the removal of the European settlers from Levuka. Even during the war years, from 1841 to 1845, Jaggar maintained normal strict supervision of the school at Rewa. In Bua, Williams continued supervision of the schools during the civil war:

We do not lack encouragement in the School department of our work, but we often observe, and cannot do so without regret that the native mind, quick at receiving and returning letters and words, is slow to understand their import or perceive the practical bearing they are designed to have. Several women and girls attend regularly to the sewing schools, to which Mrs. Williams gives attention.

The Wesleyan Mission’s regulation did not stop scholars from further attending to the duties of their matamitu. This was the case in Viwa and Rewa before the 1845 war. Cross reported from Viwa that ‘the attendance of the Schools has been irregular, arising from the frequent absence of many of them from home’. Jaggar faced the same problem at Rewa. Education was unpopular and intrusive to the normal duties of life on the delta. Even though he had some attendance, some in Rewa

63 Lakeba School Report for 1848, Minutes of the Eleventh, op cit.
64 Report of the Schools in the Vewa Circuit for the Year ending August 14 1844, Minutes of the Seventh, op cit.
65 Report of the Schools in the Bau Circuit 1842, Minutes of the Fifth, op cit.
66 Rewa Circuit School Report for Year Ending June 1844, Minutes of the Fifth, op cit.
67 Bua School Report, 1841, Minutes of the Fourth, op cit.
68 Report of the Schools Vewa Circuit 1841, Minutes of the Fourth, op cit.
who do not perhaps see the value of instructions have not so prided their privilege as to be in earnest about what they undertake, and consequently their improvement, has not been so marked & evident. Others are too old ever to make much progress in learning from books. 69

When he was leaving Viwa for the last time, Cross also observed the same attitude towards education from some of the people of Viwa. He found the reason for irregular attention to education was due to

absence from home; & at other times to a multiplicity of secular engagements. The missionary being often poorly and unable to attend other Schools has had great influence upon some to whom religious duties are rather a task than a pleasure. Their minds are being partially enlightened. They do not see the advantages that would result from a diligent and regular attendance. At present they think more of man than of God; and this is so natural to Feejeean when heathen that it will require much time & instruction, and much of the grace of God to bring them to act in all things as in his presence. 70

Would-be scholars in Rewa had more urgent business to attend to, considering the politics of Rewa from 1841 to 1844, than going to Jaggar's school. There was a war looming. Even in 1842, Jaggar reported that

the attendance of the Scholars at our morning School for males is not regular. Many of them are often absent and when at home, are sometimes otherwise employed or not so desirous of attaining knowledge as to value instruction. 71

When the war finally erupted, Jaggar saw the real reason why Rewans had neglected education. He reported to the District Meeting that

69 Report of the Rewa Schools for the Year, 1841, Minutes of the Fourth, op cit.
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71 Report of the Schools in the Rewa Circuit 1842, Minutes of the Fifth, op cit.
The native Christian has not been regular in their attendance at School. The excitement provided by the war has no doubt been the principal reason for the fluctuation. None of the heathen allow their children to receive instruction, unless they have embraced Christianity, in consequence of their connecting one with the other. Many of the scholars, both adult and children have made improvement in reading and learning. The School is not systematically arranged; a difficulty had been felt in the irregular attendance of the scholars.\(^\text{72}\)

Apart from looking after their families, the missionaries’ wives also successfully managed schools for girls. At Lakeba, they taught five girls in Christian morality, preserving them ‘from the bad conduct that usually stained the characters of age & sex, have married to Christian man, and promise to be pious and useful women’.\(^\text{73}\)

In Rewa, the girls’ school was conducted in the afternoon, for it was better attended than in the morning. The girls advanced in learning, especially in sewing themselves pillows and bed covers.\(^\text{74}\) Between thirty and forty girls attended the school at Lakeba in 1852, where they also learnt reading, writing and sewing. The girls, between thirty and forty in number, received the maternal attention of the missionaries’ wives. They were attached to their school,

and endeavour to acquire knowledge of reading, writing and sewing, and other things, which they are taught. And we are delighted to find that the labour has not been bestowed upon them in vain. Many among them can read and sew well, and a few of them made considerable progress in writing. They receive with pleasure the …[real] instructions, which were given to them, and make an effort to be obedient to what they hear.\(^\text{75}\)

The Tongan Wesleyan teachers worked side by side with Fijians in establishing schools. In 1848, Joel Bulu, Daniel Tofale, Zadoc Latu, Jeremiah Latu, Philemon Sadria, Matthias,

\(^\text{72}\) Rewa Circuit School Report for Year Ending June 1844, Minutes of the Seventh, op cit.
\(^\text{73}\) Lakeba School Report, Minutes of the Seventh, op cit.
\(^\text{74}\) Report of the Schools in the Rewa Circuit 1842, Minutes of the Fifth, op cit.
\(^\text{75}\) Lakeba School Report, 1852, Minutes of the Fifteenth, p cit.
Moses Kaulamatoa, Moses Mamafainoa, Joel Ketetha, Thomas Thua, Isaac Ravuata, were teaching in the Lakeba Circuit. In the Viwa Circuit Joshua Mateinaniu, Wesley Lagi, John Kami, Paula Vea, Isaac Bukaneo, Jonah Tonga, Benjamin, Malachi Butuki and in Bua Ezekiel Vonidaku, Lazarus Drala, Abraham Savutaki taught in schools. These teachers were being paid two pounds for a year’s work. Fijian teachers were responsible for the establishment of the station and schools in Bua. In the Nadi circuit, where five schools were operating, John Lupe Enoch, Barnabas Salakiwai, Solomon Radawa and David looked after the schools. They took advantage of the printed New Testament and gave added instruction in hygiene and cleanliness. These teachers also looked after the sixteen schools in the Lakeba Circuit. Malvern held them in high esteem:

These are very useful in promoting a love for Scripture reading among the adults proof of which we have in the avidity with which they purchase our books; and in laying the foundation of the catechetical and Scripture knowledge in the young and the rising generation.77

When the school started at Somosomo, it consisted mostly of Tongans, but their voyaging habits made their attention and attendance irregular. Lyth observed that the young Fijians in Cakaudrove were not only keen scholars but also regular in their attendance. In 1842, he reported that most of their scholars were Tongans, whom he taught to read in their own language. Even some Uveans or Wallis Islanders joined the school at Somosomo. Lyth also instituted a Sunday School at Somosomo, where the Tongans and the Wallis Islanders attended before their departure to their home island. By 1843, there was a Day School, conducted for three days a week, and a Sunday school at Somosomo.

76 Minutes of the Eleventh, F. D. M. M. R.
77 Lakeba School Report 1851, Minutes of the Thirteenth, op cit.
78 Report of the Sunday and Week Day Schools in the Somosomo Circuit for 1841, Minutes of the Fourth, op cit.
Bau and Bua reformed the education policy when they advanced their circuit policies in 1848. At Viwa, the infant school became popular, mixing instruction with amusement under missionary supervision. There was a major overhaul in the curriculum. Lyth reported that:

In addition to being regularly catechised, they are taught the elementary of reading, geography, arithmetic and a few common words and sentences in English. Of course the instructions given at present is purely elementary, but we trust it will be the foundation of something higher. We intend to extend the plan adopted at Vewa through the whole Circuit as soon as possible. 79

By 1851, every village in the Viwa circuit had a school. 80 The infant school at Levuka was revived to educate the European children and a teacher from Vewa was appointed to manage it. Only on the island of Viwa itself, three schools operated, namely the Boys, Women’s and the Men’s School. John Watsford supervised the teachers at six o’clock in the morning, with readings from Hunt’s System of Theology. 81 The Bua schools benefited from the printing of the complete New Testament in 1847. Bua became a separate circuit in 1848 and in 1851, a war, called the Veisere ko Bua, divided the matanitu. The chiefs of Bua fought with each other, resulting in neglect of schools. Williams told the District Meeting that they

cannot report so satisfactorily on our Schools as we wish. Three of them have been nearly given up in consequence of war, and the operations of a fourth have been neutralised by the scattering abroad of several of the scholars. The schools, directly under the care of the Missionary, have generally been well attended. The informal school has received an addition of several children from the Dama district, who have been sent to Televa to avoid the danger of war. For a time their rough habits had an ill effect on those children who had been longer under training; they are, however, on the improve. 82

79 The Vewa Circuit School Report for 1848, Minutes of the Eleventh, op cit.
80 Vewa School Report for 1851, Minutes of the Thirteenth, op cit.
81 School Report, Vewa Circuit, 1852, Minutes of the Fifteenth, op cit.
82 School Report, Bua, 1851, Minutes of the Thirteenth, op cit.
Williams reported further frustration with the custom of smoking tobacco. In Bua, this custom was as prevalent amongst children as amongst adults. Being convinced of the ill effects of this practice, the missionaries had endeavoured to stop it, but with limited success. Williams identified other problems in Bua, first, the unreliability of native teachers, and the absence of ‘judicious discipline’ from the scholars’ families. Pupils at Bua threw the slates and pencils away once they knew how to write. Williams complained that

the state of society in this Circuit is not sufficiently advanced to supply a motive for attaining proficiency in writing. Arithmetic except as such to have the prospect of being employed as teachers. So that most of our youth lay aside the pencil and slate, when they have succeeded in writing words, and the novelty of so doing has passed away. Yet we encouraged to struggle on, for often when, with some of the old & obstinate in view of our hope of being useful, has bordered on despair, it has been called back and strengthened by a recollection of the striplings & infants taught in our schools.

Apart from the Day Schools, the Nadi circuit operated two classes on theology to cater for their supply of teachers. The classes met twice a week and Hunt’s System of Theology was read systematically. The students were also questioned on what they read from Hunt’s work. The Children’s School at Nadi progressed well, especially in reading.

The missionaries were in charge of the education system until 1852, when William Collis and John Binner, qualified school head masters, arrived to look after the education ministry of the Wesleyan mission. They introduced the Glasgow system of education in the Wesleyan schools at Lakeba, Levuka and then at Bau.
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At the centre of the Wesleyans’ education program was the training of the ordained ministry through the Theological Institute. Elite and secluded, the Institute emerged as the brain of Fijian Wesleyanism and became the most influential ministry to affect the institutions of Fijian identity. The Institute allowed unfettered inquiries into the territories between Christian and non-Christian and sacred and secular and encouraged the investigation of Fijian customs, mentality and history. The reason for this was the influence of Hoxton’s Theology and Classics curriculum component becoming the concept behind the ordained ministry’s education. This background led them to look at Fijian customs and laws from a rational point of view. It was not syncretism, for the Instructions to Missionaries had provisions for this sort of interpretation of native cultural values. As an example, they first used the term *lewe ni soro* to identify those Fijians who had shown serious interest in becoming Christian. The term, from Kadavu, originally meant those who congregate in the sanctuary to witness the priest while performing his sacred duties. The Institute harmonised the introduction of Christian values into the Fijian society through its students. In fact the future of the Wesleyan mission in Fiji depended on the establishment of the Institute.

The Feejee Islands Wesleyan Academy for the Training of Native Teachers, or the Theological Institute as it was later called, developed and kept up the educational traditions of Hoxton. This educational tradition maintained the balance between pietism and rationalism, and theology and classics and was specifically termed as practical divinity. This divinity encourages the use of human faculties in religious living and practices. Prioritising the education of the ordained ministry, the Wesleyans drew a recruitment and

---
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education plan tailored according to the Hoxton tradition. They could not just depend on a group of men whose original background had been sailing and fishing to establish the Christian faith in major political centers. The Institute recruits had a sincere resolve to join the ordained ministry, for they were middle-aged and married. But the work ahead of them impelled the District Meeting to set up a compulsory education system for the native auxiliaries. Relying on the prevailing enthusiasm, the District Meeting knew that finding student recruits would be a matter of choice. Adding the attraction of studying in a school superior to the day school there would still be an excess of annual probable candidates. Furthermore, the students felt an imperative urge to enter the ordained ministry. It was up to the circuit superintendents to screen these probable candidates thoroughly, searching their inner hearts, to determine rationally through oral and written examination, the truth of the candidates volunteering for the ordained ministry.

The District Meeting officially resolved to set up the Institute in 1841. The constitution of the Institute drawn on the decks of the mission ship Triton, anchored at Somosomo bay:

1. That there be an Institution for the training of Native Assistant Missionaries to be called the Feejee Islands Wesleyan Academy for the Training of Native Assistant Missionaries.
2. That the Academy for this purpose be at Lakemba.
3. That the Candidates be placed under the superintendence of the Rev. John Hunt who shall instruct them in the great principles of the Wesleyan Theology as embodied in our standard works, and also in the English Language, Geography, Writing and other branches of useful knowledge.
4. That Mr. Calvert be requested to apply to the King of Lakemba for such a portion of land for their cultivation, as may be needful for their support while under instruction.
5. That a suitable building be erected on the Mission premises for the purpose of the Academy, the cost not more than Five Pounds in the Barter from the Mission Store, and that the Rev. Thomas Williams be requested to superintend its erection.

Minutes of the Fourth, F. D. M. M. R.
6. That the Candidates be selected from the list of local preachers on the different stations in Feejee and carefully examined by the Missionaries as to their conversion to God, present state of Christian experience acquaintance with the Sacred Scriptures, views of our doctrines, attachment to our discipline, ability to communicate what they know, and willingness to go to any land to which God and his church may appoint.

7. That every Superintendent shall furnish a character in writing of each person he recommends, and shall hold himself responsible to the District Meeting for the character so sent, and that it be entered into the Journal of the Academy after the manner of entry in the Conference Journal.

8. That the Preacher on the Station visit the Academy at least once a month and assist in any other way Mr. Hunt may "desire". That in each visit they shall make an entry in the Journal respecting the progress of the Candidates, to which they shall add their signatures; and that the said Journal with the a written report shall be presented at each District Meeting, which Report shall be regularly favourable to the Committee.

9. That the Missionaries in regular rotation be required to hear the candidates preach at least once a fortnight, and report on the sermons at the weekly Meeting of the Missionaries.

10. As the Candidates are to be taught in English for the purpose of giving them ability to read books on Divinity &c that a library of English books be provided.

11. That the Committee be respectfully requested to use their influence with the friends at home, to approve a supply of slates, pencils, pens, and useful elementary books for the use of the Candidates. A pair of Globes is also exceedingly desirable to give them a correct idea of the shape of the earth.

12. That ordinarily none be received into the Institution under the age of 20 or above 30

13. That in the event of Brother Hunt finding any incapable of learning irregular in their habits &c, he shall report the case to the Preachers on the Station, who shall decide upon the case.

14. That the Committee be respectfully requested to allow an Annual Grant of not less than 20 pounds in support of the said Academy.

15. That the time of the Candidature remaining in the Academy be determined from time to time by the Annual District Meeting.

16. That every Candidature hearing satisfactorily passed the above training, shall be allowed when employed on any Station a sum not less than 10 pounds a year for himself and family.

17. That the District Meeting shall from time to time examine the Candidates any of whom they may deem eligible to be immediately employed, stating their age, whatever married, if married the character of the wife, their personal experience, qualification for the work, and the terms on which they are willing to be employed.

18. That the Committee be respectfully requested to forward their judgment on the above Resolutions without delay.
The original plan was to build the Institute at Lakeba, with those four selected students required by the District Meeting. This did not happen and Hunt began with the teachers who were with him in Cakaudrove. These teachers were Josua Mateinaniu, Mosese Kaulamatoa, Jone Kami, Jone Mahe, Ilaijia Ta’aga, Pita Solo, Potuihuo and Tevita Afu. Classes began at Nasima, Yavalanavanua’s residence, that Lyth and Hunt were occupying.

Hunt brought the Institution with him to Viwa in September 1842, where he began classes with his teachers. The 1843 report said that

Four persons have had the benefit of Instruction in the Institution during this year, but only two have been considered as regular Students. The course of Instruction has comprised Lectures on the most important subjects of Theology. The students have passed a careful examination with great credit to themselves & their Tutor. The students had given some attention to the English Language and they are able to read with tolerable correctness, some portions of the New Testament. It is feared that but little will be accomplished in this department of their studies. In the coming year, Geography, Arithmetic, the Use of the Globes &c will be taught. 89

The following year, an additional student joined the four second-year students. The students’ pietism and zeal were emphasised in the 1844 report to the District Meeting, together with his eagerness ‘to be useful to their countrymen’. 90 In the context of the Wesleyan mission as a whole, the superintendent was persuaded that the ‘Institution, however humble its pretensions may be at present, is calculated to be a very useful auxiliary in the promoting the cause of God in these islands’. 91 Hunt had been using his Forty-Three Short Sermons, or Vunau Lekaleka, as the standard text of theology. As reported to the District Meeting the year before, Geography, Arithmetic and the Use of the Globe were also taught in 1844.
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The Academy's intakes were both students and candidates for the ordained ministry. As students, they were to be free to learn and explore intellectually, but as candidates, they were to be supervised in their growth in Methodist piety, zeal and practical divinity. Candidates were selected from a list of local preachers from stations around Fiji. The procedure of selection was rigid. Candidature depended on the judgement of the Superintendent missionary, based on the proven zeal of the native teachers.

Coinciding with his wishes as useful auxiliary to the Wesleyan mission, Hunt further suggested to the District Meeting that other circuits establish their own Institution branches. These branches would form feeder schools from where the cream would be selected to enter the Institute for advanced theological training. This suggestion was not taken seriously until the 1860s when some circuit primary theological schools, called circuit schools, emerged.

The complete translation of the Fijian Old Testament was published in 1853, and the New Testament six years earlier. This was something that had to be taken seriously for Fijians had been reading, meditating and learning the history of the Hebrews well before cession. By 1853, the Bauan dialect had become the Wesleyans' liturgical and education dialect in Fiji. Wesleyan stations had been established in Bau, Rewa, Somosomo, Bua, Lakeba, Nadroga, Ba, Ra, Naitasiri, Macuata and Kadavu. Through the Institute, the Wesleyans began addressing the subjects of custom and mythology. The problem I am discussing in this thesis lay in the relationship between the turaga bale and mythology, which the Wesleyans, through their Classical studies in Hoxton, helped to fashion. Ancient customs needed the turaga bale to be relevant. But the turaga bale institution had to be legitimised by mythology. This was where, I argue, the Wesleyans influenced how natives claimed
land through the NLC. The natives responded to the land question by first legitimizing the *turaga bale* institution through mythology. The Wesleyans had formed a tradition in which they developed a new comparative mythology, beginning from John Hunt and Thomas Williams’ Classical education received at Hoxton.

I have discussed the Wesleyans’ development of education and literature from 1835 to 1853 in this Chapter, leaving out a major portion of this subject. The Wesleyans continued managing their village schools until 1937 before ceding them all to the colonial government. They closed their teacher Training Institute at Davuilevu but kept their secondary schools. My intention has been to demonstrate how the Wesleyans reinforced the hierarchical unity within the *turaga bale* institution through their education and literature programs during Tanoa’s reign. Apart from the Bauan dialect being the official dialect, for liturgy and education, the Wesleyans had another profound influence on Bau’s ascendancy and the *turaga bale* institution through their interest in Classics.
Chapter 5

Degei is the greatest vu in Fiji

The interaction between the Wesleyan education and literature program and the turaga bale took place at the forefront of mission history in Fiji. But in the background was another influence of equal significance in the formation of the institutions of Fijian identity. This influence from their own education inclined the Wesleyans to apply their studies in Classics to model a comparative Fijian mythology from existing loose strands of legends floating around the various matanitu. Unlike my previous analysis of the impact of education and literature, which was restricted to Tanoa’s reign, this Chapter will take into account the Wesleyan involvement in mythology from Hunt and Koroivugona’s 1845 account up to Rokowaqa’s 1927 pamphlet.

The subject of this Chapter is Degei’s supremacy, focusing on how the Wesleyans modelled a comparative Fijian mythology using examples from the classical world. Degei was a Fijian deity whose sanctuary could be found at Nakauvadra in the district of Rakiraki in northern Viti Levu. I will discuss in this Chapter how the Wesleyans elevated Degei’s position in the pantheistic hierarchy to increase the moral authority of the turaga bale and Bau’s ascendency. I argue that as a result of the influence of Samuel Jones’ Classics, Wesleyanism coalesced with the primary institutions of Fijian identity in an area where the kalou ni valu was supposed to prove its purpose. The kalou ni valu’s influence on the political system gradually declined until it became totally irrelevant.
The problem was how could mythology justify the ascendency of Bau and the establishment of the *turaga bale* institution. To solve it, the reconstruction of mythology in such a way that it legitimised the ruling authority was a political necessity. Mythology became a political problem when the Vunivalu dynasty fought its way through Fijian politics, resulting in the ascendency of Bau and the establishment of the *turaga bale* before Tanoa's death. Bau's ascendency and the *turaga bale* faced the moral problem of not being justified by pantheistic mythology to assume political precedence over all the *qali, matanitu* and *vanua* in Fiji. Actually, mythology was not structured to justify the establishment of the Bauan *turaga bale* institution, but Verata's political supremacy. The answer to this problem, I argue, lay in the Wesleyans' comparative mythology, especially in how they elevated Degei's supremacy in the pantheistic hierarchy by shifting the emphasis away from Waituruturu to Nakauvadra as the central shrine of Fijian mythology.

Politics and Classics combined to curb the authority of the Verata oriented mythology. The redirection of mythology was an area where the Wesleyans had a huge influence on the institutions of Fijian identity. I will examine the works of the missionaries who worked in the Theological Institute, and those of some of the Institute's students, especially Noa Koroivugona, Joeli Nau, Ratu Joni Madraiwiwi and Epeli Rokowaqa. Madraiwiwi was Sukuna's father, and I argue that through him, the Wesleyan comparative mythology influenced the N. L. C.'s work, when Sukuna restructured the *Tukutuku Raraba* to justify the *turaga bale* institution through the supremacy of Degei at Nakauvadra.

The Wesleyans' Classical influence on the institutions of Fijian identity was rooted in the Classical component of the courses taught at Hoxton and Richmond Theological Institute for Wesleyan missionaries in England. The Theological Academy at Hoxton
was established at a period when the relationship between the Wesleyan Methodist Conference and the Missionary Society was uncertain. The 1834 Conference, which was chaired by Joseph Taylor, set up a Committee to draw up a proposal regarding this institution.  

The Conference bought a property at Hoxton as the site of the new institute and appointed three senior preachers to look after the school. Rev. John Hannah was appointed to look after the Theology Department and Rev. Joseph Entwhistle was entrusted with the students' spiritual life. Their spiritual life was a concern of the Conference, which did not want this new educational program to be a means of losing the Methodist zeal for religion. In order to balance theology and piety, classics were introduced. The first to take the post of lecturer in Classics in 1834 was Samuel Jones, an Irish Methodist and graduate of the Classics program at Dublin University.  

Jones had studied at Trinity College, Dublin University, which had its own rigorous classics program. The Wesleyan Methodist Conference recognised his talents and appointed him to take care of Classics and Mathematics when it set up the theological Institute for Young Preachers at Hoxton.

The Institute did not win the total support of the Conference. Wesleyan Methodist dissenters like Isaac Taylor and Josiah Conder opposed the idea. Worse still, antagonistic articles were published in periodicals like the Congregational Magazine.  

---


One minister, Dr. Samuel Warren of First Manchester Church and a graduate of a Scottish University, opposed the scheme. He was frustrated because his nominee for the post of Superintendent was not accepted. He stopped money from his circuit being sent to fund the establishment of the Institute and for that, the Conference suspended him. He took the matter to court unsuccessfully. 5

Hoxton was set up to address a number of issues within the Wesleyan movement. The first was the unity of the numerous societies in Britain and Ireland. These societies were bound to the Conference through the connexional government. There were other types of church government, popular with the Congregational churches, where each local church or society could form its own government. The formation of the Wesleyan Conference in 1784 required the support of the societies so that the connexion could function and the need to unite the societies under the Conference made training vital. The preachers who led the societies had to be trained and for that reason, the 1833 Conference decided to establish a theological institute. Secondly, the Conference identified the need for a trained ordained ministry. Most of the senior ministers in 1834 had university education. The training of the new and emerging preachers also had to ensure that the Methodist evangelical zeal was not lost. The graduates had to stand the demands of the ministry that awaited them after they were ordained. Some members of the Conference wanted the college to retain religious sensibility and discourage vanity in the minds of the students. The concern for rational pietism in the context of religious enthusiasm led to the introduction of Classics as an academic discipline, to be taught beside Theology. Thomas Jackson, who replaced Dr. John Hannah, became a tutor in 1842, the year the Wesleyan Theological Institution was divided. The Southern Branch

5 T. Jackson, Recollections, p. 274.
was built at Richmond. Jackson was responsible for the theological training and Rev. John Farr looked after Classics and Mathematics. Later in 1857, Farr left the academy for circuit work. Jackson designed the curriculum, the two major components of which had been dictated by the Conference. They were Classics and Theology. Classics included Latin, Greek, Hebrew, English Language, Logic, Natural and Moral Philosophy and Mathematics; and Theology covered Lectures on Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion, Doctrines, Duties, and the Institution of Christianity, the Pastoral Office and Work.

Both curriculum components at Hoxton and Richmond had a profound impact in the conception of Fijian Wesleyanism. Theology contributed to the emergence of Fijian Christian spirituality and divinity while Classics rejuvenated the political institutions. Fijian Christian spirituality is another important area for further studies, which I do not have the scope to cover here. It includes liturgy, doctrines, theology, practices, music and art. These are the more obvious themes in Fijian Wesleyan mission history. By comparison, the influence of Classics on missionary practices seemed an inconspicuous theme for research but I took it up.

From a historical point of view, studying the influence of Classics on missionary practice in Fiji, especially on how the Wesleyans used it to interpret Fijian history, does not pose any risk to Christian doctrine. The missionaries themselves made the difference between what is orthodox Christian doctrine and heresy in the data they collected. Christian conversion was an enriching and fulfilling experience based on Christian doctrines. The Wesleyans condemned those Fijian customs that promoted the
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outright deprivation of humanity, calling it *butobuto* or darkness as against *rarama* or light. I argue that these customs of human sacrifices belonged to the religious system where the *kalou ni valu* were worshiped. But, beside the *kalou ni valu*, another pantheistic system existed and this one became subjected to those Wesleyans who were trained in Classics.

Their caution on this issue brought them closer to the *turaga bale* institution, for this particular pantheistic system had been a problem for the political institution. To align themselves favourably with the political authority that had provided them with patrons, the Wesleyans modelled a Fijian comparative mythology using examples from the classical world they studied in Hoxton and Richmond. In this new model, Degei, at Nakauvadra, became the greatest *kalou vu*, or religious and political patriarch in Fiji.

John Hunt's interest in Fijian history resulted in the classical model that elevated Degei to the position of the greatest *vu* in Fiji. He was at that time holding three vital offices for the Wesleyan mission, namely as Chairman of the Fiji District, Chairman of the Language and Translation Department and Superintendent of the Theological Institute. From those offices, Hunt’s historical and classical interest in Fijian history led to the systematic development of the Nakauvadra tradition. As the Institute’s Superintendent, he had to build a resource on the Fijian society for mission purposes. As Chairman of the District Meeting, he wanted to see a Fijian, not an English, church emerge in Fiji; and, as Chairman of the Language and Translation Committee, he had to offer his readers quality Fijian literature. Before he came to Fiji, Hunt was one of the first students who entered Hoxton, having studied with Hannah, Entwhistle and Jones before coming to Fiji in 1838. He was stationed at Lakeba, Rewa, Cakaudrove and finally at Viwa, where he was closer to Tanoa and Cakobau, from 1842 until his death in October.
1848. He was the first Hoxton graduate in Fiji, arriving ahead of Calvert, Jaggar and Williams.

The turaga bale guided Hunt to think as a Fijian. He became involved as a historical participant and the effect of participating in Bauan daily life was reflected in his thoughts and expressions. As reflected at the beginning of his diary, the charisma of Lincolnshire Methodism and Rev. Joseph Entwistle's pastoral philosophies were conspicuous, portraying the charismatic Hunt against the background of the most challenging Wesleyan mission district in the world. However, in the last three years of his career in Viwa, dramatic subject changes appeared in his writing. He began to draw similarities between Fijian history and with classical examples. In doing so, he extended the boundaries of the Wesleyan philosophy of the mission, which stated that people were to be accepted and converted within their cultural context, into new depths and areas of Fijian society. From Hunt's point of view, only the church could deliver political survival. His chance to extend his inquiries into their history and origins came after he had consolidated his ministry at Viwa. In 1845, he sailed on the Lago Levu, Varani's canoe, to visits his out-stations in Bua and Nakorotubu, where he found and recorded the story of Nakauvadra. Hunt heard the central text of Fijian history from Noa Koroivugona, a former student at the Institute now stationed as a teacher at Kavula. The legend, titled, Fijian Traditions of a flood supposed by some to be Noah's flood, said that Tui Nakauvadra, one of Degei's sons, had a daughter called Naivilawasa. She conceived twins when a chip hit her elbow. The twins,
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Nacirinakaumoli and Nakausabaria, shot Degei's pet rooster, Turukawa, which was the cause of the civil war amongst that chiefs at Nakauvadra. Degei, according to the legend, made rain to fall, submerging and flooding the twin's fortress at Narauyaba. The rebels left their fort and traveled downstream, into Naitasiri and Rewa.

Hunt later went to Rakiraki to visit a chief who had decided to become a Christian in January 1846. On the way to that particular chief's village, he said that 'the path reminded me of home, and to a person a little acquainted with Fijian mythology, the scenery was quite classical'. He also heard the story about the 'mast of a canoe, which was raised at Naicobocobo in Bua and fell on the mountain at Rakiraki, and another at Savai, forty miles off and the other I know not how far'. He asked where Degei's cave was but was told that only the priest knew its location. Some natives pointed out the flood barrier at Rakiraki, a 'mountain which Degei threw across this part of the land to prevent the waters of the flood from flowing in the direction of Rakiraki'. He treasured the legend as a new discovery that satisfied his quest for Fijian origins and history. His fascination for Classics seduced him to compose a poem out of the legend.

```
I'll try, I mean no harm, I'll only try,
Pointing his arrow as he fix'd his eye.
His brother strikes his hand, the arrow flies,
And prostrate at their feet old Turukawa lies.

Stretch'd on the fatal ground, upon his back,
They see the deadly arrow's fatal track;
His entrails all turn out, his flowing blood
Stain the white sand and dyes the ocean-flood.

'This is no common bird', one faintly said.
'His glaring eyes retain their crimson red.
His sacred legs, with many a cowry bound,
Crash'd as the monster fell upon the ground.

My brother, can it be? Is this the bird
Whose office long has been to wake the god,
```
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Since Hunt was describing a war involving gods, the type of language used in these verses was similar to those of classical Greek poems. He was not alone in his involvement in mythology for Thomas Williams, his colleague and former student of Richmond, was also investigating the same topic.

Williams did not have the luxury of association with Ra, though he was much nearer to it than Hunt. He observed that:

Each island has its own gods, each locality has its own superstition and each individual has his own modification of both. Yet, amidst all this confusion, there may be traced certain main tracks of beliefs, appearing again and again from among the undefined legends – wild, or puerile, or filthy – in which they are often lost. In these, without being over fanciful, there may be found some points of interest in the study of comparative mythology.\(^\text{17}\)

On 29 August 1848, a group from Rakiraki visited Williams at his house in Bua. He made enthusiastic inquiries about Degei to his visitors, but they evaded his questions:

I inquired about Degei, and found they were resident on that part of the land where his cave is situated. I made many inquiries. They were shy except one man who answered readily; but I soon saw it was to prevent others answering correctly. Believing him to be a priest, I close in on him, but he would not stand fire [my questions].\(^\text{18}\)

He cited Degei as the head of the Fijian pantheon, describing him as 'an impersonation of the abstract idea of eternal existence and reminds one of Cronos of the Grecian
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mythology'. 19 Williams classified Fijian deity, kalou, into two, the kalou vu and kalou yalo. To him the kalou vu were ‘deified mortals like the daemons of Greece’. 20 Williams worked with Calvert on the two-volume work Fiji and the Fijians. These two volumes, when placed side by side by side, were works on Theology and Classics.

From Williams’ discussion, it was clear that by 1865, Degei’s supremacy at Nakauvadra was well established as the doctrine of Fijian comparative mythology. Williams argued that Degei’s supremacy was not recognised at first by all the matanitu. Each had their supreme deity. Williams’ list cited Cagawalu, Rokobatidua, Ligakau, Matawalu, Ra Nabasaga, Waluvakatini of Navunidawaloa, Tunabaga, Daucina, Kubuavanua, Batimona, Ravuravu and Mainatavasara. Degei’s sons, Tokairabe and Tui Lakeba Radinadina, were worshipped at Lakeba in Lau. Rokoua and Rokola were gods of carpenters while the tribes of fishermen worshipped Roko Voua and Vosavakadua. Ratu mai Bulu was the god of agriculture. Williams identified Matawalu, but did not put the emphasis on him as one of the patriarchs of Bau. Apart from Degei, there was Dadavanua who was born from a great stone. Degei’s sister gave birth to Roko Mautu, who emerged as a god and assumed a chiefly appearance. He threatened to devour his mother and friends, unless they acknowledged him as god. Out of all these names, Williams was confident that a comparative mythology could be designed, with Degei at the head.

The legends out of which a comparative mythology was modelled had existed all over the islands. The Wesleyans simply organised these strands of tradition and related those deities to a common sanctuary. They did not conceive the canoe and flood motifs

19 T. Williams, Fiji, p. 217.
20 T. Williams, Fiji, p. 216.
in the origin legends. Hunt accepted the story and blended it with the growing mission depository of Fijian knowledge. Comparing the two traditions he collected from Rakiraki and Kavula, he proved that the Nakauvadra tradition existed before the Wesleyans reached Ra. The existence of the flood and canoe traditions at Rakiraki, preceding the evangelisation of the Rakiraki chief, proved that the tradition was an original Fijian tradition. Later, a Fijian meke, or poem, was composed, now in the pages of the Tukutuku Raraba for the yavusa Vunivalu of Verata.21

The political value of the doctrine of Degei’s supremacy became evident from the attention being given to it from missionaries at Bau. They had favored this doctrine as the answer to the question of political authority Bau had over Verata. In favour of the turaga bale institution, the Wesleyans had confirmed Degei’s supremacy in pantheistic mythology during Tanoa’s reign as Vunivalu. Degei, according to Waterhouse, had three sons, Rokola, Roko Mautu and Naqai. Rokola was the father of the twins, Nakausabaria and Cirikaumoli, with Buivesi as their mother. Degei, signifying his humanity, had a loyal herald, Uto of Namacuku. When Waterhouse came to Bau as resident missionary in 1853, there were enough discussions and studies on this subject for him to conclude that ‘Degei is the supreme god of Fiji’.22 Lyth had noted in 1851 that Bauan mythology included Komaidrekeiselesele, Bativudi, Raico, Korokasa, Butakoivalu, Nabuliqavoka and Daucina.23 These gods were abandoned when Cakobau turned Christian in 1854, and by then the Wesleyans were working on a new comparative mythology.

Even though they did not attend Hoxton or Richmond, both Lyth and Waterhouse, for a
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term, were Superintendents of the Institute. They continued the line of investigation Hunt and Williams took, but concentrated on Bauan mythology. Waterhouse noted two other important gods, Daucina and Ratumaibulu. Daucina was lord of the gods and deity of adulterers. He was a giant of a man and the tallest of the gods. As a child, he would only stop crying when he saw the light of a lamp. His mother tied a lighted bundle of reeds to his forehead to keep him occupied. The affectionate description Waterhouse provided Daucina showed how close he might have been to the people of Soso on the island of Bau. Ratumaibulu, the Ceres of Fiji and Lord of Agriculture, had his residence in Bulu. He normally appeared in December, the holy agricultural month, to bless the land with the fruits from trees. He lived near Bau in the form of a snake.

The Wesleyans tried to understand Fijian religious systems, and under the influence of Classics, studied religion as a scientific subject. Though they had a conceptual confrontation with indigenous religion, they found that the Fijians were familiar with the idea of deity. Hunt observed their shock when they heard of the superstitions of India. He noted that Fijians were 'not idolaters themselves, though they worship false gods; they have no idols'.

Thomas William wrote three chapters on Fijian divinity, dealing with custom, polity and religion. He said that such a subject was 'dark, vague and perplexing' due to its variations, further observing that Fijians believed in the deity as 'the existence of an invisible super human power, controlling or influencing all earthly things'. Hunt and Williams concluded that
to the Fijian, idolatry, in the strict sense of the term, he seems to have never known; for he makes no material representation of his gods, or pay actual worship to the heavenly bodies, the elements or natural objects.
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Waterhouse defined the idea of *kalou* as ‘the silent thing’. It evidently means the invisible cause, the mind of matter, the origin of motion which cannot be comprehended.  

He quoted Cargill, who had said earlier that the Fijians’ ‘...religion is the poisoned source from which these demoralising qualities have been derived. They can find an apology for their inhumanity in the spirit of that religion which tradition and their priests have taught them, and assign a reason for many of their actions by pleading its injunctions’.  

He further concluded that, ‘the Fijians are slave to custom’, citing polygamy, strangling and cannibalism as examples.

There were variations in the missionaries’ records of the Fijian pantheon. These variations were politically oriented, being accounts of the pantheon belonging to the *matanitu* where the data came from. It all came to the Institute, where all information was digested to produce a comprehensive mythology. Former students were stationed in various *vanua, qali* and *matanitu*. The ordained Fijian ministry, trained by the Theological Institute, took over from local priests as mediums of divinity. They took along and taught what they had learnt from the Theological Institute. Degei’s supremacy survived and developed due to the unyielding dualism between the *turaga bale* institution and Wesleyanism as a national Fijian religion. Once Christianity achieved this prestigious status as the religion of the *matanitu*, it did not alienate itself from Degei’s supremacy due to the religious foundation of chiefly rule.

Degei’s supremacy was boosted through the search done by the Language Department for a Fijian term to represent ‘God’ in the vernacular Bible. The word *kalou* was
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adopted to mean God. There was even the intention of using Degei instead of turning the name Jehovah into a Fijian word - Jiova.\textsuperscript{31}

The doctrines of Degei’s supremacy and Bauan ascendancy were entrenched before Waterhouse’s book, \textit{The King and the People of Fiji}, went to the press. In the legend of Qurai that he used, Waterhouse said that this patriarch was sent from Cakaudrove ‘to go and see the race that should become the chief power and government in Fiji’.\textsuperscript{32} He swam past Koro, Ovalau, Verata and finally to Bau. By the time this legend was known around Bau, Cakobau was already into his first decade as Vunivalu. New systems of government were being worked out and political rivalry, except with Ma’afu, had been very much a settled conclusion - Bau was the chief power governing Fiji.

The Fijians’ thoughts on the new comparative mythology became apparent after 1862, after the Theological Institute was transferred to Kadavu and renamed Richmond Theological Institute. Jesse Carey became its Superintendent and continued the search for data on Fijian history from students. Carey came in 1859 and left Fiji at the end of 1875. In the Preface of his poem, \textit{The Kings of the Reefs}, he lamented how the measles epidemic of 1875 wiped away ‘whole Parliaments of wise Nestors, the chief depositories of the nation’s unwritten history and learning’.\textsuperscript{33} Carey offered prizes to entice Fijians to ‘put in writing the knowledge they themselves had, and also that which their friends and the people of their tribes could supply’.\textsuperscript{34} From Carey’s collection,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{31} J. Waterhouse, \textit{The King}, p. 303. The Fijian logic was that if Jehovah and Degei were true gods, then they had to be the same.
  \item \textsuperscript{32} J. Waterhouse, \textit{The King}, p. 17.
  \item \textsuperscript{33} Jesse Carey, \textit{The Kings of the Reefs, A Poem}, The Spectator Publishing Company Ltd, Melbourne, 1891, p. 3. See also MSS in Fijian.
  \item \textsuperscript{34} MSS in Fijian. The contributors were Joeli Nau, Peni, Kolinio Luvuiciva, Paula Ratutini,
\end{itemize}
Joeli Nau’s contribution seemed the most substantial. Nau, a Tongan Native Assistant Missionary, recorded the following account about Degei while stationed at Ono in Kadavu. Nau accentuated Degei supremacy over Tanovo, the original deity of Ono, thus upholding Degei’s supremacy in the pantheistic mythology. Nau showed the shift of Degei’s position in comparative mythology from the establishment of the Institute to 1865. He was, by now, the source of power to the pantheon.

According to Nau, Degei was the supreme god of Fiji. He was dismissed from heaven for presumptuousness, viavia levu, and locked up, in the form of a snake, at a cave in Nakauvadra. It was his custom to distribute his mana to other tevoro, often advising them to fight so that they could have feasts and wealth. Degei had a son called Rokola. Rokola became the father of the twins, Nacirinakaumoli and Nakausabaria. Nau, at this stage in his narrative, recited the legend that Hunt received from Koroivugona at Ra. The twin’s father taught them how to shoot, and they shot Degei’s pet bird, Turukawa. Degei sent Rokodada his herald to inquire into the killing. The herald found that the culprits were Rokola’s sons. Degei punished them, not to be chiefs but carpenters forever, so they could get tired of chopping wood. Degei finally waged war on them but he was unsuccessful. He asked help from Ra and Vunua Levu but they all failed. According to Nau, Degei prayed to heaven for rain, and a single rain-spout like water from a tap continuously streamed from heaven. The divine rain flooded the fortress of Narauyaba and defeated its defenders, who drifted to Rewa and not to Rakiraki. They
struck a mountain at Nagilogilo but Degei sent Uto to tell Rokola to go to Rewa through Naitasiri. Rokola came ashore at Naitasiri and finally to Rewa.

Nau placed the two vu of Kadavu, Tanovu of Ono and Tautaumolau of Nabukelevu, below Degei. Tanovu, said Nau, became a vu by himself but did not have a medium, or vava. He looked around Kadavu and saw that the mountain of Nabukelevu was higher than that of Ono, so he thought of levelling Uluinabukelevu and ferrying it to Ono. While digging, some dirt fell to the ground and awoke Tautaumolau, the tevoro from Nabukelevu. He came outside and saw Tanovo lifting his balewa, yoke, to his shoulders, and running off with a huge basket of earth. Portions of earth fell from his basket. When they hit the sea, Naqiqi came into being. Tanovo ran and Kabaukinavaka and Vanilove fell off, he ran and Niuwaqau and two other islands nearby fell off. He ran further and Vaboa and Galoa dropped off. The same happened with the islands of Vonopia, Naduruwalu, Waya, Veikilaivi, Bala, Vanuatabu, Buabua, Vatulutu, Vunirewa, Nukulevu, Yaba, Bulia, Yaukuve, Yaukuve Levu, Qasipote, Namara, Dravuni and Vanuakula. His basket got lighter and he threw it into the sea, forming the reef at Solo. When he finished, he said, ‘Sa suasua na noda masi na kai Ono’ ‘The Ono people’s native cloth is wet!’ He turned around and chased Tautaumolau back to Nabukelevu. Tautaumolau ran up into Nasakaleka. He ran into a bay, but Tanovo came and drank the bay dry for he was thirsty. Tautaumolau ran and hid behind a rock but Tanovo speared the rock into pieces. He ran as far as Nabukelevu and not knowing where to hide, sat and tama, or saluted, to Tanovo. Tanovo asked, ‘Why did you tama to me? Tautaumolau said ‘Let me live Ratu, so that I will present all Kadavu to you’. True to his words, Tautaumolau ordered feasts on the tevoro of Kadavu to be taken to Tanovo of Ono.
Nau's writing showed how theological students emerged as powerful agents of the Wesleyan comparative mythology. Theology coloured their narratives with Degei portrayed as an angel from heaven who was expelled for being presumptuous. Tanovu and Tautaumolau were no match for this former angel. Degei retained most of his divine nature for he was the source of mana and power. Nau further assumed Degei as a satanic model as described in the Old Testament Book of Genesis. This was a new way of reading mythology, very different from Hunt and Williams' approach towards Degei. The other point was the language of Fijian divinity. Nau used the word tevoro, devil, denoting the Fijian concept of yalo. The word tevoro was not a Fijian transliteration of the word devil, but a transliteration of the Polynesian word tevolo. The other Fijian words like vu, waqa, soro, suqe and sika were fundamental Fijian religious terminologies.

Dabea was also influenced by this search for historical legends. After spending ten years in the Wesleyan mission, Dabea joined the native administration. Dabea also became Ratu Epeli Nailatikau's secretary and a powerful critic of Langham. He was significant in that he supplied the legend of Fijian origin that Thomson published in 1892 and 1895. Dabea had been with the Wesleyan mission for ten years up to 1869 and had studied under Carey. His version of the origin story emphasised the term ciri mai or drift. Since he was ahead of Rokowaqa at the Institute, it showed that a lot of discussion must have taken place on this question before Rokowaqa came to study at Navuloa.

35 J. Carey to L. Fison, 9 February 1869, Letter Book, CY Reel 452 ML B 440, M. L., frame 271. Dabea, of Rukua Beqa, spent five years in Nadroga, one at Noco, one at Davuilevu and one at Nakelo before joining Carey at the Theological Institute in Kadavu.

36 D. Scarr, Viceroy, pp. 40ff.
Lorimer Fison, mentor of the Navuloa students, was a popular thinker on Fiji’s land issues. He was born on the 9 November 1832 in Barningham, Suffolk in England and attended Caius College, Cambridge before coming to Australia in the early fifties, after receiving his first degree. He was converted to Christianity in the Richmond Circuit in Melbourne. In 1864, he went as a missionary to Fiji, first serving at Viwa, Bua and Rewa. He returned to Australia for a short period due to his wife’s ill health and returned in 1875 to Navuloa and Lakeba. Back in Australia, he became the editor of the Spectator from 1888 to 1905. He laid the foundation of Aboriginal Studies with Dr. Howitt. Fison died on 27 November 1907, at 77 years of age, forty of which was spent in the Christian ministry.37

*Tales from Old Fiji* was Fison’s ‘unpretentious contribution to vanishing knowledge’,38 meant to entertain his family and friends. It contained a legend on how Fijians learnt to build canoes. The source of the story was none other than Roko Taliai Tupou. Tui Nayau began saying that ‘Bau was not greatest kingdom in Fiji, as it is now’.39 Degei taught a tribe to be boat builders, with Rokola and Nakausabaria as their leaders. For a time they worked in their canoe yards, until they were tired of it. They questioned the reason they were working, saying, ‘Work is for slaves, but we are chiefs, great and mighty…Come let us kill the dove; and if the Great Serpent be angry, let him be angry. We will fight with him, for we are many and strong, and he is but one, though he be a god’. The carpenters shot the bird and killed it. Degei cried out, ‘Woe to you Rokola and unto you all, O Boat-builders, ungrateful ones, because you have killed my dove!'
Now is your kingdom taken away, and given to the children of Bau. And I will scatter you among all the peoples of Fiji, making you their servants'.

The point in Tui Nayau’s mythology demonstrated what I was arguing all along, that mythology had to moralise the Bauan *tiraga bale* institution. The Bauan political system drew its authority from Degei at the sanctuary at Nakauvadra. The strength of its political supremacy depended on Degei’s supremacy in the pantheistic mythology. The carpenters, said Tui Nayau, built a watertight fence to defy Degei. Degei rebuked them. ‘Build your fences strong. Carry them up to the sky; for a god is your enemy’. Tupou said that Degei threw his club into the sky and caused a great deluge. It flooded the whole country. The *baka* tree on which Turukawa roosted drifted into the sea and formed the island of Vatulele.

Coincidentally, Fison drew his illustrations from well known Biblical family systems to explain the concept of *Kalou Vu, Mataqali* and *Vusa* in his article *Land Tenure in Fiji*. Fison used the Biblical process outlined in the Old Testament Book of Numbers XXVI to clarify the process that took place in Fiji. According to Fison, Jacob and his sons formed *vuvale* and *veitamani*, with the sons, forming the *veitacini*. When sons were born to the *veitacini*, they were collectively called *Vusa Ra Yisireli*. Each of the *veitacini*, for example brother Judah became the head of his *yavusa*, called the *Vusa Ra Judah*, or *ko ira na Juta* as presented in the Fijian Bible. The common origin for both the *yavusa* and the *mataqali* was the *Kalou Vu*. Of the *Vusa Ra Yisireli*, Jacob was the *Kalou Vu* and Joseph *Kalou Vu* of the *Vusa Ra Ephraim*. Abraham, who fathered a number of *Vusa*, would be the *Kalou Vu* of the *tauvu*.

---

40 L. Fison, *Tales*, p. 31f.
42 L. Fison, *Land Tenure*, p. 6f.
The question of the turaga bale’s political authority and succession was in the foreground of the identity issue. The Wesleyans arrived when a new Vunivalu, Tanoa Visawaqa, had regained and continued his father’s dynasty. In the background to this issue was the influence of the Wesleyan missionaries’ upbringing in Classics on the comparative Fijian mythology, whereby a tradition of academic interest came into being in Fiji. Out of this tradition, the loose strands of mythology were reorganised to form a comparative mythology that directly legitimised the ascendancy of Bau and the turaga bale institution. This tradition did not only legitimise the turaga bale institution and Bau’s ascendancy only during Tanoa’s reign, but also continued to guarantee its authority, succession and survival. Though this Wesleyan tradition continued into the early twentieth century, its impact on the institutions of Fijian identity was felt as early as Tanoa’s reign.

Rokowaqa’s background as a villager from the Yatu Mabua and also as a theological student make it interesting to analyse his thoughts to see how Degei replaced Lutunasobasoba as head of the pantheistic hierarchy. Rokowaqa did not participate in Carey’s competition but had studied at Navuloa from 1892 to 1894. His pamphlet, Ai Tukutuku kei Viti, remained the most detailed account of what Fijians accumulated in studying their own history as theological students at Navula. He compiled his stories into thirteen Chapters and published them in the Wesleyan Fijian periodical, Tukutuku Vakalotu. An advertisement for the Tukutuku Vakalotu urged its readers to purchase the periodical for

the information on your historical origins will be released monthly... Make haste and pay for your subscription to the Tukutuku Vakalotu, or you might be late and miss out on knowing about your origins.

---

44 E. Rokowaqa, Ai Tukutuku, p. 2.
Rokowaqa had lots of time to investigate and verify the various strands of legends in Fiji from 1907 to 1925 before he published his work on Fijian history; and he praised Iliai Motonicocoka, Basil Thomson's secretary, as a valuable source.\(^{46}\) In his approach, Rokowaqa used theology, especially Carey, Fison and Lindsay's ideas, to explain his theories on the question of Fijian origin. He began by discussing Vuda and the canoe called the *Kauinitoni*:

> Where is Vuda I am looking for? He said, 'In the second volume of the history book I have said there are two places called Vuda, one here in Fiji and the other in east Africa, close to Madagascar.' I then replied, 'Allow me to have a look at your history book.' After looking at the book, I said, this history book is the same as the ones that Carey wrote at Richmond and Fison at Navula. Carey had said Fiji and Thebe in Egypt had similar customs therefore the Fijian's ancestors were from Thebe. Fison taught that the Madagascan languages were similar to Fijians, using the same words as *buqqu* for grandmother, *upi* for yam and *wai* for water. Vuda was also found on the shores of the Tanganiika, a lake in Africa, likewise Verata, Rewa, Bureta, Batiki and Kabara.\(^{47}\)

He further recalled William Lindsay, the Chairman of the Wesleyan mission, or Qase Levu, saying that 'Fijian ancestors came from Turkishtan to Africa'.\(^{48}\)

Fijians, Egyptians and Madagascans may have similar customs and language, but for the Fijians to originate from the African continent is too romantic for the time being since contemporary research had identified the Malaysian peninsula as the point of departure for those races occupying the Pacific islands. Rokowaqa had over stretched his lessons in theology.

The purpose of Rokowaqa's mythology was to connect the Holy Land, especially the Hebrews, to Fijian history. He structured his Chapter Three in similar fashion to the

---

\(^{46}\) ibid.


Bible, citing a *were kalou*, sacred garden, that was trespassed upon by humans. He classified the *kalou* into two, the *kalou vu* and *kalou loa*, both living before the world came into being. The Fijians were aware of the existence of the *kalou vu*, without seeing him, and he was associated with good. The *kalou loa*, or *tevoro*, was a former angel expelled from heaven to roam the forests on earth. This was a mixture of theological and Fijian expression, roaming the forest was a Fijian concept, expelled from heaven was theological. He claimed a patriarch called Tura was Degei’s father. Tura came from Turkishtan, through Memphis and Thebe, East Africa and Papua New Guinea. These places were linked by sea, hence the need for canoes. Rokowaqa came up with the canoes, *Rogovoka, Kaunitoni, Duiyabaki* and the *Kaunitera*. The first to arrive was the *Rogovoka*. It arrived at Naicobocobo at Bua, carrying Tura, Degei’s father. The second, *Kaunitoni* landed at Vuda, with Lutunasobasoba, Buisavulu, Rokomautu, Tuinayavu, Roko Ratu, Daunisai, Degei, Kiranamoli, Coci Kaisaqere, Kailalo, Waicalanavanua and Sovanatabua, while the third, *Kaunitera*, landed at Moala, bringing Kubuavanua, Ravula, Kolimatua and Delainauluvatu. Origin legends existing in Fiji before the advent of Christianity mentioned the *Kaunitoni* at Nakauvadra and the *Rogovoka* at Naicobocobo. It was now obvious that Rokowaqa had adapted the stories of those canoes to suit his purpose of relating the Fijians to the Holy Land.

Rokowaqa showed how supportive he was to Bau’s ascendancy in his pamphlet. In his Chapter VI, on the investment of traditional titles, he cited an incident where Degei replaced Lutunasobasoba as the priest of the supreme god, similar to Melechizedek in the Old Testament. It was a powerful position, *Bete ni Kalou Vu*, Priest of the Most

High, for it led the *vanua*. Degei replaced Lutunasobasoba for he had authority and
manna, *ni sa qase vosa mana ka kaukauwa*.52 He was Tura’s son anyway.

The doctrine of Degei’s supremacy existed since Hunt in the 1840s and Nau in the
1860s. It was strengthened and standardised through Rokowaqa’s published ideas in
the 1920s. Stories about Degei had existed in Fiji before the Wesleyans arrived; but in
a form that gave them an insignificant role in regard to the political institutions. The
Wesleyans drew on it to replace Lutunasobasoba, the patriarch of Verata, as the head of
the Fijian pantheon. By doing so, the ascendancy of Bau and the *turaga bale* institution
became entrenched in the Fijian political system. Based on Degei’s supremacy, the
Bauan *turaga bale* was finally justified in holding its place of leadership in Fiji.

There is a remarkable difference in the ways the data are presented by those who
studied Classics and those who did not, especially the Fijian theological students. The
Fijian theological students moved the comparative cosmology away from Classical
Greek to the Old Testament. They could not see the logic in the classical world, nor
theirs, but only that in the Old Testament. As a result, they theologised the link
between Vuda and the Holy Land through the canoes *Kaunitoni, Duiyabaki, Rogovoka*
and *Kaunitera*. France has argued that ‘the Kaunitoni legend was born of missionary
parentage and nurtured by the inquiries of the Native Land Commission’.53 But from
this analysis, it was most likely that Dabea and Rokowaqa inserted those ancient canoes
into Fiji’s comparative mythology. They were local Fijian canoes and traditions about
them predated the Wesleyans’ arrival.54

113), p. 113.
Of all these Fijian Wesleyan writings, there was one very different from the rest. It belonged to Madraiwiwi, Sukuna’s father and son of Mara. Madraiwiwi was born at Levuka in 1859; the *Cyclopaedia of Fiji* mentions that he was ‘justly proud’ of Fison’s tuition. He was taught by Waterhouse and Fison at Navuloa and entered the civil service to be a prominent Roko Tui, at Ra and Tailevu.

Madraiwiwi’s work was important for two reasons. First, as Sukuna’s father, his understanding of Fijian mythology formed the foundation of Sukuna’s outlook on Fijian mythology. Sukuna, awed by his father’s rank, could not in anyway refute Madraiwiwi’s mythology and genealogical accounts. Second, even though he did not inherit the Vunivalu title after Cakobau, Madraiwiwi was the most senior Fijian chief after Cakobau’s and Nailatikau’s death at the end of the nineteenth century. For the first two decades of the twentieth century, Madraiwiwi was the most senior in the *turaga bale*. This was the standard custom in the Vunivalu’s household. Children did not disobey their parents. Even though Sukuna was Oxford trained, Madraiwiwi was still his father. He had to toe the line, as evident in his words to his immediate family regarding Madraiwiwi’s papers. Here is a translation:

> You have to be careful of that letter for all in it were sworn under oath at Levuka before my father. It is therefore impossible for me or anybody else here in Moala, to contradict the resolutions of that hearing, which were sworn by those four chiefs of Moala.

From affection meant for his father, he had high regard for Fison. In an unpublished paper, *Notes on Customs Regarding Land*, Sukuna quoted Fison as an ‘eminent

---

55 The *Cyclopaedia of Fiji*, 1907, (Republished by the Fiji Museum, 1984), p. 211.


57 Notes on Hearing regarding the title of Tui Moala. No. 4., J. S. M. P.
authority’ on native customs. 58 It is essential therefore to study Madraiwiwi’s mythology, especially in the way he used it to legitimise and settle the question of who was Tui Moala, which I will do first and then focus of Madraiwiwi’s status in the turaga bale institution.

Madraiwiwi was an authority on Moala’s mythology. He was related to the Tui Moala and on that ground, the ranking chiefs of Moala invited him to chair a meeting to clear the confusion surrounding the selection of candidates to the Tui Moala title. Yana Solevu, Yamani Uluimoala, Seru Laisiasa, Sepesa Koroi Tabaiwalu and Savenaca Uluibau met with Ratu Madraiwiwi at Levuka, where the Tui Cakau, Ratu Joseva Lalabalavu, took the minutes of the hearing. Uluimoala and Uluibau, sometime back, had argued who should lead the tokatoka Qaraniqio and Navutoka. As soon as the meeting opened, Uluibau asked Madraiwiwi, ‘Where is Tui Moala’s batinilovo?’ Madraiwiwi did not reply, but asked Solevu to answer the question. Solevu replied that Navutoka and Turagaulu were batinilovo to Qaraniqio, which was Roko Yamani, or Ravula I’s yavu. After Solevu’s reply, Madraiwiwi then asked them to sign the resolution of the hearing, which Uluibau declined. Reproving Solevu’s opponents, Madraiwiwi said,

As Uluibau did not want to sign, he had to be careful as to where he would be helped in Moala, since you disregarded my decision and word on the hearing today. It was you, Savenca, who asked me to chair this hearing, to be held in Levuka as you requested. After the hearing, I further understand that you knew nothing about Moala, like Solevu. 60

58 J. L. V. Sukuna, ‘Notes on Customs Regarding Land,’ p. 3, J. S. M. P.
59 Note on Hearing, No 5, J. S. M. P.
60 ibid.
Moala became a central mythological focus for the chiefs of Bau, especially between Mara and Cakobau. Madraiwiwi outlined the genealogy of the Moala chiefs, citing Tura, Kubuavanua, Rovarovaivalu and Dakunitanoa as the original patriarchs of Moala. This Tura figure was a later inclusion in Wesleyan mythology, most likely by Fison, otherwise Madraiwiwi might not have related Moala’s mythology to it. Together with Tura, Kubuavanua and his son Rovarovaivalu were recognised at Verata and Bau. Their recognition allied Moala with the apex of the turaga bale institution. Cakobau raised the issue about Moala with Robinson, where, according to him, Ma’afu took it over by force. Cakobau was very fond of Moala for he had had his ritual of vakamasi observed there. It turned Moala into a point of contention between Bau and Lakeba, with Mara and Madraiwiwi identifying them closely to the Moala mythology. Another inclusion, which Sukuna affirmed in 1934, was Rovarovaivalu’s younger brother, Dromunitabua. It left Dakunitanoa as the mythological figure of Moala. A section of the yavusa Tinitini was serving Tui Moala. Radilio led the villages of Keteicake and Nasoki, Rakasaqa the village of Manukuicake and Laginiceva the villages of Nakorovusa and Maloku.

A lot of historical emphasis was placed on the event on installing the Tui Moala. Tui Korovou and Tui Korowaiwai, in their capacity as batilekaleka, were given the masi ni lewa, cloth of authority, to be responsible for the ceremony. They were also to guard the installation grounds to commemorate their heroism in the Natobu war, where provided Ravula and Delailoa their military loyalty and service. Nasau won that war, being led by Kolilevu, Rivasua and Valenivalu. Ravula decided that Nayalelawakalou and Rivasua be the organisers of the ceremony to install the Tui Moala.

---

61 See J. Waterhouse, The King, p. 3.
62 Report of the Hearing, No 1, J. S. M. P.
Madraiwiwi defended Rovarovaivalu against Qarikau as the vu of Moala. He first asked Tabaiwalu, the Tui Nasau, as to who his vu was. Tui Nasau replied, to Madraiwiwi’s disapproval, that it was Qarikau. Again, he asked Solevu for the correct version of the Moala mythology. According to Solevu, Qarikau was not from Moala but from Lovoni in Ovalau. It was Qarikau’s father, Cavaniyali, who came to Moala and married Adi Salote Doleleiburotu, a Nakoroicake lady. Doleleiburotu, Delailoa and Rovasua’s sister, became Qarikau’s mother. She used to bath at the pool in the sea, called Nabukalou, after which she would bath at the fresh water pool called Waidoko. Her scented sandalwood from Bua and also her leba would fill the surrounding beach.

To honour his vasu, Delailoa then gave the title Tui Nasau to Qarikau. This hearing soon became very serious. Madraiwiwi then warned Tabaiwalu not to ‘bring Qarikau up again. If you do so, then look for another island, leave Moala!’ Solevu then continued saying,

I descended from Rovarovaivalu, who lived at Iteni in Delaimoala. Rovarovaivalu had four children, Dakunitanoa, Civiovicovulaca, Bulituivaluvalu and Adi Loanacama. Dakunitanoa married Rokovvati and a twin, Ravula and Lutunakabu, were born to them. Ravula was a sick child and often remained at home, playing the bamboo flute, unlike his brother, who was strong and warrior like. Roko Yamani here descended from Ravula. Dakunitanoa died and our people came down to Diri. Lutunakabu, Ravula’s twin brother, had three children, Delailoa, Rovasua and Salote Doleleiburotu. I, Yana Solevu, descended from Delailoa.

How comparative mythology gave moral authority to the turaga bale institution and Bau’s ascendancy became very clear in Madraiwiwi’s paper. Wesleyan’s comparative mythology placed Kubunavanua, Rovarovaivalu and Dromunitabua on a similar rank to Degei. The patriarchs who occupied Moala were those who won the race that Lutunasobasoba had used to select his replacement. Madraiwiwi had aligned himself

63 ibid.
64 Report on Hearing, No 2, J. S. M. P.
to them. His son, Sukuna, who became the N. L. C. Chairman, also claimed this position. In the tradition of the Vunivalu of Bau’s family, Sukuna remained loyal to his father’s decisions when he conducted the N. L. C. inquiries at Moala. In cross-examining Jeke Vakararawa, Sukuna asked whether Tabaiwalu gave him the letter containing the records of the hearing at Levuka, to which Vakararawa replied in the negative. He further warned Joji, Jeke, Yavenisi and Mosese Buadromo saying,

Do not refer to Nakoroicake, for I have studied the details of the hearing at Levuka Ratu Joni Madraiwiwi sent me while I was in New Zealand. To you Joji, begin with Vasua and do not refer to Yana Solevu for you did not respond to Bau’s declaration of war at Macuata. But Yana has an excellent record, beginning from Rovarovaivalu, Rovasua and Nayalewakalou.  

It was common knowledge that Sukuna never allowed N. L. C. witnesses to quote Rokowaqa’s *Ai Tukutuku kei Viti* while testifying for their yavusa. A probable explanation for this censorship was the peer competition with Fison’s other student, Madraiwiwi.

But Madraiwiwi’s education and service in the colonial government was not the only important feature of his life relevant to this thesis. The blood that ran through his veins was another. This was a political issue for the turaga bale institution when Cakobau died in February 1882. Madraiwiwi worked closely with Tui Cakau on the assumption that he might succeed where his father had failed. He gave his contribution to the Fijian comparative mythology with the noble intention that it would strengthen the turaga bale institution. Again, this Wesleyan involvement in comparative mythology as the authority to give moral authority to a Fijian political institution took place mostly in the background of mission history. The institution of Fijian identity itself, headed by the Vunivalu of Bau, commanded the foreground of the Wesleyans’ mission history in Fiji.
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Chapter 6

Born a Chief! Die a Chief!

The new comparative mythology, which the Wesleyans helped establish in the background to Fiji’s mission history, cushioned the political process of selecting a successor to the Vunivalu office when Tanoa died in 1852. Even though the choice of Vunivalu had been narrowed to Banuve’s immediate family after the 1836 civil war, there were other candidates in the minds of the Bauan chiefs. Religion became the authority of transition as a new generation of turaga bale took control of Fiji after the end of their father’s reign. For Cakobau, there was a very strong Wesleyan connexional government in support. In addition, he retained the institutions of identity that Tanoa and his peers had founded and used both to negotiate a completely new form of the domestic and international political relationship. Wesleyanism, on the other hand, became a prominent factor in Fijian politics, especially when Cakobau was converted to Wesleyanism in 1854, a year after he became the Vunivalu. The Reverend Joseph Waterhouse, first resident missionary on Bau, tried to convince him to introduce a parliamentary government but Cakobau refused this advice. He sternly pointed out that he was born a chief and would die one, hence the title of this Chapter. 1 Theocracy during the kalou ni valu era had dictated his actions, and he knew full well the effects of such a political system on society. He had to keep the two separate; for to be the turaga bale was one thing, Wesleyan another. He was now the Vunivalu, and a Wesleyan, with all the lewa he ever needed to lead Fiji.

1 J. Waterhouse, The King, p. 277.
This subject of this Chapter is the *turaga bale’s lewa vakaturaga*. This *lewa* is a Fijian concept, referring to the *turaga bale’s* decision, mind and word, and born through traditional councils or *bose ni vanua*. As a result of the Wesleyans’ influence on the *turaga bale* institution, the *turaga bale*, beginning with Cakobau, began to use their *lewa* more and more, and the club less and less, to govern Fiji. The *lotu* had taken over the *vanua* and a different type of political *lewa* was needed to confront the new political and religious value system. To address this subject, I will examine how the *turaga bale* tackled their problems and rivalries, in addition to the Christian and colonial conditions, to remain the foundational institution of Fijian identity. This rivalry had a lasting effect, not only on the *lewa*, but also on the very *turaga bale* institution itself. With a new generation of *turaga bale* now ruling the *vanua*, the question of *lewa* was critical when Cakobau, Mara and Enele Ma’afu’otu’itonga dominated the political scene. Authority and succession were certainly critical at Bau after Tanoa’s death and until the eventual hanging of Mara in August 1859. The cession of Fiji to Great Britain and its aftermath saw only Cakobau standing tall, with Ma’afu reduced to a Roko Tui position in the colonial government. Therefore, Cakobau’s influence on the continuation of the institutions of Fijian identity was important, both before and after cession. Cakobau’s conversion to Christianity opened a range of options that would shield the ascendancy of Bau and the *turaga bale* institution from those many potential problems.

The influence of the Wesleyan Methodists on the institutions of Fijian identity had a permanent impact on the *turaga bale’s lewa vakaturaga*. By the time Tanoa died, Christianity had become a powerful determinant of the political environment in Fiji. Bau was confronted with the impact of Christian values on village life and custom. Because of the conversion of the chiefs and the people to Christianity, the *turaga bale’s lewa*, which
was the law of the land, could no longer rely on the club to be used spontaneously and lethally as its executor. Christianity, a religion of love, forgiveness and patience, had replaced the *kalou ni valu*, which had sanctioned these cruelties and killings. For these reasons, a fundamental review had to be done on the *turaga bale*’s *lewa* in order to help the chiefly system keep up with the changes Christianity was introducing into society. It was not only the domestic political developments that called for this review, but also, foreign powers which were taking a political interest in Fiji. The *turaga bale* institution and the ascendancy of Bau, which Degei had authorised, now faced a different set of political problems from the ones Tanoa, Ro Tabaiwalu and Yavalanavua confronted. Cakobau became a Christian after his installation as Vunivalu.

On 26 July 1853, Calvert was standing outside Naulunivuaka House when he heard the shout that Cakobau had drunk the ceremonial cup of *yagona* to invest in him the title of Vunivalu. Calvert was communicating with Cakobau, Tui Cakau, and Koya mai Nadrukuta in his effort to save the lives of those destined to be the *i coi ni magiti*. According to Ravulo, the chief priest of Bau invested Cakobau with the title. At the outset of his reign as Vunivalu, Cakobau used his *lewa* and his faith to face these issues. Becoming a Wesleyan did not mean forfeiting his *lewa*. Maintaining the precedent of being a patron to the Wesleyan mission in Fiji as introduced by Taliai Tupou, Tanoa and Ro Kania, Cakobau allowed Bau to be a missionary station, with a resident missionary appointed to live with him. He had participated in the creation of the patronage system through his service in his father’s political rule and he knew that becoming a patron was not a problem for him but an advantage. It was now a new era, as none of those who
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3 See Ravulo, ‘Kava’ *Transaction of Fijian Society*, 1911; and also Deve Toganivalu, ‘The Customs
created the patronage doctrine, except Tui Nayau, who himself became a Christian in September 1849, lived to see Cakobau convert to Christianity. As for the Wesleyans, they saw their mission’s future in Cakobau’s selection as the new Vunivalu of Bau. They had unsuccessfully tried earlier to convince him to become a Christian, but he would not dare cross the turaga bale’s lewa. This lewa regulated the Vunivalu’s family customs, restricting him to decide anything for himself while the Vunivalu, Tanoa, was still alive. If other turaga bale honoured his father through procrastination, then why should not he, a son, do more than they? That was the major reason for his procrastination. Yet, although he refrained from conversion, Cakobau could not resist the attractions of Christianity. He allowed his wife, Adi Samanunu, two sons, Nailatikau and Tavanavanua, and a daughter, Kakua, to attend church services and, later, classes for reading and writing. After his father’s death, Cakobau finally decided to become a Christian.

Wesleyanism introduced Cakobau to a new rule of law. It bridged the turaga bale institution and the new rule of law. Six months after converting to Christianity, Cakobau was looking at alternative forms of government for Bau. As the executive authority of the matanitu of Bau, he was free to decide what type of reforms he could introduce. In October 1853, Joseph Waterhouse, the resident Wesleyan missionary, proposed a constitutional government. This was Waterhouse’s constitution, drafted in October 1854.

‘Having embraced Christianity, and being desirous of elevating our country, we the King and the Chiefs of Bau, do hereby agree:-
1. To take no revenge for past offences amongst ourselves or kindred.
2. To forbid within our dominions strangling, cannibalism, and internal war.
3. To engage in no war without the consent of the majority of the Chiefs in council assembled. We will endure all the insults that the enemy of Bau before the Advent of Christianity,’ Transaction of the Fijian Society, 9 December 1911.
can devise against us by mischievous talking and boasting; and will no longer engage in war on account of woman.

4. To condemn, by our example, the practice of polygamy, which is so injurious to our land.

5. To tolerate every religion within our dominions so long as our just laws are respected by its professors; and we will not allow any Protestant, Roman Catholic, or Heathen to be persecuted on account of his faith.

6. To abolish the title and rank of Vunivalu, and substitute that of King, to commemorate the establishment of this improved order of government. The King shall be aided in the government by the Chiefs, who shall meet monthly for the purposes of deliberation, and whose conference may be continued day after day, until prorogued by the King.

7. To allow for every accused Chief belonging to the said Assembly a trial before his assembled peers: those of inferior rank to be tried by the King, or by his deputy-judge.

8. To allow every Chief of this assembly to be a magistrate ex-officio, to dispose of minor offences.

9. To allow to every town and district the right of appeal to this assembly, in the event of an improper or extortionate tribute having been imposed upon it; and the assembly shall judge righteously in all such cases.  

Waterhouse was a good missionary, but a poor political strategist. As soon as Cakobau saw the proposal, he rejected it outright saying, ‘I was born a Chief and I will die a Chief!’

The question remained whether Waterhouse initiated those reforms or was he invited to make suggestions. Did he take advantage of Cakobau’s conversion, thinking that he would submit easily to his thoughts as resident missionary? Unlike Cross, Waterhouse failed to acknowledge the necessary protocol in relating to the turaga bale.

For a number of obvious reasons, Cakobau did not agree with Waterhouse’s political proposal. Take Article 6 for instance, regarding the abolition of the title and office of Vunivalu and replacing it with that of King. In the Bauan political context, these were two different offices. The abolition of the Vunivalu title was not only irrational but also
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impossible. It was illogical because the Vunivalu title was very ancient, older than Cakobau himself. It was Cakobau’s duty to inherit the title, which belonged to the *matanitu* of Bau. Once abolished, the various subordinate titles with their related duties and customs would be confused in their function. Another reason why this proposal was weak was the presence of Mara. To abolish the title would only provoke those factions that did not agree with Cakobau’s investiture as Vunivalu. If Cakobau abolished the title, it could also be interpreted as abdication, which played into the hands of opponents. Waterhouse probably did not understand that the Tui Kaba brothers were taking up arms to secure the title Vunivalu, the title he was trying to abolish.

Cakobau was recognised and respected by the *turaga bale* institution as the most powerful chief in Fiji. He did not need a new coronation to be King. The title Tui Viti was related to the Wesleyan connexional government. That was enough to assert that Viti, a collective identity for Fijians of all *matanitu*, came into being through the Wesleyan connexional government. Viti was the confederation of the major *matanitu*, Rewa, Cakaudrove, Bua, Macuata and Lau. Viti eventuated only when these *matanitu* were assembled, which they were doing through the Wesleyan connexional government. The Vunivalu was the patron governor of the Wesleyan connexional government. On this basis, he was Tui Viti. If Waterhouse’s proposed King was the Wesleyan connexional Tui Viti, then either he did not understand the ancient title or he wanted to be the Chairman of the Fiji District.

Even though Cakobau rejected the proposed constitution, he was interested in the idea of Bau being governed by laws. He wanted a better legal system to govern Bau. Each *turaga bale* was the sovereign of his *matanitu*, with its own customs and dialects. Articles 1 to 4, aimed at reforming customs and traditions, reflected the pacifist and progressive ideals of a
Christian state. Waterhouse wanted Christianity to be the unifying principle and law, but Cakobau thought otherwise. Declining Waterhouse's proposal did not mean rejecting the whole concept of parliamentary rule, but only for the fact that he did not need to be told how to govern Bau in his capacity as the Vunivalu of Bau. He saw his conversion to Christianity as an event of his own initiative and political decisions would also come from his motives. His life under his father's rule had been one of obedience and service. The sacredness and dignity of the title must not be sacrificed by submitting it to a political direction proposed by someone who may never have had the experience in that particular field. From this angle, Cakobau told Waterhouse that he was born a chief and would die a chief. It was a concise warning to leave him alone with his matanitu.

However, there is evidence after his conversion that Cakobau, in fact, formed a parliament, which also served as a court. According to Waterhouse's suggestion, parliament was to be called 'Chief in Council Assembled'. This parliament had three major functions, first, as in Article 3, to sanction war, secondly, in Article 6, to improve the order of government and finally, in Article 7, to form a judicial system. There was to be a Supreme Court, where all the Chiefs of the Assembly were to be the judge of their own accused peers and a Common Court, where the Christian King was to judge all other citizens. The constitution also enforced religious tolerance in Article 5. Waterhouse's ideas might have been honourable, but Cakobau would not submit himself to this political proposition. After his conversion and the battle of Kaba, he organised his chiefs under the matanitu of Bau. He set up a military court based on Christian principles where he judged, and hanged, criminals at Bau. In two cases, a chief at Batiki was hanged for killing another rival chief.

---

6 ibid.
and a Bauan chief who killed his wife also faced the wrath of Cakobau’s court. Cakobau used the Biblical Ten Commandments as his law, and Waterhouse as counsellor. He even stopped such practices as the strangling of women on the death of husbands and the cutting of fingers as a sign of mourning. Further, all the prominent Bauan chiefs, including the Roko Tui Bau Koroicokanauto, Tunitoga Koroiteiteivutua, Koroibabakola, Matakusiva, Koroirokotuiiviwa, Koroirokotuidreketi, Koroiravulo, Koroiravue, Koroismanunu and Koya mai Nadrukuta Kolivisawaqa were members of this court.

This court authorised Cakobau’s baptism and divorce in 1857. The Vunivalu was baptised under the name Epenisa, a name taken from II Samuel 12:7 in the Old Testament, on the 11 January 1857 at the hands of Fordham. Samuel built a rock mound after the Israelites’ victory over the Philistines and named the stone Ebenezer, meaning ‘stone of help’. Ratu Epenisa Seru Cakobau was baptized at the Naulunivuaka, together with Litia as his Christian wife, Adi mai Naikasakasa as Salote, and his daughter Asenaca Teimumu. Even the priest at Drekeiselesele was baptized and received the Christian name of Mosese Baituaua. Further, Fordham married him to Litia Samanunu, with seventy couples, who also were joined in marriage and baptism. When the Rev. James Royce preached at Bau on the 24 January 1858, he marvelled at the change in Bau:

We might well ask what cannot the power of divine grace accomplish? There were present men who had been cannibals, warriors, heathen priests, polygamists, thieves, liars, in fact they had had human nature deformed and degraded to its ugliest shape till they represented some infernal legion of the
bottomless pit; but today we saw them in their right mind, with the Vunivalu at the head.  

This primitive parliament enabled the *turaga bale* institution to endure the crisis from July 1853 to August 1859, when Mara challenged Cakobau’s authority as Vunivalu. Mara might have thought that whoever was wealthier and had enough outside support should be the Vunivalu. In this quest for the title, he misread his cousin, who, even before converting to Christianity, had Lasike and Tupou Toutai’s political support. Lasike came from Lakeba to show him his unwavering support,  

and his brother Tupou Toutai visited Tanoa in 18 March 1847. These brothers had been Tanoa’s allies when the Bauan chiefs deposed him in 1832. As for Tui Nayau’s support, it was obvious that he would cast his lot with Cakobau for his daughter, Tagici’s, sake. Tagici remained at Bau after Tanoa’s death in 1852, to be removed to Lakeba by King George after the battle of Kaba. More, Mara was related to the *mataqali* Ceiakena and the *mataqali* Naivi of the *yavusa* Vuanirewa, with Tui Nayau being head of the *mataqali* Vatuwaqa. He was the last Bauan chief to *lala* on Moala before Ma’afu conquered the island. But this did not accomplish much for Cakobau had the major and influential chiefs of Bau at his court. As Ma’afu and Vuetasau began their crusade in Lau against Moala and Matuku, Mara also began his against the *turaga bale* institution at Bau.

Whatever the origin of the war, the purpose was clearly stated: to replace Cakobau with Mara as the Vunivalu of Bau. Mara first found support from the Vusa Radave chief, Koroiravulo. Koroiravulo joined Mara for personal reasons after being humiliated at Bau
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when told point-blank that he could not have two titled-ladies as his wife since he was not a *turaga bale*. This war of words flared when he married Adi Litia Vatea after Namosimalua died. Other chiefs outside Bau joined Mara. Koroiravulo swayed Sawakasa, Cautata, Vatoa and Kaba to put their support behind Mara. These villages were part of the *matanitu* of Bau, each having a vital function in the service of the Vunivalu of Bau. Koroiravulo was not only successful in Tailevu but also managed to drag Roko Tui Dreketi and Tui Levuka from Ovalau into the crisis. He even enticed Nayagodamu, one of Cakobau’s many cousins, to shoot the Vunivalu as he went to church. On the other hand, loyalist *yavusa* like those at Viwa, Namara, Namata, the Yatu Mabua and the Yatu Naibati remained loyal to Cakobau’s installation as Vunivalu. Being loyal to the Vunivalu, as his fathers and cousins had previously showed in the past, Ratu Isikeli Tabakaucoro, now Roko Tui Viwa after his father, Namosimalua’s, death, gave undivided loyalty to Cakobau during this crisis. Cakobau had gone through this type of crisis before when Veikoso and Caucau had deposed his father as Vunivalu, but not Mara.

After a few unsuccessful attempts to capture the fortress at Kaba early in 1855, Cakobau reviewed his military options and to his relief, King George Taufa‘ahau Tupou from Tonga arrived at Bau. On the 17 April 1855, after a royal prayer meeting, Tongan and Bauan forces attacked Mara’s fortress at Kaba. Koroiravulo was captured but Cakobau spared him, probably because of Adi Vatea. That was expected for he had been a Christian and, also, there was a Court of Law at Bau. Seru, in a chiefly manner, said Koroiravulo was not of rank to require a club. Mara was not there at Kaba. Mara roamed the islands after his defeat at Kaba. Actually, the Kaba battle was short. It took not more than twenty minutes.
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16 G. M. Hennings, ‘Ratu Mara’. 
What made it short was that it was just a family meeting. Mara should have been the one to uphold Cakobau’s rule. But he made a wrong personal decision to follow Koroiravulo and Tui Levuka, who had no business in the selection of candidates for the office of the Vunivalu. Mara took to sea as the decision of the turaga bale at Bau was delivered. He had to return to Bau for judgment.

At first, he dared the turaga bale institution. With Ritova, Tui Levuka and Tui Wainunu, Mara orchestrated political opposition to Cakobau by attacking the Christians at Nasavu. In the missionaries’ eyes, each of the renegades was an ‘outlaw and a nuisance’. Mara’s company then went on to kill the chief of Nadi and burnt the village of Nasavu. Cakobau sent the Ba kei Bau to defend the Christians in that part of Vanua Levu. A new attempt was planned to strike at Bau and the island was again thrown into defence. Cakobau appealed to Lakeba for help and Tui Nayau dispatched Ma’afu. But Mara escaped Ma’afu. On his way, Ma’afu protected the Christians at Bua who were being threatened with more violence from Mara.

Mara’s chances of success began to fade when the new Roko Tui Dreketi, who was vasu to

21 J. S. Royce, Journal, 15 February 1858. For Lakeba’s help in the Bua wars see J. Yavala, Tukutuku Raraba.
Bau, pledged his support to Cakobau. This was critical support for it revived Ro Tabaiwalu’s position in relation to the establishment of the *turaga bale* institution during Tanoa’s reign. By August 1858, Mara was desperately hanging on to Nakelo, Buretu, Daku and Naivakacau. To Cakobau’s advantage, John Binner, the Wesleyan schoolmaster at Levuka, confronted Whippy, who was acting as British Consul, for his presumptuous interference in the crisis at Bau. Whippy’s son and Pickering tried to bribe Noco, Nakelo, Vutia, Muainasau and Toga against Cakobau, with Buretu unsure as to which chief to support. Binner may have been instrumental in the surprising presentation of Tui Levuka’s *i soro* to Cakobau, leaving Mara out and alone.

Mara built his home at Nasau, Levuka, so he could be close to his mother’s tomb. Tradition says that he killed all the messengers sent from Bau to accompany him for his trial in Cakobau’s court. For this reason, Cakobau sent Ratu Joni Colata, who happened to be Mara’s nephew, to bring him across to Bau. Ma’afu and Vuetasau used the same tactic at Nakorotoka, Matuku in 1853. Realising that they could not sack Roko Yaroi’s fort, they sent for Vuetasau’s wife, Salote of Nasaqalau, who happened to be Roko Yaroi’s niece, to entice the old chief to Lakeba. They dressed her up with *masi* and *tabua* and sent her to her uncle, who, in his joy on seeing his niece, stood up humbly and came on board for the trip to Lakeba. This was how the *turaga bale* waged their war. Mara could not resist the *turaga bale* institution’s messenger since he was his nephew, the son of his sister.

On 4 August 1859, Cakobau told Fordham, now resident missionary at Bau, that the rebels had come to Bau to surrender. There was a man from Macuata and Semi from Viwa,
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24 J. S. Royce, *Journal*, 18 February 1858. *Either this was Cokanauto, Rakuro or Rabici, but this could not be ascertained.*


whom Cakobau did not receive, but sent home. He only asked for Mara, who was at Nakorolevu in Namara. When Mara finally showed up, Thomas Baker, who recently had arrived to begin his mission in Fiji, was awed with Mara’s courage in coming to Bau to die.  

Mara spent a month in Bau before he appeared on 5 August 1859 before the State Council on treason charges. Cakobau’s court delivered its judgement that Mara should die by hanging. Since the two were brothers, some Bauan chiefs thought that the judgement was too harsh and begged for Cakobau’s mercy. They nearly succeeded, but as Mara stood to leave the court sitting at Naulunivuaka, Cakobau shouted the order for iviara to be bound. The Vunivalu pronounced the sentence to die by hanging, adding that one from each mataqali had to go with Mara as his loloku.

Fordham and Baker attended to Mara’s soul on his way to the gallows. Cakobau followed, openly weeping for Mara. According to Baker, Mara only lost his composure when he looked down at his little son Madraiwiwi, who was brought to him to kiss goodbye. With a salusalu on their necks, war paint on their faces, two warriors from the mataqali Vusa Radave, now Mara’s loloku, welcomed their destiny saying ‘When the moon sets, it sets with its stars!’ One of them was Koroinailatikau, Koroiravulo’s lame brother.

Traditional power hung in the balance when Mara walked to his death. Cakobau maintained that the integrity of the turaga bale institution should be upheld, saying that ‘Dua na vosa e Turaga! Ni sa rua sa kaisi!’ or simply a chief has only one word, if two he was a commoner. The judgement of the turaga bale institution had to be upheld and if

27 Thomas Baker, Diary, 4 August 1959, M. O. M 324 CY 2414, M. L.
28 T. Baker, Diary, 5 August 1859.
29 T. Baker, Diary, 4 August 1859.
Mara was spared then Cakobau knew he himself would take the walk to the gallows. Cakobau believed that the *matanitu* of Bau was not enough for both of them. One had to die to ensure peace at Bau. Little did the orphaned Madraiwiwi realise that his father had upheld the sanctity and integrity of the *turaga bale* institution. The elimination of Mara made Cakobau the *turaga saya*, or the only *turaga bale*, at Bau. From this political platform, Cakobau led the *turaga bale* institutions through a series of unsuccessful attempts to create parliaments from 1857 to 1874.

Historical research on Fiji’s history has often taken this period seriously as a starting point. The primary reason is it that marked the arrival of Thomas William Pritchard as the resident British Consul at Ovalau.\(^\text{30}\) Since Pritchard, Robert S. Swanston, Michael Jones, John Bates Thurston, Edmund March and Edward Layard manned the British Consulate in Fiji from 1858 to 1874 these Consuls left enough data for analysis that historians later used in their studies. The British aside, there were also the Americans, Germans and the French. In fact, the *turaga bale* began their history in international agreements with the French in 1857, when, to the Wesleyan’s surprise, Cakobau signed an agreement with the Frenchman Ed Le Bris. The Wesleyans thought that Cakobau had ceded Fiji to the French.\(^\text{31}\) The *Argus* newspaper reported as early as 31 October 1856 that Robert Swanston and Isaac Brower, on behalf of the French Governor of New Caledonia, had acquired Cakobau’s signature on this document.\(^\text{32}\) This treaty did not please the Wesleyans, who thought Cakobau wanted to emulate Napoleon III in grandeur and pomp. The Treaty, which had seven articles, granted religious tolerance for Roman Catholics, protection of French
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subjects and peace between Napoleon III and Cakobau. There were only four copies of this treaty, two in Fijian and two in French, and signed by Ed Le Bris, Cakobau, John Fordham, J. B. Breheret, William Simpson and William Moore.

From 1858 to 1872, Cakobau found it hard to hold the *turaga bale* institution from being drowned by the number of political reforms introduced through the British Consulate. The successive Consuls did not have the mana to hold the *turaga bale* institution together, resulting in the political disorientation of the 1860s. The *turaga bale* institution underwent a period of political reforms, barely surviving the requirement, of the rule of law. First, they attempted to cede Fiji to Great Britain. Cakobau, with Rokotuiveikau of Namara, Ratu Isikeli of Viwa, Tudrau of Dravo, Komaimitataiovea of Dravo, Koroiroivalita of Buretu, Maqala of Verata, Dabea of Kuku, Koroirovulo of Nakalawaca, Jioji Nanovo of Nadroga, Roko Tui Dreketi of Rewa, Leweiloma of Verata, Ragata of Nakelo, Nawaqalevu of Rakiraki, Roko Tui Kiuva of Kiuva, Tukana of Noco, Tora Dreketi of Tokatoka, Koroikoyanamalo of Cautata, Koroikaiyanuyanu of Lasakau, Sesebualala of Nakorotubu, Ma'afu of Lau, Tui Cakau of Taviuni and Cakaudrove, Tui Nayau of Lakeba, Ritova and Bete of Macuata and Tui Bua, ceded Fiji to England on 12 October 1858.33 From the list, it was indeed a show of unity from the chiefs in Viti Levu, Vanua Levu and Lau under Cakobau.

London took the *turaga bale* seriously and sent Colonel Smythe and Berthold Seemann to Fiji to investigate their offer. Smythe went around Fiji, trying to clarify the cession issue
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from various chiefs. By 27 July 1860, Cakobau was expressing his views to Smythe at Bau, saying that the

Fijians thought little of new things at first, and then grew afraid of them. It was so with Christianity, which now, however, they found to be good. It was the same with cession to England, which some opposed from not knowing better, but they would find the advantage of it in time...  

Finally in 1862, London declined the offer and dismissed Pritchard from Her Majesty's service for overstretched his commission as a Consul. London continued its relation with the turaga bale institution after Pritchard left, as Henry Michael Jones became British Consul in 1865.

Having learnt his lessons from the rejection of the offer of cession, Cakobau reduced the number of chiefs qualified to be turaga bale. Out of the many chiefs in the 1858 negotiation, only seven turaga bale remained to take over the issue of Fiji's supreme political authority. Cakobau's name was alone mentioned to represent the chiefs of the matanitu of Bau. The others were Rakuru of Rewa, now Roko Tui Dreketi, Taliai Tupou, Vakawaletabua, Goleanavanua, Bonaveidogo and Ritova. These turaga bale signed an agreement between themselves on 8 May 1865 to form a single Fijian confederacy:

WE, the Independent Chiefs of Fiji, assembled at Levuka this eighth day of May 1865, for the purpose of deliberating on matters connected with the welfare of Fiji and the interests of Peace and Justice "Considering that the state of Fiji requires a firm and united form of Government, such as it has not hitherto enjoyed and likewise a Code of Laws adapted to the condition of the People and to the system of Authority hitherto recognised amongst them..."  

---
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The authority of the President was purely a chiefly authority, to be supported by the obedience of the other six chiefs. The President's political authority was to be ratified by the Code of Laws, especially in the 3rd and 7th Articles on war and defense. These laws were intended to further strengthen the unity of the Confederacy, for the seven matanitu had their own customs, traditions and dialects. Through the agreement, the General Assembly was also provided with legislative powers. Article 7 said that 'no wars shall be permitted unless with the consent of the Assembly, and the Chiefs shall unite to punish any rebel or traitor to the General Government'.

Jones tried to impose a modern Fijian government using old political boundaries, now cartographically defined. Bau and Rewa had to divide the whole of Viti Levu while Cakaudrove, Bua, Macuata and Naduri had to divide the island of Vanua Levu between them. Further Bua, Cakaudrove and Lakeba had to draw the maritime boundaries regarding the islands to the east of Viti Levu. To signify their independence and sovereignty, they sewed a national flag, bearing a white star against a blue background, to distinguish the Fijian state from its neighbours Bau, Lakeba, Macuata, Rewa, Cakaudrove, Naduri, Bua.' But in 1867, the Assembly fell apart. From then on, it looked as if each turaga bale was about to form his own government.

To make the situation worse, Pritchard and Jones did not recognise Ma'afu as a turaga bale. Earlier on 14 December 1858, Pritchard forced Ma'afu to renounce his political interests in Fiji, especially in Lau, in a signed statement. For eleven years, Ma'afu fought

---
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for his status in Fiji. On 15 February 1869, the Vuanirewa chiefs, Tui Nayau, Koroiyuki, Leonaitasi, Tevita Uluilakeba, Joni Wesele, and including Tui Tubou, Vakavanua, S. Sokotukivei and Ilaitia signed a declaration to make Lau a separate state. They established the Government of Lau, or Na Tovata ko Lau, with Ma’afu as head. Robert Swanston, Louis Bigansole and the Wesleyan missionary Isaac Rooney witnessed this Declaration. The Vatuwaqa Declaration affirmed that the government of Lau held sovereignty over all the islands in the newly formed Lau group, inventing Lau as a new political unit in Fiji. The first article of the Vatuwaqa Declaration said that

The islands in the Province of Lau which formerly belonged to Tonga, and which now belong to Ma’afu, having been given to him by Tupou, King of Tonga, and by authority from Tonga, together with islands now controlled by Tui Nayau will form one government and will be called the Chiefdom of Lau.

Ma’afu was invested with executive authority over Lau, with a new title, Tui Lau. Using his executive authority, Ma’afu revoked the 1858 Declaration of Interest that Pritchard forced him to sign. The state of Lau had its own flag as the symbol of independence and sovereignty. On 13 February 1867, Ma’afu further persuaded Goleanavanua and Vakawaletabua to form a united matanitu, called the Na Tovata ni Na Tokalau kei Viti. Tui Cakau exercised executive authority, or Chieftain Supreme, over the Tovata’s General Assembly of Chieftains, which was to meet at Somosomo. Cakobau responded to the Tovata by forming his own government in April 1867. He invited Samuel A. St. John and

---

William Hoskin Drew to use the Kingdom of Hawai‘i model of government, but unfortunately, this government lasted for only a year before it collapsed.

Cakobau, as the traditional and customary head of the turaga bale institution, recovered and exercised the turaga bale’s lewa in a bid to organize Fiji’s politics. On 5 June 1871, he announced that there was a matanitu once more in Fiji. In this reorganization, he did not rely on the other turaga bale but on his own family to form the matanitu. Beside him at Levuka were his two sons, Nailatikau and Tavanavanua, and a cousin, Seniloli. Apart from his family, Cakobau heavily depended on John Bates Thurston to be the brain and shoulders of his new matanitu. In their Constitution, which Cakobau signed alone on 18 August 1871, the institution of the Vunivalu of Bau was entrenched as the sacred king of Bau. Sections 24 and 25 of the Constitution said that

24. The King is Sovereign of all the Chiefs and of all the people. The Kingdom is his.
25. All titles of Honour, Orders and other Distinctions emanate from the King.

The constitution was founded on the turaga bale’s lewa, and did not deprive the chiefs of their authority within their matanitu. There was a distinction between constitutional and traditional lewa. Constitutional lewa was used to manage those Fijian matanitu united under Cakobau, while the traditional lewa, which had instituted the constitutional lewa, continued to function within each matanitu. Whatever confusion may have risen from practising these two lewa at the same time, they were harmonised through Sections 24 and 25. In addition, in Section 82, which dealt with amendment, there was a hint that more

---


prospecting political reforms were being proposed. In 82/1 and 2, the constitution provided that

1st The sovereignty and national independence of the Kingdom of Fiji shall be maintained, under any circumstances whatever, unless the said kingdom shall be invaded, conquered, and deprived of its independence, sovereignty, and nationality, by absolute force of arms, by or under the authority of a more powerful sovereign State.

2nd That the sovereign rights of jurisdiction over all persons and things in the said kingdom be never in any way abandoned, except in so far in the same way be modified or regulated by any Treaty or Convention with any foreign Power, made on an equal footing of international equality, and with full recognition of the sovereignty of this kingdom.46

From his position as Secretary of the Fijian government, Thurston invited Sir Hercules Robinson, the Governor of New South Wales, to discuss the issue of cession.47 This was in line with those two provisions covering constitutional amendments.

The difference in the two lewa dictated the ensuing negotiations when Commodore James G. Goodenough and Edward L. Layard met the turaga bale to discuss cession in March 1874. These differences nearly damaged their report, except for the reference to Cakobau’s own words cited in point 52 of the report:

The Chiefs are obliged to trust their future to Her Majesty’s Government (in Cakobau’s own words to us, “He trusts in the generosity and justice of Her Majesty’s Government”) and they ask white advisors to help them to secure their interests, which, in this matter, Mr. Thurston has faithfully represented.

In the same report, Goodenough and Layard attached a number of conditions to the offer of cession. Those conditions covered the rights of the turaga bale if Fiji was to be under British rule. Cakobau’s title as Tui Viti had to be recognized, including pensions for him and his three sons, Epeli, Timoci and Josefa. Provisions were made to allow Epeli to

46 ibid.

47 D. Scarr, I The Very Bayonet, p. 217f for a detailed analysis of this request.
continue negotiations with the Crown after Cakobau’s death. The turaga bale institution showed up clearly in the conditions, when Epeli was designated as ‘native executive officer’ for Viti Levu, Kava and Yasawa, Ratu Golea of Cakaudrove for Vanua Levu and Taveuni, Ratu Tevita Ululakeba for Lau and Ratu Savenaca Naulivou for Lomaiviti. Cakobau called in Ululakeba instead of Ma’afu or Tui Nayau, who was still alive at this time, to be the ‘native executive officer’ for Lau. He was Tui Nayau’s grandson, but he married one of Cakobau’s daughters, therefore he gained selection. Condition 14 and 15 covered land and other rights:

Art. 14
All Crown grants issued before the date of cession, to be of the same validity as grants of Her Britannic Majesty; or her Representative, after cession.

Art. 15
The broad principle to be accepted that, the Fijian Chiefs and people, in changing their allegiance retain all existing private rights, real and personal. 48

With the introduction of cable, communication between London and Sydney was improved. On 10 August 1874, Carnarvon requested Robinson leave for Fiji and explain to all parties that Her Majesty’s Government cannot accept cession on conditions proposed by Thurston, but if all questions as to constitution, titles to land, compensation and pensions, are freely left to their decision, all claims and interests will be fully inquired into and fairly dealt with...Reasonable rights and interests of Chiefs would be recognized as far as is consistent with British sovereignty and Colonial form of Government...I count on your highest prudence and skill in this difficult matter, but if doubtful of any point, ask further instruction before sailing. 49

Literature on the cession of Fiji to Great Britain is quite extensive and the most thorough

48 Offered Cession of the Kingdom of Fiji to Her Britannic Majesty, Conditions Thereof, Appendix, Confidential Print.

49 The Earl of Carnarvon to Governor H. Robinson, K. C. M. G., 10 August 1874, Confidential Print.
being Scarr’s two volumes work on Thurston. J. D. Legge has covered the British involvement in Fiji’s cession story. Dorothy Crozier studied the ‘Evolution of a Fijian Myth’, arguing that the supposed ‘gentleman’s agreement’ between Cakobau and Robinson was a myth based on a mere assumption. She argued against the paramountcy of Fijian interests in her paper. R. A. Derrick, who relied on C. F. Gordon-Cummins, briefly described Robinson’s meeting with Cakobau that Crozier alluded to in her paper. Apart from the secondary literature, some published primary materials are also available. The first and most notable is Goodenough’s Journal.

In the course of my research, I came across some primary materials that justify re-examining the issue of cession. The two main parties in the Deed of Cession were Robinson, on behalf of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, and Cakobau, on behalf of the turaga bale institution. In between them was David Wilkinson, who acted as Robinson’s interpreter and Cakobau’s mediator. Compared to Goodenough’s and Layard’s Commission, this was a completely new set of negotiators with a new cession condition to agree on. The most important piece of evidence used in this re-assessment is ‘An Open Letter’ from David Wilkinson to im Thurn, a copy of which was attached to the Great
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Council of Chiefs Confidential Report on Native Fisheries. Wilkinson was the turaga bale's mediator and he attended their sessions at Nasova. He was also Robinson's translator and was with his staff on board the H. M. S. Pearl. Cakobau sent Sailosi, his matanivoua, to fetch Wilkinson from Bua with the message, 'we beg of you to come and help us, for we have confidence in you because you know us so well'. This was done in collaboration with Thurston and Layard who also wrote to him asking for his involvement.

Robinson arrived in Fiji on the afternoon of 23 September, after leaving Sydney on the evening of 12 of the same month. He immediately sent for Wilkinson, saying

I understand [...] that the chiefs sent for you to assist them in their negotiations with me on the subject of the proposed cession to the islands to Her Britannic Majesty the Queen[...] I also accept you as my medium of communication between myself and the chiefs.

Wilkinson then joined Robinson's staff on the H. M. S. Pearl. Robinson paid a courtesy call on Cakobau and four chiefs who had assembled at Levuka to meet him, reminding the Vunivalu, whom he constantly referred to as the King, to proceed only with the negotiation when he was ready.

Robinson made it clear that he was only dealing with the turaga bale institution. Wilkinson remembered that Robinson had 'informed the Fijian Government that I shall treat with the Chiefs only'. In taking this approach, Robinson reached for the foundation
rock of Fijian politics in executing his commission. His decision to separate the Fijian
government from the *turaga bale* institution in the cession negotiation placed the chiefs in
a superior position to the existing government. He disregarded all the institutions, namely
the Fijian Government, the 1871 Constitution, Privy Council, Cabinet and even the
Legislative Assembly, all except the *turaga bale*. Once this was done, the manner of
negotiation was confirmed – it would be *vakaturaga*, the *turaga bale’s* way.

Cakobau was ready for preliminary discussions with Robinson on 25 September 1874. By
appointment, he met Robinson on the *Dido*, with Wilkinson translating for both. In his
introduction, Robinson was frank in placing before Cakobau the new terms required by
London. He told Cakobau that the terms of cession in the offer that Goodenough and
Layard had prepared were unacceptable to the British Government. London wanted the
unconditional cession of Fiji.\(^60\) Robinson reminded Cakobau that he had been authorised to
accept cession only if it was unconditional. But unconditional cession itself was in itself a
condition set by the British Crown. Robinson clarified that Britain would

dead with the King, Chiefs, and the people, not only equitably, but also liberally.
The rights and interests, both of the King and other Chiefs, would be recognised
so far as is consistent with British sovereignty and Colonial form of
Government.\(^61\)

Robinson added, in explanation, the issues of financial liabilities, land titles and good
government. In fact, Robinson emphasised that Her Majesty’s government, in its term of

\(^60\) Notes on a Conversation which took place on board Her Majesty’s ship “Dido” between Thakombau and Sir Hercules Robinson, on Friday, the 25\(^{th}\) of September, 1874; the observations on either side being translated by Mr. Wilkinson, one of the ablest and most reliable of the Interpreters in Fiji, Inclosure No 2 in No 53, p. 34, Confidential Print.

\(^61\) Ibid.
unconditional cession, ‘is compatible with the good governance of the country’. After all those introductory words, Robinson asked Cakobau frankly, whether it was to be an unconditional cession or not. In his reply, Cakobau had a clear vision for the future of Fiji in the unconditional cession to Queen Victoria. He did not see cession as a problem, since the people would only listen to what he would decide. To the Vunivalu, the future concerned him, for he would be long gone to answer questions arising out of his decision in October 1874. He voiced his concern to Robinson, confidently saying, ‘What I say is this: Why have anxiety about the future? What is the future? – Britain’. He clarified the problem when Goodenough and Layard often asked him what he wanted, resulting in the conditions he attached to the offer. He further told Robinson that

The Queen is right, conditions are not chieflike[...] If I give a canoe on the condition of your only sailing it on certain days; of your not letting such and such a man on to it; or of your using a particular kind of rope with it, but I give him the canoe right out, and trust to his generosity and good faith to make me the return which he knows I expect. If I were to attach conditions, he would say, I do not care to be bothered with your canoe; keep it yourself.

Apart from those conditions, which reconstructed the turaga bale institution, land emerged as another key issue of unconditional cession.

When Cakobau brought the new conditions to the Chiefs, who met at Nasova from 25 to 28 September 1874, it was evident that the turaga bale were prepared to cede their lewa and vanua or matanitu, but the land belonged to the mataqali. Cakobau emphasized that

None of us have any right to give even the smallest portion of the soil of any member of the mataqali over whom we rule. The matter that we are now
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discussing must be most carefully dealt with, and our decision must be clear. What we do today cannot be undone tomorrow. 65

Cakobau was well aware of the significance of the mataqali in relation to land during the negotiation leading to cession. They sent Wilkinson to Robinson to clarify their rights in relation to the land and the sea. 66 Robinson had his reply ready, and that cession must be full and complete.67 From the ‘Notes of a Discussion’, held on the H. M. S. Dido on 25 September 1874, Robinson assured Cakobau:

As to the Land Question, I have been sorry to hear that some misapprehensions exists with regard to what might be the intentions of Her Majesty’s Government with regard to land, ... that all lands which are now in actual use or occupation of any Chief or tribe, and such land as may be necessary for the probable future support and maintenance of any Chief or tribe, shall be set apart from them, and that all the residue of the land shall go to the Government, not for the personal advantage of Her Majesty, or members of any Government, but for the general good – for the purposes of rule and order. ... For such purposes as these, not for the purpose of adding to the wealth of the Queen – is it a matter of necessity to have public land. 68

Advised by his Attorney General, G. L. Innes, Robinson drafted the Deed in such a fashion that accommodated Cakobau’s understanding of land ownership in the context of unconditional cession. In paragraph 15 of his despatch to Lord Carnavaron, Robinson explained the reasons for Article 4:

There is one clause in the Deed of Cession upon which I think it is well to make here a few explanatory observations. I refer to Clause 4, which deals with the land, a question that has given me much anxious consideration. If I had avoided all specific reference to land in the deed, restricting it to a simple unconditional cession of the sovereignty of Fiji, such a course would I feel sure, have given rise to future difficulties and complications, and probably, charges of breach of faith. Considering that all writers upon the land question, from Consul Pritchard down to the present time, have agreed that every acre in Fiji is private property, it would unquestionably have been contended that a mere cession of sovereignty did not convey the absolute proprietorship of the soil. If,
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on the other hand, any clause had been inserted transferring to Her Majesty the possession of all lands irrespective of private ownership, and the requirements of the various tribes such provision could never have been asserted to peacefully, and the attempt to insert it would, I think, have fairly lent a color to the rumors of confiscation and spoliation of private rights which had been so industriously circulated. I accordingly determined, after lengthened conferences with Mr. Innes, the Attorney General of the New South Wales, by whom I am accompanied as legal adviser, to insert the clause 4 in the shape in which it will be found in the accompanying copy of the instrument of cession. The clause simply rests in Her Majesty the absolute ownership of all lands not shown by those laying claims to be bona fide the property of the Europeans or other foreigners, or not required for the maintenance and support of Chiefs and tribes, leaving Her Majesty’s Government to be the ultimate judge as to what lands have been fairly acquired by Europeans and what extent is required for the support of the natives. It would have been impossible to go further than this without injustice, and without giving rise at the outset of British rule to serious disaffections and difficulties. The clause as it stands is in unison with the native feeling and precedent and is, I think, satisfactory to all except such of the whites as entertain doubts regarding the bona fide character of their titles.69

The turaga bale discussed Clause 4 of the Deed properly and in detail, indicating to Robinson that they understood it thoroughly. To elaborate that the turaga bale fully understood the Clause, Robinson attached Ratu Savenaca Seniloli’s question to his Despatch:

... what are we to expect or understand as regards those lands which are either ours (privately) now, or may be, when the boundaries of town (village) lands be settled, be the property of a village or [g]ali?

(a) Are we at liberty to sell, assign, or bequeath the first as we please, or will the Crown claim a right of pre-emption?

(b) Will the Crown claim any pre-emptive right over our tribal or common land? That is to say, those lands to be hereafter settled as set apart for the use of the people, or will the occupants be at liberty to sell or lease independently of the Crown?70

Robinson reaffirmed to the turaga bale that their concern would form the mandate of the Commission

69 Robinson to Lord Carnavon, 3 October 1874, Confidential Printing.
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to be appointed for the purpose of inquiring into and determining upon the whole land question, and that these and other points would be settled in the manner which should be shown to be most just and advantageous for the interests of the chiefs and tribes. It will be a matter for serious consideration whether, having regard to the improvident character of the natives, it will be good policy to confer upon them the right of absolutely disposing of their property.  

After hearing Robinson’s reply, Cakobau turned to the chiefs for a response.

You have heard the message. What is now our minds? You see we are not treating with the Levuka beach white man, but with a chief who holds the Queen’s Commission to us. We give as chiefs ("vakaturaga") to the Queen. She accepts as a Chief ("vakaturaga") as our Chief. Her Majesty does not want our firewood, etc., but she does want our confidence and trust, and to do us good. Where did our lotu come from? Did we ever get anything bad from Britannia? What say we in reply?  

The chiefs unanimously agreed to Robinson’s terms. Robinson thereby ended the difficult part of the negotiation. Robinson, who remained on board throughout the chief’s meeting from the 28 and 29 September, was continually updated on the progress of the discussion. He was finally informed that the meeting had unanimously resolved to cede ‘Fiji unreservedly to the Queen of Britain, that she may rule us justly and affectionately, and that we may live in peace and prosperity.’ He then sent a draft of the deed of cession to Cakobau, adding that if the terms of cession were clear, he was ready to receive the signatures of those turaga bale present at Levuka. On the evening of 29 September, Robinson knew that he had succeeded in his mission, for Cakobau was willing to sign the Deed of Cession. Robinson was at Nasova by 10 o’clock on the morning of 30 September, where Cakobau gave him the resolution of his Council of Chiefs, ceding Fiji unreservedly...

---
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to the Queen. The discussions and decisions were made with a Fijian mindset, the spirit of the turaga bale’s unity was as important as the legislation of that unity. For Cakobau, legislation could not dissolve the spirit of unity that the chiefs had reached during their decision. After Robinson formally received the resolution, the Deed of Cession was then read in Fijian and Cakobau signed it, together with the three other ruling chiefs who were with him. They were Nailatikau, Tabakaucoro and Naulivou.

The turaga bale used the Fijian text of the Deed of Cession when negotiating with Robinson. Throughout the negotiation, they maintained their own idea, concept and definition of cession in a vakaturaga fashion. The Fijian texts were mistranslated in the English texts. The letter of 30 September said in Fijian, ‘keimami sa soli Viti walega’. The English translation said the chiefs ‘hereby give our country, Fiji, unreservedly’. The inclusion of the word ‘country’ to qualify the political and legal term Viti, matanitu and vanua showed that Wilkinson was trying his best to find common ground for British and Fijian legal terms. A vanua is a collection of yavusa under a chief. Each ceding chief had their own independent vanua, which were Kubuna, Cakaudrove, Burebasaga, Cakaunitabua, Caumatalevu, Nakuruvakarua, Nayaumunu, Lau and Nacolase. Viti was not a vanua, but only becomes a political and legal entity when these chiefs assembled on the Vunivalu of Bau’s lewa. The relationship of Viti and the independent ceding vanua could only be understood in the context of the turaga bale institution. This was Cakobau’s idea of cession.

A comparison of the Fijian version of the deed with the English would enlighten the

---
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vakaturaga nature of cession. The second paragraph of the preamble in the Fijian version, said:

Ia ni sa lomadra dina kina, era sa taroga ka kerea ko ira na Tui Viti kei ira yadua na kena Turaga lelevu, vua na Marama dauloloma na Tui Peritania Levu kei Airladi, me mai taura na lewa vaka Mataniitu mai na gauna ogo, ka me vakaturaga kina ni lewa vaka-Peritania e na veyanuyamu ogo e ra sa solia ko na Tui Viti vata kei ira na kena turaga lelevu ni ra sa loma vata kina me ra solia e ra sa roqota ka musuka ogo vakai ira ga, ia e na vukudra talega na veimataqale, na nodra tamata na lewe ni vanua e Viti, e ra sa solia ka roqota ka musuka vua na Marama ka kerea me vakadomuya ka taura ko koya ni ra sa qai solia Viti walega vua na Marama ko ira na Tui Viti kei ira na kena Turaga lelevu ni ra sa vakararavi ki na nona lewa dodomi kei na nona dauvelomani.75

The corresponding English version said:

And Whereas in order to the establishment of the British government within the said islands the said Tui Viti and other the several high chiefs thereof for themselves and their respective tribes have agreed to cede the possession of and the dominion and sovereignty over the whole of the said islands and the inhabitants thereof and have requested Her Majesty to accept such cession, which Cession the said Tui Viti and other high chiefs, relying upon the justice and generosity of Her said Majesty, have determined to tender unconditionally, - and which cession on the part of the said Tui Viti and other high Chiefs is witnessed by their execution of these presents and by the formal surrender of the said territory to Her said Majesty.76

The question of land and governance were both addressed in the above paragraph. Cakobau relied on Queen Victoria’s justice and generosity to reciprocate his trust and confidence. These values of justice, generosity, trust and confidence, were turaga bale values as much as they were Queen Victoria’s, making unconditional cession possible. Each turaga bale found it easy to surrender his individual sovereignty once these values were understood and accepted. In the Fijian version, the emphasis on chiefly unity is captured in the phrase loma vata, meaning of one heart or mind. The English version simply used the word agreed to cede. The Fijian version says
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ni ra sa loma vata kina me ra solia e ra sa roqota ka musuka ogo vakai ira ga, ia e na vukudra talega na veimataqale, na nodra tamata na lewe ni vanua e Viti, e ra sa solia ka roqota ka musuka vua na Marama ka kerea me vakadonuya ka taura ko koya ni ra sa qai solia Viti walega vua na Marama ko ira na Tui Viti kei ira na kena Turaga lelevu ni ra sa vakararavi ki na nona lewa dodonu kei na nona danveilomani.

But the corresponding English version in the Deed says

And Whereas in order to the establishment of the British government within the said islands the said Tui Viti and other the several high chiefs thereof for themselves and there respective tribes have agreed to cede the possession of and the dominion and sovereignty over the whole of the said islands and the inhabitants thereof and have requested Her Majesty to accept such cession, - which Cession the said Tui Viti and other high chiefs, relying upon the justice and generosity of Her said Majesty, have determined to tender unconditionally, - and which cession on the part of the said Tui Viti and other high Chiefs is witnessed by their execution of these presents and by the formal surrender of the said territory to Her said Majesty.

When Cakobau and his Council members had signed the Deed, Robinson invited the Vunivalu to sail to Lomaloma, Cakaudrove, Macuata and Bua to collect the signatures of other ruling chiefs.77

What really mattered to Cakobau was that the turaga bale’s interests were, finally, protected in the seventh article of the Deed of Cession, where it said:

That the rights and interest of the said Tui Viti and other high chiefs the ceding parties hereto shall be recognised so far as is consistent with British Sovereignty and Colonial form of government.78

The Fijian version said

(Ai lvfatai). E na vukudra na Tui Viti kei ira na kena Turaga lelevu era sa cakava, ka solia ogo, sa na vakabau tiko, ka vakadimadinataka na nodra tutu vakaturaga, ka maroroya na nodra ka yadua, ia me vaka ga e rawa ka kilikili kei na lewa vakatui ni Peritania Vaka Matanitu sa dau vakaturu e na kena veivivana ki sau, a ya vaka sa na qai vakaturi i Viti mai na gauna oqo.79

77 Robinson to The Right Hon. The Earl of Carnavon, Fiji No. 1. Received 18th Nov 1874, H. M. S ‘Pearl’ Island of Tavuni, Fiji. 3rd October 1874. Colonial Office: Fiji.
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Fijian sovereignty was maintained when Queen Victoria became the Queen of Fiji, or Ranadi kei Viti, in the Deed of Cession. The words me vaka ga e rawa ka kilikili translated the phrase as far as is consistent. The consistency did not matter much, because for Cakobau, cession was from a chief to a chief. The ceding turaga bale remained turaga bale and his right as their turaga bale was recognized in the Deed.

Carnarvon replied to Robinson’s Despatches on 16 January 1875, where he praised and accepted all that was achieved in Fiji:

I have conveyed to you the Queen’s gracious approval of the manner in which you have executed the responsible mission for which you were selected, and I have notified to you by telegraph that Her Majesty has been pleased to mark her sense of the service thus rendered by you by promoting you to the Grand Cross of the Order of St Michael and St George...Your account of your transactions with Thakobau and other Chiefs is very clear and satisfactory, and I fully approve of the explanations afforded by you as to the terms on which only Her Majesty’s Government could consent to accept that reason. The Articles, also, of the Instrument of Cession appear fully to meet the requirements of the case.

He concluded by thanking Robinson for his careful examination of the complex land question. Also, he promised that Sir Arthur Hamilton Gordon, who had been selected as the first substantive governor of Fiji, would be instructed and informed of the underlying understanding and trust, which made complete and unconditional cession of Fiji possible.

The turaga bale institution and the ascendancy of Bau had taken a twenty-year political mauling to find the solacing form of government in Queen Victoria’s generosity. Cakobau, from his installation to be Vunivalu in 1853 and converting to Wesleyanism and 1854, trusted the British form of government as the best for Fiji in place of the turaga bale’s lewa.

---
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vakaturaga, with the rights of the turaga bale and the ascendancy of Bau enshrined in the Deed of Cession. These rights and ascendancy, entrenched in Clause 7/1 of the Deed of Cession, became the foundation of the colonial policies on the institutions of Fijian identity. Gordon arrived in July 1875 to translate those rights into legislation.
We Have Only The One God.

The *lewa vakaturaga*, used to cede Fiji to Great Britain, unified the Fijian *matanitu* under the *turaga bale* institution. The Vunivalu trusted in Queen Victoria's generosity to rule Fiji, especially for the Fijians, justly. This particular trust formed the political, and later legal, framework that ensured an enduring protection of Fijian identity, rights and future. Central to this protection was the land question. After being ensured that land ownership would remain with the *mataqali* after their *lewa* was ceded, the *turaga bale* confidently accepted British law and government in Fiji. Cession also allowed the *turaga bale* to harmonise the native land tenure from a number of systems that were practised by each *vanua* and *matanitu*. When the Native Council, later called the Great Council of Chiefs, discussed the landowning unit in 1878, Vakawaletabua, Tui Bua, said, 'It is easy for us to divide into *mataqali*...that we have only the one God...' hence the title of this Chapter. However underneath this harmonising process, which was gradual, there existed complex customs relating to land.

This Chapter discusses the impact of the standard colonial land policy on identity. I will focus on three areas, first on how the *turaga bale* settled the question of land ownership and registration with London, second, the effect of standardisation on the *turaga bale* Roko Tui Bua, in *Notes of the Proceedings of a Native Council, held at Bua on the Island of Vanua Levu, in the months of November and December 1878, Sixteenth Day’s Meeting*, T. P., p. 49. (See p.158, Tippet’s Copy)
institution, and last, the unyielding nature of the third Fijian world, as portrayed by the continuous practise of varied customs at the lower levels of identity institutions, after the mataqali was imposed uniformly as a unit of ownership. I will discuss the problems, especially those that existed, or later emerged, out of the standardisation process. For the benefit of the Colony, it was necessary to standardise the land registration unit so that legislation could be introduced on a uniform basis. The Colony had to move forward with new legislation, and land was the first obvious obstacle to progress. Being shrouded in customary, political, religious and local economical values, applying a uniform legislation was going to be a challenge. Using the mataqali was not the end of the issue. At least, it was a secure to serve as a beginning, only because it was formed through the lewa vakaturaga. Yet, behind that lewa vakaturaga, many more powerful minor institutions, which were part of the turaga bale institutions, were also involved.

Custom and politics had to be in harmony before any land legislation could be introduced. The lewa vakaturaga had to be acknowledged as the customary authority on native land. Cakobau’s trust in Queen Victoria’s generosity was an example of this political understanding. It resulted in Gordon’s policies on native land to be introduced without opposition from Fijian chiefs. Before the introduction of the 1892 Native Land Ordinance, there was first the 1877 Native Regulation Ordinance, where the turaga bale institution continued, through the Ordinance’s regulations, to manifest its authority on the land question. In fact, the turaga bale institution and the ascendency of Bau were the fulfilment of ancient custom, which London decided as the best and most amicable formula for settling the land question.

Before the N. L. C. came into being through the Native Land Ordinance of 1892, Gordon and Sir William Des Voeux made sure that *turaga bale*’s institutional rights were secured through the policy that would govern the Commission. Gordon was instructed to take this understanding between the *turaga bale* and Robinson regarding land seriously when he arrived as Fiji’s first substantive governor in 1875. It took four years, after cession, to fashion the policy and another twelve for the N. L. C to be created. By then, the policy to regulate how native land had to be owned was clear to both the government and the *turaga bale* institution. Throughout the seventy odd year process, from 1892 to 1966, the *turaga bale* institution dictated the policy on native land. Through the *turaga bale*, the Wesleyan’s influence on the institutions of identity found its way into Fiji’s land history. The Colonial Office also fully understood that land was the central issue critical for the progress of the infant colony. It was a complex issue, for on the one hand economic progress depended on a favourable land policy and, on the other, the Fijians’ survival depended on the inalienability of land they now possessed. Balance and caution had to be maintained, and Gordon was determined from the beginning to preserve the native race. He now understood that land was the essence of identity, and losing land ownership was losing identity. In the first Despatch he received from the Secretary of State, he was warned on the issue of land, that

> you will be required to address yourself, and the settlement of which on a clear and simple basis, is of the gravest importance to the future peace and prosperity of the Colony. \(^3\)

---

\(^3\) Secretary of State for the Colonies to Sir Arthur Gordon, Despatch No 1, 4 March 1875, J. S. M. P.
In another Despatch, the Earl of Crewe designated five ‘broad principles’ for dealing with how land had to be legally owned. The first principle affirmed *complete cession*, where all lands within Fiji had been transferred absolutely and unreservedly to Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain, and Her Majesty had the ultimate authority to dispose of these lands in whatever way she pleased. In the second principle, Crewe took land policy into the area controlled by the *turaga bale* institution. Gordon was instructed to ‘require all Europeans claiming to have acquired land by purchase, to give satisfactory evidence of the transactions with the native on which they rely as establishing their title’; and further inquire most strictly into the claims of Europeans occupants which, as Her Majesty’s Government has been repeatedly warned, are likely to be in many cases excessive or unfounded.

This instruction meant that all titles issued before cession were now invalid, and to revalidate their claims, the European settlers had to convince the Land Claim Commission that the lands they claimed were alienated according to the customary land tenure.

Crewe was very cautious, reminding Gordon to approach the issue ‘with the view of disturbing as little as possible existing tenures and occupations’. The task of the proposed L. C. C. was to deal with and issue new titles, if claims were acquired through customary traditions of land tenure. The provisions for native titles to land came in the third principle. Crewe made a specific distinction between lands owned and occupied and those owned but not occupied, and instructed Gordon to verify and determine what lands

---

4 ibid.
5 ibid.
6 ibid.
are 'now in occupation of or actually required for the probable future support or maintenance of Chiefs and tribes'. The Crown would hold such land in trust for the tribes, families and Chiefs. In the fourth principle, Crewe authorised Gordon to be personally responsible for judging whether it was suitable to sell native land to Europeans. In this area, Gordon had to draft the relevant ordinance and model it on laws practised in Australia. Under the fifth principle, Crewe stressed that the government could take any lands it wanted for public purpose. These principles became the mandate of the L. C. C. that Robinson had earlier advised.

In addition to those five principles, Crewe also forewarned Gordon on unoccupied land mentioned in Clause 4 of the Deed of Cession:

in the case of native claims also great care should be taken to protect the interests of the Crown by allowing no more than a fair and liberal interpretation of the 4th Article of the Instrument of Cession as illustrated by the conversation between Sir H. Robinson and Thakobau on 25 September.

It is now clear that the turaga bale and Robinson had agreed upon the principles controlling the native population and land before Gordon took over as Governor of Fiji in July 1875. Robinson had been assured that Gordon would be instructed to uphold those conditions. Gordon arrived, with the Charter to Erect the Colony of Fiji, and withdrew the New South Wales laws that Robinson had instituted for the Interim Administration at Levuka. Gordon built the lewa of the new Colony on those agreements and understanding, which were enshrined in the Deed of Cession.

---

7 ibid.
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Gordon outlined his native policy in a speech to the Aberdeen Philosophical Association in 1878.\(^9\) Introducing him that night, the Chairman of the A. P. A. mentioned, to the applause of the audience, a saying common in Aberdeen, that 'the Gordons hae the guidin o’ t'.\(^10\) Simply, it meant that the Gordons are reputable organisers. Gordon began his talk by describing the geography of his new Colony and the types of Europeans who had settled there fifty years earlier. Gordon summarised his views on the native Fijians, confessing that he

wanted to see whether he could maintain the existence of the native races of the country, and preserve them from the danger to which they have been exposed in many of the colonies.\(^11\)

He came with the idea that the Fijians were 'hordes of black savages', but within a few weeks, he discarded his original image due to the evidence of Christianity and education amongst them. Gordon continued:

remembering as I do the sort of cottages that I have seen in this very county, within twenty miles of this city, within the last forty years, that the houses of the Fijian peasantry certainly put to shame those in which the Scottish peasantry lived forty years ago...Knowing who have come out of these cottages of which I speak, I am not prepared to call the Fijians uncivilised because they live in houses which are of a different construction to our own. They are an eminently settled people. They are not nomadic, which is one of the principal attributes, I think, of a savage race.\(^12\)

He identified


\(^12\) ibid.
elements of an imperfect but crude civilisation, and that they have shown an extraordinary aptitude in the acquisition of higher knowledge, and in progress towards a higher and more perfect state of society.\textsuperscript{13}

Gordon concluded with the issue of the ‘preserving the native race against the new comer’.\textsuperscript{14} He did not think Fijians conforming to English habits and ideas healthy to their future. Four agencies, he believed, contributed to the destruction of native races. The first and most obvious was liquor, the second, foolish excessive legislation, the third, alienation of land and last, the introduction of English clothing. On the first agent of destruction, Gordon saw that Fijians had an alternative drink, called \textit{yaqona}, which deflected the fatal effects of liquor. In regard to legislation, Gordon affirmed, that it was our responsibility to make only such legislation as shall not injuriously affect or needlessly harass and interfere with the settled habits and modes of life of the native population, and we are endeavouring to enable them to retain and use the land, which is theirs...\textsuperscript{15}

Gordon maintained that Her Majesty’s Government had authorized the use of old native laws.\textsuperscript{16} The idea of imposing English law on the Fijians had never appealed to him, after having learnt examples from India, where

\begin{quote}
Mahomedan and Hindu law was allowed to remain as regards the natives. We have also elected to keep up native law for natives in many cases. We also kept up the native hierarchy...\textsuperscript{17}
\end{quote}

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{13}] A. Gordon, \textit{Fiji}, p. 12.
\item[\textsuperscript{14}] ibid.
\item[\textsuperscript{15}] A. Gordon, \textit{Fiji}, p. 14.
\item[\textsuperscript{16}] ibid.
\item[\textsuperscript{17}] ibid.
\end{itemize}
In comparing the beachcombers and missionaries, Gordon could not hide his appreciation of the latter’s contribution to Fijian civilisation. He was in want of vocabulary to praise the efforts of the Wesleyans in Fiji, but managed to say that

the work that they had done there is a great work, because they had been the founders and the sole founders, and to them belongs the whole merit of the degree of civilisation to which the natives of these islands have now arrived.

He saw them as having ‘a machinery by which they can feel as it were the pulse of the whole group at any time’ and holding the population together.

The basis and rationale of Gordon’s native policy was the turaga bale institution; and used it to rule the Colony. He appointed Lieutenant Governors, or Roko Tui for each province and two from each district to be members of the Native Council. This Council, which was to meet annually with the Governor, was a local institution that existed before Cession, and Gordon merely adopted it for his administration. He added only two changes, firstly converting the irregular meetings to a regular and annual basis, and secondly, drawing the boundaries of the districts which were earlier geographically undefined. This was part of an earlier understanding between Robinson and Cakobau that Gordon took into account. In that understanding, Robinson had outlined the foundation of Gordon’s native policy. Robinson had assured Cakobau, during their 25 September 1874 discussion, regarding native apprehension towards the operation of British laws upon the native population, that ‘there is not much difficulty in the

18 A Gordon, Fiji, p. 5.
19 ibid.
20 A. Gordon, Fiji, p. 18f.
government of natives by Europeans... Robinson used his term as Governor of Ceylon as an example of this case.

It was found that they could communicate their discontents and wishes to the Government through their Chiefs... In the same way the Fijian people could communicate their wants through their Chiefs, and the system would work as well as in Ceylon.

And second, after the Deed of Cession was signed, Robinson divided Fiji into twelve Provinces, each to be headed by a ‘Provincial Chief styled Roko’ and eighty-two Districts under the charge of a Buli. In reference to land policy, Robinson advised that these and other points would be settled in the manner which should be shown to be more just and advantageous for the interest of the chiefs and tribes. It will be a matter for serious consideration whether, having regard to the important character of the natives, it will be good policy to confer upon them the right of absolutely disposing of their property.

Gordon further noted that Robinson had abolished the ‘lala’, the custom of communal work on the chief’s command which he interpreted as a modified form of slavery. Robinson prohibited this practice. Once that ban was in place, Gordon found taxation a major problem for the Colony. He was still in England when the turaga bale met at Bua from November to December 1878 to discuss land registration.

Cakobau himself initiated the harmonisation of native land policy through the turaga bale’s institutional meeting, now called the Native Council. On Tuesday 10 December...

---

21 Notes of a Conversation, Colonial Office: Fiji.
22 ibid.
23 Despatch No. 7, Robinson to Carnarvon, 16 October 1874, Colonial Office: Fiji.
24 Paragraph 15, Despatch No. 1, Robinson to Carnarvon, 3 October 1874, C. O. 83/5.
25 A. Gordon, Fiji, p. 17.
1878, the sixteenth day of meeting, eight Roko Tui were present, together with the Buli, magistrates and scribes who were members of the Council. This particular session discussed Cakobau’s letter, containing five questions ‘relating to the survey of lands and other matters’.

1. In reference to the survey (and issuing of grants) of lands in Fiji, it is supposed and reported that after the lands claimed have been apportioned the balance will be sold by the Government.

2. Again, respecting the lands owned by the Taukeis, whether occupied or unoccupied by the owners it is reported that if any Europeans wish to become possessed of any such land, either on lease, or absolutely, the Government will receive the emolument derived from the land. How about the taukeis? They do not understand these matters, as they have not been explained to them, and they derive no benefit from such sales.

These questions opened the discussions on Article 4. Roko Tui Cakaudrove was the first to speak on the topic. In the end, the Council made seventeen resolutions regarding land registration, the first on the mataqali:

1st. The great and true divisions of land are the mataqali; these divisions are clearly understood by us throughout Fiji, and the people of these various lands have always known the practice of their lands.

The chiefs were not confused in their resolution on the mataqali, even though there were occasional light interjections in their discussions, like Buli Serua’s father, son and

---

26 Eight Roko Tui were present. They were Roko Tui Ra, Cakaudrove, Namosi, Macuata, Ba, Nadroga, Bua and Tailevu. Notes of the Proceedings of a Native Council... November and December 1878, p. 45.

27 ibid.

28 ibid.

29 Notes on the Proceedings of a Native Council... Wednesday 11 December 1878, p. 50. This was repeated in Resolution No. 17: ‘In furtherance of this, it is necessary that the whole inhabitants having lands shall be registered according to mataqali’, op cit, p. 53.
grandson’s mataqali\textsuperscript{30} and Usaia’s ‘… no territory is called the mataqali.’\textsuperscript{31} From eleven o’clock in the morning to one o’clock in the afternoon, the meeting proceeded very slowly, this being a very important subject, and weighed heavily on their minds, as to the position of some of the lands in the future, and to settle the true position of the land, according to the best custom of the land, and to finally settle it for the future, for the taukeis and the people individually.\textsuperscript{32}

On the eighteenth day, Thursday 12 December, the Council resumed at three o’clock in the afternoon to discuss land registration. The question was ‘whether the individual lands and their owners with its mataqali should be registered.’\textsuperscript{33} Roko Tui Ba, Ratu Vuniani Vukinamualevu, suggested the tokatoka, even though Ba had a different name for this unit.\textsuperscript{34} It might be that the Bauan delegates had asked him to be their representative.

Ratu Nemani Dreu, Native Magistrate for Nadi, closed the discussion:

These mataqali are divided into Tokatokas which are understood by us, true in some places it (the Tokatoka) is not understood: nevertheless all our lands are managed and controlled according to custom. Should the mataqali and Tokatoka custom be established it will be clear to all.\textsuperscript{35}

Land could not be dissociated from governance, as reflected in the resolutions of the 1878 meeting. Ending their discussion, the turaga bale prepared their presentation of the resolutions to Gordon. They based their presentation on Gordon’s promise, to ‘take into

\textsuperscript{30} op cit. p. 50. Buli Serua said, ‘…my father’s mataqali is called Natokalau –mine Nadruadrua, and my son’s, Nabatilili.’ He was probably referring to house yavu.

\textsuperscript{31} Ratu Usaia was a Native Magistrate from Tailevu.

\textsuperscript{32} Notes on the Proceedings of a Native Council... Wednesday 11 December 1878, p. 50.

\textsuperscript{33} Notes on the Proceedings of a Native Council... Wednesday 11 December 1878, p. 53.

\textsuperscript{34} ibid.

\textsuperscript{35} ibid.
consideration and discuss a law for the permanent management of lands’. In their view, they were now confident in the form of Government that had been suited to their conditions and ability. But they still had some fears and doubts on the future of their land, for ‘if a wrong course of action was taken’, they told the Governor, ‘that could mean the ‘end of our life as a people’. Gordon gave a brief answer, ‘I shall give it my best consideration, with a strong disposition to preserve the native custom whenever possible’. He was responding to the need expressed by the Chiefs, when they concluded that ‘the course of the land customs in Fiji is clear, and understood by us, and we are able to carry them out because they have been handed down to us by our fathers from time immemorial’.

Most, if not all, of the thirteen turaga bale who ceded Fiji, were present at Bua where they re-affirmed the mataqali as the legal Fijian land owning unit. They unanimously agreed that they were acting on behalf of the mataqali within their matanitu when they ceded Fiji. In their capacity as heads of the matanitu, they ceded land on behalf of the mataqalis under their matanitu. The vernacular version of the Deed of Cession, in its second paragraph, asserted that the mataqali was the true landowning unit. The Tui Viti, as head of the turaga bale institution, acted on behalf of the mataqali in his capacity as head of the matanitu. The English version lost the political significance of those three

36 Notes on the Proceedings of a Native Council... Wednesday 11 December 1878, p. 57.
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39 Notes on the Proceedings of a Native Council... Wednesday 11 December 1878, p. 68. See also P. France, The Charter, p. 110.
40 Notes on the Proceedings of a Native Council... Wednesday 11 December 1878, p. 57.
41 Fiji Government Gazette, No. 1, Saturday, 10 October 1874.
terms, for it mentioned the term ‘natives’ for the Fijian phrase ‘na nodra tamata na lewe ni vanua e Viti.’ In the vernacular phrase, the authority of the turaga bale was significant in that they had their ‘tamata’ whom the Deed called ‘natives’. Literally, the phrase meant, ‘their people, inhabitants of Viti’ and indicated that the turaga bale’s lewa ruled over both, the people and their land.

In addition to being assured their rights to land, they were also granted their rights to the waters and sea. In 1881, the Earl of Kimberly wrote to Sir William Des Voeux, who replaced Gordon as Governor of Fiji, and said:

> With reference to the claim advanced in this letter to the Reefs, I am commanded to instruct you to inform the Chiefs in that the whole matter will at once be investigated by you and that it is Her Majesty’s desire that neither they nor their people should be deprived of any rights which they have enjoyed under their own laws and customs.  

The second area I am interested in is the effect of standardisation on the turaga bale institution. Standardisation may have a price for the vanua and matanitu that have different customs of ownership and tenure, yet, for turaga bale it brought more responsibility on their part towards customs and the people. This responsibility arose from the fact that the mataqali was an ancient institution, peculiar to Bau and Rewa. Kemueli Uluikavoro revealed that the matanitu of Rewa was made up of a number of mataqali.

*The Tui Dreketi.*

This is the highest chief in Rewa. The name belonged to one mataqali only, the mataqali Vale Levu. When a Tui Dreketi is installed, authority is given to him, together with all lands in Rewa. There are chiefs in Rewa who have their own people, but the Tui Dreketi owns all, land and the people.

---

42 Earl of Kimberly to Governor Sir William Des Voeux, 2nd June 1881, Despatch No 69, J. S. M. P.
The Vunivalu is installed from this mataqali. When the Tui Dreketi plans a war, word will be sent to each bati village. As they assemble, the Vunivalu will present a whale’s tooth, or tabua, called the kabakaba ni valu, or war ladder.

The Sauturaga
They are divided into two mataqali, the first is Navolau, with two other minor mataqali attached to it, and the second, Navasuvasu, which also consisted of two minor mataqali. Members of this mataqali remained with the Tui Dreketi, counselling and deciding with him.

Na Toga
There are two mataqali here, the Vusanamu and Naluveluve, responsible for the large canoes of Rewa. The do not plant gardens but sail. They sail at day and at night, finding food wherever they sail to.

Na Mataisau
They have only one mataqali and their main duty is to build canoes.

Na Gonedau
There are three mataqali who are fishermen to the Tui Dreketi, namely Vutia, Kuku and Nasilai.

The religious nature of the mataqali at Rewa, as in Uluikavoro’s account, was different from that of Bau, as in Lyth’s description of the Bauan society on the eve of Cakobau’s conversion to Christianity. From that description, Bau was organised into five mataqali, each having its own cults. These cults were based within the mataqali, transforming the mataqali into cultic groupings. The mataqali Tui Kaba had their sanctuary at Drekeiselesele, where they worshiped their kalou Komaidrekeiselesele. They had another kalou, Kalouniuca, with Baituauwa as their priest. Lyth did not clarify whether Komaidrekeiselesele and Kalouniuca were Cagawalu, Tanoa’s war god. As I have discussed in Chapter 2, the 1832 coup d’etat changed the political structure of the Bauan matanitu, elevating the Vunivalu as the supreme ruler of the matanitu. He took over Roko Tui Bau’s sanctuary, Na Vatanitawake, and worshipped his kalou ni valu, Cagawalu, in that temple. Roko Tui Bau’s kalou was removed to a new sanctuary, called

---

43 Kemueli Uluikavoro, Ai Tukutuku e na vukui Rewa, MSS in Fijian, frames 272 – 5.
44 Richard B Lyth, Reminiscence and Customs, CY Reel 119 - B551, frame 100, M. L.
Nabuliveivava, and ministered by his priest, Koroisauunitoga. Instead of taking Komainayavucere, or Vueti, with him to Nabuliveivava, Roko Tui Bau worshiped Bativudi, a different kalou in his new temple. Another mataqali, the Vusa Radave had Raico as their kalou, with Tola as priest, at their temple called Naveikilaisautu. The mataqali Tunitoga’s sanctuary was called Vunikura, under the care of Kamunaga and Koroinaua. At Vunikura, Korokasa was worshiped as the mataqali’s kalou. As for the mataqali Lasakau, they worshipped their kalou, Butakoivalu, at Navico temple, with Sito as priest. They also had another kalou called Nabuliqavoka. The fifth mataqali on the island of Bau, Soso, had their shrine at Gunuabo, where they worshipped their kalou called Daucina. Apart from these mataqali cults, there existed another cult, which was the matanitu cult, centred at Na Vatanitawake. On state occasions, Kamunaga and Koroinaua, the priests of the mataqali Tunitoga, became priests to Cagawalu at Na Vatanitawake, hence the close association between the two mataqali, Tui Kaba and Tunitoga. Tui Kaba’s kalou ni valu, Cagawalu, was worshipped on these occasions, with Kamunaga as the high priest. All the mataqali were combined under this cult united at Na Vatanitawake, as in the case of Cakobau’s installation in 1853.

The same religious features, of the mataqali, were evident in Namacu on the island of Koro. There, each mataqali preserved their identity through their history. The history of each mataqali made it aware that it had a yavusa, which was broken at sea while migrating from Bau to Koro. The yavusa entity, therefore, became the guardian of history and identity. From a pre-cession account, the people of Naulunivuaka, now living at Namacu, had Koya mai Qaraqara, Koya mai Tabuiga, Tuivunivatu, Daucina, Buiyayamo,
Ko ira na Gone and Kuvumainaqele as their kalou. 45 Each mataqali had its kalou, but Koya mai Qaraqara was the greatest of them all, and all the mataqali of the yavusa Naulunivuaka worshipped him. The supremacy of Koyamaiqaraqara, within the yavusa Naulunivuaka, denoted the religious foundation of the Naulunivuaka political system. Naulunivuaka consisted of the mataqali Tunidaunibau, Taurisau, Vusaratavuto, Sanisugu and Baleinasinu. When they left Bau, out of sympathy for the yavusa Delai’s expulsion from their hill top residence, they left their house, called Naulunivuaka, behind. Legends about this house said that it had five doors, one for each mataqali. They left this house behind, only to be used as the Strangers House and later as the first Wesleyan Chapel at Bau. The yavusa left Bau by mataqali and separated at sea. The Vusaratavuto reached Koro, where a kindred yavusa, the kai Nacawa gave them land at Navakaravi to settle. The Tunidaunibau and the Taurisau ended up in Vanuaso, the Sanisugu at Natauloa and the Baleinasinu in Ovalau. 46 On hearing that the Vusaratavuto had been given land to settle on, the rest of the mataqali began to make their way to Koro. These examples, from Bau, Rewa and Namacu, should be enough to demonstrate the fact that the mataqali, as an institution, had very deep roots in terms of politics and religion.

Further, this particular institution had different names. The name mataqali was not a Fiji-wide term, however the unit was associated with land management, politics and religion. Take Ba and Tailevu for instance. In the province of Ba, the mataqali was known as

45 Aisea Vukilevu, Koro, MSS in Fijian, frame 400.

46 See Alan Richards Tippett, The Survival of An Ancient Custom relative to the Pigs Head, Bau, Fiji, Transaction of the Fijian Society, 13 June, 1955, p. 30-39. Tippett was at Bau in 1955, when Ratu Joji Kadavulevu Cakobau invested the title of Tunidau ni Bau on Ratu Laisiasa Raloka. Ratu Kadavulevu was later invested with the title Vunivalu in 1959. Tippett must have gathered his data from those who came for Ratu Raloka’s investiture. According to Raivalita, the Butoni people were part of Vueti’s migration from Nakauvadra. See T. Raivalita, Tukutuku Raaba.
tokotoko in Nailaga. In Tavua, the mataqali Belaga and Nadokana in Tavua managed land by the mataqali. Meli Qarakosa of Nadala said that he was the one who governed and managed the land. ‘Land,’ he said, ‘is under my leadership’. At Vatutavui, land was managed by the tokotoko or na lewe and land rights were maintained within the mataqali. Alematabua held land by the tokotoko, veitacini and individuals as well. The Naketenamsi held and managed their lands through their fathers and household elders of the tokotoko or nalewei. The Nabo managed their lands through the tokotoko. The yavusa Saquele and Vanuakula in the Bukuya managed their land by yavusa and the other two, Tidamu and Tunuloa, managed theirs through na lewe. The Tunuloa then divided their nalewe land into vuvale holdings. At Vuda and Sabeto, management was by the yavusa while holdings remained with the na lewe. The yavusa Noiyasawa did the same, managing their land through the mataqali, tokotoka or na lewe, tacini and luveni. At Nadi, inhabitants at Narewa village owned land through their yavusa, mataqali and veitacini.

48 Meli Qarakosa, Nadala, Tavua, op cit.
49 Esava Lovokatini, Vatutavui, op cit.
50 Aminiasi Sese, Alematabua, op cit.
51 Paula Nawaimalua, Naketenamase, op cit.
52 Jiali Wainivesa, Nabo, op cit.
53 Sakuusa Marawa, Enquiries into the land belonging to the yavusa Saquele, op cit
54 Nikola Vetaua, Enquiries into the lands belonging to the yavusa Nacekuaia, op cit
55 Sakuisa Usa, Ai Tukutuku ni Vanua nodra na kai Naqualitola kei Tole e Koro e na Yavusa ko Noiyasawa, op cit.
56 Naibuka Nayamu, Ai tukutuku ni Vanua ni Yavusa ko Sila e na mataqali ko Nakoyo kei Vunamu
At Vaturu, land was managed by the *mataqali*. Similar to Vaturu, the *mataqali* at Nawaka managed and held their land through the *mataqali*. The *yavusa* Toru managed their land through the *mataqali*, which distributed it to the *na lewe*, while the *yavusa* Korotogo managed their land through the *yavusa*. Here, the *kai* Yalatina, *mataqali* Dua, *kai* Noituba and the *kai* Nanuku used the *mataqali* to govern their lands. However, the terms *kausivi* and *kete* was used at Yasawa, as at Bua, instead of the word *mataqali*. The *yavusa* and *kausivi* owned land on the island of Yasawa. Timoci Ciba of Malakati said that the *kete* was a unit of the *yavusa*, which owned land at Malakati. The *kete* existed also in Nacula, Cube, Navotua and Yaqeta. At Kese, in the district of Naviti, land was owned by the *yavusa*, *kete*, *veitamani* and *tamata yadua*.

These variations also existed in the province of Tailevu, from where standardization began. At Dawasamu the *matanibure*, a unit similar to the *tokatoka* was the land owning unit, but Vorovoro village, a few miles to the east, managed its land by the *savusavu* of the *mataqali*. Luvunavuaka, Lawaki and Qelekuro also managed their land through the *savusavu*, and as it was at Namena. However, a *yavusa* subjected to Namena, the *yavusa* Dere at Naqeke and Vatucou, insisted that they owned land through the *mataqali*. Management was not consistent in Tailevu, for Sawakasa had a different system to
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Dawasamu. The yavusa Kai Waimaro, the mataqali Nadereivalu, Wainivesi, Waimaro, Wairua, Narocake, Tacilevu, Naduguca, Talea, Navitilevu, Bure, Bau, Kabatia, Naboutini and Neovini claimed that the mataqali and yavusa were units of management. Within the same vicinity, the yavusa Nadereivalu and Narocake owned land through the mataqali and savusavu. They had another name for the savusavu, called lalavi. Between Namena and Waimaro, the yavusa Wainivesi, Waimaro, Nadereivalu, Vulagi and the kai Naloto, used the mataqali as the unit of land management. The yavusa Naboutini and Naovini in the villages of Dakuinuku and Saiyaro recognized individual ownership, but land was managed by the mataqali, veitamani and veitacini managed the land. In the district of Namalata, the yavusa Bau and Bure preserved the mataqali system of ownership. Their representatives also mentioned the presence of the lalavi in their social structure. At Matacaucau village, land was held by the mataqali, yavusa and the veitamani. The yavusa Nasau living in various villages of the district of Namalata also practised this system of land ownership. In the district of Verata, land management was very specific. The yavusa Yasa and Naikasakasa at Kumi village held land by mataqali, matanibure veitacini and veiluveni and tamata yadua. At Ucunivanua village, the yavusa Yatusawa and the yavusa Daviko held land through mataqali, savusavu, veitacini and veiluveni. The yavusa Qalibure and Naloto and the yavusa Kabatia in Sawa maintained that they held land by the mataqali. The yavusa Vunisaqiwa preserved the mataqali system of ownership. In the District of Tai Vugalei, the yavusa Tai Vugalei owned land by mataqali and the savusavu. This was also the system for the yavusa Naivakacere at Nailega village. The yavusa Vugalei in the villages of Natobuniqio, Nadaro, Sauravua, Savu Botia, Kauasa and Matanikorowalu used the mataqali and the matanibure as their unit of ownership. The yavusa Nacovu at Naimasimasi village owned land through their mataqali and matanibure. The term tokatoka first appeared at Namata, where the yavusa
Nacobua, Namata, Naibali Vusa Koli and Nokonoko maintained that they owned land by veitacini, tokatoka and mataqali.

In Tailevu, the units of land management were matanibure, tokatoka, mataqali, savusavu, yavusa, lalavi, veitamani veitacini, veiluveni and tamata yadua. Ba had the tokotoko veitacini, na lewe, tokotoko, yavusa lewe, na lewe, vuvale, na lewe, tokatoka, na lewe, tacini, luveni, kausivi, kete, veitamani, tamata yadua. New terminologies further appeared in Serua and Bua. In Serua, the mataqali and tadratadra governed land, while in Bua the rara was similar to the mataqali and huvuluvu to the kausivi.

The turaga bale’s 1878 resolution for uniformity saw the mataqali replacing these other terms on land holding. The replacement however was not instant. It came out gradually through the N. L. C. after Wilkinson made thorough investigations of the institutions of land management.

Uniformity of owning units does not mean the dissolution of customs that the mataqali had been practicing from time immemorial. Even though it was used as the standard unit of ownership, the nature and function of the unit remained. The function and nature of those units standardized continued because the mataqali was the very foothold of Fijian identity. Each Fijian had to be known and identified through his customary duty to the turaga bale institution, and that duty was the function of the mataqali. Fijians used religion to inspire them to their duty, hence the influence of religion on identity. Though the turaga bale introduced harmony by imposing its political and religious unit as the unit
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of land registration, customary practices continued within those units. And this is the third area that I will discuss in this Chapter, which is the third Fijian world I emphasized in the Introduction.

Identity, on its institutional foothold, had four fundamental levels. In some cases, there are five. They are the mataqali, yavusa, vanua and matanitu. Briefly, a matanitu is a collection of vanua under the leadership of a turaga bale. Most of the study of Fiji’s history had been focused on this level. Further, the harmonisation of the land owning unit took place in this matanitu level. It was a turaga bale issue and decision. However, each turaga bale had his vanua. A vanua consists of a number of yavusa and led by a turaga i taukei. On this level, identity is matter of everyday life. Customs, like identity, are more defined and localized. The presence of the turaga bale at this level of identity institution eases the impact of harmonization on this level. The turaga bale institution, which had harmonized the land owning unit, continued to accept the vanua’s customary obligations to the chiefly system, at the level of the vanua and matanitu. As this practice continued amidst harmonization, it further revealed the fact that identity, at the vanua level, continued with its customary forms of expressions.

To demonstrate this continuing practice at the vanua level, despite harmonization, I will use the data on the sevu custom in the vanua of Dawasamu, Namena, Verata and Tai Vugalei in Cakobau’s matanitu. As additional illustration to the fact that the practice was Fiji-wide, I will also analyse information on that practice selected from some vanua in the matanitu of Bua, and the vanua of Nawaka, Koronubu and Nadi in the province of Ba. This selection should be enough to show the dynamics of land customs on identity. Sevu is the custom of presenting the first fruits of the land to the mataqali’s patriarch.
This custom has four significant dimensions, political, religious, chronological and geographical, critical to the issue of Fijian identity. The political dimension linked the mataqali to the yavusa, the yavusa to the vanua and the vanua to the matanitu. Each turaga bale did not own land, but would be normally presented with the first fruit of the land in his matanitu. Enforcing this political dimension was the custom of vakarorogo or obeisance, where the sevu strengthened the political links between the turaga bale, matanitu, vanua, yavusa and the mataqali. Each year, the cycle of presentation would be observed, renewing the links between all levels of political institutions from the mataqali to the matanitu. The religious dimension was local and spiritual in nature. It was confined to the mataqali and yavusa. Each mataqali would present the sevu to their mataqali’s patriarch before all the mataqali within the yavusa would present their sevu to the yavusa’s patriarch. It was a powerful dimension for all the sentiments associated with Fijian land ownership were rooted in it. The sevu pacified these sentiments when the patriarchs were appeased with the ritual offering of the first fruits of the land.

In Tailevu North, each mataqali, or matanibure, in the yavusa Navunisea in Nasinu presented their sevu to their matanibure, and then to either their turaga or the priest. After that first set of presentations, made to the mataqali’s bure kalou, all the mataqali would bring their mataqali’s sevu to Namasoli, the yavusa bure kalou. The yavusa Dawasamu also divided the sevu into two, the first to the matanibure and the second to
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the *yavusa*, and observed in February, or the month of Tinasau. After a few miles east of Dawasamu, the *sevu* had another name, *drawe*. After the *sevu*, the ritual clearing of the annual ash from the *bure kalou*’s hearth, or *tadravu*, was observed. Agricultural products such as *dalo, uvi, yaqona, madrai*, or bread, *vudi*, sugar cane and the first fruits from all fruit trees were presented as *sevu*.

From Ilaitia Bularua’s account, the *sevu* custom was more convoluted in Namena. The *i sevu* was garnered from each *mataqali* and presented to Koya mai Nawainovo, the chief of Namena. After receiving the presentations, the yoke used to carry the *sevu* was unfettered with a *tabua*, called the *kali ni vua ni sevu*. *Tadravu* followed, first to be observed in the *bure kalou* and then in each house. The priest would then *nita*, that is, rubbing two sticks together, to create the new annual fire, after which, the conch shell, *davui*, was blown and food offered to their *kalou*. Another feast called the *ai sigana*, or the *magiti ni vakavinavinaka*, was observed apart from the *sevu*. It was a feast of thanksgiving, presented and eaten at Naivuki, the central *bure lmlou* of the *vanua* of Nawainovo. Tui Nawainovo also received the *sevu* from other *yavusa* within his *vanua*, like the *yavusa* Dere, who, after offering their *sevu* to the Tui Dere, would present the *sevu* to Komainawainovo. In similar fashion to the rest of the *mataqali* in Tailevu North, the *yavusa* Dere observed the ritual *tadravu* after the *sevu*.

At Verata, custom required that *sevu* be observed on two political levels, first to the
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mataqali and then the main bure kalou. In the village of Naivuruvuru, the sevu from each mataqali was presented to Ucunivau village. There, it was presented with a banana and via leaf, together with the taqaruru or votu ni saqiwa. These leaves were symbolic, as covers, and used as lou ni wai and lou ni yaqona, in the ritual yaqona ceremony for the Ratu at Verata. Yaqona was chewed for Roko Mautu, the small snake at Waituruturu. On such occasions, tradition says that rain would fall at Davetalevu beside Moturiki to mark the successful presentation of the sevu. In the village of Sawa, each mataqali presented its sevu to its bure kalou and observed the tadravu afterwards. In the village of Kuni, Watisoni Koroidelaibatiki mentioned a new custom, musu na i sau, the breaking of the annual digging stick, to mark the close of the sevu ceremonies. The tadravu was also observed at Sawa. In the yavusa Vunisaqiwa, the sevu was presented to the chief, who presented a reciprocal vakamalua, or customary receipt, followed by the breaking of the digging stick, musu na i sau.

The first recorded case of sevu to be cooked in Tailevu was at Naimasimasi in the vanua of Tai Vugalei. This denotes a banquet, not sacrifice. The other unique aspect of the sevu custom at Naimasimasi was that after being presented to the priests, it was presented
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to the bati, warriors.\textsuperscript{73} Still, the sevu was presented to the chiefs in the two villages, Nailega and Naseva. But in the village of Savu, the sevu was presented first to the priests, then to the mataqali Rokotuni.\textsuperscript{74} After that, the mataqali members and tenants presented their sevu to their turaga ni mataqali, mataqali heads, and tadravu observed after the sevu.

It is therefore shown, in the data from Tailevu, that the mataqali was the foothold of identity and the vanua its rallying point. This is important for it showed the possible directions of people movement in defensive, or offensive, situations. Identity issues emerged now and then, all using the same foothold and the same rallying point. To show that it was a Fiji-wide issue, Naitasiri, Bua, Ba, Yasawa and Serua will be briefly discussed.

Naitasiri is also part of Cakobau’s matanitu. The minor institutions of identity, at the vanua and mataqali level, paid special attention to the rituals of the sevu. In many ways, these rituals reflect the reality of the mataqali and vanua identity. At Navuso, the principal village of Naitasiri, and where the Qaranivalu resided, sevu was first presented to their priests and kalou, and the Qaranivalu later.\textsuperscript{75} It was cooked and presented with pork, chicken, and a special yam variety, called kauregu. For the mataqali Naitauwa, whose special responsibility was to present the sevu, this custom carried a lot of weight in terms of their identity. This was also the case for the yavusa Nayavumata in

\textsuperscript{73} Amori Cabenalevu, Mataqali Waimanu, A Report on the Native Land Commission Enquiries on the Land belonging to the Various Mataqali in the Yavusa Nacovu at Naimasimasi Village, op cit.

\textsuperscript{74} Joela Mototabua, A Report on the Native Land Commission Enquiries on the Land belonging to the Various Mataqali in the Yavusa Vugalei and Vusa Ratora in the Village of Natobuniqio, Nadaro, Sauravua and the Village of Savu, op cit.
Nacokaika. The kai Vuniyaca, Tauya and Naleca first observed their sevu in their bure kalou before each mataqali presented its first fruits to the Qaranivalu. They cooked it in secret and presented it in silence. A ritual bath would follow, after which the Qaranivalu would observe a four-night vigil of purification with the mataqali Waitabu, Viti and the Nasi. This bath was significant for those three mataqali since it was an annual renewal their identity. Such a renewal could only happen when they serve the Qaranivalu in that manner.

The strength of the turaga bale’s grip on uniformity could be felt as one gradually move into the interior of Naitasiri. In Vuna, on the lower banks of the Waimanu River, the tadravu, with the uvi gaci as the feast, preceded the sevu. The mataqali Matanivanua presented their sevu first to their bure kalou. Four nights after, each mataqali would present theirs to their bure kalou, followed by feasting. Games would be played after the feast to end the season. This was differently timed with the games in Koro Island, which were played after the yams begin to grow in September and October. The kai Viwa in Deladamanu presented theirs to their bure kalou, also yams cooked with pork. Before the season arrived, the kai Roko Tuni first buried vudi. After their vudi had been in the ground for four nights, the Roko Taiki buried their vudi. In Viria, the mataqali Drekeniwai presented their cooked sevu first, eaten at the door of the bure kalou. It was then divided, with the first portion taken to the Vunivalu to eat. The yams were cooked secretly, giving time for the mataqali Drekeniwai to assemble in the bure kalou. The
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yavusa Lewenikoro of Namuamua village ate its own i sevu. They buried the vudi to ripen quickly and a portion of the sevu was taken to the Vunivalu at Viria. The kai Ovalau in Savu village cooked their sevu in pots painted reregu or pink, and taken to the sanctuary where the elders of the mataqali assembled with Roko Tui Ovalau. The Tunimatanitai at Motonoko village also buried the vudi before the sevu season. The sevu pot was also painted pink and the yams were roasted, not cooked. When cooked, the sevu was beaten with the flowers of the gasau and taken to the chief, who remained indoors for four nights. The celebration then continued for four nights, with the chiefs remaining in the bure kalou as the women went to harvest the yams. The kai Tai at Natavea presented their sevu cooked to the kai Burekalou at the bure kalou Navimaka. Their yams were sacrificed before each mataqali presented their sevu to their own bure kalou.

A general observation at this stage showed that religion determines customs relating to land. This factor of land history in Fiji had been overlooked in the past. It is obvious that in the sevu custom, the uvi and vudi, were two sacred fruits of the land. In Fijian mythology, these were the foods of the gods, being the only plants allowed in a were kalou, or sacred garden. In addition to this observation, these data reveal the very bowels of the third Fijian world, where the vu, turaga bale, turaga i taukei and the vanua refurbish, on an annual basis, their status and responsibility to the other through rituals leading to a renewal of identity.
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The position of the *turaga bale*, in relation to the continuous practices by the minor institutions of Fijian identity, was the same in Bua. At the *matanitu* level, uniformity was definite, whereas in the *vanua* and *mataqali* level, the essence of what is Fijian, *vaka-Viti*, was multi-*vanua* and multi-*mataqali*. The emphasis placed on the *kalou vu* and their *bure* at Bua and Yasawa further illumine this complex nature of the third Fijian world. Ravuravu, at the *sava* called Ratukituki, was the deity of the land in Bua. 83 Other *sava* at Bua were Matanisava, 84 Nasaru, Vatuka, Matainavaka, Matanisava, Naritia, Rokocaginiloaloa, Korodreudreu, Sarava and Nasauloa. From these *sava*, Ravuravu, Koyamainavilaca, Ra Rokie, Rabukareka, Rokosolo, Kokeamaiuduvau and Raboteanaivalu. The *a nitu vu* in Yasawa were Semoala, 85 Tuiwedre, Tavutavuvanua, Ravuravu, Nauluvatu, Railumi, 86 Waikidailagi, Bulibalavu, Rainima and Vasu. 87 There were only two identified sanctuaries, and they were Nasigasiga on Malakati and Muaira on Naiviti Island.

In Ba and Nadi, the *sevu* had different names, namely *vakasiga*, *cava ni siga*, *ai sigana*, *masawa* and *cuqecuqe*. 88 But, there is a remarkable shift in the religious nature of the custom, probably due to the *mataqali*’s mobility and displacements. The *sevu* was presented to the hosting *mataqali*. This certainly has a strong resonance on the larger
issue of identity, especially in the *matanitu* level. The chiefs replaced the *anutu vu* as the gods of the land. Samuela Namalua explained the concept of *dhuulu ni drole*, wild bamboo suckers, where there was no overall chief. According to Epeli Rasolo, the *vakasiga* was taken to Natavacake. The *kai* Raiwaqa presented theirs to the *kai* Nalotawa and the *kai* Yalatina presented their *cuqecuqe* to the *lewe* Namolida. The *mataqali* Dua presented their *vakasiga* to the *lewe* of Raravatu and the *kai* Noitubai to Natogo. Manasa Qoro, of the *kai* Nawaka, said that they presented their *sevu* to their own *mataqali*, while the *kai* Natutu to their chiefs. At Yavuna village, *kai* Nakorokula, *kai* Namulomulo and *kai* Vutuma presented their *sevu* to the priests, and the villages of Natovoli and Tebenidio to the chief at Tavua, after which they presented their *sevu* to their *bure kalou*. Natovoli presented its *sevu* to Rokodrakawalu, a male *kalou vu*, Sagawe presented to Korosuvi, and Buleya to Batinaci. In the villages of Drakaniwai and Nabalavu, the *sevu* was presented to their chief. The people of Nabou at Vuniuto presented their *sevu* to Dradramea, Rokouvi and Cauoro. In Bukuya, the *sevu* was presented to the *tukani*. Joni Sovasova of the*yavusa* Vanuakula called the *sevu* the *ai sigana* or *masawa*. The *mataqali* Saquele presented theirs to the *kai* Taviri but the *mataqali* Vidilo presented its *sevu* only to their chiefs. In Sabeto, the *sevu* was called the *cuqicuqi*, and the *mataqali* Nasara presented theirs to *na lewe* Nalagi. The*yavusa* Conua presented theirs to Naboutini and the*yavusa* Ne presented theirs to *na lewe* Koro.

Vuda presented their *sigana* to their chiefs. In Vaturu, Navokasiga presented their *sevu*
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to the lewei Natoga and the mataqali kai Nanuku presented theirs to Nanika. In the Nadi, the cuqecuqe were cooked from each lewe or yavusa and exchanged with that of the other lewe.92 The cuqecuqe in the yavusa Navo were done in similar fashion to Yavusania. Each mataqali would cook a pot of the first fruits and then they would exchange it with another cooked pot from another mataqali.93 The yavusa Nasesevia also observed the sevu by celebrating it within their mataqali. The kai Naqualitola, in the yavusa Noiyasawa, called sevu with another name, cava ni siga.94 In the yavusa Sila, the cuqecuqe was cooked from each mataqali and then exchanged for all to eat. If raw, then they would distribute it to all the participating mataqali.95 The yavusa Naua also presented the cuqecuqe to their mataqali.

In these cases at Ba, there were only two references made to the priests. Viliame Veikoso, representing the yavusa Nadi and Tukani, said that the vakarere cuqecuqe was cooked on the village green as a form of celebration and shared by all the mataqali with fish, chicken or pork. After they had observed it as such, they would present another vakarere cuqecuqe to the priests. In Nawaka, the village of Tubenasolo presented their cuqicuqi to Vacoro in the month of Malaba, whilst the mataqali Yavuni in the villages of Nakorokula and Namalumalu presented the priests.


93 Apakuki Vurabera, A Veitarogi ni Yalayala ni nodra Vanua na Yavusa ko Nava, e na Mataqali ko Noiyaro, Ko Natakuici kei Nava, op cit

94 Sakiusa Usa, A Veitarogi ni Yalayala ni Nodra Vanua na kai Naqualitola, kei Tole, kei Koro e na Yavusa ko Noiyasawa, op cit.

Serua, on the other hand, observed the **vakasawa** as a remembrance banquet for family members who had past away. In the **yavusa** Saiaki, Navusu and the Batiwai Qale, it was the traditional moon keepers’ responsibility at the *bato* Narogi, to inform the **yavusa** that it was time for the **vakasawa**. The **taniloa**, comprising yams and fish, was taken to the principal *bure kalou*, where the feast was dedicated to the ancestors, fathers, mothers, brothers and children who had died. 96 The **yavusa** Tuluga and Nakausaki observed the **vakasawa** in three special forms, all directed to their ancestors. If they had died a natural death, the **vakasawa** was cooked, but uncooked if they died at sea. If they were clubbed, then the **vakasawa** was roasted. 97 The **yavusa** Naicabe, *mataqali* Noikodruku and the **yavusa** Noinakorolevu also presented the **vakasawa** to the spirit of the dead ancestors, either cooked, roasted or boiled. They performed the rituals during both day and night. 98

The nature of the third Fijian world, from Bua, through Ba, Yasawa, Nadi and then to Serua, and as shown by the changing nature of the **sevu** custom, is varied according to *vanua* and *mataqali*. The unity of the *turaga bale* institution, as rectified through the standardization of the land owning unit, was sitting on a variety of customs, of which the **sevu** was only one of them.

After discussing these three themes in relation to harmony and variations, the question as to the position of Wesleyanism in this Fijian cosmos comes up again. The Wesleyans
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were patronized from the beginning by the turaga bale institution. I have discussed in this Chapter, especially in the sevu customs, that the turaga bale institution is a part of a larger system of authority that is deeply rooted in the vanua, yavusa and mataqali. What went on at the matanitu level, that is the harmonization of the land owning unit, did not stop the vanua and mataqali customs relating to land. To the Fijians, the veiwekani vakaturaga, reflected in the way they unified the mataqali as the land owning unit, would be strengthened by the myriad of customs practised by the 1,379 yavusa, 5,657 mataqali and 10,644 tokatoka in their individual cosmos level.
The new century dawned on a new, and second, generation of *turaga bale*. Cakobau had
died in 1 February 1882 and was buried in May at Bau. Ma’afu had died a year earlier,
Thurston in 7 February 1897, Ratu Golea in April 1879 and Katonivere on the 25 March
1892. On the 10 December 1902, the end of the customary mourning period for
Nailatikau’s death was marked with the custom of *taraisulu* at Bau; where Ratu Joni
Colata presented the final set of *tabua* to the chiefs of Tailevu. He reminded them that of
those *turaga bale* that ceded Fiji to Queen Victoria, Nailatikau was last to die, leaving
their legacy to Ratu Penaia Kadavulevu.1 The young boy Madraiwiwi, who was
embraced by his father at the gallows in August 1859, was by far the most senior chief in
Fiji. His nephew, Kadavulevu, was now the uninstalled Tui Kaba and Vunivalu of Bau.
It was probably one of Cakobau’s last duties to ask for the Suva peninsula from his
relatives, the *yavusa* Suva, as the site for the new capital of the Colony.2 In 1882, the
capital was shifted from Levuka to Suva, with the Governor’s Residence built at
Naiqasiqasi Hill, overlooking the harbour. The Wesleyans followed the government to
Suva, when Arthur James Small removed the Qase Levu’s residence from Bau to Suva in
1903 and took up residence at Mission Hill in Toorak on the Suva peninsula. The shift
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ended the period that began when the Qase Levu took residence with the Vunivalu of Bau. In 1907, the Methodists’ Theological Institute and High School were relocated from Navuloa to Davuilevu on the banks of the Rewa River, opposite the sugar mill at Nausori and within twelve miles of Suva. Even though the Wesleyans vacated Hunstville and Bau as the residence of the Qase Levu, their institutional connection with Bau and the turaga bale institution remained intact, as proven through the events in the first decade of the century.

This Chapter discusses how the Wesleyans intervened in the earlier decades of the twentieth century in the legislative process to preserve the main institutions of Fijian identity. This intervention was a consequence of their influence on the institutions of identity, an influence that drew them closer to the turaga bale institution. The concept of na lotu i na Vunivalu, or the religion of the Vunivalu, carried a huge responsibility. I will, therefore, discuss how the Wesleyans strove to preserve the nature of the institutions of Fijian identity they built when, through legislation, it became vulnerable to modern conditions. The Wesleyans were aware during the first Wesleyan District Meeting in 1838 that ‘mission property in these islands is not on the same footing as most of the missionary stations…’, hence the title of this Chapter.3

Their effort was inspired through their participation in the ascendancy of Bau and the establishment of the turaga bale institution. Their participation, ascendancy and establishment evolved into a legacy for both the turaga bale institution and the Wesleyans. The Deed of Cession enshrined this legacy in Clause 7/1 and for that reason,

3 Answer to Question 12, Minutes of the First, F. D. M. M. R.
any review of legislative had to respect this legacy. The Deed, 1877 Native Regulation, and the 1892 Native Land Ordinance were rooted in this legacy. The problem was that at the turn of century, the colonial government reassessed its policies on demographic and economic grounds. It found an urgent need to review these fundamental policies in order to enhance the economic welfare of the Fijian society. These were evident in Sir Everard im Thurn’s speech to the Great Council of Chiefs in 1905, which I will later analyze in the Chapter. All those who created this legacy were dead, and with Gordon, now Lord Stanmore, in England, the Wesleyans were left in Fiji with the second generation of turaga bale, to meet these challenges at the dawn of the twentieth century. I will discuss how the Wesleyans used their influence to protect the institutions of identity when the government relaxed some fundamental regulations on native land.

William K. Allardyce, who was Acting Governor in 1902, went to Nailatikau’s taraisulu at Bau. During the ceremony, he reiterated to his audience that Bau, being Cakobau’s village, was the koro vakaturaga in Fiji. ‘What you think and do today, Fiji will think and do tomorrow’. These words were reflected in his appraisal of the native regulation. In the beginning of 1902, he published a pamphlet titled Ai Vola ni Lawa i Taukei ka Vakatekivu e na i Vakatekivu ni Yabaki 1877 ka Yacova na i Otioti ni Yabaki 1901. He had found at the beginning of 1902 that the Native Regulation needed an overhaul. In the twenty-four years since cession, some regulations had been repealed, others amended and new ones instituted, confusing the original intention of the Native Regulation. With the

---

4 Na Mata, ibid.
6 W. K. Allardyce, Ai Vola ni Lawa, p. v.
help, of the Masau of Bau, Deve Toganivalu, Allardyce published the vernacular version of the Native Regulation, where all the amendments and new regulation since cession were presented to refocus the Government’s native policy. Even though this volume had some offensive vocabularies, and was to be revised, it contained the basic regulations on Fijian government since 1877.

Allardyce began from *Ordinance Number I of 1877*, an ordinance introduced by Gordon enacted for the *Better Regulation of Native Affairs*. In Section VII, the Board responsible for native affairs was required to ‘consider such questions relating to the good government and well being of the Native population’. The Board was also authorised in Section IX to make regulations, later called the Native Regulations, for the government of the Fijian people and advise the Governor on them. The Governor, on finding it proper, shall introduce the regulations to the Legislative Council. These regulations, after approval, ‘shall have the force of Law in as far as the same are not repugnant to any Law or Ordinance in force in the Colony’. According to Allardyce’s *Ai Vola Ni Lawa ni Taukei* of 1902, Section 1 of the Native Regulation of 1877 instituted the Great Council of Chiefs, and spelt out the members of the GCC in Section 2. The members of this Council were Cakobau, in his capacity as Tui Viti, all the Provincial Roko Tui, Native Magistrates, two Buli from each Province, Provincial Clerks and the Secretary for Native Affairs. To maintain the close relationship between the *turaga bale* institution and the Governor of the Colony, Section 3 stated that the GCC originated from

---


8 ibid.

the Governor, with only the Governor having the authority to open and close the proceedings of the GCC. Voting rights were reserved for the Roko Tui only as specified in Section 6. In Section 9, the GCC was required to discuss and decide matters of national interest, whether it be vaka-Vanua, or vaka-Matanitu, and notify the Governor of their decision.

The Native Regulation stipulated three levels of Fijian administration. The first level was governed by the GCC. On the second level, governed by the Provincial Council, the work of the District Buli, Turaga ni Koro, Turaga ni Qali, Native Magistrates and Scribes were coordinated and supervised. Each Buli governed the third and most-local level of Fijian administration. A Buli was a District Chief, and Chairman of the District Meeting. Each village headman, or turaga ni koro, and all the turaga ni qali within the District were members of the District Meeting.

There was a special section on the vanua, aimed at harmonising the relationship between the authority of the district Buli and Turaga. In Section 28, each Turaga was required to report to the District Meeting all work instituted by his koro, and the District’s Turaga was to report all the works instituted by his vanua to the District Meeting for the Buli to include in his district’s report to the Provincial Office. Receiving all the district reports, the Roko Tui was then to inform the Governor on matters regarding his Districts. In addition to the section on the vanua, the Native Regulation also outlined a Code of Ethics for the turaga bale institution. Section 103 affirmed that all chiefs should rule their
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10 Lawa 6, 1881 gave the Buli, not the Turaga of the District, the privilege to represent the district to the Provincial Office. See W. K. Allardyce, Ai Vola ni Lawa, p. 8.
11 Lawa 3, 1877, See W. K. Allardyce, Ai Vola ni Lawa, p. 28.
people justly to ensure peace. This Section did not allow for oppressive chiefs, or chiefs who were *deuveivakasaurarataki*. It had provisions for an oppressed *mataqali* to complain to the Roko and the Governor if a chief was oppressive. On the other hand, Section 105 demanded that all the *lewe ni vanua*, within a district, were to be obedient and respectful to their Turaga. Disobedience, or *talaidredre*, and the absence of respect, or *vakarokoroko*, to his or her Turaga carried the penalty of two shillings. In Section 108, each *lewe ni vanua* was required to be obedient and *veivakarokorokotaki* according to the custom of his or her *vanua*.

Allardyce’s book also addressed the custom of *lala*. In Section 109, the custom was to be observed when building homes, planting the annual yam garden, repairing roads, hosting visitors, turtle fishing, delivering mail and ferrying civil servants. The Section provided strict observance of the *oco*, the custom whereby those asked to perform work were paid with meals and other items. If the *oco* were not paid then the chief was not to *lala* again for two years on his people. A village could be free from the *lala* custom if arrangements were made with their chiefs and a proper *drawe* determined between the two parties.

The Native Regulation harmonised the *vanua*, including the *turaga bale* institution and the Colonial government. Even though new institutions like the twelve new Provinces and eighty-two Districts were created to represent the pre-cession *matanitu* and *vanua*, those pre-cession institutions continued to exist in their original form and function under the Native Regulation. A *vanua* was turned into a District, or Tikina, and a *matanitu* became a Province or Yasana. The term *matanitu* had been adopted to mean the Colony. The *turaga bale* institution, represented by the twelve Roko Tui, was just the tip of the
hierarchy, for under their *lewa vakavanua*, eighty-two Turaga i Taukei formed the intricate network of the *turaga bale* institution. Through Allardyce’s book, this network was again re-focused towards its original purpose in 1902, and in time for the twentieth-century *turaga bale* institution to face new challenges.

There was an alarming gradual decrease of the Fijian population of Fiji by 1881 before it picked up again between the 1911 and 1921. From Fiji’s Census Reports, the Fijians numbered 114,748 in 1881; 110,528 in 1890; 94,397 in 1901 and 87,096 in 1911.12 The Fijians were still the majority race by 1911. As for the Europeans, they numbered 2,671 in 1881, 2,059 in 1890 and 3,707 in 1901. The only significant increase was from those of Asian origin, from 588 in 1881 to 17,105 in 1901. With economic factors, especially through the Colonial Sugar Refinery Company, forcing the Colony to move towards industrial development, and demographic variations as they were, land became the central political, economic, demographic and moral issue at the turn of the century. The issue of land became increasingly complex.

In fact it had been turned into a political issue in 1900, when Sir G. T. M. O' Brien was the Governor of Fiji. O’Brien had defended the colony’s system as the best form of government for the Fijians for it protected their interests, especially their land rights. He was defending the Colony against a group of Europeans who were pushing for a federation with New Zealand. A *Fiji Times*’ correspondent in 1900 commented that native policy was never a public issue, but locking Fijian land laws into a fixed tenure was a disastrous formula.13 That same month, F. E. Riemenschneider, the Warden of
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12 Fiji Census Report, 1891 – 1956, mfm G 12473, NLA.
13 ‘Editor’s Column,’ *The Fiji Times*, Friday 3 August 1900. The Premier of New Zealand came to
Suva, presented a copy, also to the *Fiji Times*, of his communication with Honourable R. J. Seddon, the Premier of New Zealand.\(^\text{14}\) The force of the communication lay in the Queen's speech, which was read to the New Zealand Parliament:

> My advisors consider it to be of the first importance to the Empire and this colony that British interests in the islands of the Pacific should be definitely conserved, and, in respect to several of the islands, that, with the occurrence of the inhabitants, annexation should, where possible, take place. With the view of removing difficulties and providing satisfactory administration, the extension of the boundaries of this colony may found necessary, and if so, the people of New Zealand may be required to assume increased responsibility.\(^\text{15}\)

Riemenschneider was Chairman of a Committee that organised the public meeting on federation on the 13 September 1900. Helping him were Humphrey Berkeley, G. L. Griffith, W. T. Sturt, H.G. Hunt, J. Renie, F. A. Thomas and Dr. Fox. Humphrey, Chief Justice Henry Berkeley's brother, delivered a speech during this public meeting, criticising the government's native policy:

> The Government regards the native question as their strongest card when any idea of a change of administration is suggested. It is said that the native would suffer much were we to obtain Responsible Government or were we to federate with New Zealand. What would become of the poor native?...Who will look after him?...The native at present is no better off than a slave. He is a slave to all intents and purposes, except that instead of being the slave of a private individual he is the slave of Government...He has to pay tax on every sulu he wears...or every mosquito net he sleeps under, on his biscuits, on his meats, his kerosene...Who had made the hundred of miles of road on this Colony? The natives...the Government
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\(^\text{14}\) Fiji in 1900. See John Mackay (by authority), *The Right Honourable R. J. Seddon's, The Premier of New Zealand, visit to Tonga, Fiji, Savage Islands, and the Cook Islands*, Government Press, Wellington, 1900. From Seddon's speech attached as Appendix B, in p. 21, it was probable that the idea of federation with New Zealand was a reaction against the Commonwealth Bill. The Bill 'destroyed the Royal prerogative in as much as took away the right of appeal to the Privy Council...'.

\(^\text{15}\) *The Fiji Times*, 18 August 1900.

*ibid.*
does not pay the natives for work...Fornication according to the native law is punished by imprisonment. I refer to this to show you that there is one law for Fijians and another for the white man...The decrease of the native population has caused successive Governors no little anxiety. Various theories have been put forward to account for the steady decrease during the last 25 years, which represent the period which has elapsed since annexation. During this time the native race has dwindled from 120,000 to 95,000. A Commission has been appointed and has sent in its report, but the problem is as unsolved today as it was 10 years ago...I suggest that it is attributable solely to the mismanagement of the natives.  

While opening the Wainibokasi Hospital on the Rewa Delta on 23 October 1900, O'Brien included in his hospital speech the volatile subject of federation with New Zealand:

Be informed I will be with you the Taukei on this issue, and write to the Queen not to annex Fiji to New Zealand. In fact, I had informed the Queen of the details of this intention.  

O'Brien revealed that the real intention of this group was to unsettle the current land policies. A move of this magnitude would result in the redrafting of the land laws, deviating from the ones originally entrenched in the 1874 Deed of Cession. He drew the attention of the Fijian chiefs to the Maori plight in the area of native land. In his departure speech, he re-affirmed his opposition to the annexation plan. That spelt the end of the Taukei. Everything was calmed when the Na Mata published a translation of the telegram from London. Lord Chamberlain, the Secretary for State for the Colonies told Seddon that it was impossible to annex Fiji to New Zealand. The advocates of federation with New Zealand responded, in the Fiji Times, that the High Commissioner to the Western Pacific and Governor of the Crown Colony of Fiji was 'a one man
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16 The Fiji Times, 22 September 1900.  
17 Na Mata, November 1900, p. 166f.  
18 Na Mata, September 1901, p. 140.
Government. To enforce his ideas, O’Brien drafted legislation whereby those who
attempted to change the colonial system of government, and stir political unrest, were to
be imprisoned for six months.

Four years later, the government addressed the question of the Fijian economy through
land legislation. This attention was compounded when it was connected with the
government’s native regulation. Three separate issues, the decreasing native population,
federation with New Zealand and the government’s native policies, were entwined into
one before Sir Everard im Thurn arrived on 10 October 1904. The native policy that
Gordon and Thurston implemented was rooted in the Deed of Cession; and thirty years
later, with a new generation of turaga bale, the policy was questioned. The S. S.
Miowera arrived in Suva on 10 October 1904, with im Thurn on board to begin his
service as Governor of Fiji, a bit too late for the benefit of Fijian economic progress in
Gordon’s views. He did not hesitate to review Gordon’s and Thurston’s native policy.
On 29 October, im Thurn doubted whether Wilkinson was fit enough for him to carry on
as Commissioner for native lands and by December, was advising London that
Wilkinson should resign:

I am however regretfully bound to report myself convinced that Mr. Wilkinson’s age and feeble state of health – and perhaps his incapacity to
advance beyond the unfortunately stereotyped ideas which prevailed in the
early days of the Colony, unfit him the work of Commissioner. I regret to
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20 See Na Mata, August 1901. Me baleta na Lawa Vou, Ai Karua, 1901, Me Baleta na Nodra Tiko
Vinaka na Tamata e Viti, G. M. T. O’Brien, 29 June 1901.
21 See Na Mata, May 1905, p. 69.
22 im Thurn to Lytton, 29 October 1904, Despatches, P. R. O., C. O. 83/79 (2) – 80, A. J. C. P.
Reel fmf 3435.
say that I feel it my duty to report that he also should be requested to retire at the end of 1905.\textsuperscript{23}

Im Thurn knew the close connection between Wilkinson, Thurston and Gordon. Gordon had invited him from retirement in 1894 to be Native Land Commissioner. At that stage, he saw no purpose in reforming the NLC, which, he saw as very disorganised.\textsuperscript{24}

Im Thurn made five special points in his policy speech while opening the Great Council of Chiefs on 10 April 1905. They were patriotism, individualism, the Native Regulation, the ancient custom of the chiefly system, and land. His intention, he confessed, was ‘to instruct you, for your benefit, on the best side of English culture’.\textsuperscript{25} Patriotism, he argued, was placing the \textit{vanua} ahead of one’s interests. In this definition, many chiefs had failed for they oppressed their people with the \textit{lala} custom. He blamed the ancient custom of \textit{lala} as a major cause of infertility, as Fijians were uninterested in sex after being oppressed. Since the custom was defended in the Native Regulation, the Fijians, he argued, had been led to their fate by senseless legislation, ‘if this regulation is not changed soon, there will not be any Taukei left in Fiji’. He encouraged them to be individualistic,

to decide for himself and be self-sufficient. A person must decide for himself and uses his hands to be industrious for his wife, children and relatives. He will be in charge of his wealth and house, find life enjoyable and reproduction an enjoyable activity.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{23} Im Thurn to Lyttleton, 3 December 1904, Despatches, Offices and Individual, P. R. O., C.O. 83/79, A. J. C. P., Reel fnf 3435.

\textsuperscript{24} ibid.

\textsuperscript{25} Na Mata, May 1905

\textsuperscript{26} ibid.
Im Thurn considered the Native Regulation had outlived its purpose. He argued that there were two reasons for the Fijian’s economic downfall: the ancient chiefly customs and Native Regulation. He told the G. C. C. that Gordon had introduced two sets of laws, one for Europeans and the other for Fijians, based on ancient customs. He wanted English laws to gradually replace the Native Regulation. On the land question, Im Thurn affirmed that the government would be looking into those lands owned but unoccupied, with the intention of buying and leasing them to benefit not only the Fijians, but also those who needed lands for agricultural purposes. He further reminded the GCC that he needed the support of its two representatives to the Legislative Council on the land legislation.

In his report to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Im Thurn said he critically examined and addressed the social relations prevailing in the Fijian community between the Chiefs and the Commoners: on the effect of those relations in entirely preventing the development in the commoners of any spirit of individuality: and on the large share which those reactions consequently in the hastening the threatened extinction in the near future of the entire Fijian race.

He was certain of his facts, confident that most had agreed with him in his faultfinding.

Im Thurn’s motives on the economy and status of the Fijians were sound. But it was his approach that raised some concerns. Instead of working his way through Kadavulevu, he brought Madraiwiwi and Ratu Josefa Lalabalavu, the Tui Cakau, closer to him,

27 A. Gordon, Fiji, 1878.

28 Im Thurn to Secretary of State for the Colonies, C.O. 83, Reel 84-85-86, fmf PRO 3438, A., J. C. P.
appointing them as the first Fijian members of the Legislative Council in 1905. He might have thought that he had the *turaga bale* institution on his side. Im Thurn probably did not see the strain and tension in the *turaga bale* institution situation in 1905. Madraiwiwi belonged to the same rank as Nailatikau. Kadavulevu was considered as a son, but Bau now saw him as their leader. To counter that move by Bau, Madraiwiwi edged closer to im Thurn and Cakaudrove. Im Thurn thought he had the support of the *turaga bale* institution, which in fact was not totally behind him due to the presence of Madraiwiwi at his side.

With Madraiwiwi and Lalabalavu close to the Government House, im Thurn began revising the Native Land Ordinance of 1892, on which the N. L. C. is based. The 1905 ordinance, had eleven sections. Section 3 re-enacted amendments of Sections 2, 3, and 5 of the 1892 Ordinance, while Sections 4 and 6 regulated land alienation, unlocking Section 4 of the 1892 Native Land Ordinance. Lease term, which was twenty-one years, was relaxed together with the right to sell land. In 1907, im Thurn suspended the NLC.

But he had misjudged not only the depth of the relationship between the *turaga bale* institution and the Wesleyans, but also the structure of the institution. This was probably because the current generation of *turaga bale* was born within Fiji’s Christian era, *gauna ni lotu* and did not experience the establishment of the *turaga bale* institution nor the tremendous task in placing Bau as the apex of the Fijian political hierarchy. Even though the Qase Levu had vacated Bau, the Wesleyans continued their tradition of preserving and defending the institutions of Fijian identity. Whatever policies im Thurn introduced,

---

in the attempt to review Gordon’s and Thurston’s native policy, the fact remained that the turaga bale institution had first to be convinced that a review was needed. They still had huge influence on how legislation was shaped. Im Thurn was too close to Madraiwiwi and Lalabalavu to convince the institution. He drifted far from Kadavulevu and Roko Tui Dreketi, who were heads of the turaga bale institution. The ascendancy of Bau and the turaga bale institution, at this stage, were overlooked. It later proved fatal to im Thurn’s vision.

On behalf of the turaga bale institution, Lord Stanmore moved a motion in the House of Lords in July 1907 to stop im Thurn from reversing the native policy that was created in 1877. By Her Majesty’s approval, he accepted two islands as gifts, which were classified as native land, making him a turaga i taukei. He opened his speech by affirming the fact that the policies ‘...affect...our national honour on one hand, and the existence, or destruction of the people of the Fijian Islands on the other...’ He reiterated that during cession, Britain promised to protect the Fijians against the lawless white settlers, preserve their rights to their ancestral lands and allow them to maintain their customs, as long as they were not objectionable or immoral. In addition, Stanmore told the House that

---


31 One of the islands was Yagasa Levu, or Table Island as William Bligh called it, in the district of Vulaga. As a native land-owner, he is also a turaga i taukei. See Register for Native Lands, District of Vulaga, Province of Lau, NLCA.

32 The Parliamentary Debate, p. 473.
by the solemn word of Her late Majesty, the Queen. On two separate occasions, Her late Majesty did me the honour to convey to me her commands from Her own lips that I was to tell the Fijian people that their lands were theirs and should never be taken from them. I told them so on the authority of Our Sovereign, and I do trust that that pledge then given will be maintained.33

Im Thurn, in Fiji, clarified a lot of confusion in the Wesleyan opinions towards his proposed land legislation. He had gauged the influence of the Wesleyans on the Fijian’s way of thinking and had the proposed legislation read to the Synod in 1904. The Synod then discussed the status of the vanua ni cakacaka in the context of the Government’s proposed legislation and referred the matter to the Privileges Committee for ‘consideration and subsequent action...to carefully safeguard our interest therein, and treat with the Government on all matters affecting the same.’34 Once the implications of the legislation reached the villages, they recoiled, not through the Great Council of Chiefs, but the Fiji District Meeting. The Fijian villagers turned to Arthur James Small, Chairman of the Fiji District Meeting, for help. On the 3 January 1907, while the new-year celebrations were under way, the chiefs of the yavusa Calia, west of Nausori, came to Small at Toorak, who referred them to the Talai, to direct them to im Thurn.35 Even the Wesleyan ordained ministers raised the issue of native land with the Commissioners from Sydney sent to investigate the affairs of the Church in 1907.36
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33 The Parliamentary Debate, p. 478.
34 Journal – Synod Minutes, 1904, Resolution XLII, Methodist Church in Fiji Collection, N. A. F.
35 M. M. S. A., Fiji District, 1906 -1909, N. A. F.
36 The Fijian ministers were Vilikesa Kalou, Jona Ulunaceva, Kemueli Uluikavoro, Amenio Baledrokadroka, Kelepi Naba, Pauliasi Muavesi, Sāmuela Cikaitoga, Pita Tuidela, Taniela Lotu, Aliki Raloka, Timoci Salaca, Mataiasi Vave, Joeli Cama and Inoke Buadromo, Commission to Fiji, 1907, Report, p. 11.
The Wesleyans responded, for the proposed legislation threatened the cooperate legacy of the *turaga bale* institution. Their reaction was inspired by the nature of their ecclesiastical authority, economy and property policy. A major part of this policy was developed with the *turaga bale* institution, which, out of their position as the Wesleyan mission patron, instituted a tradition whereby they provided land for mission purposes. These lands were known as *vanua ni cakacaka*, and were used by the missionaries; native assistant missionaries and *vakavuvuli* to build their chapels, homes and schools. To the Wesleyans, authority, economy and property policies were inter-related. The economic and property policies were based on the ‘authority’ of the day, which were from Nuku’alofa, London and Sydney. It was the authority from Sydney, out of those three, that was instrumental in the Wesleyans’ involvement in Fiji’s native land legislation.

The first authority of the Fiji Wesleyans, from London through Nuku’alofa, encouraged a no trade policy on its missionaries for the WMMS provided most of their supplies. So why trade when the stores were supplied for you. From the accounts kept at the Free Wesleyan Church Archives in Nuku’alofa, it took two hundred and thirty one pounds to transport Cargill and Cross by sea to Fiji. The W. M. M. S. continued to stock the missionaries with stores for barter, for even those who poled canoes and fetched leaves for the chapel roof had to be thanked.\(^37\)

The second authority was introduced in 1838, when London withdrew Nuku’alofa’s authority by instituting Fiji as a similar District of the British Wesleyan Methodist Conference. Fiji then had its own Chairman and exercised a considerable amount of
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\(^37\) W. Cross, Diary Extract 98, CY Reel 334, ML. and also W. Cross, Diary, 17 November 1836, Dispatch 11, Letters, Volume 1, MLA 2809, ML.
autonomy under the British Conference. Each circuit had its own store, which sometimes had to be guarded day and night for pilfering was common. From Cross’ experience, missionaries would be in a difficult situation when these stores were empty. His store at Viwa was empty for seventeen months forcing him to sell apparel for yam and salt. The clothes and possessions were his wife’s gown, bed curtains and old children’s shoes. Often, a yard of calico was sold for ten yams and a hatchet worth one hundred yams, items that cost less than a shilling in England. In war, the price of food soared high as the gardens were neglected. Since their salaries were borne by the WMMS, the five British missionaries who were the face of this authority in Fiji were expected not to ‘follow trade.’ There was strict supervision of their character, progress, thought, piety, industry and welfare, which were scrutinised, recorded in the Minutes of the District Meeting with copies sent to London. Since the minutes had to be sent to London, Hunt made sure that the honesty of the missionaries’ met the WMMS English sponsors’ expectations. The frequency of a missionary’s preaching, prayer meetings attended, leaders meeting convened, medicine dispensed and native teachers instructed were all noted in the Minutes. Besides those, translating, printing, attending the schools, visiting from house to house filled a missionary’s itinerary.

Authority and economy became an issue when the welfare of the native teachers was addressed. The Fijian and Tongan teachers were paid from the same source from
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38 D. Cargill, Memoir, p. 335
39 W. Cross to General Secretary, 11 June 1841, in W. Cross, Diary, Extract 73 A, op cit.
40 W. Cross, Diary, 10 August 1837, Letters, Volume 1, CY Reel A 2809, M.L. and in W. Cross, Diary Extract 98, op cit.
41 Minutes of the Fiji District Meeting, 1844, Question 18.
Mateinaniu wrote from Bua to Cross saying that he did not mind the hunger but going out without a shirt to preach was a different matter. He had sold his shirt for food. Take for instance the welfare of the 9 missionaries and 39 catechists, who in 1848 were paid an equivalent of two pounds. Each missionary was supported and accounted for within the circuit where he was serving. They were all given allowances; forty eight pounds each for boarding and quarterage, children’s allowance at fourteen pounds per child, ten pounds for washing and fuel, and a further ten pounds each for servants and stationery. They were expected to contribute only in Class or Society Ticket monies, normally at one pound per year. The total cost of this ‘no trade policy’ to the W. M. M. S amounted to five hundred pounds twelve shillings in 1848.

To fund the native auxiliary, the Wesleyans used agricultural and industrial products. Society members were taxed through yams and handicrafts, and were issued with membership tickets in return. The District Meeting required that a record of all station stores be submitted annually, the contents of which identified three major groups, materials, food and monies. In addition to what the WMMS provided, the District Meeting developed its taxation system, known as the vakamisinari. This was John Malvern’s account from Tiliva in Bua:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiliva</td>
<td>Dalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yams 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mats 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42 W. Cross, Diary, Extract 91A, CY Reel 334.
43 W. Cross, Diary, Extract 99, op cit.
44 See Appendix
45 Bua C/1 MCOA Bua Circuit, Accounts of Trade, etc., (the property of the Wesleyan Missionary Committee, London) in the Televa Station, Bua, 1850 – 1859, NAF.
Much of the proceeds from the society’s tax went to the payment of the native teachers.

This was what John Malvern paid his teachers at Bua in June 1854:

**Teachers Allowance in the Bua Circuit Commencing June 1854**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Produce</th>
<th>Money</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pita</td>
<td>80 Yams</td>
<td>3 Kuta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josaia</td>
<td>80 “</td>
<td>2 “</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usaia</td>
<td>30 “</td>
<td>2 “</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jemesa</td>
<td>4 “</td>
<td>2 “</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasarusa</td>
<td>63 “</td>
<td>2 “</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisaki</td>
<td>40 “</td>
<td>2 “</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isikeli</td>
<td>20 yasi</td>
<td>5 “</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taniela</td>
<td>20 yasi</td>
<td>5”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to agricultural produce, the teachers were also paid with whale’s teeth, Bibles, knives and cloths of Fijian *masi* and calicoes. Even those who manned the canoes were paid in this manner.

Through the second authority, the Wesleyans in Fiji were receiving land, but the British Conference did not enforce any policy on how those lands were to be held. It was left to the missionaries in the field to determine the best policy of holding such property. As a result, the missionaries in Fiji received and retained land through native customary laws. They acknowledged such lands as physical property of the WMMS and registered them in the Minutes of District Meeting.

18. **What changes in Mission Properties as in chapels, dwelling houses, schools etc have taken place in this District?**

---

46 Bua/C/1, op cit.
Ans: The Chapel at Oneata had been enlarged.

NB. We are aware that Mission property in these islands is not on the same footing as in most other Missionary Stations; but we enter an account of it here that the Committee may be made acquainted with our proceedings in this department of our work

13. What chapels have been built during the past year?
Ans: One at Lakemba; one in Ono and a heathen temple at Namuka had been converted into a chapel.

14. What chapels are being built, or propose to be built, in the next year?
Ans: The Natives purpose to build a chapel at Wathiwathi, Waitabu, Narocake and Nukunuku. 47

The note attached to Question 12 explained that to the Fijians, land given to the WMMS or soli ki na lotu, was absolutely alienated through the authority of the turaga bale institution. Even chapel sites, as in Question 13 and 14 above, were used by the Wesleyans according to the rights granted under the authority of the chiefs. These lands were received, and held, according to Fijian land customs, but registered in the Minutes of the Bose ko Viti. These lands were not included in the normal category of annual gifts to the church. In the summary of the General Account, it could be seen the land used by the missionaries and contributions from the local class members were not accounted for. This was a significant omission for the Wesleyans had not, during this period, levied their members.

The third authority which governed the Wesleyan mission in Fiji was from Sydney. In 1853, the Conference sent Robert Young to the islands to survey the feasibility of autonomy. In his report, he concluded that

47 Feejee District Minutes and Reports, 1835–1852, Minutes for 1838.
their important mission churches in Australia, including Van Dieman’s Land, ought thus be cast upon their own resources. In those churches it was believed there were adequate pecuniary resources to supply the means for the accomplishment of this arrangement, and piety and intelligence rendering them capable of taking with advantage this higher position among the churches of Christ.48

The transition of ecclesiastical authority from London to the South Sea Colonies finally took place in 1855. The new Australasian Methodist Connexion included New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania, were to be given conference status, and New Zealand, Tonga and Fiji were to be districts of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference of Australasia, whose headquarters was in Sydney. 49 This connexion would have absolute ecclesiastical authority, similar to the English Conference.50 The President of the Conference was ‘expected to spend as large a portion of the year in the intervals of the Conference, as may be convenient, in the visitations of the Districts and Circuits of the Conference’.51

The property and economic practice faced another structural review through this transition. In Article 2, Section 1, of the Memo on autonomy, the Australasian Conference was to

continue to maintain, in [connexion] with the English Connexion, the Wesleyan [doctrines] as outlined in Mr. Wesley’s Four Volumes of


49 ‘No. A., Plan for the Forming of the Australian Missions into a district Connection or Church, with a Conference of its own’, Section I, in ‘Extracts of Minutes, &c., 1853, for the New South Wales District, Held in the Vestry of York-Street Chapel, Sydney from the 28 July to 6 August 1853’, Extracts and Minutes of the Australian Districts for the Year Ending 30 June 1852, Robert Barr, Sydney, 1852, Appendix II, pp. 10 – 13.

50 Section I, No. A, Extracts and Minutes.

51 No. B. Proposed Plan of the Connection of the Mission in New Zealand, Polynesia, with the Australian Conference, Section 5, Extracts and Minutes.
Ecclesiastical authority and economy were inseparable in this autonomy, for the ‘Mission Churches in Australia and Van Dieman’s Land shall now, in accordance with the New Testament Rule, undertake the entire sustenance of their own Ministers.’ Financial support enjoyed under the WMMS was about to end, and self-support was encouraged. From the expectation to fund its own ministries, the Wesleyan authority in Sydney reviewed the economic and property policy with extreme caution, especially on the Connexional Funds. This review led to a marked increase in industrial and agricultural gifts to the mission. More than one thousand Wesleyans attended a Missionary Meeting held at Tiliva on 21 May 1856. They managed to raise

1332 mats, 31 lbs of tortoise shells, 73 gals of oil, 470 large yams, 3 small rolls of sinnet, 10 clubs, 10 pieces of sandalwood and 1 Pound in cash with a net value in Feejee of 13 Pounds 5 shillings and 2 pennies, the net value being thirteen pounds five shillings and two pence.

To cater for its responsibilities in the Pacific, the Australasian Connexion formed the Missionary Committee, whose responsibility was to oversee the expenditures of missions in New Zealand, Tonga and Fiji. In addition, the General Superintendent of Mission’s responsibility was to inform the Missionary Committee in London on the ‘state and prospects of the work of the Australasian Connexion’ for publication in the Missionary Notices and the Society’s Annual Report.

53 Section II, I, op cit.
54 Section V, op cit.
55 Bua/C/1, ibid.
Fijian Wesleyanism, from what had been discussed, had this close association with New South Wales for twenty years before Cession in 1874. Fiji was a district of the Australasian Conference based in Sydney. Using the authority of this Conference, Benjamin Danks, who was President of the New South Wales Conference, and George W. Brown Superintendent of Missions, became involved in the Wesleyans’ property and economic policies in Fiji and through that, on the Fijians’ behalf, in matters concerning native land.

In 1907, the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church of Australasia sent a Commission to Fiji. Under their mandate, which J. G. Morris Taylor, the President of the Australasian Conference, issued, this Commission had to assess two issues:

First the state of work there, and to consider and report upon the best means to be adopted to promote the progress of the district generally, and secondly to study alterations to the Constitution of the Methodist Church in Fiji.  

The Commission included J. E. Carruthers, Benjamin Danks and T. H. England of New South Wales, Henry Bath of Victoria and J. Newman Buttle of New Zealand. By 16 January 1907, the Commissioners began their work in Suva on the amendments to the Constitution. They studied the situation of mission lands in relation to land tenure and native policy. Without their possessing a copy of the Deed of Cession, the Commissioners worked their way through the Ordinances that had been enacted since 1874. They concluded that ‘an Ordinance might be passed dealing with the matter and allowing the church the use of the lands so long as they were used for church purposes’.  

---

56 Methodist Church of Australasia, Commission to Fiji, 1907, Report, p. 1.
57 Commission to Fiji, 1907, p. 33
The Commission easily identified the 'uneasiness, not only in the minds of the Missionaries, but also in the minds of the Native Ministers on this subject of native land tenure'. They focused on lands set aside for Native Churches, Teacher's residences and *kanakana*, or gardens. On these properties, the Commissioners encountered a contradiction. They had to decide whether land given to the mission was given outright or for specified purposes only. These were the properties I highlighted as missing in the mission financial and property accounts during the period of establishment from 1835 to 1855, and from 1855 to 1874.

The Commissioners found out that forty-six pieces of land were vested in three trustees under the provisions of the Real Property Ordinance of 1876. But the trustees were legally provided for in the 1881 Religious Bodies Ordinance, under the advice of Messrs. Garrick and Caldwell, a law firm in Suva. These lands, they concluded, were for religious purposes only. They were not absolutely alienated to the Church, contrary to information from natives on church and house sites and gardens.

But, whatever the law said regarding these lands, Fijians still believed that land given to the *lotu* under the customary laws before Cession were unredeemable. From their inquiry, a native minister told them that

---

58 *Commission to Fiji, 1907*, p. 31.

59 *Commission to Fiji, 1907*, p. 31.

60 Ordinance No. XIII, 1881, in Royal Gazette, No7 Vol VII, Saturday July 2, 1881; and Schedule C, as cited in *Commission to Fiji, 1907*, p. 35.
the same ceremony was observed in relation to giving possession of these lands for the purposes indicated as was usually observed for giving possession of native lands, and that they were never intended to revert.  

By November 1907, the House of Lords was discussing im Thurn’s reforms on native policies. The debate was centred on lands at Wainibokasi, on the Rewa river delta, and Navuso, which the Colonial Sugar Refinery Company preferred to develop for agricultural purposes. From his understanding of the Deed of Cession, im Thurn pointed out that Gordon erred in his interpretation of Clause 4:

the difference between native land cultivated or occupied in 1874 and that which was not so cultivated or occupied has been overlooked. ‘Vaka Viti,’ even if anyone knew what that is, should really have no force in the treatment of this, as it appears to me, undoubtedly Crown land.

Im Thurn claimed that for three decades, the Crown had allowed the natives to exercise their rights over lands cultivated but not occupied. In paragraph 18 of his November 1907 Despatch to the Earl of Elgin, im Thurn said that he had met the objections from Wesleyan and Catholic missionaries in Fiji and accused Wilkinson of being Stanmore’s informer on his reforms.

But the calmness of the ocean top does not mean that the currents on the ocean floor were still. im Thurn may have reassured the minds of the Wesleyan missionaries in Fiji, but those in the Sydney Wesleyan Methodist head office had a very different point of view,

---

61 Commission to Fiji, 1907, p.29
62 im Thurn to Earl of Elgin and Kincardine, 5 September 1907, C. O. 83/ 86(2) – 87(1), fmf PRO 34399, JCP.
63 op cit, 2 November 1907.
64 ibid.
and im Thurn had no control over them. In my opinion, im Thurn’s major opposition came from the Reverend Dr. George Brown through Small, the Chairman of the Fiji District Meeting in Suva. Small tracked the public discussion on native land after the 1907 Commission from Sydney left. He attended a meeting organised at the Berkeley’s residence for the purpose of doing what I could to quieten the minds of the natives with regard to the Petition being sent Home to the Secy. of State on the vexed question of the ownership of “Native Lands”. 65

The petition had argued that lands cultivated but unoccupied fell in the category of Clause 4 of the Deed of Cession. 66 His intention was to take ‘some wind out of Berkeley’s sails’ and formally informed im Thurn of his presence in that meeting. 67

The Wesleyans were uneasy with the security of the vanua ni cakacaka under the new land legislation. Danks led another deputation to visit im Thurn at the Sydney Hotel in November 1908,

to assist the Home Government to draft such Land Laws for Fiji as would deal with satisfactorily with the whole question, not only in its relation to the Methodist Church, but also as it affected other religious organisation and also the community as a whole. 68

They raised the issue of vanua ni cakacaka, asking the Governor for

65 Small to Nolan, March 14 1908, Methodist Missionary Society of Australia, Fiji District, Correspondence (H) 1906-1909 Special Series, N. A. F.

66 Small to Thurn, 14 March 1908, MMSA Inward/Outward, 1906-1909, NAF and Gordon to Brown, 12 February 1909, Various Papers c 1886 – c 1941, ML M. O. M 238, CY Reel 3465, frame 0432f, M. L.

67 To Nolan, 14 March 1908, MMSA Fiji Districts (N) 1906-1909, N. A. F. The letter was unsigned and Small’s authorship can be questioned.

the immediate measures should be enacted to permanently secure such lands to the Methodist Church and to solicit the assistance and advice of His Excellency with the view to obtaining the said measures. 69

Im Thurn diplomatically replied that the nature of the gifts should be left as they were. Further, he told Danks that the Memorial he sent 'was being subject to careful consideration at several meetings of the Executive Council.' 70 The Memorial, addressed to im Thurn, had fourteen articles and those referring to the property policies were:

2. That for the purpose of carrying on the Evangelistic and Educational work of the Mission the Chiefs and the people of Fiji have from time to time granted the Methodist Church certain small portions or allotments of land in the respective villages for the erection of churches, school houses, teacher's houses, and allotments of land for gardens for the supply of food to the teachers.

3. That these lands were granted in strict accordance with the usage and customs of the Fijian people by the Mataqali who were owners of the said lands in the respective districts.

4. That these lands were given by the natives to be used solely for religious purpose, and that they have been and are still used by the Mission for these purposes only, and the Mission had held undisputed possession of these lands in some cases for periods extending up to sixty years, with the approval of the respective Mataqalis

5. That the Methodist Church of Australasia has for many years past conducted the primary education of ninety per cent (90%) of the native population of Fiji, free of all expenses to the Government, and that the possession of these lands necessary for the residence and maintenance to the native teachers, who, after having been educated and trained by the Missionary Society, are employed solely in educational and evangelistic work in Fiji.

6. That subsequent to cession of the Colony to the British Crown, a Land Commission was appointed to investigate the claims made by Europeans for Crown titles to land held by them. No claim, however, was presented by the Methodist Church for the titles in fee simple to the aforesaid sites of Churches and Teachers' houses and planting land, as the

69 ibid.
70 ibid.
Church had no desire to acquire the freeholds of such lands, they being held by the Church only for religious and educational purposes for the benefit of the native populations, and on the understanding that when no longer required for such purposes they should revert to the original owners.

7. That the rights and grants mentioned in paragraph 3 and 4 have been recognised by the Mataqali, who, when they wish to substitute another parcel of land for that so held, have applied to the representative of the Mission to make the exchange.

8. That the Missionaries, however, have reported that there have been cases where, without reference to the authority of the Church, some of these parcels of land have been leased without the consent of the Government to the exclusion and without regard to the rights of the Church, such instances having occurred at Natutu in Ba in the year 1905 and the Province of Cakaudrove in connection with the piece of land known as Navukea.

9. That active measures to appeal against the action taken in these two cases were proceeding and evidence could have been tendered of the great and long possession, but the Rev. A. J. Small, the highest representative of the Church in the Group, was officially informed by a letter from the Colonial Secretary in August last year that the Governor in Council could not consider an appeal by the Missions as the Missions appeared to have no right of intervention in the matter.

10. That during the earlier years of Missionary operations in Fiji it was not necessary to ask for a more secure tenure than was afforded by the knowledge of the native people as to these grants and right of user handed down from one generation to another and the acquiescence of the Mataqali therein, but owing to the challenging conditions of Fijian life and the consequent present uncertainty as to the question of ancient tenure, and the attempts (successful in some cases) to ignore the claims of the Church, it has become necessary for the successful maintenance of the work to have a more secure tenure.

11. That in the year 1903, a Deputation acting on behalf of the Church visited Fiji and found that the Government had passed an ordinance under which they were registering the titles of the respective Districts and were advised that this proceeding would ensure security of tenure to the Methodist Church in respect of the lands afore-mentioned for the purpose for which they were granted, but the Church learned subsequently that such ordinance had been repealed on account of the magnitude of the work.

12. That in the month of January in the year 1907 duly appointed representatives of the Church visited Fiji and your Excellency was pleased to grant them interview, and they then pointed out to your Excellency the facts, and that the Methodist Church did not ask for the fee simple of the lands in question but asked that an ordinance might be passed dealing with
the matter and granting the Church the use of such lands so long as they were used for the purpose named, and to this request your Excellency promised favourable consideration.

13. That although this matter has been the subject of communication to the Colonial Secretary of Fiji since, no reply has been received and nothing has been done to make the position of the Church in relation to these lands more secure.

14. That the Methodist Church of Australasia regards this matter as one of extreme urgency and regrets that no action has been taken by the Government of Fiji towards a definite settlement thereof in response to previous communications and representations on behalf of the Church to your Excellency, and now respectfully ask that your Excellency will favourably consider the facts herein set out, and that some steps may be taken without delay by the passing of an ordinance or otherwise that will ensure to the Church the use of the lands referred to so long as they are used for religious or educational purposes.\(^{71}\)

Brown was not with Danks at the Sydney Hotel because he was in London, to discuss the issue of native land with Lord Stanmore. In a reply to one of his letters, Stanmore said:

> It is indeed only too true that Sir E im Thurn is indeed seeking to upset the native tenure and to have all land not actually at present occupied and cultivated by natives declared the property of the Crown. If it were not essentially tragic, the contention would be almost comic that everybody since 1874, Colonial office, Governor after Governor, Missionaries and Settlers failed to understand the meanings of the Deed of Cession, till it was discovered 34 years later by Sir E Thurn. I should very much like to see you and concert with you such measures as may seem feasible to avert so monstrous an injustice.\(^{72}\)

---

\(^{71}\) The Memorial was signed by the President of the General Conference, under and in pursuance of a Resolution of such Conference, For the Methodist Church of Australasia, Carlton, Victoria, April 1908. See also Rev. W. Williams to Sir Everard im Thurn and Hutson to Williams 29 October 1908, Various Papers c 1886 – c 1941, M. C. O. M. 238, CY Reel 3465, M. L. frame 0415f.

\(^{72}\) Stanmore to Brown, February 19, 1909, Various papers, Methodist Church Overseas Missions, c 1886 – c 1941, ML MOM 238, CY Reel 3465, M. L., frames 0432 – 0433.
A copy of the Memorial was sent to Stanmore, who was not impressed, but said that he would support its intention, which was the enactment of an ordinance. Brown also informed im Thurn of his views on native land. In response, im Thurn wrote 'a personal interview that would at once dispel the notion which I think you have that I am opposed to your views on the native question and on general policy in the Pacific'. They did not meet for im Thurn had gone to Scotland.

Im Thurn must have returned to Fiji when Stanmore, arriving from Italy, invited Brown on 7 July 1909 to meet him at the House of Lords. Brown, probably from Stanmore's advice, wrote directly to Crewe:

I have the honour most respectfully to ask if you will grant me the honour of a brief interview with regard to the proposals, which have been recently made for the resumption by the Crown of the waste or unoccupied lands of the Fijians.

I am I think the oldest living missionary of all those who have been engaged in that work in Fiji and the islands of the Pacific. I have had a very close acquaintanceship with most of the Pacific groups for 45 years as a missionary on the Field or General Secretary of the Australasian Methodist Missionary Society. I was deputed by the Board of Missions of that Society to bring the matters of our Church sites in Fiji & other matters under the considerations of his Majesty's Government if deemed thus to be necessary as His Excellency, Sir Everard Im Thurn was in England I feel that it would be neither courteous nor wise on my part to do this until I personally see His Excellency especially as he had several times expressed a wish to talk with on the South Seas affair. After some correspondence, I met His Excellency just prior to his departure for Fiji and received from him very courteous assurance that he entirely sympathised with us in our wishes with regards to church sites in Fiji and that he was prepared to help us in any way possible.

73 Im Thurn to Brown, 27 February 1909, Various Papers c 1886 – c 1941, ML M. O. M. 238, CY Reel 3465, frame 0438, M. L.


75 Stanmore to Brown, Various papers, Methodist Church Overseas Missions, c 1886 – c 1941, ML MOM 238, CY Reel 346, M. L., frame 0459.
He also informed me that with regard to the proposed resumption of the waste lands of Fiji he had decided not to press his proposals to the decision of His Majesty's Government at the present time, though his own personal opinions were unchanged. I enclose for your Lordship consideration a copy of my letter to His Excellency in which the opinions I hold with regard to Fijian Lands titles are set forth and I shall deem it a great privilege to give to Your Lordship any further information which I may be able to give. I am compelled to leave London tomorrow and I am leaving England on the 29th inst. But I will return to London previous to the date of my departure from England should this be more convenient to your Lordship. 76

In reply, Crewe told Brown that he had received the Memorial and would contact im Thurn on the subject. 77

The Wesleyans provided Stanmore with enough moral support to oppose im Thurn’s native policy. According to Tony Chapelle, the House of Lords confirmed Gordon’s interpretation of Clause 4 of the Deed of Cession in 1911. 78 Im Thurn’s successor, Sir Henry May, was directed to stop all land sales. This directive ended all public discussion on native land policies in England, Australia and Fiji. Meanwhile in Fiji, the Native Land Amendment Ordinance of 1912, in Section 2, repealed Section 4 of the Native Land Amendment Ordinance of 1907, allowing a fresh start to the examination and registration of native land. The N. L. C. was re-instituted to complete the work it began in 1892.

The response from the Wesleyans toward im Thurn’s policy was obvious. A synonymous identity had emerged between the Wesleyans and the Fijians, especially

---

76 G. Brown to Crewe, July 13 1909, Various papers, Methodist Church Overseas Missions, c 1886 – c 1941, ML MOM 238, CY Reel 3465, frames 0424–0427.

77 Correspondence to Brown, Various papers, Methodist Church Overseas Missions, c 1886 c 1941, ML MOM 238, CY Reel 3465 (Frame 0432 – 0433), frame 0430.

with the vanua and matamitu. It had reached the point that whatever was Wesleyan was Fijian. The symbiotic nature of the lotu, specifically Wesleyanism, and the vanua by now meant the real Fijian identity. This was a powerful nature of the Fijian identity, and very much related to the third Fijian cosmos. The Wesleyans responded because of their interests, not only in terms of property, which was huge, but also for the sake of their future as a missionary church in Fiji. They had been too closely associated to the turaga bale institution to be neutral in such a situation.

The decade, from 1902 to 1912, from Allardyce’s re-focus on Native Regulation to the introduction of the Native Land Amendment Ordinance, saw events that tested the durability of the institutions of Fijian identity. The Wesleyans, through their authority in Sydney, provided the extra stimulus for Lord Stanmore to recover the original legacy of the turaga bale institution. And in Fiji, the turaga bale institution continued the ancient rivalry that led to war after Tanoa’s death. Madraiwiwi was promoted through the civil service to be a Roko Tui and was transferred to Tailevu. He also became the first Fijian member of the Legislative Council. Sukuna, his son, was at Oxford, and he was to return to the civil service after his studies. If Madraiwiwi’s contribution to the moralisation of the Bauan turaga bale was important, then Sukuna’s work in the N. L. C. was even more significant. Sukuna harmonised the N. L. C.’s Tukutuku Raraba on Degei’s supremacy at Nakauvadra, resulting in the entrenchment of the turaga bale institution as the foundation of the texts of Fijian identity.
Nakauvadra now rules the Vanua

Sukuna was not deterred in his work as Chairman of the NLC from upholding the ascendancy of Bau and the turaga bale institution, in spite of Bau repudiating Madraiwiwi’s status as the most senior turaga bale at the beginning of the twentieth century. This affirms the fact that a study of the influence of the Wesleyan Methodists on the institutions of Fijian identity would be incomplete if Sukuna’s work on mythology was not assessed. Taking a cue from his father’s mythology, Ratu Sukuna’s work summed up all the topics discussed in this thesis. He asserted the period when Waituruturu once ruled the vanua as the cradle of the turaga bale institution and declared Bau’s primacy thereafter. The formation of Wesleyanism as the religion of the turaga bale, the impact of liturgical language on Bau’s preeminence and the development of a Fijian comparative mythology to give moral authority to the turaga bale institution were all features of the Wesleyans’ influence on Bau’s ascendancy. Other topics, turaga bale’s lewa, harmonisation of land ownership unit and renaissance of the turaga bale’s legacy emphasised how Bau and the second generation turaga bale managed the institutions of identity in a Christian and colonial context.

This Chapter focuses on Sukuna. As the last of the third generation of turaga bale, he strengthened the institutions of Fijian identity by asserting Degei’s supremacy through the N. L. C.’s Tukutuku Raraba. As a consequence, of the Wesleyans’ influence on the ascendancy of Bau and the establishment of the turaga bale institution, the N. L. C. joined the various testaments of identity, of the different vanua in Fiji, on Degei’s superiority in Fiji’s comparative mythology. Sukuna refocussed and harmonised the
Tukutuku Raraba on this supremacy in the patriarchal pantheon hence the title Nakauvadra Now Ruled the Vanua. Nakauvadra is Degei’s sanctuary. I will discuss how the N. L. C. elevated Degei and Nakauvadra by analysing the Tukutuku Raraba, or testament of identity, in the first and second phase of the N. L. C.’s work. The first phase was when Sir Basil Home Thomson and David Wilkinson were Commissioners, from 1892 to 1905, and the second, from 1911 to 1940, under Gerald Verner Maxwell, Robert Boyd and Sukuna. Sukuna took over the N. L. C. from Richard Boyd and recovered the historical and institutional ascendancy of Bau and the turaga bale as the foundational principle of his investigations. Refining the policies Maxwell worked on, he used the ascendancy of Bau and the turaga bale institution to reformat the text of the Tukutuku Raraba. The legacy of Banuve’s dynasty now became the principle on which the N. L. C. standardized mythology.

The purpose of the discussion Chapter is twofold. First, to illustrate how the Wesleyan comparative mythology, used to give a moral base to the ascendancy of Bau and the turaga bale institution before Cession, became the harmonising standard of the N. L. C.’s mythology through Sukuna’s work. Second, to exemplify the fact that Fijian identity is not just an idea, but it had its testament and documents that could be assessed and analysed. These testaments are restricted materials and kept in the N. L. C. Archives in Suva. One has to be registered in the Vola ni Kawa Bula to be able to access materials, and then is given only that relating to his or her yavusa.

Degei’s supremacy in the pantheistic mythology, and Nakauvadra’s importance over Waituruturu, was not, at first, the idea behind the Tukutuku Raraba. It never occurred to Wilkinson, that mythology and religion were an important aspect of land ownership.

---

1. Service Record Book, N. L. C. A. Maxwell, who was born on the 23 January 1877, replaced Wilkinson as Commissioner for Native Land on 1 January 1906. Boyd became a Commissioner on 1 June 1910 and Sukuna in 1 May 1930.
when he took over the N. L. C. in 1894. His *Taro Raraba*, when he investigated native land claims in Ba from 1894 to 1896, did not show this aspect of land ownership,² until his witnesses testified to the significance of mythology to Question 13 of his *Taro Raraba* that he was convinced of its importance.³ Question 13 asked about the *sevu* custom and the answers he received pointed to *mataqali* gods. As he progressed through Serua, Naitasiri, Tailevu and Bua, he reshaped his *Taro Raraba*, now fully convinced that mythology was an important nature of Fijians claims to ownership of land. Question 13 of the *Taro Raraba* he used in Serua asked:

Have you any tradition of your origin mythological or otherwise? How come you occupy the lands you now use? Is there any tribe or *mataqali* or *yavusa* in[to] which you are hereditary connected? Its name? Does that name cover all?⁴

Question 25 and 26 of the same set of *Taro Raraba* inquired about the *kalou* or *yanitu vu* and the *tauvu*.

25. What was your *kalou* or *yanitu vu*? What was his shrine [*waqa*] or cogniscence?
26. With whom are you *tauvu*? How did the connection arise? What is the manner?⁵

It was from the answers he received to those three questions that Wilkinson identified Nakauvadra as the sanctuary of origin for most tribes in the Province of Serua and Naitasiri on the island Viti Levu. In Serua, he heard Alivate Naoliga on 12 October 1898 recite that the *kai* Burenitu of the *yavusa* Vuratu came from Nakauvadra through

³ ibid.
⁴ Wilkinson, David, 1898, Yasana Serna – English. Wilkinson also used the same questions at Bua. See Wilkinson, David, Evidence Book, Bua Province, 1900, Page 1 – 265, N. L. C. A.
⁵ ibid.
Bau, Navosa, Namole and finally to Burenitu. Levani Drotini said that about eight generations before, Nadreve brought the *yavusa* Tuluga and Nakausaki to Serua. The *yavusa* Noilutuya came through Magodro, where Kuruiwaralumu took over and brought them to the southern shores of Viti Levu. The reason for their migration was a quarrel between the children who were playing games. Sailosi Vasaki also related how the *mataqali* Noikodruku took the route through Nadroga, passing through Waibasaga, Navatusa, Evata and then through Namatakula. Navulusele, Noinaculava’s patriarch, led them through Tubuanavai and Nasigatoka. The Noinavusu, in the District of Komave, came through Vusu while the chiefs of Deuba took the route passing through Waimaro Soloira. The *mataqali* Saiaki, *kai* Vusu or *bato* Narogi and Soromaca were original settlers at Nakauvadra. The *mataqali* Vusu were Qereqeretabua’s offspring, the *mataqali* Soromaca originated from Roko Degei and *mataqali* Saiaki from Turagalevu.

Wilkinson also found some *mataqali* in Naitasiri whose *kalou vu* migrated from Nakauvadra. Pita Tamanikaisawa said that Mautu and Rokola led them from Nakauvadra, establishing the villages of Natavea, Viria, Naitasiri, Davuilevu and Calia along the riverbank. A number of *yavusa*, *mataqali*, and *kai* later followed, including the *yavusa* Nayavumata in Nacokaika, Matanikutu in Kalabu and Lomaivuna in Viria. Six *kais* followed those *yavusa*, the Naleca in Nakini village, the Ovalau in Savu,

---

6. Enquiries into the lands belonging to the *Yavusa* Vuratu and its divisions and subdivisions, Wilkinson 1898, Yasana Serua, English, N. L. C. A.

7. Levani Drotini, Enquiries into the lands belonging to the Tuluga Nakausaki *Yavusa*, who adjoin the *Kai* Vunimoli to the eastward, op cit.


Natavea in Nataveaira, Tai in Naseva, Burenitu in Nabaitavo and Rara of Nauluwai. Four mataqali, one called a matanibure, also migrated from Nakauvadra, including the mataqali Baulevuira in Tovutovu village, Tui Vugalei in Natoaika, Rokotaiki in Deladamantu, Vunivalu in Vuna and the matanibure Navuakece in Batikia.

In Wilkinson’s Commission, Nakauvadra, as a shrine where yavusa originated from, was not popular in Tailevu. He heard of Nakauvadra only once when he investigated Tailevu in 1904. Joela Mototabua of Natobuniqio insisted that their vu, whose name was Kau and who lived at Delaikurukuru in Natakali in the form of a snake, came from Nakauvadra. Wilkinson did no more than identify Nakauvadra as having some sort of influence on the tribes south of Viti Levu and Degei’s name was mentioned only once. Further, he exposed Waituruturu, the sanctuary at Verata where Roko MauTu lived, simply as another sanctuaary in Tailevu. Roko MauTu was worshipped by the mataqali Vunivalu, Sanokonoko, Turaga Lewena, Vusa Ratu and Naitotokau at Ucunivanua village, the yavusa Yatusawa at Naivuruvuru, the Daviko at Navunimono, the Buretu or Saraviti, Macoi, Matanivanua and the Matasau. Apart from these mataqali and yavusa that recognised Waituruturu, Wilkinson heard of the sanctuary at Verata only at Qoma and Naigani Qoma was linked to Verata by a tradition of two brothers, Ramasilevu and Naitini. Naitini went to Verata while Ramasilevu remained at Qoma to be their war god. On the island of Naigani, Naivodre, Nakumilevu’s wife, lived in the form of a dog at the sanctuary called Naututu. Through Nakumilevu, the sanctuary of Naututu was related to Verata.

Apart from Waituruturu, Wilkinson identified other sanctuaries in Tailevu, which were as important as Waituruturu. There was Delakurukuru, where the yavusa Vunisaqiw


worshipped the snake god called Kau. Another sanctuary, Nakanaka, belonged to the *vu* Rokotakala, a grasshopper. He was worshiped by the *mataqali* in the *yavusa* Qalibure in the village of Naloto and all the *mataqali* of the *yavusa* Kabatia in Sawa village. Wilkinson mentioned two more, Burerua and Vuniyaro. These sanctuaries belonged to the *yavusa* Tai Vugalei, where they worshipped Raitoko, a flying fox at Burerua and the *yavusa* Naivakacere in the village of Nailega, who worshipped Bakeivuya, a woman in the form of a bird called the *teri* at Vuniyaro. At Namata, a shrine called Naigunugunu did not accommodate any *kalou vu*, only *kalou ni valu*, or war gods. They were Koyamaidelanubu, Naibili, Maikadavu and Komainaduruvesi. Naduruvesi did not have any natural medium, but the priest.14 Rabuku further claimed that their *vu* is from Waimaro.

Outside Tailevu, he found only two references to Verata, the first from Jese Waqanibau of the *mataqali* Vuanileba in Kasavu village in 1899, as I have identified in Chapter I, and the second, from the *yavusa* Senikarawa of Nacokaika, who said they came directly from Verata.15

Another significant feature of Wilkinson’s Commission was the number of *yavusa* who said that they grew up in the places where they were currently settled. They claimed that their *yavusa* grew up where they lived and that their *kalou vu* were local, supported by their claim of having local sanctuaries of worship. Wilkinson did not find a common sanctuary of patriarchal origin for the *vu* in his investigation at Tailevu in 1904. Each *vu* had its own sanctuary of residence and many were married. Vukuta, the


female vu venerated by the yavusa Navunisea, Wailevu, kai Taci, Navatu, Dranivau, Tova and Nagilogilo in Tailevu North lived in a cave on Tova peak with her husband Luluca, a kalou vu from Vunisea. Vunikaulevu, the vu of the yavusa of Dawasamu, lived at the village’s old site called Nabukebuke. Veretivoni, the vu of the kai Voni, lived in the form of an eel at Wairuku, and the kai Dalai worshipped a female, Caraqila, who lived in the form of a snake at Navuniasi. Colailati, a frog or ula, which lived at Sovatuinalogana, captivated the reverence of the yavusa Nabuto of Vorovoro village.

Further evidence given to Wilkinson’s Commission proved the various yavusa of Tailevu North had a pantheistic organization unconnected to Nakauvadra. Namena had its own sanctuary, called Naivuki. As outlined by Ilaitia Bulurua, five other sanctuaries circled Naivuki.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yavusa</th>
<th>God [Kalou Vu]</th>
<th>Conscenge [Tolo]</th>
<th>Sanctuary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kai Nawainovo</td>
<td>Raturagalevu</td>
<td>Ganiwatu</td>
<td>Naivuki(Yavu Kalou)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai Sawatini</td>
<td>Rokoduna Leka</td>
<td>Kabu</td>
<td>Nautututu(Yavu Kalou)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai Macoi</td>
<td>Naiqilai</td>
<td>dadakulaci</td>
<td>Taginamada(Yamotu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai TuiKoro</td>
<td>Naiqiti</td>
<td>kakakula</td>
<td>Korolevu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai Nabati</td>
<td>Tuivakatadra</td>
<td>koli</td>
<td>Nabati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai Rara</td>
<td>Daridariwai</td>
<td>sega</td>
<td>Wailotua17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Isiromi Saniveikau also identified two other sanctuaries, Balama and Navaleni, belonging to the yavusa Dere. These two sanctuaries belonged to the vu Liwa of the kai Naqelevu and Ququ of the kai Vatucou. Vasili Koroiwaqa of Qelekuro village also

---


cited three other sanctuaries. They were Nariba, Nasavalevu and Nasalevu in Qoma. The 

vu of the kai Naicula, Tui Nariba lived at the sanctuary at Nariba and Uluvakokalo 
of the kai Tai lived at Nasavalevu. Radibulewa lived at the other Nasavalevu on the 
island of Qoma. Ra Bulewa, a woman, was the vu of the yavusa Nabubulewa on the 
island of Qoma.

Wilkinson discovered more sanctuaries in the Districts of Sawakasa and Namalata.

Filimoni Rawaibula supplied a table similar to Ilaitia Bulurua’s from Namena:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mataqali</th>
<th>Kalou Vu</th>
<th>Medium[Tolo]</th>
<th>Sanctuary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nadereivalu</td>
<td>Ulukula</td>
<td>Vuaka[pig]</td>
<td>Nailagobakola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wainivesi</td>
<td>Vakamalamaia</td>
<td>Bici[bird]</td>
<td>Naieceecee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimaro</td>
<td>Salusalifulu(man)</td>
<td>Gata[snake]</td>
<td>Taunovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narocake</td>
<td>Ralautoka(man)</td>
<td>Dadakulaci[seasnake]</td>
<td>Naot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bure</td>
<td>Qiovoou (man)</td>
<td>Duna[Eel]</td>
<td>Veikarawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bau</td>
<td>Navoci (man)</td>
<td>Dunaleka[Short eel]</td>
<td>Waikava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabotini</td>
<td>Waitela (man)</td>
<td>Vo [Fresh water fish]</td>
<td>Navusega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neovini</td>
<td>Boio (man)</td>
<td>Ganivatu[Duck]</td>
<td>Naveivoto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, Digidigituraga, who lived at Taivakarua, was the vu of all the mataqali and 
the yavusa in the village of Matacauau. Roko, who lived in the sanctuary of 
Naburebalavu at Navunibokoi, was worshipped by all the yavusa in the village of 
Kumi. 

There were claims of independence, even in Bua, regardless of the fact that 
Buatavatava came from Verata. Wilkinson identified the first state religion in Fiji, a

19 Vasili Koroiwaqa, Mataqali Tainuvatuleka, Naqelevu, op cit.
loose national religious relationship existed between the \textit{yavusa}, based on the worship of Ravuravu, the greatest \textit{vu} in Bua.\footnote{Wiliame Delai, \textit{Mataqali ko Buaira}, Bua, Tikina ko Bua in Evidence Book, Bua Province 1900, Page 1-265, Fijian, (Wilkinson), N. L. C. A.} The \textit{sevu}, first fruit offering, from all Bua were offered at Ravuravu's sanctuary in Bua village. The sanctuary was called Nasaru, where a temple called Ratukituki was built. Apart from Ravuravu, the other \textit{yavusa} in the province of Bua had their local and individual sanctuaries. The \textit{kalou vu} of Bua had their individual sanctuaries as well. Damudamu, the \textit{vu} of the Tai Matau ni Wailevu ko Bua, right bank of the Bua River, lived in the form of a stone at Damudamu, on the Nawi river. Wesele Ciri identified another two, at Vakarakanawaikoro, where the female \textit{vu}, Lewaula lived in the form of a frog, and Uluiraba, belonging to Rabatagane, who also lived there in the form of a spirit. He was a naughty spirit who loved to eat coconuts.\footnote{Wesili Ciri, \textit{Mataqali ko Naroroi}, Tiliva, Cobuya kei Devoka, op cit.} Droge of Koroinasolo village lived at the sanctuary of Nakabakabatia in Seseleka, while Malo lived at Kawiki in the middle of the village Vunievu. Kawara, the female god of Navakasiga, lived at Natuvuikawa and Rokolewa of Devoka lived in Devoka. Other sanctuaries in Navakasiga were Nasaqata, where Tobo of Naiviqiri and Ailea lived. Matua, the male \textit{kalou vu} of Lekutu had his home at Narawa and Qesa of Votua lived at Nadraki.

Two other sanctuaries, Ululagilevu and Curuvotu, could be found on the island of Galoa and Yaqaga, while the sanctuary of Vulega of Tavea is called Vunitivi. Rokotuku, the female \textit{kalou vu} of Kavula lived at Nawaisavu and Rokotelelevu of Tavua, Naitauvoli and Tebenidio, was at Nagasauwaru in Draidrai. Meli Vasaga of Drakaniwai also identified four sanctuaries, Waisuli, where Ratinitini lived, Manavunibou where the grasshopper, Cauoro could be found, Nabakasere where Tuvakalakala the snake lived and Nadevatu where Rokouvi, another snake, had his
home.

Unlike the *yavusa* in Naitasiri, the *yavusa* in the Bua did not know where they came from. Wilkinson also recorded that a number of districts in Bua did not know their sanctuary of origin. Only three knew where they came from. They were the *yavusa* Burenitu at Votua, who knew that they came from Seaqaqa, the village of Galoa in Yaqaga, who came from Macuata while Jone Vabua, of the *mataqali* Kacuvesi, said that they grew up in Tavea. But the rest seemed to say that they, like Tavea, grew up in Bua, *nubu ga e Bua*. The *yavusa* who grew up in Bua included the villages of Navotua, Dalomo, Bua, Tiliva, Cobuya and Devoka, Tacilevu, Vunievu, Waitabu and Koroinasolo in the district of Bua. In the district of Navakasiga, the villages of Savusavu, Devoka, Naiviqiri, Ailea also grew up in Bua, while in the district of Lekutu, the villages of Nativi, Kavula, Banikea, Natarutaru, Nadrodro, Tavua, Natovoli, Tebenidio and Drakaniwai maintained the same stories of their origins.

From the above discussion, it is evident that Wilkinson did not have any plan to nationalise this varied mythology. The sanctuaries of worship were independent, the *yavusa* grew up locally and Degei supremacy over the pantheon was never acknowledged. But he had identified mythology as an integral component of native land ownership and had not had the chance to continue to explore the importance of mythology, when Maxwell replaced him in 1906.

Maxwell did not start with mythology but with the *turaga bale* institution, specifically the title of Vunivalu of Bau. This was a new beginning in the NLC’s work. But it was short lived. When Boyd replaced Maxwell, he revived Thomson’s approach, separating mythology from land claims, when he dealt with the province of Ra. Sukuna, who had

---

24 Jone Vabua, op cit
been working with Maxwell and Madraiwiwi, provided the mythological footing to Maxwell’s resolution through the *Tukutuku Raraba*. France argued that Maxwell had introduced an imported land policy into the NLC. I will come to this imported land policy theory after I place Maxwell’s work in the NLC within the perimeter of my argument. I will analyse two theories that emerged during Maxwell’s term in the NLC to see if they had been imported theories or if they were local realities, only used to formulate new policies. These theories are concerned with the constitution of native communities and the acceptance of Nakauvadra as a common patriarchal shrine of origin. As I have been arguing in this thesis, what transpired as NLC doctrines had been historically, politically and religiously shaped through the interaction between the *turaga bale* institution, thirty-nine years before cession. Maxwell was confident he had found the original model of the ‘constitution of native communities’, based on data he received from Tailevu.25 This constitution included the *yavusa*, made up of *mataqali*, which were direct agnate descendants of a single *kalou vu* or ancestor god. In the second paragraph of his report, Maxwell noted that a separate *mataqali* could form a new *yavusa* and a number of *yavusas* could combine to form a new *vanua*, a number of *vanuas* could amalgamate into a new *matanitu*.

Maxwell took his new theory on the constitution of native communities to Nadroga, where he was confronted with the relationship between the two institutions of governance, the *vanua* and *matanitu*.26 On the 18 July 1913, Alekisadro Savenaca Seniloli helped Maxwell and Boyd examine the various native land claims in Nadroga, focusing on the concepts of *mataqali, yavusa, vanua* and *matanitu*. Reconstructing the *matanitu* of Nadroga on the Tailevu constitution of the native communities was a

---

25 G. V. Maxwell, Chairman, Native Lands Commission to Colonial Secretary, 6 June 1913, paragraph 1, Native Lands Commission, CP 27/1914, N. A. F. I am using G. R. Ward’s hand copied copies of this correspondence. Ward inserted his observation in his notes saying, ‘it seems though he [Maxwell] is reporting on Colo West’. I have a copy of Ward’s notes in my possession, which he gave me.
Herculean effort. Maxwell’s July 1913 findings in the Nadroga Evidence Book needed slow and careful consideration before a pattern could be identified. Here is an example. A certain claimant, Eliesa Ratuva of the mataqali Leweinaadroga in Cuvu, told Maxwell that there were seven divisions in Nadroga. Maxwell did not give the Fijian correspondence of the term ‘division’, but in regards to the fact that Nadroga was a matanitu, then the term ‘division’ had to mean vanua.27 Perplexing Maxwell’s conclusions, Ratu Luke Nalasi of the mataqali Noinasesevia refuted Ratuva’s list, claiming that there were sixteen vanuas in the matanitu of Nadroga.28

Whatever was the problem at Nadroga, it became very simple two years after, when Maxwell came to Bau, the cradle of his constitution of the native communities. He reaffirmed his theories on Fijian governance when the chiefs of Bau outlined the ancient governing institutions and titles on the chiefly island. On 15 April 1915, Maxwell, with Ratu Savenaca Alekisadro Seniloli, Richard Boyd and Sukuna, met the chiefs of Bau.29 Maxwell raised and discussed ten weighty issues, all relating his views on the constitution of native communities. He was interested in how the matanitu of Bau came into being, and who established it, asking the chiefs of Bau to explain the origin of the mataqali Tui Kaba and identity of Vueti, Bau’s patriarch. Turning to custom, Maxwell made inquiries into the marriage customs of the Vunivalu, especially on the wives’ hierarchy and children’s ranks. On political supremacy, Maxwell questioned the relationship of the Vunivalu with the Roko Tui Bau and the 1832-36 coup d’etat. The Bauan chiefs also highlighted the sau ni dra nei Misi Peka, an incident that gave birth to the Native Armed Constabulary in 1871. The last issue this

27 ibid.
28 ibid.
meeting dealt with Verata, was who was the supreme matanitu in Fiji. Maxwell did not settle this issue. It waited sixteen years for Sukuna. After this discussion at Bau, Maxwell was able to shape the constitution of the native communities, from the tokatoka to the matanitu.

The N. L. C. clarified who was turaga bale and who was to the tamata talai to the turaga bale within each family in Bau. A turaga bale was a Bauan blue blood and a tamata talai was, in its literal meaning, a servant and a messenger to the turaga bale. And what type of turaga one was depended on the type of marriage the chiefs of Bau entered into during that era of polygamy. A true wife, watina bau, lived with the chief and had concubines, vada, who might also be mothers of other chief’s sons. The vada’s sons were called i kaso. Again, there were two types of i kaso, i kaso vesi and i kaso dolou, depending on the rank of the concubine. How the women were brought into the harem decided the category of wife. A women who was brought in as soro, or surrender in war, could be counted as a watina bau, but if brought in as spoil of war, she did not qualify as a watina bau. She was merely a vada or concubine to the watina bau. The queen, or watina bau, of the installed Vunivalu received a higher status than all other wives. A Vunivalu was first installed at Kaba to be the Tui Kaba and his watina bau would automatically be Radi Kaba. When he was installed as Vunivalu, his watina bau became the Radi Levuka. These customs were observed for Banuve and Rokolewasau, and later Tanoa Visawaqa and Adi Talatoka, who were Vunivalu and Radi Levuka respectively.

Baneuve, the founder of the matanitu of Bau, had three wives. They were Davila of Nairai, Rokolewasau of Rewa and Ufia of Lakeba. Banuve’s wives had two yavus in Bau, Naqaranikula and Naivutuvutu. Davila was at Naqaranikula and Rokolewasau at Naivutuvutu or Vale Basoga, which was built at Drekeiselesale. The chiefs of Bau
raised the question regarding Ufia's house, affronting Madraiwiwi, who was also at the hearing. Rokolewasau, Banuve's watina bau with the title of Radi Levuka, had two sons, Naulivou and Tanoa. Davila also had two sons, Ramudra and Caucau. Ufia of Kedekede had a son, Vuibureta. The customs of Bau decreed that Ramudra, Caucau and Vuibureta should be subordinate to Naulivou and Tanoa. History has shown that Caucau led the coup d'état against Tanoa in 1832, replacing him with Veikoso, and Mara, the son of Vuibureta who later challenged Cakobau's authority after the death of Tanoa in 1852.

Maxwell faced the volatile subject of succession to the title of Vunivalu, trying his best to iron out the differences which existed between the chiefs on the island of Bau. The NLC came to accept the fact that chiefly rivalry in Bau was very strong before Cakobau's reign as Vunivalu. These differences had strong roots in history. According to custom, the son of the Radi Levuka was the Crown Prince of Bau. But in rare cases, the son of the uninstalled wife, who might be older, stronger, and showed the potential to be a chief, could supersede the son of a marama buli. Adi Talatoka was installed as Radi Levuka, but Draunibaka was not the Vunivalu. Cakobau, the son of Adi Savusavu, became the Vunivalu. Adi Savusavu died at Vanuaso, when Cakobau was still an infant. The young boy survived on coconut milk.

A Vunivalu received authority by installation. Thus the Vusa Ratu, from the tokatoka Nacokadi, affirmed their traditional duties to the NLC. Maxwell reiterated that the Vuaniiivi were all killed war at Vanua Balavu during Naulivou's reign. The Vusa Ratu retained their title, Roko Tui Bau. Naqicatabua was the Roko Tui Bau when Nailatikau or Ra Matenikutu was the Vunivalu. This meant the two of them, Naqicatabua and Nailatikau, settled the island of Bau after expelling the fishermen on Bau Island. According to Ratu Orisi:
None but I install the Vunivalu! The Tunitoga and the Vunivalu are installed the same day. The Tunitoga convenes the chiefs of Bau to discuss the coronation. He decides on the day. The chiefs of Bau decide on who should prepare the *yaqona* ceremony. The Vunivalu’s brother becomes the cupbearer. The Tunitoga’s younger brother will then drink after the Vunivalu.\(^{30}\)

Ratu Orisi’s declaration was pregnant with history. As I discussed in Chapter 2, Roko Tui Bau from the *tokatoka* Nacokadi, presented the whale’s tooth of surrender to Tanoa on his return from exile. It elevated Tanoa’s position as Vunivalu, the secular king, over the Roko Tui Bau, the sacred king. Banuve was installed at Bau but Tui Cakau and the chiefs of Cakaudrove installed Tanoa at Rewa in 1836. The NLC was now legalising history and traditional politics first before putting land into its proper context. Maxwell further heard and recorded that Maqala was *buli* with Tanoa as his Tunitoga and Ra Se1u as Tunitoga to Cakobau. When Tanoa died, Maqala retired.

The chiefs of Bau raised the subject of *qali* or tribute with Maxwell. They concluded that *qali* was different from *vanua*. As an example, the *matanitu* of Bau consisted of the *vanua*s of Bau, Dravo, Buretu, Kiuva, Namata, Namara, Yatu Mabua, the Yatu Nai, which included Cautata, Vatoa and Waicoka, and Waimaro, who were *bati* to Bau. Lomaiviti, as a province, was a new name, created to ease administration during the Cakobau government. Moturiki was *qali tu*, while Bureta was a *vanua* and free from the *qali vaka*-Bau in Ovalau. Lovoni, like Bureta, was also a *vanua*.

Old political and historical wounds opened before Maxwell when he was confronted with the question of Bau’s supremacy over Verata. Ratu Venioni Ravoka, the Ratu of Verata, challenged this. The Commission noted Ravoka’s outcry that:

\(^{30}\) ibid.
Verata was not invited or acknowledged in the Cakobau Government [Matanitu Vaka-Viti]. Bolatabanivau was not in the negotiation for Cession ... the reason was we were suppressed. Cakobau suppressed us! Bolatabanivau did not sign the deed of cession. Verata had the right as sanctuary of patriarchal origin, which Bau later overthrew by might of arms. But what the NLC did, as argued generally in this thesis, was to maintain Bau’s ascendancy over Verata. In fact, Maxwell left the question open for Sukuna to settle in 1933.

After Bau, the standard constitution or structure of a native community was applied with more confidence. On the 19 February 1920, Maxwell, Boyd, Seniloli and Toganivalu met with the chiefs of Macuata at Naduri. In his Taro Raraba, Maxwell outlined the NLC’s new standard model of Fijian governance. All the mataqali who originated from the same kalou vu and lived together in the same place were to be members of the same yavusa. The mataqali was a component of the yavusa, originating from the sons of the yavusa’s kalou vu. Within the mataqali were the different tokatoka, which were called na kena vale in Macuata. Maxwell went beyond the yavusa, noting that a number of yavusa made a vanua, and a number of vanua combined to form a matanitu.

If Maxwell received his data on the constitution of the native communities from Tailevu, then there would be a number of possible sources, but mostly Bauan chiefs closely associated with the N. L. C. There were fellow N. L. C. Commissioners, Seniloli, Madraiwiwi, who was the Roko Tui Tailevu, and Deve Toganivalu, who was both the Masau of Bau and Roko Tui Macuata. The data were institutional practices that the matanitu of Bau had used to exercise governance. It had been there since time

---
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immemorial. To further prove that the data and constitution pre-dated 1911, the Great Council of Chiefs’ meeting held at Bua in November and December 1878 had outlined this very constitution of the native communities. At the end of the seventeenth day of their meeting, the chiefs made a particular resolution regarding succession to titles, affirming that

the course of succession (of the various chiefs and elders) will be as aforesaid with the Turagabale, Turaga ni Vanua, Turaga ni Qali, Turaga ni Koro or the Mataqali, and also the succession of those who lead the various Mataqali, or any other division of the people upon the land, each being headed by the elder, according to their several ranks or status by the custom of their land, and which may be decided upon in their assembly. 33

Standardisation, therefore, began with the chiefs and not with Maxwell’s 1911 report. This resolution clearly outlined the constitution of the native communities when it discussed succession to leadership titles. The Turagabale, Turaga ni Vanua, Turaga ni Qali, Turaga ni Koro or the Mataqali represented the matanitu, vanua, yavusa and mataqali. Maxwell merely adopted this constitution as the chiefs outlined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Council, 1878</th>
<th>G. V. Maxwell, 1911</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turaga bale</td>
<td>Matanitu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turaga ni Vanua</td>
<td>Vanua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turaga ni Qali</td>
<td>Yavusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turaga ni Koro or Mataqali</td>
<td>Mataqali</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though the chiefs raised different meanings of the matanitu, the affirmation of the turaga bale institution as in Resolution 5 simply meant that the turaga bale was the head of the matanitu. Wilkinson, who was present at the 1878 Native Council meeting at Bua, afterwards asked who were the turaga dina, turaga i taukei and turaga ni

33 Resolution 5, Wednesday, 11th December 1878, Notes on the Proceedings of a Native Council held at Bua, On the Island of Vanua Levu, in the Months of November and December 1878.
mataqali at Ba and Serua. 34 As discussed in Chapter 2, the turaga bale institution developed when Bau emerged as a matanitu by subduing the political supremacy of Verata, introducing a new political order into Fiji.

This new social order became established with the advent of Christianity, especially when the Vunivalu became a Christian in 1854. Maxwell stressed the fluidity of the yavusa, especially the formation of new vanua and matanitu. But whatever state a vanua or matanitu had achieved by 1854 remained as such until cession. Another subject Maxwell raised in his 1911 report cannot pass without a critical response. This was his reference to Nakauvadra as the patriarchal shrine of origin. Maxwell noted that

in almost every case, tradition has it that this kalou vu originated from the [Na]Kauvadra Range, the house of Degei, and he was presumably a descendent of those legendary founders of the Fijian race? 35

The above statement discussed cases from the Colo West. It was not new for the N. L. C. to hear that the kalou vu originated from Nakauvadra, for Wilkinson had confirmed this in his investigation.

The N. L. C., in the end, accepted the tradition that some kalou vu came from Nakauvadra. What was new in Maxwell’s theory was the doctrine of Nakauvadra as Degei’s house, thereby proclaiming Degei’s supremacy. Nakauvadra now had a leader through Maxwell’s perception of the past, and that position was to be fully confirmed when Sukuna took over the N. L. C. from Boyd. But Maxwell’s standardised system

---


35 G. V. Maxwell, Chairman, Native Lands Commission to Colonial Secretary, 6 June 1913, paragraph 1, Native Lands Commission, CP 27/1914, N. A. F.
of government could not hold together unless a strong and unified pantheistic mythology was in place.

Sukuna had a definite plan in mind when he became the NLC’s Chairman, mainly gained from his father. Madraiwiwi, I presume, was the major influence on Sukuna’s mythology. Under his influence, the NLC nationalised the pantheistic mythology and system of governance.

The chiefs of Bau were unkind to Madraiwiwi and Sukuna when Maxwell met them in 1915. They pointed out that Ufia, Vuibureta’s mother, did not have a house in Bau for she was a spoil of war. Vuibureta was, in that context, disqualified as turaga bale. His son, Mara, fought hard to assert his authority, but was defeated in the 1855 battle of Kaba and his final hanging in 1859. By 1915, it was Madraiwiwi’s turn. Madraiwiwi’s son was sitting with the NLC Chairman, and the fate of each Bauan chief was at his mercy. Ratu Sukuna registered his name in the Register of Native Landowners, Vola ni Kawa Bula, with his mother’s tokatoka Matailakeba, the mataqali Vuanirewa, yavusa Lakeba in Lau. Madraiwiwi concealed all signs of being affected by the disqualification of Vuibureta, his grandfather, from being a turaga bale. In his capacity as Roko Tui Tailevu, he held great authority over the NLC proceedings as assessor. Also, the NLC had to go through the Provincial Office each time it conducted its inquiries in any village or district. He continued serving Bau as Roko Tui Tailevu.

---


37 The 1878 GCC had been concerned by the presence of the District Buli during the land commission’s sitting and requested all Roko to be present as assessors.
Fijian mythology, in this thesis, regenerated politics, justifying and sanctifying the *turaga bale* institution. History and traditional politics was now used as the most vital component in settling native land claims. Sukuna took this approach when he ruled on the supremacy dispute between Bau and Verata, raised before Maxwell at Bau in 1915.

In his report, witnessed by Ratu Aseri Latianara of Serua, Sukuna said that

Bau conquered Verata twice. During Ratu Cakobau’s time, the village was burnt, and the villagers fled to Naloto and from there to Namena. Later, Bau again conquered Verata, due to internal conflicts at Verata. The Ratu, Ratu Ravoka, fled and reached Viria, where he was murdered. His followers were taken as prisoners to Bau. This was closer to the time of Cession. A daughter of a Verata lady was born at Bau and named Adi Lolou.

It is then beyond reasonable doubt, that the reason for Verata weakening was Bau, who conquered it in war, capture its citizens and later return them to Verata. It our decision therefore that the Ratu mai Verata should *wakarorogo* to the Vunivalu mai Bau. 38

The N. L. C. needed mythology to justify and sanctify the supremacy of the Vunivalu over the Ratu mai Verata. Through Sukuna, it reconstructed the *Tukutuku Raraba*, focusing on Degei’s supremacy in the pantheistic mythology and Nakauvadra’s supremacy over Waituruturu. It was a clear deviation from Wilkinson’s and Maxwell’s policies. Tevita Raiwalui submitted the *yavusa* Kubuna’s *Tukutuku Raraba* in 1925, beginning with the legends of the Vueti and the civil war at Nakauvadra. Vueti, the *kalou vu* of Kubuna, flooded the fortress of Narauyaba when he cut the root of the *vugayali*. 39 Rokola, the god of the carpenters, had tightly battened the fortress of Narauyaba with *vesi*, belonging to the twins, Nacirinakaumoli and Nakausabaria. As the fountain from the broken *vugayali* root flowed quietly under the *vesi* fence, it flooded the watertight fortress. Consequently, the Narauyaba twins surrendered to

---

38 Resolution at Naimasimasi, Vugalei, 9 September 1933 in E. B. Tailevu, p. 426, N. L. C. A.

39 T. Raiwalita, Tukutuku Raraba.
Degei. Degei rewarded Vueti with a promise that he would be Chieftain Supreme of Fiji, with the title Roko Tui Bau.

The legend of Degei awarding Vueti with the title Roko Tui Bau for his bravery justified and sanctified Bauan supremacy over Verata. It also legitimised Bau’s political supremacy, and, through that, Degei’s authority in the patriarchal pantheon to confer political supremacy. This thesis argues that political authority needed mythology for legitimisation. The evidence proves that Bauan political supremacy resulted from the Vunivalu’s *liga qaqa*. Also, the evidence that the Wesleyan Methodists used models from the classical world to rejuvenate the original Fijian mythology legitimising Bauan supremacy. Ratu Sukuna finally adopted the Wesleyan Methodists influenced mythology in the *Tukutuku Raraba* to justify Bauan political supremacy, a process which the N. L. C. finalised at Naimasimasi in 1933.

Mythology entrenched the ascendancy of Bau through the *Tukutuku Raraba*. The *yavusa* Vuku, the *mataisau*, carpenters, of Bau, identified themselves with the twins of Narauyaba. Both, Daucina, *vu* of the *yavusa* Tunidau of Soso, and Vuetidua, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Naitodua of Kaba, brought their *yavusa* from Nakauvadra. Even though it did not know its *vu*, the *yavusa* Davetalevu in the village of Vatoa also believed that their *vu* came from Nakauvadra through Waimaro. Maiunibulu, *vu* of the *yavusa* Matanibulu of Ovea, came through Viria in Naitasiri. Leka, a lazy and spitting *vu*, was exiled from Nakauvadra to become the *vu* of the *yavusa* Koronikalou in Cautata village. Ratumaibulu, in the form of a snake, became the *vu* of the *yavusa* Nayaumunu of Viwa Island. Bakubaku, a *vu* in the form of a shark, came from Nakauvadra to be the *vu* of the *yavusa* Tabukasivi of Kiuva, while the other *yavusa* in the village of Kiuva, Takalaikiuva, had Savuwaitui as their *vu*. Rokovono was *vu* of the *yavusa*.

---

40 Legend said that he was *dau vakacauoca ka dau kasivi*. 
Nalewadina in Naisausau village in Namara. This *yavusa* was *bati* or warrior to Bau. Lalavanua, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Toga living also at Naisausau village in Namara, came from Nakauvadra.

After schematising the *Tukutuku Raraba* for the *yavusa* within the *matanitu* of Bau, Sukuna attended to other *yavusa* in Tailevu. He paid special attention to the *yavusa*’s tree, bird, *kalou vu, vu* and *yavu tu*. The *yavusa* Buretu in the village of Naloto did not know of their *vu*, who, according to them, came off the canoe *Duivabaki*. Kumilevu, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Kumi, came from Nakauvadra. Taive the son of Taute of Verata was the *vu* of the *yavusa* Naikasakasa of the village of Kumi. Nadakudua and Buliratu his wife, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Daviko at the village of Navunimono came from Nakauvadra. Kumilevu of the *yavusa* Qalibure placed their origins at an obscure sanctuary. Raroba and Buikorotoma of the *yavusa* Kabatia in Sawa village also came from Nakauvadra. In the District of Namalata in Tailevu North, the *yavusa* Nadereivalu of Matacuacau did not know their *vu* but the other *yavusa*, Tacilevu, knew that Vutalaki and Lewakisi, his wife, and their *vu*, came from Nakauvadra. Liganikau and his wife Rokotina of the *yavusa* Navitilevu in the village of Veinuqa also did not know their place of origin but Naulumatua and Buliyavu his wife of the *yavusa* Nawaibuta or *kai* Nasau in the villages of Nailega and Navunisole came from Nakauvadra. Rokovacuni and his wife Tuilomanisala, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Nasau, also came from Nakauvadra with Natuituba and Mocayawa, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Nawaidina residing in Matacula village. Other *vu* like Raluve and his wife Lewadeva, of the *yavusa* Coloinasau, Taburai and his wife Lewaka, of the *yavusa* Bau in the villages of Nakorovou and Navunisole, also came from Nakauvadra. In addition, Daboto and his wife Vuluwaqameidua, of the *yavusa* Salatu in the village of Nakalawaca; Dakudua from Nakauvadra and his wife, Batiratu, of the *yavusa* Daviko in Veinuqa village, Qaseqase and Sanibau his wife, of the *yavusa* Nakukuco, all came in pairs from
Nakauvadra.

The *vu* of the *yavusa* in the District of Naloto also came from Nakauvadra. Rokusuka and his wife Lewadeke of the *yavusa* Naloto in the village of Naveicovatu and Nasau and as well as Ratu Bose, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Namoia came from Nakauvadra. The *yavutu* at Namoia is married to the *yavutu* at Naloto. The *yavusa* Rara does not have any *vu*. Roko Dutu, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Wailevu in the district of Wailevu came from Nasautoka in Wainibuka, as did Bikoto, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Rara and Seruvakula, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Naivucini in the village of Vuna. Naqio and Adi Bale, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Nadakua in the village of Malabi came from Nakauvadra.

Politically, Nayavu was closely associated with Bau. It was named after the dispersion of the various *mataqali* of the *yavusa* Kubuna before they assembled once again at Namuka under Roko Tui Bau’s rule. The *vu* of the *yavusa* Bau, Ravouravou came from Nakauvadra. So did Tuinikoro, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Qelema in Nasaibitu village, Sukuvatu of the *yavusa* Navalavuqa also of Nasaibitu village, and Uraniwaimaca and Likucevuga his wife, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Rara ni Naqia village.

The *Tukutuku Raraba* schematised Namena’s mythology in favour of Nakauvadra. Dakunikutubuta and Lewai his wife, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Tui Nawainovo in the village of Naburenivalu in the district of Namena, came from Nakauvadra. Likewise, Tabakausere and Lewavaivai of the *yavusa* Macoi were also from Naburenivalu, and so were Tuikoro of the *yavusa* Tuikoro in Nanunu village, Saunivanua and Leleasiga, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Dere in Naburenivalu and Lawaki village, Naqelelesocake and Lewaga of the *yavusa* Naqele in Qeleku village and Naulubasoga of the *yavusa* Naicula in Qeleku village. Naulubasoga came from Nakauvadra and established Naicula. The other *yavusa* in the District of Namena, *yavusa* Naibati in Nanunu village, had their *vu*. 
Tuibati and Daligadamu, from Naboutini while the other two yavusa, Sawatini of Nananu village and Tai of Luvunavuaka, did not know their vu.

Sukuna rearranged the pantheon of the province of Ra to relate to Nakauvadra. Boyd had earlier inquired about this in 1918, and dislocated the Ra pantheon from Nakauvadra. In his inquiry, each yavusa had their local mythological orientation, and lacked a unified mythology. Sukuna took over the NLC and continued with the harmonisation of mythology, as he had done at Tailevu. Ratu, a son of Tunakauvadra, was the vu of the yavusa Namotutu in the District of Rakiraki. Other vu known by the yavusa Namotutu were Nagusulevu and Degei. The yavusa Navuavuha had Kanailagi from Nakauvadra as their vu, while the yavusa Viti had Turoko also from Nakauvadra as their vu. Leka and Lovai, his wife from Nakauvadra, were the vu of the yavusa Cakova. Lovai of Nakauvadra was the vu of the yavusa Natiliva, while Dokidoki and Dikalevu of Nakauvadra were the vu of the yavusa Wailevu. Dada vanua and Likumasei were the vu of the yavusa Malake, the fishermen of Degei. Fero and his wife Losucoto were the vu of the yavusa Wailevu in the district if Raviravi in Ra. Waqabalabala, Degei’s son, with Losawisi, his wife, were the vu of the yavusa Naisogoliku, while Tuiburelevu and Lowai, his wife from Nakauvadra, became the vu of the yavusa Burelevu. Savadroka also from Nakauvadra was the vu of the yavusa Bua. Vero and Lesucoto were the vu of yavusa Raviravi while Bakadroti and Yadi, who were also the high priests of Nakauvadra, were the vu of the yavusa Qilaqila. Saumaimuri was the vu of the yavusa Namacuku and Rasare and his wife Naikanivatu were the vu of the yavusa Vatukaloko.

Seven vu were registered in Naroko. They were Silitabua of the yavusa Navisama, Namatalevu and Kitu, a lady from Vuradreudreu was the vu of the yavusa Vaikitu, Botitu from Nakasekula in Nakauvadra and Memesiga his wife were the vu of the
yavusa Nabaqatai. Ralulu and his wife Naisau, a lady from Nubu, were the vu of the yavusa Moliti while Vudi and Vuki of Bua were the vu of the yavusa Veitautau. Rakalevu and Masidravu of Vitautau were the vu of the yavusa Natolevu. Mavoka and Savaivai, a lady from Mali, were the vu of yavusa Namasasa.

Sukuna’s name appeared in the N. L. C.’s report in the province of Macuata from 1917 till 1927, where the pantheistic mythology was schematised, realigning most of the vu to Nakauvadra. Rokovakararawa from Nakauvadra was the vu of the yavusa Naduri and also Lico of the yavusa Nukubati, Geta of the yavusa Namama, Werenisiga and Taviri his wife of the yavusa Raviravi and Matanakilagi of the yavusa Ligaudamu. Saligadamu, who came from Verata, became the vu of the yavusa Namoli in Nabukado. Roko Dinono of Nakauvadra became the vu of the yavusa Kia and also Nailevu of the yavusa Navave in the village of Bua. Ro Qitoqito of the yavusa Batiri was a local deity. The vu Nabouono in the village of Nabouono had Qiovuli of Nakauvadra their as their vu. Roko Taga and Roko Lewai the vu of the yavusa Burenitu, were both local but Vatusoga and Lewataqali, vu of the yavusa Burenitu in the village of Tuva, came from Nakauvadra. In the District of Sasa, Roko Batiuvi their vu came from Nakauvadra.

The vu of the district of Seaqaqa were of unknown origin. They were Ratumaiwanono, Virivoli, Salautoki, Ququ, Tobesau, Saumure and Qitoqito. They had their own sanctuaries in Seaqaqa. Rabilabilavanua, the vu of the yavusa Uluitoga in the district of Dreketi, came from Nakauvadra with Rasadravu, his wife. The pantheon of the district of Namuka was related closely to the deities of Bau. Lulu, who came on Vueti’s canoe, had five sons, Konawale, Busia, Gani, Leka and Ucusa. He was the vu of the yavusa Visoqo. Kura, the vu of the yavusa Naduru in the district of Dogotuki came on the Kaunitoni from Verata, while Madraiaqata of the yavusa Dokanaisuva in the village of
Vunikodi at Udu point came from Nakauvadra through Cakaudrove. Matua, the vu of the yavusa Koroidrano in the village of Vuninuku in Cikobia also came from Nakauvadra also through Cakaudrove. 41

Although Bau had taken precedence in the pantheistic mythology and the Tukutuku Raraba, Sukuna verified that precedence in Verata’s Tukutuku Raraba, forcing Verata to conform through mythology to justify the ascendancy of Bau. The pantheistic doctrines maintained by the yavusa Vunivalu in the village of Ucunivanua at Verata linked Verata and Nakauvadra. 42 It said that Degei and Waicalanavanua remained at Nakauvadra, heading the pantheon, while the rest of the vu left for various places. Waicalanavanua’s sons, the twins of Narauyaba, had acquired Tui Nubulevu’s rooster, which became the source of the civil war at Nakauvadra.

Once Verata acknowledged Degei’s pantheistic supremacy, the mythology of other yavusa who recognised Verata as head did not matter. The head had been subdued. Naulumatua of the yavusa Levukana also came from Verata, while Tuinayavu of the yavusa Batiki of Nakalawaca came straight from Nakauvadra. Taqa and Rokowati his wife, the vu of the yavusa Nakawaga came from Verata. The vu of the yavusa in the district of Vugalei, a district in between Bau and Verata, originated mostly from Verata. Tuinono and his wife Adi Senicakau, the vu of the yavusa Vugalei living at the village of Natobuniqio, came from Verata, but Kau, the vu of the yavusa Ratova lived in his shrine at Delakurukuru. Botebotevanua, the son of Tuinono, with his wife Ravula, was the vu of the yavusa Vunisaqiwa in Sote village. Tadau and his wife Adi Cakau, also from Verata, were the vu of the yavusa Nacovu from the village of Naimasimasi.

41 Tukutuku Raraba, Tikina ko Cikobia, 19 July 1928, N. L. C. A.
42 T. Bolobolo, ibid.
The *vu*, Rabo and his wife Rokotagavugavu, according to tradition, seeded humans at Tai Vugalei, another district between Bau and Verata. Leka and Tinailewa, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Naivakacere at Vatukarasa village, came from Nakauvadra. Also from Nakauvadra were Leka and his wife Adi Vadra, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Tai in the village of Naseva. Rokoseru and Wati his wife came from Naikasakasa with Bulukisawaru and Donakai his wife, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Naivakalau at Naisaumua village. Naikasakasa was the sanctuary of the *kai* Naikasakasa. Tui Nawainovo and his wife, Di Verevanua, the *vu* of *yavusa* Nawainovo in the village of Matamaivere came from Verata.

Sawakasa, a district aligned closely with Verata because it was headed by a Ratu, had most of their *vu* from Naboutini. The *yavusa* Nadereivalu in the chiefly village of Sawakasa did not know or have any *vu* but Batigaga and Nabena, his wife, *vu* of the *yavusa* Waimaro, came from Naboutini, together with Balavu and Lewakadru, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Wainisei, and so was Mocekinaula, the *vu* of the *yavusa* Bure. Two *vu*, Tuinavitilevu and Buliyavu of the *yavusa* Naboutini in the village of Dakuinuku and Tuivatu of the *yavusa* Naovini in the village of Lodoni came from Nakauvadra to Naboutini.

Sukuna changed the *vu* of Bua as recorded by Wilkinson. In 1900, Wiliame Delai of the *mataqali* Bua-i-ra in Bua said that Ravuravu was the greatest *vu* in Bua. In the *Tukutuku Raraba*, Delai said that Buatavatava and his wife, Adi Vukiavanua, were the *vu* of Bua. Although it related Buatavatava to Verata, Sukuna made a special note in the typed pages of the *Tukutuku Raraba* that Tui Bua was independent, *tu vakai koya ga*. Religious independence was easy once political independent became a reality. Tui Bua’s independence restructured the pantheon of Bua to maintain a religious independence detached from Verata’s mythological hold. The Bua pantheon included
Roko Lewaulu and Lewauci from Verata, Rokosuka and Radinibale, Batidradra, Tabakauketena, Rokotudruma and Ravikona from Vuya, and Raiyala from Rukuruku. Three *vu* families, Koyamanikusemanu and Rakaria, Masiyarayara and Divolo, and Kulavati and Lewatagau, came from Verata. Na Matua and Di Manasali from Nasuva and Namalata while Daoro and Tavolewa came from Takarilevu in Lomaidama.

In Lekutu, Qesa and Nailewa from Verata became the *vu* of the *yavusa* Burenitu in the village of Votua. Batimaci and Madugu came from Nakauvadra to be the *vu* of the *yavusa* Kavula in Banikea village. Rokotavukalala and Nailewa of Nakauvadra became the *vu* of the *yavusa* Drakaniwai in the village of Nasarowaqa. In the district of Wainunu, Rokotudruma and Rabinaivalu of Verata became the *vu* of the *yavusa* Wainunu. Dromunautouto and Naisika from Muanaicake became the *vu* of the *yavusa* Dawadigo. Kulavati and Naimasi from Nakorotiki were the *vu* of the *yavusa* Tanidamu and Bici, and Rokodrakawalu, also of Korotiki, became the *vu* of the *yavusa* Maururu. Another *vu* from Nakorotiki, Rokovatudua and his wife Vatudamu, became the *vu* of the *yavusa* Nabutubutu. Mokiu and Walu, of unknown origin, were the *vu* of the *yavusa* Dawacumu. Moto and Rokusucuwalu of Verata became the *vu* of the *yavusa* Muanaicake.

On the island of Kadavu, the *Tukutuku Raraba* linked the *vu* of the *yavusa* in Kadavu to Verata and Rewa. Rokovuruvuruivanua of the *yavusa* Nacolase in Kadavu came from Rewa with Ro Tabakanalagi. They landed at a place called Nawaisomo. Another *vu*, Daunisai, a Verata figure, of the *yavusa* Nukunawa, came from Kabara. The *yavusa* Naibati had Rokobiau as their *vu*. He came from Vuda, a sanctuary also associated with the Verata traditions.

---

43 Ratu Ilaitia Lacabuka, *Tukutuku Raraba ni Yavusa ko Nacolase*, N. L. C. A.
Even the Cakaudrove pantheistic mythology had their origins in either Nakauvadra or Verata. North of Somosomo, the sons of Rawaka established Wainikeli. Mainaqaraqara of Verata established the state of Natewa and Rokovukelevu created the chiefly title in the *vanua* of Tawake. He came with Matawalu and landed at Korolevu in Navatu.

In Saqani, Waqavatu, who came with Matawalu, was the founding ancestor of the chiefs of that *vanua*. Lele and Liliwalevu came with Buatavatava from Verata and became the chief of Koroalau while Roko Liga, who came from Verata through Naicobocobo, established Vaturova. The mythical chief of Navatu, Mainadala, came from Nakauvadra while the two, Sigarara and Di Mai Benau from Vunisavisavi, Cakaudrove established Tunuloa. Their sons were Mainawi, Mainavatu, Ravosai and Mainasigasiga. Vosaira from Verata was the mythical chief of Naweni.

At Nasavusavu, three patriarchal origins had been preserved. They were Dianikoila, who came with Buatavatata from Verata; Mainakorolevu who came from Batiki with Ratu Livanisiga; and the third group belonged to Ratu Sigaruarua. These groups formed the *yavusa* Nasavusavu. In Wailevu Dumusoqo from Bua, Rakanadovidovi, Radakualevu, Maqarusa and Rabulevu established this powerful state on the southern coast of Vanua Levu. All these titles and *vanua* were now aligned with Tui Cakau and made up Cakaudrove.

Sukuna let slip his standardising formula when he imposed the land customs of the Bauan and Cakaudrove *turaga bale* on the island of Vulaga in the southern Lau group. At first, Mao confessions in the *Tukutuku Raraba* of the *yavusa* Vulaga, in the Province of Lau, that there existed with them such land customs as *a i covicovi ni*

---

44 Hocart mentioned that Vulaga was also known as Bau Leka, or Little Bau. See A. M. Hocart, *Lau*, p. 27.
But when it came to settling land disputes, Sukuna brushed these customs aside and applied Bauan land customs. This was to settle the dispute between the **yavusa** Vulaga and the **yavusa** Ogea over Lomaji, a piece of land on the island of Ogea Driki. Below is a copy of the verbatim report from the Register of Native Lands.

**Inia Leqa:** Ogea Driki is ours for it is in our reef. Tui Ogea did not have any war. It was the Vulaga War, the war of Rorovakabelo, a chief from Naseuvou. Moce and Kabara participated. Our warrior was Baiyadrena. The purpose was to turn Ogea to Lakeba. Our ancestors were defeated and taken to Vulaga, Kabara and Moce. Each had an Ogea woman. Those taken to Vulaga were all killed. The flag of Ogea was the cause of the war.

**Tevita Uuluilakeba:** Qaraituruku was the Tui Ogea. Jone Magiti combined Ogea but Cinavaki led Ogea towards Kabara. Qaraituruku left no descendants.

**Iliesa Vakarau:** It was not the Vulaga War but a Lakeba War. Ravasu was the Tui Ogea. There were three villages on Ogea, Nabateteva, Korovusa and Sigasigari. [Two ladies Gatolo and Tovo.]

**Lasarusa Vakananumi:** Rorovakabelo received four women. Netani Mocelutu, Rorovakabelo’s son or grandson, looked after them. One of them was Filimone’s grandmother, whom the island was given as the *ka ni bula*, price of life.

**Lala Sukuna:** Rorovakabelo’s family is divided into two in Vulaga, one in Muanaicake and one at Naividamu. Land is not alienated in war as in Bau and Cakaudrove. But what is important is the people and their obedience [vakarorogo] to their chiefs [sa bibi ko ira na tamata kei na nodra vakarorogo ki na nodra turaga]. But the circumstantial vacation of the land in war, and the entry of Tui Vulaga to safeguard the land on behalf of the *vanua*, like in Lomaiviti and Taveuni – *ni sa lala ia me maroroi* - the Commission ruled that Ogea Driki be registered to the Yavusa Vulaga.

That was not the end of it. From the list below, Sir Arthur Gordon and Sukuna, in his capacity as Tui Lau, were also landowners in Vulaga.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mataqali Nasava</th>
<th>The island of Onealia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yavusa ko Vulaga</td>
<td>Owns the islands of Drekeinukulevu, Taluma, Vuu, Nasucu, Natubo, Vututautau, Koroigavu [two islands], Yanumasaiai, Nasucuiwai, Vatunivai, Sauvakasokina, Turanigugu [5 islands], Nukuveilavuraki, Baubau [5 islands] Naitata [4 islands]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Mano, Tukutuku Raraba.
The gist of Sukuna’s ruling lay in the concept of vakarorogo.\footnote{The phrase, \textit{sa bibi na tamata kei na nodra vakarorogo vei ira na nodra turaga}, summarised Sukuna’s NLC policy. The policy emphasised the importance of the \textit{vanua} or people and their obedience to their chiefs. He concluded his decision by applying another Bauan and Cakaudrove custom of \textit{ni sa lala na vanua ia me maroroi}, meaning when the \textit{vanua} became empty, then it must be looked after. He did not want these lands alienated and conferred Lomaji on the \textit{yavusa} Vulaga.}

Harmonising a comparative mythology to uphold the significance of Nakauvadra as the home of the Fijian pantheon destroyed the mythological underpinning of Verata’s reign over Fiji. Sukuna, through his ruling at Naimasimasi in 1934, gave authority to a comparative mythology that was restructured in favour of the Bauan \textit{turaga bale} institution. I have argued that the Wesleyan Methodists had earlier influenced the institutions of identity. This influence developed out of the interaction, both political and religious, between the \textit{turaga bale} institution and the Wesleyan Methodists, forty
years before the cession of Fiji to Queen Victoria. Disposing land as she pleased, after the unconditional cession of Fiji to the British Crown in 1874, Queen Victoria, through Gordon, confirmed native ownership of land through ancient land customs. This became the principle of settling native land claims through the NLC from 1892. Here, as I have argued, the turaga bale institution was the foundation of ancient customs. Central to my argument is the fact that the head of the turaga bale institution, Ratu Seru Epenisa Cakobau, the Vunivalu of Bau, became a Wesleyan Methodist in 1854, twenty years before he ceded Fiji to Queen Victoria.

The Wesleyan Methodists influenced the institution of Fijian identity through an intellectual practice where they used the classical model in the development of a comparative Fijian mythology. This tradition gave moral authority to the turaga bale institution by focusing on Degei as the supreme deity of Viti Raraba, and Nakauvadra, Degei’s shrine, was elevated as the head religious sanctuary in Fijian mythology. The timely Wesleyan Methodists’ appearance helped the new Bauan political order to successfully establish itself. The Wesleyans’ policies in adopting the language of Bau as the language of Christianity further helped the strengthening of this political order. Through their evangelical, educational and intellectual ministry, the Wesleyan Methodists helped shaped a common Fijian identity, before the British Crown assumed the government of Fiji in 1874. Through the NLC, an institution based on the Deed of Cession, the Wesleyan Methodists’ profound influence on the institutions of identity was reinforced in the Tukutuku Raraba, or testaments of identity. This combination then enshrined the ascendancy of Bau and the turaga bale institution as the foundation of Fijian identity.
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