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My understanding of the complexities of Samoan history resulted from a total of three years spent in Samoa. A gradual realization that there were competing claims and alternative versions of the Samoan past grew from interviews and conversations with a number of people. Slowly an understanding also evolved that changes in political regimes were explained as having true legitimacy because it was the ‘will’ of the spirits that such changes occur. Human motivations were not enough. Nafanua, a powerful aitu, or spirit, sanctioned such changes in the Samoan polity.

My understanding of Samoan history was also tempered by a sense of sanctity and respect for genealogies and ‘family histories’. This sanctity is also revealed in the literature relating to Samoa. Few Samoans of recent times have published such ‘sacred knowledge’. The majority of recent publications and theses by Samoan historians have tended to focus upon the colonial era and provide a refreshing voice in re-evaluating this experience from a more indigenous viewpoint. Tuia Tupa Tamasese, a Samoan high chief and politician, is one who has had the courage to speak of the Samoan past and inform ‘outsiders’ of the importance of honorifics, names, and the meaning of poetical language in Samoan history. His works have provided a challenge for me to consider more deeply Samoan source material and modes of imparting knowledge that I was initially unaware.

Much of Tupua’s revelations of taboo subjects are also contained in ‘revelations’ in archival material I have examined in the archives in Samoa, Germany, Australia, Fiji and New Zealand, which in itself is symbolic of Samoa’s fractured past in terms of colonial intervention. This study draws on material from these archives and published material in the Samoan, English and German languages. By examining these sources, again an awareness evolved that just as Samoa’s history is multi-layered, there are also competitive and variant claims revealed in the foreign language sources, which often reflect the alliances made by the English, American and German residents and consuls who resided in Samoa in the colonial era. This study hopefully benefits from an examination of events from multiple viewpoints. A methodological approach is taken, wherein the same event is perceived from different angles. The work, because of this
approach, is not only concerned with history, but historiography, due to historical constructs of Samoa’s past being, at times, limited by restricted access to source material in only one or two languages.

One of these historical constructs is Gilson’s seminal work on the history of Samoa. This work was the first history of Samoa I read and I have often relied on this work as a reference. Of immense assistance also were his detailed notes, which are held at the Australian National University. Other influential ‘touchstones’ have been the publications of the early German ethnographers Krämer and von Bülow and the more recent publication *Lagaga*, which offers a history of Samoa from a Samoan viewpoint.

There are certain conventions followed in this study, which need some initial explanation. One of these is that given the extensive sources in Samoan, and in particular in German, the study would become unmanageable if all original sources were also placed in the text or in footnotes, along with the English translation. The study also concerns itself with the relationship between Samoa and Tonga. Again the Samoanized Tongan names are used and the Tongan – Samoan relationship is largely discussed from a Samoan point of view. In this sense there may be differentiation between Samoan and Tongan genealogies and historical understandings that would be disputed by Tongan sources and historians.
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ABSTRACT

This history of Samoa breaks new ground in using largely neglected Samoan and German language sources. The history examines the relationship between spiritual and temporal power in Samoa and concentrates on Samoan motivations and Samoans themselves.

The narrative focuses most particularly on the aitu Nafanua – a powerful female ancestor god whose will and suggestions, received through her spirit mediums, enabled the family she speaks through to take action and bring about changes in the Malo or Government. She acts not only as a harbinger of change, but also spiritually legitimizes changes in the Samoan polity.

The study is divided into two sections. Part I examines the pre-Christian history of Samoa. It discusses origins and the close relationship between Samoa, Fiji and Tonga. The study recognizes the significant interaction between the leading families of these islands, prior to, and even after the European powers ‘colonised’ them. The currently held impression that they were isolated from each other by vast oceanic distances and cultural difference is evaluated. It reconstructs the relationship between Samoa, Fiji, and Tonga in particular as being significantly closer than that which has come to exist into the 21st century.

The study examines the nature of sacred chiefs and orators, the latter often having a spiritual function akin to priesthood. Chapters three to seven focus more exclusively on Nafanua and the Tonumaipe’a heritage in Samoa. The Tonumaipe’a title has Nafanua and her father Savea Si’uleo at the genealogical apex. The early descendants of the title are all female and are represented by title-holders embodying the deeds, achievements and sacred power of the former holders. Nearly all the major political transformations in Samoan history have been presented, by Samoans themselves, as either having been caused or legitimized by Nafanua or her agents. Nafanua provides spiritual legitimacy for new regimes (Malo). She does this by means of the shamans or chiefly priests whose bodies she enters and speak through to reveal her will. She is also assisted by the alataua villages
designated to assist her designs through her warriors, geographically situated in the villages on the southern side of Savai’i.

Nafanua’s and the Tonumaipe’a lineage reaches a peak in the time of Levalasi and Salamasina, the first regent of Samoa. The Salamasina inheritance continues until the time of Leiataua Leuga and his son Leiataua Tonumaip’e’a Tamafaiga. It is said that Nafanua was displeased with the former Malo in Upolu and entered the body of Tamafaiga of the island of Manono. Tamafaiga himself was viewed as a powerful god due to his being the embodiment and ‘voice’ of Nafanua.

Part II examines the struggle between the old Malo of Nafanua against the new, namely the arrival of the Christian missionaries in the form of the London Missionary Society, and examines the tensions between the old religion of Nafanua and the new. Nafanua is accredited with foretelling the arrival of the missionaries and promising that the Malietoa family would have the opportunity to assume the mantle of national leadership. The new religion provided this family to achieve leadership of the Malo, and it did so because it is believed that Nafanua allowed this transformation to occur. The Manono people, and the old areas of Satupa’itea and the alataua on southern Savai’i would not give in to this supposed promise to Malietoa and fought vehemently against the new political power of Malietoa throughout the 19th century. They did so by choosing to become adherents of rival Christian denominations. The old leaders of Upolu, the daughters and sons of Salamasina, also fought against the new religion of Nafanua.

Again the struggle between the old Malo of Nafanua and the new is discussed chronologically. The traditional forms of religious worship were replaced, but the division between the old Malo and the new took new forms. The old Malo would largely identify with Wesleyanism, and, later, Catholicism. There was also division within Sa Malietoa itself. The celebrated Malietoa Tavita became a Christian, as did his brother, who for some time was courted by the missionaries. This brother, Taimalelagi Tiai became Malietoa after the death of Tavita. Taimalelagi and his ‘son’, Talavou, however, renounced the London Missionary Society and Talavou who was actually both half-brother and nephew to Taimalelagi, was blessed with the Tonumaipe’a title. For almost 50 years the Malietoa representative of the ‘old religion of Nafanua’ would fight against the representatives of the
'new religion', namely the son and grandson of Tavita – who were both educated by the mission and were members of the London Missionary Society church.

Other leading family heads and elites also identified with the different Christian religious denominations. One elite would make an alliance with the LMS. A counter elite would ally with Wesleyanism and/or Catholicism. These religious affiliations reflected the already existent tension between leading family heads prior to the arrival of Christianity and both recognised the import of spiritual legitimacy in gaining political ascendancy. For example, Tupua Moegagogo became a strong Wesleyan convert and Mata’aafa a strong Catholic adherent. Mata’aafa eventually became the leading chief of the government under the German administration in the early 20th century.

Alliances were also made with rival foreign nationalities, which likewise mirrored the traditional divisional factions within Samoa itself. The Malietoa title-holder supported by the LMS generally had the support of the British and American consuls and residents. The principal chiefs of the old Malo, namely Tupua Tamasese and somewhat reluctantly Mata’aafa upon his return from exile, were supported by the Germans.

The story concludes with an overview of the 20th century and discusses the triumph of the new Malo of Nafanua and Malietoa Tavita’s reception (and control) of the early missionaries which resulted in him not only becoming the leader of the Malo, but also evidence of the truth of the prophecy of Nafanua to the Malietoa lineage.

The author is well aware that this is only one rendering of the history of Samoa and by focusing on Nafanua, the ‘Tonumaipe’a family, Manono and Savai’i, other voices and counter histories are not given full voice. Attempts have been made to take in other understandings of Samoa’s past and examine events from more than one viewpoint. Attempts have also been made to indicate where regional history and national history merge.
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INTRODUCTION

The history of Samoa is regional. Samoan history is multi-layered and this study recognises the diverse and competing claims of families, villages and districts, each with its own understandings of the Samoan past.

Samoa is concerned with history and the past is brought into the present through oratory, poetry, honorific addresses and genealogies. Genealogies are closely guarded and there is a saying in Samoa, which is oft quoted: *O Samoa o le i’a e ivi’ivia*, meaning literally that Samoa is like a fish with many bones. This poetical saying implies that in genealogical terms, all are related. It is often quoted when members of many families are assembled. It is a warning not to speak of genealogical issues and histories. It is also a form of apology in advance, a way of ensuring that what one says is subject to the limitations of the speaker and that speaker’s inherent bias towards his own family and perception of history.

There is a sacredness associated with genealogies. They are not meant to be made public. Many village councils forbid the presentation of genealogies in a public forum, and they are often discouraged in the Lands and Titles Court. The reason for this is that while there are many bones of the fish, there is a warning that if one leaves out one of the bones of the fish, one may choke on it and die.

This history of Samoa does leave bones out and does focus on one version of Samoa’s past – that of the influence of Nafanua, and the Tonumaipe’a clan who claim Nafanua as their tutelary deity. There are other readings of Samoa’s past from other perspectives. This is only one version and I hope that the bones I have left out are not an affront, but are a consequence of being unable to produce a history of Samoa that would be able to present such divergent viewpoints, even if that were possible.

Nafanua is an aitu, a deity, who acts as a signifier of transformation of the Samoan polity. As a god, she is able to turn stone into fish. Samoan poetics recall that when

---

A'ana did not respect her they only gave her stones, but Leiataua Tonumaipe'a Tamafaiga provided her with fish.\(^2\) As a result Nafanua is said to have approved of him and entered his body, enabling him to be revered as a god.

The story of Nafanua does, however, at certain levels, unify and agrees with divergent family, regional and even national interpretations of Samoan history.

Every village has a different hierarchy and traditionally revered different gods. Villages were united loosely into wider political areas and are likewise referred to by the godhead of their area. When one, for example, says that Nafanua took the \(papa\) or major titles back to Savai‘i, it means that those who were followers of Nafanua fought in Upolu and achieved victory. The listener – or reader – is assumed to know exactly who her followers were. The practice of referring to an individual god - or indeed an individual chief can imply a great number of people. In order to move beyond ‘god lists’ and the normal presentation of compartmentalised gods it is necessary to examine in depth the nature of \(aitu\) and their role in the leadership structure.

In dealing with the ‘lesser Gods’ Stair and Turner are consulted heavily. These give us a long list of gods venerated and some of the forms they take, such as stones or animals. However, there are great contradictions and few concrete examples of how these gods interact with the people. Furthermore they do not elaborate on which families venerated these gods and what region they belonged to. This is of vital importance. There is a Samoan saying which states that an alien \(aitu\) cannot dance on the grave of another \(aitu\). This argument was used by the Tumua of Lufulufi in the recent Tuiauta case wherein they argued that the Lotofaga \(aitu\) has no right to dance over the grave of the Lufulufi \(aitu\).\(^3\) In essence they were implying that Salevalasi, the family line of Valasi, are followers of a different \(aitu\) to themselves and have no rights in their area, namely Lufulufi.

The most comprehensive work to date on \(aitu\) is Horst Cain’s \textit{Aitu: Eine Untersuchung}.\(^4\) The clearest statement, according to Cain regarding the nature of \(aitu\) comes from von Bülow who writes that, ‘A Samoan enters after death into the Kingdom

---


of the dead beneath the sea (Pulotu) and as an aitu here he continues his earthly life in idealised form'. Cain goes on to state that Turner, Stair, Brown and Krämer ‘contain a wealth of material’ but this is ‘often imprecise and fragmentary’. 5

The difficulties in the fragmentary evidence will be hopefully overcome by historical reconstruction using a wider range of sources than are normally used. In this sense this is an attempt to establish a typography or model that can make sense of an exercise that is dealing with an oral tradition, dealing with issues that well predate the arrival of Europeans.

Although the major objective of this study is to discuss the influence of the aitu, Nafanua, on historical personages and events, it is however appropriate to establish the social and political basis of religious belief in Samoan society by examining the persistence of those beliefs in the early European contact period. By doing this certain errors in interpretation can be avoided. It also serves as a basis for understanding the implication of aitu in the material world.

The principal recorders were missionaries who kept diaries and wrote letters to each other, as well as a few who published works relating to the social basis of religious beliefs, namely Turner and Stair. There were also the records of the early consuls and beachcombers in Samoa. These works were followed by the German ethnologists; most prominent among these being von Bülow and Krämer. The latter’s massive monograph is still considered to be the seminal ethnographic work about Samoa. It is still consulted today by both claimants and judges in the Lands and Titles Court of Western Samoa.

Krämer’s main aim was to collect as much ethnological data from Samoa as possible. He did not seek to analyse this material, rather he hoped to collect, translate and publish what was known. Typical of most ethnologists of this era, he considered that traditional culture was disintegrating. In religious matters he deferred to Turner and Stair, whom he says ‘are the sole good reporters and eye witnesses of the old time who especially of religious matters render account in greater detail than usual’. 6

---

A contemporary of Krämer was also well aware of Krämer’s methods of collecting and translating. Krämer removed the writings of an old chief while treating him for an illness. These writings concerned the chief’s own family and his family genealogy. However written in the cover of the book that contained the genealogies Krämer found a message, written in Samoan, that the book was holy and was not to be used. If this message was ignored there would befall severe punishment on the culprit. That is the chief, who had the power to curse, would inflict a terrible punishment upon the culprit after the chief died.\(^7\) Krämer ignored this tabu and used the material. His work was published with the genealogies included.

What united these ‘recorders’ was a belief that it was worthwhile to record and interpret, to some extent, the Samoan past. Their work discloses a common thread present in these records, which is the political-religious basis of power in Samoan history.

The most distinguishing feature of Samoan religion is the great number and diversity of spirits (aitu). The sheer number of aitu is a distinctive characteristic of Samoa, which sets it apart from its other Polynesian neighbours.

The Wesleyan missionary, Martin Dyson, while in Manono, noted that people invoked the assistance of seven gods. The rainbow, Nafanua and Tamafaiga were among these and they were all connected at sometime with the island. The first settlers were supposed to have brought the rainbow god with them. Nafanua had helped them in warfare and had entered the island as a result of marriages within the Tonumaipe’a family. Tamafaiga held the Leiataua and Tonumaipe’a titles. He was said to have been possessed by Nafanua and brought Manono into a position of great pre-eminence and had, by the end of his lifetime, brought virtually all of Samoa under his control. He had also become a ‘living god’.

Every village has a number of aitu, who dwell in trees or were represented in various animals or inanimate objects such as rocks. There also appears to be a great number of different religious practices and priestly functions, which also set Samoa apart from its immediate neighbours. Indeed Samoa appears to share more in common with its

\(^7\) E Reiche, Tagaloa: Ein Beitrag zur geistigen Kultur der Polynesier, München and Berlin, 1926, 18.
Austronesian forbears from South East Asia, where there is likewise a baffling diversity of spirits and practices.

'Austronesian religion can only be understood as an intimate part of every significant event of daily life ... [In South East Asia] ritual and shamanistic activity was usually designed for immediate, practical ends. Spiritual forces had to be manipulated to cure illness, ensure fertility, increase power, safeguard the living, particularly during threatening crises, thereby ensuring that the dead were assisted through the most traumatic of all transitions into a contented afterlife.'

This suffusion of spirits into the material world and the attempt to control and manipulate the power of these spirits, especially by offerings, is the dominant feature of Samoan religious practice. A commentary by a Catholic journal records that divinity among the Samoans, was the *aitu*, the spirit. 'This word aroused within them firstly the idea of fear. *Aitu* were powerful and dreaded beings who must be appeased by offerings. But they inspired in them more generous sentiments, hope at least, though perhaps not love. The natives had confidence that they [*the aitu*] would show themselves favourable, that they would protect them and ward off evils.'

The multiplicity of *aitu* in Samoa can be seen in the god-lists of many commentators, most particularly those of Turner and Stair. Like other commentators, they recorded the names of these gods and explained that some gods were family gods, other village, district, or national gods. They also tended to compartmentalize these gods into areas which effect social life, for example gods who are patrons of boat building, fishing, war and so on. However, there is little historical evidence, showing how these gods actually affected the social structure. It is also the contention of this author that these gods have been over compartmentalized. The dominant feature of spirits is not as patrons, but as members of their respective descent groups. As with the example given of Manono, it was the link to the descent groups of Tonumaipe’a and Leiataua that allowed consequent descendants to call on their *aitu*s assistance. These *aitu*, in a sense, belong to the family line.

The most effective and widespread *aitu* were ancestor gods, who had already distinguished themselves when they were alive. They proved to be the most effective in

---

9 Monfat, *Les Premiers Missionaires des Samoa*, Lyons, 1927, Chapter IV. (Translation provided by Andrew Hamilton.)
protecting the family line. Examples such as Nafanua, often referred to as merely a ‘war goddess’ show this. Appreciation for the ancestor-spirit’s protection had an effect on the material world. Furthermore the descendants of the aitu benefited. The missionary Heath wrote in 1838 that nearly all of Upolu and Savai’i made offerings to Tamafaiga, the ‘human-god’ that went to Manono, which was also the seat of the Malo (government). After offerings the priests predicted success in war.10

Gurr writes that even as late as 1930 the persistence of offerings and appeasement survived. He noted that ‘there are still devil doctors .... At the present time many of the old superstitions survive with a number of Christian adherents. In recent years in Tutuila people have been known to make offerings to one or more of their heathen gods. The reincarnation of the departed spirit in some form of animal or insect life is believed by some’.11

In one von Bülow account, he tells of still-living Samoans who remember the sacred trees [aota] to which offerings were brought as each was considered the home of a god. It was not only foodstuffs but also siapo, mats and all that Samoans considered of value which were brought. Even when the holy trees, the home of the gods had disappeared, the lands and groves of the aitu were left undisturbed. Even in von Bülow’s day the holy forest, vaosa, or the sacred or tabu forest, made holy by the god Tuifiti, of the village Matautu was left undisturbed. The ground of the Tagaloa title of Safune and others were also protected as godly property.12 The more distinguished the ancestor normally indicated a more distinguished or important aitu. If one lied, fornicated or broke the rules of tapu, supernatural punishment could occur, even to bringing sickness and death.

George Pritchard, the English consul, recognised the connection between the spirit of a person being a deceased ancestor of a family member and the importance of the burial. He observed that ‘relatives are careful to bury the bodies they identify, lest their spirits should haunt them’. I have often heard the natives say, ‘hear that spirit moaning.... ’ While the continuation of the spirit of the deceased after death is not a material form, it is sometimes recognisable as such. This spiritual dimension is termed agaga. The

10 Heath, Manono, April 16, 1838, SSL.
*agaga* travels to Pulotu the abode of the dead. This is resonant of the traditional homeland – Fiji – in the west, the direction of the setting sun. However this spirit can take on an apparently physical shape in the material world. An example of this is an account from a village in Upolu, recorded in 1861. Sai, a boat builder died and was buried approximately half a mile from the town. On the ‘day after the burial, two young men saw the deceased Sai sitting alongside his grave looking towards them’.  

The Samoan belief was that at the time of death the soul leaves the body. The point of exit was the head. If the head was not carefully tended the spirit could enter into another living object. In times of warfare it was the custom to cut off the heads of ones enemies. A sign of peacetime reconciliation was the return of these heads to the families of the decapitated warriors. The LMS missionary, Pratt, wrote from Matautu in 1851 that a decomposed head was brought back and buried. Before the burial, cloths were spread out to attract the spirits of the dead, in order to lay them to rest along with the heads. After decapitation, many bodies were lost, or found to have been interned elsewhere. For instance one spirit possessed a dragonfly and another a butterfly. Both needed to be carefully buried with their respective heads. Stair also notes that the head was considered to be the most sacred part of the body. The usual custom was to bury the body in a grave near the home until decomposition had set in.

Then the head was severed from the body and reinterred in some family burial place in the mountains to save it from insult in time of war .... In case a person died a violent death, much fear was expressed by the survivors, lest the disembodied spirit should haunt its former abode. To obviate this, a woman proceeded immediately to the spot where the death occurred, if within reach, and spreading a *siapo* upon the ground, waited until an ant or another insect crawled upon the cloth ... [the] insect and *siapo* were then buried with the corpse.  

At death the spirit may become an *aitu* with the power to act positively or negatively for the family. The future action of the *aitu* appears to depend upon the extent to which the burial procedure was correctly followed. Dyson, stationed in Manono describes a line of coconut trees in front of the Mission house that were claimed by a family of Saleiataua. He recounts that a young girl from the village died and how afterwards young men from her family ‘cut away a piece of bark of each tree, [the] size of a hand, just above the

---

14 SSL, Pratt to Tidman, Matautu, 10 June 1851.
roots’. This was done to ‘propitiate the dead and repel evil influences which might follow them. Now anyone daring to eat nuts from trees will expose himself to the anger of the girl’s spirit’.16

The aitu appear to have a dual role. They travel to their final resting place, Pulotu, but can also appear at will to affect the material world. The term ‘underworld’ is conceptually difficult. The term ‘mirror world’ is more apt as a definition. The mirror world’s role was to counter societal sanctions. Samoan society is highly ordered and emphasises rank and social position. No chief, no matter how important, could offend his ancestors without being subject to the aitu who dwell in the mirror world, but can appear in the material world to punish misconduct.

The assumptions that many researchers had about the lack of religion in Samoa is unfounded. It is true that there was only one stone temple,17 and no easily definable priesthood. But there were plenty of temples and groves termed malumalu that house representations of various aitu and these aitu could inhabit their priestly representatives. They also could inhabit certain animals, trees, and other elements of the material world. Aitu still continue their earthly existence and play a role in the affairs of tagata by revealing themselves through their representatives, most recognisably in speaking through their orator-priests, the taulauniu, va’aafaatau, aitutagata and other designations which revealed that they served as intermediaries between deity and the material world. In other words there was no need for cult figures. Aitu were deceased ancestors who played a material role in the material world through the individuals through whom they spoke. This gives those individuals a status that goes beyond the role of what is normally perceived to be the role of orators (tulafale). Furthermore, aitu are characterised by them being foreign and the most powerful aitu are the result of incest.18 It is by breaking these rules and surviving that they reach a status beyond that of normal tagata.

---

16 Dyson Journal, mss A2579, 1863, 24 December 1863, ML.
17 This is called the fale o le fe’e or residence of the octopus in Vaisigano. It is generally perceived today to be associated with the religion of Nafanua, although it is also seen in Tuamasaga as belonging to the religion of the Tuamasaga region – the fe’e being the regional war god. Pava is said to be the one who protected this site.
18 As stated this is Cain’s main assumption in The Sacred Child.
Another word, which is commonly used for the gods is *tupua*. This word, as with *aitu*, has been translated in a number of ways – from god to devil.\(^{19}\) *Tupua*, however, like *aitu*, are also associated with deceased ancestors.

An old Samoan tradition relates that with the arrival of Samoans, after a long sea voyage from their original place of residence, most of their *tupua* were left behind. They resolved therefore that everyone would search for an object wherein he could see his *tupua* embodied – fish, stones and so on. This became his *tupua*, giving him spiritual power and in return they gave the *tupua* godly veneration. In this way originated personal protective gods, family gods, district and national gods.\(^{20}\)

The word *tupua* is also used in Samoa in a wider context than the representation of the god. It is sometimes used to indicate a ‘priest’. Turner writes that the Samoans ‘believe that the gods can enter the body and hence become priest, *tupa‘i*, become *tupua*’. The association of priest is with ancestors and another use of the word *tupua* links the gods directly with those ancestors. Heider’s definition is that these *tupua* were the incarnated ancestors living in the kings of Samoa in pagan times. In this way they become ‘the demonic descendants of the gods’ and ‘the *tupu* (king), becomes the *tupua* (incarnated demon). He is the visible mask under which another being (*Wesen*) is concealed’.\(^{21}\)

The *aitu* can take different forms and choose when to speak through the priest. In this sense *aitu* become the silent movers in Samoan historical presentation. They affect events from the mirror-world. Being the result of incest, which breaks the sacred *tabu* between brother and sister, initiates something uncontrollable. It may be that the issue of brother and sister strengthens the genealogical line. By breaking this *tabu* they create something more powerful, an ancestor spirit that is stronger than its forebears.

This ‘uncontrollable’ spirit is complimented by *tupua*. These *tupua* are associated and bound to particular chiefly titles in the family lines. They are descendants of the issue of Tagaloalagi and the ‘demonic women’ in the heavens and all the following descendants. Chiefs (*ali‘i*) thus become the ‘something unseen’, which means that the sacred ancestor is passed from one generation to another forming a consecutive and

---

\(^{19}\) For example, Heider, in one definition of the word says that the kings of old in Samoa were ‘incarnated *tupua* (*Demons*, gods)’. Thus is one example where the word demon and god are synonymous, making our attempts at classification extremely difficult.

\(^{20}\) Ibid., 121-122.

\(^{21}\) Ibid., 121.
cumulative group of incarnations. The custom of the last title bearer breathing his last breath into the mouth of his successor symbolises this sacred genealogical connection.

The new head of the family inherits the title of his or her forbears and in this sense becomes the latest in a sequence of title bearers. The family line and all the ancestors are concentrated in that individual. This is the basis for sacred chiefly power and what allows him or her to become 'ex officio' priest of the family. It is for this reason that there is no really identifiable priesthood as distinct from the chiefly class.

The spiritual continuity from one title-holder to the next is easily discernable in the fact that an individual title-holder refers to himself as being an accumulation of ancestors concentrated in himself. It is not unusual to hear an individual refer to himself achieving something that in chronological terms would be impossible for him, as an individual to achieve. To give some concrete examples: In a title case in 1940, a chief of the Malietoa family said, 'I am Matua (Senior chief) of the ... family. The ... (Group of orators) and myself conferred honours on Malietoa Fitisemanu.' Malietoa Fitisemanu was the father of Malietoa Vaianupu, who received the missionary Williams in 1830. In the same case another chief states; 'I was appointed by the ... (Group of Orators) of the four set up by Malietoa Taulapapa ... He appointed me to live at ... .' Malietoa Taulapapa lived, according to the genealogies, at the same time as the daughter of the celebrated Salamasina, first tafa 'ifa, or holder of the major titles to attain national leadership. Her birth is normally dated at around 1600 AD.

According to the Samoan historian, Malama Meleisea, the social basis of Samoan religious belief is twofold: that chiefs (ali'i) are sacred and secondly that deceased ancestors return to play a role in the affairs of chiefs and people in general. 'The ali'i derive their sacredness through the genealogical connection of their ancestors with the god Tagaloalagi', the progenitor at the apex of these genealogies. As part of this sacredness, 'divine ancestors, both male and female' became aitu 'after they had died and could take human form or appear in plants, fish, birds and animals or possess the body of another person'.

---

22 Malietoa title case, 1940, in Grattan, ACC, Box 4b, 15, Alexander Turnbull Library, (ATL).
23 Ibid. As these title cases do reveal material that is considered to belong to the family of the title-holder and is therefore tabu — and as each branch of the family contradict the history of the other, I have tried to leave this tabu knowledge out as much as possible. Neither do I attest to the veracity of each statement.
25 Ibid., 9.
Funefe’ai was the first holder of the Tagaloa title. Tagaloalagi was instrumental in providing Funefe’ai with both the Tagaloa title and his sacred priests. Tagaloalagi is the god who is credited with the position of supreme ancestor of most other lineages. In the Samoan cosmology Tagaloalagi, as progenitor, stands at the apex of nearly all the principal genealogies. His most celebrated ‘sons’ are the Tuimanu’a, and Pili who is responsible for the political organisation of the islands into districts. Yet Tagaloalagi is not the apical ancestor god for all chiefly lines. The ancestral god of the Tonumaipe’a line is Saveasi’uleo, along with his daughter, Nafanua. Nafanua however has been undervalued and the evidence regarding her is much less in volume. It is also imprecise and contradictory.

It is important to make known at the outset the position attributed to Tagaloalagi. He is the atua, the highest god who is considered to have existed before all others. He came from the skies, the heavens, and created all. The only god comparable to him is Saveasi’uleo, the father of Nafanua who is the king of the underworld, or more properly mirror-world. These two are the only gods said to have ‘lesser gods’ auao, who serve them. However there is a large distinction made between atua and aitu. The former is the far superior. It seems strange therefore that Saveasi’uleo is classified together with the lower aitu, and this deserves explanation. The reason for Saveasi’uleo being classified in this way is, no doubt, due to European contact and in particular the introduction of Christianity, which has radically transformed the two principal religions, those of Tagaloalagi and Nafanua.

Tagaloa as atua above the world of people fitted more comfortably into the Christian concept of ‘God’. By being progenitor he was always ‘above the world’. His interaction with human women and acts of wrath are not stressed, indeed they seem forgotten. He was certainly more in keeping with the European concept of the deity than the aitu Nafanua who, like the Tuifiti, is a deceased ancestor, taking part in the affairs of tagata by speaking through their chosen vessels. Furthermore the word atua was the word adopted by the missionaries for the Christian God. In contrast most missionary writings and indeed most sources of the period translate the word aitu as either devil or demon, (or Dämonen in German).

Recorders of traditions in the German period were also influenced by the transformation, although this does not appear to have been acknowledged by them.
Krämer and von Bülow, the principal ethnographic source of the German period gathered their information in the early 1900s, over seventy years after the introduction of Christianity. They were recording in what had become a strongly Christianised country, whose people distinguished between the ‘days of darkness’ and the ‘time of light’ in reference to their acceptance of the new god. It is worthy of note that during the LMS missionary, Heath’s, visit in 1840 he met the Tuimanu’a at Ta’u, who had already ‘renounced heathenism’, although the people of Malaetele said ‘they’d stick to Tagaloa’. 26

Ironically, the fact that Tagaloalagi and Jehovah are now in a sense synonymous and are both referred to as attua, most Samoans believe that the introduction of Christianity had nothing to do with Europe. Rather the arrival of Christianity is viewed as the fulfilment of the prophesy of Nafanua – the gift granted by her to Malietoa.

The published work exclusively on Samoa, which deals more than cursorily with traditional religion and its relationship to leadership is small. Among the principal secondary works in English, published in the 20th century, which deal at some length with Samoan gods, Nafanua is underplayed. 27 Gilson gives but a brief mention of the relationship of Nafanua with the Tonumaipe’a title but does not elaborate on traditional religion. The massive work of Derek Freeman devotes a whole chapter to traditional religion. 28 However the only god to be mentioned in this chapter is Tagaloalagi. Nafanua, and the other numerous gods are not mentioned at all apart from the owl in which the god resides, and is the war god of the Tuimanu’a.

The publication Lagaga, which is co-written by a group of Samoans, likewise focuses primarily upon the god Tagaloalagi. In the first chapter entitled ‘The settlement of Samoa’ only the Powell and Pratt versions of the origins of Samoa are quoted. Both versions were collected from Tau in Man’ua and both stress the god Tagaloalagi as creator being and the primacy of Manu’a. There are references to Nafanua, but the stress is not on her. In the chapter on political divisions in Samoa the only version

---

26 Heath, Apia, 30 March 1840, LMS Samoa Letters, 1836-44.
27 Gilson, History of Samoa: Freeman, Margaret Mead and Samoa, Meleisea, The Making of Modern Samoa and Malama Meleisea and Penelope Schoeffel, Lagaga.
given is that of Pili, ‘son’ of Tagaloalagi, who settled Manu’a, then Savai’i, (Aopo) then moved to the district of A’ana, Upolu.  

Nafanua ranks as one of the highest aitu. Nafanua enjoys an extensive list of achievements over a vast period of time. She spoke or acted through her priests and priestesses who were members of families related to the Tonumaipe’a title. She is generally viewed as the mightiest of aitu, victorious in war. Among the victories attributed to Nafanua are the freeing of Falealupo from the yoke of the Salega district and assisting Tuia’ana Tamalelagi, through the Tonumaipe’a line in attaining all the papa or major chiefly titles and passing them on to Salamasina, the first recognised national leader of Samoa. In this sense Nafanua established stability and set the model for national leadership until the modern era. She also possessed Tamafaiga and assisted him in taking control of the major titles, enabling him to be elevated to the category of aitutagata, or part aitu, part person during his lifetime. Finally she is attributed with foretelling the arrival of Christianity, and promising Malietoa that this would form the basis of his Malo or government.

The most exalted statement regarding the nature of Nafanua comes from a Catholic missionary who states: ‘The first one of all having no beginning or end was Nafanua. He lived in the heavens and he was superior to all the others .... Next came the heirarchy of subordinate aitu’.  

This is also the only reference that speaks of Nafanua as male. It is reasonable to assume that according to preconceptions of the time it would have been more acceptable for the principal god to be male.

Stuebel gives two versions of the origin and life of Nafanua, one from Safotulafai and the other Salailua. In both accounts she was born as a blood clot – alualuto. In the account from Safotu, Saveasiuleo, king of the underworld, Pulotu, was also born a bloodclot, which eventually turned into a sea eel and thus was confined to the sea. Saveasi’uleo’s brother, Ulufanauase’e’e, married and produced Taema and Tilafaiga who were Siamese twins - being joined at the naval. Nafanua is born as a result of Saveasi’uleo bonding with his niece Tilafaiga.

---

29 Malama Meleisea and Penelope Schoeffel (eds), Lalaga: A Short History of Western Samoa, Fiji, 1987, Chapter I. The work involved the cooperation of a number of Samoans.
30 A Monfat, Les Premiers Missionaires des Samoa, Lyons, 1923, 135. (I thank Andrew Hamilton for the translation of this text.)
Cain has argued successfully that Nafanua along with Soesa, Moso, Sega, Saveasi’uleo and LeteleSa – all well-known aitu of Samoa were born as alualutoto or clots of blood, which means a child resulting from incest. His conclusion is that Saveasiuleo, an aitu, who was born a clot of blood, commits incest with his niece, which leads to a fresh ‘clot of blood’. The end product therefore is one of the mightiest aitu in all Samoa.\textsuperscript{32}

Nafanua is most often portrayed as being of Fijian origin. In oral tradition today she is often just said to be the daughter of the Tuifiti – the King of Fiji. Likewise Taema and Tilafaiga are said to be of Fijian origin. According to Krämer, two women, Taema and Tilafaiga, arrived near Falealupu and introduced the art of tattooing to Samoa. This is also supported by Stair.\textsuperscript{33} Furthermore the two main families who appear to have gained the knowledge of tattooing from the pair were Tulega in Satupaite’a and Falealupu and Su’a from Safata, Upolu.\textsuperscript{34}

What these stories say is that the Fijian religion and influence appears to have made its appearance in Samoa at this time. This refers not only to religious practices but secular as well, namely tattooing and kava protocol. Saveasi’uleo, Taema, Tilafaiga, together with Nafanua are all of Fijian origin. Taema and Tilafaiga furthermore as being Siamese twins, join Nafanua and Saveasi’uleo in being both malformed and of Fijian origin.

According to Stuebel, Nafanua went to Falealupu from Fiji, on request from her father Saveasi’uleo, and fought against Falealupo’s enemies and they were driven back as far as Neiafu and Falelima.\textsuperscript{35} Neiafu and Falelima are in the alataua district, and are united politically with Satupa’itea in the district of Salega. Satupa’itea, in the district of Salega, along with the alataua villages (Falelima, Tufutauoe and Neiafu), Sataua and Falealupu are all associated with the Tonumaipe’a title, and view Nafanua as their tutelary deity.

\textsuperscript{32} Cain, \textit{The Sacred Child}, 180.

\textsuperscript{33} E.g., Krämer, 1902:120-121, two Fijian women arrived near Falealupu and Stair, 1897:157-164, quoted in McGrey, Noel Lawrence, ‘An Examination of Certain Aspects of Samoan Tattooing to the Present’. MA, University of Hawai‘i, May 1973. c.f., also Diehl, OMPA 61. E19 who says; ‘They [Taema and Tilafaiga] were the goddesses of tattooing and the story is that they swam over from Fiji to bring the knowledge of tattooing to Samoa’.


\textsuperscript{35} Stuebel, \textit{Myths and Legends}, 44, (English), 45 (Samoan). Here Nafanua uncovered her breast and the field of battle was henceforward called the Battlefield of Shame.
According to von Bülow the *alataua* region was originally populated from Tonga. Thus both the Itu Salega and the *alataua* are of foreign origin and Nafanua’s influence spread from Falealupu to the *alataua* and Satupa’itea district. Nafanua’s aunt, Taema is also associated with the *alataua* district in Tutuila. The *alataua* in Tutuila is not closely associated with the Tonumaipe’a title, but with Leiato and other alataua chiefs of Tutuila.

Salega is said to have been established by Lega, the sister of Ututauifiti, who was the issue of a Tongan woman, Laufafaetoga, and a Fijian chief named Lautala. Thus we have yet another example of Fijian and Tongan influence in Savai’i, not only with Salega but the village of Matautu, who was named after Lega’s brother, Ututauofiti. It is further stated in the Safotu version of the tradition from Safotu that Nafanua went to live in a place called Filimapuletutu’u, where she entered into (*ultitino*) the body of Auva’a.  

Krämer quotes the *faalupega* of Falealupu in the early 1900s as follows: Greetings to the house of four, which is a reference to the Tonumaipe’a title. Then follows: Greetings to thy highness Auva’a, the High Priest of Nafanua(*va’a fa’a atau*). Krämer says that the reference to Auva’a as the *va’a fa’a atau* means that Nafanua speaks through him. He then says to compare *vaafa’a atau* (Auva’a) with the *va’a i ti* Tupa’i, who lives in Satupaite’a. This leads us to the Salega district, which as mentioned had Satupaite’a as its main village established by Lega. Krämer describes Tupa’i as the priest of the god of war (Nafanua) and mentions her in relation to the district of Salega. Krämer describes *va’a i ti* as meaning that the ‘goddess stretched herself out on the body of Tupa’i and spoke through him’.

The villages of the Tonumaipe’a title are those of Falealupu, and also Satupaite’a, Neiafu, Tufu and Falelima. It appears that at some stage Nafanua was adopted by the Tonumaipe’a as the spiritual leader of the title or vice-versa. In the tradition of the

---

36 Ibid., 44, English, 43. Samoan. It is interesting here that in the English, Brother Herman, as most authors places Auva’a with the servers of the devil. The English translation says that she ‘entered into the body of her devil priest Tupa’i’. The Samoan just records that she entered into the body of Auva’a – *e ultitino ai Auva’a*.


battle between Salega and Faecalupu the forces of Salega were forced back to Falelima and Neiafu. Nafanua, by being victorious in this war co-opted the assistance of these areas and they came under her tutelage, especially through her ‘priest’ Tupa’i. In other words the religion and person of Nafanua spread into two important districts and Nafanua allied herself with the Tonumaipa’a title.

When one consults the fa’alupega of both districts now we can assume the above conclusion is true. In Falealupu the fa’alupega begins with ‘Greetings to Auva’a’. Solia and Foaima are likewise mentioned as the ‘descendants of Nafanua’. In the present fa’alupega of Satupaite’a, Asiata is greeted as va’a i malae and Tupa’i as va’a i ti. The ao of the Tonumaipa’a (The high title of the Tonumaipa’a) is greeted in both places as well as in the alataua villages.

In oral tradition and present day accounts, Nafanua is said to have come from Fiji in support of A’esisifo (Falealupu) against A’eaisasa’e (Salega district). As a result of being victorious in this war she made the following appointments. She decreed that Sataua would be the warriors\(^39\) (toa), Falealupu the onlookers (tapu’aiga) and alataua (referring to Falelima, Tufu and Neiafu) as the orators. These appointments are still taken very seriously as a product of divine sanction. Indeed even during the time of Solf, Falealupu managed to get their own Ta’ita’i Itu, even though they were a small district, by arguing that they, as tapu’aiga (sacred family) were set apart from other areas in Savai’i, because they no longer took part in wars but prayed assistance from the deity.\(^40\)

It can be further assumed from oral evidence and the fa’alupega that the place where Nafanua resided, just as where the Tuifiti resided, was regarded as sacred and therefore worthy of special care.

---

\(^39\) Note that Sataua’s origin is from Taua, brother of Lega (Salega) and Utu (Mataautu). These village areas are all close and are on the western side of Savai’i. The Fijian entry into the area at this time – for those interested in chronology – is dated by von Bülow, in Die Bemühungen, at approximately 450 A.D. What is more interesting is that these areas, all of Fijian origin, come under the auspices of aitu who also have their origin in Fiji.

\(^40\) In a letter from Tonumaipa’a to Solf, Tulei argues that Falealupu should not be united with any other district in Government, due to their position as Tupa’i meaning that they do not join in war but ‘always remaining to pray God in Samoa’. GAP, XVII, 6.b. Vaisigano, 4. In Gilson files, ANU. Notice also the Christianisation of God in this letter.
One of the *malesfona* or village residences where village meetings are held in Satupaite’a is called Tausunu. At this place Nafanua established her residence, which was called Alafale. This Maota or place of residence is now the site of the residence of Tupai. The fact that these place names are remembered and celebrated indicates their importance. The names become ‘potted histories’ and as such demand respect. Tupai is a high title and the history and status of that title rests on Tupai’s relationship with Nafanua. Nafanua’s final ‘earthly’ resting place was here at Alafale and from here she ‘lay on the body of Tupai’ and spoke through him.
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PART I

CHAPTER 1


The first human beings are said to be responsible for the political ordering of Samoa. These Samoan origin figures act as metonyms for village and district origins; their individual names are representative of village and district names. There are competing origin stories. Who the first human beings were and their influence politically depends on the region or family that is telling the story. There are two major versions, one is that of Pili, the son of Tagaloalagi, the other a more Savai’i based account. There are also major family versions like the Malietoa origin account, which date their founding father, Malietoa Savea as one of the first human beings.

The traditional history of Samoa, in terms of named individuals, represents the beginning of a more definite historical genealogical timeframe than the preceding genealogical period of gods, natural elements and animals. Some, like Krämer, place Pili one generation prior to Atio and emphasise his achievements.

According to a popular oral tradition the political ordering of Samoa came about due to the wanderings of Pili and his subsequent appointments of his sons. Pili is said to have been the son of the great god Tagaloalagi and a descendant of the Manu’a line. The stress is on Manu’a and Upolu in these accounts of origin as Pili moved from Manu’a across to Tutuila, Upolu and finally Savai’i. Also three of his children – Ana, Saga and Tua – are said to have established the three main districts of Upolu, namely, A’ana, Tuamasaga and Atua respectively. When it comes to Savai’i however it is often said that Pili’s youngest child, a daughter named Tolufale, ordered Savai’i, Manono and Apolima. In this tradition the majority of stories narrate that Pili visited and stayed in A’opo, a village situated well inland on the north coast of Savai’i not far from Safune. In the fa’alupega there is still a Pilia’opo today. In Savai’i based accounts it appears
that neither Pili, nor his descendants, actually politically ordered the Island. The sons of Lealali were responsible.

Atiogie’s son was Lealali, who produced a number of male children – all named Tupa’i. Laufafaeetoga of Tonga married twice. She married Tupa’i, the grandson of Lealali. She also married Lautala, sometimes termed the Tuifiti or king of Fiji. Thus early origins unite Tonga, (Laufafetoga), Fiji, (Lautala) and Samoa (Tupa’i) as originary human ancestors. The children of Laufafaeetoga’s marriage with the Fijian Lautala produced the children Ututauofiti, Tauaofiti, and two daughters, Lega and Fotu. Again the names of these children act as metonyms, as they are said to have established the village of Matautu, and the districts of Sataua, Salega and Safotu respectively. The child that resulted from Laufafetoga’s union with Tupa’i was Va’asiliifiti – meaning large boat from Fiji, whose two sons, Fune and Lafai, become the holders of two great titles because of their interaction with deities: Funefei receives the Tagaloa title from Tagaloalagi and one of the descendants of Lafai receives the Tonumaipae’a title with the assistance of the aitu Nafanua and Saveasi‘uleo, her father – the ‘king of Pulotu’.

Von Bülow understands that these first human beings were representatives of large groups of people and argues that the Island of Upolu and parts of Savai’i were settled from the descendants of the ‘Pili people’, but Savai’i and Manono were also settled by Tongans and Fijians.¹ (See map.)

Krämer on the other hand states his disagreement with von Bülow as follows:

[1] I oppose Mr. v. Bülow’s views that Savai’i was populated from Fiji and Tonga .... In my opinion he places too much emphasis on the word ‘colonisation’ [Besiedlung] while there were actually only individuals who came from Fiji and Tonga and were so fully amalgamated that today only minute traces may be observed in individual cases.²

Krämer argues that Savai’i stood in closest relation to Eastern Samoa – namely Manu’a and argues that Pili, son of Tagaloalagi, came from Manu’a to A’opo, Savai’i to settle. It was he who was therefore responsible for the settlement of Savai’i.³ He also looks at the close genealogical connections and the fa‘alupega to argue settlement from Manu’a.

---

² Krämer, The Samoa Islands, Vol 1, 51f.
³ Ibid.
SETTLEMENT OF SAMOA

Source: Adaptation of von Bülow 'Zur Besiedlung der Insel Savai'i (mit Kartenkizze)', IAE, Bd. XIII, 62.
In essence he argues the primacy of the god Tagaloalagi and the primacy of Manu’a due to the settlement and political organisation originating from that area.

Sometimes Malietao Savea is also stated as being a brother of Lealali. Savea was the first Malietao and his name stems from the words of a Tongan chief after Malietao was victorious over the Tongans in the war of the matamata me. Savea’s immediate children are said to have established the major villages of the Tuamasaga region. Savea, and his brothers Tuna and Fata, do not seem to logically fit in the genealogy as brothers of Lealili. There is a tendency to ‘backdate’ events and genealogies. The expulsion of the Tongans is linked very much with individuals and celebrates a specific event and even the war is named. Von Bülow probably recognised this in his later writings and also saw the difference between other ‘individuals’ of the time. Tupa’inatuna, Laufafiaetoga and Lautala represent Samoa, Tonga and Fiji respectively. They represent the early interaction between the islands. They are larger than just one individual. This understanding of the individuals representing a larger group is the insight that appears in his later writing.

What appears to be the case is that these first few generations of the genealogy are truncated. The children of Laufafiaetoga, namely Utu, Taua, Lega, Fotu and Lavalu all established major village and district areas. Her grandsons, by her marriage with Tupa’i, are said to have established the other villages and districts. These villages cover most of the coast of Savai’i. Within the space of a few generations they are said to have been established.

The genealogy is representative of an index genealogy. Gunson describes the meaning of index genealogies as follows:

Index genealogies are not necessarily long in themselves and often constitute the opening section of a narrative genealogy. They begin with an apical ancestor and include all the major titleholders and heads of branches in one or two generations as if they were siblings.

In Samoan origin genealogies, the major title Malietao is placed as one of the first human beings alongside personalities of an older regime, namely Lealali and his

---

5 For a more extensive account of the Fijian influence in Savai’i and Manono, as well as the differences between von Bülow and Krämer, see Appendix III.
children. The first children are representative of village founders. They are presented as siblings and these major villages are presented as being established within a few generations.

The brother of Lafai is Fune, also called Funefeai. Both Turner and Krämer say that he got this name from his habit of biting his nails before going into battle. It is more likely, however, that Fune got his name from the habit of cutting a little finger off before going to war. Funefeai or Fune the fierce is thus in oral tradition placed against his brother Lafai who is also represented as being fierce and fearful. Most commentators refer to Lafai as Tama o le po or child of darkness, which is normally indicative of a illegitimacy. Fune is said to have been the first title-holder of the Tagaloa title and this is said to have been the gift of the god Tagaloalagi himself. It is possible that Fune received this title from Tagaloa A’opo who was to fight against his brother’s grandson, although it seems most likely that this Tagaloa is either the Tuimanu’a or someone related to him. It is also important to note that the two brothers, Fune and Lafai are separated by a great distance and in agreement with von Bülow, these two brothers represent groups of people rather than mere individuals – especially when these two brothers’ children are said to have established most of the villages in Savai’i.

The beginning of the Tagaloa title, like that of the other great ao title of Savai’i, Tonumaipe’a, is explained in terms of mythological events. In both cases the origin of the title is linked to a spiritual justification of the title’s emergence. It is sanctified by supernatural events and sanctioned by the gods. In the case of the Tagaloa title Tagaloalagi himself is said to have come to earth to visit Funefeai because he wished to take Sina – Fune’s love interest – for himself. The following version is from Krämer:

Lafaiaotete married Sinafagaava of Falelima who gave birth to the girl Sinaalaua. Funef’ai lay with Sinaalaua, and when Tagaloalagi, the god of heaven saw her, he greatly desired her. He therefore spoke to him: Funef’ai, give me the girl to wife; in return I will give you my name Tagaloa as a title for you. Besides, I will give you eight men to sit at your two sides (tafa’i), the ‘taulaunu mai le lagi’, the ‘protecting coconut fronds from heaven’, namely Sae and Fataloto of Vaiafaif, Tugaga and Tagaloaataoa of Safunetanao, Gale and Tuiasau of Vaisala, Mata’afa and Taliva’a of Sili (Tufu).
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7 Turner, Samoa A Hundred Years Ago and Long Before, London, 1884, 256; Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 76.
8 E.g., von Bülow, ‘Beiträge zur Ethnographie der Samoa-Inseln’, IAE, Bd. XII, 1900, 59.
Funefe’ai agreed and the four places henceforth called themselves Safune, ‘Fune’s family’.  

The most extensive explanation comes from von Bülow. He spent most of his time in Samoa living in the village of Safune – the village of Fune and the Tagaloa title. It is also the most graphic in its description. His account of the title’s origin is quite similar to his fellow ethnographer but notes that Tagaloa came down from heaven with only two orators originally and these were Tagaloataoa and Tugaga. Tagaloa arrived at a most auspicious moment – as Sina was kneeling before Fune. Another major difference with the former account is that Tagaloalagi not only gave him the ao title, Tagaloa, but he also gave him his water-holders, ‘two coconuts tied together (taulua)’ as well as the two orators. He also stresses again that ‘the attribute of Tagaloa of Safune is one of two empty coconut water holders tied together, out of which water is taken in order to sprinkle him ... somewhat like holy water’.

There are also other aspects of the story that will be discussed presently, but the story revolves around three principal exchanges. Funefe’ai gives up his wife to Tagaloalagi. In return he receives the taulauniu to serve him and the two coconut water holders. The story is very much tied to the sacredness of the title and associated sacred symbolism of the coconut.

The term launiu refers to the coconut palm or leaf. The coconut leaf represents, in Samoa, life, elevation of status and death. The coconut represents the source of both physical and spiritual wellbeing. According to tradition, the first coconut palm sprang from the head of Sina, the first woman. From the head, which is the place of the soul, the birth of the coconut is a sign of fertility and nourishment. The coconut frond is waved upon the newly elected high chief. This is done by the taulauniu.

When a Tuimanu’a was inaugurated, he sat in front of the centremost post above which the afifi had been fastened – the afifi refers to the tip of the coconut frond, which is normally called l’u o le launiu. L’u also has a figurative meaning, namely the phallus. The entitling of the Tu’imanua is like a birth and represents that the new title-holder is a rebirth of the old. It also means that he is the symbol of fertility and sanctity. Krämer does not make this connection, but does say that ‘if the afifi is placed over the same

---

centre of someone’s house it signified that the Tu’imanua desired the maiden of the house, a command which must be obeyed'. Krämer calls this practice *tu o le afigi o le Tu’imanua*. Again Krämer does not see the semantic significance of the phrase as *tu* means ‘erect’ and the erect phallus is figuratively referred to as *ua tu le i’u*. The term appears in other expressions ensuring fertility and good harvest. One example is that the decorative phrase for raising the rod in bonito fishing is called *fa’atu le launiu*. The verbal form *fa’atu* indicates the raising of the rod, also figuratively referred to as a coconut frond links the fertility of the land to that of human beings; the material and spiritual realms.

Samoan decorative language and illusions make a veiled reference to the Tu’imanu’a’s sanctity and fertility by representing him as an erect coconut palm. The Tu’imanua, like the Tagaloa, represents the godhead. The coconut fronds are waved upon him. In Safune, the *taulauniu* do the same. The new title-holder is a potent representative of the godhead.

Female fertility is also spoken of in figurative terms in association with the coconut. In the *solo* of Sina, she bemoans the trade winds that had caused much destruction. She sings: ‘I brought forth the coconut palm. Pray that it bears fruit. May it bear fruit not only once. May it bear fruit like a *titi*’. The *titi* refers to the loincloth. Both a fertile land and a fertile womb are the essence of Sina’s song. Even today a polite way of wishing a woman to be capable of bearing many children is to say that one hopes that the coconut harvest is ripe.

The coconut leaves also represent continued fertility into the afterlife. Krämer recounts the story of Mata’ulufotu, who was killed by his mother. She decapitated him but he continued to speak as she carried him around in a coconut leaf basket. This head was an embodied *aitu*, meaning the spirit or soul of her son. This *aitu* went into the ninefold heaven where he found the soul of Sina, a daughter of the Tuifiti. Mata’ulufotu seized it and Sina came back to life again. In another account Lauti, the adopted daughter of Sina ‘crept in during the night and caught the soul of Sina. She gave it to her parents

---
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and they were very pleased when she brought the coconut leaf sheath in which Sina’s soul was wrapped. The symbolism of the coconut leaf, together with the return to life and the dwelling place of the spirit appears to be very important in Samoan belief.

In Samoa today the practices of the ancients regarding death are remembered. The mourning party carry with them the tips of coconut leaves to mourn the dead. The reason for doing this is the belief in the continuation of the agaga or spirit’s existence in both the material world and the mirror world, Pulotu. Alongside this runs the belief that the dead can come back to life as though they never died. Every district in Samoa dates the rationale for the carrying of coconut leaves back to certain historico-mythic events. These events reveal clearly the belief in the continued existence of life. In a spiritual dimension as an aitu or as the resuscitation of a human being. The mourning practices of the Malietoa family villages like Faleata in Tuamasaga give as the basis of their practice of carrying coconut leaves, launiu, the following explanation: Poluleuligana was the son of Ulu lumina, the son of a Tuitoga and the brother of Alainuamua, the wife of Malietoa Faiga. He was then adopted by M. Faiga and became his son. Malietoa Faiga, often described as part human and part divine, lived off human flesh. Poluleuligana, in an attempt to show his dislike of this practice wrapped himself in coconut leaves. When his father opened them up and found his son, he could no longer practice cannibalism. In this sense Polu was saved by the wrath and awesome sacred power of Malietoa Faiga. The tips of the coconut leaves symbolised this story and the leaves are carried as a sign of respect for the dead. It acknowledges the possibility of coming back to life.

On Savai’i the most common explanation is that the Tuitoga Fakapouri was brought back to life through the intervention of the Tuimanu’a. The following explanation from the district of Salega is an example of how the explanations differ slightly from village to village. Tuitoga Fakapouri was the good friend of the Tuimanu’a who lived in Fitiuta, on Ta’u, Manu’a. It was customary for them to visit, due to their friendship. On one visit Tuitoga wanted to see the Tuimanu’a’s village to observe what it was like. The Tuimanu’a said, ‘Good I will prepare everything for your visit’. Although Tuimanu’a allowed him to do everything he wanted, he did not allow Tuitoga to bathe in his pool, because this pool was tapu to all but Tuimanu’a.

16 Ibid., 259.
17 Lealiiaalotu Nofoaiga Kitona and Fuataga Lauulu Tauiliili, O le Fa’avae o Samoa Anamua Malua Press, Western Samoa, 1985, 55.
After a month Tuitoga set sail. Fitiuta was hidden from view and the Tuitoga commanded his crew to visit Faitolo who looked after the vaisa, sacred water or bathing place of Tuimanu’ a. Tuitoga said he wanted to bathe in the pool. Faitolo was surprised at this request and told him there would be much trouble for him if he did so. In spite of this Tuitoga jumped into the water without fear. Then he got sick and died. The Tongans watched this dreadful event. They responded by smashing their heads with rocks. Faitolo told them to stop this stupidity. Then he witnessed the Tongans laying the Tuitoga down on a coconut leaf whilst they sang ‘Tuitoga, my Lord, Tuitoga, lo’u ali’i e’.

When Faitolo heard the singing he went to the Tuimanu’a and told him what had transpired. Tuimanu’a then went to the vaisa and asked the Tongans to change their song to: Tuimanu’a my lord, Tuimanu’a lo’u ali’i e and he came to life. Since that time, when a prominent chief dies on Savai’i, it is customary for the mourners to encircle the home of the deceased with the tips of the coconut leaves. Their singing invokes the concept of eternal life. ‘Tuimanu’a my Lord!’

In the Ituotane district of Savai’i, two explanations are given. The first is that of the son of Malietoaafaiaga, as related earlier. The second concerns Tagaloaniu and Tagaloau. Tagaloaniu lived in the forest, while Tagaloau lived in the sea. Tagaloanuui had his house on the top of the sea. Close to his house was a coconut palm. Under this palm was the place that Tagaloanui normally used as a resting place from his work. When Tagaloanui died it is said that he went to live in the ninth heaven. The mourning party today carry their coconut leaves to ensure that the chief is at rest.

Safune is significant because it is different from the majority of villages in the Ituotane, Savai’i. Here all mourners carry the coconut palms. When mourners arrive they place their palms over the place where the deceased is laid. The palms symbolise shelter and protection of the deceased. The rationale for this practice is given in the following story. Tagaloalagi wished Sina, the wife of Funefei’a to be his wife. Funefei’a responded to the request and in return asked for Tagaloalagi to bring him a house. Funefei’a announced to Tagaloa that he would cut off his head if his request for the house did not eventuate. The fale or house of Tagaloa was completely decorated with coconut leaves. The house was named Fale ole Tagaloa [House of Tagaloa] and

18 Ibid., 76f.
became the central meeting place of the village Safune. The house of the *ao* [high-title] of the Tagaloa was given to Funefe’ai.

There is also an *au-osoga* or special mourning party belonging to the high title of Tagaloa. Not all villages have an *au-osoga*. The role of this distinctive mourning group is to protect the *ao* when death occurs. When a Tagaloa dies they are to ensure that the body cannot be stolen, thereby protecting the *ao* title. Using axes and knives they lay waste all the trees in and around the village. This will ensure that there is no suitable hiding place for an enemy. This destruction of everything, including animals, is done to ensure that an enemy cannot hide under any form, flora, fauna, or animal.  

The justification for razing the village and slaughtering the animals is linked to the spirit’s ability to choose and inhabit various shapes. The spirit could enter and take on the form of an animal, enter the village and take over and possess the body of the Tagaloa. Their function was to lay waste all the vegetation and animal life of the village so that there is no possibility that a foreign spirit or *aitu* could possess his body. The common thinking among most European commentators links the razing of the village to respect for the chief. In fact, the Safune Orators’ account leads one to understand that this ritual action has more to do with protecting the corpse of the chief against being possessed by an enemy spirit.

The symbolism of the coconut palm is linked to death, life, *tapu* and *aitu*. The coconut palm in the *aitu* house called the ‘*fałeoaitu*’ in Lepea was made in the form of a basket and the *aitu* was said to have dwelled within this basket. The soul of Sina was encaptured in a coconut leaf sheath. Mourners carry coconut leaf tips which symbolise new life and *tapua’i*, which are most often made of coconut leaves, are put on plants to ward off possible offenders. They serve as a physical sign of the *aitu*’s presence. Deceased ancestors, *aitu*, can take on physical form but are not themselves material beings. Coconut leaves become a physical representation of the *aitu* and their role in the material world. The coconut, on a natural level represents the staple diet. It is connected with shelter, furniture and clothing. On a symbolic level the coconut is connected with spiritual power and the journey into death and beyond.
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20 See, Lealalaulotu Nofoiga Kitiona and Fuataga Laulu Tauilili, *O le Fa’avae o Samoa Anamua*, 74f. Explained more fully in Chapter One of this study.
Krämer does not record the coconut water-holders in his account of the Tagaloa title. He does, however, record a song of the water-holders. In this song he notes that the water-holders were sacred and used only by the four highest chiefs. The song also recalls that the Samoan custom forbids anyone but that chief to drink from that container. 'There is a great fear for anyone but the chief to drink from the water-holder, as if they did so they would become ill. Even the true children of the chief would not dare drink from it.'

The Tuimanua also had his water-holders, but as he had no sennit attached for carrying them, 'his Taupou carried it aloft in her hand. She was forbidden to speak when carrying his water.' Krämer adds that 'when the village maiden went to get the cup of the Tu’imauna, the kava chewers followed her. When the girl left the house, the kava chewers began to smash boats; to kill chickens', and everything else in their way.

Water, as with the coconut is essential in ensuring both physical and spiritual well-being. The Tagaloa, like other sacred chiefs were sprinkled with water. Von Bülow notes that the sprinkling of water 'happens when a village bestows an ao title', and still existed until the early 1900s when he was writing. He stated that this practice stems from the gods and this sprinkling with water made the title-holder holy (heilig).

In the first exchange between Tagaloa and Fune that allowed Fune to receive the titles, the woman, Sina, was the cause of the exchange. Even gods have to pay the price for beauty, and Fune received his taulauniu and taula as reward. In the von Bülow version, Tagaloalagi enters just as Fune knelt at the feet of the woman (Sina) implying a sexual position. It is also possible to construct this meaning from the original Samoan. The Samoan can be understood in two ways; either Fune was kneeling at the foot of the woman or kneeling between the legs of the woman. What is clear is that Tagaloalagi arrives at a crucial time in this relationship.

As a result of Fune’s respect and allowing Sina to go to Tagaloalagi, Tagaloalagi told him to come and take his ao title (the Tagaloa title). Tagaloa also gave him two.
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hollowed out coconut water holders (taula) and two tulafale. According to most stories pertaining to the origin of the Tagaloa title Fune receives eight orators not just two. In the faʻatupega there are eight tulafale or Taulauniu that are appointed to sit on the left and right of the Tagaloa in each of the four villages that make up Safune. Krämer criticises von Bülow on this point and it does seem unusual that he records the tradition in this way. The reason that von Bülow says that the two Taulauniu, Tagaloataoa and Tugaga, were the orators left by Tagaloalagi is because von Bülow's informant was Taulealea from Safune i Taoa. Von Bülow only states in the publication that Taulealea was from Safune. He does not say that the Taulealea title is a title from Safune i Taoa – the same village as that of Tugaga and Tagaloataoa.

Krämer does not inform us who he received his information from in regard to the title. It is common, however, for the informant to favour and emphasise his connections to the detriment of others. Krämer should have understood this as his own monograph favours the emphases of his own informants. In all these instances a relative on another side of the family or a family line would emphasise their own importance in the story. It is in this sense that there is no generally accepted national history of Samoa. There is no doubt that if von Bülow was collecting this story from a group of orators from the other sub-villages of Safune, Taulealea would not have made the claim that the two taulauniu were the taulauniu of the sub-village Safune i Taoa. Rather respect would have been shown to the other three sub-villages and they would have been included. The ideal situation is that the conferring of the title is a consultative process involving the taulauniu of the four parts of Safune. However, in terms of Pule or authority, each will attempt to gain precedence. One of the major difficulties of recorded traditions in Samoa is that very often – as in Turner and Stair – we are not informed who the informants were. Very often also they record a tradition without giving specific names of title-holders or the names of villages. This makes analysis very difficult. Also by only giving one version the sense of the nature of historical presentations and internal politics is not revealed. The differences in the versions are what allow an understanding of the nature and forms of historical presentation in terms of Samoan society itself.

A further example of this form of emphasis is revealed in a title case regarding the
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Tagaloa Taoa title in 1956. In this case the then present title holder of both the Tugaga and Tagaloa Taoa titles argues for the primacy of these titles in relation to the ao title of the Tagaloa. The two original title-holders are said to have been the first to live in the village and the term Tapunu’u – meaning literally sacred village or the sacred bond between the original settlers and the land, is applied to them. He also says that there were ten principal figures in the Government of Tagaloalagi; the eight, which are normally referred to, and two additional taulauniu. The added taulauniu are those from Tuasivi in Vaimauga and, secondly, Tapuele’ele. These villages do not belong to the traditional Fale Safune. However the petitioner in this case argues that they were established at the time Funefe’ai obtained the government from Tagaloalagi. However he does say that Tagaloa Funefe’ai moved to settle in Malaelei in Samaa Fagae’e. Tagaloa Taoa settled in Lealofiotua, the malae of troubles.

Over time the Tugaga title gained in importance to such an extent that Tugaga built up a family of Ta’auso or brother-chief. Each of these is said to have been assigned particular appointments such as vanguards in war – kava chewers of the Tagaloa and other appointments. Obviously in 1956 other title-holders in that village argued against the petitioners. What is important in terms of historical reconstruction is to recognise the tendency of interested parties to pre-date events and also to realise that there will be differences in the telling of the origin of the titles even within one family.

In another case, in 1923 regarding the Tagaloa title the taulauniu of Vaiafa maintain that they have more exclusive rights over the Tagaloa title in that they are the two sauali’i tagata of the Tagaloa and they together with the orators (fofoga o fetalai) were given the Pule over the title by Fune. The term sauali’i tagata was translated by the court translator of the time as being the two magicians of the Tagaloa. A more correct rendering would be ‘living gods’ or semi-human and semi-divine beings who were generally able to break tabu, including consuming people, without retribution from their relatives. It is interesting that in the Tusi Fa’alupega, published in 1958, these two taulauniu, namely Sae and Fataloto are referred to as aitu tagata – with aitu being a less formal word for spirit than sauali’i. The other six taulauniu are merely referred to as taulauniu and not as aitu or sauali’i tagata. In the more recent Tusi Fa’alupega, Sae
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and Fataloto are referred to merely as taulauniu. The question which then confronts one is whether Sae and Fataloto did have a special relationship to the Tagaloa title in regard to them being semi-divine priests or not. It may be that the Christianization of Samoa has allowed the use of aitu tagata to be dropped from the address or that the older Tusi Fa'alupega favours the taulauniu of Vaiafai for some reason. It is also possible and indeed likely that all the taulauniu had some form of ‘priestly’ function. If they did not then it is unlikely that the taulauniu could be publicly addressed as aitu tagata.

The work on the former Tusi fa'alupega of 1958, was begun by Le-Mamea and the Tusi Fa'alupega is largely a result of his labours. It is also notable that the fa'alupega of Vaiafai is more detailed than for the other ‘villages’ of Fune probably due to Le Mamea’s family connection with Vaiafai. Without wishing to be contentious it seems more likely that the isolating of only two Taulauniu as being aitu tagata is because of this connection and his awareness of the claims of Sae and Fai. The question as to what function the taulauniu played is the key issue in terms of a spiritual function and the sacred status of the Tagaloa himself.

Von Bülow says that the high chief of the village (Sa'o) – more correctly the holder of a family’s founding title is blessed. ‘The person holding the title is holy, inviolable. They are attributed with supernatural powers’.31 This is especially so with regard to the ao titles. Von Bülow speaks of godly veneration of these titles and that the ao titles are transferred from gods to people. ‘Different foods and animals may only be eaten by him. They have servers -agai who are endowed with particular names and the office runs in particular families …. The severs -agai of the Tagaloa are called Gie o le Tagaloa and are chosen from the family of the tulafale Moana and Tuliatu …. The South-sea herring, atule, is sacred to him and therefore may not be caught with “deep-down” nets’.32

The sacredness of the title is established with privileges and godly sanction; however the use of the word Gie is unusual and it appears that in Samoa today this is not a term used in relation to the Tagaloa title. Again it may be that von Bülow’s informant mentioned these two orators as they are of the sub-village of Matavai, which is a sub-
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village of Fale Tagaloa or Safune i Taaoa although it is possible that they had a definite function.

According to von Bülow, and contested by Krämer, Vaisala was named after an event at Taufasala. He states that ‘a rat came and bit [sala] the taulua in half [so that it fell down]. Therefore the village was named Vaisala’. 33

The reason that the village was called Vaisala (which is not clear in the German or the Samoan) is that the vai or water spilt due to the rat biting or cutting the taulua with its teeth. A chiefly or polite word for water is taufa, the common word is vai. This is the reason why it is said that Fune slept in Taufasala.

Then von Bülow says that the eight taulauniu were assigned, despite his earlier reference that there were only two taulauniu given to Fune. These appointments were as follows: Gale and Tuiasau would live in Vaisala, while Tugaga and Tagaloataoa would live in Safune. Sae and Fataloto decided to stay at Vaiafai and Fune appointed Taliva’a and Fiu to live in Sili. Von Bülow also recounts that Faleata in Upolu was inhabited by the descendants of the Safune people. The people of Faleata were ‘unwillingly colonised’ during a war. 34

Von Bülow also states that the term taulauniu is a mythological name for Safune. 35 Krämer criticises this statement saying that it is not a mythological name of Safune but is named when Tagaloalagi appointed the eight men ‘who shall sit (tafa’i) on either side of thee (Fune) the “Taulauniu mai le lagi”, the coconut fans from heaven protecting thee’. He also says in a footnote that the taulauniu ‘bestow and proclaim the title at the same time swathing their limbs with coconut leaves’. 36

The term tafa’i, is the more normal honorific for those tulafale who are appointed to sit on either side of holders of the sacred titles. In regard to the Fale Safune and the Tagaloa title the tafa’i are normally referred to as taulauniu. It is also notable that in Safune all mourners carry coconut palms. The village also has an ausoga who ensure that neither the body, nor spirit of the Tagaloa is stolen. The sacredness of the Tagaloa

33 Ibid., 64. The added ‘so that it fell down’ is added in the German to indicate that water spilled from the taulua.
34 Ibid., 64.
35 Ibid.
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is revealed in how he is respected. Krämer and von Bülow agree on this facet of the argument. However, the role of the taulauniu as priest-protectors of the title is not developed. As discussed, they can also be referred to as aitutagata as well as taulauniu. Both honorifics indicate the notion of some form of spiritual authority. Krämer lists the eight Taulauniu as Sae and Fataloto; Tugaga and Tagaloatea; Gale and Tuiasau and finally Mata’a’afa and Taliva’a. He thus differs from von Bülow in regard to the Taulauniu in Sili. The Tusi Fa’alupega agrees with Krämer as does current evidence, although Fiu has been included as one of the principal figures in Tagaloa’s government as the taulauniu of Tuasivi, Vaimauga and Tapuelele in one Lands and Titles case.37
The accepted taulauniu of Sufune i Sili are Taliva’a and Mata’a’afa.38 The reason why von Bülow’s informant records Fiu instead of Mata’a’afa could have been that Mata’a’afa was holding the Tagaloa title at the time that von Bülow recorded the account.39

The sacredness of titles is linked to the central meeting-house. It would appear that in many villages the central meeting place was also sacred in former times. It was there that fires were lit and the aitu honoured. The functional purpose of these sacred sites today is their use in the bestowal of titles, which are performed there. For example in Leulumoega there are two meeting places. Leulumoega is the capital of A’ana and is divided into two sections: Leulumoega at Alofi, and Leulumoega at Samatau. The meeting places of these two sections are Mauga and Niuapai respectively. It was at Niuapai that Sualauvi was proclaimed Tuia’ana. It is claimed that it is not possible to confer the Tuia’ana title outside one of these two meeting places.40

During the conferral of high titles there are practices, which are suggestive of the sacredness of the papa and ao titles. There are also practices which reveal the spiritual function of those orators who confer the title and ‘sit to the left and right’ of the papa or ao title-holder. The papa and ao titles are not family titles and are therefore not inherited necessarily within one lineage.41 These titles are ceremonial titles and are
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‘sacred’ as has been explained although Krämer – somewhat cynically – states that the *ao* titles are conferred merely to gain fine mats.

The terms *papa* and *ao* are often used indiscriminately. For example in the Lands and Titles cases mentioned earlier the Tagaloa is sometimes referred to as an *ao* and at other times a *papa* title – even within a submission by a single author. The difference between them is perceived to be that they are interchangeable depending on what area one comes from. In secondary literature the term *papa* is normally explained as consisting of only four titles – all conferred in Upolu. These are the four ceremonial titles needed to be held together in order to attain the ceremonial honorific *tafa’i fa’a.* A closer inspection of how the address *papa* is used reveals that the Safune people regard their *ao* title as sacred and a *papa* title. The four *papa*, which are supposedly needed in order to attain national leadership are all conferred in Upolu. The *papa* or *ao* of Savai’i are neglected because of this. Also neglected are other *ao* titles such as the *ao* of the Mata’afa in Amaile, Upolu.

In relation to these *papa* and *ao* titles are those who serve to uphold the sacred status of the title by sitting to the left and right of the title-holder. The orators Fata and Maulolo are referred to as the *tu’itu’i* of the papa Natoaitele and they sit to the left and the right of the Natoaitele at the bestowal. Umaga and Pasose in Leulumoe’a are known as the *tafa’a* of the Tuiaana. Tupa’i and Tainau sit either side of the papa Tuiaatu. They are called the *tu’itu’i* of the Tuiaatu and in Safune those who sit on the right and left of the Tagaloa are called the *taulauniu*.

The majority of titles connected with harnessing the spirits were likewise *tulafale* and as discussed the *taulauniu* have a priestly or shamanistic function. The term Tafa’a also appears to have been associated with a shamanistic function. In many parts of Polynesia Tafaki (*tafa’a*) ‘was the model of the master shaman’ while ‘Maui was the prototype of the popular shaman’.

In Faleata there is a family of *tulafale* called the *Tauaitu*. This village, according to von Bülow was colonised by Safune and this seems to be confirmed by the *fa’alupega*.

---

42 Note, especially, LC 610.
What is interesting is that in this village, as with Safune there are orators who are referred to as having a spiritual function. Their function was to communicate with the aitu. The Toafa [the four chiefs] – Une, Leleua, Ale and Ulu are a unique authority. If these four want something they inform the Tauaitu who can then call together a fono in Faleata. Their combined power encompasses the killing of pigs to the placing of a sa or tapu on coconut palms. The two chiefs in Faleata, namely Mataia and Faumuina are called by the four ‘the sons of the house of the aitu, which is in Lepea’.

Two families have this communication with the aitu. The heads of these families are traditionally called Va and Vaitagutu. Today they are referred to as Veletaloolo and Taliausolo. They are identified with Tauaitu. Inside the house called the “Fale o aitu” there was a basket made of coconut palms. The empty basket was suspended from the roof. This symbolised that the aitu once dwelt there. The Tauaitu’s unique role was to consult this spirit. It is unclear whether the aitu dwelt unseen, without physical form, or were present in the basket itself.

According to Lemana, there are also igoa fa’aitu, that is, spirits of the tulafale. Once again in Faleata the Tulafale Ai is referred to as taulauniu after the taulauniu had consulted with the aitu. Lemana also makes the distinction between the terms va’aataau and tau[laj]aitu. The va’aataau are either a group or an individual who converse with the aitu. The aitu are the ones who choose between war and peace. The va’aataau follow the aitu’s instructions. The tauaitu is a man, normally a chief whose body is possessed by the spirit. In Lemana’s village [Lepea] ‘there was only one Va’afa’atau. In other villages all chiefs who went to war were Va’afa’atau.

It appears then, that there are distinctions to be made between those we might term ‘priests’ or those who have a priestly role. In the fa’alupega of Satupa’itea and villages connected with the ao of the Tonumaipe’a, the terms used are va’a i ti (Tupa’i) and Va’afa’atau for Asiata. This term is also used in Lepea for those who are responsible in carrying out the wishes of the aitu. The terms va’aatau and tauaitu are the most common terms for priests in Samoa. Faleata, which was colonised by Safune uses the term taulauniu and symbolises a priestly role and the continuation of the spirit. There is, it appears, regional differences in spiritual terms and the extent of use of these terms may indicate the spread of an individual cult over the islands. Unfortunately it is difficult today, in a very Christianised Samoa to find any distinction between these

\[44\] Stuebel, Samoanische Texte, 104.
\[45\] Ibid., 105.
\[46\] Stuebel, Samoanische Texte, 74f.
terms. The form *taula* – *taulaitu* or *taulasea* are what is generally explained as meaning priest. The *taula* are however perhaps more clearly distinguished as being spiritual healers and shamans, but they are not necessarily dependent upon their position in relation to titles, especially *ao* and *papa* titles. These *Taulaitu* rather seem independent of those they serve. The distinction between the terms outlined allow one to realise that there are really two forms of priesthood.

*Taulaitu* still exist today in Samoa. It appears that they are individuals who possess a special power that is recognised only within the community. It is often unclear whether these people are titled or untitled, male or female. As in traditional times the *taulaitu* often blame sickness on upsetting the ancestors. Often they will be shut inside the *fale* with the mat curtains drawn, because of traditional custom. Usually they are asked to attend at a burial.

Traditional tales of *taulaitu* expressed how powerful they were. Tupa‘i, the priest (*va’a’itti*) of Nafanua was said to be so powerful that he could make trees wither and die. The two *taulaitu* of the Tuifiti, the King of Fiji, were said to be so powerful they could make their *aitu* appear. They could also transport Sina, the daughter of A’uaumona of Saleauala, Tutiula, back to Fiji. According to this account her real father had just died and Sina rode on the top of her father’s funeral litter, while the two *taulaitu* had to stand. Presumably affronted by this position the Fijian *aitu* appeared and she was transported to Fiji. It is also significant that this appearance of the *aitu* is associated with the actual time of death, the time when the spirit appears to be most ‘free’; they had the ability to fly, shape-shift and appear at a different place.

Oral traditions record the events of chiefs. They distinguish the elite of the past. Not all chiefs are of equal sanctity however. Those who attain a level of leadership, which allowed some transformation of society, are considered to be more sacred. Also these leaders tended to be genealogically closer to the primal ancestors. Stair writes of eighteen especially sacred chiefs or Ali‘i Paia and names them: Tuiaana, Tuiauta, Tonumaipe’a, Fonoti, Muagututia, I’amafana, I fangu, Malietoa, Tamosoali‘i and Natoailele. These he considered the most sacred. After these sacred chiefs there were also Lilomaiva, Mata’afa, O Tui Manu’a, Fiame, Salima, and Levalasi.

47 Stair, *Old Samoa.*
It is important to note again that this information is dependent upon the sources or informants that Stair consulted. It is also somewhat confusing. The *papa* titles Tuia’ana, Tuiaatu, Natoaitele and Tamasoali’i are included. These are honorifics. However this is confused by Stair adding individual historical titleholders of these *papa*. I’amafana, Fonoti and Muagututia are individual people of the Satupua or the Tupua family who held either all the *papa* or most of them during their historical lifetime. The *ao* titles are also present, namely Malietoa, Tonumaipe’a, Lilomaiva and Mata’aafa. However how he has determined their importance again is rather arbitrary. Also the *ao* of the Tagaloa is absent from this list, as are other *ao* titles of Savai’i. The inclusion of Fiame is interesting in that this title is that of the family head of Salevaluai, a family mainly represented in the Atua district of Upolu with its headquarters in Lotofaga. The title serves their accepted Tuiaatu, namely Mata’aafa. The inclusion of Fiame indicates Stair’s sources in this case were of Salevaluai and supporters of Mata’aafa. It has been lists like this, which have confused secondary sources on sacred titles, just as the ‘god lists’ have confused historians and commentators about the nature of *aitu*.

The key political transformers are able to able their magnificent deeds by means of spiritual power. The transformation from one political order into a new one, is due to their supernatural prowess. Three figures – Malietoaafaiga, Nofoasaefa and Tamafaiga – are consisatly recurring individuals in *tala*. They were all said to be *aitutagata*, possessed by *aitu*. They were frequently said to be cannibals, which is, according to Krämer, another meaning for *aituagata*. These leaders were able to achieve significant transformation by being placed above other chiefs. Their unique spiritual power was clearly recognised as the *modus operandi* for their being able to break the normal *tabu* against cannibalism, without incurring censure.

These stories associated with historical figures reveal the cultural significance of the hero in Polynesian society. It is their special spiritual attributes that allow them to perform and to transform.
CHAPTER 2

NAFANUA'S GIFT: THE AO OF THE TONUMAIPE'A AND THE TONUMAIPE'A INHERITANCE

The story of the origin of the Tonumaipe’a title links characters from a seemingly indeterminate time period. The central themes in the various accounts are similar; the origin is linked to a time of the union of the Tuitoga with Leutogitupa’itea of Savai’i and eventually Leutogi defeats the Tuitoga. It is essentially a story of victory of Samoa over Tonga. This victory resulted in titles particular to Samoa and resulted in an elite family line that would produce descendants responsible for unifying Samoa by marriage alliances with other elites. It also was a family that would be renowned by its spiritual founder, Nafanua, whose sage counsel in warfare was able to dominate – or at least contend – with other elite family lineages.

The following is an account from Brother Henry, a Catholic teacher who compiled a history of Samoa.

The Tuitoga Manaia had two wives, one was a Tongan and one was a Samoan. The latter, Leutogitupa’itea, was the daughter of Mulianaalafai. After some time the Tongan woman bore a child, but Leutogi remained childless. As the Tongan teased her on this account, she became very vexed and finally resolved to kill the child of the Tongan woman. One day both went together to their common bathing place. When they reached it, the Tongan said let me bathe first while you hold my little child. This Leutogi did, for she thought that the hour to revenge herself had come. As soon as the Tongan was out of sight, she took a ‘tuanui’ [coconut mid-rib] and forced it into the brain of the baby. The Tongan hearing the sudden wild cry of her child returned, but her child was already dead. Of course, Leutogi was suspected of having killed the child. Looking for a proof of her suspicion, she soon found the ‘tuanui’ and told the evil deed to the Tuitonga, who became so angry that he ordered Leutogi to be burned alive.

The unlucky woman was then dragged by the angry people into the bush and bound in the fork of a fetau tree. Soon a tall heap of dry wood surrounded her. Then the people set fire to it and, not willing to hear the shrieks of the miserable woman, they went back to their village. But, wonderful to relate, as soon as the flames began to rise thousands of bats (pe’a) came to put out the fire by dropping on it their water. In this way Leutogi’s life was saved by the devoted bats. When the attendants of the King found the woman still alive and the fire out, they were greatly surprised. Leutogi then said to them in a friendly way: ‘Ua tatou fetai’a i le magafetau soifua’. I.e., ‘we meet under
the fetau tree while yet full of life’. All this was told to the king. Thereupon he
resolved to put Leutogi on a barren, uninhabited island. This island was haunted by a
mischievous aitu named Losi, and the king, who knew this, felt certain that Losi would
soon kill the woman. Losi, however, did not touch her for he thought she would soon
die for want of food or water. So he simply sat down and watched the woman. Great,
therefore was his surprise when the next day he saw a multitude of flying foxes, each
bringing some kind of food to Leutogi. This the bats did for many days while Losi was
looking on, wondering more than ever about the wonderful event.

After some time, the Fijian Tuiaea happened to sail along that island. Leutogi called
him and begged him to take her along with him. This he did gladly, and as she was a
very nice looking woman, he married her and in due time, she bore him a son whom
they called Pa’asega. When the boy had grown up, she sent him back to Savai’i, but
before he left, she gave him three titles to be taken to her family:-

1. Tonumaipe’a – in memory of what the pe’a had done for her;
2. Tilomai – in memory of the aitu’s looking on;
3. Tau’ili’ili – because she had to use stones to cover her oven, instead of leaves.

All those names belong to the Falefa of the Tole’afoa family who confer the title (ao) of
Tonumaipe’a.1

In terms of understanding these accounts, there are certain key features or markers that
allude to historical and cultural perceptions of the origins of the title. Leutogi is
presented as a real person, whose father was Mulianalafai. The origin of this ao title,
therefore lies with the woman Leutogitup’itea, who is the daughter of Mulianalafai, thus
genealogically linked to Lafai. The ao of the Tagaloa comes from Lafai’s brother Fune.
By extension, the children of Lafai also receive an inheritance, namely the Tonumaipe’a
title. A distinctive feature of this ao title, however, is that all accounts indicate the
origin of the Tonumaipe’a and associated titles took place in Tonga. From previous
discussion, the aitu Nafanua, whose father was Saveasi’uleo, is the representative aitu
of the Tonumaipe’a title. This also indicates a strong Tongan connection. The names
of the Falefa or villages of Satupa’itea, Falelima, Neiafu and Tufu are indeed the areas
in which the Tonumaipe’a resides. They are also recognised in Samoa as being of
Tongan origin. The name Neiafu, is not a Samoan name. The Neiafu of the alataua, on
the south-western side of Savai’i is possibly named after the village of Neiafu in
Tonga.

The origin of the ao of the Tonumaipe’a involves spiritual intervention. Fune is
connected with Tagaloalagi, the Tonumaipe’a with Saveasi’uleo and Nafanua. The two
brothers, Fune and Lafai are portrayed at the apex of human life, the first named

1 Bro Fred Henry, (wrongfully attributed to K R Lambie), History of Samoa, Commercial Printers Ltd,
Apia, 1979, 12f.
humans in most genealogies. But in many ways they seem to mirror the major divisions of Samoa. Fune is allied with the great God of the East, while the daughter of Lafai is with the god of the South or the West. Leutogi’s inheritance is, in many accounts and genealogies, passed on to a woman, a female child, while the Fune inheritance is passed on to a male. A strong feature of the Tonumaipe’a and the influence of the title in Samoan history is the succession of women whose sacred power in the genealogical line is a distinctive feature that will be discussed presently.

Another key feature in the accounts is Leutogi killing the Tongan child. The legitimisation of the Tonumaipe’a inheritance, in these Samoan stories is a definitive statement that Leutogi has eliminated the competition. Leutogi’s child is the daughter of the Tuitoga. In the account of Brother Henry, the mention of the Fijian Tuiaea, seems strange and may be a means of diminishing the Tongan connection to the origin of the titles. The term Tuiaea [Tuiaea], in Samoan, means the Tui or ‘king’ of the Wallesian Isles. He is therefore unlikely to be Fijian.

The anthropologist, Jeannette Mageo, views the origin of the Tonumaipe’a title as a Samoan ‘charter story’. Mageo does not define a charter story specifically, but the essence of a charter story is that it embodies key elements of cultural identity. It encapsulates a key moment of significant change both politically and culturally. In this charter story Samoa, represented by Leutogi, manages to turn the tables on the Tongans by killing the heir of the Tuitoga. By this action and her cunning she ends the ‘pervasive political influence and presence of Tonga in Samoa’. She also, through her increased dominance, manages to gain prestigious titles that eventually influence internal politics within Samoa itself.

Mageo concentrates upon the account in Brother Henry. She does note that Krämer also gives a very similar account but states that ‘the ethnopolitical ideas around which I believe the tale revolves...are more fully formed in Henry’s account’. No other accounts are examined. The analysis of itself notes that Leutogi’s identity is derivative, meaning a Samoan wife’s status is subordinate to her husband. She is a tributary wife and her ‘subordinate status is iterated by her childlessness’. Initially, therefore what distinguishes Leutogi is not her positive qualities but her lack of a child.’ Leutogi

---
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represents more than herself, she represents the larger relationship between Tonga and Samoa. ‘Leutogi’s child with the Tuitonga would be a royal child. A royal child embodies a royal line: as every woman’s child continues the life of the person, a royal child continues the life of a proto-state, or a proto-empire’. The Tuitoga’s Tongan wife is with child, however, and this ‘suggests Tuitonga’s dominant relationship to Leutogi and Samoa’. Leutogi is furthermore the second wife representing a younger sibling, but this relationship to the elder sibling is often unstable and numerous Samoan tales tell of the younger sibling through stealth or trickery overcoming the elder one. Mageo notes that the Tongan wife’s teasing Leutogi makes ‘the humiliating position of Samoa vis-à-vis Tonga, implicit in the Tongan wife’s royal babe, explicit’. But the teasing, used to assert dominance, ‘insinuates an uncertainty about her possession of it’.4

The Tongan wife asserts this dominance further by claiming the right to bathe the first and ‘sequence is a Samoan trope for status’, an example being the ‘sequence in which Kava is served to attending chiefs’.5 Normally ‘the chiefly Samoan women who married early Tongan royals were generally regarded as the ma’itaki, the principal wife likely to bear the titular heir’.6 This also reinforces the instability in the relationship between the two wives. Leutogi complies by letting the Tongan wife bathe first, but this compliance is only pretense and Leutogi’s ‘emergent identity’ becomes more defined when she kills the child. In this action Mageo notes that ‘Leutogi redefines the Tongan/Samoan wife relation as one between what one might call a bodily mother and an anti-bodily mother and thereby prefigures the mother she will become through the course of the story – a mother of titles’.7

The coconut midrib ‘is the royal child in a new guise’. Mageo reinforces this royal child by quoting Tongan poetics. In an elegy to a deceased Tuitoga it is said ‘The midrib of the Coconut-leaflet is dead’.8 The midrib also represents titles, symbolized in the garland presented to the Tuitoga upon his instillation.9 The coconut is also a powerful Samoan symbol. The action of Leutogi ‘transfers symbolic capital from the

4 Ibid., 9, 11, 12, 12.
5 Ibid., 13.
7 Mageo, 13.
9 Collocott, 1928, 139; Mageo, 14.
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Tongan wife (and by symbolic reverberation from TuiTonga) to Leutogi’ – both women are now childless. Leutogi increases in status and mana.

The Tuitoga, as a result of the killing of the child now opposes Leutogi as an enemy. Mageo again sees this symbolically wherein the ‘TuiTonga’s aggressivity towards Samoa, implicit in imperial rule, becomes explicit’. ‘In classical structuralist terms, what TuiTonga and his people want to do is cook Leutogi.’ Furthermore ‘Mana has long been a question of who eats who’.\(^\text{10}\) Mageo gives examples of legends of high Samoan chiefs called \textit{sauali}'i who ate their subjects’ children and the last Tuitoga resident in Samoa was said to be a \textit{sauali}'i.\(^\text{11}\)

Mageo says that ‘in Samoa, status is an indicator of mana and height is a trope for status’. The Tuitoga places Leutogi high in the fork of the tree, which is indicative of the Tuitoga’s high status. However, while the Tuitoga ‘attempts to enact dominance by punishing Leutogi, what he brings about is Leutogi’s elevation (in the tree fork), but this elevation only betrays its real character through the epiphany of the bats. The bats intercede between Leutogi and TuiTonga, redefining their relationship just as the midrib redefined the wives’ relationship’. A number of \textit{mana} exchanges occur and each time Leutogi wins. She challenges the mana of the Tuitoga title by killing the heir and wins the man challenge between herself and the Tuitoga with the assistance of the bats. Mageo notes that trees are metonymys for mana and bats are metonyms for the Tuitoga’s mana, as bats are forbidden food to all but the Tuitoga – but it is bats that come to Leutogi’s rescue.

When Leutogi lives through the ordeal and makes a speech ‘Leutogi’s negative identity turns positive. Her earlier aggressiveness metamorphoses into a gracious chiefly salutation’. ‘Phoenix-like (or bat-like?), Leutogi arises to represent the oratorical style of talk that is constitutive to Samoan politics and that prefigures a distinct cultural identity for Samoa.’ Leutogi begins as a negative figure but through the story she develops symbolic capital. On the barren island the \textit{aitu} Losi is a surrogate for the Tuitoga. The Tuitoga expects Losi to kill or ‘eat’ her. In this sense the Tuitoga ‘has now taken up Leutogi’s former role ... that of a death dealing agent.’\(^\text{12}\)

\(^{10}\) Ibid., 14-16.
\(^{11}\) Gunson, 1990, 176; Henry, 1979, 22; Mageo, 16.
\(^{12}\) Ibid., 16-21.
Mageo views the migration of symbolic capital from the Tuitoga to Leutogi as a three-stage process as follows:

The babe (signifying the royal lineage): begins as a signifier of the Tongan wife (and TuiTonga); then becomes between that wife and Leutogi (in the babysitting scene); and then mutates into the coconut midriff, which embodies Leutogi’s plot and thus becomes one of her signifiers. Likewise the fetau tree: begins as a TuiTonga signifier (of elevation and paramount status) then comes to stand between TuiTonga and Leutogi (in the scene of the mana duel); and is finally assimilated by Leutogi in the form of bats.  

Likewise the barren island began as Losi’s and the Tuitoga and is the scene of a second mana duel. The bats not only bring her food, an indicator of her status, but they also make the barren island ‘food bearing’. ‘The bats food bearing gesture consecrates Leutogi as a mana chief, transferring this symbolic capital from TuiTonga to her’.  

Mageo argues much about the importance of ‘who eats who’. She notes the importance of Leutogi eating while Losi – who was meant to eat her looks on. Furthermore the names of the titles Leutogi establishes are all from events on the barren island.

The next stage in the story is that Losi (and the Tuitoga) are replaced by the Tuiuvea. The new relationship is quite different from the old. The marriage between the two is an elopement, thus not a tributary exchange. Neither is there a history of Wallis dominating Samoa. Mageo views the relationship not merely as equal, however she states that:

Royal Tongan sisters were married off to Fijians because their status and Mana were greater than of the TuiTonga (Kaeppler 1978). Like them, Leutogi is now too ‘high’ to remain in the Tongan cultural system. As in Kaeppler’s model of Tongan sisters, Leutogi goes off with a ‘Fijian’ husband. Leutogi bears Tui’Uvea a royal child, Fa’aasega, fully reversing her original significance as a barren tributary wife. Leutogi/Tui’Uvea suggests an isomorphic relation that takes bodily form in their offspring, Fa’aasega.

Fa’aasega is indicative of the sega bird with red feathers that were part of the traditional trade exchange between Tonga, Samoa and Fiji. They were necessary in the decorating of fine mats. The sega feathers originated in Fiji and ‘Samoans got them through the intermediary of Tongan Marriage exchanges ...’.

---
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In the Leutogi tale the person Fa’asega breaks the Tongan dominance in trade and political power of Tonga in the south, as he comes from uniting with the west. ‘Fa’asega completes a circle around the triangle: he brings titles back to Samoa as his mother’s gift rather than via marriage exchanges that served the needs of the Tongan royals.’

Towards the end of the article Mageo looks at other ‘origin myths’ that are likewise tales of cultural identity. She notes an origin myth about bats that postdates Leutogi’s tale, the winged Fijians who plundered Malietoa Faiga’s yam plantations. This is the first time in the narrative that Mageo gives any definitive historical (or mythological) time line. Again the source is Brother Henry and the details including the ‘postdating’ are only contained in a footnote. She notes that Henry divides the history of Samoa into three periods, based on genealogical reckoning. ‘The first is an originary period that includes the Leutogi story and, somewhat later, Malietoa’s overthrow of the TuiTonga’s regime. The second period, which Henry dates as 1250-1550, is the period in which the Tafa’ifa developed and includes Malietoa Faiga as an early figure.’

The essence of the Malietoa story is the overthrow of the Tongans by Tuna and Fata and the centralisation of Samoa due to the united effort to evict the Tongans, although the degree of centralisation that occurred and whether the Tongans were evicted on a national level is disputed by some. Mageo notes that Gunson argued that ‘many Samoan high chiefs were relatives of Tongan royals’ and ‘since they were affines, Samoan chiefs enlisted Tongan aid in war and Tongans thereby secured continuing influence and even suzerainty over Samoa’. The point that Mageo stresses is that the story has relevance for the twentieth century – and is one of many tales of national identity relevant to the struggle with and eviction of foreign powers.

The story of the winged Fijians places Samoa as the dominant partner among the three island groups of Samoa, Tonga and Fiji and challenges the idea of Tongan dominance that is the ‘regional scholarly model’. Malietoa nets the Fijians, changes them into bats and ‘chases these bats to Tonga’. ‘Bats as Winged Fijians who fly via Samoa to become the [Tongan] king’s sacred bird again reconstellate the idea of a trading triangle’. Samoa is at the apex with movement being ‘towards and away from

---

17 Mageo, 25.
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Samoa’. Mageo does not assert that Samoa was the apex — but neither was Fiji or Tonga necessarily the apex or dominant centre of the triangle. Rather she notes that each of them perceives ‘their own culture at the centre’.

Mageo, towards the end of the article notes that Leutogi’s Tonumaipe’a bore ‘an incipient idea of a cultural identity back to Samoa. Over the centuries that followed Tongan domination, Leutogi’s descendants achieved the political centrality represented in Samoa’s culture identity glyph — the ring of indents around a centre.’ She states that:

Tonumaipe’a was a family of orators in Savai’i through whose political machinations a title that was truly isomorphic with that of the Tuitoga was forged. As the story goes, Nafanua, a spirit who was a member of the Tonumaipe’a line, garnered the four sacred district titles (the papa founded by Pili) in exchange for her assistance in war. Her favourite human was a high-born woman of the Tonumaipe’a, Levalasi to whom she gave these titles. Levalasi adopted a girl named Salamasina and conferred Nafanua’s titles on her because Salamasina’s ancestry confederated all four papa.

The holders of the four papa titles is given the honour of the tafa ‘ifā, akin to paramountcy or national leadership — akin to the Tuitoga in Samoa. Mageo talks more about this relationship and notes that ‘Salamasina (like Malioto) fights with and overcomes the Tongans.

Mageo’s narrative is instructive in evaluating a charter story and its implications in cultural identity. I have given an extensive summary because it reveals the benefits of examining a tale from a structuralist/post structuralist viewpoint. The narrative, however seems devoid of an historical context, apart from being placed in an ‘originary period’ (early in the period prior to AD 1250), yet having relevance in a much latter period, i.e. the time of Levalasi and Salamasina who are treated as ‘real’ people, while at the same time Nafanua, a spirit, was responsible for the elevation.

Mageo only considers two accounts of the original story — the Henry account that is given in full, and Krämer, whose account only differs slightly from that of Henry and is alluded to briefly. There are no other comparative accounts, which would show the diversity and bias within the accounts. Furthermore, there are no genealogies presented or honorifics discussed. Neither is there any indication as to how this ‘family of

20 Ibid., 27.
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orators’ produced its most influential member – a spirit named Nafanua, who ‘favoured’ Levalasi, who then managed to unite the papa of Samoa in the person of Salamasina.

The Tonumaipe’a title is not a tulafale or orator title, it is an ao or district title. It is sometimes even referred to as a papa title itself. Tonumaipe’a in the genealogy is the high chief or ali’i of the ‘sacred family or ‘tapuaiga’. Tauili’ilili is another key ali’i title associated with the Tonumaipe’a and the Tilomai title is the sa’oaualuma or taupou title of the Tonumaipe’a. Mageo does not discuss these two titles at all. The papa were not founded by Pili, they came about due to political marriages and historical events well after the ‘ordering of the districts by Pili’, which is only one origin story of early political divisions in Samoa. The challenge is to accept the benefits of ‘reading’ a tale using various means of comparative analysis and structuralist/post-structuralist and modernist insights without confining the story within the limitations of a simple (single) narrative. The only way to do this is to extensively examine other variants of the tale and examine the titles within an historical construct using genealogies, honorifics and historical accounts of the origin of the Tonumaipe’a title and its importance in Samoa.

Many accounts are similar to the Krämer and Henry version. The wording of the Krämer and Henry versions is so similar that it seems likely that Henry used the Krämer story as a base and added detail from accounts he may have heard. Certainly Henry had access to the Krämer monograph and the genealogical list of the five key families, including the Tonumaipe’a that Henry includes in his history of Samoa, is directly from Krämer, with the descendants being numbered in the same way.

A quite different account is found in the Churchill genealogies, although many of the features in the story are similar. The account stresses that Leutogitupa’itea was with the Tuitoga and killed the child of her rival, a Tongan woman, at the bathing pool with the ‘tuaniu’ or coconut midrib, which she ‘thrust down into the fontanelle of the head’ of the baby. In the Churchill account, Leutogi lied and said that the baby was hit by a branch of ironwood. The Churchill account also places her on the island before being burned. She was placed there by the Tuitoga to starve, but she was assisted by the aitu Saveasi’uleo rather than Losi, who said to her, ‘why has a man far away done this thing to you? But come now, I will go to fetch you food’. A significant difference is then revealed as Churchill’s informant reveals that by this time Leutogi was pregnant to the Tuitoga. The meaning of Tau’ilii’ili, one of the three titles that Leutogi got from the
barren island is explained in the text of the story, as there were no banana leaves on the island to cover the oven or umu.

Leutogi, having survived, was then ordered by the Tuitoga to be burnt alive. Again the aitu Saveasi’uleo came to her and said ‘do not fear if you are fetched, but go on with them’. The aitu in this account was the protector of Leutogi. It was through Saveasi’uleo’s intervention that Leutogi survived. As with the account of Henry, she was saved by the bats because they ‘made water’ or urinated on the fire and she was saved. Hence the name Tonumaip’e’a, as it was the decision of the bats that Leutogi lived. There is no mention of the Tilomai title in the Churchill account. The story ends quite differently, for Leutogi bore a child to the Tuitoga while she was on the island. The Tuitoga went to look at his and Leutogi’s little girl ‘which was handsomer than his son which died’. Then ‘his love was renewed to Leutogi and her child and they again formed one family’.23

Meleisea et al. record another legend which ‘tells of Leutogitupa’itea, the daughter of Lafailapaitagata from Pouliafata in the village of Vaisala who married Tuitoga Niutamatou. Their son, known as To’osega or Fa’aasega, brought the ao title, Tonumaip’e’a to Samoa’.24 Tuitoga Niutamatou is a very early Tuitoga and in most accounts is recalled as a ‘stick of wood’. He was the issue of Tala’atama, who slept with his sister.25 Tuitoga Tu’itatui enticed his sister upstairs and the blood dripped down from the deflowering. The word ‘to’i peka is the word used for the blood of defloration.26 The stick of wood is also recorded in a solo recalling a mother’s pride in the Malo of her son. That child was Lafai Taulupo’o, the brother of Leutogitupa’itea. The language is evasive, but one piece of advice from Taulupo’o’s mother was to ‘speak to your father and friend the stick of wood’.27 This story has similarities with the accounts of Taema and Tilafaiga, the mother of Nafanua who sailed with their father, a stick of wood between the various islands of Fiji, Tonga and Samoa. The stick of wood is linked to fertility and taboo. He represents an originary union that is one of incest, just like the incest that created Nafanua. The taboo union is mirrored again in Samoan history. The union produces powerful aitu, pure bloodlines and powerful titles. In

---

25 Personal communication with ‘Okusitino Mahina, June 1991.
26 Personal communication with Morgan Tuimaleali’ifano, June 1991.
27 Lafai Sauoiga, O le Mavaega i leTai, Western Samoa, 1988, 34.
Tonga, as in Samoa, the union between close blood relations is meant to exist on a symbolic level. But when the taboo is broken a powerful person with divine attributes eventuates.

The union of another Tuitoga, this time a significant time later in the genealogies, occurs that also mirrors the origin of the Tonumaipe’a title. A Tongan source also gives an account of Leutogi and the Tonumaipe’a title. Fetunai examines the genealogical table of elites in both Tonga and Samoa. According to his account, Leutogi was sent from Manu’a as a tributary bride for the 9th Tuitoga, Afumei’oluga. She was the granddaughter of the Tuimanu’a Momo, who, at that time had hegemony over both Samoa and Tonga. According to Fetunai,

Leutogi and Afu had no children, so Leutogi adopted one of Afu’s children, probably a concubine. She named the child Momo, after her Grandfather’s name. There was another son, whose mother was a chief (eiki) and it was more likely that he would be next king. One day Leutogi went with the mother of the other child to Afaa, the well. Leutogi killed the child with ‘her comb and pressed it upon the child[’]s head’. Leutogi then left the child and ran away.28

As a result they – the Tuitoga is not specifically mentioned – were to punish her by having her burnt on the island of Motutapu. She was tied to a fetau tree at Motutapu and set fire to. She was saved by the Tuimanu’a who ‘sent a mob of flying foxes, being led by a white flying fox’ to rescue her. The bats extinguished the fire by urinating upon it and ‘bit on the strings which tied Leutogi and set her free’. They also brought her food in the form of ifi nuts.

‘Meanwhile Afu, the Tuitonga was unable to sleep. He missed Leutogi very much’. There was a tapu on the island because both the son of the Tuitoga and the daughter of the Tuimanu’a were dead. But the Tuitoga was informed by a fisherman, who had passed the island, that Leutogi may still be alive. The Tuitoga still enforced the tabu over the island. ‘This may be the reason why the island is called Motutapu, or perhaps it was because Fasi’apule and the dead body [of the child] had landed there’. Afu then went across during the night in a canoe to the island and found Leutogi there, together with a set of twins, which she had borne. One twin was named Tonumaipe’a – rescued by the flying fox – and the other Tau’ilili’ili. ‘Tonumaipe’a was a high chief in one part

28 Fetunai, Kolovai, ‘The genealogy of the beginnings of the chiefs of Samoa and Tonga’, which is a transcript from the Ata family book (circa 1890s?), 9f, Niel Gunson collection’.
of Savai’i. The descendant of Tau’ili’ili was Kili, the uncle of Tohu’ia’ who came with Latu from Samoa and formed the Fale Ha’akili. Fetunai adds that it is not known ‘which generation the descendants of the child of Leutogi and Afu (the 9th Tuitoga), who was the uncle of Tohui’a who makes the fourth of the Falefa at Matamoana, Hihifo’, returned to Tonga. Leutogi was responsible for naming the 10th Tuitoga. She named him Momo, after her grandfather’s name – the Tuimanu’a.’29

Interestingly in this account the child of Momo, the Tuitoga Tu’itatui, is said to have slept with his full sister in a ‘two storied house’.

Tuitatu’i forced his sister and had sexual intercourse with her. The blood dribbled down to the lower story where the Fijian maidservant was, and she remarked about the blood. Tu’itatui then replied that it was only the blood from a flying fox’ and the burial place at Heketa, where Tuitatui’s resided at is still called ‘Langi To’ipeka’, [meaning a burial place of the falling bat(s blood)].30

In shame Tu’itatui ran away to Eua and died there. It was also Fasiapule and Tuitatui who went to look for the shells of the tortoise that belonged to Tigelai in the village of Sagone.

In a solo entitled Tapatapaga a Poulifataletagaloa i lana tama, Taulupo’o’s mother sings to him. The language is very decorative and evasive. She sings of the victory of his government. Taulupo’o and his people were threatened by Safata. Taulupo’o was chased by Tuisamoa (from Safata), although Taulupo’o found refuge there. The mother’s advice was to return to Savai’i and establish his government there and to return to Muliagalapaitagata. The meaning of Muliagalapaitagata comes from Muliaga, the descendant of Fotulafai and Lapaitagata refers to the ‘meeting of aitu’.31 Lañai Taulupo’o’s connection continued with Safata and Tonumaipe’a Sauoaiga married into Safata.

The name of Tonumaipe’a Sauoaiga’s wife was Le atogaua o Tuitoga. Literally this means the ‘basket made of the turtleshell of the Tuitoga’. In the genealogy her father is named as Sanalala and her grandfather the Tuitoga. Leatogaua lived in Safata. The name is curious and there are stories in Tonga of Tuitoga Tuitatui who had intercourse

29 Fetunai, ‘Genealogy of the beginnings’, 9f.
30 Fetunai, 10. Fetunai explains the English term for Lagi as burial place but does not translate the meaning of ‘To’ipeka’. The translation in the text therefore is mine based on the meaning of the account.
31 Lañai Sauoaiga, Mavaega i leTai, 34. I thank Asofou So’o for the translation.
with his sister and ‘told his Fijian maid that it was only the blood of the flying foxes’, who went with Fasiapule to ‘look for the shells of the Tortoise which belonged to Sinilau in the village of Sagone’. The village of Sagone is in the alataua region on the south-western side of Savai’i in the district of Salega. The Salega district has Satupa’itea as its capital and consists of the village communities of Sagone, Vaipu’a, Fai’a’ai and Samata. In Tongan stories Hinehengi, a ‘Pulotu maiden’ from Fiji, landed in Tonga with her mother, Sagone, a turtle. In Samoa, Lekapai, decided to wage war against Tonga. He went to Tonga and married Hinehengi and returned to Samoa on the back of his mother in law, the turtle named Sagone. On her arrival in Samoa, however, the people of Savai’i ‘killed and ate her’ and buried her shell. The village was then named Sagone. The Tongan legendary figure Lo’au was witness to the event and Lafai from Samoa. Lo’au returned to Tonga and reported the event to Tuitoga Tuitatui, who then sent his half brother, Fasi’apule to Samoa to return the shell. Lafai showed the Tongans the burial site and the shell was exhumed, and Lafai – due to Lo’au – ‘collapsed and died’. Then Fasi’apule and his party returned to Tonga.

The composite name of the wife of the first recognised Tonumaipe’a, Sauoaiga, link Tonga to Samoa and produce three of the most celebrated siblings of Samoa. Tupa’i Tauili’ili and Tupa’i, with the assistance of Nafanua, gain all four papa, the major titles of Samoa. Samoa, represented by Sagone and the Tonumaipe’a clan, defeated the Tongans at the time of Tuitatui, a tale that seems to link a number of elements of the origin story. The revenge upon Samoa and possible expansion of Tonga into Samoa could also be a possibility. The compromise – and eventual victory of Samoa over Tonga – is represented by the marriage of Tonumaipe’a Sauoaiga with the basket made of the turtle shell of the Tuitoga. Their children establish and legitimise the political structure of Samoa.

In the recent Tuiatua title case that focussed heavily upon the rights and privileges of orators and aiga after Nafanua restored the papa, there is no mention of Tonga at all. In Brother Henry the Tongan presence is mentioned, but it remains unclear how strong the Tongan presence was. According to a Tongan account of the interrelationship between Tonga and Samoa, Fetunai states Tuitoga Puipuifata’s son, Seiuliali’i lived with ‘Uhila and had Tunamafono, whose descendant was Tuimaleali’ifano, later to become
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33 ‘Okusitino Mahina, ‘The Tongan Traditional History Tala – e fonua’, PhD, ANU, 36f for a full account.
Tuia’ana. The children of ‘Uhila were Tuia and Ama. The daughter of Ama was
Tohui’a and Tohui’a was Latu Ngata’s mother.34

Levalasi is famous throughout Samoa as being the person who was really eligible to
become the tafa’ifa. She is often said to have been Tuia’ana Tamalelagi’s taupou.
Normally it is said that upon the Tonumaipe’a clan gaining the papa, Levalasi’s name
was changed to So’oa’emalelagi, indicating her rise in status. So’oa’e is the more
commonly used form in Upolu. By using this form of Levalasi’s name, it allows Atua
and A’ana to claim Levalasi as their own. Certainly in recent writings, like that of
Tupua, Levalasi is seen as the chosen one of Nafanua. She is from the Tonumaipe’a
line and her achievements were due to assistance from Nafanua, and the intervention of
her brother Tupa’i who was the intermediary between the Tonumaipe’a clan and
Nafanua. No recent writings have drawn a connection between the alataua regions of
Safata and Savai’i, nor any Tongan connections made. Indeed, in many discussions I
have had in Samoa, there is fierce resistance to admitting any real influence in Samoa
by Tongans after Talakaifaiki was evicted by the first Malietoa. A Tongan connection
in a genealogy can indeed be an insult. In one discussion with a leading Manono orator
there was a certain frustration in his comment. He stated that his ancestors were now
considered ‘too Tongan’.

A detailed Samoan account comes from a direct descendant of Tonumaipe’a Sauoaiga,
named Lafai Sauoaiga.35 Leutogitupa’itea had an older brother Tonumaipe’a Lafai
Taufolepo’o. In this account the Tuitoga had heard of Leutogi’s beauty. The Tuitoga
was staying at Fagaloa (Upolu) at the time and sailed west to visit her. The Tuiatua of
the time advised the Tuitoga to be careful due to the dangerous nature and cruelty of his
father, Lafai senior. Before the Tuitoga arrived, Leutogi’s father was warned by his aitu
that Tuitoga was on his way. Lafai was also informed by his people in Tufu and
Ulusuati (the house site of Taufalematagi and Alao) that boats were arriving. Leutogi’s
father said to Folasaitu to prepare for warriors if needed. The intentions of the Tuitoga
to wed Leutogi were agreed to by everybody involved and in a few weeks they left
Samoa. Before he left the Tuitoga was amazed to see how organized and brave Lafai
was in terms of the many caves and forts that he had built, as well as the many bats he

34 Fetunai, ‘Genealogy of the beginnings’, 12.
35 Lafai Sauoaiga, O le Mavaeaga i le Tai, Mahaa Printing and Publishing, Apia, Western Samoa, 1988, 26-
31. I thank Asofou So’o for the translation, and discussion, of this account.
had. Tuitoga said to Lafai, ‘You will be the first Ao (Tonumaipe’a) title holder after he
had seen the many bats’ and told him that he would be famous.

When Lafai bid his sister farewell he told her that ‘if you feel threatened remember your
“tiamalo”, a type of war club, and break it and let it sink into the sea and I will know
that you need help’. This ti’amalo was Lafai’s favourite club and was also the
embodiment of his god.36 Lafai also had two other female spirits – Papaga and La’autu,
meaning the rocks that speak and the wood that talks. These two ilamutu were the
reason Lafai Taulupo’o won his wars. For when he travelled in his boat the ilamutu
from the wood would inhabit his club and Papaga, the other spirit became a dark stone
that sat and moved around beneath Lafai’s seat.

Two years on, Lafai sensed something wrong regarding Leutogi because the ilamutu,
Laautautala (La’auta), was wet, as though weeping tears. The following morning
Lafai’s ilamutu told him that his club had been broken and Papaga foretold that Leutogi
was going to be burned. So Lafai called upon his ilamutu to awaken the aitu of the
underworld, Pulotu, to inhabit all of his bats (pe’a).

In Tonga Leutogi’s joy with her husband had dwindled because she had not borne a
child and she killed the child of the Tuitoga’s Tongan wife. She knew she would die.
But she remembered what her brother had said and buried the ti’amalo in the sea just
before the Tuitoga’s servants were to take her to Tongatapu to burn her to death. The
Tuitoga’s seat of government was at Neiafu, the capital of Vava’u. Leutogi was taken
to Tongatapu, however, which was the place where the Tuitoga fought with other chiefs
and the capital of Neiafu was later transferred to Tongatapu.

Leutogi was left at the island to be burnt while the Tuitoga went to attend the burial of
his son. Leutogi looked to Samoa for help and finally through the smoke the two
ilamutu, along with other aitu who had inhabited the bats, came and urinated on the fire.
As they were urinating, they also made fearful noises to scare the Tuitoga and his
warriors as then there were no bats in Tonga. The Tuitoga and his warriors were scared
and talked among themselves and soon darkness fell. They looked up at the sky and
saw thousands of bats, so they screamed and ran for their lives. The warriors ran to the
Tuitoga who was already scared himself and became more frightened when he

36 In Samoan, ‘E avea ma sana tupua’.
remembered the bats in Samoa and feared that the Samoans may know about the attempt to burn Leutogi. If Leutogi were to survive, it would mean that he would be defeated by Lafaitaulupo’o and his bats.

The Tuitoga noticed that Leutogi seemed to be conversing with people and the bats had disappeared from the tree under which Leutogi was being burned and had moved to another tree nearby. So the Tuitoga told his warriors to crawl up to Leutogi to see if she was dead. He told them that if she was still alive, they should drag her towards him. It was too late to get Leutogi as two of the bats, the two ilamutu of Lafai Taulupo’o had gnawed the string holding Leutogi and she was freed. Because of their exposure to the smoke the two bats turned white and to this day there are only two white bats in Tonga. Also to this day the royal family in Tonga speak of these bats coming from Satupa’itea, Savai’i. Not only were the titles Tonumape’a and Tauiliili won, but also the name of the Tuitoga’s capital, Neiafu was acquired. Lafai, due to the victory, brought the name Neiafu back from Tonga and renamed Satupa’itea Neiafu. The descendants of Lafai also have their land in Falealupo called Pa Pe’a. This land has since been given to the pastor of the Wesleyan Church.

As a result of the victory over the Tuitoga, Folasaitu and Moemoe were well supported. During these years Matautia and his village of Fogasavai’i were unrelenting in the service of their niece Mooui. People came from all over the country to pay homage to Tonu Lafaitaulupo’o. From that occasion his descendant received his name, Sauoiaga, as his family came to pay homage to him. 37

The final account is from Faleauto Fotu in Lepa, another Samoan account. In this version it is not Leutogi, but Maupeni, the daughter of Lauulu in Tufu and Poulitaua who married the Tuitoga. ‘This woman, Maupeni, was taken and placed on a barren island to Fa’aletuli to the Tuitoga and she lived on the islet with her child Leaumoaga. On that island [the titles] Tauili’ili and the Tonumape’a were established’. The child Leaumoaga married Levalasi producing Tonumaip’ea and the child Tauili’ili by his second union with Fuaielagi of Vailele. It was Tau’ili’ili who married Taufau, the sister of Sina’. 38

37 Sauoiaga, 33.
38 F. Fotu (Lepa) in Grattan Genealogies, MS Papers, 4879-072, ATL.
In examining a variety of accounts, certain commonalities are revealed. In all cases the scene is set in Tonga. The origin accounts, like that of the origin of the Tagaloa title, are ‘set’ in a most distant time period, and the actions of the gods are pivotal in Samoa gaining the titles from Tonga. Mageo understands that Losi is actually a Tongan god. It was assumed by the Tuitoga that Losi would ‘eat her’. Losi, however, in Samoan *tala* is always represented as a Samoan deity. As far as I am aware there is no Losi, or the Tongan equivalent ‘Lohi’, in Tongan stories. Why Losi is added in the Henry version is unknown. The fact that Losi is an integral part of the narrative is important in that the Tuitoga did not realise that this powerful presence was on Leutogi’s side. In Samoan *tala*, Losi is viewed as trickster god. He is said to be responsible for bringing both taro and coconut to Samoa, ‘having purloined them from the gods through his cunning in battle’.39 Stuebel also gives an explanation of the account. He states that Losi concealed the small taro shoot ‘below his prepuce so that the people of Tagaloa who searched him, found nothing, beat him and chased him down to earth.’40 Losi, having become so furious gathered together other *aitu* – among them the famous Samoan *aitu*, Moso and the Fe’e, or octopus. Together they overcame ‘the traps of the Tagaloa people’. Losi and his fellow *aitu* attacked the Tagaloa people and forced them to flee and ‘thus secured the coconut, the banana and the breadfruit and brought them to earth’.41 Turner also has an account along a similar vein in which Losi overcomes the ‘Tagaloans’.42

In the Churchill account, it is Saveasi’uleo who comes to the aid of Leutogi. Saveasi’uleo, the Samoanized form of the Tongan ‘Havea Hikule’o’, intervenes on Leutogi’s behalf ensuring one of her first victories over the Tuitoga. Similarly the account by Lafai Sauoaiga notes that the majority of the bats came from Pulotu, the mirrorworld. In nearly all accounts and explanations of Pulotu, Saveasi’uleo is seen as king of this mirrorworld. The essence of both these accounts is that Tonga is overcome by Samoa due to intervention by the gods. Nafanua becomes the apical ancestor of the Tonumaipe’a line. Her father, Saveasiuleo, is responsible for her becoming the ancestor of the line and in most genealogies it is Nafanua who is presented as having married the Tuitoga Manaia. The issue of these two, the Tuitoga and the Samoan deity Nafanua, brings reward in Samoa because of her cunning and renown as a warrior. She becomes

40 Stuebel, 142; Krämer, *The Samoa Islands*, Vol 2, 156.
the embodiment of successive title-holders and the genealogy of the origins of the title (see over page) stems from her.

The subsequent title holders – until Tonumaipe’a Sauoaiga are all female. Nafanua is the deity who lives through these women and this culminates in Nafanua being the most powerful woman in Samoa at the time of Salamasina, apart from Salamasina herself. Salamasina is the first person to receive all the four papa or leading titles required for national leadership in Samoa. Levalasi, the descendant of Nafanua is the rightful heir. Salamasina receives the papa, however, but only because she becomes the adopted daughter of Levalasi who wishes for her to accept the titles.

The Samoan deities, and Saveasi’uleo are, as noted, pivotal in the mana struggle between the Tuitoga and Levalasi. In this sense the ‘mother of titles’ is really the daughter of Savea, king of Pulotu, namely Nafanua. The relationship with Tonga and Tongan dominance in the group is ended by a supreme victory with Samoan deities beating the Tongan ones. On the island it is Saveas’ileo (or Losi) that allows Leutogi to survive. The next great test, surviving the fire, was also achieved by Saveasi’uleo by him sending the bats from his world, Pulotu, to urinate on the fire.

The victory is epitomised in the Samoans appropriating the Tongan cosmological beings. These cosmological beings are the ones who provide spiritual sanction for the Tonumaipe’a line. Their assistance provides the raison d’être for legitimacy. One of the apical ancestors and principal god of the Tuitonga is Havea Hikuleo. The Tuitoga and Havea Hikuleo suffer the ultimate defeat, being beaten by their own god - Savea Si’uleo. Havea has become a Samoan god, progenitor of the key deity of the Tonumaipe’a, the goddess Nafanua, Savea’s daughter. Samoan dominance is achieved by turning the god of the Tuitoga against himself and becoming a Samoan one. The origin story can then be read in this light. The mana challenges that Mageo talks about between Losi (the Tuitoga’s god) against Samoa hides the message that the god Losi – or in the other two accounts Savea Si’uleo and the bats from Pulotu – are able to conceal motives and by supernatural cunning impose a new order in the relationship between the islands. It is the Spirits who have the ability to do this – not the human beings in the story.
Origin accounts in Samoa reveal that in order for major titles to achieve dominance, human interaction is insufficient. In the previous chapter, Tagaloa received the title, along with his servers and the coconut water-holders from the great god Tagaloalagi. The dating back of genealogies to interrelationships between gods and humans and their subsequent descendants are common in all maximal lines. In a western sense this ‘predating’ seems strange. But many great cultures maintain elite status because they are said to be the offspring of the gods. Also common in societies where genealogical connections are essential in proving one’s status, the further back the genealogical line goes is the most important indicator of that title’s status.

The Malietao title is a simple case in point. The story of the origin of the title does not involve either a union or a result of the interaction between gods and humans. The story – and in almost all cases the origin story is consistent – the title was the result of the words of Tuitoga Talafei’i upon leaving Samoa in defeat. His words were ‘Malietao Malietao, meaning ‘well fought brave warriors’. The Tuitoga may well have achieved god-like status, but the event is portrayed as having occurred in a distinct ‘historical’ moment. The title achieved status due to its historical importance, namely the end of Tongan domination in Samoa. But it is unusual as an origin story because of it being comparatively recent in genealogical terms. The story is accompanied by a genealogy that then dates as far back as the Tui A’ana title, for example with Tagaloalagi at the apex.

Samoan genealogies are kept in the notebooks of many orators in Samoa even to the present. The two features that distinguish these genealogies are length of line – even when the orator belongs to an offshoot of an original line. The other is the importance of extremely high-ranking marriages. One of the great families of Atua for instance, Safenunuivao is the result of key marriages of a high-ranking woman (Fenuunuivao) with a high-ranking male.

The importance of women in genealogical lines is again represented in women, who in the majority of accounts of warfare, even in to the 20th century are responsible for assistance in warfare. It is the wife’s family who provide this assistance and receive rewards in terms of status. Women also have the ability to punish offenders through spiritual means. A woman, normally a maternal aunt or ilamutu, has the ability to cause physical harm to her husband and her husband’s family by making them ill if she feels
aggrieved. The *feagaiga* or sacred relationship between a brother and sister is extended to that between a husband and his wife’s family. In Sauoaiga’s account of the origin if the Tonumaip’ea title, it is the *ilamutu* who are the key players in the Tuitoga’s defeat. In the most quoted tales in Samoa, often referred to as *fagogo*, it is nearly always the maternal aunt of the hero who comes to the rescue in any altercation between the male and female hero in the story.

Nafanua, in the Sauoaiga’s publication *Mavaega i le Tai*, is the recurrent figure who intervenes on the family’s account. She is constantly referred to as the *Feagaiaga* or the *Feagaiga o Tina*. She is the one who wields the power behind the scenes. Also in Sauoaiga’s publication, she is one of the few women who are given this status. This may well be because it was written in the 1980s. It reflects a male bias – and also a Christian one. It does provide a brief genealogy up to the time of Tonumaipe’a Taulupo’o to Tonumaipe’a Sauoaiga, but also a replica of title holders back to the time of Nafanua and her ‘parents’ Alao and Taufalematagi. This genealogy is an abbreviated version of the one in Krämer or Brother Henry, but disguises Nafanua’s father, Saveasi’uleo (Genealogy 1). The difference is that in the Sauoaiga genealogy, only the title holders are listed, not their marriages, and there is no indication that these title-holders are women. Also the ‘hero’ of most accounts is the female Leutogi (or Nafanua), whose descendant, Levalasi is also a female. Sauoaiga downplays both Leutogi and Levalasi. Sauoaiga emphasises the males. He does, however, see the importance of Tonumaipe’a’s wife in the elevation of the title – for this could not be ignored. It is possible that Levalasi is downplayed because she ‘slept with her cousin’. This, in Christian terms is a sin, and therefore unacceptable.

There also exists considerable variance in the genealogical origins of the Tonumaipe’a and Tau’ili’ili titles. There are three distinct genealogies that are quite different within the Krämer monograph itself, although the one favoured is the one revealing the spiritual origin, with Saveasiule’o as progenitor. His daughter, the result of incest then marries the Tuitogamanina and produces heirs (genealogy 1). That Krämer favours this account is evident in his inclusion of this account in his final table linking the five maximal lines towards the end of Volume 1 of his monograph. Henry also includes

45 Krämer, *The Samoa Islands*, 646f.
this exact genealogy and favours this account in his table of the five maximal lines, although in the latter he does not add the partners of the title-holders, nor the gender, which is indicative of the failure to reveal the importance of high-ranking women and also male bias.\textsuperscript{47} Sauoaiga, likewise gives a genealogical table, without marriages or gender based on either the Krämer or Henry publications (or both). The most obvious discrepancy between the story and the genealogies is that in the story it is Leutogi that marries the Tuitoga Manaia, while Nafanua marries the Tuitoga Manaia in the genealogies. The resultant offspring is also different.

The divergent genealogies, like the divergent stories of origin reveal a very important facet of Samoan history and how Samoans view their origins. The most exalted of Samoan society are the sacred chiefs, even though a lot of their ‘sacred nature’ has diminished since the impact of the new chiefly class of Missionaries since the 1830s. The other exalted class are the orators – and in particular what may be termed the ‘orator-priests’ – who have an extensive knowledge of where they fit into the ever unfolding tableau of the political and spiritual chess game aimed at outmanoeuvring one’s opponents. Often enough the earliest feature of origin stories is for the progenitor of the title to exact payment or reward by outmanoeuvring the gods themselves. Fune received reward from Tagaloalagi; the Tonumaipe’a because Nafanua and her embodiment – the orator priests could outplay the machinations of their opponents and their opponents’ gods.

The Tonumaipe’a line won the power from Nafanua to establish government and they were the administrators. But the Tonumaipe’a inheritance produced a lot of heirs. Sauoaiga, for instance downplays Leutogi and does not even mention her progeny. Lafaitaulupo’o is the victor, not Leutogi. Sauoaiga, though is a descendant of Lafaitaulupo’o, not the result of the offspring of Leutogi. His allegiance is obvious. Sauoaiga sees the Malo being established by Lafaitaulupo’o and his descendants were all male. He does not agree that the first Tonumaipe’a is Sauoaiga, the grandson of Taulupo’o, but is Taulupo’o himself.\textsuperscript{48} Furthermore the progeny of Leutogi are implicitly Tongan; as with a number of the other accounts examined, the Tuitoga (and later the Tuikanokupolu) did have high-ranking wives from Samoa and intermarriage among high-ranking elites from both countries did continue into the 19th century.

\textsuperscript{47} Genealogy of the Tonumaipe’a line: Henry, \textit{History of Samoa}, 44f; The Main Lines of Savai’i and Upolu, 87.

\textsuperscript{48} See Sauoaiga, \textit{Mavaega i le Tai}.
By 1980, however, the uniting of Tongan and Samoan elites and the resultant elevation in status of both sides had given way to isolation from one another. The history of contact produced division between the groups and the artificial boundaries between them became real. Even by the time Krämer was writing, there seems to be reluctance by Samoans to push their Tongan heritage. After all Krämer was above all a ‘collector of traditions’. It is not Krämer who is telling the stories, but Samoans themselves. Krämer’s work is merely a compilation, which includes the bias of his informants, even though it is also affected by his bias against Sa Malietoa or the Malietoa family, and his favourable treatment of Sa Tupua, especially Mata’afa who he considered to be the primary Tupua candidate to lead the Malo – or government of the time.

Another element in the Krämer monograph that becomes clear is his attempt to ‘make sense’ of the genealogies and associated traditions. He numbers his genealogies and chooses the genealogies and stories that seem to be follow a logical outcome. His scientific background and belief in applying this method to ‘ethnology’, certainly simplifies the complexity of the Samoan past. He numbers the generations and produces a relatively ‘consistent’ account of Samoa’s past. The variants rarely emerge. One elite line where a great degree of divergence is with the Tonumaipe’a genealogies and these deserve discussion.

Apart from the genealogy with Nafanua as progenitor, there are two separate genealogies given with purely human characters. In the first of these accounts, the parents of Lafaitaulupo’o and Leutogi are Poulifataiatagaloa and Le Muliaga, hence the two are descendants of Muliagalafai, the youngest child of Lafai and Mata’uiatali.49 The marriages of Taulupo’o are only placed in the appendix and no further descendants are discussed. The most important of these is included, however, and this is the marriage of Lafaitaulupo’o to Momoitanumaga, daughter of Va’aoti in Falelima, whom Krämer notes is the real ancestor of the Tonumaipe’a line. The first version is actually similar to that of Sauoiga’s account. The line and its importance are undeveloped and there is no connection to future descendants. It also appears unusual that the founder of the line is said to be from outside the actual Tonumaipe’a inheritance, and has no connection to Leutogi – and no apparent connection to Nafanua.

49 Krämer, The Samoa Islands, Vol 1,122.
GENEALOGY OF THE TONUMAIPE’A LINE (#1)

Saveasiuleo — Pi’ilua (Tilafaiga)

Nafanua — Tuitogamanaia

Latuivai (f) — Mimisapu’a (Fai’a’ai)

Lilomaiaava Seve (Safotu) — Taigalugalu (f)

Foalo(f) — Lolgaapivao (Samata)

Maisina (f) — Fouafa’asani (Tuamasaga)

Leanui(f) — Leuluafi (Fogasavai’i)

Lafainatu (Palauli) — Mo’oui (f) [Acc to Krämer, Mo’oui is the real founder of the TMP Line]

Leato-ugauga-a-Tuitoga d.o Sanalala (Safata) — Sauoaiga

Moeleoi — Liutogitui — Tau’ili’ili — Tupa’i vailigi — Levalasi (f) (also known as So’oaemalelagi)

Tuactali — TMP Saumaipe’a — Valasiologa (f)

Fausiatamari (d.o. La’ulu, Gataval)

Tapumanaia — Salamasina

(f) Fofaivao’ese

(f) Sina. (f) Taufau
The second genealogy (genealogy 2) seems to fit more neatly into Krämer’s account of the origin of the title. The heirs of the title are named from the child of Leutogi and the Fijian or Wallisian king, Fa’aasega. The marriage of Fa’aasega to Leutogitui, the daughter of Folasa of Falelima, described as the first orator of Falelima, ensured that Folasa ‘received from his son in law the rights to confer the Tonumaipae’a title’. He was also ‘first to receive this right’.  

The table also shows female descent, like other Tonumaipae’a genealogies, but it is also much more condensed. Perhaps more clear is that again the female inheritance is passed, after Fa’aasega, to Finetele and her daughters. One of these daughters produces Fusilagitele, who then marries Lau’ulunofovaleane from Tufu Gatavai and produces Tuaetali, the husband of Tonumaipae’a Saumaipe’a. In this sense Tonumaipae’a is marrying his own relation. Furthermore Fulisailagitele was also married to Tamalelagi, the father of Salamasina. There is no specific mention of Tonumaipae’a Sauoaiaga and the generations presented between Fa’aasega and Fulisailagitele is only three. This can be read then in two ways; as a condensed genealogy or indicative of a relatively recent genealogy, if one dates back from the time of Tuaetali. It could also be read as a genealogy supplied by a non-member of the Tonumaipae’a clan, or one who wishes to ensure his descent is emphasised. This fact can be seen in that Krämer notes that it is Sataua who has the right to confer the title, an assertion which would be disputed by the majority of the Tonumaipae’a family. (See Genealogy 2, over page).

The marriage of Fusilagitele to Lau’ulunofovaleane produced Tuaetali who married Tonumaipae’a Sauoaiaga, but another marriage of Lau’ulunofovaleane to Pouliotaua produced Maupenei. Maupenei then married the Tuitoga and produced another daughter, named Aumoana, who was the mother of Tau’ili’ili i Papa. He then married Taufa’u, the daughter of Salamasina’s daughter, Fofaivaose!

If one goes back to the last account of the origin of the Tonumaipae’a and Tau’ili’ili titles, that account said that it was this Maupeni who was responsible for getting the Tonumaipae’a and Tauili’ili titles on the Tuitoga’s barren island. Furthermore in this account, the child of the Tuitoga and Maupeni was a male named Leauomoaga who married Levalasi, the daughter of Moelia’i in Satupa’itea and produced Tonumaipae’a.

---

GENEALOGY OF THE TONUMAIPE’A LINE (#2)

2A. Leutogitupaitea (f)  Tuiuvea
    Fa’aasega  Leutogitui (d.o. Folasā, Falelima)
    Lefufugatasi (Saleaula)  Finetele (f)
    Tuma’ai (Safotulafai)  Tologauvale (f)  Ului fuga (f)
    Fusilagitele (f)  Lau’ulunofovaleane  Lefaa’anāpulu (Saleolologa)
        Tuaelali (f)  TMP Saumai pe’a  Leuluopō
        Senate (f)  TA

Tamalelagi

2B. Lau’ulunofovaleane (Tufu)  Pouliataua
    Maupeni (f)  Tuitoga
    Leaumoaga  Fuiailelagi

Taufau  Tauili’ili I Papa

TMP = Tonumaipe’a
M = Malietoa
TA = Tuia’ana
d.o. = Daughter of
Tau‘ili‘ili’ was the result of another of his marriages and it was this Tau‘ili‘ili who married Taufau, the granddaughter of Salamasina.  

As seen in the previous genealogy by Krämer, Maupeni does marry the Tuitoga and produces Aumoana (the same name as Leaumoaga), who then produces a son Tau‘ili‘ili i Papa, who marries Taufau. The name Tau‘ili‘ili, who Sauoaiga refers to as the ‘ali‘i o le Aiga, ‘or ‘founding father and chief of the family’ is normally listed as one of the three children of Tonumaipe‘a Sauoaiga. The introduction of the name from a source seemingly from Tonga is revealing. The last story examined states that it is Maupeni, not Leutogi, who received the titles. What seems highly likely is that the relationship between the descendants of Leutogi, represented by their deity Nafanua, sought marriages within the Tongan hierarchy and produced Samoan heirs. Of great importance is that the period prior to Levalasi and Salamasina saw nearly all maximal lines marrying not only the Tuitoga, but the issue of these marriages – the daughters of the Tuitoga marry Samoans – and not Fijians.

When examining the accounts of origin, the majority view is that the father of Leutogi’s child is the Tuitoga. The victory is not escaping tributary wife status but producing heirs from the line of the Tuitoga and transporting the mana of the Tuitoga to Samoa and Samoan genealogical lines. The benefit of the union between the Tuitoga and Leutogi is for Samoa and Samoan descendants. The other factor is that the story has relevance from an originary period up until the time of Salamasina and her descendants. In the Krämer account of the origin of the titles, he notes that Tuitoga Manaia was the brother of Tuitoga Faisautele. Tuitoga Faisautele was not an originary figure. He resided in Samoa a few generations prior to Salamasina and in many genealogies he appears as her grandfather. The story appears ancient but also appears to belong to the historical period at the time of Salamasina. The genealogy also shows that the title Tauili‘ili is first listed at the time of Salamasina. Tilomai first appears in the genealogy some five or six generations later. The story of origin is really a composite potted tale celebrating the mana of the titles. From the ancient Tuitoga Tamatou to the time of Salamasina, the story is a retelling of victory that is relevant. The purpose of a pedigree story is to compact and refashion the story and celebrate the exploits of the key characters and their victory over Tonga.

51 In Grattan, MS Papers, 4879-872, ATL.
Krämer notes that in the period just preceding Salamasina, a number of Tuitoga resided in Samoa in succession. This time period was not necessarily one of Tongan dominance but the daughters of the high-ranking Tuitoga were sought after brides for Samoan chiefs. The period is relatively consistent, and one Tongan historian, Phyllis Herda, has effectively examined Krämer’s Tongan genealogies and found them consistent with Tongan traditions since the time of Talafe’ai who was expelled from Tonga by the first Malietoa. Faisautele and the next five Tuitoga all resided in Samoa and perhaps precipitated the rise of the Tuiha’atakalaua in Tonga. The benefit for Samoa was that not only did these Tuitoga resident in Samoa marry high ranking Samoan women, but their daughters, the Tuitoga fefine marry Samoan men.  

Tuitoga Manaia is a name not found in the Tongan king lists, but a number of sources orally have stated that he was the brother of Tuitoga Faisautele. One of the few differences in the origin of the Leutogitupaitea story is that Kramer also names the brother of Faisautele as Tuitogamaia. Likewise the ‘genealogical spiritual origin’ of the title sees Nafanua marrying the Tuitoga Manaia. In Krämer, Faisautele, known in Tonga as Kaulufonuafekai, married Vainu’ulasi and sired Fa’aulufanua and Ulualofaiaga of Fagaloa. He also married Popoai and Taufaitoa and sired Tuiavi’i, Togiaelei and Puipuifatu, which in Tonga are known as Vakafuhi (the eldest), Puipuifatut and Kaulufonu. The gafa of Lofotaga also places Tuitoga Faisautele and Tuitoga Manaia as brothers. The issue of Vainu’ulasi and Tuitoga Faisautele were Ulualofaiaga and Vaetoea. In the gafa of Ulualofaiaga, it is also stated that Painu’ulasi married Tuitoga Faisautele. Her pedigree is from the Tuimanu’a. The child of the Tuimanu’a—who in this account seems to be female, was a daughter named Ualegalu. She travelled with Aumua and Olotua to Tonga and ‘left the name Seuealaeman’. In Tonga she also received the names Seutausilinu’u and Painu’ulasi from the Tongans on her travels.  

The historical relationship between the Tuimanu’a and the Tuitoga is strong in both Tongan and Manu’an traditions. It almost seems that the title-holder of one of the groups could have been the same as in the other. Certainly the claim from Fetunai is

53 Krämer, The Samoa Islands, Vol 1, 121.  
54 Ibid, 649.  
55 Grattan Collection, MS Papers 4879-072, ATL.  
56 Ibid. I thank Helina Schmidt for this translation. It should also be noted that these accounts are from Samoan sources and do not necessarily reflect the Tongan historical view.
consistent with the dual status of the two paramount chiefs with the emphasis on Leutogi being the daughter of the Tuimanu’a.

The time of Faisautele, however, seems to be more able to be evaluated in a more historical manner than this more ancient version and its merging traditions. From about the time of Faisautele and his descendants who lived in Samoa there is a great deal of consistency in both Tongan and Samoan accounts, although the majority of Tongan accounts say that this was a time of considerable expansion of the ‘Tongan Empire’. A greater level of certainty seems evident in all the various gafa of families and is quite different from the compressed genealogies of earlier times. In terms of the origin of the actual Tonumaipe’a title, we see the names of Tonumaipe’a and, for the first time, Tauili’ili in the genealogy. The establishment of two of the papa are presented as being established in the period also. The two papa tamafafine or female papa – often referred to as the Malietoa papa are the result of the children of Malietoa La’auli, whose true parents were brother and sister, hence his name, meaning ‘step in the dark’. Malietoa Lau’uli married two sisters, who produced two daughters. These two daughters then married Sanalala, the son of Samoanagalo and Fitiamauupoluaga, the daughter of the Tuitoga. Sanalala, according to most sources was taken to Tonga and returned later to Samoa. According to Pratt, he came back to Samoa and lived with his mother in Safata.  

Safata seems to be the hub of activity in Upolu at this time. It is also the home of the daughter of Ama who became the ancestral mother of the first Tuikanokupolu. Also both the Tonumaipe’a regions in Savai’i and Safata in Upolu are the only regions referred to consistently as alataua regions. One of the sisters that Sanalala married was named Gatoaitele who was barren. This same Gatoaitele would give her name to one of the four papa that was necessary for national leadership. It is a title originating from this individual. The other individual who would become the other papa tamafafine is Vaetamasoa, the daughter of Gatoaitele and Sanalala. The papa tamafafine are in what Krämer describes as the historical period, a period in which individuals and their exploits are remembered and can be treated as having historical accuracy. This may be an overstatement, but certainly these Papa and the stories told of these women are

57 A number of sources note the incestuous relationship. For example, Henry, History of Samoa, 36f; F.Fotu, in Grattan, MS Papers 4879-072, ATL.  
58 Pratt, The Genealogy of the Kings and Princes of Samoa, 660.
consistent as are the genealogies of their descendants. The papa are certainly not the result of the divisions of Pili which Mageo assumes.

The children of Sanalala are Lalovimama, Vaetamasoa and Leatougauga a Tuitoga, and all these children played pivotal roles in Samoa. The eldest, Lalovimama married Sefa’atavemana, daughter of Tuiauta Togiai according to Henry, whom he refers to as the ‘most famous title in Samoa at the time. Leatogaugatuitoga was named in memory of her grandmother and means the basket made of turtle shell of the Tuitoga. It was this woman who married Tonumaipe’a Sauoaiga, and their children were Tauili’ili, Tupa’i and Levalasi.

It is within this generation that the origin story reveals its key themes. Tau’ili’ili is mentioned for the first time and through their spiritual mother, Levalasi and her progeny really prosper in Samoa. Origin stories encapsulate key themes as Mageo evaluates. The story, however, begins to make sense only in light of its relationship within the context of the genealogy and other associated tales. Origin stories establish legitimacy by alluding to far distant times, yet also must be ‘backed up’ by genealogies and consistency with other genealogical lines and ‘their stories’. A striking factor of Samoan oratory is using historical allusions to justify present situations. Mageo noted this to some extent. An examination of Samoan speeches reveals that historical allusions to justify and explain the present are hallmarks of Samoan oratory. Analogies abound in all serious speech making. Allusions reveal one’s knowledge of the past. They also reinvent the past. In some cases a very distant past is created to justify ancestral longevity. Whether the origin story is a reflection of a past reality or a more recent happening tied with the appearance of the titles in the genealogical tree and creating a past is not really the issue. The issue, as Mageo notes, is cultural – and in my opinion just as importantly ‘clan’ – identity.

The story’s elements reveal a number of mana challenges and the period from Tonumaipe’a Sauoaiga and Levalasi to Taufau seems to mirror the challenges of the origin story. Tonumaipe’a Sauoaiga marries the granddaughter of a Tuitoga. He is said to have been the issue of a mana challenge over the Tuitoga and his Malo or government was established in Satupaite’a and Leatogaugaatuitoga is remembered in the other great alataua region of the group, Safata. Their daughter, Levalasi, according

59 Henry, History of Samoa, 42.
to nearly all accounts has the greatest mana in the group and is herself really eligible to take on the mantle of national leadership. She passes this on to her adopted daughter Salamasina, whose father was Tui’a’ana Taimalealagi and whose mother is most often said to be the daughter of the Tuitoga Fa’aulufonua, the successor to Faisautele. Levalasi, furthermore, marries her cousin, the son of Lalovimama and the daughter of Tuitoga Togiai. Their child dies and this allows her to adopt Salamasina.

Certainly the *mana* challenge is won by the Tonumaipe’a clan. Firstly Levalasi, who becomes childless, increases her status by adopting the child Salamasina. Salamasina, as first *tafa’i’fa* or first holder of all the *papa* titles seems to be an unusual choice. A closer relative would seem the natural choice.

Salamasina becomes the real hero in this period. She is the first *tafa’i’fa* in Samoan history. An impressive addition is that, as the daughter of a *Tuitoga fefine*, she could also be a *tamaha*, a sacred child.60

The Tonumaipe’a heritage is one that gains victory over Salamasina by ensuring that power – if not status – remains with the Tonumaipea’s. Nafanua really becomes the ‘mother’ of the clan. Her nominated descendant, Levalasi, after the death of her own child, adopts the highest-ranking person in Samoa, a *tamaha* who outranks the Tuitoga. Nafanua then ensures that many subsequent marriages from Salamasina to Tamafaiga – including Salamasina’s own husband are Tonumaipe’a or Tau’ili’ili title-holders.

The origin story, like the ‘reincarnations’ of Nafanua, reflects a type of timeless historical relevance. The story is refashioned and transformed in the reincarnations that make the story relevant. These analogies and reflections to the past give the story a reaffirming relevance; transformed yet solid – a timeless story of intrigue and victory.

---

60 The possibility that Salamasina could have been a *tamaha* was first suggested to me by Niel Gunson. The possibility first appears in print by Penelope Schoeffel. This will be discussed in the next chapter. I thank Niel Gunson for the insight and subsequent discussion relating to the relationship between Tonga and Samoa at this time.
GENEALOGY FROM MALIETOA FAIGA TO SALAMASINA

M. Faiga
  
  M. Uitualagi (adopted)
    
    Gatoloiaolelagi
  
    Ali'amanaia
    Tuitoga d.o. Manu'a (Safata)

  M. La’auli
    Gauifalealii and Totogata (sisters)
      Samoanagalo
    Fitiaumuupologa (f)

    Gatoaitele (f) (sisters)
      (sisters)
    Gasoloaio’olelagi (f)
      Sanalala

    Lalovimama
      Sefa’atauemanu (f) d.o Tuitua Togiai

      Vaetamaosoa

      Tuia’ana Selaginato

      Leatougaugatuitoga

      TMP Sauoaiga

      Tuia’ana Tamalelagi

      Vaetoefaga (d.o the Tuitoga)

      Tauili’ili

      Tupa’i

      Levalasi

Tuiatua Mata’utia
  Tuimavave (alualutoto)

  Salamasina (adopted)

M = Malietoa
TMP - Tonumaipae
CHAPTER 3

NAFANUA AND THE WINNING OF THE PAPA

The extended Tonumaipe’a family from the southern side of Savai’i were renowned warriors and through the advice of their deity Nafanua, managed to gain and control the papa, or four major titles of Upolu and take the papa back to Savai’i. The victories of Nafanua are still spoken of and the majority of families in both Upolu and Savai’i believe this to be historical fact.

The most detailed account of the Tonumaipe’a clan gaining control of the papa is from Bro. Henry. He states that at the time when Tamalelagi was proclaimed the Tuia’ana, Sagate was already Tuia’ana. Tamalelagi was advised by his orators Alipia and Ape to solicit help from his niece, Levalasi, daughter of Tonumaipe’a Sauoaigna and begged ‘her to go to Nafanua and solicit her assistance’.¹

Levalasi then sailed to Falealupu, Savai’i where her brother, Tupa’i one of the two high chiefs of Nafanua was awaiting her. Only ‘Auva’a and and Tupa’i her high priests, were allowed to communicate directly with the goddess’. Nafanua then told Tupa’i that he should ‘begin the war against Sagate on the morning of the fifth day’. The concession Nafanua exacted for her advice and assistance was that Nafanua ‘would take for herself the Title of Tuia’ana while her cousin would retain executive power’. Tamalelagi and Alipia agreed to these terms and she ‘sent Tupa’i with her two famous war clubs to Tonumaipe’a ordering him to put himself with all of his warriors at the disposal of Tamalelagi’.² The war only lasted a few days. ‘It came to an abrupt end when Sagate was killed with one of Nafanua’s clubs’.³

The papa Tuiatu’a was also won by Nafanua. Henry states that ‘at the time of Sanalala and Vaema, the Tuiatu’a title was conferred upon Togiai of the Salevalasi family in Lotofaga. Tuiatu’a Togiai’s grandson, Fa’atulou succeeded to the title and was known

¹ Henry, The History of Samoa, 47.
² Ibid., 47f.
³ Ibid., 48.
as Tuiatua Mata’utia. ‘This Tuiatua died after a few months to his marriage with So’oa’emalelagi [Levalasi].’ After his death the title Tuiatua was claimed by Fogaoloula of Lufilufi and Foganiutea of Fagaloa. The latter appealed for the help of Tupā’i who was residing in Afega. Tupā’i promised to go immediately to Falealupo to find out Nafanua’s intentions. ‘Nafanua readily acceded to Foganiutea’s request and sent her famous war clubs to Satupā’itea ordering Tonumaipe’a to go with his warriors to the assistance of Foganiutea’.

Again the war was won and ‘in accordance with the orders of Nafanua, the government was set up at Pulema’ava, the eastern part of Lufilufi where Tupā’i had to take the sacred seat of the Tuiatua’. Henry then quotes a proverb that in Samoan means that the government was set up at Pulema’ava and Tupā’i became the Tuiatua. ‘Ia tutu’i le alafale i Pulema’ava, ae nofo ai Tupā’i e fai ma nofoa sa o le Tuiatua’.

The two papa tamafafine were also won by Nafanua through warfare. In the war between Malie and Afega Nafanua came to the assistance of Tuisamau. Resident in Malie was Malietoa Sagaga, son of Malietoa Falefatu. The question was again one of succession as Malietoa Laauli’s father had promised the succession would go to La’auli’s children. His daughter, Gatoaiatele was resident in Afega and the orators, Fata and Maulolo refused to accept Malietoa Sagaga’s position. Tupā’i, after consultation with Nafanua fought on behalf of Gatoaiatele and was victorious. Tupā’i then established ‘the government on Tanumafili and he remained there to answer the speeches of Tuisamau’, a reference to the orator chiefs of Afega. Auimatagi, the orator chiefs of Malie were defeated and Afega became the capital of Tuamasaga. Henry adds that the ceremonial greetings refer to Nafanua and Tupā’i’s victory with the greeting tulouna na a lau fefalaiga a Tupā’i na e leo Tanumafili. This means ‘greetings to Tupā’i, the guardian of the mala’e Tanumafili’. The translation could be more aptly translated as Tupā’i being the ‘voice’ of Tanumafili. Tupā’i had the right to speak on behalf of Afega and the papa, Gatoaiatele was taken back to Savai’i by Nafanua.

Safata was divided into two sections, Satunamafono and the alataua. Malietoa La’auli’s two children were married to Sanalala. Gatoaiatele was barren, but her sister, Gasolo produced three children. When Vaetamasoa, the eldest of these were born, her

---

4 Ibid., 49.
5 Ibid., 50.
6 Ibid.
7 Ibid., 48f.
father and her aunt, Gatoaitele, ‘proclaimed that Vaetamasoa should become the titled chief of the alataua and named Tamosoali’i’. 8

Meanwhile Tamalelagi was at Leulumoega, ‘a ruler without a title’ watched on as a quarrel arose between Satunamafono and the alataua ‘on account of the new title Tamosoali’i’. The orators of Satunamafono ‘who jointly form the house of Safuiane and Faleata, despatched a message to Tupa’i to secure for them the favour and help of Nafanua’. Nafanua then ‘ordered Tonumaipe’a and Tamalelagi to take up Satunamafono’s cause’. Again the exacted payment for Nafanua’s assistance in war was that ‘Tupa’i established the government at Togamau, the malae of Vaie’e [Satunamafono] in Safata. Tonumaipe’a took the title of Tamosoali’i back to Nafanua. Henry states that ‘the set of ceremonial greetings used in Vaie’e still testifies to the fact that Tupa’i, Nafanua’s prime minister, had lived here with his family. The greeting runs: Tulouna lau Tofa a Tupa’i ma au tama o Te’o ma Tuia’. 9

Nafanua’s acquisition of the papa is rarely disputed by anyone in Samoa. The understanding of the orators of the alataua in Savai’i is echoed by traditions in Atua and A’ana and elsewhere. Nafanua’s consolidation of the papa is seen as the basis for the spiritual legitimacy of subsequent holders of the papa. The distribution of the papa is viewed as the beginning of a new Malo, one that benefits all parts of Samoa. The alataua orators recall that Nafanua’s domain is the homeland of the Tonumaipe’a family. Tupa’i, with the assistance of the alataua helped Tamalelagi win the war against Tuia’ana Sagate. Gatoaitele also required Nafanua’s assistance in the war against Malietao Falefatu. In this war Nafanua sent Tupa’i to conquer Malietao and bring the papa back to her. They also state that Tuiauta Foganiutea asked for help in their war against Fogaoulula and the papa went back to Nafanua. Finally Vaetamasoali’i also went to Savai’i ‘to Fili ma Puletu’u where Nafanua resides to ask Nafanua’s help to restore her to her royal position at Safata, denied by Satuisavaiulu’u (alataua)’. She won with the aid of Tupa’i and again the papa went back to Nafanua. 10

Nafanua’s legacy is remembered in Leulumoega, A’ana. When the representatives of Leulumoega went to ask her for a share of government, according to oral tradition they went to visit her in her house named Ana Lega. The house ‘was named for the place

---

8 Ibid., 50.
9 Ibid., 51.
10 Petition of .... ALC11/LC 3603.
Lega (the sister of Utu and Taua amd Va’asiliifiti) in the region ‘now called Itu Salega. Nafanua said she would help them if they assisted in moving her house site to Fili – ma-Puletu’u at Falealupu … . The move is remembered in the names of some important titles of Leulumoega: Lepou after the post in Nafanua’s house; Lefau, the roof arch: the titles Lauvao, Agilau and Le’uli were also named for this occasion’.  

Nafanua’s legacy is also remembered in Atua. Nafanua’s acquisition of the four papa was accepted by all the parties contesting the recent Tuiatua title case in the Lands and Titles Court. While there was obviously much debate as to the rights and privileges of the different aiga and orator groups involved, Nafanua’s taking of the papa is not questioned by any party. The question really was what occurred when Tau’ili’ili and Tupa’i returned the papa.

How the papa were attained and who the individuals were is also rarely questioned. In the Tuiatua title case a number of parties mention the confrontation between Tuiatua Foganiutea and Tuiatua Fogaoloulou. In the case itself no party questioned the origins of these two individuals. One reason for this is because of the breaking of taboo. The informants of Stuebel, Pratt and Krämer all speak of this confrontation also. In a paper prepared By Tupua Tamasese in 1992, and published in 1994, Tupua is prepared to break this taboo. He notes that neither Foganiutea nor Fogaolo’ula can be found in genealogies. In fact they are place names.

Saletete was originally part of Fagalaoa, now a subvillage of Falefa. The honorifics of Saletete provide another clue: recognition of Sefa’atauemana as the taupou (belle) name of all the chiefs ... Sefa’atauemana was the name of Mata’utia Fa’atulou’s mother ... Mata’utia was the husband of Levalasi, the lady principally responsible for Salamasina’s acquisition of the four papa ... Tuiatua Sefa’atauemana quarrelled with Lufulufi, left Lufulufi in a huff and established her household in Fagalao’ula. Her daughter also named Sefa’atauemana, the Tui Atua’s taupou followed her mother and set up household in Foganiutea. Amituana’i a chief of Aleipata, paid court to the mother and was accepted, and after the customary formalities they became husband and wife. Shortly after, the husband in a manner of speaking took up with the daughter, creating friction between mother and daughter on the issue of Fa’amoteane – taking someone else’s husband to bed or – muliua - two muli – rearends meaning an adulterous husband. The nab issue of course was a woman (and a mother at that) scorned. The quarrel became bitter and spilled over to titles. The daughter claimed the Tui Atua title. Atua was divided and the issue became pretext for war. The mother called on her nephews by an earlier marriage …. The nephews responded in the name of the war goddess Nafanua. Once victory was achieved Tupu’i and Tauili’ili took

11 Malama Meleisea and Penelope Schoeffel, Lagaga: A Short History of Western Samoa, USP, Fiji Times Ltd, Suva, 57.
away the *papa* Tui Atua and gave it into Nafanua’s keeping; and, to underline dominion, the Tupua’i title was imposed on Lufulufi which had espoused the daughter’s cause … . The custodians of knowledge decided to camouflage by referring to the protagonists by the names of their residences—thus Tui Atua Fogaolo’ula and Tui Atua Foganiutea.  

In the original paper more is revealed for Tupua adds that this incident ‘is the key to understanding the appropriation of Matautia by Leifi and Tautolo and the latter’s designs on the Tumua and *papa*. The Leifi and Tautolo, i.e., Tafua and Fuataga claim to Tumua status or at least parity with Lufulufi persist to this day’.  

Tupua emphasises that European sources have failed to detect many of the ‘hidden’ elements of Samoan history because they were not revealed by Samoan sources. The clues, however, are found in the narratives. Faleauto Fotu wrote that the Malo of Vaetoefaga was defeated by the Malo of Leifi and Salevalasi and the *papa* passed into the hands of the *alataua*. This *alataua* was not the *alataua* of Savai’i, but Safata and the heads of the *alataua* were known at that time as Leutaipeaea. As a result of this victory, Tautolo appointed Mata’utia’s child as the Tupu or regent. A brief genealogy is given. The genealogy shows that Lalovimama was married to Sefa’atavemana of Fogaoulia in Aleipata. The place name is clearly revealed, even if the tension between mother and daughter is not. Faleauto Fotu stresses the Safata *alataua* over the *alataua* of Savai’i. This could be because of bias towards Safata, but the links between the two *alataua* have also been examined. The link between the two is represented in the marriage between Leatogaugaatuitoga and Tonumaip’a Sauoaiga.  

There are also other claims that honours and privileges rival those of Levalasi and Tupua’i. Tupua Tamasese has already noted the claims of Leifi and Tautolo. The orators Leifi and Tautolo also claim honours associated with the bestowal of and choosing of a candidate. These were the orators, also known by their ‘spirit names’ Tafua and Fuataga, who existed at the time of Levalasi and Tupua’i who are said to have encouraged the marriage of Levalasi to her cousin Matautia to produce an heir. In this sense they claim to have existed prior to Nafanua’s appointments of the Tu’itu’i and therefore have rights in deciding who will receive the *papa* title. They also stated that Levalasi entitled them with honours. Also, although not clearly stated, they claim

---

15 Faleauto Fotu, in Grattan, MS Papers 4879-072, ATL.
authority over Tumua which appear to have evolved after the time of Levalasi and the
papa being claimed by Nafanua and the Tonumaip’ea warriors of Savai’i.\textsuperscript{16} Essentially
the argument is that the sacred orator chiefs who sit on the ‘right and left’ were created
before the council of orators known as Tumua. The council of orators in Atua consist of
six orators, an extension of the original two. Similarly in Leulumoega, A’ana, the
original two orators have become nine in number.

Leifi and Tautolo’s rights are still hotly debated and the forum for discussion now
includes such publicly accessible sites as the Internet. Some of the discussion seems
very convoluted, but the essence of the argument is about rights and honours. One
respondent argued that Leifi was responsible for winning the papa. In the war between
Leifi and Tunumafono (representing Aleipata and Safata respectively), Nafanua came to
the aid of Leifi.\textsuperscript{17} A response by Legataula to the position of Leifi and Tautolo was as
follows:

\begin{quote}
They did not control the titles as you say. Why do you think they wanted the marriage
to Levalasi? Her Tonumaip’a heritage! The proof that Nafanua and Le Alataua or
Levalasi’s family as you put it controlled the four ‘Ao’ is the fact that the Tupa’i title is
planted in Atua. That was Nafanua’s condition for acting in the war that was fought
there; To atu le Ao o le Tuiaata ae sunu’i le Tupa’i.\textsuperscript{18}
\end{quote}

The reference to the proverb means that Tupa’i was imposed or established in Atua and
implicitly has a role in choosing the candidate for the Tuiaata title. A further response
from Sina was that ‘my knowledge of Nafanua is only of a mythological mid-ranking
Aitu or demon from Savai’i... Was Nafanua a human or aitu?’\textsuperscript{19}

The ethnographer Schultz also collected and explained a number of proverbs and
expressions. Quite a few of these relate to Nafanua and the papa. He records that:

\begin{quote}
Tui Atua Mata’utia was urged by his orators, Leifi and Tautolo (Fuataga and Tafua) to
marry his cousin Levalasi. The lady had another cousin Tui A’ana Tamealelagi whose
adopted daughter she was. On his mother’s side she had a connection with Gatoitele
and Tamanasolli. Her marriage with the Tui Atua would be a means of uniting the four
highest titles. Samoan custom forbids the marriage between cousins hence Mata’utia
refused. Leifi and Tautolo replied ‘Tau o se mea a ala ai’; ‘as long as the end is
attained .... Punishment was not long in coming ... Levalasi gave birth to a clot of blood
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{16} See LC 8384.
\textsuperscript{17} Posted by Splinter, ‘Leifi na fa’ausu gafa naa ai nei o aloali’i ma le Tui Atua ma le Tui A’ana, May 23,
\textsuperscript{18} Posted by Legataula, response to the above, May 25, 2001.
\textsuperscript{19} Posted by Sina, response to Legataula, May 22, 2001, www.samoan-sensation.com
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... A successor had now to be found. This was done by Levalasi adopting Salamasina, daughter of Tamalelagi, who ... became queen of Samoa.\textsuperscript{20}

Schultz also adds that ‘The story that the war goddess Nafanua had the four titles in her possession and that it was she who gave them to Salamasina seems to be a legend invented by the Falealupo people for their own glorification’.\textsuperscript{21}

In a Stuebel account, the informant favours Sa Malietoa rights. In a rather unique twist on the Malietoa Lauuli story, ‘Malietoa Lauuli’s father pretended to be sick and wished for one of Lauuli’s wives’. She was rolled in amongst the sleeping mats and taken by Lau’uli to his father, Malietoa Utitualagi. ‘It was Malietoa Utitualagi, then, who instituted the four royal titles and conferred them on Lauuli’s children as a reward for his son’s kindness in surrendering his wife to him’.\textsuperscript{22} La’auli was actually adopted by Utitualagi as he was the issue of Utitualagi’s wife, Gatoloai and her natural brother Ali’amanaia.

Krämer claimed that La’auli had rights for a different reason. It was Fata and Maulolo the two orator chiefs who served him and it was La’auli who gave them the right to confer the name of his daughter in order to obtain fine mats. The same thing applied in the case of the ‘mighty Safata’. Safata gave the niece of Gatoaitele the Tamasoali’i title and the two orator chiefs Soa and Alapapa therefore received the right to obtain fine mats.\textsuperscript{23} Safata tradition counters by saying they were responsible for defeating La’auli’s successor, Falefatu and thus gained the rights for themselves.\textsuperscript{24} Tupua also offers an insight into the Gatoaitele papa. He notes that:

Because Malietoa Laauli sired only daughters, he adopted Falefatu who succeeded him. Gatoaitele quarrelled with Falefatu and insults were exchanged. The story of her incestuous grandparents and the fact that Gatoaitele was not even an heir of Malietoa were all mentioned. The quarrel became pretext for war. Tuamasaga led the Falefatu faction and Afega the Gatoaitele faction. Gatoaitele sought the assistance of her Tupa’i and Taulilili to redeem family honour .... The new papa Gatoaitele, named after the grandmother .... The residence of the new papa was in Afega. Malie, the seat of Malietoa, and Afega, the seat of Gatoaitele, share the honours anomalously as Tumua.\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{20} Schultz, Samoan Proverbs and Expressions, 101.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{22} C Stuebel, Myths and Legends of Samoa, (English Trans. By Bro Herman), A H and A W Reed, Wellington, Sydney, London and Wesley Productions, Apia, Western Samoa, 71.
\textsuperscript{23} Krämer, ‘Die Samoanische Königsfrage im Hinblick’ Globus, 75:12, 1899.
\textsuperscript{24} Personal communication, Asofou So’o.
History in Samoa is a ‘living entity’. Chiefs not only take on the title of their predecessors, but, in a sense, become living embodiments of all the former title-holders. The rights and privileges that a current title-holder enjoys only exist because of the success and victories of his or her predecessors. Despite the significant changes that have occurred in denuding the sacred power of chiefs and orator priests, like Tupa’i, the sense of embodiment of the past through appointments and genealogical rights continues. As noted in examining the origin of the Tonumaipe’a title, the past can be brought into the present to justify and enforce one’s status and current actions.

The Tuiatua title case rested upon the rights of aiga and the rights of orators. The main argument of the ‘Tupua camp’ was that the Tumua or orators had the right to confer the title. Tupua argued that Tumua, or the orator group existed before the establishment of aiga and had the right to accept or reject a candidate put forward by aiga. Tupua’s summary was that in olden days the soil of Tumua was taboo. Tumua were the only ones allowed to be present at the conferral and it was the exclusive right of the orator chiefs, the Tumua to confer papa after the ‘taking of points’ or saesae-Laufa’i, meaning a decision among the orators to decide upon the candidate.\textsuperscript{26} Although not developed, the primary argument was that the Tumua had a priestly function. The soil being taboo and their rights of choice and conferring meant that these orator chiefs were really a formal priesthood. The ‘sacred chief’ was honoured with the title by the ‘orator priests’ who had the spiritual authority to confer the title.

The position of Tupa’i, in the Henry account, is also that of an orator priest. It is Tupa’i who is the one who consults Nafanua to find out her will. In the ceremonial address or fa’alupega he is referred to as the va’a i ti, Auva’a, also referred to as the va’a fa’atatu meaning that Nafanua entered their bodies and then ‘speaks through’ them.\textsuperscript{27} In examining the orator-priests of the Tagaloa, it is clear that the prefix ‘va’a’ refers to a spiritual function. In a solo or story by Lafai Taulupo’s mother to her son she speaks of the glory of his Malo. In one statement she advises him to ‘be ready in case of war so your boat remains victorious’.\textsuperscript{28} The boat (va’a) does not just refer to naval superiority but is figuratively symbolic of the Malo. The ‘steerers of the boat’ of the Malo are the orator priests, who are the shamans who mediate and confer with the aitu for success and maintenance of the Malo.

\textsuperscript{26} 27/9/1988, LC 8384.
\textsuperscript{27} Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 103.
\textsuperscript{28} Lafai Sauoaiga, Mavaega i le Tai, 34.
Previously a number of versions of the origin of the Tonumaipe’a title were examined, but even though the major titles of the family appear to have been explained in the mana struggle between Leutogi or Nafanua and the Tuitoga, there is no mention of Tupa’i or Auva’a in any of the accounts discussed. These two titles are orator titles, and the former of these in particular is pivotal in the Tonumaipe’a family managing to attain the papa and taking them back to Savai’i. In the genealogy, Tupa’i is the brother of Tauili’ili and Levalu, so his existence genealogically appears for the first time along with Tau’ili’ili. That he is not mentioned in the origin story as one of the titles that Nafanua or Leutogi gained may indicate the emphasis of ali’i titles over orator titles that has developed since European contact.

As a result of the victory of Nafanua in gaining the papa she is said to have exacted conditions upon their return to the place of origin of these papa. She left orator priests to sit ‘on the right and left’ of the incumbent of the papa. These are referred to as ‘tu’itu’i’ or ‘tafa’i’. Again these could well be said to be orator priests. Their authority comes from Nafanua and ensures their continued presence in the decision-making process and affairs relating to the papa.

The tafa’i or tu’itu’i were left by Nafanua and the alataua warriors of the Tonumaipe’a clan at each of the main centres responsible for conferring the papa. The holders of all these papa titles are not referred to as papa e fa or some other such designation, but tafa’ifa, meaning the four pairs of tafa’i are united under one chief. Whether it was their duty to appoint the tafa’ifa seems likely, although this is much disputed. In the fa’alupega of the villages and districts involved, the tafa’i or tu’itu’i are represented and indicate the conditions placed on these areas by Nafanua. In Atua Tupa’i and Tainau are the Tu’itu’i of the Tuiauta. In Leulumoega, Umaga and Pasase are known as the Tu’itu’i or Tafa’i of the Tuia’aana. Similarly the orators Fata and Maulolo are known and referred to as the ‘Tu’itu’i of the Natoaitele’.

As noted in the Tagaloa title, the orators who sit to the left and right of the sacred chief are referred to as the Taulauniu, but are also referred to as the Tafa’i. A suggestion was made that these orators represent a type of formalised priesthood, a notion that is unclear in many of the writings by Europeans, especially those who were missionaries, such as Stair, Turner and Brother Henry. Krämer gives a more detailed insight into this.

29 See LC 8384.
formalised priesthood, especially in rights of conferral of the major titles. In the
collation of the Tuia’ana title upon Mata’afo on 22 November 1898, the tafa’i or
orator priests of the Tuia’ana, namely Umaga and Pasese finished the ceremony by
‘chanting and placing the tip of the coconut fronds before Mata’afo and spoke as
follows: Tuiaana le e paia, e tupu, Tuiaana the sacred king’. 30

The link between the alataua and the tafa’i become clearer in the bestowal ceremonies.
Even in Krämer’s time (early 1900s), Krämer states that the orator chiefs of the alataua
had great sacred power because they were able to mediate and confer with aitu. Krämer
notes that ‘Aana and Atua have no alataua like Savai’i and Tuamasaga (Safata)’. The
alataua, he describes as being the orator chiefs with a spiritual role. They are ‘the
Haruspices inspired by their family demon or even the district demon. This also
explains the power of these orator chiefs who were – and still are – looked upon as
demoniachal people (aitutaga)’. 31

The following account is from Krämer explaining how those in Leulumoega, A’ana
have this ‘priestly function’ and ‘act as alataua chiefs’. At the aitufono in A’ana it is
Galu and Lemana who act as alataua chiefs and this pair have concourse with the
spirits.

Each sits in a round part of the house. In addition there is still one more man with four
nuts; he cracks them and brings one nut to Galu and the other to Mana; the third he
takes to a post on the frontal side of the house and the fourth to the back of the house. It
is strictly forbidden for either one of them to speak. Those chiefs now remain seated till
dawn, and now the man who brought the coconuts goes to get the meat of the nut. If he
reaches into the nut and there is still coconut juice in it one knows that the demon will
not come to the fono. Then Galu and Lemana are sad. But if he feels that all the
coconut water has been drunk everyone will know that the demon will come to the
fono; then their joy increases. When the morning breaks, all of Aana comes to the fono.
And so they reveal what the demon has imparted to them. 32

Leulumoega, through Galu and Lemana, thus, acts for the district as alataua, just as
Satupa’itea and alataua act for Nafanua in harnessing the wishes of the deities. The
contention about tafa’i and the role of the orator chiefs versus the role of aiga is still
unclear, but also unclear is the position of the tafa’i. The tafa’i in Leulumoega that
were installed by Nafanua and the alataua of Satupa’itea seem to have no role in this

30 Krämer, The Samoa Islands, Vol 1, 219.
31 Ibid., 196.
32 Ibid., 197.
deliberation in the aitufono. Nafanu’a’s orator priests Umaga and Pasease are not mentioned in this account. Rather it is Galu and Lemana. Lemana is one of the Tumua or orator group consisting of Leulumoeaga and Lufulufi. Galu refers to Alipia, the one who has the right to speak first when Tumua speaks. Krämer does refer to Umaga and Pasease in the fa’alupega of Leulumoeaga, but reduces their role to those who sit on the left and the right to ‘chase away flies etc’, despite having mentioned earlier their voice being the ones who proclaimed the papa upon the Tuia’ana. As one historian records: ‘The taf’ifa was evidently a compound of the traditional concern with the honorific and a new and more aggressive concern with power. A further indicator of its compound nature was the provision that the official grant of the title had to be made by the alataua – the great and semi-divine orator chiefs of the neutral districts’.34

* 

This discrepancy of the role of the tafa’i also lay at the heart of one of the arguments in the Tuia’ana title case mentioned earlier, where historical precedent is so important. Tupua Tamasese, who won the case and thus is also Tuia’ana, argued not only the primary role of the orator group, but focussed upon the ‘orator priests’ or Tumua, the combined orator groups of Lufulufi, as preceding not only aiga but also the ‘imposed tu’itu’i or tupa’i status claimed by Leifi and Tautolo. Krämer’s informants were primarily from Atua and Aana. He appears to have had little input from ali’i and tulafale from the Tonumaipe’a clan, evidenced by his confusing genealogies and also his comments that the Tuia’ana and Tuia’ana titles were really the ancient titles of Samoa and held significantly more weight than the papa tamafafine, which are treated as a recent phenomenon. Krämer does note the great impact of Satupa’itea and the alataua, but only goes as far as to say that the Tonumaipe’a clan came ‘close to threatening the position of A’ana’ during the time of the children of Tonumaipe’a Sauoaiga and Leatogaugaatuitoga, with the assistance of Nafanua.

Aiga claimants, like Salevalasi argued that the rights of bestowal were given to aiga by Nafanua when the papa were returned from Savai’i, and they argued that they too had responsibilities and traditional rights in the decision making process and anointing of the Tuia’ana. They claimed honorific addresses also to support their claims. These divisions themselves reveal the impossibility of presenting a nationally accepted history of Samoa.

33 Krämer, The Samoa Islands, Vol 1, 199.
The discussion also reveals that Nafanua is responsible for the establishment of a new phase in Samoan history by concentrating the authority of the *papa* by her advice and insight. She is the legitimizer of the Malo and the reason why Salamasina became the first *taf'ifā* in Samoa.

The history of Samoa is remembered in a number of ways. This study has focussed primarily upon *tala*, and genealogies. The honorifics of a village or districts are likewise a record of titles and appointments and a celebration of past victories and achievements. Honorific addresses reveal historic personages who pass on their titles and privileges to the current title-holder. Many were created due to a specific event. The honorific address can also be the basis for counterclaim of achievements. Titles of villages allow each village to claim its importance in the district and Samoa as a whole. The consensus generally is that Nafanua through the Tonumaipe’a people gained the *papa* and controlled the *papa* by some extent, by imposing the *tafa’i* on three of the four *papa*. Umaga and Pasese ‘act as the *alataua*’ for Leulumoeaga, A’ana, but Fasito’outa and Fasito’otai also claim honours in A’ana. Pa’o of Fasito’outa records their honours and subsequent privileges as follows: Tutuila and Ape, from Fasito’otai and Fasito’outa respectively, stole the child Tamalelagi from Safata. ‘Ape fought with Safata while Tutuila took the baby’. The baby was taken to Tuasivi then Fasito’outa and a number of other places. At each village he was taken to places named after events that occurred with the child. ‘Tuia’ana Sagate lost and was sent away. Tutuila and Ape took away the *papa* from Tuia’ana and gave it to Tamalelagi, hence Fasito’otai and Fasito’outa are called the ‘*alataua*’ of Leulumoeaga’.

One of the major keys to understanding the power and rise of the Tonumaipe’a clan is the important marriages made. The three children of Sanalala who was said to have been taken to Tonga and named Lesa, and Gasoloaio’olelagi were Lalovimama, Vaetamasoa and Leatougaugatuitoga. Lalovimama married Sefa’atauemanu of Foganiutea and was herself a Tuatua. Their son, Mata’utia was also Tuatua and married his cousin Levalasi. The second child, Vaetamasoa married Tuia’ana Selaginato and their child was Tamalelagi. He married the daughter of Tuitoga Fa’afulufanua or Vakafuhi and produced Salamasina. Salamasina was then adopted by Levalasi. The third child, Leatougauga married Tonumaipe’a Sauoaiga and produced
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35 Story by Pa’o the Faalua of Fasito’outa, MS Papers 56 (Gurr):25, ATL.
the three children Tauili’ili, Tup’a’i and Levalasi. The relation of Levalasi to the key papa title-holders allows her to form alliances and gain the titles.

Tamalelagi himself is recorded as having made ten marriages. The first of these marriages produced Tuala, and Tuala became a separate genealogical clan. His third marriage produced Peseta, another major family in Samoa. His fifth marriage produced Tuioti, whose son, Fuiaivailili, by Nanuola, the daughter of Folasale Falelima and referred to as the ‘voice of the Tonumaipe’a’, was the first Tupua. His seventh marriage produced the female child Tuitogama’atoe. Tuitogama’atoe, by a different adulterous marriage is said to have brought forth Malietoa Taulapapa who carried on the Malietoa line. The taupou name Tuitogama’atoe is also prevalent in many villages in Upolu. His eighth and ninth marriages were to two daughters of Puni of Aiga Sa Moeleoi, of whom Tonumaipe’a is their Tamaaiga. His final marriage to Vaetoeofaga, would produce possibly the first tamaha.

In Samoa she is presented as the child of Fa’aulufonua, which would make her eligible. In the Tongan account by Fetuani, she is actually the daughter of Vakafuhi, the eldest of the brothers. The anthropologist/historian Penelope Schoeffel is the first to note this relationship in print. She notes that ‘in Tongan terms Salamasina was probably a Tamaha, being the daughter of a Tui Tonga Fefine (firstborn sister of a Tui Tonga)’, or more correctly a ‘female Tui Tonga’.

The genealogies record that there were three brothers who were all Tuitoga and produced only female offspring. Vaetoeofaga would therefore be a Tuitoga Fefine, not just by being the eldest daughter, but a regent in her own right. Two of these brothers who were Tuitoga were Vakafuhi and Puipuiifatu. Vaetoeofaga is listed as the daughter of one of these brothers. Salamasina, as tamaha was the highest-ranking Tongan of all, someone to whom the Tuitoga would have to prostrate before her feet. In terms of status she certainly outranks Levalasi, but by adopting her and with Levalasi’s spiritual authority from Nafanua, she appears to have the attributes that Salamasina lacks. Her (and by extension Nafanua’s) cleverness assures that while Salamasina enjoys the privilege of position, Levalasi ‘runs the show’. It was Levalasi and her Tonumaipe’a kin that won the right to all the papa titles, not Salamasina. The four papa needed for

37 Fetuani, Kolovai, ‘Genealogy of the beginnings’, 12.
39 Personal communication, Niel Gunson. The genealogies are based on his own collections.
national leadership were in the hands of Nafanua and her descendants. Salamasina was queen because Nafanua bestowed the honour. The victory for the clan was that Salamasina married into the Tonumaipe'a clan. Her daughters and granddaughters also married into the clan. Indeed Nafanua ensured that the Tonumaipe’a line succeeded in producing all subsequent heirs of succession until the time of Tamafaiga who became the new embodiment of Nafanua just prior to the arrival of the missionaries in 1830.

According to Henry, the daughters of Puni were close relatives of the Tuitoga and the Henry account recognises the presence and influence of Tonga in Samoa. He speaks of the presence of large Tongan ships led by Tuitoga Fa'aulufanua, ‘who had probably come to visit the parents of his wife, Taupoimasa, a daughter of Lefano in Samoa’. Taupoimasa was the wife of Tuitoga Fa‘aulufanua and mother of Vaetoefaga. Tamaelagi was encouraged by Alipia and his orators to go to Samatau to visit the Tuitoga ‘with all the honours due to his rank’. They left for Samatau as ‘Puni, the high chief of that place was related to the Tuitoga’. Puni was also the father of Tamaelagi’s last two wives. To appease Puni he conferred the honorific ‘the round part of the house of the Tuia’ana’ or ‘Le tela o le fala Tuia’ana’, Puni’s faleupolu or group of orators ‘shall henceforth be called by the name ‘Leulumoega’, and my two youngest sons shall be cited as the ma’apu of the Tui A’ana’.

The Tuitoga’s family at Amoa were Va’afusu and Toleafoa. This is a large clue that despite the Tonumaipe’a clan’s victory over Tonga, the real victories are through marriage alliances and issue produced. Va’afusu is a Samoanised form of the name Vakafuhi, the Tuitoga. Va’afusu is also of the Tonumaipe’a lineage. Toleafoa is the line in which the Tonumaipe’a title eventually passed in to.

The papa were rightfully said to have been bestowed on Levalasi. Salamasina received them because she was the adopted daughter of Levalasi. There are a multitude of stories about Salamasina. In many Samoan stories the emphasis has been placed upon her privileges being won due to the position of her father, Tuia’ana Taimalelagi. Her mother is not often stressed. Yet her mother, Vaetoefaga was a tuitoga fefine. Bro. Henry does stress her Tongan heritage. Vaetoefaga is treated as a ‘princess’ and
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40 Henry, History of Samoa, 59.
41 Ibid.
42 Ibid.
43 Ibid., 61. The fa’alupega of Samatau does begin Tulouna oe Leulumoega. The ceremonial address also extends to the Ma’apu o Tuia’ana and greets the sons or alo o Tamaelagi.
Tamalelagi was only able to secure her marriage by promising her father that her issue would be his successor.44 Vaetoeefaga, however, was taken back to Tonga soon after Salamasina was born because of the plotting of the orators and her senior siblings.45 This also allowed Vaetoeefaga’s child to be adopted by Levalasi and the papa to be bestowed on Salamasina. When she grew up she was installed as Tuia’ana by Umaga and Pasese.46 She then received the other three papa.

According to Bro. Henry, Salamasina’s main threat came not from Samoans but Tongans. The brother of Tuitoga Fa’aaulufonua, named Ulualofaiga, invited Salamasina to his residence at Lona. Levalasi was suspicious of this invitation to Fagaloa and it was proved correct because there were a number of Tongan ships in the harbour at Fagaloa. It was Levalasi who suggested that they ‘anchor at Musumusu where they could put up at Foganiutea, the former residence of TuiaTugiai’.47

Two Tongans turned up and ‘following the custom of their country they prostrated themselves before the queen and kissed her feet’. Ulualofaiga actually wished to lure Salamasina to Fagaloa and take her back to Tonga. He pretended to be sick which is why he sent his two representatives. The lure to get Salamasina was to say that her mother, Vaetoeefaga was sick. Again it was the intervention of Levalasi that saved the situation. ‘Levalasi’s forces brought Salamasina’s salvation’. Upon hearing that his life would be forfeited if he ever brought an invading force into Samoa again, he ‘prostrated himself before the queen’ and ‘kissed her feet’. He blamed the scheming on the orators Leifi and Tautolo. He also presented Salamasina with ‘one hundred fine mats and among them one that has been woven on the Va’a-aitu [Spirit boat] of Saveasiuleo and which is known all over Tonga and Samoa by the name of Lagava’a (woven on a ship). Ulualofaiga added an assurance that ‘henceforward I and my house will be your servants’.48

Again it was Levalasi who acted against the schemers Leifi and Tautolo. She was satisfied with Ulualofaiga’s gift and apology to Salamasina, but felt that Leifi and Tautolo needed to be eliminated. Sa Levalasi, or Levalasi’s family attacked the above two orators in Aleipata. They were not only responsible for a possible capture of

44 See Henry, The History of Samoa, 61.
46 Ibid., 70.
47 Ibid., 77.
48 Ibid., 78-80.
Salamasina, but were directly responsible for her husband, Mata’utia’s death. ‘The traitors were burnt alive’.\(^{49}\)

The story reveals that Salamasina, through the actions of Levalasi, managed to really become a Samoan ‘queen’. As the daughter of Vaetoeata, whose father is recorded by Bro Henry as Fa’aualufanua and by a Tongan source as Vakafulu, she is the sacred child and the highest-ranking Tongan of all. Her Tongan opposition is represented by Ulualofaiga, who prostrates himself before her and proclaims that he will be her servant, as will his descendants. The granting of the fine mat from the spirit boat of Saveasi’uleo also represents a passing of the riches and honours of Tonga to Samoa. The embellishment in the story serves a particular purpose. Just as in the origin story, the victory of Samoa over Tonga is represented by the winning of mana challenges. Nafanua and the Tonumaip’a family gained the \textit{papa}. Levalasi is the heir to the titles but passes them on to Salamasina. Salamasina receives the titles and brings the sacredness of her heritage with her. This is then passed on to her descendants, who are not only Samoan, but are high-ranking members of the Tonumaip’a line.

\(^{49}\) Ibid., 81.
SALAMASINA GENEALOGY

Salamisina  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tapumanaia, son of TMP Sammaipea (Satupa’itea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | Fofaivasese (f)  
| | Tapumanaia  
| |  
| | Tauataminiulaita, Satupa’itea  
| |  
| | Sina (f)  
| | Taufau (f)  
| | Asomua  
| |  
| (1) Titoiaivao, Faleatui  
| Faumuinä (was adopted by Taufau in place of Tupuivao and designated successor)  
| (2) Ifi, (Apia)  
| Seumanutafa  
| | Toomalatai  
| | (3) Tagaloausufono, (Saleimoa)  
| Noamaleniu (f)  
| | Toleafoaiolō  
| | Nonumalo  

Faumuina (1)  
|-------------------|  
| Talaleomalie, d.o. Vovasa (Gataivai)  
| Aiga Salemuliaga and son of Tauilihili Papa |  
| | Fonoti |  
| Taulapapa.  
| | (2) Tuuamaleulu’a’ili’i, whose mother was a god daughter of M  
| Samalaulu (f)  
| | (3) Atamulau (from Tonga)  
| Vaafusuaga also called Toleafoa  

(and as such continued the Tonumaipe’a lines on Savai’i. He fought together with Samalaulu against Fonoti and lost. Founder of the Taulagi family).
Fonoti
  Fuatino d.o. Toalepai (Satupuala).
    Muagututia
      (2) Taele’asa’asa, d.o. Tautaiolefue, (Tufulele).
        Falenaoti (f)

Muagututia (1)
  Fenunuivao, d.o. Leutele
    (falefa)
      Tupua (adopted)
        (2) Tauamatu, d.o. Toa, (Saluafata)
          Fepulea’i
          Lagi (f)
        (3) Aiganalefili

Mata’utia
  Fualau
  Taloapatina (f)

Tupua
  (1) Matua fale’ese, d.o. La’ulu
      (Palauli)
    Afaoafouvale
    (2) Tuolupetu (Saleimoa)
      Galumalemana
    (3) Punipuao, d.o. Alai’asa falefa
      Luafalemana
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Galumalemana (1) — Galuegaapapa, d.o. Maiava (Matautu) (Sa moeleoi)

Nifoasaefa — Taisi — Puamefa (f)

(5) Sauimalae d.o. Tauiliili and Tuitogama’atoe.

Iamafana

Nifoasaefa — Sauimalae (the wife of his father, Gaumalemana)

Taeoali’i

Iamafana (1) — Tongan woman from Apolima

Tuioneula [Teoneula]

(2) — So’omalelagi

Safeofafine

TMP = Tonumaipia
d.o. = daughter of

Source: Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 224-229.
CHAPTER 4

THE MALO OF SALAMASINA AND HER DESCENDANTS

There have been many works providing genealogies of the *tafa 'ifa* Salamasina and her descendants. One of the reasons for this is that the idea of 'kingly' and 'princely' lines appealed to foreign observers, but it is also very much a Samoan concern. The 'keepers of the genealogies' not only kept their own immediate ancestral lists, but also linked these back to the major elites, those who held the major titles and were holders of the *papa*. These elite genealogies also reveal that Samoans were concerned with a form of national identity, beyond their own immediate *aiga* and districts.

One of the earliest genealogies recorded in the published literature was Pratt's 'Genealogy of the Kings and Princes of Samoa'. Pratt received the genealogy from the LMS missionary Powell, who was the missionary at Manu'a '35 years ago'. He obtained it from the 'keepers of the genealogies' at Manu'a under a promise of not divulging it to the Samoans'.¹ At the time Powell collected the genealogy, Tuia'ana Sualauvi was still alive. Sualauvi died in 1870, so the genealogy predates the later versions, particularly of Krämer and von Bülow. The source was from Manu'a, far from the 'action' in Upolu and Savai'i, yet it records the actions of the elite lines of these isles.

The genealogy records that Salamasina was the first king and he 'united the chieftainship of Atua and Aana and the Tuamasaga. He was the king who held the united titles'.² Despite naming Salamasina as king, which was probably more the result of the missionary recorder than the keeper of the genealogies, the subsequent genealogy of the elite is consistent with most other genealogies, collected later on. The difference is the associated *tala* and the emphasis placed on either Atua and A’ana, or the Tonumaipe’a regions in Savai’i. Pratt does note that the daughter of Salamasina was Fofoaivaose, who had two girls Sina and Taufau. The issue of Sina was Faumuina, who held all four of the titles, referring to the *papa*. Faumuina’s first marriage was to

² Pratt, The Genealogy, 661.
Tuuama, producing Samalauulu. His second marriage was to Atamulau from Tonga, producing Va’afusuaga, and his third was to Talaleomalie, the daughter of Mata’utia of Aleipata, producing the child Fonoti.  

Pratt does not make any further mention of the Tongan lady, nor does he make any connection to the Tonumaipe’a. Yet in the Tonumaipe’a lineages, both Va’afusuaga and Toleafoa are Tonumaipe’a title holders and they are greeted together in many villages in the ceremonial address. In Tonumaipe’a genealogies they are also sometimes treated as one person, perhaps a more modern intervention to hide yet another Tongan marriage, producing Tonumaipe’a heirs. The ancient connection to Tonga is presented as a victory over Tonga, but it also bespeaks a union between the two. The important marriage of Maupeni to the Tuitoga produced Le aumoaga, whose child Taui’iili’i l i Papa married Sina’s sister Taufau. Sina’s son also marries Atamulau from Tonga and produces another member of the Tonumaipe’a line. The origin story is a victory for the Tonumaipe’a clan and its prominence very much depended on its marriages into Tonga.

Pratt does mention the Tonumaipe’a title some generations later with Nofoasaefa, who ‘came from Savai’i’ and received the Tuia’ana title. Atua was divided. Some were in support of Mata’a’afa. The orators Leifi and Tautolo went to Nofoasaefa and asked him to be the king of Atua, ‘because they did not desire Mata’a’afa, who had disregarded their taboo, in that his canoes came and went with songs’. Then Nofoasaefa raised war. A’ana, Savai’i and Tuamasaga, together with the majority of Atua were with Nofoasaefa. ‘Only Falefa, Lufilufi and Samusu, and a part of Salefao and Salevalasi’ were with Mata’a’afa, and Mata’a’afa was defeated. ‘Again he raised war against Lealataua in Satupa’itea, that he might seize the title of Tonumaipe’a. They fought and Nofoasaefa ‘died on Savai’i.”

The mention of Nofoasaefa desiring not only the *papa tamatane* but also the *ao* of the Tonumaipe’a reveals the importance of the title. Also the story reveals the authority and power of Leifi and Tautolo as politicians and powerful orator priests. Their taboo was broken in that the canoes passed their residence without respecting the *sa* or taboo. In the period that this genealogy was published there were still many instances when

---

3 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid.
there were skirmishes because people were standing while rowing or holding umbrellas aloft when passing the houses of chiefs.\(^6\)

The best account of the relationship between the Tonumaipe’a with the descendants of Salamasina is from Tupua Tamasese. He states:

‘Salamasina married a Tonumaipe’a. Her successor Fofoaivaose married a Tonumaipe’a as well. Clearly the marriages acknowledge that the principal bolster of the Salamasina dynasty were the Tonumaipeas of Savai’i and by extension the war fleet’.\(^7\)

The Tonumaipe’a who married Salamasina was Tapumanaia, the son of Tonumaipe’a Saumaipe’a and Tuaetali, the daughter of Lauolunofovaaleane of Tufu Gatavai, Savai’i. The Tonumaipe’a who married Fofoaivaose was Tauatamainulaita who, according to Kraemer is the daughter of Valsi i Olaga. Her brother is Tonumaipe’a Saumaipe’a. Their father is Tau’ili’ili, son of Tonumaipe’a Sauoaiga.\(^8\) The marriage of Tauatamainulaita was certainly a close one genealogically but is acceptable in strengthening family connections. Saumaipe’a and Valsi i Olaga were brother and sister. Tauatamainulaita and Tapumanaia were first cousins, and Tauatamainulaita married his cousin’s daughter.

Fofoaivaose means ‘conceived in a foreign bush and was the result of Salamasina’s union with Alalpepe, according to Bro. Henry. Nevertheless the Tonumaipe’a clan enforced its position in the line of ‘kings and queens’ of Samoa.

Tupua recognises the continued importance of the Tonumaipe’a clan as being one of the three props of Government, the other being Atua and A’ana, who were often at odds. ‘Fofoaivao’es was succeeded by her daughter Taufau who married Tau’ili’ili of the old Tuiatua line and sired Tupuivao the founder of the Mata’afa Amaile line’, but Tupuivao was disinherited.\(^9\)

Certainly Tau’ili’ili could be claimed by Atua, but, as seen in the previous chapter, Tauili’ili was the son of Le Aumoaga and Fuialelagi and grandson of Maupeni and the

\(^6\) Noted, for example in the Journals of M Dyson, ML.
\(^8\) Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 124f.
Tuitoga. Krämer refers to him as Tau’ili’ili i Papa and concurs with the genealogy.\(^{10}\) The greatgrandfather of Tau’ili’ili i Papa was Lalunonofovaleane who was a descendant of Muliga’a. Lalunonofovaleane was also the person who abducted the wife of Tuia’ana Tamalelagi, and also produced a granddaughter who herself was married to Tamalelagi. There seems no immediate connection to the old Tuiatua line. Tau’ili’ili in the *fa’alupega* is first to be greeted in Amaile as the *Matua o Tau’ili’ili*, revered as the father of Amaile, but it is difficult to work out which Tau’ili’ili this is. Also as one of the titles won by Leutogi, The Tonumaipe’a genealogy claims Tau’ili’ili as their own. The issue seems further confused by Tau’ili’ili and Tupa’i appearing in the genealogy only about the time of Salamasina. I have not viewed any genealogy that places Tau’ili’ili before this time so to what old Tuiatua line he belongs is difficult to place. Furthermore Tau’ili’ili (rather than Tau’ili’ili i Papa) was the brother of Levalasi. Atua claimed Levalasi, and Salevalsi is now seen as one of the principal *aiga* of Atua. By extension Tau’ili’ili is also claimed by the line. This, however, is a different Tau’ili’ili and one of the only criticisms I have of Tupua’s work is that Tonga is not recognised in his historical constructions.

The criticism is tempered by current opinion in Samoa. In Sautouaiga’s publication *Mavaega i le Tai*, there is likewise no further mention of Tonga, apart from Leutogi’s and Lafai’a’s victory over Tonga. History can transform itself and Tonga is expunged from the record. But genealogies often reveal what tales and other historical constructs do not. From the time of Salamasina on the genealogies are consistent. Even before this time there is a remarkable consistency in Tongan and Samoan genealogies since the time of Tala’i’ta’a. In one Tongan account both Mata’a’a and Fiame are direct descendants of Tuitoga Akatoe.\(^{11}\) Tuitoga Akatoe had as his wives the daughters of the Tuiatua, namely Popoa’i and Tau’akitoa,\(^{12}\) which is indicative of Atua’s status, but Tau’ili’ili i Papa does not seem to be of an old Tuiatua line. He was to be claimed by the Tonumaipe’a clan, as was his famous son Vao vasa, who was the father of Talaleomalie, who married Tuia’ana Faumuina.\(^{13}\) Again this was a reasonably close marriage, for Faumuina was the daughter of Sina, sister of Taufau, daughters of Fofoiva. According to Bro Henry, the child of the eldest sister, Taufau should

\(^{10}\) Krämer, *The Samoa Islands*, 113.

\(^{11}\) Fetua’i, Kolovai, ‘Genealogy of the beginnings’, 12.

\(^{12}\) Fetua’i, Kolovai, ‘Genealogy of the beginnings’, 12.

\(^{13}\) See Krämer, *The Samoa Islands*, 113.
have produced the rightful heir but he ‘was debarred from succession because of his
scandalous (cannibalistic) behaviour.\(^{14}\)

As soon as the Queen (Taufau) died Tupiuvaio claimed the Tui Atua And the Tui A’ana
and as the mighty Salem[u]liaga clan to which he belonged declared itself in his favour
... war between the to parties. Yet as both Atua and Aana (Tumua) sided with
Faumuina, Tupiuvaio was defeated and banished to Tutuila.\(^{15}\)

Faumuina made three important marriages, as outlined by Pratt. Again the Tongan
marriage is claimed by the Tonumaipè’a people. Va’afusuaga was the result of
Faumuina’s marriage into Tonga; his wife being Atamulau. Va’afusuaga and his elder
sister, according to Pratt, fought against their youngest brother Fonoti. Fonoti had
married Fuatino of Fasito’otai in A’ana.\(^{16}\) Against opposition from his elder siblings, he
fled to Atua initially, ‘Then Misa and Aiono, and Taimalieutu and Fa’ifa’i followed to
Manono.’\(^{17}\) Then they went to Faleata who held a council and received Fonoti. They
fought for him and Samalulu and Va’afusuaga were conquered.\(^{18}\)

In Tupua’s analysis the time of Fonoti was crucial. He states that Fonoti as ali’i o aiga,
or the senior chief of the family should have succeeded his father Faumuina.

However a Leulumoea party led by Galu (later Alipia) joined forces with the
Tonumaipè’as to induce Faumuina to will that after his death Fonoti should share the
honour with his half sister (Samala’ulu) and half brother (Va’afusuaga – Toleafao) ...
Fonoti unlike Tupiuvaio was popular and admired and it was the general feeling that
Fonoti was a victim of political machination. Atua and Tuamasaga save Safata were in
the Fonoti camp. The Tonumaipè’as and Manono were in the forefront of the
Samala’ulu/ Va’afusu’a’aga party. For that reason it was as much a war of succession as
a war of liberation – Upolu’s liberation from the overweening domination of the
Tonumaipè’as.\(^{19}\)

As a result of this victory the far eastern side of Atua received its special designation of
Va’a o Fonoti, for this ‘region in Atua under Ulualofaiga and Molio’o had greatly
assisted in the war’ and ‘bested the Tonumaipè’a/Manono fleet’. A’ana, which had
previously held closer links to Savai’i had previously encouraged the Tonumaipè’a

\(^{14}\) Henry, History of Samoa, 106.
\(^{15}\) Ibid., 108.
\(^{16}\) Pratt, The Genealogy, 661.
\(^{17}\) Pratt, The Genealogy, 661.
\(^{18}\) Ibid. See also Krämer, The Samoa Islands, Vol 1, 225; Schultz, Samoan Proverbs and Expressions, 98.
\(^{19}\) Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese, ‘Tamafaiga’, 5f.
union and ensured the seat of the Malo was in Leulumoega with ‘Tonumaipe’a arms’ had now accommodated Atua in a more vital way.20

In Pratt’s genealogy the language is more decorative – but just as damning about the result of Fonoti’s victory. ‘Va’afusu was appointed by the king of A’ana to be guide of travelling parties and to sit with the kava chewers.’21 To sit with the kava chewers is a designation outside the circle of chiefs, no pole to lean on and no further role in decision-making. This is the role confined to him today in Atua, which one can see by consulting the fa’alupega.

Fonoti married Fuatino, the daughter of To’alepai of Satupuala. According to Krämer, To’alepai is a descendant of the Su’a family in Savai’i;22 Su’a is referred to in the fa’alupega as a ma’upu of Nafanua. Their child was Muagututia. Fonoti’s second marriage was to Taele’asa’asa, the daughter of Tutaiolefeu and produced Falenaotii.

According to Tupua, concession was made by Fonoti to Toleafoa. ‘On his deathbed Bonoti achieved an accommodation with his rival. Tonumaipe’a (which now was part of the Tuiaana patrimony) became Toleafoa and his heirs’ exclusive inheritance – Galu the head of Toleafoa party in Leulumoega was formally recognized as Alipia le matua na togia, i.e., primus inter pares in the House of Nine.23

One apparent problem is that Galu is the alataua or priestly name of Alipia. Galu was probably an earlier form of the title Alipia. Also the successor to Tupua was Galumale mana, the two orator chiefs in Leulumoega who do act as alataua. The name would suggest an acknowledgement of these two orators in their role in assuring that the child of Tupua’s second marriage acceded to the title, instead of his older brother Afoafouvale.

Tupua Tamasese notes that this child was named Galumalemana because Alipia and Lemana attended the fa’aafailelegatama, ‘the ritual which attends the birth of the child – and on their insistence the boy was named after them, Galumalemana’.24

20 See ibid., 4-7.
21 Pratt, The Genealogy, 661.
22 Krämer, The Samoa Islands, Vol 1, 225.
Muagututia made three marriages. The first marriage, according to Krämer was to Fenunuivao and produced Tupua.²⁵ Krämer’s informants did not wish to show that Tupua was not a natural son. The genealogy also favours Sa Fenunuivao, one of the major families in Upolu, particularly in Atua. Pratt’s ‘keepers of the genealogies’ couches the adoption by saying that Tupua ‘was the chief who was lifted down by Salagi, the child of Fuimaono’.²⁶ Salagi is a village on the southern coast in the Atua district. According to another genealogy, Tupua was the grandson of Muagututia, and his name was Fuivaiaili. The original Fuivaiaili was the result of one of the marriages of Tamalelagi who produced Tu‘ana Tuioiti. He married Nanuola the daughter of Folas, of Satupa‘itea.²⁷ Folas in the fa‘alupega is the ‘voice of the papa Tonumeaipa’a’. In this account Tupua was the legitimate heir to Muagutitia, but his adoption also was one that strengthened Tonumeaipa’a claims into A‘ana and Atua.

Galumalemana’s first marriage was into the Tonumeaipa’a family and this produced Nofiasefa. This name recalled the four sacred seats, which according to Tupua Tamasese were ‘Alipia, Lemana, Soloi and Manuta of Leulumoega, whose occupants consult with the gods before any large undertaking’.²⁸ He was challenged by Mata‘afa Fa‘asuaamaleau who was killed.²⁹ Nofiasefa had thus attained the Tuia’ata title, but he was not satisfied and wanted the Tonumeaipa’a title as well. We have already looked at Pratt’s genealogy and there are similar accounts of the battle. Nofiasefa is often portrayed as an aitutagafa who was a cruel leader. His elevation to ta‘afa ifa was engineered by taking his own father’s wife to bed. Tupua Tamasese notes that he could be ‘detribalised’³⁰ for giving out this information, but the information is in private collections and published accounts. Von Bülow’s Genealogy of kings notes that Nofiasefa, the eldest son, went against his father and took his father’s wife Sauimalae as his own. He also killed his brother Afoafouvale and went to Asau and began cannibalism anew.³¹ According to von Bülow, Nofiasefa took on the Malo [in

²⁵ Krämer, The Samoa Islands, Vol 1, 226.
²⁶ Pratt, The Genealogy, 662.
²⁷ Krämer, The Samoa Islands, Vol 1, 223.
²⁹ Henry, The History of Samoa, 96, Tupua Tamasese, ANU Address, 12.
³¹ von Bülow, Der Stammbaum, Globus, bd. LXXI, nr. 10, 1897, 151. In von Bülow’s account in 1898, he also states that Galumalemana had named I’afamana as his successor but Nofiasefa, the eldest, took his father’s wife as his own wife, Der Stammbaum, IAE, XI, 1898, 124. In private collections, see F Fotu account in Grattan, MS Papers 4879–071.
Savai’i] but was ‘defeated by the rising chief Toleafoa of the Pe’a family whose roots lie in the village of Asau.\[^{32}\]

The marriage of Nofoasaefa to his father’s wife is hidden, however in the majority of genealogies. This is one reason why Nofoasaefa is said to have come from Savai’i to receive the Tuia’ana title in Pratt’s genealogy. The child of the womb, however, is not. That child was I’amafana, who in the majority of accounts was said to have passed the Malo onto Sa Malietoa.

Nofoasaefa’s death allowed the return of I’amafana. Again Tupua Tamasese’s account is informative. He states that:

\[^{33}\] I’amafana] spent most of his reign in A’ana and died in Alafua, just behind Apia, where he and his troops sought refuge after a military setback in A’ana inflicted by a Manono/ Tonumaipe’a combination ....

His successor, Safeofafine was also bested by ‘the Tonumaipe’as, Manono and most of Savai’i’ who ‘joined A’ana’ against Safeofafine who was only left with support from Atua.\[^{34}\]

Tupua Tamasese makes no mention of Teoneula, the other son of I’amafana. Teoneula is present in most public genealogies and his exclusion – and his life – seem a mystery.

\[^{34}\] Ibid.
CHAPTER 5

NAFANUA SANCTIONS THE NEW MALO OF TAMAFAIKA AND MANONO

As a simplification it is generally perceived that there are two principal family lines in Samoa, that of Sa Malietoa, or the Malietoa family and Sa Tupua, or the Tupua family. All villages trace their principal lines of descent back to these two families genealogically and the fa’alupega, which is the ‘potted history’ of the settlement and titles of each particular village, reveal to which of these two principal families one is related. Of course due to the extensive ‘intermarrying’ of these two principal lines the distinction is not always clear. However each village – and each sub-family indicates genealogically its relationship to one of these two families and in this way status is achieved and ones ‘place in the world’ is revealed.

The moving of the attainment of national leadership – which can be associated with the ceremonial function of the ‘sacred king’ from the Tupua family into the Malietoa family is one of the most confusing periods in the history of Samoa. The accounts and counter claims of what happened in this period reveal great disagreement. This is true not only within Samoan accounts – but in the analysis of this period by foreign recorders.

The most generally accepted account is that I’amafana adopted Vainu’upo as his son and upon his deathbed willed that this ‘favoured son’ should take precedence over his biological sons and be given the titles of national leadership. Nearly all recorded accounts do speak of this adoption as being the legitimizing force that allowed the movement of the national leadership to pass from one principal family into the other. Even Krämer, who was a strong Tupua (Mata’aufa) supporter, agrees that Malietoa’a Vainu’upo did become tafa’ifā and the power base moved from A’ana in Upolu (Sa Tupua) to Manono, Safotulafai and Tuamasaga which are all areas associated with the Malietoa family.¹ He does not however see his movement of the power base or Malo as being the result of a legitimate process, but speaks of Malietoa as being a ‘usurper to the throne’ and states that as a result of the English mission associating itself with

¹ Krämer, The Samoa Islands, Vol 1, 449.
Vainu’upo it ‘felt itself closely connected with the Malietoa family and this is to be seen the reason for all troubles and difficulties which have involved the Samoan royal question. In other words he sees that it is the usurpation of the Malietoa family over the traditional rights of the Tupua family as being the cause for the almost constant warfare from the time of the death of I’amafana in about the year 1800 until the time Krämer was writing at the beginning of the 20th century.

Recorded accounts of this period from informants of the Malietoa family are equally numerous and as is to be expected they enhance the status of the Malietoa family. It is in this sense that it is important to be able to recognize who the exact informants are in order to recognize the bias that eventuates. Some prominent examples of the elevation of the Ao title of the Malietoa are as follows. Stübel records that the origin of the four Papa or titles needed for national leadership result from the time of Malietoa Uitualagi and Laulii’i. Uitualagi instituted them and bestowed them on the children of Laulii’i. Also of note is that the sentence ‘aua o Malietoa lava o le pogai o le tofiga papa', meaning that it is only the Malietoa who established the papa, is not translated in the English version. Another account, in the British Consulate in Tonga says that Malieto’a Tavita (Vainu’upo) ‘became the first king of the whole of Samoa’, denying that any former ceremonial king existed. Another pro- Malietoa account, written in 1887, states that the ‘present Tupua family now pretend to be of equal rank with the Malietoas’.

These claims can be equally countered from accounts recorded from Sa Tupua informants, like those revealed in Krämer for instance and in these – as in most accounts – the ancientness of the Tui Atua and Tui A’ana titles, which are two of the papa, is asserted.

In this sense there is no nationally accepted history of Samoa as the many claims made in the Land and Titles Court reveal. The recorded history and legends also emphasise these two families and concentrate principally on the areas of Tuamasaga and Safotulafai for Malietoa and A’ana for Sa Tupua.

Krämer who dedicated his massive monograph to Mata’afa of the Tupua line reveals clearly his bias towards this family. The other principal German recorder of the period,
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2 Ibid., 450.
3 Stübel, Myths and Legends of Samoa: Tala o le Vavau, London, Western Samoa, 1976, 70f.
4 ‘Samoan 1887, Genealogy of the Malietoas’, Public Archives of Hawai’i.
von Bülow, and the German Government favoured this line also. Von Bülow says that the first Genealogy published was in the Samoa Times in the year 1879 and states that it ‘followed the political objective to produce evidence that there had never been another “kingly family” like that of Malietoa’. Von Bülow even joined the Tupua Tamasese camp for some time to supposedly ‘lend his assistance to this cause’, and like Krämer says that the English and the English missionaries supported the Malietoa family after the nominal Christianisation of Vainu’upō while the German authorities – ‘probably on good grounds held to the older kingly family of Tupua’. He is also rather derogatory about the union of the English London Missionary Society with Malietoa Vainu’upō who ‘died as a Christian even though he had four wives’.

This general view of the association of the Germans with the Tupua line and Catholicism is well enough documented as is the English and American association with the Malietoa line and the LMS. However the subsequent historical literature has generally followed these same biases – with historians and commentators relying principally on English sources claiming a more legitimate role for Malietoa and those relying on German material generally favouring the Tupua line.

Subsequent German literature also seems to follow the same line as the original commentators speak of the ‘myth making LMS machine’ elevating the status of the usurping Malietoa line. For example one more recent commentator writes that ‘Under the strong influence of the LMS, who feared a deterioration of their missionary work under the kingship of the catholic Mata’afa fought before the high court against the validity of the Mata’afa Vote and presented the young son of Malietoa Laupepa, the (LMS) missionary pupil, Tanu’. The problem remains however that the interim between the death of Šamafana and the gaining of all the papa titles by Malietoa is unexplained and all that is generally accepted is that in this interregnum Tamafaiga or Leitaua Tonumaipe’a of Manono had seized power and under the influence of the goddess Nafanua’ managed to rule the whole of Samoa for a brief period until his gruesome death.
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6 Ibid.
7 Ibid., 124.
Despite the efforts of the LMS to speak of Maletoa as the principal chief of the Islands when they arrived in 1830, the Power base was still at Manono, where Tamafaiga resided. Furthermore the LMS missionary, Buzzacott, refers to Tonumaipe’a of Manono as the head of the Malo in 1836. It is he, who with the Tonumaipe’a title areas and the influence of the goddess Nafanua, maintained the Malo and did so for some time. What need to be delved into further are the time of Tamafaiga and his father Leiataua Lelologa and the relationship of Manono with the Maleietoa title.

This period is often glossed over in the literature. In Von Bülow’s two publications entitled ‘The Genealogy of the Kings of Samoa’, Tamafaiga does not even rate mention. In the 1898 publication he moves I’amafana who had a peaceful reign to Maleietoa Vainu’upo who fought against his brother and won. Krämer speaks of Tamafaiga but — as mentioned — emphasizes that power passed from the Tupua line to the usurping Maleietoa and the areas Manono, Safotulafai and Tuamasaga which all have a say in Maleietoa title. He further states that it is Malie (Tuamasaga) that actually bestows the title but Manono and Safotulafai are always consulted and if Maleietoa is abused there is a war fono (meeting) held in Tuamasaga (Afega) and Manono is called to assistance. It also appears that Krämer had very little to do with Manono and his traditions from there are scarce. In addition to this the terror and memory of Tamafaiga is expunged not only by our sources but by Samoan informants as well. In a country that had become strongly Christianized Tamafaiga became the evil or devil and was a sign of the evil and dark days of Samoa’s past.

In the story of Sapapali’i in the Gurr manuscripts, Tamafaiga is likewise not mentioned. The informants merely states that Maleietoa Fitisemanu was the king that went to Falealupo to buy a government from the aitu Nafanua. The government was brought to Faasalelagia and Salofo (Savaii) … Tavita [Vainu’upo] was the successor. Fitisemanu lived at the same time as the father of Tamafaiga, but again Tamafaiga is ignored every time. The kava was presented to Vainu’upo and his successors, as the cup name refers directly to Fitisemanu acquiring the government from Nafanua.
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9 Buzzacott, Journals 41, SSJ.
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Sa Malietoa and their religion the LMS attempt to emphasize the legitimacy of Malietoa as ‘head of the Malo’ before and during the time of Tamafaiga of Manono. The LMS missionaries are not surprisingly, perhaps the strongest opponents of the legitimate passing of the Malo from I’amafana to Malietoa Vainu’upo, especially in published sources.

The majority of missionary writings, if they do accept Tamafaiga as holding Pule or authority head of the Malo, he is normally seen as an interloper with no legitimate authority. For example, the LMS missionary George Turner writes that Tamafaiga was ‘not descended from any of the royal families of Samoa, but the supposition that he could rule the destinies of war raised him high in the scale of political influence and ‘before any other daring upstart had the time to concoct a scheme for political influence by declaring that he had the spirit of god who dwelt in Tamafaiga’, the mission arrived.¹³ The LMS missionary, John Stair also views Tamafaiga similarly. He wrote that the A’ana war was an attempt to ‘rid themselves of the tyrant Tamafaiga who had usurped the regal authority of the islands’ and who was also worshipped as a god.¹⁴

An LMS article extolling the important events achieved by Malietoa Vainu’upo, dates the elevation of the title to a time well before the death of Tamafaiga. It speaks of the battle of the Taeaofua in 1802 or 1807. This battle was, according to the LMS, due to the ‘refusal of Sa Tupua to recognise Vainu’upo, I’amafana’s successor to the titles Tupua and Galumalemana’. A subsequent war, called the Faitasiga of Atua in 1822 was caused by the ‘refusal of Tupa’u and Lufilufi to recognise the Pule of Vaiinupo.¹⁵ The leader of the Malo in early, 1830 was Leaiataua Tonumaipe’a Tamafaiga and his authority came from his connection with Tonumaipe’a.

The transformation of Manono and Tamafaiga being subsumed into the Malietoa family is perhaps most evident in 1985 publication from the LMS institute in Malua. In this recent publication astoundingly he is referred to as Malietoa Tamafaiga.¹⁶ This publication reveals that Tamafaiga was the leader of the Malo. There is no mention of his Malo being sanctioned by Nafanua nor did he have the Tonumaipe’a title. In no

---


¹⁴ Stair, Old Samoa, or Flotsam and Jetsam from the Pacific Ocean, 250.


primary documents I have consulted had Tamafaiga being referred to as Malietoa. The
calling of Tamafaiga as Malietoa reflects the transformation over time of the
dominance of the new Malo, a final victory over Manono and their inheritance from
Nafanua.

Probably due to the influence of the LMS and Christianity in general, informants from
Manono were reluctant to further their claims although there do exist documentary
material written down early in this century that has been kept within the family of an
heir of both Luafataali’i and Luatutu – the hereditary ‘founding fathers’ of Manono.

Krämer writes that peace reigned in the times of the six tafa ‘ifa of the Tupua line and
blames the eventual break in this peace due to the incoming of Europeans into Samoa.
He speaks especially of the time of the court decision of the Chief Justice Chambers to
install Malietoa Tanumafili as king as breaking the peace and speaks of the most evil
liars who witnessed before this court. However in the publication of this question of
Kingship in Samoa he does not mention Manono and Tamafaiga, nor does he list any
Leiataua or Manono descendants in his ‘Genealogy of Kings’. The period between the
death of I’amafana and the arrival of the Europeans is not explained.

Krämer in his monograph Die Samoa-Inseln is also confused as to this period. He
records that Malietoa received the Kingship from I’amafana in an incident, which
occurred when I’amafana went to visit Vainu’upo’s father, Fitisemanu. A
misunderstanding arose between the aumaga and servers of both parties over the
distribution and preparation of Kava. As a result the servers of Malietoa chased the
servers of I’amafana into the sea and were only saved by the actions of Fitisemanu’s
son, Vainu’upo. Vain’upo ‘called the aumaga of Malietoa back and gave them such a
hiding that there were many with bruises and covered with blood. As a result I’amafana
willed that he would be next tafa ‘ifa.

There are some major problems with the implications of this story. The story itself does
legitimize – or attempts to legitimize the passing over of power from one family to the
other. However prior to the arrival of the missionaries – Malietoa was, according to

17 Krämer, Die Samoanische Königsfrage im Hinblick, Globus, Bd LXXV, Nr12, März 1899, 188.
18 Krämer, Die Samoanische Königsfrage im Hinblick, 187.
19 Also in Krämer’s Die Samoanische Königfrage, 188, he noted that ‘Malietoa served I’amafana and first
Tumua gave him the titles’.
Manono tradition almost incarcerated on Manono. It is said in these traditions that his housesite – which is the housesite of the present Catholic catechist – was only just raised off the ground. This is a sign of low status.\textsuperscript{20} Furthermore the power of the Malo was with Manono and Satupa’itea in the person of Tamafaiga. Only after the death of Tamafaiga did Malietoa attain further status and even the seat of the Malo remained in Manono and areas associated with the Tonumaipe’a title – principally Satupa’itea. A further difficulty is the emphasis put upon the will of the king. Those who have the right to confer the papa titles are the orator groups of the respective districts associated with the title. Thus the Tui Atua papa is conferred by Lufilufi orators and the Tuia’ana by those at Leulumoega. No individual, even the tafa’ifa can dictate who accedes to the titles, although his wishes can be honoured if those assembled for the mavaega agree. The mavaega of I’amafana – if indeed this was his last will, was not accepted. The Atua district and the orators of Lufilufi chose Safeofafine – the natural son of I’amafana to be their Tui Atua. Likewise the A’ana district refused to accept the last will of Malietoa Vainu’upo to bestow the Tuia’ana on his first cousin fifteen years after Vainu’upo’s death.

Brother Henry, like most recorders of Samoan history, accepts that the last will of I’amafana was to bestow his honours on Malietoa and over-emphasises this last will. Brother Henry however does explain to some extent this interregnum between the death of I’amafana, which he dates as being 1802, and the coming of the missionaries and the rising of the status of Malietoa Vainu’upo.\textsuperscript{21}

I’amafana had two children. The first was Safeofafine and the second was Tuioneula. Brother Henry assumes that Tuioneula died before I’amafana. However according to Stair he was virtually expelled from Samoa due to his murdering a Samoan. As his mother was Tongan, he is found in 1830 in Ha’apai. Safeofafine was chosen to be Tuiatua. However Henry assumes that he must have proved unfit to rule in the eyes of his father – I’amafana. Oral evidence suggests that he was effeminate and weak. Henry also sees that Vainu’upo was eligible for the Kingship due to his being related to the Tupua family – being a descendant of both Galumalemana and Tuimaleali’ifano. Also the lines of Tuionaula and Safeofafine died out as they did not produce issue. The

\textsuperscript{20} Testimony of Taupa’u.
\textsuperscript{21} Henry, \textit{History of Samoa}, 128f.
intervening thirty years is then presented as a time of ceaseless warfare with various factions fighting for supremacy.\textsuperscript{22}

Up until the death of I’amafana, Henry states that Manono formed a political unit with A’ana. Whenever a new king was installed at Leulumoega, Manono sent him a heap of spears and clubs ... in order to indicate its willingness to assist him in any war he might decide upon. The majority opinion however is that, as Manono is strongly related to the Malietoa family, Malietoa was supported by Manono. Manono is called ‘one of the eight families of Malietoa’. Literature – especially that written by English missionaries and those historians relying on them – take this notion of the alliance between Manono and Malietoa for granted. These sources – for example Gilson – associate Malietoa Vainu’upo with Manono and assume the Malietoa headship of this Malo. However this denies the reality that Malietoa was fighting on the side of Safune and Safotu prior to the death of Tamafaiga against Manono and Satupaite’a forces. It is true that by the time of the arrival of the missionaries Malietoa who burning and sacking the A’ana district with Manono forces. The simple fact is that he knew that by ‘changing sides’ at this point he might be able to attain the papa. It was only with Manono’s assistance that the Malietoa family and titleholder could be elevated in status.

During the interregnum between I’amafana and Malietoa, Safune and Safotu were together with parts of Atua. These united against the Manono/Sapapali’i regime. The head of these Safotu and Safune forces according to Henry and others was Vainu’upo. However this seems to be highly unlikely. Firstly these are strong Tupua connections also. That Malietoa would lead these forces is extremely doubtful.

According to Safune accounts, the war against Satupa’itea is called, the \textit{Valuvaluagatao}. The Safotu alliance tried twice to arrest the power of the Manono/Satupa’itea Malo and failed twice. One of these wars, the \textit{Valuvaluagatao}, allowed new titles to be created. The famous Mamea title of Safune rose from this war. Furthermore Safune accounts, which obviously favour Safune, record that the woman Fa’atupuigati of Gaga’emalae acted as mediator and held back the Safune troops. Tuagaga, one of the orators or \textit{taulaitu} responsible for electing the ao of the Tagaloa, stated that if it had not been for her as mediator, Faletoi (referring to Satupa’itea) would have suffered.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{22} Henry, \textit{History of Samoa}, 128-130.
\textsuperscript{23} See LC, 1515.
The most recent, and clear account of this interregnum period, is by Tupua Tamasese. As to be expected, even though this was written in the 1990’s, it favours the Tupua version of the affairs of the interregnum. He does however admit to the preeminence of Manono and Satupa’itea as the Malo. It is stated that A’ana did not support the biological son of I’amafana, Safeofafine; A’ana was weakened and this allowed their traditional allies – Manono to take precedence in the form of Leiataua Lelologa – the father of Tamafaiga. The battle of this new regime against Atua (Safeofafine) was he says ‘one of the most crucial battles in Samoan history and is known appropriately as ‘Peiga ole Malo’. Meaning the dismantling of the Malo. According to those who informed Bro Henry, the peiga o le Malo actually refers to the dismantling of the Malo of Tamafaiga when Malietoa and Manono avenged the death of Tamafaiga in A’ana. The Peiga o Malo more likely refers to the final defeat of Safeofafine, which literally meant the taking away of the Malo from Lufilufi and Leulumoea and setting it up in Manono. The avenging of A’ana is more probably the war referred to as the Faitasiga o A’ana.24

Tupua does not record anything about the last will of I’amafana favouring Malietoa, rather he says that after the death of I’amafana ‘Lufilufi and Leulumoea were at loggerheads over the succession but the Tui Atua was bestowed on Safeofafine.25

A’ana did not agree and ‘the Tonumaipe’a, Manono and most of Savai’i joined A’ana against Atua’.26 In the interim the Malietoa faction had joined Safotu and Safune against Leiataua Lelologa who ruled ferociously. Mata’a faa Filisonu’u rallied with an Atua contingent. Again there is difficulty in analysis as the informants of Brother Henry said that Mata’a faa Filisonu’u joined Malietoa in the Safune/Safotu contingent. According to Tupua Tamasese, Tamafaiga eventually overcame Mata’a faa Filisonu’u and encouraged the above contingent to join them. Filisonu’u died at the hands of Tamafaiga and Manono forces.

As opposed to Malietoa, Tupua explains that the head of the Safotu-Safune regime was Tuiailemafa who was a descendent of Puamea who was a full sister of Nofoaosefa, and the aunt of I’amafana.27 It does seem more likely that she was in this position rather

25 Tupua Tamasese, The Riddle, 76.
26 Ibid.
27 Ibid., 19.
than Malietoa. Tupua’s account does not mention the reality that in a sense those in Safotu and Safune (Lilomaiava and Tagaloa) had their own agenda, which was to decrease the power of the Tonumaipe’a and their goddess Nafanua. Tuailemafua was also connected with the old regime of the Tupua line and thus could be a valid candidate for headship of this Malo. The resulting first battle between Leiatua Leologa and Manono against Tuailemafua ended in stalemate. As a result of accommodating the result, a marriage was compromised involving both sides. Leologa’s son, Tamafaiga married Laolao the daughter of Tuailemafua who was leader of the Safune/Safotu Malo.

Tupua also stresses that his ancestors Puamemea improved his (Tamafaiga’s) credentials. Tupua also stresses in his genealogy in this paper that Tamafaiga was able to attain the Tonumaipe’a title through his father’s marriage to Laolao, the daughter of Tuailemafua Laolao. This seems to be possible and convincing, but does favour the interpretation that the Tonumaipe’a title passed down within the Satupua line, although Tupua does say that on the death of Leologa, Tamafaiga succeeded to the Leiatua title ‘because of his mother’s connections, the Sa Moeleoi conferred the Ao of Tonumaipe’a on him’. The stress in the genealogy provided does indicate that the genealogical claim was through Puamemea. Tamafaiga’s claim may have been strengthened as Leologa also married the daughter of Asiata in Satupa’itea. Asiata is referred to in the fa’alupega as the vaaiti or priest of Nafanua of the Tonumaipe’a line.

Safune and Safotu also again warred against Tamafaiga and lost. This also leads to the assumption that Tamafaiga obtained the ao of the Tonumaipe’a through his father and not his wife, as it is customary for the wife’s family to associate with that of the husband. Leologa obtained the Malo with the assistance of Asiata and Satupa’itea. In doing so they gained status – which is a good reason for the holders and districts of the other ao titles of Savai’i to rebel against them.

In Tupua’s account however there are certain conclusions one can make. He hardly even mentions Malietoa – apart from the fact that the Malietoa has genealogical connections to Manono. Also he emphasizes in the genealogy that the Tonumaipe’a title passes through the Tupua line.
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The general impression one obtains from the available literature is that the interregnum between the death of I’amafana and Vainu’upo was that it was a period of instability. It was also a period in which the appointed heir – Malietoa – is seen to be thwarted in his attainment of the papa by the interloper Tamafaiga. It is also said in Samoa that Vainu’upo’s father Fitisemanu received the message from the goddess Nafanua that he and his family would receive the Malo from heaven – which is interpreted as the arrival of the missionaries. Tupua does to some extent, dispel the Malietoa myth and does avoid the oversimplification of the interregnum as a period of the family awaiting their true inheritance from the goddess Nafanua.

However Tupua, like Henry and Kramer, does lay stress on the goddess Nafanua. Henry says that the reason why the Safotu/Safune regime lost out was that it was not sanctioned by the goddess Nafanua. There also seems to be an inconsistency in the argument as Tamafaiga is perceived as being possessed by the goddess Nafanua – in other words his leadership is sanctioned by her – yet on the other hand Fitisemanu is said to have received word from a Manono taulaitu or priest that the Malo of the old gods was about to end and that Nafanua would give the Malo to the Malietoa family. In this way Tamafaiga is generally presented as not only cruel and an interloper – but also a person who was unique in Samoan history by being a ‘crazed ‘living God’.

Perhaps the most undervalued personality in the interregnum is Leiataua Lelologa and it was he and his advisors who seized the opportunity to gain the Malo after Tumua – A’ana and Atua failed to achieve unity after the death of I’amafana.

It was also he who maintained this Malo until his death and Tamafaiga took over. The rival Malo of Safune and Safotu had far less support than Manono with her Satupa’itea allies but while Tupua maintains that this first skirmish between the two ended in stalemate, it is likely that, as Henry suggests, Lelologa won because of the arrangement of the marriage of his son with the daughter of Tualemefua. These types of marriages are a common sign of victory and Lelologa and the Manono regime appear to have had control of the Malo continuously from the death of Safeofafine and continued to fight for it well into the 20th century.

Leiataua Lelologa established and named the village Salelologa in the Fa’asaleleaga district in Savai’i. A descendant of Manono and Leiataua – namely Papali’i, established Sapapali’i, which became the residence of Fitisemanu. Lelologa lived for it appears a
long time in Tufu, which is close to Falealupo the traditional Nafanua stronghold. It is also in the Alataua district, which is associated with the Tonumaipe’a title.

Lelologa thus had good connections and a strong hold in Savai’i – and through his marriage to the daughter of Asiata. It was they who assisted Lelologa in his various campaigns. Lelologa established the settlements of Vaota between Falelima and Neiafu. He also established Sa – Oloa between Neiafu and Tufutafaoe and the little village of Leiatua in Papa Puleia.30

In a recent book published by a descendant of the Tonumaipe’a (Sa Moeleoi) lineage – which unfortunately is not available in English – the emphasis in the interregnum period is on Lelologa and Tonumaipe’a. Of course in this publication, the author, Lafai Sauoaiga, states that the effective rule was with Asiata and Satupa’itea. Lelologa united with this rule. Also consistent with Safune/Safotu traditions the interpretation of the war of Lelologa against this faction is perceived to be an internal Savi’i war. Sauoaiga explains it as being a war of Satupa’itea and Lelologa against Lilomaiava – a rival Ao title in Savai’i. It is an oversimplification to view the Safune/Safotu faction being a unification of people under the Tupua banner as Tupua Tamasese emphasizes with Tuailemafua being leader of this faction. This is not to downgrade the importance of Tuailemafua – but to emphasise that this ‘rival Malo’ was fighting as much for their own standard – Lilomaiava and on the other side Tonumaipe’a, as for anything else.

Sauoaiga also speaks of the daughter of Tuailemafua as being a ‘ransom to end the war’, which seems the most reasonable explanation. The most extensive explanation of Lelolga is recorded in Stuebel’s *Samoanische Texte*, with a brief abridged account in the English translation ‘Myths and Legends of Samoa’.31 The account is consistent with the common Samoan understanding that his Malo was legitimized because he was possessed by Nafanua. Nafanua possessed him because of his kindness to two daughters of Nafanua. Of note also is that Lologa is portrayed as gaining position to the detriment of A’ana, as the account mentions that the daughters of Nafanua first went to Alipia – an important orator in Leulumoega but he was rude to them. The main purpose of this story is that the power base moved from A’ana to Manono and was sanctioned by Nafanua. It is also portrayed that this possession allowed him to ‘see the battleground Leetu between Safotu and Matautu’, thus he called his warriors together

30 Lafai Sauoaiga, *Mavaega i le Tai*, 94.  
31 Stuebel, *Samoanische Texte*, 78. The full account in the *Texte* is entitled *Die Erzählung von dem aitu Tamafaiaga*. 

108
to fight and overcome this faction. Lelologa is portrayed as ruling from the time of winning this war until he died in 1823 and his son; Tamafaiga was a grown man and powerful in his own right. For much of this time he lived in Sili-inland from Tufutuafoe. As a further indication of his power he established his aitu or spirit house in Sili in the chiefly house called Savelu. In here presumably he continued to seek favour from Pulotu and Nafanua.

Another facet of Tamafaiga's inheritance was due to his relationship with Tonga. Tupua Tamasese noted that Manono and Savai’i were assisted in the wars of the 1820s by their Tongan and Fijian allies. Otto von Kotzebue, in his voyages in the Pacific was the only European to meet Tamafaiga and assumed he was Tongan. He met an 'elderly man seated on a platform' who carried a European Parasol. He 'wore a fine mat over his shoulders' and 'had a white cloth around his head'. The 'natives immediately made way for his canoe'. He was not tattooed and he greeted Kotzebue as the Eigeh of the vessel and said he 'was the Eigeh of the Island'. He also 'motioned south, said “Tongatabu” where Kotzebue recalled he had been in his own canoe'.

Some scholars have assumed that this person was Tamafaiga – and this seems very likely. There are many tala recalling Tamafaiga’s headdress and his not being tattooed. More confusing is whether he himself was a Tongan, which is implied in the story. Not only did he point to Tongatabu, he also called himself, and Kotzebue, ‘Eigeh’, which seemed to indicate the Tongan word for chief, ‘eiki’. Panapasa, a Wesleyan, teacher from Tonga claimed that Tamafaiga had come from Tonga. Leulu Va’a comments that ‘it may be that there were important Tongan sources for Tamafaiga’s power’. Gunson, relying on the von Kotzebue account and the journal of John Williams, who visited Samoa in 1830, also assumes a strong Tongan connection. Williams reported that seven large Tongan canoes visited Samoa to collect fine mats just prior to his arrival, and notes that more were due to return. Gunson intimates that Tamafaiga was a Tongan on these grounds.

If Tamafaiga were Tongan this is not accounted for in the genealogies. He may have had Tongan kin – indeed it seems most likely, but one questions his relationship – and by extension, the Malo’s relationship with Tonga. Gunson suggests that Manono was paying tribute to Tonga – evidenced by the number of canoes taking fine mats back to
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33 MS Brown notes on Samoan customs; Dyson Journal, 12 February 1863, Leulu Va’a, c.f. 66, 147f, MS.
34 Neil Gunson, 'The Tonga-Samoan connection 1777-1845: Some observations on the nature of Tongan Imperialism'.
Another possibility was that the fine mats were part of a tributary exchange, as king George, or Taufa'ahau, had just married the daughter of Matetau, a leading orator of Manono. They could also be part of the strong connection of Manono and the southern coast of Savai'i's commercial transactions that reflect the power of the Malo. The connection with Tonumaipe'a marriages into the Tongan elite, indicate the desire for the clan to marry into Tonga to strengthen their ties and to benefit their position within Samoa itself. The power of the new Malo was also strengthened with Tongan commerce and support. The belief that Samoa was in an inferior relationship with Tonga does not seem to fit the story. That Tamafaiga had kin in Tonga, and also that he was not subject to it is revealed in the following poem. Falepalagi was a famous bard in the early to mid 1800s in Tonga. Uluamoleka's poem upon the death Veainu, Papalagi's father, records the collecting of mats as a gift to the family in honour of the dead man. On their way to collect mats from Tonga the poem goes:

'But on we come we two
To reach Manuka at dawn;
Do you remain with Nafanua,
A difficult fellow, for 'tis
A god to Sau and Leiataua'.

Sau refers to the principal chief of Apolima and Leiataua to Tamafaiga of Manono. Nafanua was the tutelary deity and not an easy aitu to reckon with.

In conclusion this interregnum period is not simply a brief period of unrest while Malietoa awaited his rightful inheritance from I'amafana. Neither is it a brief period while Malietoa awaited his Malo from Nafanua in the form of the LMS missionaries. Rather it was a period of assertion in Savai'i and Manono, while A'ana and Atua lost control of their former power and position. Tamafaiga was not just a 'freak of Nature' rather his position was secured during the rule of his father. The assumption that Manono is just one of the 'eight families of Malietoa' also serves to downgrade Manono independence. Malietoa does not control Manono and Manono traditions recount that one of their 'claims to fame' was that they killed – and ate the liver of Malietoa Lauaufolasa – the great-grandfather of
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Vainu’upo. The relationship with Tonga was a feature of the Malo and the Lotu Toga or the Wesleyan religion would form strong ties to these old Malo areas.

Finally, in terms of research in Samoa, it is essential to recognise the bias of the informant or historian/storyteller. As Tupua says ‘Everyone has their own barrow to push’. The difficulty with Samoan sources is recognising how this affects subtle – and not so subtle emphases in the accounts and making some sense of these emphases.
PART II

CHAPTER 6

NAFANUA’S GIFT TO MALIETOA (1830-32)

This study as a whole presents the rise of influence of the Nafanua cult in Western Samoa. This section focuses on the last phase of the old cult of Nafanua and the arrival of the Christian missions. Formerly Malietoa had joined with Manono’s opponents in the Safune/Safotu area on Itu o Tane. However Malietoa had seen the writing on the wall for this faction and had joined with Tonumaipe’a Tamafaiga.

The difference between the chiefly status of Malietoa and Tamafaiga was that Tamafaiga was viewed as a prophet or god. He held the Tonumaipe’a title, which was associated with the goddess and it was in Tamafaiga that she chose to reside. He believed supernatural powers had allowed the traditional powerbase of Sa Tupua to be overtaken by himself, Leiataua Lesa of the island Manono, with his allies belonging to the Tonumaipe’a areas of Savai’i, the title associated with the goddess Nafanua. Malietoa on the other hand did not have the religious or cult status of Tamafaiga. In this sense the coming of the missionaries offered him a status, which would give religious legitimisation to his new regime.

It is the commonly held perception in Samoa that with the coming of the missionaries Malietoa gained headship of the Malo. The prophecy of Nafanua is said to have been that his Malo was to come from heaven – e tali le lagi i lou Malo, the implication being that Malietoa’s headship of the Malo was religiously sanctioned by Nafanua and that his headship of the Malo began with the missionaries who ‘came from heaven’.

The arrival of the London Missionary Society [LMS] at Sapapali’i is believed to be the fulfilment of this prophecy of Nafanua. John Williams, the European LMS missionary, portrays his arrival as a momentous event for the Samoans. He arrived, along with a fellow missionary, Charles Barff, at Sapapali’i along with eight native Tahitian teachers
in Samoa in 1830. They were warmly welcomed. The history of Samoa is divided in many oral history accounts as being between the days of darkness and these new days of light. The most informative source is the journal record of John Williams’ encounter with the Malietoa people in Sapapali’i and the position of Malietoa within the Malo of Manono.

Tamafaiga, the embodiment of Nafanua and head of the Malo had just died. He had held considerable sway over all of Samoa. Williams recognised the power of Manono politically and, in his second trip in 1832, returned with a missionary for Matetau, whom he describes, as one of the two principal chiefs of the islands. The other was Malietoa. Matetau is also described as a ‘relative of Malietoa’. The problem is that while Matetau is a powerful principal orator of Manono, he was not Leiataua or Tonumaipe’a, the ali’i one would expect to be noted as the principal chief of Manono. By 1836, Barff would proclaim Pe’a referring to Tonumaipe’a of Manono as the leading chief of the Malo. What had happened to Matetau? Why was Pe’a not mentioned as a principal chief formerly? Perhaps the most important question to ask is why Malietoa was said to be the leader of the Malo of Manono.

There are no texts in Samoan of the actual encounter at the time. The actual meeting is recorded in Samoa by means of a type of codified linguistic form in the ‘taeao’ or morning of the meeting of Malietoa and Williams in Sapapali’i. The taeao are a formalised part of lauga or formal speech-making that are passed down in stylized form to orators or Tulafale in Samoa. The transformation of the event over time has made Malietoa Tavita receive the missionaries, his gift from Nafanua. There are important elements that are preserved, like the name of the place of the meeting. According to Williams’ journal, however, the initial meeting was between himself and Vainu’upo’s brother Taimalelagi. The replacing of Taimalelagi or Tinai with Vainu’upo is perhaps not that important, as the more important reality was that Malietoa Vainu’upo was titular head of the family at that time. His legacy, recorded in the taeao and tala of Samoa has led to the belief of many people in Samoa today that the new Malo was initiated upon this meeting between Malietoa Vainu’upo and the LMS, a meeting that was prophesied and sanctioned by the goddess Nafanua.

In the meeting of 1830, Williams records that Malietoa’s brother ‘Tuiano’, referring to Tinai, received Williams and his party as Malietoa was away fighting in Upolu. He was
avenging the death of Tamafaiga. Not only was Malietoa not at the initial meeting, but ‘the chiefs had agreed to divide the teachers among them, four to reside with each chief’. Tinai received four of the eight teachers, Malietoa Vainu’upo receiving the other four. Malietoa Tinai or Taimalelagi later rejected the Lotu or the LMS worship. He does not feature strongly in Samoan tala about the lotu. His record – or part of it would be expunged, which will be discussed presently. Williams noted that in the exchange of gifts, he was reluctant to give Malietoa a musket. He acquiesced when ‘the chief Malietoa pleaded he should become the laughing stock of all his brother chiefs if we did not give him a musket.’ Williams also met Matetau of Manono. Williams noted that ‘we were soon apprised of the old chief’s visit viz to beg for a blunderbus which he had been told was on board.’ Williams took Matetau back to Manono along with John Wright, a European who had lived on the island for some considerable time. Williams proclaimed that Matetau was ‘chief of that Island’. He also said that Matetau was desirous of two native teachers ‘when we came again and said he would build a chapel for them’.

In the transformation from the journal to the publication based on the journal, entitled Missionary Enterprises certain additions and deletions are made. In a work by Besser, based on Missionary Enterprises, even further transformations are made. This publication by the Berlin Missionary Society was written for those interested in missionary lives, works and the spreading of the faith through the islands by John Williams, and certain embellishments are made. In Besser’s work, there is no mention of John Wright, the European, nor is there a mention of the musket or blunderbus. Instead after Malietoa had received the gifts of cloth and blue beads etc, he proclaimed that ‘This is the greatest day of my life.’ Matetau is elevated to being called ‘the powerful king of Manono’ and Malietoa as Savai’i’s king, although a footnote notes that ‘although the individual chiefs were independent princes [Fuersten] … Malietoa had a kind of kingly power … we will therefore continue to call him king.’
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in reference to the Government of Malietoa, records that it was of a ‘very indifferent kind every principal chief having almost equal authority in his own place. Malietoa is called the principal chief of the Leeward Islands now that Tamafaiga was dead. He was therefore of no real authority but at his own place except in case of war…”.

The elevation of Malietoa and Matetau to the status of ‘kings’ in the latter publication allies the mission with influential parties in Samoa. Williams and the Lotu had powerful backers. The omission of other Europeans reinforces Williams’ impact upon the Samoans as being greater then it was. He is representative of the great white god. Having another European, John Wright, takes away the wonderment of the papalagi – the person who, translated from Samoan, ‘broke from the heavens’. John Wright is therefore omitted. Williams, Malietoa and his brother Taimalelagi Tinai and Matetau are all elevated to be seen as the ideal giver (Williams) and receivers of the Word of God.

Williams’ first visit was fleeting. Matetau, while highly influential in Manono would not have been a candidate for the kingship. Matetau refers to Matetau Tuila’epa. The Tuila’epa title is an ali’i title. The fact that Matetau is constantly referred to by his non-titular name (Tauita’epu) perhaps indicates his own personal mana. But how influential was he? His village was in Apia, not Salieataua. Tuilaepa is referred in the fā’alupega of Manono as the ‘alo’ or son of Malietoa – indicating a close genealogical connection. Leitaua Lesa is the foremost ali’i title on Manono. Perhaps one could say Williams was misinformed. Malietoa, likewise was an influential chief. But why would he be the leader of the Manono party, when his village was Sapapali’i and his connections extended to Tuamasaga in Upolu and other areas of Savai’i. He had relations in Manono, but how strong was his connection to Manono? Williams had come from Tonga and was informed that ‘we were told at Tongatapu that Tamafaiga ‘was likely to be prove a great obstacle’ to any proposed mission. He had died 15 days prior to William’s arrival, which was auspicious, and read as a message that God was with the mission. But in fifteen days Malietoa was in A’ana sacking homes along with Manono. How did he become head of the Malo immediately after Tamafaiga’s death? He was not a god like Tamafaiga, nor did he have the Tonumaipe’a title – the title that would have seen him succeed to the leadership of the Malo as the voice of the goddess
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Nafanua. Herein the Myth begins. Leaving aside the relationship of Manono and Malietaoa, subsequent histories sometimes leave Manono out of the picture altogether. At least Williams recorded and recognised the political importance of Manono and promised a teacher.

A contemporary Samoan view is revealed in *Lagaga, A Short history of Western Samoa*. The authors wrote that ‘when Williams anchored at Sapapali’i, a war was going on between Malietaoa Vainu’upo in Savai’i and *aiga i le Tai* ‘referring to Manono, against A’ana.’ There is no mention of Malietaoa’s brother, who became *persona non grata* to the LMS and also the extended family of Malietaoa or Sa Malietaoa. Matetau is not mentioned either. It is only a ‘short history’ of Samoa, and the authors chose what they viewed as the significant points. The authors record that ‘Malietaoa was related to Tamafaiga and was fighting to revenge the assassination of his kinsman. Malietaoa came to visit Williams on the *Messenger of Peace*, and agreed to accept the eight teachers whom Williams had brought from Rarotonga.’ The more convincing, if somewhat brutal analysis, from Tupua Tamasese was that Malietaoa decided to ‘throw in his lot with the predictable winners’. Manono were the Malo and were going to be the likely victors. Malietaoa made a pragmatic decision to ally himself with them. This latter view is a minority opinion, at least in terms of what would be expressed publicly.

On Williams’ second trip in 1832, he passed through Manu’a and Tutuila and he found that Christianity had spread to these Islands. They also dropped off Teava and met Matetau and Johnny Wright. Williams asked if Matetau had become religious, to which he replied ‘No, he had been waiting for me. I told him I had fulfilled my promise and had brought him a teacher to reside with him.’ Matetau also refused to go to Sapapali’i with Williams’ crew. The exchange was merely cursory and Williams arrived in Sapapali’i without Matetau. Malietaoa is portrayed as having ‘advanced’ by wearing some European clothing and he was very thankful that the ‘word of Jehovah was brought …’. He said his heart was manao tasi lava I le lotu a Jehovah – wishing solely for the religion of Jehovah.”

12 Meleisea (eds), *Lagaga*, 56.
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In relation to Malietoa and Manono, Williams makes a very interesting observation. He said the following:

The bringing of a teacher for Matetau occasioned considerable debate as Malietoa wished the Teachers for the various Islands to be brought to him first and then those Chiefs who wished to become Christians were to apply to him …. We plain saw the drift of this reasoning. It was to give him a kind of supremacy over the whole of the islands but as there existed a serious difference between the Manono people and Malietoa who lately wished to make war on him, I thought it by all means advisable if possible to get them together and to let them adjust their differences.16

The desire of Malietoa to dominate and have control over the Lotu was to persist and be commented on by many Wesleyan missionaries especially. It was also the reason for the dispute between Matetau and Malietoa. But the reason for the threat of warfare against Malietoa was quite a different issue than the disagreement between Malietoa and Matetau. Williams later reveals the real reason for Manono proposing to kill Malietoa was due to the serious tension between the new religion of Nanana and the old. As noted, Tamafaiga’s head was preserved and Tonumaipe’a of Manono consulted with the head of Tamafaiga. Williams noted this in his journal but also noted that ‘Tribute is also demanded for the spirit of Tamafaiga residing in the skull.’17

It is pretended that his Spirit still resides in the skull and to keep up the villainy (for many of the sensible chiefs know it to be nothing else) the Chief pretends to consult this head by taking it down before him and in a low tone of voice holding conversation with it. Tribute is also demanded for the Spirit of Tamafaiga residing in the skull.18

Williams adds, however, that ‘of course those who have embraced Christianity have ceased to make presents’.19

In a later entry in Williams’ Journal, the ‘of course’, implying the ease in which one chose a new path was an easy transformation, is misleading as Malietoa’s failure to offer tribute was the cause of the tension that could have led to war between Manono and Malietoa. Williams wrote that:

About three months before my arrival there had been a great talk of war between the Manono people and Malietoa. It appears that he went there on a visit when the Chief who has Tamafainga’s head proposed to demand a tribute for it from different settlements. Malietoa replied that there was no Tamafainga and he would not agree to

16 Moyle, *The Samoan Journals*, 123. Note the underlining is my own emphasis.
17 Ibid., 131.
18 Ibid.
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demanding any tribute for anything of the kind. He replied that Jehovah of the skies was his God and with his consent there should never be a Tamafaina. This exasperated Pe’a the keeper of Tamafaina’s head and he proposed to kill Malietoa.  

War, and possibly Malietoa’s death, did not eventuate due to the intervention of Matetau, who was the chief who had been promised a missionary in the Williams trip of 1830. Pe’a had gone to Matetau’s side of the island, Apia and Matetau dissuaded Pe’a from taking action against Malietoa. The main person who was in favour of killing Malietoa, was named by Williams as Vavasa [Vaovasa]. This was the same Vaovasa that had ‘proposed to kill him [Malietoa] some years ago’ and had ‘actually killed one of Malietoa’s favourite daughters’.  

Malietoa, fearing an attack felt that he would have to fight against Manono. Williams records that the teachers advised against Malietoa invading and ‘he said he was determined if possible now he had become a Christian to end his days in Peace’. But it was a tense time and ‘scarcely a day elapsed but Malietoa would come into the teacher’s house and ask them how much longer it would be before I came’. Once again Williams notes that his arrival was auspicious.

Perhaps the most well-known publication relating this period is Gilson who indicates that by 1832 the missionaires recognised that the power of Malietoa in the Malo was limited and was more ceremonial than authoritative. Gilson even suggests that there was consideration to abandon Malietoa’s patronage of the mission. This changed when Williams heard of the disagreement and threat of war by Manono against Malietoa. Gilson writes that ‘Williams felt that this was a breach that had to be repaired, owing to Manono’s prominence in the Malo and he set out to effect the reconciliation himself.’ Gilson wrote that the reconciliation was successful and Manono was placated because ‘Manono would receive the one teacher that Williams had brought on the voyage.’ The footnote states that the ‘teacher was actually brought in fulfilment of a promise given to Tuilaepa Matetau, one of Malietoa’s closest kinsmen on Savai’i’.
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Gilson does not mention Tonumaipe’a or Pe’a at all, who Williams himself noted was the cause of the proposed war of Manono against Malietoa. Tonumaipe’a was the ‘keeper’ of the head of Tamafaiga, and spokesman for Nafanua. Gilson does not mention Nafanua or Tamafaiga’s skull either. It was Pe’a, not Matetau, who wanted war against Malietoa for failing to pay tribute to Nafanua. In fact Matetau’s intervention on behalf of Malietoa apparently resulted in a cooling of Pe’as vengeance against Malietoa.

Gilson distorts the tension to being one of an argument between Matetau and Malietoa. He also indicates in the text that the resolution of the difficulties was to grant Matetau a teacher, but in the 1830 diary Matetau was the only other chief that Williams had promised to have a teacher. Gilson only mentions in a footnote that Matetau had already been promised a teacher. The Gilson portrayal seems to be quite a misreading of the Williams Journal as well. It is unclear why Gilson failed to see that the main reason for the proposed war against Malietoa came from Pe’a, the spokesperson for Tamafaiga and Nafanua. It may have been an oversight, or perhaps a level of discomfort in someone consulting a skull, or perhaps a certain belief that Williams had exaggerated.

There is a good deal of confusion in the accounts so far. Malietoa was supposedly heading the Manono war party avenging the death of Tamafaiga. Again Gilson supports this interpretation by saying that on Williams’ arrival the war party was in A’ana avenging the death of Tamafaiga. ‘Much of Savai’i and Upolu had joined with Manono in a powerful alliance headed by Malietoa Vainu’upo’.28 Tamafaiga was supposed to be one of his relations. But Matetau was also one of his relations, and supposedly the highest chief of the island. Later Pe’a would be described by LMS missionaries, along with Malietoa as the two greatest chiefs of the island although once again Gilson does not mention Pe’a. To resolve this disparity, a knowledge of Manono is essential. Manono is not one single family, although Manono does seem to have acted as a single unit in warfare. Pe’a was of Sa Leitaiua and was the new representative of Tamafaiga. Tamafaiga’s father, Leitaiua had married the daughter of Asiata and resided in the Ailataua (Satupa’itea) region. In this way Leitaiua secured the spiritual basis of their political power. Also Vaovasa had ties to Satupa’itea.

28 Gilson, 1974, 70.
Fauea, the Samoan who had accompanied Williams, did not land on Manono for fear of Tamafaiga. He would have encouraged Williams to obtain a missionary for Manono. Fauea was later rewarded with the Mulipola title and ‘became Mulipola Fauea of Salua village on Manono’. The picture that Williams portrays is his own prophetic intervention into Samoan affairs. Malietoa is portrayed as being a true Christian and Pe’a is portrayed as a ‘heathen’ consulting the skull that embodied Nafanua. An obvious reading into the period is that Christianity, with Malietoa at the apex, won out over Manono. But the major wars until the end of the century involved Manono, and the old religion of Nafanua, in transformed guise. The old religion, with Nafanua and her representative Tonumaipē’a, would threaten Malietoa – as even would rival Malietoa title-holders themselves. Malietoa Tinai (Malietoa Vainu’upo’s brother) would fight again against A’ana and his ‘son’ Malietoa Talavou would take on the Tonumaipē’a title. He, with the assistance of Manono, would fight against the missionary accepted Malietoa candidate and grandson of Vainu’upo, Laupepa. The fight between the Old Malo of Manono and the home base of Nafanua, Satupa’itea and the alataua against the Malietoa title-holders who were LMS adherents, would be a long drawn out fight.

The followers of the ‘Old religion’ in terms of rituals and practice moved from Tamafaiga’s skull to a rival Christian religion, namely Wesleyanism. Matetau is said to have offered his son to become Wesleyan.

During the visits of Williams in 1830 and 1832, he makes no mention of Wesleyanism in Samoa. He mentions sailor sects and the Siovili cult, but he does not mention any Wesleyan influence in Samoa itself. After the return from Samoa to Tonga in 1832, Williams does record a recent connection between Samoa and Tonga, but he makes this reference in Tonga. He records that an immense canoe carrying the daughter of Matetau was carrying her to Samoa with gifts for her father. Her husband was Taufa’ahau, king of Ha’apai, later King George of Tonga. ‘She and Williams met at Niuatoputapu and she asked him to take a letter to her husband in Ha’apai’. She was

29 See Meleisea and Schoeffel (eds), Lagaga, 56.
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evidently baptised by John Thomas, the Wesleyan missionary who would align himself to King George or Taufa’ahau.32

Prior to Williams and Barff leaving for Samoa in 1830, Williams had engaged in conversations with the Wesleyan missionaries, Nathaniel Turner and William Cross, during which they seem to have agreed, though not in writing, that Samoa should be a field of the LMS, while Fiji should be tended by the Wesleyans. This agreement was not discussed by Williams and John Thomas when they met as Williams proceeded northwards and stopped at Ha’apai.33 After having made the agreement with the Wesleyans, Turner and Cross – an agreement which Nathaniel Turner denied having actually happened.34 Williams and Barff made sure they returned – with only one teacher, for Matetau, and no additional teachers for Malietoa in 1832. During the 1834 trip of Barff and Buzzacott, Wesleyanism is not mentioned either. Gilson assumes that they ‘failed to detect it’.35

The strength of Wesleyanism, especially on the southern side of Savai’i was significant – perhaps already stronger than the LMS by 1834 in Turner’s estimates of 1835. Perhaps they just avoided the disagreeable subject.

Williams’ account of the supposed agreement was made to avoid politicisation of the Lotu. It was made to avoid confusion among the ‘natives [who] though comprehending but very imperfectly our objects, would at once discern a difference in the modes of worship, and their attention would of necessity be divided and distracted… and thus evils would arise, which otherwise might never have existed.’36

The arrangement ‘in the field’ became formalized by the directors of both missions in London upon Williams’ return to England. The stresses between the two missions within the two countries, Tonga and Samoa, were mirrored within internal struggles for
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ascendancy in Samoa itself. The relationship between the two missions and the relationship between the old Malo of Samoa and the new Malo of Samoa are inexorably intertwined.

Williams’ 1832 journal is most informative of the legacy of the Malo of Tamafaiga. The sacred power of women, always a feature in the sacred feagaiga relationship between brother and sister, in which the sister had spiritual power over the brother was very strong. It was a particularly strong factor in the Tonumaipe’a/Nafanua inheritance. Williams records that the successors to Tamafaiga were also women. Williams accepts the threat from the new embodiment of Nafanua when he records the following:

[Tamafaiga] has left one daughter a little girl about seven or eight years of age. I saw her at a settlement called Satupa’itea. It is said that she will be the future Tamafaiga unless the introduction of Christianity removes the sanctity, which invests the office or abolishes it altogether which is by far the more probable. A woman who was Tamafaiga of a neighbouring island very nearly sacrificed the life of an Englishman indeed of three or four. A canoe had arrived in safety, the voyages immediately presented this Tamafaiga a basket of Kava as an offering for being conducted in safety over the deep. This was deposited in the spirit house. One of the Englishmen went and stole it.37

Luckily for the Englishmen Tamafaiga ‘became inspired and said “why should they put an ignorant papalagi [papalagi] to death who had no knowledge of their ways and customs”.’38 Williams’ record of this heathenism is designed partially to show the barbarism of what the ‘true religion’ was facing, but is also revealing about how he, himself viewed women. Most of his references seem to show women as ‘dusky maidens’ like Malietoa’s new young wife who he ‘bought’ with the beads that Williams and company had brought with them.

The new representatives of the ‘old religion’ continued to be in the old Malo strongholds of Manono and Satupa’itea, the homeland of Nafanua. Nafanua had chosen her successor in Satupa’itea. These were not the ‘godless Samoans’, which he mentions early on in 1830. There were living gods, spirit mediums and dead gods with spirit houses.

The Malo was divided and Williams elevation of Malietoa to the highest chief of Savai’i, and supplying him alone with missionaries allowed him to eventually gain the

37 Moyle, The Samoan Journals, 132.
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*tafa'ifa* titles, though this was a long drawn out process. In 1835-36, Malietoa finally received the Tuiatua title, indicative that his leadership of the Malo was always in an uneasy alliance with the Malo of Manono and other Malo areas like Satupa’itea.\(^{39}\)

\(^{39}\) S S J Platt, 1835-6; MS Turner Journal 1836 in footnote in Gilson, 1970, 88
CHAPTER 7

THE DECISION TO LOTU

The strongest belief today is that it was the prophecy of Nafanua that the Lotu would come to Malietoa, and due to this prophecy the religion was destined to become the new spiritual, and hence political power in Samoa. The prophetic phenomenon was not unusual in Polynesia. In Mangaia, also visited by Williams, it was ‘Numangatini who prophesied the arrival of the missionaries in a vessel off Atuokoro’, which did indeed arrive. But the process of Christian acceptance in Samoa, as in other islands was not straightforward. Old gods were not merely discarded. Heathen ‘practices’ continued and there were many variant forms of Christianity. There was not a whole-scale conversion or ‘eating of one’s family aitu’. Samoa was polytheistic. The new god of the foreigner had to compete with and become incorporated into a belief system that was already existent. Samoa was also aware of the Lotu well before the arrival of Williams. Not only was there regular contact with Tonga, which can be seen in the von Kotzebue account, where Tamafaiga had a European parasol and a Spanish coin – but there were also sailors who had brought news of the Lotu.

The historical and ethnographic works almost exclusively record that either there was no significant religious structure, or it had declined by the time the missionaries arrived, often said to be due to the ‘timely’ death of Leiataua Tamafaiga Tonumaipe’a. The change is therefore seen as being quickly achieved, and many Samoans did Lotu within a short time after the arrival of the missions. For example Graeffe argues that religious or cult practices had declined severely by the time that the missionaries arrived, so the missionaries found a favourable ground for the spreading of the Christian faith. He also noted that between the years 1850 and 1855 the Samoans had publicly discarded all of their pagan beliefs. Meleisea et al in Lagaga wrote similarly, except that the authors do not mention that the earlier pagan beliefs were on the decline. Rather they say that the Europeans were ‘like gods’, of supernatural origin. The world was to change
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quickly for the Samoans and ‘old ideas and old gods were no longer adequate to explain the world or to deal with changes. As a result Samoans were receptive to the teachings about a new God, when John Williams arrived in 1830.’ Meleisea, in The Making of Modern Samoa, also claims that by 1860 the church leaders had taken over the spiritual function in Samoan society.

One of the problems that occur in Lagaga, is that it states that the Papalagi foreigners were like gods. It seems strange that after making this statement, they recall a European named Irish Tom, who lived on Manono in the early 1820s, ‘was eventually killed by his hosts who could no longer tolerate his violent ideas’.

Perhaps gods can be killed and this was a good reason to Lotu. European status and superiority with their technology, medicine and Christianity need close examination. These ‘superior abilities’ need to be noted but have perhaps been over-emphasised. Also needing examination is what forms the new Lotu took as well as the continued resistance to the Christian religion.

There have also been a number of works focussing on the subject of the decision by Samoans to Lotu. One of the most interesting factors is that the Lotu was quickly indigenised and adapted into already existing belief systems. The new Lotu did not immediately follow the forms of worship that the LMS Protestants had back at home. Also interesting is that Williams’ diary details some of the religious variants existing in Samoa in the early 1830s. It also gives some reasons why the Samoans ‘turned religion’.

An interesting encounter was one that Williams had with two ‘ignorant and wicked’ Englishmen. They discuss with Williams the reasons for their success as follows:

I does a great deal for these people sir. I go miles to see them when there sick. I’ve been nine miles today to see a sick man. I asked him what medicine he gave them. He said None, but reads a Chapter and a prayer over them and when they gets well they generally ‘turn religion’. He informed me of two cases a day or two ago when his prayers had been effectual to the healing of the sick. A man was taken very ill with a

---

3 Meleisea and Scheoffel (eds), Lagaga, 42,45.
4 Meleisea, The making of modern Samoa.
5 Meleisea and Meleisea, Lagaga, 45.
6 For other views, see David Jackson Inglis, Change and Continuity in Samoan Religion: The Role of the Congregational Christian Church, PhD, UNSW 1980; Periera, The Decision to Lotu, Otago, NZ, BA (Hons), 1978.
sad pain in the bowel. He was sent for when he read a chapter and prayed. In the morning the man was well. Another was a violent swelling in a man’s arm which he prayed away. This had such an effect on the people that says he I have made nine religion today. His other little comrade immediately said and I have made two.\footnote{Moyle, The Samoan Journals, 110.}

Death was nearly always attributed to supernatural causes. The two ‘sailor missionaries’ with their prayers encouraged people to turn to religion was the result of the efficacy of divine intervention in curing illness. The link between sickness and the acceptance of religion has perhaps been undervalued. There are many instances where illness and cure has been the deciding factor in the decision to Lotu.

In Samoa, sickness and being healed was a key to converting. Platt records cases of sick persons moving between traditional healers, the tauaia, Sio Vili, the Wesleyans, LMS and later the Roman Catholics in the hope of cure. ‘Malieta Vainu’upo’s resolve to Lotu was in part a result of a successfully lanced ulcer.’\footnote{Platt, Raiatea to Hervey and Samoan Groups 1835-36, 20 December 1835.} Another key player in the Malo, diviner and keeper of the head of Tamafaiga was also a convert due to fear of illness. Leiataua Tonumaipe’a became persona grata in 1836, and named in the LMS literature as one of the two powerful chiefs of the Malo only after he became an LMS adherent. Heath, the LMS missionary visited Pe’a in 1836. He had bad asthma and the decision was not an easy one.

\footnote{Buzacott, 15 August 1836, SSJ; Crawford, 1977, 264.}

Mr H found him much afflicted with asthma and inquired if he did not wish to take medicine ... when Mr. H went to see him and took the medicine to him, Mr. H’s interpreter in speaking about the medicine [happened] to mention that if it were the will of Jehovah he might get better. At this he took fright and ordered them immediately to go to the other side of the house and reminded them that he had not yet lotu’d. After waiting an hour during which time a lively discussion was kept up, he signified his intention of now professing Christianity.\footnote{Collocott, ‘King Taufaahau’, 75, in Sione Lātūkefu, Church and State in Tonga, ANU Press, Canberra, 1874, 64.}

Taufa’ahau, or King George of Tonga who was to play a large part in the establishment of the Wesleyan mission in Tonga was also supposedly converted by in essence ‘cheating death’. He threw a spear at the shark god Haefaetahi ‘and missing it, threw Pita Vi and another man overboard to fetch the spear and bring it to Ha’ano. He reasoned that if Jehovah were really God, he would save Pita Vi and his companion from the sharks. Fortunately for the mission, Vi and his friend arrived safely on shore with the spear’\footnote{Collocott, ‘King Taufaahau’, 75, in Sione Lātūkefu, Church and State in Tonga, ANU Press, Canberra, 1874, 64.}. In essence God had saved them from death.
We shall discuss the Sio Vili cult presently, but a recurrent feature is the curing of disease. The LMS missionary George Pratt wrote in 1843 that Sioviliism was on the decline, but ‘a youth has started calling himself a great prophet and some call him God ... he claims to cure diseases.’ The missionaries themselves were well aware of the link between religious and physical health. Slatyer, the LMS missionary then stationed in Saluafata wrote that ‘Siovili parents denied their child to join the LMS school and became ill. He ‘was treated by a Samoan’. The LMS missionaries ‘refused to administer medicine ... as a result of Samoans denying him thus, he died of dysentry’.

The introduction of new diseases themselves would have been strong indications of the powerful new God. With the introduction of new diseases to which Samoans had never been subject to prior was also a strong pointer to the efficacy and perhaps wrath of the new God. The Tahitian teachers that originally accompany Williams were all sick with influenza and the virus spread. The disease they brought with them ‘raged among the natives and they charged them with bringing the disease with them’ and ‘the natives at once traced the disease to foreigners and the new religion’.

The new religion had the power to bring a new and deadly disease and this had consequences and could easily have led to a desire to join the new Lotu. It is also interesting to note the occurrence of what are termed ‘religious revivals’ at the time of new outbreaks of disease. The Tutuila ‘revival’ in 1840 followed an epidemic that had spread through the island. Needless to say this aspect of the decision to Lotu is rarely emphasised. The LMS missionary Mills wrote on 4 November that the influenza epidemic had ‘taken many of steadiest people away’. Murray, the LMS missionary on Manono recorded that the religious revival came to a head on 4 November 1839. Influenza was a new and powerful killer disease and the religious revival in Tutuila and elsewhere seem to be linked to the new religion. The LMS missionary Whitmee reported that the epidemic in 1866 killed, in one village, 17% of Church members, and that ‘among the survivors the number of inquiries after salvation has increased’.
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11 Pratt to Tidman and Freeman, Matautu, Savaii, 14 September 1843, SSL.
12 Slatyer to Tidman, Saluafata, 1 March 1844, SSL.
13 Moyle, 123. Moyle also notes in the footnote that the first attack of influenza in Samoa occurred during the A’ana war of 1830, ‘just as the missionaries William and Burff, with Tahitian teachers, first reached their shores. The natives at once traced the disease to the foreigners and the new religion.’ (Turner 1884:138).
14 Mills, Apia, 4 November 1839, SSL
15 Whitmee, 25 December 1866, SSL; Crawford, 1977, 265.
There seem to be many correlations between the revival and former festivals and night dancing which were designed to harness the realm of the sacred. The revivals allowed the worshippers to achieve a state of liminality, a heightened awareness or trance like state. The concept of journeying to the ‘other world’ is consistent with the shamanic ability to transcend the traditional physical realm.\textsuperscript{16} Some features of Sioviliism also strongly indicate this liminal state.

Williams records in his journal the essential features of the Siovili cult. The main proponent was a native Samoan, Joe Vili who had travelled to Tahiti, with another Samoan named Tuineula [or Teoneula], who introduced the religion or cult. He had the ability to ‘have intercourse with Jehovah’ and ‘he told them that if they embraced his religion he told them they would not die’\textsuperscript{17}. However ‘about 80 of his people had died lately’. Again dancing seems important as the two ‘sailor missionaries’ reported to Williams that he encouraged them to ‘sing as they do their new songs in dancing’\textsuperscript{18}.

The other aspect made clear in the song is that Sio Vili and Tuioneula were the ‘lords of the song’. The identity of Siovili is clear. The identity of Tuioneula is unclear, although it seems he came from the southern coast of Savai’i and the villages of Satupa’itea and the \textit{alataua} were early Siovili adherents.

This causal relationship between the introduction of disease and the punishment of God can be found in the diaries and reports of the missionaries. The LMS missionary, Macdonald, records that there is much tuberculosis in Samoa ‘also epilepsy, ague, rheumatism … now Christians believe that disease is caused by a devil in payment for sin’\textsuperscript{19}. The use of the term ‘a devil’ rather than ‘the devil’ presumably indicated that the perceived causes for disease were \textit{aitu}, ancestral spirits who were agents in causing suffering and death for wrongdoing. The principal reference to traditional religion is the persistence of Samoan beliefs in death being caused by \textit{aitu} for wrongdoing. The other frequently mentioned association with the ‘old religion’ in missionary accounts was the persistence of the ‘evil ‘night dancing. Night dancing is rarely explained, but it strongly indicates a movement towards a trance like state, although the missionaries linked it

\textsuperscript{16} See Appendix II
\textsuperscript{17} Moyle, \textit{The Samoan Journals}, 111.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{19} Macdonald, Safune, 12 September 1838, SSL.
with sexual climax. It was to persist well into the 1870s despite it being the most frowned upon activity by the LMS and other missionaries.

One convincing argument comes from the historian Crawford\textsuperscript{20} who stresses that the ‘immediate effect’ of the visit of Williams and Barff was not, as Williams imagined, but the forging of a link between the agents of the LMS and Malietoa Vainu’upo. In answer to the question ‘why become Christian?’ Crawford says it was ‘to gain access to the mana of a powerful god’.\textsuperscript{21} Another historian also links the political importance of the Lotu and Malietoa. The reasons for evangelical success, according to Leulu Va’a, was that other ‘heretical’ and other forms of Christianity had already been introduced, but it was also influenced by the ‘favourable stance by the new leader of the Samoan Government, Malietoa Vainu’upo’. The reasons he gives are convincing. Malietoa’s position as ‘successor to Tamafaiga was not yet stable’. Malietoa also ‘needed symbols for his legitimacy’. He also suggests that Malietoa had possibly ‘placed his credence in the prophecy of Nafanua’.\textsuperscript{22}

Crawford emphasises new technology and the eating of one’s sacred animal that contained the spirit of an ancestor as aitu as defining the new Christians and certainly this is the emphasis in Williams’ own journal. Va’a notes another aspect of eating ones’ aitu and that was that in so doing one became ‘empowered’ by eating the aitu. Also implied is that freedom from the former tabu on eating the aitu allows a heightened state of being – essentially a strong tabu that could cause death, is inverted and brings greater life. He noted that the people in one village ‘ate their prohibited fish, the eel’. They did this without their Chief, Malaesala’s permission.

Malaesala became angry and banished them. He knew they had eaten their aitu because of the bright appearance of the peoples’ ti leaf girdles as if they had been oiled.\textsuperscript{23}

Va’a also thinks that the untimely death of Tamafaiga is overplayed as it ‘doesn’t sufficiently explain Malietoa’s acceptance of Christianity’.\textsuperscript{24} Many commentators also stress the desire for new knowledge like reading and writing. The literate revolution took a considerable time to take hold and despite William’s assertions about Malietoa’s

\textsuperscript{20} Ronald James Crawford, The Lotu and Fa’asamoa: Church and Society in Samoa 1830-1880, PhD, Otago, NZ, 1977.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 98.
\textsuperscript{22} Leulu F Va’a, An analysis of Samoan Texts of the 1860s, MA, ANU, 1987, 51f.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 60.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 53.
immediate acceptance of the new Lotu, is unlikely, although he eventually was baptised. Also both Malietoa Vainu’upo and Taimalelagi immediately returned to warfare and the sick teachers were left with the women and children of Sapapali’i. Also Williams himself indicates that the real reason was the new God’s power in protecting them from death being a major decision to lotu. Williams records that Malietoa and his brother Tuiano [Tinai] left for the war in Upolu.

Tuiano had already professed his intention to become a Christian and had attended family prayer morning and evening. On leaving he begged the teachers to pray for him that he might be saved in war. About a fortnight after he returned saying that God had heard their prayers for him. They had a severe encounter with the enemy. Many had fallen and he escaped .... Many of the women and children now began to attend worship so much so that the house was full on Sabbath day.  

---

25 Moyle, The Samoan Journals, 125.
CHAPTER 8

AND THE TEMPLES WERE DESTROYED: NAFANUA AND THE END OF TRADITIONAL RELIGION?

Detailed descriptions of traditional religion with specific reference to actual rituals, the people involved in the ritual, and areas in which various aitu are revered are scarce. The works of the missionaries Stair and Turner contain valuable general information, but there are few specifics. There is no publication that is as detailed in its description of the practice of traditional religion as that of Williams in 1830 and 1832. Subsequent descriptions focus upon conversions and achievements or problems with other Christian denominations and, to an extent the syncretist Siovili cult. In missionary journals one can often obtain more comprehensive accounts. One of these is in Dyson’s journals. He spoke to an old Savai’i chief about the ‘old customs’. He notes that idols were almost innumerable. ‘Some had the pu [conch], others stones as in Safotulafai ... others animals’. The old Savai’i chief said that in Atua the ‘Lupe and Ve’a were the chief gods’, both birds. ‘At Folasan on Manono the boat was the idol and the toeoletiti, a string of striped beads from the king of Tonga, obtained before the Lotu came, became a new and popular god among the Samoans’. The gods he names in person were Moso, Nafanua, a sea god, and Saveasi’uleo, another from Pulotu and Taema. He also mentions Fa’amalu, a god of war who visited the pu and certain stones who leads the battles of Safotulafai, Tuifiti of Matautu and Tamafaiga the war god of Manono.¹

There were also ‘heathen temples’, called malumalu:

The temple of Fa’amalu contained nothing but a pu hung to the roof in a basket. The heathen also gave the name malumalu to the groves where the stone idol was. A larger stone of this sort was in a grove at Safotulafai, made of several kinds of trees ... . All these were cut down and desecrated after Mr P Turner arrived in Savai’i in 1835.²

Dyson’s informant reveals that he was probably himself from Safotulafai. The rapid ‘whirlwind’ years of ‘Misi Tana’, the Wesleyan missionary Peter Turner, had allowed a relatively rapid transition from the old religion of Nafanua and other aitu, a time of

¹ Dyson Journal, 19 March 1863, vA2580, ML.
² Ibid.
which Dyson, writing in 1863, refers to in the past tense. Turner himself does not speak of these ‘desecrations’, but he does speak of ‘devil chiefs’ and rapid conversions. His refusal to leave despite the ‘agreement’ with the LMS also speaks of his character.

The destruction of the temples and the rapid conversions were not merely imposed on the Samoans. He obviously met with resistance, but Samoans themselves converted and allowed the temples to be cut down. There seems to be a certain belief in Turner himself being a prophet and Dyson notes more than once in his own journal that people were awaiting his return. Perhaps more importantly the cutting down of temples, without adverse affects perhaps allowed a freedom from fear and reprisals. The new religion, with its new god-like leaders, was, perhaps an attractive option.

The importance of Nafanua and her father Saveasi’uleo were obviously also prominent, as was Nafanua’s aunt Taema. They were all mentioned by Dyson’s Safotulafai chief. Dyson also notes that prayer was offered ‘always a little while after sundown’. The place for prayer was the dwelling house. The leader of the worship said ‘O le fa’amalama lena i sawali’i, ia te oe le ali’i o le Malo, o Moso, atoa ma Nafanua ...’.

The offerings were to the spirits, to the chiefs of the Malo, Moso and Nafanua. These spirits were treated as chiefs and having a material form, and it was they who were the leaders of the Malo.

Buzacott in 1836 is more informative than Peter Turner about traditional belief and its persistence. In Faleata he records that the chief was ‘still a heathen’. He would not let him worship in this ‘house’ as it was ‘sacred to the aitu’. He did, however, let him use another house.

In Tutuila he mentions a number of ‘heathen villages’ including ‘Fangaitua, Alaoa, Tula and Aoa’. At Aoa Buzacott met the ‘old heathen chief’. Again Buzacott was not allowed to hold his service ‘in the house’ as it was ‘sacred to their aitu’. Amanave was ‘very angry because some Christian chiefs had trespassed in the shrine to Taima’. He was also told by the chief of Aoa that he couldn’t lotu because his village was in
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3 See P Turner Journal, B304, ML.
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political association with Fagaitua and they could not become Christian until Fagaitua did. The allowing of principal chiefs and villages was another reason for the rapid spread of the Lotu.

The shrine to Taima, meaning Taema, the aunt of Nafanua, was sacred. The Island of Tutuila was sometimes called the ‘island of Taema’. The twin sisters Taema and Tilafaiga were mostly associated with the alataua of Tutuila, and the Leiato title.

George Turner also mentions the ‘goddess found by some fishermen swimming between Tutuila and Apolima’. He records that ‘they covered her with some fine native cloth and conveyed her to a place in the bush, where they built a temple for her. Offerings of food and fine mats were taken to the place and laid before two men who acted as priests’ and the temple was destroyed when the people changed to become Christians. 7 Again this village is not named, which is typical of published accounts and leads to much imprecise information, but it is highly likely that it is the village of the chief Leiato.

In 1845, the LMS Missionary, Powell, was resident in Tutuila. He gives an account of a ‘heathen village’ of about 150 people who had resolved not to lotu and the village had a law prohibiting the Lotu, ‘on pain of banishment’. He stated that at the village was a sacred coconut tree. ‘It is stated that many years ago the god Tuiaatua spoke to a man from this tree and commanded that no one should pluck its fruit on pain of sickness or death. Since then it has been sacred ... the LMS people ate the nuts though. 8

The breaking of powerful taboos again allowed a freedom from restrictions. The new religion provided an avenue to benefit from restrictive taboos without incurring the ‘wrath of the gods’. They did not fall ill or die. The placing of taboos was another practice that would persist well into the 19th century. The sacred power of the chiefs would still allow the practice to continue and not only would the chiefs have this power. The personal aitu of all in society were still feared.

Powell also gives a detailed description of the temple in this village. He writes that:

---

7 G Turner, Samoa a Hundred Years Ago, 54.
8 Powell, 3 November 1845, Upolu, SSL.
There was also a temple in the village...a little Samoan house about five feet high ... the sides consist of small round posts about three inches apart. The doorway is narrow, there is no door. This place is erected on an elevated portion of land which in front of the temple and on each side is covered with small roundish stones and thus a platform of neat appearance has been formed. This temple is dedicated to three sons of the Tuiatua, the great national aitu, who, although the same aitu made himself known by different names to different lands. These three sons are represented by three stones of different sizes ..... The prerogative [of the first stone, the eldest son] was to defend the kingdom from insurrection ... defend kingdom against rival aitus ... against foreign powers.\(^9\)

The detail given by Powell is perhaps the best account of a temple on record. The village is not named, but the LMS missionary, Murray, was with Powell in Tutuila and he does give the village name in his account – Sailele. The story is much the same, but he does not mention that the prerogative of the eldest son was to protect from foreign aitu and powers. He does, however add that he originally visited the temple with the missionary, Slatyer,

But on a subsequent occasion another missionary brother accompanied me [and] broke some chips off one or more of the sacred stones with the view I suppose, of convincing the heathen that they were worthless in a religious point of view, and when I next visited the village I found the stones had been buried that they might not again be desecrated by profane hands. The village remained wholly heathen for many years.\(^10\)

The missionary could have been Powell. The most important element in the accounts is that these three stones represent deceased ancestors, the Tuiatua and his sons. The political alliance between Tutuila and Atua is also strong, and Tutuila is sometimes referred to as an extension of Atua. The detailed account also reveals another element relating to traditional religion. The description is portrayed as a rare occurrence, a capturing on paper of something seldom seen. One can assume that malumalu or temples were rare and Powell is keen to transmit the existence of a dying religion.

The last ‘heathen temple’ in Samoa was at Salelavalu and was destroyed in 1865. The LMS missionary, King, records this momentous occasion as follows:

It was a large tree ... under the shade of this tree the principal deity of the village was supposed to reside. Here the people were formerly accustomed to assemble to keep their feasts sacred to their village God. One of the highest chiefs, Su’a, who has died since we have been here, remained a heathen to within about three months of his death, and by him the sacred tree was preserved. When Su’a died ... a young new Malua

\(^9\) Powell, 3 November 1845, SSL.  
\(^10\) A Murray, *Forty Years Missionary Work in Polynesia and New Guinea from 1835 to 1875*, London, 1876, 171.
graduate went to the principal chiefs of Salelavalu to get consent to destroy the temple of Taima and so remove from their midst what had so long been a reproach to them.\textsuperscript{11}

There are many letters referring to Su'a's obstinate and heathen nature. He was perhaps the last openly 'heathen' chief, in the sense that he made no attempt to accommodate any of the elements of the new religion into his own belief system. Su'a of Salelavalu is referred to in the fa'alupega as a branch of the family of Nafanua (Ma'upu o Nafanua). His temple, dedicated to the aunt of Nafanua, Taema, saw the end of Samoan temples – or at least those that were recognised by the missionaries. The old religion of Nafanua in real terms lost its status and the LMS recorded its end. The head of Tamafaiga, according to one of my discussions with a person from Manono, is still preserved at a cove in Apolima, but if it was revered it was done so quietly and hidden from the missionaries. Dyson, who was resident on Manono for some years, only refers to Tamafaiga briefly and assumes he was an old 'warrior chief'. The old Malo would continue to fight against the new religion of Nafanua, the LMS by different means, and as we have seen that was identifying with a different group of Christian messengers.

Buzacott, in 1836, refers to traditional beliefs and animals as a medium of communicating with the gods. He also mentions Samoan magicians and even though the last 'heathen temple' would be burned down in 1865, Samoan magicians or taulaitu would persist, even up to the present day. He also mentions the sacred power of women, which was based on the feagaiga relationship between a brother and her sister, and by extension the maternal aunt. The sacred feagaiga would become transformed with the relationship between God and people, pastors and their flock. The sacred power of women would persist, but in a greatly reduced form.

The taulaitu were 'possessed of spirits to comprehend the cause of disease'. The cause was 'usually attributed to a quarrel which had taken place in the family'. Buzacott records an experience of one of his fellow missionaries, Mills. 'Mills had one case in which the male child of a chief had become afflicted with hydrocephalus; one of the Samoans explained the cause of the illness ... the boy's aunt had created a disturbance in the family. A chief with a liver complaint had beaten up his wife.'\textsuperscript{12} Another example

\textsuperscript{11} King, 18 December 1865, Safotulafai, SSL.
\textsuperscript{12} Buzacott, Journal, 55.
was that if a sick person died ... 'the deceased died in consequence of his having been overpowered by the aitu on the mother's side.'

Belief in aitu also persisted well into the twentieth century. In frustration Dyson wrote in 1865, that 'Samoans have to worship something', whether it be men, demons or the 'true god'. He notes that 'the worship of demons is very strong in many Samoan homes today'. Belief in Pulotu still persisted as well and that supernatural causes were responsible for illness and death. Death itself was a taboo subject. The missionary resident on Manono said that in 1840 'our chief, referring to Tonumaipe'a Tavini, has stopped coming to chapel because native preachers referred to hell and its [miseries]'. Pe'a said 'I ought to tell you that allusions to such matters, or even to death, before chiefs are contrary to Samoan etiquette'.

The introduction of Christianity, as we have seen, allowed one to break from restrictive taboos without consequent illness or death. Europeans also brought disease with them and this many believed to be a sign of the efficacy of the new god. Christian missionaries themselves were viewed as new and powerful aitu and their new God was effective and offered a new spiritual foundation for many Samoans. Christianity spread very quickly and was proving to be a powerful force in society, but in a society that was politically orientated, allegiance to different denominations would mirror the different political interests in Samoa itself.

In Williams' journal there is mention of heathens, but there were sailor sects and the Siovili cult. Both of these sects would be overtaken by the LMS and the Lotu Toga or Wesleyanism, but the syncretist elements reveal important attributes of the traditional religion.

The transition took some considerable time. In early 1836, the LMS missionary Pratt toured Savai'i and Upolu, visiting many villages and reporting the religious beliefs of those villages. Of the 158 villages he visited he reported that:

38 villages were partly or wholly LMS
39 villages belong to Mr Turner (Wesleyan)

---

13 Stair, Old Samoa, 224.
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31 of the ‘native delusion’
22 to sailors of all sorts.\textsuperscript{16}

The Siovili cult was a means of adopting what was perceived as the most powerful and persuasive elements of Christianity into a traditional belief system. Even the ‘official’ Christian religions would maintain certain elements of the traditional systems, producing a unique Samoan adaptation of official doctrine. But the Siovili cult was perceived by the Christian missions as being a ‘deluded adaptation of Christianity that was ‘worse than unmixed heathenism’.\textsuperscript{17} In regard to followers of the old ‘heathen’ ways there were ‘but few comparatively, principally among the older folks.’\textsuperscript{18}

The major reason for the missionaries lack of perception and reporting of the relatively large number of Samoans who were still heathen seems to be a result of two processes; the Samoans were not willing to talk about their own private practices in missionary company, and, secondly, the new missionaries did not seem overly interested in these primitive beliefs with their associated totemic and polytheistic views. They had a new view, and in their view, a very much superior God.

The Siovili cult persisted into the late 1870s, at least in the official records. One of the major problems in explanations of Siovilism was that it is so frequently presented as a unified belief system, introduced by Tuioneula and the Siovili adherents were his followers. This view persisted into the secondary literature also. Freeman treats the Siovili cult in this way. He notes that Siovili was a native Samoan of the village of Eva in Atua, who accompanied ‘Teoneula’ to Tonga and the Society Islands. He notes that Barff, Buzacott and other missionaries ‘all refer to him as a visionary’ and it would seem that even before going to Tahiti he was a taulaaitu or spirit medium.\textsuperscript{19} The movement spread from Upolu to Savai‘i and Tutuila, ‘surviving for more than thirty years.’\textsuperscript{20} The essence of the movement, according to Freeman, and it is a convincing argument, was that the core of the movement was spirit possession, in this case Jesus Christ possessed the spirit mediums. ‘Siovili was the most important of them, but there were many others a proportion of them females and transvestites’. The main centres of
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strength were Lefaga, Safata, Faleata, Itu-Anoma’a, Va’a o Fonoti in Aleipata of Upolu and Itu o Salega, Alataua, Falealupo, Vaisigano and Gagaifomauga in Savai‘i. But it was in Atua, the district of Mata‘afa that the Siovili cult became the most strongly established.21 The Siovili cult is presented as a unified cult, following the most important of the taulaitu, Siovili. There are three major problems in the analysis, the first is that Tuionelu of Savai‘i was probably instrumental in the initial establishment of the cult in Savai‘i, and the second is that Siovili established itself in villages that provided an alternative to the missionaries of Malietoa, the LMS. The third is that the cult was not a united one. It had many variants in ritual and expression. Rituals and practice changed to local pressures and the new Christians. Missionaries referred to all these syncretist forms under the heading of Siovili, but the variant adaptations are revealed in their descriptions.

One of the most persuasive aspects of the Siovili cult was the prevalence of women and what Freeman misleadingly calls transvestites (with a footnote that until this time transvestitism was unknown in Samoa prior to this time).22 The account referred to is from Thoma Slatyer, the LMS missionary resident in Saluafata. He speaks of an old Siovili chief in the village that was ‘expected to die soon’ and had sent to Savai‘i for the ‘Siauvilian headpriest to cure him’.23 About a week later Slatyer spoke of the excitement due to the arrival of many ‘aitu’ from Savai‘i. He also states that the Siovili ‘aitus are mainly women who dress in men’s clothing’. He said also that ‘they are themselves worshipped’.24 The old chief, Leota, did die, but Slatyer complained that ‘now the aitus say they’ll restore him to life when the body has decayed’.25

The female aitu and female head priest (aitu) dressed in men’s clothing for ritualistic purposes. It indicated that they were more than just spirit mediums, they were embodiments of aitu. They were shamans who could take a different form and produce powerful results.26 The most famous account, known to almost all Samoans today is that Nafanua won the war in the battle of East versus the West in Savai‘i when ‘her

21 Ibid., 197f.
22 Ibid. 192.
23 Slatyer Journal, 21 September 44, ms A1770, ML.
24 Ibid., 30 September 44.
25 Ibid., 14 October 44.
26 For more information, see Appendix II.
breast was revealed’ and the *malae* named after this event is called the *malae* of shame. She was able to dress in men’s clothing, lead warriors and win in the classic guise of the shaman. Although there is a fusion of the Christian sense of shame now attached to this event, regarding her impropriety, the real message was that she was able to transform and lead without being noticed.

Cross-dressing was part of many shamanic rituals. Women also had, as discussed, spiritual power in Samoan society. The *feagaiga* relationship allowed women the ability to curse and cause illness and death. They could also heal, often portrayed by blowing coconut juice from her mouth on the afflicted person. Their position allowed them privileges. At the time of marriage or union between a couple the husband’s family brought pigs, food and the *ie ula*. At death it was also the *feagaiga* or female relatives who sat at the head of the deceased and it was their function to scent the body with oil. The family also provided the *sua* to the *feagaiga* first and the *feagaiga* were also acknowledged in being first satisfied at the distribution of goods.27

Monfat, a member of the Catholic Marist catholic order wrote a history of the mission in Samoa. He mentions Siovili, who ‘wished to stand out as a prophet’. The status of women in the cult is confused in the account. He records:

> The cult of *aitus* incarnated in beasts being discredited day by day, he aimed higher, and he dared to declare incarnate in the body of a woman as Jesus Christ himself under the travestied name of Seeso Alaisa. It was, however, of his own will and thoughts that she became the interpreter. They bought to her the sick who she cured by touching the afflicted organs...her reputation grew far and wide.28

Neither French Catholic missionaries, nor missionaries of other denominations had female ministers. The understanding was that Siovili was really the prophet and it was his will that he let the woman become his interpreter. The traditional sacred status of women and female gods like Nafanua seemed incomprehensible to the Catholic mission.

George Turner gives a very similar account, and was probably the basis for Monfat’s account. Again the prime mover is Siovili himself. Turner notes that ‘by and by he and

27 See LC 983.
his party made out that they had the son of God among them, dwelling in the body of an old woman, and that whenever she pleased she could tell them the true mind and sayings of Jesus Christ. . . . She gave out that Christ came in person to her house from the bush after dark, and that all the sick were to be come to be touched and made whole ... the hoax was carried on by the old [lady’s] sister. 29

The role of the woman as a spirit medium or taulaitu is clear in these accounts, but she is more than a spirit medium, in the normal sense of the world. She is like an incarnated aitu. She becomes Jesus Christ, she can take on male form, represented by wearing human clothes as well as curing illness.

There are strong adventist themes in many accounts. The LMS missionary, Pratt recalls a youth who started calling himself a prophet ‘and some Samoans call him God; he predicted general conflagration and when a comet appeared, he declared it to be the fulfilment of his prophecy’. Pratt also notes that the worship was like the LMS with communion services and it also includes or permits heathen practices, such as ‘obscene dances’. 30

In 1844, Slatyer spoke of the popularity of Siovili in Saluafata, Savai’i, where the Siovili followers outnumbered the Christians. He states that they ‘hold a monthly Sabbath service’, which was heralded by ‘firing guns’. Perhaps the most revealing, though not surprising addition to his narrative, is that Siovili was not just one singular sect. He notes the beginnings and that the cult ‘had a large following when Williams first arrived. ‘Since then it has disappeared in certain areas, and in others like Saluafata it has grown from nothing...the cult alters its practices and claims from time to time.’ 31

Another account of the ritual was that they were ‘mumbling like Catholics’. 32 Another missionary account recalls that ‘Vili left with his successors a trace of Judaism in that they use the blood of beasts in their services to signify the blood of Christ.’ 33

The Wesleyan missionary, Peter Turner went through Eva on his tour of Upolu, ‘where the Vili sect started, but “couldn’t make any headway there”’. He also encountered

29 Turner, Nineteen years in Polynesia, 106.
30 Pratt, Matautu, 14 September 1843, SSL.
31 Slatyer, Saluafata, 1 March 1844, SSL.
32 Heath, Manono, 29 November 1838, SSL.
33 Dyson Journal, 17 April 58, A2579, ML.
another possible Siovili character in Faleaseela in Upolu, the ‘principal place of the Imposter’. He was pleased to note that ‘the female who principally supports the religion is very ill and likely to die and that the religion will come to naught’. On the same voyage he visited Saletele, where ‘we had a little contention with one who professes to have been in heaven’.  

In religious terms the euphoria and claims to have gone to heaven appear to have made certain LMS ministers uncomfortable, especially during the ‘revivals’ of LMS church members in Tutuila in the early 1840s which later spread across Samoa.  

The LMS missionary, Harbutt, recalled that in his village of Lepa, Upolu, the Siovili sect was still strong. He says that ‘they speak of Jehovah and Christ but they still have aitu’. In the same letter Harbutt recalls the hysteria in the district and the ‘hysteria and fainting in Tutuila’. He was told by his ‘native teacher’ that ‘interest awakened when a woman died who had been seriously concerned for her soul and she had fainted in family prayer’. She ‘died the next day’. Since that time Harbutt recorded that ‘faintings had increased’ and noted that ‘Samoans have an excess of emotion’.  

It seems that Harbutt felt that these ‘faintings’, perhaps indicated heavenly experiences or ‘spirit possession’ like the Siovili people. Some months later he records that he is ‘anxious about worship’ in the eastern part of his district’. He also questioned those who had ‘convulsions’, but they ‘could give no reasonable account of why they did so’. Harbutt’s response was that they were ‘sinful’.  

Other pastors responded similarly. Murray from Pagopago records the ‘overpowering convictions’ and he ‘tried to pray; but while I was so engaged, the feelings of those who had been seized with convictions became more and more ungovernable and when prayer was finished, the house was a very Bochim’.  

The other aspect, which was very much part of the Siovili option was that it presented a new way to incorporate the power of the new Christian god, without having to align oneself with a rival Lotu in a different village district or family. The case mentioned of
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Aoa not joining the Lotu was because of their political alliance with Fangaitua. The Siovili Lotu was a new form of expression of Christianity, albeit one that was not viewed very positively by the majority of the formal Christian denominations.

The places where the Lotu were strong are all areas that were not associated with Malietoa’s new missionaries. Heath noted the following.

‘The vili crowd were also present in the five settlements of Satupa’itea and Savai’i under the chief of the high family, with its chief being Pe’a.’ \(^{39}\) Tonumaipe’a was, he notes, the ‘same Pe’a, Popotonu, who had murdered the crew of an American whaler, which occurred just before the LMS came.\(^{40}\) Much has been written about Pe’a Popotonu, but he and his people would join with their kin from Tonga and support the Lotu Toga. As Gunson has noted,

\[\text{Siovili tended to share the Tongan sphere of influence with Methodism, particularly on the Savai’i coast. In later years Siovili was absorbed into Methodism or Catholicism rather than the LMS church. Siovilians were quite open about their Tongan affinities and told Peter Turner that both religions, Methodism and Siovili, came from Tonga.}^{41}\]

The eastern part of Atua, with Mata’afa being a strong Siovili supporter, later became Catholic. But he also turned first to Tonga and claimed to the French Catholic priests that he was responsible for bringing the Lotu Toga to Samoa. Monfat records Mata’afa’s claim. ‘It was I, myself, who in order to resist the chiefs from the western districts, caused the ministers of Tonga to come here’.\(^{42}\) There were two processes at work. The new religion of Nafanua was being replaced with Christianity, but politics was part of the face of Christianity in Samoa. The other was that the traditional ties that the Old Malo had with Tonga meant that the arrival of the Lotu Toga was a natural counter to the new religion promised by Nafanua to Sa Malietoa.

\(^{39}\) Heath, Manono, 1 October 1837, SSL.  
\(^{40}\) Ibid.  
CHAPTER 9

THE MALO AND CHRISTIANITY

The Malo had belonged to Tamafaiga and his goddess mother Nafanua. Offerings went to Manono, which became the seat of the Malo and when Tamafaiga’s death was avenged ‘Savai’i Manono and the rest of Upolu fought against A’ana – 35,000 against 10,000 people’.¹ This war was not the war of Malietoa but the war of Leiataua Tonumaipē’a.²

The immediate successor to Tamafaiga lived in Apai, Manono. His brother was Tupā’i of Satupa’itea.³ Chief Tagaloa of Tufu was also of Tonumaipē’a’s family.⁴ Neither of these would join the LMS. However Tonumaipē’a of Manono did become an LMS adherent. It is often asserted that the LMS turned to Malietoa as the highest chief of the islands. However by 1836 the reality was clearly observed by the LMS missionaries. Heath speaks of Pe’a (Tonumaipēa) of Saleiataua as the highest chief on Manono.⁵

Peter Turner, the first European Wesleyan missionary, made quite an impact on Samoa, particularly in the Old Malo areas in Manono and Satupa’itea and the alataua. Turner’s diary reveals that he was well aware of the Malo and what he refers to as the ‘weak people’ or the Vaivai. In Vaimoso, a large town mostly followers of Siovili he adds, ‘They are what is called a weak people’.

Turner, like the first LMS missionary, John Williams, recognised that Samoan political structure was not so much centred and concentrated in individual chiefs, but between those associated with the powerful party or Malo and the vanquished party, the Vaivai.

Turner was stationed in Satupa’itea and Manono, the two ‘strong areas’ of the Malo. He noted that the principal chiefs were ‘of our Lotu’, but complains of Mata’afa, who ‘still

¹ SSL, Heath, Manono, 16 April 1838.
³ Charles Hardie Notebook, 17 October 1836, ML.
⁴ Ibid., 18 October 1836.
⁵ Heath to Turner, Apia, 1 December 1836, LMS Samoan Letters, 1836-44.
Lotu’d to an Englishman long since gone’. As was common in conversion, Turner managed to convert him through the use of medicine. Mata’afa had been sick and had been given medicine by the LMS, which had not produced any change in his condition. Turner then gave him ‘a strong purgative’, and he ‘soon discharged the contents of his stomach’. Turner then administered castor oil and Mata’afa got better. As a result, ‘several people of Malietoa’s Lotu joined the Wesleyans’.

This same Mata’afa (not Mata’afa of the Tupua line, but an orator and one of the principal advisors to the Tonumaipē’a Tavini), said to Turner that the success of the mission depended on Manono. He states ‘Upolu and Savai’i are one with Manono, and if Manono turn to the other missionaries, [meaning the LMS], then Upolu and Savai’i will turn. If Manono will not turn, then the other will not’.

Buzacott, the LMS missionary also speaks of the power of Manono. He refers to Manono as ‘an Island of chiefs, the tyrants of Samoa, including Tutuila’ and ‘the principal chief of the Malo is Pe’a, referring to Pe’a Tavini’. Buzacott was annoyed with Turner who was trying to convert one of Pe’a family, Mata’afa by tempting him with a Christian missionary. He went to see Turner about this and found him at ‘Salieataua, Pe’a’s residence and noted several Manono chiefs there were Wesleyans’.

In the period between the return of Barff, with his six LMS missionaries, George Platt noted in 1835-36 that the strength of the Wesleyans were particularly strong in Falealupo, and the alataua villages. In regard to Tufu, he notes that most were still ‘heathen’ and some Siovili people, Neiafu, which was mostly Wesleyan and Falelima, which he refers to as ‘Turner’s crowd’. Interestingly these are all Tonumaipē’a villages with strong Tongan connections and under the aegis of Nafanua. As noted the other area, which was strongly Wesleyan, was Manono and when Barff arrived in June, he informed Malietoa that the planned destination of the missionaries was two for Savai’i, two for Manono and Upolu and two for Tutuila. Malietoa agreed to this on
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condition that the Apia missionary should come frequently to Sagaga where he intended to reside.

Platt noted earlier that a great *fono* was held on 22 April 1936 at Sapapali’i. The subject was ‘about restoring the districts which were laid waste in the late wars’. Malietoa by now had perhaps decided that A’ana had suffered enough and his move was one towards reconciliation. He thus left for Sagaga going to build a place of worship’. It was also a move to distance himself from Manono, especially as Tonumaipe’a Tavini was also an LMS adherent, and was, as a coreligionist, seemingly acceptable of the move.

Important for the mission and also the Malo was the impact the Lotu Toga would have on the Malo districts in Savai’i and Manono. Williams, when examined carefully, despite the elevation of Malietoa to the most influential chief of the Leeward group, consistently refers to Manono as the Malo. The supporters of the Malo were the Itu o Fafine district, Satupa’itea, the *alataua* and Manono. These were all areas where the Wesleyan Lotu would flourish. The spread of Wesleyanism in these Malo areas also dispel many of the myths of the influence of the ‘white’foreigners. As Dyson states: ‘In three years from the time of Tuinaula’s return, there were 40 villages and hamlets in Savai’i and 25 in Upolu … . Thus during the first six years of its existence in Samoa, Methodism without a guide, overseer or ruler had penetrated into half of the villages and hamlets of the whole group’.  

The spread of the new Lotu was ‘self sustained’. It did not rely on foreign missionaries. Also, importantly, it did not develop in the Vaivai areas but the Malo villages. Even Gilson, who over-emphasises the LMS connections with the Malo areas, does note with insight that the Wesleyan cause was strongly associated with the Malo areas of the southern side of Savai’i. He also noted that when Peter Turner tried to establish a station at Matautu, who were of the Vaivai, Turner was dissuaded ‘as Turner’s move was particularly abhorrent to Satupa’itea, which then belonged to the Malo’.
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In regard to Manono, Buzacott states, for the first time, that the ‘principal chief of that island is Pea’, referring to Tonumaipe’a Tavini. He became a Christian convert when Buzacott came this time’.\textsuperscript{14} He had Lotu’d, when Heath assisted him in overcoming an asthma attack, although this is not mentioned, neither is there any mention of Matetau. Pe’a’s residence was at Saleiataua, Manono and Buzacott refers to two Wesleyan teachers there and regular comings and goings. He also heard that Turner was trying to convert Mata’afa, one of Pe’a’s family.\textsuperscript{15}

Heath, stationed on Apai, Manono, complained in December 1836 about Wesleyans infringing into their territory. He complained that when Mr Wilson of the Wesleyans came, ‘Turner tried to place him on Manono because of the political importance of the Island’.\textsuperscript{16} Essentially Both new Lotu recognised the political importance of Manono as the scramble between the two was on. The mere number of missionaries attracted to Manono is indicative in itself of its importance. Yet as Malietoa began to take more control of the LMS missionaries, many of the old Malo chose to align with the Lotu Toga. A sound indication that Manono was Malo was the amount of missionaries this small island attracted. In 1832, the LMS Rarotongan teacher, Teava, was not left with Malietoa, but Matetau of Manono. When Turner arrived, he also arrived in Manono and discovered the Lotu Toga in two of the three villages existent in Manono at that time. These villages were Saleiataua and Salua respectively. Turner left three teachers in these villages, two at Saleiataua, and one at Salua, while the LMS teacher Tevea was at the smaller village, Apai, under the protection of Matetau.\textsuperscript{17} That such a great concentration of teachers was in Manono indicates its Malo status; it also perhaps indicates the impact of its proximity to Tonga.

Heath viewed the Wesleyans as a cause of division enticing ‘pledged’ LMS members of crossing over to his rivals. One example of this was, he states was Tuionelu, the chief of Satup’aitea who originally joined the LMS, but went to Tonga and returned with Wesleyan materials.\textsuperscript{18}

The extent of the Tongan Lotu’s early influence in Samoa is debated by Samoan and missionary sources, as well as subsequent historians. Gunson claims that prior to the
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LMS arrival, it is ‘doubtful’ if the Lotu Toga was ‘practiced openly’ in Samoa outside Saiva’aia’s [Tuioneula’s] two villages on Savai’i. 19

There is also confusion over the first Wesleyan Samoans responsible for bringing the Lotu Tonga. The difficulties in Samoan orthography have allowed a confusion of three separate chiefs to be treated at times as one. Dyson speaks of Saiva’aia, a native of Savai’i visiting Tonga in 1829-30, becoming a Christian who ‘introduced his new Lotu to his friends and kindred at Tafua and Saleloga’. 20 Later he says that ‘about this time Tuioneula, a chief of Upolu planted the Lotu Tonga in Satupuala’. 21 This is a different person than Tuinaula, the ‘leading chief of Satupa’itea who had brought the Siovili sect to Savai’i who Dyson claimed went to Tonga to get missionaries. 22

The Upolu chief Tuioneula’s identity seems shrouded in mystery. But it seems highly likely that he is the son of I’amafana, whose second wife was Tongan. He stayed in Tonga in the royal household. I’amafana’s Tongan wife’s name is not recalled. It seems likely that she was of high rank. He seems to have returned to Samoa in the late 1830s. This Tuioneula is always associated with Upolu and Saluafata in A’ana specifically. There is no likelihood that he is Saiva’aia of the Tafua/Saleloga region, nor is he associated with Satupa’itea.

The extent of Wesleyan adherents is also disputed, but the most accurate account seems to come from Peter Turner. Turner was almost modest about the extent of the existence of the Lotu Toga prior to the LMS arrival. At a major meeting in Manono he says that he ‘proved’ that some persons were of the Tongan Lotu long before the LMS ‘Tahitian teachers came. He also writes that the ‘Tahitians began to conduct their Lotu in Sapapali’i about eight months before our people. 23

The Lotu Toga had spread quite rapidly after this time and he claims that the Lotu Toga had established itself on forty places in Savai’i, three on Manono and 25 on Upolu. He also claimed that the Lotu Toga adherents were more numerous than the LMS
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members. This claim seems to be borne out by the entries of Barff in 1836 on his tour of Upolu and Savai’i.

The rapid spread of the Wesleyan cause, according to Gilson was ‘strategic’. It was associated with the ‘Malo areas with four great aiga’, referring to Sa Lilomaiaava, Sa Tonumaipe’a, Sa Moeloei and Sa Muliaga. Gilson notes that ‘one suspects, too, that the great aiga, which had branches in other districts may have been the means of spreading the Lotu elsewhere’. He also states that ‘Manono, though formally a member of Sa Malietoa, may have been inclined towards division by virtue of a link between the Leaitaua clans and Sa Tonumaipe’a, whose title they used’.  

Unfortunately Gilson failed to realise it was not just a title they used. Tamafaiga did hold both the Leaitaua and Tonumaipe’a titles. The leading figure on Manono – and indeed of the Malo on William’s arrival was also Tonumaipe’a, even though he was portrayed by Williams as an old man who consulted the head of the dead Tamafaiga. The Tonumaipe’a inheritance would also retain a strong influence in Samoa after Pe’a Tavini’s death. This was due to Talavou, the son of Malietoa Tavita, having the Tonumaipe’a title conferred upon him and was therefore strongly supported by both Manono and traditional Tonumaipe’a villages. Gilson’s suspected connection was insightful, but perhaps a lack of understanding of honourifics and *fa’alupega* meant that Gilson makes no further connection between Manono and the ‘Tonumaipe’a title and thus leaves an interesting and vital connection out of his historical reconstruction.

The journey that the LMS missionary, Hardie, made along the coast of southern Savai’i reveals that the spread of the new Religion or Christianity had mixed results. He notes the dominant religious affiliations in each of the villages that he travels through. In Falelima, one of the Tonumaipe’a villages, there was a Tongan teacher resident, so the village was Wesleyan. The village of Siova were Siovili followers. He also informs us that the chief of that village was currently married to the daughter of Matetau of Manono, who had ‘been to Tonga’, where she became a Christian, but was ‘now JG’. The JG (Joe Gimlet) reference indicated that she was now a Siovili follower. Samata was also Siovili. Fogasavai’i were LMS people, while Fualalo and Fualuga and
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Gagaemalae were Wesleyan. The neighbouring Salailua was partly Wesleyan, partly LMS.

Tufu was mostly LMS while Satupa’itea was the headquarters of Peter Turner and the Wesleyan mission. Satupa’itea was, as formerly stated, not only the headquarters of the Wesleyan mission, but also the principal village in the Tonumaipe’a district. Hardie met Pe’a of Manono’s brother in Satupa’itea. Pe’as brother was Tupa’i of Satupa’itea.\textsuperscript{28}

Palauli had a Tahitian teacher but on 18 October 1837, he notes that he met two heathen chiefs of that village named Lilomaiaava and Seata.\textsuperscript{29} Hardie also met two heathen chiefs as Iva named Mata’utia and Magele, while at Salelavalu, he met the heathen chief of that village, Su’a. This chief, according to a number of sources was said to be the last heathen chief on Savai’i.

Turner then went to Satupa’itea, the home of the Tonumaipe’a title and was greeted warmly by Tuineula and Asiata – the vaa – I-ti, or voice of Nafanua.\textsuperscript{30} The Wesleyans were strongest in the Malo areas. Likewise in Upolu the Wesleyans were strongest in Malo areas. Their greatest stronghold in the 1830s was in Atua district, and weakest in the Vaivai district of A’ana. As Gilson correctly noted, Turners ‘best openings were in the sub-district of Falealili and within Aiga Salevalasi … whose titular head was a contender for the Tuiauta title and hence no friend of Malietoa’s.\textsuperscript{31} The Wesleyans, also called the Lotu Toga had forged well ahead of the LMS by the time the six new LMS missionaries arrived in Samoa in 1836, some three months after Turner.\textsuperscript{32}

Within a very short time Samoa was well aware of the differences in the two Protestant denominations, and the political alliances formed represented the new religion of Nafanua granted to Malietoa, namely the LMS, and the old religion, which became associated with Wesleyanism. The result of the meeting in Manono clearly demonstrates the sectarian differences had been well established by 1836.

When Buzacott and Barff arrived in June 1836 they had with them the London agreement of 1835, which meant that Samoa was to remain the exclusive missionary
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ground of the LMS, as a result of the contested agreement that Williams had entered in to while in Tonga. This meant a Wesleyan withdrawal from Tonga was required. This caused great consternation in Manono and Satupa‘itea and other areas that were not granted access to teachers by Malietoa. Taufa‘ahau, who felt that the Wesleyan Lotu, was an extension of his domain, sent his brother Joel as representative to the meeting in Manono.

When Turner received official word to leave Samoa, due to the ‘agreement between the Wesleyan and LMS hierarchy’, he records that ‘the Manono chiefs have sent for all principal chiefs of the Wesleyan Lotu in Samoa to have a meeting to decide what shall be done’.33 Two months later the big meeting was held. He notes that the LMS missionaries were there and sixteen chiefs spoke. Most said that ‘there would be bad results’ if he was removed and noted that ‘All the speakers alluded to the oneness, which had subsisted between these islands and the Tongan Isles from time [immemorial].34 Turner also replied to the LMS people that,

You forget one thing, viz that, we had many hundreds in these islands who called themselves of the Toga Lotu before I came. Such places were Satupa‘itea, Uliamo, Neiafu, Manono, Samatau (Upolu) etc .... This people and the Tonguese are as one and are attached to each other. The Toga canoes have been frequently to these islands and by that means many began to Lotu.35

The record of the event is somewhat different from that recorded in Dyson’s journal well after the event in 1844. There may have been some differences in the published version of the John Williams journal. The Dyson publication entitled, *My Story of Samoan Methodism*, represents a major departure from his own journals and is definitely an embellishment upon his own and Turner’s accounts. According to Dyson, King George was impressed and ‘was to go himself to get the Wesleyan mission started.’ Dyson also claims that King George came to the monster meeting on Manono and on Manono there ‘was an oath taken that they should die Methodists’.36

It was to Joel that the Manono chiefs addressed themselves as follows:

We have not one king here .... Have you any love for this land? Has King George any love to us? .... Will Tonga throw us away? We are your friends, your sons and your
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daughters. You know that Tongan chiefs are chiefs here, and Samoan chiefs are chiefs at Tonga. And shall we be separated by our Lotu relatives in England No-no-NO. Never let it be thus. But what do we know of Tahiti? What communications had the Tahitians with us or Tonga?  

A frequent claim made by the LMS missionaries was that the Lotu Toga was imposed by Tonga and was part of King George’s own plans for extending the influence of the Wesley mission and his own ‘kingdom’ to Samoa and Fiji. The desire to continue the Lotu Toga after Peter Turner’s dismissal came from Samoans themselves. Manono sought support from King George. Dyson also noted that it was Samoans in Upolu who chose to send for teachers. Masua, who claimed to be ‘the chief orator of the kingdom of Atua had also been a local Wesleyan preacher for Turner, ‘proposed to Alaiasa that he go to Tonga to get teachers’. The desire for Wesleyan teachers was, 

Taken up by the thousands of Methodists in Atua and Tuamasaga and three influential teachers were appointed to go ... Alai’asa of Falefa, Sosua of Falealii and Samuelu of Vailele .... There was a whaler at Saluafata, got passage in her to Tonga in 1840 and returned with some Tongans in two double canoes, among them Panepasa, Latuselu ...

King George received other representations from Savai’i, Manono and A’ana. Among these were Pa’u of Safotulafai, Talo of Manono and Aufa’i of Saleaula and Pilia’i of Leulumoega.

Turner had difficulties in Manono as the Manono chiefs wanted him to stay but he refused, so they asked him to live with Malietoa, ‘who had the most authority in Samoa and Turner couldn’t live anywhere until Malietoa agreed’. This letter was from an LMS missionary, probably also present at the fono in Manono. Turner himself claimed in June that Malietoa had asked him to stay and Teava, the LMS teacher in Apai, Savai’i had asked him to take over the missionary effort in Manono. The reasons for this were that Malietoa had refused to relinquish any control of the LMS teachers and Manono wished for its own Lotu, distinct from that of the one sanctioned by Nafanua – the LMS. Turner records that he refused to take over the mission. In this letter to the LMS in London, Turner refused to leave Samoa, though he eventually would in 1839.

---

38 Dyson Journal, 23 February 1864.
39 Buzacott, 51, SSJ.
He also claimed that ‘the chiefs would not let him return’. Furthermore he claimed that ‘only two men made the agreement in Tonga; and he had nothing to do with it’.\(^{40}\)

Evidently the chiefs who would not let him return were from the Manono fono, and only acquiesced when Satupa’itea left Manono. The reference to Malietoa was misunderstood by Turner, for it was indeed an insult for his refusing to stay on Manono. The Manono chiefs clearly knew the difference between the Lotu Toga and Lotu Taiti, as they knew that Malietoa was the recipient of the LMS missionaries. Turner originally took the request seriously and was told by Malietoa that he already had his missionaries and his Lotu and rejected Turner.

Palauli, like Satupa’itea embraced the Lotu Toga. The LMS missionary who had been placed in the district after Turner was forced to return to Tonga records that ‘many fono decided to detain Turner and many blame his removal on the LMS’.\(^{41}\)

The fono were influential and Turner finally left on the Camden in May 1839. Just before leaving he tried to get people to accept the LMS missionary Macdonald.\(^{42}\) Despite Turner’s plea, Macdonald felt the consequences of Turner’s forced dismissal, for when he tried to preach to the Wesleyan group, ‘they refused to hear’.\(^{43}\)

---

\(^{40}\) P Turner to LMS, Satupa’itea, 21 June 1836, SSJ.

\(^{41}\) Macdonald, Palauli, 13 May 1839, SSL.

\(^{42}\) P Turner Journal, 6 May 1839, B304, ML.

\(^{43}\) Ibid.
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CHAPTER 10

MALIETOA VAINU’UPO AS Tafa ’ifa

There existed considerable tension between the exalted status of the missionaries vis-à-vis the status of the chiefs in Samoa. In 1836, the LMS missionary Platt recognised that the desire of the mission to spread across Samoa was hampered by the traditional authority of chiefs. He complains that ‘all wanted leaders, but Malieta would let none leave him, he would be greatest’. Furthermore the power lay with the chiefs: ‘If a chief got a white man he was great ... therefore he consecrated him as a priest’.¹

Some five months later Platt felt some victory as the teachers had left Malieta on LMS orders’ even though ‘Malieta was opposed to it. Malieta said he was ‘seeking more aigas or districts’; and began making a political move to increase his influence over ‘more districts’ by ensuring that one of the newly arrived teachers, Moia went to Falelatatai to ‘a nephew’ of his.²

This nephew, actually Vain’upo’s first cousin, was To’oa Sualauvi, who would later hold three of the four papa. Sualauvi was married to Malieta’s daughter and it was very much an arranged marriage. To’oa Sualauvi was the son of Malietoa Fitisemanu’s sister, and was thus a first cousin of Vainu’upo. His father was from the Taisi line, thus linking To’oa to Sa Tupu’a, enabling him to claim aloali’i status. Malieta, after the death of Tamafaiga, had made a wise political move to join Manono in sacking Falelatatai and A’ana. The granting of the LMS teacher was his first move towards a reconciliation with A’ana and extending his influence over the district. It also was an initial move to prove his worthiness as a possible leader in his own right, but he needed the tacit support of Manono for this to happen. His move was not popular with Manono. Sualauvi was to become a great supporter of the LMS mission, like his uncle.

Malieta also made a move to Sagaga or Malie in the Tuamasaga region of which Malieta is the head of the district. He moved in mid-1836, comparatively close to

¹ Platt, Sapapali, 15 February 1836, SSL.
² Platt to LMS, ‘at sea’, 27 July 1836, SSL.
Apia, already a nascent hub of commerce. Interestingly the chief of Apia is referred to as Tonumaipe’a Pogai. The Tonumaipe’a inheritance was still active and Pe’a Pogai’s position in Apia reflects this. The tension between the old religion and the new was also evident by this time. Tonumapea Tavini and Pe’a Pogai were both LMS. Pe’a Popotonu’u, Satupaite’a and the alataua were strictly Wesleyan. There were further divisions within Manono, some leaders choosing LMS, others the Lotu Toga. The division would also have long-term ramifications for the Tonumaipe’a clan and that was division of title. No longer was there a single title-holder. This division of title, along with divisions in religious affiliation would eventually put considerable strain on Manono, and reduce the sacred authority of the ao of the Tonumaipea.

In 1836, however, Manono was still viewed as the ‘seat of the Malo’. Heath wrote in 1836 of the importance politically of Manono and, although not stated explicitly, he informed the LMS directors in London that Malietoa was not a member of the Manono chiefs and more emphasis and effort was needed on Manono. He wrote that even though the population of Manono was approximately 1000, and only about forty of that number, call themselves Manono chiefs, ‘their influence is paramount at present in political affairs’.  

He also stated that the ‘weak party’, formerly the strong A’ana people, had been allowed by a fono decision to return to their lands. This was, however ‘tarnished’ by the ‘subsequent depredations of Malo party’. These depredations were caused by ‘the Wesleyans and the Wesleyans had a much larger following in Manono that the LMS’.  

Heath wrote later that Malietoa and Pe’a, who had assumed the name ‘servant of Christ’ were the two greatest chiefs in Samoa. Now that Pe’a had joined the LMS, his status was publicly recognized by the LMS. Ironically neither Malietoa nor Pe’a being LMS members stopped the majority of Manono supporting any move by A’ana to threaten their dominance. The Wesleyan chiefs of Manono and the Malo districts of Satupaite’a, which were also Wesleyan, did not support any move to lesson the hegemony they had achieved.

---

3 Heath, Apia, 9 December 1836, 552.
4 Heath, Apia, 9 December 1836.
5 Heath, Manono, 1 October 1837, SSL and assumed the name ‘servant of christ’.
Malietoa's control of the new LMS teachers allowed him to rise in status prior to 1836. It seems that despite missionaries recording their disillusionment with him, Malietoa embarked upon gaining the papa. When, and how Malietoa gained the papa are disputed but some preliminary observations can be made. His support of Manono in sacking A’ana forged a link between Manono and himself. The moves made by Malietoa to gain the papa was supported by – or at least, not opposed by Manono who had gained its status without having the papa titles. The key to Manono’s success was through Leiatau Lesa Tonumaipe’a Tamafaiiga wrestling the Tonumaipe’a title. Manono was the Malo that allowed Malietoa Vainu’upo to achieve a prominence, which was enhanced with the arrival of the LMS. His new position allowed him to gain ‘districts’; and this meant a move to Upolu. He was rewarded with the Tuia’ana title in 1835.\^6

His move to Malie was also a means to attain the papa tamafafine or the papa that had been established by former members of the Malietoa lineage. The strategic marriage of his daughter to the already married Sualauvi helped him to secure the Tuia’ana title. The marriage did not take place in Sapapali’i, where Malietoa and his immediate forefathers lived, but at Faleatai in A’ana. According the LMS missionary, Hardie, stationed at Sapapali’i, the move was opposed by Tamalelagi and his son Talavou. Hardie implies that it was opposed because it was not in accord with LMS principles regarding marriage. Hardie himself was incensed at the repercussions for the LMS and decried the union because of the ridicule it brought to Sapapali’i and the LMS.\^7

Another possible explanation for the opposition was that this marriage ‘made in heaven’, as Tupua puts it, elevated the position of A’ana, a Vaivai district. The political trade off was that Malietoa would receive the Tuia’ana papa – and then, in his mavaega, or last will, name his nephew as successor to the Tui’a’ana title.

It seems that Manono allowed Malietoa Vainu’upo to extend his districts and gain the papa but a very serious rift between Malietoa Vaini’upo and Manono would occur just before his death. Manono was wary of the growing strength of A’ana, and this was not helped by the return of the great John Williams ‘championing the cause in A’ana’. Also Manono was not consulted first by Manono in the distribution of his titles. Malietoa had needed Manono’s support and Manono expected to have a say in the distribution of

\^[6] SSJ, Platt 1835-36; Ms, Turner Journal 1836; Gilson, History of Samoa, 88.
\^[7] Hardie, Sapapali’i, 9 February 1842, SSL.
the *papa*. They were the Malo leaders and Pe’a was furious. Both Malietoa Vainuupo and Taimalelagi had no real choice but to recant.

There was disagreement also when Malietoa left Sapapali’i because of differences between him and his brother, Taimalelagi. Taimalelagi’s consequent actions would reveal that he supported the Manono cause. He joined with Manono when Manono felt that A’ana had gained too much power. His ‘son’ Talavou would also join Manono and take on the Tonumaipa’a title.

Meanwhile To’oa Sualauvi in Falelatai showed interest in being baptized and also tried to forge an alliance with the chiefs of Manono. In the capital of A’ana the first chapel was opened, although it seems there was not a great attendance due to the many Siovili followers.

Manono watched the rise in the status of A’ana warily, but there was no doubt that it was the seat of government. When Malietoa’s *ausoga* was assaulted at the village of Lotoanu’u in 1839, ‘Malietoa came to Manono, requesting chiefs there to plunder and destroy the village concerned’. Manono, however, refused citing Christian doctrine as the reason not to avenge the assault.

The departure of the Wesleyan missionary, Wilson, in May 1839 caused some discord in Manono. Heath states that when he left he encouraged the Wesleyans of Manono to join the LMS but noted, ‘Some Samoans are writing to Tonga for another missionary’. Few Wesleyans joined Heath. When the Wesleyans officially returned almost twenty years later, the new Wesleyan missionary, Dyson, who considered personally that it was better for Samoa to remain the sole territory of the LMS, also sought for the Wesleyans on Manono to join the LMS. He was met with a flat refusal.

The LMS had little luck in Satupaite’a, which was ‘still Wesleyan and expect Turner’s return’. The resident missionary had made little inroad into Satupaite’a and Palauli. He

---

8 Hardie, Apia, 7 April 1837.
9 Heath, Manono, 29 November 1838.
10 Heath, Manono, 3 May 1839, SSL.
11 Heath, Manono, 21 October 1839.
speaks of Pe’a Popotonu’u as one of the principal chiefs of Palauali and ‘a wicked man’. He also noted that American warships were searching for him.  

The Wesleyans from Manono who wrote to Tonga for missionaries were rewarded in April 1841, when a ‘Tonga and a Keppel Island canoe arrived with four Tongan teachers who had left with Turner’. Also returning was the ‘Keppel Island chief who first introduced the Tongan Lotu into Samoa’. This is not the first mention of a Keppel Island (Niua) chief introducing, or at least accompanying the original Tongan party. His name was Mafoa. The Malo in Manono was soon worrying about political advances made by the prior Malo of Nafanua. A’ana was, with Malietoa and LMS assistance, in a position to try to re-establish her rights. The mighty A’ana had been vanquished and reduced to Vaivai status. It fought back when To’oa Sualauvi tried to seduce the wife of Pe’a Tavini of Manono.

Early in April 1841 ‘Manono threatened to plunder Faleda’u’ due to this affront to Pe’a. War was averted, however when a party from Faleda’u ‘came to Manono and ifoga’d’. In May war again threatened when Tuioneula, a chief of A’ana, killed Futi of Manono’. This Tuioneula could well be the son of I’amafana, and Futi was the principal orator of Leitaalaua. Futi’s daughter would become the wife of Mata’a’afa who, as a Catholic and of the Tupua line, was favoured by the German administration. The Germans were also vehemently anti LMS.

Tuioneula and his party also came to Manono ‘to make their submission’ and ifoga to the party who were present. They had green boughs about their heads and shoulders in taken of their abject submission. They advanced with a fine mat as an offering’. At the second meeting Tuionauala was pardoned and ‘sent away uninjured’.

Just over two months later, Malietoa Vainu’upo Tavita died. He had received the new religion of Nafanua and his influence grew throughout the group. He had gained the papa and was therefore tafa’ifa. He was the first of his family to enjoy such privilege,
although his distant ancestors, Malietoa Savea and his immediate descendants must have also enjoyed a similar position before the creation of the tafa i'fā. Yet the Tonumaipe’a clan who gained the papa before Salamasina, remained a major problem for him and after joining Manono in sacking A’ana, he felt that the best way to challenge Tonumaipe’a was to unite the former Malo with the assistance of the LMS.

After the death of Tamafaiga, Malietoa joined with Manono, and was recognized as King by the new missionaries of the LMS. Malietoa’s alliance with Manono allowed him to advance the Malietoa cause. For generations the qualifications for national leadership and thus leadership of the Malo came from the line of Salamasina and the Tonumaipe’a marriages. The strategy seems to have been to distance himself from Manono and attain the papa in Upolu. Hardie of Sapapalii gives a good insight into the aims of Malietoa and Manono. Already by the time Hardie arrived in Samoa in 1836, Malietoa Tavita had moved to Sagana where he would remain until his death. Hardie gives a lengthy denunciation of Malietoa’s ‘wicked designs’ in securing the marriage of his daughter to To’oa Sualauvi. This was a political marriage, opposed to by the LMS and, according to Hardie, by his own family. It is also possible although Hardie does not state it, that this was the disagreement with his successor, Taimalelagi when Malietoa Tavita left Sapapali’i.

The following extract from the letter is enlightening regarding the relationship between Pe’a and Malietoa.

On his deathbed . . . . There were several speeches, some of them in accord with the requirements of the gospel, but others in a very different character . . . finding fault with Malietoa himself for disposing of the titles in their absence. This was particularly the case with Pe’a a chief of Manono. Malietoa then denounced the worth of the titles before Pe’a . . . . Taimalelagi also replied given to him and others of his family, they willing gave them all back for they no more regarded them as important. 17

Even though the titles were rejected, Taimalelagi would make it up to Manono for the insult, as would his ‘son’ Malietoa Talavou Tonumaipe’a.

17 Harbutt, Lepa, 24 January 1842, SSL.
CHAPTER 11

A SPLIT IN THE MALIETOA CAMP, 1841-53

The fight between the LMS and the opponents of the Malietoa faction naturally continued after the death of Malietoa Tavita. The new complexity in the relationship between the ‘Malo of Malietoa’ versus those who did not believe that the new Malo rightfully belonged to Malietoa, was the consequent divisions within Sa Malietoa, or the family of Malietoa itself. The immediate successor was clear. Malietoa Tavita’s half brother, Taimalelagi Tinai succeeded to the title. Certainly Malietoa Vainu’upo Tavita, wished for his major titles to be dispersed to the heads of other maximal lineages within Samoa, which did not happen in the way he wished. A further complication was that the succession of the ao of the Malietoa, or the Malietoa title itself would be disputed after Malietoa Tinai’s death.

There were two rival candidates, one a mission educated Christian, the other who did not believe that the Malo was blessed and received spiritual sanction from the new LMS missionaries. Taimalelagi, also known as Tinai, is sometimes hard to find, especially in Samoan tala. Krämer also leaves Malietoa Taimalelagi out of the succession to the title. Malietoa Vainu’upo is the thirtieth Malietoa, and Moli, Vainu’upo’s son is listed as the thirty first Malietoa. Taimalelagi was not liked by the LMS either. The missionaries often refer to him in letters as a ‘pagan’. Taimalelagi also took another candidate under his wing, Talavou (Pe’a). The rivalry is often portrayed, as a contest between Moli, the eldest son of Tavita, and his ‘uncle’ Talavou.

The ‘favourite son’ of the LMS was Moli. The other candidate, Talavou, would battle against the LMS during his lifetime. He was at one time a Wesleyan, but later became Catholic. His religious adherence mirrored his political decision to join with Manono and the old Malo and take on the Tonumaipe’a title. He was not perhaps favoured at birth because he was the issue of Vainu’upo by Fuatai, the wife of Vainu’upo’s father,
GENEALOGY OF MALIETOA

Malietoa (M) Ti’a

Palo (f) ——— M. Fitisemanu ——— Fuatai (f)

M. Taimalelagi

M. Vai’inupo

M. Moli ——— M. Tonumaipe’a Talavou ——— M. Laupepa

M = Malietoa
Malietao Fitisemanu. This made Talavou a half brother, or nephew or, quite commonly ‘son’ to Tinai and a half-brother or ‘uncle’ to Moli1 (refer to genealogy previous page).

The histories that reveal an LMS bias, including Samoan accounts, tend to gloss over Tinai for reasons that will soon become clear. They also refer to Malietao Tonumaipe’a merely by his given name Talavou. The genealogies given in numerous publications by German sources, notably Krämer and von Bülow do likewise. Yet it is extremely rare in primary documents such as archival sources for him to be referred to as Talavou. He is always referred to as Malietao Tonumaipe’a, or just Pe’a. The fact that he was Malietao as well as Tonumaipe’a meant that he continued to legitimize and validate his Malo with that of the Old Malo of Nafanua. In Gilson’s, *History of Samoa, 1830-1900*, the Manono – Tamafaiga – Tonumaipe’a connection is not acknowledged and he continually refers to Malietao Pe’a by his given name Talavou. It is a major problem because the Old Malo was based in Manono with the Tonumaipe’a being recognised as having the spiritual authority to form a government. The recent works of Tupua Tamasese have acknowledged the importance of the relationship between Manono and the Tonumaipe’a title.2

In 1843 the Wesleyan cause was still strong in the Old Malo areas. The LMS missionary Drummond complained that in Faalealupo, the Wesleyans refused to join the LMS and ‘another Tongan canoe has come bringing four Tongan teachers’.3 Another LMS missionary bemoans the chance of gaining a foothold in Satupa’itea. He wrote that ‘Lauulu, a chief of Satupa’itea, invited Mac Donald, [the LMS missionary] to preach there’. Macdonald describes Satupa’itea as a ‘Wesleyan centre’ and describes the people as ‘deluded’. He also noted that it was the ‘first opening’ he had to preach, but ‘when the rest of Satupa’itea heard of this they were enraged at the prospect of having another Lotu’. They ‘attacked the property of Lauulu’s people and destroyed it’.4

---

1 See works by Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese, ‘The Riddle’ and ‘Tamafaiga’.
2 See works by Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese, ‘The Riddle’ and ‘Tamafaiga’.
3 Drummond, Faalealupo, 10 June 1843, SSL.
4 Macdonald, Palaui, 13 September 1843, SSL.
The LMS were also not happy with the son of Malietoa Taimalelagi, Tupapau, who was reportedly ‘living in sin and died’. Of concern for the LMS was that the young man’s father, Malietoa, who had joined the Church, had responded badly to Tupapau’s death. The LMS missionary Hardie reported that ‘on the death of his son he indulged in vile hypocrisy and provocation ... then dared God to visit him with same illness [as his son].’

Another, perennial problem for the missionaries was threat of warfare. In 1844, warfare erupted in Savai’i. One incident, according to Hardie, was provoked by the Fa’asaleleaga and others against Palauli. The people provoking the incident, i.e., the Fa’asaleleaga, were ‘all Wesleyan by name’ and ‘among the Fa’asaleleaga war party were the brother and son of Malietoa, who were both church members’. The reference here was to Malietoa Tinai, and his cousin, who would often be referred to as his son, Talavou.

In March 1844, George Turner complained that this was the first war since 1830. Palauli and Satupa’itea were attacked by Safotulafai and another LMS missionary wrote that ‘when Palauli and Satupa’itea party finishes building its fort, further fighting may occur’. The missionary was stationed on Manono and said ‘on Manono it is the Wesleyan party that is keenest to enter the war’. The war was soon finished, and there may have been a disagreement between Palauli and Satupa’itea as Vavatau and Sapa of Palauli were now receptive to the LMS. War threatened in October 1846 between Salailua and Fai’a’ai and the LMS missionary Powell, records that ‘Salailua said they had many insults ... and they talked of sending to consult the Falefa and Manono, the present dominant parties with whom they are in alliance’.

Meanwhile Malietoa Taimalelagi had taken up residence in the Apia district and the LMS missionary, Mills, complained that he ‘pays no attention to religion now ... he is normally accompanied by a set of wicked young men’.

---

5 Hardie, Sapapali’i, 26 September 1843, SSL.
6 Hardie, Sapapali’i, 26 September 1843, SSL.
7 Hardie, Sapapali’i, 11 March 1844, SSL.
8 Turner, Vaie’e, 21 March 1844, SSL.
9 Chishold, Manono, 12 May 44, SSL.
10 Macdonald and Drummond, Sapapali’i, 11 July 1845.
11 Thomas Powell, Samata, 9 October 1846.
12 Mills, Apia, 7 September 46.
The religious adherence of the principal villages in Savai’i in 1846 revealed the continued predominance of the Lotu Toga in Savai’i, particularly on the southern coast and Tonumaipe’a villages. Powell, who noted the extent of the Wesleyans, also noted that the village of Asau was a completely Wesleyan village and the ‘residence of a very influential chief Tupua’. Powell states that Tupua ‘has got authority over the whole district from Asau to Falelima. He is a Wesleyan teacher and uses his influence to prevent people from receiving instruction’. ¹³ This Tupua is Moegagogo, the father of Tupua Tamasese Titimaea. Moegagogo’s wife was from Asau and it is interesting that his influence extended to Falelima. Powell ascribes the dominance of Wesleyanism from Asau to Falelima to Tupua.

Tupua was an influential chief, a tama’aiga, often referred to as an ‘hereditary prince’, a distinction shared by Mata’afa and Malietoa, and Tuimaleali’ifano. Sualauvi, who had been promised the Tuia’anâ title by Malietoa Tavita, was still in A’ana. To’oa Sualauvi, who does not seem to be referred to as Tuimaleali’ifano at this time, had also enthusiastically embraced the LMS cause and become an LMS teacher. The LMS also set up their first printing press in Sualauvi’s village of Falelatai. There was a division between the four prominent chiefs. Sualauvi joined with Malietoa and the LMS.

Many of Sa Tupua, the other major family from the sons of Kings in Atua and A’ana rejected the LMS. In this way religious affiliation mirrored political aims and the genealogical line of sacred kings. If Sa Tupua, with the tama’aiga or family heads, Tupua Moegagogo or Mata’afa, accepted the new religion of Malietoa, they would have to accept his Malo. They chose either Wesleyanism or Catholicism.

The Satupa’itea village of Falelima had remained firmly Wesleyan. A chance occurred for the LMS to enter that village in early 1848, but it was recognised by the LMS as a political move. Powell, wrote that ‘Fiame, who had been residing at Sapapali’i, but has some authority at Falelima, has removed thither and on doing so requested me to send a teacher to preach …. Some of the other chiefs objected to it and the Wesleyan teacher who resides in Falealupo’. The LMS teachers were permitted only for Fiame and his family. Powell was sceptical about Fiame’s motives and wrote that Fiame was not a

¹³ Powell, Samata, 9 October 1846, SSL.
good man, 'far from it'. 'I fear he has done what he has from a vainglorious spirit. Some of the chiefs have given him the honourable name of Pe'a, others objected to it'.

Political manoeuvring by Fiame reveals that those responsible for granting the Tonumaipe'a title appear to have been divided. However the Tonumaipe'a inheritance as the speaker for Nafanua, along with the region's ties with Tonga would lead to the assumption that Fiame had limited support. This is evidenced most strongly by the fact that the LMS were only allowed to minister to Fiame and his own family.

During the three-year war of 1848-1851, there was an attempt by A'ana and Atua to regain the status they felt they deserved as the domain of the ancient line of hereditary rulers, which Nafanua had sanctioned. Manono and the Tongans and Satupai'tea had risen against them. This was a chance for A'ana and Atua to strike back.

Manono also received assistance from the Tongans. The reasons for Tongan assistance were threefold: The Tonumaipe'a regions, centred around Satupa'itea and the alataua, including Neiafu had strong ties historically with Tonga. Secondly, Taufa'ahau had married the daughter of Matetau of Manono and assisted in warfare and had assisted Tamafaiga formerly. Thirdly KingGeorge or Taufa'ahau's elevation in Tonga, was greatly assisted by the Wesleyans and he felt an obligation to expand his newly found spiritual support into his neighbourhood, namely Fiji and Samoa.

By March 1848, King George, with a Tongan party came over to Savai'i. The LMS missionary Pratt noted that he 'left some Tongan teachers, leaving one at Safune'. Pratt was worried because in his 'district alone' there were '1500 Samoans who adhere to this Wesleyan party' and Pratt did not know what to do about it. He complains that 'only a few have come over since Turner left'. Pratt noted further that these Wesleyans 'seem more obstinate than they were eight years ago', although in most villages both denominations were present.

The Wesleyan cause, like the LMS, had survived and prospered without 'white missionaries'. White 'superiority' was not the cause of the continuation of the missions.

---
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The Lotu Tonga had one advantage over the Tahitian religion. Tonga was close by and King George was not only prepared to spread the new religion, but support his allies with armed men.

On 1 April, King George had arrived with eight large canoes carrying warriors and Heath felt that his motives were to assist Manono in war. He noted that ‘Tonga assisted Manono in a former war’ and Tongan and Wesleyan influence in Manono was strong’. 18

When war broke out by mid-year, the parties were clearly divided. Manono, parts of Savai’i and Tuamasaga joined against A’ana and Atua. A’ana was burned, as was Safata in Tuamasaga. George Turner, stationed in Malua, wrote that Manono was almost defeated when Atua and A’ana burned Safata. 19

Malietaoa was with the Manono party. His decision indicates his desire to forge his way with the powerful Manono, just as Tavita had done. The missionaries complained that Malietaoa and his party ‘refused to listen to missionary entreaties to end the war’. 20 According to George Turner, the real causes of the war were ‘the jealous feeling and tyrannical disposition of the Manono people and their adherents and the desire for titles and preeminence in some of their chiefs’. 21 Turner wrote that the ‘fighting occurred when Malietaoa joined Manono’. They attacked A’ana, who fled and were beaten, but in a second fight in Safata, in Tuamasaga territory, ‘Malietaoa’s party fled’ and Safata was ‘then burned by the A’ana/Atua party’. 22

It was not just missionaries who pleaded with Malietaoa Tinai to refrain from involving himself in war. The LMS missionary Sunderland compared the LMS with the Catholics who ‘are trying to flatter Manono party’ into thinking that they ‘support their cause’. 23 Unfortunately for Sunderland his chapel in Leulumoega was soon to be burnt down, and he himself threatened with an axe.

Captain North, of the Calypso, wrote to Malietaoa, who he refers to as the ‘Principal chief of the Tuamasaga the following. ‘It is with much sorrow I learn that you are still

---
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so determined in this war ... you are not only acting contrary to the wishes of the greater part of your own people but advice of your best friends." 24

By 4 August 1848, neither the British consulate, nor the missionaries, had much to celebrate in regard to Malietoa and his ‘war party’. A report by George Prichard, the British Consul, and JC Williams wrote that ‘Malietoa’s war party have wontonly destroyed much British property’. They were ‘going forth day after day to plunder and destroy the property both of foreigners and natives in every direction where they thought they could do it with impunity’. The point being made was that foreign property was not ransacked by mistake for ‘agreeable to Malietoa’s’ request, flags were flying on the premises, in order to distinguish their property from that of the natives’. The main problem for the British – and the missionaries – was not just the taking of property, but ‘having forcibly entered the house of Mr Sunderland, the [LMS missionary at Leulumoeaga], they held an axe over his head and leveled a gun at the servant maid’. 25 They then proceeded to burn the church. The list of damaged property, according to Prichard and Williams was equal to $1625.50; by far the largest cost was for the damage to Sunderland’s chapel at $1000. 26

The Captain of the British ship Calypso wrote to Malietoa, this time addressed as the ‘Principal chief of the Manono party’, that ‘we wish for ample reparation for the injury your party has done’. To ensure this ‘I have felt it my duty to put an embargo upon all the canoes assembled at Mulinu’u and if it is not acquiesced to (referring to the $1000 in reparation), I shall follow it up by proceeding in the ship directly to Manono ... and devastate them’. 27

Some LMS missionaries felt that the fine of $1000 was too much and Platt told the directors that the episode had made the LMS ‘stink as a mission in the esteem of the natives’. 28 In the LMS Samoan district meeting in December 1848, the mission

24 Captain H C North to Malietoa, Principal chief of the Tuamasaga, Apia, 1848, in BCS Roll 5, series 2 Inwards Correspondence, 1847-1911, Micro S 3512, NA.
25 G Prichard and J C Williams, British Consulate, Apia, 4 August 1848, in BCS Roll 5, series 2, Micro s3512, NA.
26 Prichard and Williams, ibid.
27 HBM Ship Calypso (Worth) to Malietoa, Principal chief of the Manono party 1848, in BCS, Roll 5, series 2, Micro S3512, NA.
28 Pratt, Matautu, 3 November 1848. See also, Gilson, 220.
complained of the fine imposed by the British consul and noted that it was ‘better just to bear the cost of the chapel’.  

Pratt, who felt the fine on Malietoa Tinai was excessive, found religion ‘dead in Palauali and Satupa’itea areas’. He noted that the ‘two divisions of Satupa’itea joined for service and there were only 20 altogether’. There are no reasons given, but it seems that the above areas were divided about the extension of war and the fine. The choice to ally with Wesleyanism was strong since the Wesleyan Peter Turner came to Satupa’itea. The Wesleyans, with the help of King George were prepared to fight a religious war. The LMS wrote, on the other hand, that ‘Malietoa and his party knows that that the LMS [are] neutral politically and cannot bless them in their aggressive war.  

Malietoa Tinai certainly did not look to be the ideal candidate for the LMS mission, and in Samoan tala his deeds are expunged from the record. Sa Malietoa would receive their Malo from heaven. The LMS mission would provide the spiritual legitimacy for the rise in the political regime of the Malietoa. But the myth would allow eventually a sanitized history to evolve precisely because Christianity, especially the London mission, would successfully be integrated into Samoan society, and Malietoa received that Malo. Furthermore His Highness Malietoa Tanumafili II, as Head of State, is viewed by many as the proof that the Malo was to belong to the head of Sa Malietoa, in accordance with the prophecy of Nafanua.  

In the Gurr notes of succession, submitted before Consul JC Williams in regard to the succession in 1898, many genealogies are produced. While these acknowledge Tinai, his withdrawal from the LMS is expunged from the record. For example in the letter from Lupetuloa (one of the Aumatagi or orators of Malie, Tuamasaga) and Fata, one of the orators of Afega, to CJ Chambers, they attribute the success and prosperity of Samoa to the arrival of the Lotu. They note that this is expressed in Samoan as ‘O le Atua o Malietoa na Sali’. Malietoa’s God [and hence spiritual justification of his Malo] will come’. After Malietoa’s death the high titles were distributed as per the wishes of the mavaega of Malietoa Vainu’upo. Tinai gets a mention. He ‘became the Malietoa in 1857, but died on 1-10-58’. By 1940 one of the members of Sa Malietoa

29 LMS ‘Minutes of meetings’, in PMB 41.  
30 Sunderland, Leulumoega, 5 October 1848, SSL.  
31 Sunderland, Leulumoega, 5 October 1848.  
32 Lupetuloa and Fata to CJ Chambers, Apia, 12-12-98, in Gurr papers, 25. ATL.
would say that ‘anyone who was not of the LMS church was “of no use”’. The myth-making machine was in process.

The impact of war in 1848 and the fining and blaming of Malietoa Tinai did affect church membership. In May 1849, the LMS missionary Schmidt was happy about an opening for the LMS in Falelima. He wrote that the wife of one of the principal chiefs there was said to want an LMS teacher’. Schmidt responded by asking ‘Pe’a, the big chief about sending in a teacher . . . Pe’a said the village wanted no divisions, it was all Wesleyan’. Some concession was granted as Pe’a let Schmidt preach to the two LMS visitors there.33

Malietoa Tinai’s decision to join with Manono was misunderstood by many of the LMS missionaries. By taking this step he was distancing himself from Moli, the primogeniture candidate, and thus would lead to divisions within Sa Malietoa. During the course of the period of this study – until the end of the German administration in Samoa with Mata’afa as highest chief – Sapapali’i and Tuamasaga would often be at odds. Sapaplai’i chose continually to oppose both Pe’a and Pe’a’s son, Fa’alata who allied himself with Mata’afa. Sapapali’i and neighbouring Iva remained fairly consistent in this opposition. Some regions would ‘change sides’, but Sapapali’i seems to have stayed firmly in the camp of the ‘sons’ of Tavita.

The LMS missionaries in their letters seem to misconceive the meaning of the division within Sa Malietoa. One example of this lack of understanding can be seen in a comment from Macdonald in Savai’i. He wrote that ‘Sapapali’i is in an interesting situation, as Malietoa [Tinai] who is head of the war party, is their chief, but they won’t join him in War’.34 Malietoa also had problems in Fa’asaleleaga, another area of Sa Malietoa. Macdonald noted that Malietoa ifoed (pleaded) before Fa’asaleleaga in Safotulafai trying to get support and didn’t get it.35 Again this is not surprising. Fa’asaleleaga would, for most of the century remain with the primogeniture candidate and support Sapapali’i, also Sa Malietoa would perhaps question whether they should once again get involved in Manono’s war. It also shows that their emphasis on Malietoa as the leader of the War party is doubtful. If Malietoa Tinai was the head of the party, one would have expected that he would receive support from his family in

33 Schmidt, Salailua, 1 May 1849, SSL.
34 Macdonald, Savai’i, 22 December 1848, SSL.
35 Macdonald, Savai’i, 22 December 48.
Sapapali’i and Fa’asaleleaga. In 1849, when the war seemed to be heading for a Manono victory, Alipia and Molio’o, orators of A’ana and Atua respectively, ‘went over to the Manono people and paid homage to them as Malo’. They did not go to Malietoa or Sapapali’i.

Manono had made an accommodation with their relatives, Sa Malietoa. By 1849, Old Pe’a, referring to Pe’a Popotonu of Satupa’itea, saw Erskine, a naval visitor to the island, off on his departure and Pe’a listed some of his various names. Pe’a ‘had been known as a great warrior by Williams and d’Urville’. In terms of the Tonumaipae inheritance, Talavou, who was also Tonumaipe’a, would carry on the tradition. Just as the war of Manono against A’ana in the period prior to 1830 was Manono’s war, so too was this one. Malietoa Vainu’upo had assisted Manono before and had caused a rift between Manono and himself by his mavaega and refusing to join Pe’a of Manono in sacking A’ana in the 1830s. Malietoa Tinai assisted Manono in this war, with no support from his family in Sapapali’i and the Fa’asaleleaga because he hoped to keep A’ana in check and, as brother of Vainu’upo, and his own son dead, he hoped to set up the necessary credentials for his ‘son’ Pe’a.’ to gain the honours of the Malietoa title. Also ‘Talavou renounced the Lotu Taiti [the LMS mission] together with Taimalelagi’.

Also difficult for the LMS was that, despite it being supposedly aligned with the strong Malo areas, in the 1840s it was not. The Old Malo, namely Manono and Satupa’itea were not always amenable to the LMS. The LMS scored a victory with Vainu’upo and Pe’a Tavini, the forgotten party on Savai’i. But Pe’a had split with Malietoa and turned to the Wesleyans. The Malietoa successors chose either to accept the Old Malo and take up the Tonumaipae’a, or become firmly entrenched with the LMS and the British. Eventually the latter won out, but this took time. This is a point that such seminal works of Gilson’s History of Samoa fail to adequately explain either. The Malo areas of Manono and Savai’i were Wesleyan, and adopting this Lotu was a way of associating with the Old Malo and disassociating from the LMS. For example, Macdonald wrote

---

38 Erskine and other refer to Malietoa Pe’a as the son of Tinai.
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that in Savai’i, the two villages of Salevalu and Salelologa were ‘unanimously supporting Manono; these are villages that have stood out against the LMS’. ⁴⁰

The old Malo areas were suffering and weakening by late 1851 however. Manono was suffering defeats. At the end of April, Manono, Malietoa and Savai’i were routed by Atua and A’ana. The latter offered the Manono party a peace deal. One LMS missionary wrote that ‘this was more than Manono expected and readily she embraced it. The chief Malietoa, Manono and all her Savai’i allies left their forts on this island (Upolu) directly and went off to Manono and Savai’i’. ⁴¹ It seemed an LMS victory.

Even in villages of Sa Malietoa the victory was not as the LMS were hoping. There are a number of letters between mid to late 1851 written by LMS missionaries bemoaning the fall in church attendance and return to heathen ways. ⁴² Even in Sapapali’i, where there was cause for celebration among Sa Malietoa, the missionaries expected worship to remain strong. Nisbet complains, however, that there was an ‘increase in sin after the war … there is evidence of overwhelming licentiousness’ and ‘sales of the New Testament have ceased’. ⁴³ The Wesleyan cause was to suffer much more heavily as the LMS missionaries were also pleased to point out. The missionaries do not see the huge drop in Wesleyan attendance as linked to political defeat, but defeat it certainly was.

Reports of Wesleyan defections begin in mid-1851. Pratt reports that the leading Wesleyan chief at Matautu had come over to the LMS. ⁴⁴ Mills wrote of a ‘collapse’ of the Wesleyan movement in his district by 1852, with ‘several hundred joining the LMS’. ⁴⁵ In the Fa’asaleleaga district, which had both Wesleyan and LMS adherents, there was also a collapse of Wesleyanism. The LMS missionary, Nisbet, wrote that in November of that year the Tongan evangelist was ordered away by the Methodists in Tonga … though only two or three Tongan teachers have gone with him’. ⁴⁶ Tonga knew that the mission was in difficulty and the Wesleyan cause was perhaps too closely tied with the Manono and Satupa’itea faction. Nisbet noted that ‘the Samoans see this as the end of overseas support for the movement and see that no missionaries will come

---
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now'.

This claim had been made many times before. But the Wesleyans, and the Old Malo faction had been routed by Atua and A’ana. The old Malo and Wesleyanism were on shaky ground.

Moli, the Malietoa candidate supported by the LMS, had kept out of the war. In early 1849 he was residing in Apia. Mills writes enthusiastically that Moli, son of the late Malietoa and nephew to the present, promoted peace. Mills added that ‘his whole conduct through the affair reflects credit on his judgement and Christian character’. If Nafanua had said that the Malo of Malietoa was to come with the arrival of the new religion, it was slow in coming and only a tentative Malo was evolving by the end of the 1850s. Malietoa Tavita had converted. He also had become tafa‘i fa. Moli was definitely not tafa‘i fa. The LMS missionary/ethnographer Ella later reported that during the three-year war, 1848-51, ‘A’ana and Atua struggled to gain their position’ and ‘they were able to establish their independence’. In regard to Moli, he wrote that ‘Moli, father of the present Malietoa Laupepa, declined the honours of the kingship and an uncle, Pe’a, was chosen by the Savai’i and Manono chiefs to be king; but nearly the whole of Upolu preferred the son of Moli’. Malietoa Taimalelagi Tinai was left out, just as he would be in the ‘Samoan tradition’.

Malietoa Tonumaipe’a, who will be discussed presently, had made a bid for honours and received the Malietoa title, but he was not even an LMS member. The struggle over the next quarter of a century would be between these two rivals, despite Atua and A’ana winning the war ending in 1851.

---
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CHAPTER 12

A FIGHT BETWEEN THE OLD MALO OF NAFANUA AND THE NEW, 1853-70

The Lotu Toga may have suffered by the end of the war in 1851 and the withdrawal of missionaries did not assist, but this was by no means the ‘collapse of Wesleyanism’ that the LMS missionaries felt was imminent. The Wesleyans would decide once again to send missionaries to Samoa in 1857 and find the Wesleyan adherents strong in the Old Malo districts of Satupa’itea and the alataua, as well as in Manono. The LMS wrote instead that the strong body of Wesleyanism on the south coast of Savai’i were suffering from the lack of missionaries. Pratt noted that the ‘people from Falealupo to Asau regard themselves as having no missionary … and Wesleyans in that area are fast lapsing into heathenism’. 1

Wesleyanism had survived already by King George providing missionaries and expanding the Wesleyan faith. Just as King George assisted Manono and Satupa’itea in Samoa in the war beginning in 1848, he was also, in 1856, ‘away in Feejee mixed up with war and confusion’. 2

In the district minutes of the Wesleyan Church in Tonga for 1852, it was noted that Benjamin Latuselu, Native assistant missionary, ‘was ‘still being detained forcibly in Samoa’. 3 Many sources attribute the fall in the number of Wesleyan adherents to Latuselu for being overly involved in the war of 1848.

Catholic sources also emphasise the spread of the new faith, which had arrived in the form of French priests, from the Society of Mary, in 1845. The number of Catholic adherents was small in the 1850s and the 1860s. It was not until the 1870s that it would challenge the place of the Lotu Toga as a counter to the LMS.
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The LMS initially had no great fear of the Catholics. Pratt noted that in Matautu, ‘two heads of families were sore at LMS members for not helping in war ... in revenge they sent for a [Catholic] priest’.\(^4\) He noted furthermore that ‘this makes the RC congregation of five or six, and not much fear of its getting bigger’.\(^5\) The LMS reluctantly admitted that the Catholic mission had one advantage over the Protestant missions and that was the use of holy water. Harbutt noted that ‘Holy water is a valuable article in their medical practices, especially in a kind of lunacy common here and which the natives call a possession of the devil’.\(^6\) Stallworthy, another LMS missionary gives credit to the Catholics for the same reason. He stated that for the Catholics, ‘holy water is an important medicine of priests’ as it is ‘used to cast out evil spirits’.\(^7\) The LMS were well aware of the persistence of supernatural causes of sickness, and they too utilised threats in regard to this fact, even though they did not use holy water. Pratt wrote that ‘in dealing with the church members, the law of tapu is still necessary, as holding up death by supernatural causes seems to be important to them, they understand it ... and it keeps them in line when other things will not.’\(^8\) By 1878 George Turner, training pastors at Malua, recognised the persistence of traditional ‘superstitions’. He wrote that ‘it is wrong for any pastor to encourage old ideas as taboo of lands’ and ‘superstitious ceremonies for ‘good luck’’.\(^9\)

Possession by aitu was a very real concern for Samoans, especially if a relative had recently died. Persistence of belief in successfully capturing the spirit of the dead when buried is one of the most prominent comments by European recorders in Samoa in regard to Samoan traditional belief. Despite this apparent advantage the Catholics had, the initial impact of Catholicism was small. Perhaps the primary cause for this was the comparatively late introduction of Catholicism to Samoa. But early anti-papal and anti-Catholic literature from the LMS printing presses and the anti-Catholic attitude of the LMS missionaries also gave cause for distrust. There were also constant rumours of a French invasion.

Tension certainly occurred between the two Protestant missions, but the strain between the LMS and the Wesleyans with the Catholic mission would be expected to have been
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of a much greater intensity. The reality was that in Samoa, the Wesleyans and Catholics were closely associated. Dyson noted that in a discussion with a Manono chief who was a Wesleyan member, the chief said that if Turner and Wilson had taught that the LMS was a ‘good Lotu’, the Wesleyan Lotu may no longer exist in Samoa. This chief claimed, however, that Turner gave the impression that ‘it was better to go to the Lotu Pope [Catholicism] than the LMS’. 10 Wesleyanism and Catholicism were also associated along political lines as a counter to the LMS, and the majority of converts to Catholicism were from Wesleyanism.

In 1855 the official Wesleyan Church in Tonga was eager to resume work in Samoa and in the Vava’u district report it was stated that ‘we earnestly reiterate our request of last year that two missionaries at least be sent [to Samoa]’. An additional note mentioned that ‘the District meeting fully depending upon the promise of the Conference to resume the work in Samoa sanctions the return thither by the earliest opportunity of as many teachers as can be obtained.’ 11

Finally in 1857 Wesleyans had ‘obtained the authority of the Conference to enter upon the Samoan mission. We sent a number of native teachers last year, fully expecting a missionary, by the [ship] Wesley … . But no one being sent it was judged imperative to appoint Brother Dyson to proceed to that station’. 12

George Turner was suspicious of the Wesleyan return in September 1857. He had noticed the return of some Tongan teachers to Samoa and his analysis was that it had very little to do with religion. He listed two reasons:

1. King George and the Tongans wish political and trading influence in Samoa, and seem to be making a tool of the missionaries to accomplish this object.
2. On the other hand the ‘missionaries seem to be making a tool of the King and his Tongans to propagate their Wesleyanism’. 13

Turner was not happy with the matter and noted that the ‘Wesleyans have ignored LMS opinion throughout’. 14 His fellow missionary, Nisbet, recorded in his Journal that he
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had received a note from Turner which ‘confirms the report about the John Wesley … . It seems one missionary has come and six Tongans’. Nisbet was not as concerned about this as Turner for he wrote of the arrival of the Wesleyans: ‘this can only be to keep up the party spirit. Talofa to the authors of this movement – I should not like to stand in their shoes’.  

Dyson, no doubt, would have felt the animosity of some of the LMS on his return to Samoa. The Tongan District meeting for 1858 noted, not surprisingly that ‘Dyson was originally sceptical about re-establishing the mission as revealed by his early letters in 1858’. They did, however, note that ‘in more recent ones he expresses his conviction that we did right in re-occupying our abandoned stations’.  In Dyson’s own Journal the reality was very different. He wrote in 1860 that it was wrong to re-establish the mission and noted that ‘it will never be justified’.  By 1863 he was just as convinced and noted that the ‘Wesleyans should never have come back to Samoa’.  

In the Samoa District report of 1858 Dyson mentions that he visited nearly every place with a Wesleyan chapel. He noted that ‘we have a considerable influence in Neiafu and the whole population with two or three exceptions belong to us in Tiavea, Upolu. He wrote, again not surprisingly, that the Wesleyan strongholds were the same places that represented the Old Malo strongholds of Manono, Satupa’itea and the alataua. ‘Between the mission house in Manono and Neiafu there were 17 chapels, with 190 members. Between the mission house and Tiavea, there were only two chapels’.  

Dyson settled in Manono. He was received by ‘the chief of Saleiataua, named Toleafoa’, who provided him with a house.  By this time the leading family of the Tonumaipe’a clan and the decision was to join with Wesley mission. Pe’a Tavini had joined with the LMS but the dispute between himself and Malietoa Tavita had caused a rift, which saw its consequences in the 1848-1851 war.
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Dyson was aware of the possible tension with the LMS and did everything ‘not to cause divisions and offences’ with the LMS missionaires.21 Indeed Dyson attempted to merge the Wesleyan mission with the LMS, an attempt that was fiercely resisted by the Samoan Wesleyans themselves. He used the LMS form of service but was constantly reminded that this was unacceptable by the chiefs. The Lotu Toga was part of their identity and a signifier of their difference between LMS chiefs and villages. Dyson received letters and reprimands from chiefs and villages and even from Tonga about his use of LMS rituals and changing ‘customary differences’ between themselves and the LMS.22

Dyson was frustrated by the customs of ‘Misi Tana’. In his journal he complains that when he visited Tufu, there were no efforts to learn to read and they still insisted on using the Tongan Bible.23 In Asau likewise he complained that ‘LMS books have been refused here, as is general for the Wesleyan people’. Neither would they buy the LMS version of the Bible, Their only texts were ‘bits from Turner’s translations’ and the Tongan Bible.24 He complained that people refused to stand while singing, an LMS custom, and even his own assistant missionary was ‘sore about getting him to sit’.25 In Salelologa Dyson led the service but was interrupted by a leading chief who said that ‘they would have nothing new in the service’. Dyson responded by walking out.26 In December 1858, Dyson received a letter from the Chairman of the mission in Tonga criticising him about his attempts to unify the two Lotu. Among the criticisms listed were his changing of the service, appointing teachers only where Wesleyans currently had chapels and ‘not consulting the body of chiefs in anything’. Other criticisms from the chairman were, Dyson records, ‘profane and wicked’.27

The official mission documents downplay the reality that the ‘official Wesleyan missionaries’ were not the cause of the majority of the divisions. The divisions existed internally in Samoa itself. The Wesleyan faith was accepted by the Old Malo areas. The most recent of these was centred in Manono and Satupa’itea. But also the ancient line of Kings in A’ana and Atua, members of Sa Tupua, were also to take up the Wesleyan cause, Tupua Moegagogo was a Wesleyan teacher and Fagamanu Mata’afa
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was Wesleyan before becoming a Catholic. These aloali'i, or sons of the line of ancient kings and queens, did not associate themselves with the LMS and Malietoa. They would not join the religion of Malietoa, or his Malo supposedly sanctioned by the goddess Nafanua.

This was particularly true of Satupa’itea, the seat of Nafanua. They had not ‘converted’ to the LMS, despite the Wesleyans having no ‘official presence’ in Samoa. This was both a political and spiritual decision. They were in opposition to the LMS. It did not matter if there were no ‘white’ missionaries. They too needed to take hold of the new Christian religion. But like those of Sa Tupua, the other big family in Samoa, there were very few LMS adherents. The opponents of the New Malo and the Malietoa candidate supported by the LMS were invariably Wesleyan or Catholic, and the political/religious affiliations continue into the 21st century. By April 1858, Mata’afa was appointed Tuiatua and had moved from Amaile to Lufilufi.²⁸ He had become a Catholic and Dyson recalls that he already had got several Protestant families of Lufilufi to turn to the Catholic Church.²⁹

Dyson noted that Manono was divided, but one seventh of Savai’i and one twentieth of Upolu were ‘professedly our people’.³⁰ He also noted that ‘popery’ was ‘very small in 1858’.³¹ The re-establishment of the Mission, however, brought an opportunity for Wesleyanism to be seen as a viable option for many not wishing to join, or remain with the LMS. The total adherents including those at school jumped from 2445 in 1858 to 4863 in 1860, although the number of chapels had decreased from 43 to 39 in the same period.³²

In 1860, George Brown, another Methodist missionary was sent to Samoa. He was stationed in Satupa’itea, while Dyson remained in Manono. By 1861, George Brown ‘earnestly requested two more missionaries’. His plan was to set up two training institutions; one in Satupa’itea and one in Falealili, Upolu.³³ He also noted that two ‘of

²⁸ Dyson Journal, 11 April 1858, ms A2579, ML.
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³⁰ Samoa circuit report, 1858.
³¹ Samoa Circuit Report, 1858.
³² Minutes of the Tongan District Meeting, 1860.
³³ Samoa District Report, 1861.
the RC clergy challenged a public discussion with us’ and ‘the King of Atua and several hundred natives were present’.\textsuperscript{34}

In July 1857, Nisbet was at Sapapali’i, and both Malietoa [Taimalelagi] and Moli were present. Of interest is that Nisbet was doubtful of the intentions of Malietoa to join the Church based on his past, and was probably speaking courteously. Also Moli is not referred to as Malietoa. Nisbet records that he ‘talked to Malietoa and his wife who profess to have become candidates’, and ‘after the service he ‘spoke to Moli’.\textsuperscript{35} Moli was certainly the ‘favoured son’ of the mission however. Later that month Nisbet spent the afternoon ‘talking chiefly with Moli about the misa (disagreement) with Pe’a’.\textsuperscript{36} P’ea, under the tutelage of Malietoa Taimalelagi would not let himself be courted by the LMS mission, but it was he who would get more broad based support from Samoans than his rival, Moli’s son, Laupepa.

Nisbet in his diary entry on 10 October 1858, records the death of Malietoa, but it is not the first comment for the day. His first comment was a note about the large supply of Catholic priests in the district. He adds that he ‘heard at Fusi of the death of Malietoa’ but was gracious in saying that ‘all the chiefs of consequence seem passing off the stages’.\textsuperscript{37} The Malietoa/LMS connection was not strong with Pe’a. The building of the Myth was far from complete. What was positive was that Moli was now in a position to be elevated to Malietoa status and prove the message from Nafanua that Sa Malietoa would continue with the Malo from heaven.

In March 1859, Moli had finally attained the \textit{ao} of the Malietoa. But even Sapapali’i were divided about Moli’s elevation and Nisbet, in the church meeting ‘excluded all the male church men who were involved in the teva from Sapapali’i on account of Moli getting the Ao of Malietoa’.\textsuperscript{38} Malietoa Moli remained Malietoa for only two months. He died in May 1859. Moli’s death had an immediate affect on the LMS. ‘The death of Malietoa had caused so much sensation and took up the people’s attention so that they postponed the Me for a month’.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{34} Samoa District Report, 1861.  
\textsuperscript{35} H Nisbet Journal, 4 July 1857.  
\textsuperscript{36} H Nisbet Journal, 18 July 1857.  
\textsuperscript{37} H Nisbet Journal, 10 October 1858.  
\textsuperscript{38} H Nisbet Journal, 12 March 1859.  
\textsuperscript{39} H Nisbet Journal, 8 May 1859.
The fight was now on between Pe’a and Moli’s son, Laupepa for the *ao* of the Malietoa. The LMS would remain firmly on the side of Laupepa, helping to create the myth of Malietoa receiving the LMS and remaining firm with the LMS. It also perpetuated the simplification of title succession, where the only valid titleholder was the primogeniture candidate. An examination of records written during the 1850s and 60s reveals a different picture. In May 1860 Nisbet records that ‘Tuamasaga have gone across to Sapapali’i to appoint Moli’s son to the Malietoa – but some have gone ahead to Pe’a to proclaim him’.

Malietoa Pe’a was not overly liked by the LMS but he did not immediately turn towards Wesleyanism or Catholicism. Nisbet recorded in May 1862 that he ‘was hindered by a very unwelcome and long visit from Pe’a and he wanted me to sanction his getting married again forsooth’.

In 1861, the LMS complained that ‘A French “man of war” was here the other day and the chief [Tuiatua] was invited on board and treated like a king; a large number of guns being fired off on that occasion’. This Tuiatua was the French Catholic missionaries’ ‘favourite son’ Mata’afa. The Tuiatua would almost certainly not have been an LMS adherent. Another French ‘man of war’ would also invite Malietoa Pe’a on board, who was by that time Catholic and the most popular Malietoa candidate.

The French, like the English, understood the interrelationship between religious and political activity, just as the Samoans themselves did. Many LMS letters in 1862 concerned themselves with a fear of both a Tongan war party supposedly invading and French Catholics offering the assistance of a warship. Nisbet, in his journal wrote in July 1862 that ‘the principal tala from Apia this week was an attempt by the Priests and the Captain of the French steamer to induce the chiefs in that neighbourhood to put themselves under French protection. It seems they did not succeed’. Again in 1863, the Catholics hoped to gain a foothold in the heart of Malietoa territory, Afega. One *tulafale* and his family invited the Catholics into the village. ‘Trouble threatened at Afega as the people wished Tuli and family who have the Lotu Pope and the priest
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40 H Nisbet Journal, 26 May 1860.
41 H Nisbet Journal, 20 May 1861.
42 Henry Gee to Tidman, Apia, 15 November 1861, SSL.
43 E.g., Nisbet to Tidman, Malua, 22 July 62; Gee to Tidman, Apia, 4 July 1862, SSL.
44 H Nisbet Journal, 6 July 62.
threatening punishment for the said vessel [a French steamer]. It ended in the *tulafale*
saying he would leave of his own accord."45

The early 1860s did not seem a good time for the LMS. In 1864, the LMS missionaries
complained that ‘you would scarcely think it possible that there were Samoans who had
been sitting under the sound of the gospel for more than thirty years. The people seem
to have lost all interest in religion ... apart from the war, things are in a low state
throughout the whole of the island. You will see that our May contributions are much
less than in former years’.46

To’oa Sualauvi, of Falelatai, had been promised by Malietoa Vai’inupo Tavita in his
*mavaega*, the Tuia’ana title, which by the end of the 1850s had still not been bestowed
upon him. One obvious reason was that despite the *mavaega*, Tavita did not have the
authority over this title. The Tuia’ana title was bestowed by the orator groups, the
House of Nine in Leulumoega, A’ana. It was not bestowed by *mavaega*, especially the
*maveaga* of a member of Sa Malietoa. Sualauvi To’oa, however, remained firmly on
the side of the new Malo foretold by Nafanua and the LMS, yet still needed the
assistance of the old Malo.

The LMS were generally high in their praise of Sualauvi, who had become an LMS
teacher. Ella, wrote that despite the *mavaega* of Malietoa Tavita to bestow the Tuia’ana
title on To’oa, A’ana had never ‘ratified the bequest ... so he is now seeking to obtain
by force of arms what he has failed by peaceful means. He tried to unite with him
several other A’ana chiefs and their adherents and to join his cause with the old war
party of Manono and Savai’i [but] it seems Manono and Savai’i were not supportive’.47
Dyson, stationed on Manono, also records the event. Tuia’ana Sualauvi had come
across to Manono to petition Manono ‘for warriors’.48 Dyson also records that the
chiefs asked if it were permissable to hold the *fono*, a petition, which Dyson agreed to.
That the Manono chiefs asked Dyson is an indication that the mission could provide an
easy way to refuse warriors – which is what Manono did.

45 H Nisbet Journal, early July 1863.
46 King to Tidman, Falealupo, 30 September 1864, SSL.
47 Ella to Tidman, Fasito’otai, 22 December 1857, SSL.
48 Dyson Journal, 16 January 1860.
The move was really calculated by To’oa Sualauvi to see if Manono would support his cause in A’ana, and to inform Manono of his intended action. That To’oa was not supported with warriors is perhaps not surprising, but neither did they interfere. Dyson was informed later that year that To’oa was only Tuia’ana because of their approval.

Dyson received word from his catechist in Fasito’outa about the war. It began in Fasito’outa. The cause was due to Nofoali’i and Faleasí’u not recognising To’oa as the Tuia’ana. These two villages had fled ‘and the Tuia’ana and his army were on the chase’. Dyson remarks that Tuia’ana Sualauvi ‘required all in A’ana’ to accept him as ‘their king’. The majority of A’ana indeed had, except for ‘two chiefs in Fasito’outa, all of Nofoali’i and orators of Lefaga who refuse to bow the knee’. Nofoali’i fled to Saleimoa in Tuamasaga and the houses of Nofoali’i were ‘laid waste’. Dyson was sceptical about this war and notes that:

> It is a most contemptible chase after a little honour on the part of the king, yet feignedly done in order to make way for the spread of religion.\(^49\)

Dyson’s recording of the supposed cause is a reference to the LMS. This does not mean that the official Church approved. Nisbet, noted that he was annoyed with his teachers ‘as they went to see what was doing in A’ana at Tuia’anas instance’. ‘Nofoali’i have come off and are now at Saleimoa’ and ‘he has got Falelatai to back him’. Nisbet was really complaining because, like all white missionaries in Samoa, they were the Church leaders but the Samoans themselves were the people who really ran the Church. Nisbet was also suspicious of Tuia’ana’s political motives and ‘that man’s restless ambitions’.\(^50\)

By 1869, Sualauvi To’oa had gained the influence he had fought so hard for and he, and his son would achieve *tama’aiga* status, under the name Tuimaleali’ifano. In 1870 the LMS missionary Murray speaks of Tuia’ana (Sualauvi) as the ‘most important man in Samoa at the present time, as regards rank and titles’. Sualauvi also sought to get peace in the battle beginning in 1869 between the rival Malietoa candidates.\(^51\) Despite these efforts the battle would only intensify. His attempts for peace were thwarted also by
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\(^{49}\) Dyson Journal, 8 February 1860, ms A2579, ML.

\(^{50}\) H Nisbet Journal, early February, 1860.

\(^{51}\) Murray to Mullens, Apia, 7 July 1870, SSL.
Sualauvi’s death within a few months of the writing of this letter.\textsuperscript{52} Whitmee, another LMS missionary recorded on 31 August that Sualauvi, the King of A’ana and Atua (who also had the chief titles of Tuamasaga) died.\textsuperscript{53}

The cause of the large-scale war, which began in 1869, was, according to Krämer, due to Malietoa Laupepa being declared king on 24 January 1868 ‘through the influence of the missionary Turner and the English consul’. Gilson also noted that the ‘missionaries had thrown their weight behind Laupepa’.

This has been the first instance of the mission’s involvement in such an important title dispute. With European backing, which some accounts say was crucial to his having a claim at all, Laupepa had secured an edge over Talavou in Upolu (mainly Tuamasaga) but not in Savai’i or Manono.\textsuperscript{54}

Catholic records are damning of the affair and claimed that Malietoa was proclaimed king in January 1868 ‘by Mr Williams’ the English consul. The record states:

This election was done out of fono against therefore the accepted traditions of the Samoans and hence held to be irregular and not valid. … Malietoa Laupepa was supported by Leulumoega and Tuamasaga. Manono and party supported Malietoa Pe’a.\textsuperscript{55}

The causes of the large scale war in Upolu in 1869 were explained by the LMS missionary George Turner as follows. ‘About ten years ago when Malietoa, King of the Tuamasaga died … those entitled to vote for a successor were divided. Some were for Pe’a (a brother of the former Malietoa), others were for a son, a young man called Laupepa’.\textsuperscript{56}

Turner, who was accused of being instrumental in the appointment, does not record his own role in his account of the war in Upolu. Turner also notes that both Laupepa and Pe’a received the Malietoa title and the seat of government was moved to Apia. The new parliament met:
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\textsuperscript{52} For an excellent detailed account of Sualauvi and the rise in the status of the Tuimaleali‘ifano, see Ato’ese Morgan [Maukeni] Tuimaleali‘ifano, Aganu’u Ma Agafana Fa’a Samoa: Custom and Usage in Samoa. A history and process of a tama‘aiga title dispute in Falelatai, PhD, University of the South Pacific, 1997.

\textsuperscript{53} Whitmee to Mullens, Apia, 31 August 1870, SSL.

\textsuperscript{54} Gilson, Samoa, 261f.

\textsuperscript{55} Fotheringham, Notes on Falealupo, OMPA 73.

\textsuperscript{56} Geo Turner to Tidman, ‘The War in Upolu in 1869’, Malua, 16-04-69, SSL.
One of the first things they did was a passing of a resolution to throw off the senior chief Pe' a, and Laupepa proclaimed king of the Tuamasaga. No warning was given to Pe' a and at the sudden arrival at Malie of a party to carry off Laupepa to the Parliament at Apia to proclaim him sole king. Pe’ a rose, followed, and took up his abode at Mulinu’u on the western side of Apia bay as a protest .... Those who rallied around Pe’ a were Manono and three states of Savai’i, those for Laupepa, the Tuamasaga.  

He does observe that the Laupepa party was in the minority. On the other hand, Turner recorded that ‘Atua and A’ana wished to constitute a new government for the whole of Upolu, Manono and Savai’i’. As a result ‘Savai’i, Manono, Atua and A’ana together with Pe’ a agreed to form a union’. Turner wrote that ‘we had a hope that angry feeling would subside and that the Laupepa minority would amalgamate with the new Government’. He also noted that ‘we tried to get the Laupepa party to make an apology to the unionists for driving them off in such haste at the point of the Bayonet .... ’ Unfortunately Turner’s entreaty was ‘in vain’.  

For the first time there are a number of letters, which show that fighting was not accompanied with the ‘old heathen practices’. Murray, in Apia, noted that even the aggressive party (referring to Pe’ a) ‘abstain from night dances and kindred abominations which used to be practiced, and in the Tuamasaga camp the Sabbath is strictly observed’. One of the reasons may have been ‘hard line action’ by some of the LMS. Pratt wrote that ‘in his district 66 church members went to war and are excluded [from receiving communion]; of the rest many sympathise with the war’. Another LMS missionary had a contrary view. King, in Malua, wrote that he did not think Church members should be expelled for fighting. ‘So far as I can ascertain, the majority of church members who have taken up arms are living as consistent lives in the camp as they were before the war broke out .... Family worship is held in nearly all the huts, and on the war boats in the evening’.  

The majority of LMS letters that refer to the war portray the Pe’ a or unionist side as the aggressors. They do not explain that they had the right to be the aggressors. Pe’ a, on his side had the majority of Upolu – excluding the Tuamasaga district – as well as Savai’i and Manono. Laupepa was seen as an interloper by the majority party, but he was the candidate very much supported by the mission. He was an LMS adherent, and
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57 G Turner to Tidman, 16 April 1869.  
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like his son Tanumafili would train for some time at the LMS institute in Malua. He would not have had any claim on LMS support alone, for he was a legitimate contender, as the grandson of Malietoa Tavita. The LMS and English support for this candidate was seen by German sources as the major reason for his elevation in status. The French Catholic mission thought likewise.

One LMS missionary thought that when peace was made between Laupepa and the aggressive party of Malietoa Pe’a, it was because the latter 'could only lose by continuing the war .... Plans had gone wrong and many seemed to think that the other side had the righteous cause. They thought that God was favouring the other side, Tuamasaga'.

The LMS were right in thinking that God's support was needed for political aims. They were wrong in thinking that Laupepa had, at this time at least God's undivided blessing. This was proved in the sporadic warfare between the two sides that escalated in 1872. It would not just be a Samoan fight. The foreign missions and consuls would become increasingly involved.

---
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CHAPTER 13

THE STRUGGLE FOR POLITICAL LEGITIMACY, 1872-1899

An extensive amount of literature has focused upon the 1870s onwards in Samoa. This is mainly due to political infighting between the Treaty powers so that Samoa reached the international community in a form that often only mentions Samoan concerns in passing. This account attempts to redress this imbalance.

The old religions in terms of traditional ritual belief had passed. The relationship between temporal and spiritual authority was however still strong. The surest sign of the interconnection between politics and spiritual sanction from the 1870s was the spiritual alliances made by the highest chiefs as justification for their authority. As discussed, the ‘new Malo’ of Nafanua provided the spiritual sanction for Malietoa Laupepa. It was God, represented by the London mission who blessed the Malo.

In 1870 war still raged between the two sides. J C Williams, the English Consul, wrote in May to Laupepa, ‘urging him to make peace either by joining Manono or let us consuls act as Mediator’. Two days later he received a letter from Laupepa saying that ‘he and the Tuamasaga did not wish to join with Manono and thought they must fight’.\(^1\) Laupepa made it clear that the ‘enemy’ was Malietoa Pe’a and Manono, who refused to give up their status as the old Malo.

Three days later the Manono fleet attacked the A’ana large boats and casualties occurred.\(^2\) According to Faletoese FS, the first fight occurred in ‘Faleasi’u and Tufulele’, with both alia or large decked boats as well as European style boats involved.\(^3\)

J C Williams, however, continued to try to mediate peace between the two parties through the assistance of the missionaries at Malua. In August he went with the
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\(^1\) J C Williams Journal, 9 May 1870; 11 May 1870.
\(^2\) J C Williams Journal, 13 May 1870.
\(^3\) Faletoese F.S., Notes – translated from a record kept by Faletoese F.S., 4 March 1939, in Grattan Collection, ACC 91-127, Box 4/4, NA.
missionaries to ask Mata’afa for a peace agreement. Mata’afa responded by telling Williams to await their reply six days later. Inu, one of the Savai’i chiefs supporting Pe’a, came to Williams and said that he would make peace at Utuali’i. On the same day Tuia’ana To’oa Sualauvi died.

Utuali’i is in the Tuamasaga region but is a Sa Tupua stronghold. Her high chief, Matiu, is a descendant of Galumalemana. The death of To’oa Sualauvi allowed a reassessment in A’ana. In October ‘Leulumoega and A’ana ‘fa’alaloed’, indicating that they were to give in to Pe’a, and J C Williams was confident that war was at an end.

War was to break out again between Malietoa Pe’a and Malietoa Laupepa in early 1872. Williams again got involved. Mauga of Tutuila had entered into a Treaty with Captain Meade and the US in 1872 and Williams proposed that Western Samoa follow suit. This was one of many treaties that would be proposed until the German protectorate in 1900.

Williams’ desire for a successful American protectorate relied on religious representatives to achieve a peace settlement. The demarcation between the parties was also perceived to be along religious lines. Williams and the LMS missionaries acted as representatives for the Laupepa party, while the Catholic bishop acted on behalf of the Pe’a party. Williams himself saw and advised Malietoa Laupepa and Tuiatafa (a Malie orator) to accept the agreement while ‘the Catholic Bishop spoke to the other party at Mulinu’u’. Again success was supposedly achieved as Tuamasaga destroyed their forts.

The ‘American Treaty’ was however unofficial and short-lived. On 23 February, Williams ‘received a letter from the Bishop complaining of the Tuamasaga violating the treaty by seizing things from Manono’. Williams’ view was that the Manono party were the aggressors for ‘they first seized things from a Saleimoa woman’ and ‘Manono was threatening to attack Tuamasaga’.
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4 J C Williams Journal, 18 August 1870.
5 Ibid., 25 August 1890, 26 August 1870.
6 Ibid., 5 October 70.
8 J C Williams Journal, 19 February 1872.
9 Ibid., 23 February 1872.
The Catholics were probably a minority in the Manono party, but it was a rival Lotu to that of the LMS. The Catholic mission seized the opportunity to ally itself politically with the Manono party and the first official Catholic entry into Manono began in 1872, with a catechist being placed there.\textsuperscript{10} A number of other leading chiefs also became Catholic in this period. The majority were formerly Wesleyan. Among those who did convert were Suatele of Safata,\textsuperscript{11} Fiame of Lotofaga, and Faumiuna. Catholic sympathy was not with Williams, and Catholic sources accuse Williams of being responsible for ‘elevating the young chief Laupepa’.\textsuperscript{12}

Other commentators noted this close relationship between temporal and spiritual authority and the backing of different leaders. One resident noted that during the war of the \textit{Faitasiga} ‘the Catholics took the side of Pe’a and Williams took the side of Laupepa’. He noted the strength of Pea’s party versus the ‘small party’ of Laupepa. He did not have a great understanding of Pe’a’s position however. He wrote that ‘Pea was a high chief on Savai’i’, and added that ‘Laupepa was entitled to his father’s title but Pe’a stepped in, defeated Laupepa, who retreated to the eastern end of Savai’i’.\textsuperscript{13}

In the 1872 War, ‘Savai’i’s troops assembled and built a fort in Leulumoeaga, A’ana’, indicating that the Pe’a faction had support in Leulumoeaga at least. The establishment of a fort was opposed by some in A’ana which resulted in A’ana casualties.\textsuperscript{14}

A’ana then came up with Tuisamau [Afega] and his district Tuamasaga and the fort of A’ana was erected in Vaiusu. Tuamasaga made their fort in Matautu. [Pe’a] Talavou’s troops were in Safune and Lepa. The troops of Ituotane and Ituofafine [Savai’i] went to Falealili and warred with Atua.\textsuperscript{15}

This assault forced Laupepa and his fleet, including Lauaki, to flee to northern Atua. They stopped in Saluafata to get support without avail. They also called on Falealili, who were facing Pe’a’s troops, but ‘the war canoes came from Lufilufi and other pro-confederation villages’ to get Laupepa handed over to them.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{10} Extracts from ‘Les Annales de la Propogation de la Foi’, Vol 44, p367f, in Marist Provincial Archives, Fiji, A 9.2 (5).
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 317. Monfat says that Williams was prejudiced against Mata’afa and Suatele; Newell calls Suatele a ‘bigoted RC’; Newell 12 July 1898, SSL; Andrew Hamilton, ‘The French Catholic Mission to Samoa 1845-1914’, PhD, ANU, 1997, 222.
\textsuperscript{12} Monfat, Mgr Elloy, 352.
\textsuperscript{13} George B Rieman, \textit{Papalangee, or, Uncle Sam in Samoa}, Oaklands 1874, 36.
\textsuperscript{14} Faletosee, FS, Notes.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
Laupēpa’s party refused to submit and Laupēpa did manage to obtain support in Siumu, Va’a o fonoti and Southern Atua, but the major villages of A’ana and Atua especially Leulumoega and Lufilufi continued to support the confederation of Malietoa Pea.\textsuperscript{17} Williams had been informed of the reasons why Lufilufi and Leulumoega had joined Manono – ‘because Manono had always been Malo never Toilalo [conquered] and so these two joined them to be the Malo also’.\textsuperscript{18}

This union, especially with Atua, represented by Mata’afa joining Malietoa Pe’a Talavou was meant to bring its rewards. It also makes sense of why Lufilufi was supporting Mata’afa as he was their elected Tuiatua, while those areas in Atua which did not support Mata’afa or his alliance with Manono were subject to Manono and Savai’i aggression. The relationship with A’ana was somewhat different until the death of To’oa Sualauvi, who had died holding three of the papa. But they had suffered Manono’s aggression before and knew the consequences of opposing Manono.

When a peace was settled by the missionaries and consuls in 1873, there was a desire from both sides to settle their differences. The new government was made up of seven leading chiefs called the Ta’imua, which was established in Mulinu’u. A destabilizing factor, however, was due to LMS interference when it was decided that the Sa Tupua candidate would be Pulepule, who, while an aloali‘i and eligible, did not come close to the achievements of Mata’afa, the more obvious candidate.

In 1873, Albert B Steinberger, unofficially representing the US, visited Samoa and made a report to the State Department. His report reflected the position of Samoa at the time. He mentions Malietoa, and the ‘female branch of the family To’oa’. He also spoke of the Great families. He names Leiatua of Manono first, in Atua he names Mata’afa and in Savai’i, Inu, Pau and Asiata.\textsuperscript{19} Of the individuals named of the great families, probably all were on the side of Malietoa Tonumaipea in the faitasiga war. Steinberger is perhaps the most famous and popular American in Samoan politics. He was most unpopular with the LMS and perhaps most favoured by the majority of Samoans. His popularity was partly due to his recognition of the complexity of Samoan

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{18} J C Williams Journal, 1 December 1869.
\textsuperscript{19} A B Steinberger, Report upon Samoa or the Navigator Islands made to the secretary of State, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1874, 15.
politics. He also recognized that the strongest party in the *faitasiga* war was that of Manono and allies.

When Steinberger returned he was instrumental in consolidating the powers of the Samoan Government. He felt the most suitable solution was to alternate the Kingship every four years. It began with Malietoa Lauapepa, which the LMS should have approved of, but it also, eventually eased Pulepule out of the position he had been placed in. Pulepule would only last for three years in Government.

Steinberger’s popularity also seemed to stem from his familiarity with Samoan desires for a greater role in their own self-determination. He was available, listened to Samoan concerns, rapidly acquired the Samoan language and his European staff ‘did not number above a half dozen’. ²⁰ He also dispensed ‘his medicines free of charge every day to the Samoans – his house is consequently full every day – he treats from 40 to 100 cases (almost all trifling complaints) in a day’. ²¹

Another possible cause for his popularity could possibly have been his attitude to Tonga. An avid recorder of the Steinberger regime, James Lyle Young records that:

Steinberger has sent a deputation to Tonga for George to recognise his new Government ... Steinberger is very much annoyed at the result of the mission to Tonga, and said in our presence that the Tongans were a set of barbarians and boors, and that he would like to see in a little while whether it would not be desirable for the Samoans to conquer Samoa and annex it to Samoa. ²²

This suggestion was just one of many schemes of either conquering or unification with other Pacifican countries.

In the early 1870s there were a reasonable amount of conversions from the Lotu Toga to Catholicism. Steinberger was popular with the Catholics, who assumed that his position allowed some resistance to the dominance certain LMS missionaries played in Samoan
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²¹ Private Journals of James Lyle Young, 6 January 1875 to 31 December 1877, 30 June, ML.
²² Private Journals of James Lyle Young, 1 July, ML.
politics and their pro-LMS and pro-Laupepa interference. Steinberger even suggested that more Catholic priests be sent to Samoa.\textsuperscript{23}

Steinberger only lasted in Samoa for nine months before being deported. The Ta‘imua and Faipule were active when Steinberger was dismissed. They immediately sent a letter to US President Grant ‘informing him of the misfortune that had befallen Samoa through the aggression of Captain Stevens [US Navy], [the American] Consul Foster and the London Missionary Society’.\textsuperscript{24} The specific reference to the LMS was once again due to George Turner, who had intervened on Malietoa Laupepa’s behalf in establishing him in Government in 1868. This time Turner, who was interpreter for Captain Stevens, misinterpreted Laupepa’s speech which implied that Steinberger could be removed from Samoa for any wrong doing – in relation to his commercial arrangements with a German plantation venture, when Laupepa actually said that it was a matter for the Samoan government to investigate.\textsuperscript{25}

The Ta‘imua and Faipule blamed Laupepa and on the very next day they dispatched a letter to the Catholic Bishop saying they had deposed Malietoa from the title of Tupu and leader of the government. The letter stated; ‘\textit{ua le toe ta‘ua o ia [Laupepa] o se Tupu, ua faate‘aina o ia me le igoa o le Tupu’}. The reason given was his deportation of Steinberger.\textsuperscript{26}

As a result of the affair, Bishop Broyer visited the US and met with President Hayes. Broyer recorded that, ‘I had a long meeting with the President of the US’ in which the bishop explained that Samoans ‘do not at all want an annexation as has been said, but an ornamental protectorate with a treaty which assures their independence and their tranquility’.\textsuperscript{27}

Steinberger himself blamed the LMS for his removal and for conformation of this fact he referred the authorities ‘to the Catholic Bishop Elloy, to the leaders of the Wesleyan missionaries in Samoa and to William Williams, the brother of the British Consul at

\textsuperscript{23} MC. Vol 7 (1875) 41, in Andrew Hamilton, The French Catholic Mission to Samoa, 182.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 68.
\textsuperscript{26} Pape Taimua o Samoa-Tipasa, Ali‘i Epikipo, Mulimu‘u, 9 February 1876, OMPA 27.
\textsuperscript{27} Archdiocesan Archives, Elloy, 23 November 1877, in Hamilton, The French Catholic Mission.
Apia’. Steinberger also wrote to Ta’imua and Faipule asking that they write to the LMS in London to complain of Turner’s behaviour and ‘ask that he be removed from Samoa’. Some three weeks later the Samoan Government did indeed write to the Directors of the LMS in London complaining of the behaviour of Turner ‘in causing or fostering reports about the Samoan Government’. They also wrote that Turner ‘conspired with the British and US Consuls against the Government’ and complained of them ‘breaking the government laws which protect the Sabbath and the work of God’.

Laupepa’s handing over Steinberger, was unpopular with the majority of Samoans. The Ta’imua and Faipule of that Government deposed Laupepa and people were aware of the LMS involvement. Pratt bemoaned both of these facts in September 1876. He wrote that ‘this year is unexampled in the history of the mission. For the first time the missionaries have lost their influence with the natives’. Pratt put the blame on foreign sources. First he blamed Steinberger who ‘took people home to board and bosom and managed to convey the idea that we [the LMS] were proud’. Secondly he blamed the interference of the British man of war which took Steinberger away. Pratt implies that there was no connection between the man of war and the LMS mission but ‘the mission was blamed’.

The deportation of Steinberger was not just blamed on LMS interference, however. Steinberger in his letter to the Samoan government asking for Turner’s removal, also adds, ‘Tell Tuiatafu and Lauaki that Steinberger forgives them’ and ‘that they should not cause war and bloodshed’.

The historian, J W Davidson, claimed that Lauaki’s opposition to the new Samoan Government was that those appointed to it did not represent Tumua and Pule. The leaders of the Samoan Government are not named by Davidson, so it is difficult to determine if this was the reason. Certainly this is a possible interpretation, and by 1909, Lauaki’s principal aim was to increase the presence of Tumua and Pule after the

28 Steinberger to Fish, 1 June 1876, H. Ex Doc., No 44, 80, in Ellison, Opening and Penetration of Foreign Influence, 75.
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30 Ta’imua and Faipule of Samoa to Directors of the London Missionary Society in London, 22 July 1876, Ibid.
31 Pratt to Mullens, Matautu, 29 September 1876, SSL.
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33 Steinberger to Ta’imua and Faipule ma Ali’i o Samoa, 8 June 1876, SGP, ML.
34 Davidson, ‘Lauaki Namulau’ulu Mamoe’, 277.
German governor, Solf, abolished the office of Ta’imua. Lauaki also envisaged himself as the leading voice of Pule and Alipia the leading voice of Tumua. Neither of them was appointed as Ta’imua in the ‘Steinberger government’. The Ta’imua were Letufuga, Fuataga, Taupa’u, Samoa, Asiata, Tia, Matautia, Aupa’i, Mata’afa, Misa, Lemana, Tagaloa, Tuiā and Lavea.  

A number of factors, however, need to be taken into account. The first is the meaning of the terms Tumua and Pule. The Tumua are really the leading orators of Lufilufi, representing Atua, and the leading orators of Leulumoega, representing A’ana. The Pule orators are those leading orators representing Savai’i and in Lauaki’s mind Pule meant the leading orators of the districts of Safotulafai and Saleaula. The Tumua orators would push their own Tupua tamaaiga, namely Tupua Tamasese Titimaea and others would favour Mata’afa. There was also often fierce opposition between Pule and Tumua orators, and the German administration would claim that indigenous attempts to gain self-government in 1909, were thwarted by the division between Pule and Tumua orators.

Another consideration was that Lauaki had remained firmly on the side of Laupepa, and was himself an LMS catechist. The other person mentioned in Steinberger’s letter was Tuiatafu, a Malie orator. Another possible reason for Lauaki’s resistance may have been the lack of representation of Laumua orators, the orator chiefs of the Sa Malietoa dominated district of Tuamasaga.

The Ta’imua were made up of members of Tumua and Pule, as well as some ali’i. Lauaki was Safotulafai based and the only Safotulafai orator in the new government was Letufuga. Safotulafai was split in terms of their support for Malietoa Laupepa and Malietoa Tonumaipe’a. Pa’u, another Pule orator from Safotulafai, was not in the new government, but neither was Lauaki. Pa’u had been a strong supporter of Malietoa Pe’a.

The other Savai’i orators were Asiata of Satupa’itea/Manono, Ti’a, probably from Salelologa and Aupa’i of Saleaula. The Upolu representatives in the new government were Fuataga of Aleipata, Samoa and Lemana, both Tumua of Leulumoega, Tuia of
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Lufilufi, Misa, one of the Falefitu of Aiga Taua’ana, along with Lavea as well as the ali’i Mata’aafa and Tagaloa. The make up of the new government reveals that Lauaki’s opposition to it was twofold: the strength of supporters of Malietoa Pe’a and the strength of Sa Tupua. The makeup of the Ta’imua was therefore to the detriment of the Laupepa supporters.

Steinberger’s popularity rested on his ability to conciliate a compromise that would have been worked out by discussions among Samoans themselves. It allowed Laupepa to head the government, but also allowed a majority of the new Malo representatives to have been supporters of Pe’a, as well as offering Sa Tupua a prominent role in trying to effect an administration that would be less divisive than those proposed by consuls which reflected foreign nationalist interests and traditional foreign alliances among the Samoan hierarchy. It also allowed an avenue for Malietoa Pe’a to depart the political scene without losing face. Ironically he would later return, in a loose alliance with Malietoa Laupepa, when faced with the rising power of Tamasese.

Laupepa, in September 1875, reminded Manono of the compromise with his uncle. In a letter he reminds the chiefs that the appointments are not Steinbergers. Malietoa Tonumaipe’a came and visited Laupepa earlier that week with his choice of Leitaua for appointment to a government position. Laupepa writes, ‘O lenei lo’u taofi e ui foi lava i le toe o le usu, o lo ma tino lava e tasi’, meaning that my choices for appointments are in agreement with Malietoa Tonumaipe’a, we are as one.37

Despite this message of unity between Laupepa, based in Tuamasaga and Pe’a in Manono, Tuamasaga itself had been divided during the faitasiga war. Of the seven orators of Malie, known as Auimatagi, only Ali’iva’a, Sia and Tuiatafu supported Laupepa.38 None of these orators were present in the new government. As soon as Laupepa was dismissed, the Tupua candidates, Tamasese Titimaea and Mata’aafa rivalled for leadership of the Malo. Tupua Tamasese Titimaea ended up leading the government and it was he who was chosen by the Germans to head a rival Malo against Laupepa, after the Samoan government itself disbanded later. He was chosen by the
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37 Malietoa, Mulinu’u, to Ali’i uma o Manono, 27 July 1875, Samoan Government, Steinberger Papers, Roman Catholic archives, Samoa (RCAS).
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Germans to oppose Laupepa, who once again with LMS missionary and consular support, set up a rival regime against the Ta’imua and Faipule in 1877.

Lauaki remained a firm supporter of Laupepa, and later of Mata’aafa who represented the Malietoa cause when Laupepa was exiled. Mata’aafa was also able to canvass support from Manono due to his connections with Malietoa Pe’a and his son Fa’alata. Also his wife was the daughter of Futi, a leading Manono orator.

Malietoa Laupepa did not stay away from the political scene for long, despite being rejected from the Malo in Mulinu’u. With the assistance of the British Consul and some LMS missionaries, he, and some of his supporters formed a rival government called the Puletua. Laupepa’s Samoan support is said to have come from Malie, Saleimoa, Safata, Iva, Sapapali’i and Safotulafai. 39 Tupua Tamasese Titimaea emerged as the leading ali’i opposing the Puletua Government. A number of clashes occurred between the Samoan government and the Puletua forces. The Samoan government won these clashes and the Laupepa party was forced to take refuge in the British consulate. 40 Williams pleaded for the English to annex the islands and support Laupepa and he wrote that ‘the Puletua even call themselves Englishmen’. 41

The perception that LMS and British intervention was responsible for the Puletua government had repercussions for the mission. Pratt wrote in 1877 that ‘war has once again devastated the Tuasivi district’ and the ‘mission house was broken into three times and robbed’. 42 He writes in depression that ‘in my own home district there is a decrease of over a hundred in the churches; and many of our adherents have gone over to the Papists and the Methodists. Wickedness is rampant. Night dancing, immorality, tattooing … [LMS] Missionaries are still evil, spoken of wishing to bring Samoa under the British yoke.’ 43

The Wesleyans were also worried about the rise in Catholic support. Austin, the Wesleyan missionary in the Old Malo area of Satupa’itea, wrote that when he arrived in Satupa’itea in early 1875, he got a good reception and noticed that the Wesleyans were

39 Faletose FS, Notes.
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still in this village, despite the lack of a pastor. He also noted that there was a ‘new stone Wesleyan chapel at Saleloga or Salelavalu.’ By 1876, after Laupepa was deposed, Austin wrote that he ‘hears on good authority that it is the intention of chiefs to put a Papist on the throne as soon as Stevens leaves’ and was worried that this ‘would increase RC power greatly.’ Wesleyanism, however, also benefited by the belief that the LMS were supporting the Laupepa government. In 1878 Austin wrote that ‘several villages or parts of villages’ have come to the Wesleyans from the LMS recently. Curiously he also wrote that the ‘Wesleyan mission can’t use Tongans in Samoa anymore’ and states that ‘Samoaans are greatly prejudiced against Tongans now though he doesn’t know why’.

In 1879 Malietoa Pe’a set up yet another government called the Pulefou or ‘new rule’ in Mulinu’u. According to the Samoan historian, Featuna’i Ben Liua’ana, ‘Perhaps the most significant episode of this whole charade was a decision by Mata’a’afa Iosefo, a nephew of Fagamanu and strong supporter of the Catholics to support Talavou.’

The move by Mata’a’afa was a result of attempting leverage over Tamasese for power in the Samoan government. It seems that Mata’a’afa made a shrewd alliance with Malietoa Pe’a which would bring him into great prominence by 1898. His decision to unite with Malietoa Pe’a ensured Manono support through his wife, who was the daughter of Futi, and, eventually, support from the supporters of Laupepa, as well as dissident elements on A’ana and Atua who had became disillusioned with the government headed by Tupua Tamasese.

The Pulefou saw Sa Malietoa outwardly united and they occupied Mulinu’u, with Malietoa Pe’a appointed king for life, Laupepa as vice king and Mata’a’afa appointed as chairman of the Tumua. Malietoa Tonumaipe’a Talavou died in 1880 and another compromise was made known as the USS Lackawana Agreement, which appointed Laupepa as king, Tamasese vice king and Mata’a’afa premier.

44 Austin to Chapman, Satupa’itea, 19-02-75, Methodist Conference Records, 1857-1913, ML.
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46 Austin to Chapman, Satupa’itea, 12-12-78.
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A New Zealand historian wrote of this time:

In March 1881, Laupepa received formal salutes from foreign men of war, and was generally looked upon as supreme. But this was not so. The high chief Tamasese held the title Tui-Aana; Mata’aafa was Tui-Atua. In April representatives of these two districts met and resolved an alternative monarchy of two years – Tamasese first, then Mata’aafa. Hostilities were about to commence when on the arrival of the USS Lackawanna in July 1881, a peace was made at the instigation of the Consuls, which, with all its disregard of native custom, lasted some four years. Under it Laupepa continued as king, Tamasese as vice-king.  

That Tamasese and Mata’aafa agreed to unite is supported by Faletoese who noted that in April Tamasese was crowned in Leulumoega as ‘king of Atua and A’ana’. He also wrote that Tamasese was to be succeeded by Mata’aafa after a period of two years. He also adds that ‘the French bishop attended this coronation’.  

At this stage, with Malietoa Tonumaipe’a dead, Mata’aafa made an alliance with Tupua Tamasese, although later he would join again with his Malietoa relatives. He certainly did not become king after two years. This was largely due to German interference.  

By 1885 the Germans persuaded Tamasese to withdraw and establish a rival regime at Leulumoega, and in 1887 the Germans ‘deported Malietoa Laupepa after declaring war on him for non-payment of reparations’. On the day of his departure, Laupepa entrusted Mata’aafa with the welfare of the country.  

Mata’aafa did lead the interests of the Malietoa camp against that of Tamasese and the Germans who supported his government.  

The German support for the Tamasese Government, which was viewed as an extension of the Old Malo or government of the Ta’imua and Faipule did not have the support of the other two Treaty Powers, the English and Americans. There are many letters asking the consuls to respect his government but he did recognise his real threat as coming from the desire of the chiefs of Manono, Fa’asaleleaga and the Itu o Fafine on
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the southern coast of Savai'i, to come over to Leulumoeaga and defeat his Malo; an action which could lead to war. He ends this letter by saying that he is the government of Tumua and his desire was to live in peace. Tamasese also attempted to make amends with Mata’afa. On 13 June 1887, he wrote to Mata’afa informing him that Fuatagas had bestowed upon him the Tuiatua papa and was worried about the effect it would have on him. He notes that this was the wish of the Tumua. He also admits that Mata’afa is the Tuiatua. He asks him to recognise their common bond and asks Mata’afa to remain firm with the Malo of Tumua.

Mata’afa did not remain firm with the Malo but did carry on as Koven, or governor, of Atua. His, and Atua’s protest was not to pay taxes, which virtually rendered the government inoperable. With other districts also refusing to pay taxes the Malo was unable to function effectively. The same problems would emerge in the Malo of Laupepea when he returned from exile and again formed a government. It was not until the government of Mata’afa which did achieve a great deal of unity initially, and with only a singular foreign power to deal with and fight against, was a successful government run for a reasonable period of time.

Tamasese also is said to have received all the papa required for national leadership. Again the bias of the source is revealed in the explanation. Davidson, relying on I’iga Pisa, notes that in May 1888 ‘with the support of a minority in Atua’, Tamasese assumed the Tuiatua title. ‘Shortly afterwards on the basis of even more irregular procedures, he laid claim to those of Gatoaitele and Tamosoli’i. Some of his associates even refer to him as Malietoa.’

Faletoese FS recorded that in 1888 Tamasese received ‘control’ of the ‘titles Tamosoli’i, Mata’afoa. Natoaitele, Lilomaiava’ and ‘the previous year he had received the Tuia’ana and Tuiatua titles’. He also noted that there was a ‘great ceremony to Tamasese in Leulumoeaga’ in which 400 fine mats were exchanged’. The reference to the fine mats was important because only upon this traditional exchange was the ceremony completed. Faletoese mentions it because it provides legitimacy for the titles

54 Tuiaana Tamasese le Tupu ma le Malo atoa o Tumua ia latou Susuga ali’i Konesula Malo tetele e tolo, 29 April 1887, SG. 1.a, A 68, NA. (Ua ou iioa le mana o alii Manono ma Fa[a]saleleaga ma Itu o fifine. Latou te fia ase vave mai fa’afluase’i i Leulumoeaga nei, e fia fa’atollalo i le Malo o Tumua ...).
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received. Many other views are likewise expressed, for example the famous author Robert Louis Stevenson, who was very pro-Mata’afa, spoke of the scandal half of Samoa felt when Tamasese ‘began collecting Malietoa mats’. 58

In August 1888 the first moves of rebellion against the Tamasese government took place. As Tamasese himself had predicted, it was led by Manono and Savai’i as well as Mata’afa who had emerged as the unifying force of Sa Malietoa and disaffected elements in Upolu. This act of rebellion resulted in the bombardment of Manono by the German warship the Adler. 59

Mata’afa was the accepted leader of the Manono party and was also, by extension, representing the interests of Sa Malietoa. Lauaki was also supporting Mata’afa and reportedly said, ‘Let us go to fetch Mata’afa Iosefo from Atua. He is the heir to To’oa in Manono. He is to be Malietoa To’oa, for we cannot tell whether Malietoa Laupepa will return. 60 And Mata’afa was duly appointed Malietoa. In December 1888 Mata’afa’s forces defeated a landing party of German sailors at Vailele, which would lead to the provisions in the Berlin Act, which would bar him from the kingship.

When Laupepa returned on 11 August 1889, he himself resigned in favour of Mata’afa. This event occurred on ‘2 October 1889 at a great meeting held at Vailiele’ 61. Earlier that year Brandeis, who had acted as premier for the Tamasese government, left Samoa. The Germans effectively gave up on Tamasese, and in April 1891, Tupua Tamasese Titimaea died. At the end of May 1891, Mata’afa moved to Malie and was the residing Malietoa with the support of Sa Malietoa and Manono. 62

Mata’afa may have been the popular choice of Manono and Sa Malietoa in general but he was encouraged once again to play an active part in politics. Mata’afa was rejected by the German authorities because of his killing of German nationals. The Germans decided, for the first time, to back Laupepa and Bismarck’s principal objective in the Berlin Conference was to exclude Mata’afa from any future government. Laupepa had
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the support of the other consuls and the LMS mission. Laupepa was once again appointed King.

Mata’aafa’a religion may also have encouraged the move by Laupepa to take on the mantle of kingship once again. In 1893 Laupepa wrote to bishop Broyer reaffirming the Malietoa heritage as receivers of the LMS mission. He wrote that it was not possible for two different denominations to exist in Malie. Only the Lotu received in Sapapali’i by Malietoa Tavita could exist in the Malietoa stronghold of Sapapali’i and the same was the case in Malie. Laupepa adds that ‘we are of one and the same lineage’. 63

The Nafanua prophecy had brought the LMS to Samoa and Laupepa had benefited from the mission, especially through the intervention of Turner. The letter indicates that Broyer was proposing to introduce Catholicism to Malie. The letter was a strong warning that Broyer’s Lotu was not the promised one.

On 1 July 1893, Malietoa and his troops decided to attack Mata’aafa and his supporters at Malie. An account published by the Samoan Times is a relatively unbiased report and was reprinted in German (with the deletion of a few ‘unpleasantries’ committed by the Germans such as the deportation of Laupepa by the German authorities).

The ‘first speaker’ at the fono was Alipia, the leading orator of Leulumoeega who ‘urged war’, a sentiment that Lauaki agreed to. Lauaki then spoke urging that the Laupepa government was ‘sufficiently strong to go to the front even that very day. Moefa’auo of Atua followed with more prudent counsels’, which was to wait until ‘Atua and A’ana districts had reinforced the government troops at Apia’. There was obviously a clear awareness of ‘the clauses of the Berlin Final Act’ as ‘these were discussed at length’ and the decision arrived at was to attack the following Thursday. 64

These very chiefs Lauaki, and the Tumua chiefs Alipia and Moefa’auo, would support Mata’aafa after his return from exile and after the death of Laupepa. 65 The principal chiefs who were with Laupepa were Leiataua of Manono (not the same Leiataua

63 Malietoa – Broyer 1893, on OMPA 29. (E le’i lua lava ni Lotu i Malie – e tasi lava. Na o le Lotu lava na tala i e Tavita i Sapapali’i – O lea lava e le ese Malie. E tasi lava ona i ai o se tasi Ituaiga).
64 Samoa Times, The Samoa Civil War of 1893, 3; A F Tandler Der samoanischer Bürgerkrieg von 1893, verlag von R T Chatfield, Samoa Times, 3. Note: Samoan misspellings have been corrected by the present author. In original Louati (-Lauaki), Ailepea (-Alipia) and Moefano (-Moefoa’auo).
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supporting Mata’afa), Lemana of Leulumoega, Tuilagi of Safotulafai, Toelupe of Malie and Pele of Tutuila.66 These met with the consuls and war began.

Mata’afa and his supporters were to lose in this war. A Samoa Times reporter was sent to Malie and Laupepa’s government troops were in occupation and he reported that ‘forty five houses had been set fire to’.67 Malie was the very heartland of Malietoa country and Malietoa Laupepa’s troops had set fire to this very village. The reason was that Mata’afa was the Malietoa resident in the village. The English consul, Cussack-Smith, records that on 9 July ‘the King’s forces are in Mata’afa’s own village of Malie’.68

Mata’afa fled to Savai’i then Manono where his principal support came from. He was also their To’oa. Earlier in the war Manono boats had protected Mata’afa, as had the southern coast of Savai’i. According to the Samoa Times publication, Broyer was seeking a peace guarantee for Mata’afa, which the council perceived as irrefutable proof of the influence of the Catholic mission upon Mata’afa.69

The ‘last stand’ was on Manono and the war may have lasted a lot longer if foreign warships had not intervened. Two German warships and one English one tried to entrap Mata’afa and ‘his twenty eight most important chiefs’. The following morning the three consuls ‘went to the house of the Reverend H Mills where the king was a guest’, and informed him of their decision to entrap Mata’afa. Malietoa thanked the three consuls for their support of him and his government.70

On 18 July Mata’afa was found in Savai’i in the company of some priests of the Catholic mission. Cussack Smith claimed that the day before the French priests had ‘warned Mata’afa of the instructions to have him captured’.71 Mata’afa was given the ultimatum that if he wished to live he ‘had to board the English warship within three hours’. The chiefs who boarded with him were Fiame of Lotofaga; Tupuola of Lepa and Leitataua, Ura, Mulipola, Futi, Taupau and Aupa’au – all of Manono. Also placed on board were Faumuina of Faleata; Telea of Faleula; Ale and Soa of Safata; Tagaloa
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and Lau of Tufu; Ma’utia, Tafua and Tamatoa of Aleipata; Talumaivao of Fagaloa; Lesi of Tutuila, Tofae and Olo of Siumu among others.\textsuperscript{72}

At about this time eight full boats came from Savai’i to assist Mata’a’afa and the Manono chiefs but these were sent back. Also arriving at this time were Malietoa’s boats which proceeded to set fire to Apolima and Manono.\textsuperscript{73}

The principal supporters of Mata’a’afa were Manono and his wife’s family of Futi. The Tonumaip’e’a inheritance had diminished through diffusion. There were now many holders of the Tonumaip’e’a title and no one emerged as a leading Tonumaip’e’a figure after the death of Malietoa Tonumaip’e’a. Malietoa Pe’a’s alliance with the old Malo of Manono also continued through Mata’a’afa who was also assisted by his own family in Atua, as well as those of Sa Malietoa who continued to support him. The religious divide had diminished and the fear of a ‘Papist’ leader was subjugated to wider concerns. The country was now extensively Christian and denominational differences had also diffused. The missions themselves were seen as important and perceived, especially by foreigners, as a dividing force. The separation between church and state was not that separate. Not only was Broyer implicated in the affair, but he also provided a counter voice to the dominant English press and made it known that the Malietoan party was overzealous in their victory celebrations by burning and destroying property. He also noted that the wives of Ale and Popo did not even have lavalava to dress in when the Malietoa Laupepa party invaded Manono.\textsuperscript{74}

Those actually deported were mostly of Mata’a’afa’s close family in Atua, and most of these were Catholic. Tupuola and Flame, both of the Faleagafulu of Faine of Aiga Salevalasi were deported. Faumuina was also deported. These were all Catholic chiefs.\textsuperscript{75} Among others deported were Lei’ataua and Mulipola of Manono; Tagaloa and Lau of Tufu Gatavai, Sauni one of the orators of Malie (Aumatai).

The districts were heavily fined for the war by the government and consuls. The districts fined were Falefa, Lotofaga, Lepa, Amaile and Aleipata all in Atua, and all

\textsuperscript{72} Samoa Times, Civil War in Samoa, 12. (Muaisola = Mulipola).
\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., 12f.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., 13.
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having established Catholic churches. Also fined were Malie itself, Safata, Siumu, Faleata, Saleimoa, Poloa, Faleula, Fagaloa as well as Tufu and Palauli. The largest fine, £2000, went to Manono. Of note is that no A’ana districts were fined and the major proponents for warfare were Lauaki, along with the two Leulumoega orators, Alipia and Lemana. Again the A’ana decision was to join with Laupepa and upon Mata’afa’s return, Tamasese would join with Laupepa against Mata’afa.

The young Tamasese Lealofi continued, as had his father, to oppose the Laupepa government until the end of the century. Cussack-Smith wrote in early 1894 that ‘Tamasese has been proclaimed king according to the most reliable information’ and adds that ‘my colleagues have called for warships’. German residents also still preferred Tamasese but the German authorities would make a pragmatic decision to support Mata’afa when he returned from exile. Their decision was based on the amount of support for Mata’afa from the local populace. The governments of Tamasese Titimaea and Laupepa had been attacked from both internal Samoan opposition and foreigner demands. The death of Laupepa and the return of Mata’afa allowed a new phase in Samoan politics, one in which the Catholic bishop saw his ‘favourite son’ elevated to the status of Tupu.
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CHAPTER 14

MATA’AFA LEADS THE MALO

The return of Mata’afa and fellow exiles from Jaluit came at a crucial time in the battle for the kingship between the Malietoa family and the old families of Atua and A’ana. Malietoa Laupepa had just died and many historians have assumed that there was no immediate successor to this line except for the young Tanumafili. This assumption belies the fact that in August 1888, prior to his exile, Mata’afa himself had been elevated to the ao of the Malietoa in Fale’ula. Just prior to his exile he had moved to Malie, the very heartland of Malietoa country and the malae Fale’ula was in Malie. It was at this malae that the orators of Faleula decided to bestow the Malietoa title upon Mata’afa, along with the honours and blessings that befit that title.

One commentator noted that the effects of this were twofold: ‘It created Mata’afa a candidate for the kingship and demonstrated his defiance of the existing [Laupepa] government’. But Mata’afa was also Tupua. Mata’afa’s tamaaiaga status and being of Sa Tupua with the support of many families in Atua and A’ana, along with orator support in Tupua regions meant that he was already a strong candidate. After the deportation of Laupepa and gaining the support of a significant number of Sa Malietoa, including Manono, he was a very strong candidate indeed. The stand that Mata’afa had made in 1893 set up his credentials for Tupu status. The difference on Mata’afa’s return from exile was that Malietoa Laupepa had just died.

The most complete account of the crucial period just prior and subsequent to Malietoa Laupepa’s death is that of Augustin Krämer. As usual his invective against Laupepa and the conniving of the English missionaries comes through very clearly in his account, as does his support for Mata’afa.

Krämer heard about Malietoa Laupepa’s death by means of a messenger to his house in Sogi at about 11 o’clock on the night of Monday 22 August 1898. Krämer describes
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Laupēpa as ‘the lauded king of the English mission’. The LMS missionaries had supported Laupēpa even though he had forsaken his wife Sisavaii whose great standing stemmed from her descent from Galumalemana. He chose instead to live with a Rarotongan woman whose past was allegedly ‘of the worst reputation’. As a result he died almost alone. In his last days the only person at his side was ‘the wife of a German, who stemmed from the Tuimaleali’ifano family’. Krämer does not say, however, that this woman was in a sacred relationship to Malietoa Laupēpa, for Tuimaleali’ifano was the issue of the daughter of Malietoa Vainu’u’upo’s marriage to Sualauvi of A’ana. It was most appropriate that she be there. Also present at the time of Laupēpa’s death were two English people, a missionary and a lawyer. Krämer indicated that it was due to the presence of the two individuals that hindered Laupēpa from naming the ‘Catholic Mata’afa’ as his successor, even though some months before Laupēpa had been reconciled with Mata’afa and had ‘even taken steps to bring him back’.

The German support for Tamasese was also strong at the time of Mata’afa’s return. This support was largely historical and related to the Tamasese-Brandeis period. The Germans had, at this time, stood behind Tamasese against both Malietoa and Mata’afa. But, once again the old Tamasese had died and his son and successor was young. The pragmatic decision by the Germans to support Mata’afa over the young Tamasese led to Tamasese siding with Malietoa out of ‘rage against the Germans and blind hate against Mata’afa’.

Mata’afa ‘and his companions’ arrival in the German warship Bussard on 19 September 1898 invoked suspicion on behalf of the Americans and the English. The majority of Samoans were prepared for his return and eight days after his arrival Tumua – the orator chiefs of Lufilufi, Atua, and Leulumoea, A’ana conferred Mata’afa with the Tuiatua and Tuia’ana titles respectively. Krämer’s assertion appears to be confirmed by other evidence. For example, a letter was sent to the three consuls from the orator group of Leulumoea, A’ana saying that following a fono in Leulumoea on 22 September, they chose to follow Mata’afa and it was Mata’afa who had the Pule in the Malo of Samoa.
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Other evidence also supports Mata’afa being proclaimed Tuiatua, though not always in this month.  

Catholic accounts also record the return of Mata’afa on 19 September and their pleasure that in the evening of that day ‘Mata’afa came to Mulivai to pay a visit to Bishop Broyer, the Fathers and Brothers’, noting that the ‘scene was very touching’.  

They record that on ‘November 11 Mata’afa was elected king of Samoa by the Tumua. At the same time Tanumafili, son of the late king Laupepa was elected by some minor chiefs.  

In Krämer’s monograph, he records the conferring of the Tuia’ana title on Mata’afa on 22 November, some two months after the decision to elevate Mata’afa to the title. The orators arrived and Mata’afa sat in the ‘centre of the round part of the house. Salelesi sat near to him on his right’. Umaga and Pasese took positions on his left and right ‘and sang out the prolonged ‘u’-notes. Each of the callers had in his hand a tip of the coconut frond. When they had finished they cast the two fronds down before Mata’afa and spoke as follows: Tuia’ana le e pa’ia e tupu’, proclaiming him both as the sacred Tuia’ana and king. Then Lemana spoke and congratulated the new Tuia’ana. Later he called for the kava. There were three pieces of kava representing Lufilufi, Leulumoea and Pule. ‘Fa’alata, the son of Malietoa Pe’a began to stir the kava seating himself in front of the bowl while Lemana standing behind him added the water’. Then Lemana’s son presented kava to Mata’afa then Umaga and Pasese then the Salelesi, ‘who now drank lying on the ground and having drunk, sang out long and loud, privileges which this jester and personal servant enjoys’.  

Having discussed the sacred power of chiefs, and the symbolism of coconut fronds, along with Lemana’s traditional status with Alipia in the aitufono, the conferral was done in accordance with custom. Also interesting is the presence of Fa’alata, who was together with Mata’afa, a crucial ally that ensured support from Manono and associated areas of Sa Malietoa. Fa’alata was also to be considered by Mata’afa as his successor to the kingship. His presence as the son of Talavou also signifies the continuing presence
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of Manono’s attempts to participate in the Malo, just as they did with Talavou Pe’a, and Mata’aafa who fled to Manono prior to his capture in 1893.

The Malietoa party and the Tuamasaga had to decide whether or not to continue to support Mata’aafa. According to Krämer, on 11 October two great villages of Tuamasaga, Safata and Faleata brought their gifts of food indicating their support for Mata’aafa, the latter village having also been a key player in deciding the recipient of the Mata’aafa title. Krämer gives no further explanation of Safata, but it was Safata which was responsible for deciding the recipient of one of the four papa, traditionally associated with national governance and leadership of the Malo, namely the Tamasoali’i title. Neither does Krämer mention that Suatele had conferred the Tamasoali’i title on Tamaseese some two years earlier.

Again Krämer makes no mention of the decision of Auimatagi and Tuisamau, although the strong indication is that Lupetuloa and Fata represented a minority decision within the orator groups. In letters in the Gurr collection it seems that the Auimatagi were well aware of Article 1 of the Treaty. They make it clear that they had decided to abrogate their authority in favour of Atua and A’ana. Toelupe and other orators of Auimatagi wrote that ‘we have given over our rights to Lufilufi and Leulumoega to appoint a Tupua’, as they did not wish Malietoa – referring to Tanumafili – at present. There are other letters in the collection from Tuisamau explaining that Tuisamau met with the ‘Tauaitu of Faleata when Laupepa was still alive and there decided that after the death of Laupepa, Lufilufi and Leulumoega would appoint a king’. It should be noted that the ao of the Mata’aafa is conferred by the Tauaitu and Faumuina.

The period of decision-making began on 16 October. On this day there was a great meeting of village and district heads in Mulinu’u. Lauaki, who Krämer incorrectly describes as ‘the orator for Pule’ and ‘for the whole of Savaii’; and Alipia, the great orator of A’ana spoke first. They spoke in support of Mata’aafa and after them many other chiefs spoke. As a result all of Savai’i with the exception of the ‘little village of Sapapali’i, the residence of the Malietoa Family, and the neighbouring great village Iva supported Mata’aafa. In the Tuamasaga district, many villages followed likewise the example of Lauaki, most notably the great capitals of Afega and Malie. The only parts
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of Tuamasaga, which did not approve of Mata’a fa were Sa le’ imoa and part of Vaimauga. In Atua, likewise the support for Mata’a fa was considerable, only Falealili, which had ‘always been a stronghold of Malietoa remained true to Malietoa’.\textsuperscript{16} The decisions made between 16 October\textsuperscript{17} and 12 November cemented support for Mata’a fa and he would be proclaimed king with the support of the overwhelming majority of Tumua and Pule. However the decision by this majority did not settle the kingship question, as a small group would contest Mata’a fa’s eligibility before the Court, to be discussed presently. Importantly, the support that Krämer records for Mata’a fa corresponds to the support in submissions to the Court in regard to the ‘kingship question’.

Samoan leaders themselves were well aware of the difficulties of the Court and the impact of the Lackawanna treaty in 1881 and the Berlin Treaty, which essentially gave the kingship back to Lauapepa, despite ensuring that the question of leadership was left to Samoan customary concerns. The Treaty itself has been examined in many other studies. My major focus is that it appears that Samoan chiefs were aware that the final authority was with these same leaders and chiefs. On 12 November the ‘leaders of Pule and Tumua and Aiga’ wrote to the chief Justice Chambers to inform him of their decisions in relation to ‘the question of the kingship, according to Samoan custom’. The leaders described themselves as the ‘Rulers in Muliu’un’. They wrote: ‘It is decided by us, Tupua Mata’a fa will guard Samoa in the office of king’. The signatories were impressive: Moefa’a uo, Alipia, Lemana, Lauaki, Aupa’au, Aufai, Mata’a fa, Tapusoa, Asiata, Afitu and Molio’o, representing Tumua, Pule Itu’au, Alataua, Aiga and Va’a o Fonoti.\textsuperscript{18}

Three days later Chambers received a letter from Lupetuloa, Fana Lemusu, Fa’apulou and others disputing the call for Mata’a fa being installed as king.\textsuperscript{19} Most of these signatories were officials in the Lauapepa government and perhaps they felt they had a lot to lose if Mata’a fa was installed as Tupu.

Krämer does not mention either of these letters. The first signed by Tumua. Pule and Aiga was a formal note informing the Chief Justice that the decision for Mata’a fa had

\textsuperscript{16} Krämer, \textit{Hawai’i}, 530.  
\textsuperscript{17} See also, O Riedel, \textit{Der Kampf um Deutsch Samoa}, 125. On the 16th Riedel states that there was a great gathering of chiefs from all districts and Mata’a fa was proclaimed king.  
\textsuperscript{18} Rulers in Muliu’un to C J Chambers, Muliu’un, 12 November 1898 in 10.01, KA, 3043, BA.  
\textsuperscript{19} Government chiefs to Chambers, Muliu’un, 15 November 1898, in 10.01, KA, 3043.
been made in accordance with Samoan custom. The second letter indicated that there were factions, which did not support Mata’afa being elevated as Tupu. The doubt allowed the case to go to court.

According to Krämer, the court action began as a result of a letter to the Court. The letter claimed that the election of Mata’afa as Tupu or king of Samoa was illegal. It was against the Berlin Treaty, which expressly stated that Mata’afa was ineligible for the kingship as a result of his party’s killing and beheading some Germans in 1889. The German position had changed however and the German Consul, Rose, did not see the Berlin Treaty in this light. The Germans had never supported Malietoa. Mata’afa was now the most popular Tupua candidate. Rose knew that the Berlin Treaty was a problem for the new support for Mata’afa. He wrote to the German Chancellor that ‘the problem is Article 1’ which Rose says entailed the transferal of the rights of Tumua to Sa Malietoa in the matter of choosing a king.20 He diplomatically did not mention that at the Berlin Conference the only real demand Bismarck made was to prohibit Mata’afa from becoming king.21

Auimatagi and Tusimau are the orator groups of Malie and Afega in the Malietoa territory of Tuamasaga. By getting a letter from Lupeuloa and Fata, who were members of the orator groups, not only the Germans, but also Samoan leaders had a problem. Krämer was scathing about Lupeuloa and Fata. The single letter Krämer refers to was signed by eleven chiefs: Tagaloa, chief of Saluafata, formerly the Samoan Chief Justice under Lauapea and Tagaloa, (who was supporting Tamasese, although Krämer does not state this). The next signatory is Lupeuloa. Krämer describes Lupeuloa as an orator from Malie – who had been ‘thrown out of the great house of nine itself’. Also signing were Fata, and again Krämer notes that this is not the great orator Fata in Afega, but an interloper who ‘had no right to the title name’.22 The final signatories were Leota from Solosolo, Pa’o of Fasito’outa, Leasio and Fuimaono of Faleali’i, Tauvasa of Nofoali’i; Ama from Safata and two of Mata’afa’s own relations, Aiono and Leutele of Fasito’outa and Falefa respectively.23 Krämer notes that it is significant that none of the signatory

20 Rose to Herr Reichskanzler, Fuersten zu Hohenlohe-Schillingsfuerst, Apia, 28. November 1898 in 10.01, KA, 3043, BA.
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chiefs had any authority in the conferring of or choice in the kingly titles. He also notes that there were no signatures from Tuamasaga chiefs.

There is little doubt that there were some ali'i and tulafale in Tuamasaga who would not have benefited from Mata'afa becoming Tupu. But what is more interesting is that Krämer continually presents this period as one of Mata'afa against Malietoa even though he does say that Mata'afa received the Malieoa title on 16 December 1898.24 He had already written his famous monograph, Die Samoa-Inseln, and was revisiting Samoa. In this later account Krämer's prejudices are more clearly expressed than in his monograph. He correctly identifies the tensions between Sa Tupua and Sa Malietoa. He stresses that the two old titles inherited by the descendants of Tupua were eligible for the great Tuia’ana and Tuiatua titles. The other two titles required to become tafa'ifa, Gatoaitele and Tamasoalii, are described by Krämer as ‘minor titles’.25 The ‘Mata’afa versus Malietoa struggle is often too easily accepted by subsequent historians and commentators. Mata’afa could maintain significant support from the great majority of Samoans, in that he could himself claim the Malietoa title and reside at the capital of Malietoa territory – Malie in the district of Tuamasaga, as well as being a leading tama'aiga of Sa Tupua.

Krämer describes the son of Malietoa Laupepa, Tanumafili, as ‘barely adult’ and a ‘pretender to the throne’.26 He furthermore states that the support for Tanumafili really came from the Press, and the Press was without any doubt under the influence of the English mission.27 This episode illustrates the interrelationship between political and spiritual power. From Krämer’s evidence there seems little doubt that the LMS mission was not keen on Mata’afa for two major reasons: He was not of the ‘English mission’, nor was he obviously connected to the Malietoa line which was identified with the LMS church in Samoa. Yet the support of the majority of the Tuamasaga that Mata’afa received reveals that his ‘being Catholic’ was not a significant ‘stumbling block’ for those who supported him. The religious-political divide so clearly revealed in the early years of the establishment of the Churches had become diluted. The relationship between religious and political power would, however, continue, but the power of

24 Ibid., 540.
25 Ibid., 524.
26 Ibid., 534.
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sectarian division was, by the end of the 19th century, of more concern to ‘foreigners’ than many Samoans themselves.

The English, and in particular the LMS Mission, were strong supporters of Tanumafili. In 1889 Tanumafili was a schoolboy at the Society’s educational establishment at Leulumoega. Even fellow English commentators of the period recognised that ‘on account of his youth, and according to Samoan ideas, he was not considered eligible for the kingship; but Malietoa’s claim was supported by the Protestant Missions and the British and American consuls.”

How much actual interference there was from both the missions and the three powers in the Court procedure varies according to which source is examined. The most obvious interference does seem to come from the LMS and others concerned with English interests. The Catholic Mission does not seem to have taken any direct action in terms of the actual court case. The Catholic Church was not, however, an innocent bystander. The possibility that the mission would greatly benefit from a Catholic as Tupu was not lost on the Catholic bishop Broyer. Also Broyer would have seen the advantages of a closer relationship with a German administration. Indeed ‘at the request of Fritz Rose, the German Consul, Broyer delayed his departure for Europe for some weeks in order to help rally support for the election of Mata’afa as king of Samoa.”

According to Otto Riedel of the DPHG, the court case was a ‘set up’. Even before a word was spoken to the Chief Justice, ‘the whole world knew that the two lawyers [Carruthers and Gurr] had already received 500 dollars from the English Mission for their eloquent testimony’. Krämer is not so explicit but does say that the English missionary interference could be proven. Krämer does clearly state, however, that the English lawyers ‘would plead the case at the cost of the English mission which was

28 Westbrook. Typed unpublished article entitled ‘Ten years After the Berlin Treaty’. P.1, MS – Papers – 0061 (Westbrook) 62, ATL.
29 Broyer had considerable contact with Germany questioning the return of Mata’afa from exile. For example, in 1896 he had written to Canon Hespers of Cologne asking what was being done about Mata’afa’s return. Hespers directed Broyer to write to von Richthofen of the Colonial office of Prince Arenberg to find out. In Hespers to Broyer, Köln, 16 January 1896, OMPA 38.
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naturally kept quiet’. Additional complaints were received by other German officials, whose ‘chief concern … remained the extent of the influence exerted upon the Samoans by the LMS’. The German consul Rose also sent home reports about the attempts to secure a pro-British candidate for the throne. The Catholic chiefs were also accused by the LMS of spreading false rumours by letter. The LMS newsletter, the Sulu defended itself against this letter that supposedly stated that British missionaries were working to prohibit the return of the exiled chiefs to Samoa – a falsehood originating from Samoan Catholic priests.

In regard to Catholic agitation, the LMS also had evidence to support its claim. Fr Forester’s letters and notes attempted to discredit the British Navy and the Malietoa party, especially after war broke out. It should also be noted that many British and American residents also felt that Mata’afa should be king. Their opinion was not often that of the consuls.

LMS sources do indeed ‘keep quiet’, if they did support the case for Tanumafili. The LMS minutes record ‘with sorrow the outbreak of civil war on January 1st 1899, consequent to the decision of Chambers that Malietoa Tanu was duly elected king of Samoa in opposition to a large number of representative chiefs and leaders of Upolu, Savaii and Manono who had nominated Mata’afa’. The LMS firmly place the blame upon the Chief Justice and consular activity by noting that the determination of the British and US officials to support the Chief Justice by force of arms if necessary placed Mata’afa in rebellion and led subsequently to the bombardment of the Mata’afa positions’. The LMS did have a point. The new British consul, Maxe, telegraphed home saying that ‘Mata’afa’s return should be delayed until after the election of a new king’ due to the failing health of Laupepa. The Americans were not so keen to interfere as the State Department was cognizant of the conditions of the Berlin Treaty that the Samoans themselves should choose a king according to the laws and customs of
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Samoa. They did, however agree to keep Mata’afa away from Samoa – but it was too late. He was, together with the other exiles, on his way to Samoa.\textsuperscript{39}

The decision to disregard the Samoans themselves electing a king was also based upon the Berlin Treaty – but invoking a different clause. Just prior to this court case the Tanumafili supporters set up Tanumafili as a ‘legitimate’ counter candidate to Mata’afa, for it was decided in the Berlin Treaty that a decision regarding the kingship would be decided by the Chief Justice only if there were more than one contender for the kingship. As a result Tanumafili was elevated to the position of ‘king’ on 30 November.

Again Krämer stresses the lack of traditional custom accompanying Tanumafili’s selection. He states that Tamasese, alone, ‘set about the unbelievably arrogant task of bestowing on the boy the four kingly titles that he either himself possessed or had some right to’. The ‘young Tamasese bestowed all four titles upon Tanumafili with a simple hand movement’.\textsuperscript{40} The English Press reported this quite differently. The \textit{Samoan Weekly Herald} reported in early December, that ‘the Tamasese and Malietoa parties coalesced; the name of Malietoa and the four titles which we understand are requisite before a chief can become eligible to be king of Samoa were bestowed on the young chief [Tanumafili] with all the ancient observances and ceremonies’. The paper also noted that some of these titles ‘but we believe not all have been bestowed on Mata’afa’.\textsuperscript{41}

The support for Mata’afa was, meanwhile, becoming much more extensive. On 9 December the Chief Justice said the decision as to who would become king would be announced in ten days time. On that very same day twenty boats came over from Savai’i to pay homage to Mata’afa. One of those from Savai’i supporting Mata’afa was Fa’alata, son of Malietoa Pe’a.\textsuperscript{42} Mulinu’u was packed and Mata’afa supporters had to move out into other villages in the surrounds of Apia. On 20 December thirty more boats came from the Savaii districts of Palauli and Satupai’itea. These boats, according to Krämer contained approximately 750 men. Also arriving were people from the greater part of the Atua district and Tutuila, resulting in a combined total of 5000 to
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6000 men.\textsuperscript{43} This figure is consistent with other sources. The lawyer Napier recorded that approximately 1000 supported Tanumafili, while Mata’aafa supporters numbered 5,800.\textsuperscript{44}

Krämer stresses the difference in the bestowal of chiefly titles upon Mata’aafa, and Tanumafili. Mata’aafa had already been conferred with the Tuiatua and Tuia’ana titles. On 16 December the Malietoa title was bestowed upon Mata’aafa by the House of Nine in Malie. Presumably this was done to reaffirm his status as Malietoa. Shortly before he had received the Tamosoalii title and on 22 December he received the last of the four kingly titles, the Gatoaitele, which was conferred upon him by Fata and Maulolo, the House of Two in Afega. On 29 December a Proclamation appeared in the Samoan Times reporting that Tumua, Pule and Aiga proclaimed Malietoa To’oa Mata’aafa as king. Among the signatories were Leiataua of Manono, Asiata and Tuimaleali’ifano.\textsuperscript{45}

That the Chief Justice went ahead with the court case, given the overwhelming support for Mata’aafa, was due to the Berlin Treaty and the minority support for Tanumafili and Tamasese. It was also due to the perceptions that the American and British Powers and the LMS mission had about how Mata’aafa as Tupu would affect their own interests.

The Chief Justice, an American named Chambers, allowed Carruthers and Gurr to plead the Malietoa Tanumafili case. Gurr’s notes are still in existence and reveal his attempts to discredit Mata’aafa from eligibility on genealogical grounds. The argument tried to prove that Mata’aafa was only descended from Luafalemana and not his brother Galumalemana. Galumalemana, it was argued, had stated in his mavaega that all future kings be descended from himself and his children. Mata’aafa was not an aloalii, or child of this chief and therefore was ineligible for both the Tuiatua title – and, by extension, the kingship.\textsuperscript{46} Another major focus was upon the mavaega of Tamasese Titimae. Not recalled in this evidence, however was that Tamasese had angered Mata’aafa during the Tamasese-Brandeis period by signing himself Tuiatua as well as Tuia’ana – an affront to Mata’aafa who he had formerly referred to as Tuiatua Mata’aafa. Titimae in his
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mavaega had requested ‘Leulumoega and Lufilufi to bestow his son, Lealofi with the papa. He also recommended that they join the Malo of Malietoa Laupepa’.

The alliance that the young Tamasese had made with the supporters of the young Malietoa Tanumafili thus had representation in court. The old Atua/A’ana rivalry was re-ignited. Tamasese had little support from the populace. Neither did he receive the support from the German faction that his father had received. Perhaps at this juncture he had little choice but to try to form a new Malo that would have to rely on foreign intervention to lessen the position and popularity of Mata’afa.

The problem was that the high chiefs present at the mavaega of Tamasese Titimaea, namely Lemana, Tupuola, Vaitoga, Tuaena, Aiono, Pao, Maiava, Sauvao, Fesoloa’i and others were now mostly in support of Mata’afa. Despite the court arguing about the binding nature of Titimaea’s mavaega, the only members of the powerful Tumua who were not in support of Mata’afa were Pa’o of Fasito’otai and Sauvao in Faleasi’u. Both these villages were in traditional A’ana territory but the great majorities of this territory were supporting Mata’afa and had indeed conferred him with the Tuia’ana title. Pa’o and Sauvao, along with Leaupepe, Maiava, Taimalie, Toleafoa, Leaupepe Mamo, Feagati, Muliu, Iva, Apupu, Fesolai’i, Fiame, Matalumia and Finau actually petitioned the court for approval to bestow the Tuia’ana title on Tamasese. This indicated that he had not actually been bestowed with the title by the time of the hearing. Another group of chiefs wished Tamasese to be bestowed with the Tuiaatu title – among these were Tagaloa, who has already been mentioned. Tagaloa, Leota, Taula and others petitioned Chambers for Tamasese to be bestowed with that title.

Also among Gurr’s manuscripts are two letters from Lupetuloa and Fata, dated 8 December and 12 December respectively. There is also one individually from Fata. The second letter was also amongst evidence for the court case. Lupetuloa and Fata’s testimony attempts to establish Tanumafili’s eligibility to the kingship. They argue in this letter for the sacred relationship between the English mission and the Malietoa family. They speak of the period following the introduction of Christianity as a
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‘peaceful time (manuia), for Samoa thanks to Malietoa Tavita’. In 1868, Laupepa was conferred with the Malietoa title. ‘In that same year, Talavou succeeded to the ao of the Malietoa by ‘certain persons in Malie’. ‘This resulted in warfare’. Interestingly the submission would also have been intended to impress upon those in attendance that at this time Mata’afa was in the same camp as Malietoa Talavou (Pe’a). Mata’afa and these ‘certain chiefs’ were really enemies of Sa Malietoa.

Lupetuloa did, however, admit that in August 1888 Mata’afa was elevated to the ao of the Malietoa in Fale’ula. Also after the death of Tamasese in 1891, Mata’afa went off to Malie and established his Malo and raised his flag there whereupon another fight took place. Lupetuloa and Fata, therefore do not question that Mata’afa was conferred with the ao of the Malietoa, nor that he was resident in Malie. Indeed the thrust of their argument seems to support the legitimacy of Mata’afa. They had to argue so in order not to alienate the majority of Tuamasaga chiefs. Lupetuloa was a minority in Auimatagi. Their argument was left with Mata’afa having been the cause of so many wars and peace would reign if he was ‘sent home’. Their final point was also meant to be the major one. This was that Mata’afa was new in the ao of the Malietoa. ‘Tanumafili is the true son’ of Malietoa Laupepa and therefore should be king.  

An individual statement by Fata as the ‘Failauga Sili o Tuisamau’, or principal orator of Afega is also enlightening. This Fata, therefore is the Sao or principal holder of the Afega title, and a different individual to the Fata referred to earlier. He stated that he was in on the deliberation at Faleula in the decision to fight in the war against Tamasese at the time of the Tamasese – Brandeis government. They initially decided ‘to bring a son or daughter of Sa Malietoa to become king to fight the war’. But then came the petition of Manono and Safotulafai, asking that the children of Malietoa be set aside and Mata’afa brought in. This was in order to break up Atua, as he would bring Atua followers with him – the implication of which was that it would reduce Atuan support for Tamasese. Therefore the Malietoa was taken to Mata’afa. 

The key figure of Lauaki of Safotulafai, who had also received the Leiatatua title of Manono, compromised in order to reduce Tamasese’s support base in Atua. Mata’afa’s
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wife was the daughter of the principal orator of Leiataua Lesa of Manono. Also in Mata’aфа’s favour was that he had long supported Manono. Manono’s dislike of A’ana, which had been the cause of so many wars perhaps also assisted him. Mata’aфа also benefited by being able to unite much of Atua with him. There was also Fa’alata, the son of Malietaoa Talavou, who had not only been Tolumaipe’a with the support of Manono, he was also toe o le uso, or brother of the chief and had substantial claims to the Malietaoa title himself. Mata’aфа, despite his Catholicism and fears that the foreign Powers had of him, was on his return the natural candidate for selection. This was why his support base was so extensive.

Lupetulua and Fata’s argument that stressed the importance of primogeniture, especially in regard to the Malietaoa title may well have been more convincing if Tanu had been older. Genealogical descent was often a strong factor in court decisions. However, genealogical connections, while being crucial in considering an eligible candidate, pragmatic decisions, like Malietaoa Tavita becoming the ‘adopted son’ of the Malo leader Tamafaiga, also established legitimacy, as did mavaega – even when successors were not obvious candidates with closer genealogical connections to the maximal line.

The major advocate for the ‘Mata’aфа side’ in court was Lauaki. He also was of Sa Malietaoa, but canvassed support from all areas of Samoa. Regarding Lauaki’s speech to get supporters for Mata’aфа, Chambers himself records that the support hinged partly upon a ‘sacred pact’ made aboard the Lackawanna when Laupepa was banished in 1887. The pact was made between Lauaki, Malietaoa Laupepa and Alipia, the matua na togi or principal orator of Leulumoea. They agreed that when Malietaoa died, the next king should be of Sa Tupua, and that candidate was to be Mata’aфа. The decision was made sacred by Lauaki and Alipia placing their hands upon Malietaoa’s head at the time the agreement was made. Chambers himself records this speech and he noted that ‘the lack of support for Tamasese could well have been due to the actions of Suatele’, who had single handedly bestowed the Tamasese title upon Tamasese Titimaea without the support of the rest of Safata. Lupetulua and Fata had also blamed Suatele for causing discord, but for a different reason. They claimed that Laupepa was deported on account of the ‘bad letter’ sent by Suatele to the Consuls.
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His arguments could well be summed up in a letter to the three treaty powers in January 1899. His was not the only signature. Indeed the strength of the support for Mata’afa was clear in the beginning of the submission.

We are Tumua and Pule, Itu’au and Alataua, Aiga and the Va’a o Fonoti. We have the Pule of Samoa and have the true authority in the choice of a king. ‘We all agree that Tupua Mata’afa should be tupu. He has already received the papa and Ao to be king and both the families of kings, Sa Tupua and Sa Malietoa agree that Tupua Mata’afa be king.’\textsuperscript{54}

The overwhelming support during the court case was for Mata’afa, which was a problem for the English lawyers. The problem was described insightfully by I’ugafa Tugalu. He noted that:

As long as the investigation remained at the level of ascertaining Samoan Law and Custom pertaining to the kingship, Carruthers, Gurr and the Tanumafili party were bound to lose. It would prove impossible to reject the testimony of those who represented the major villages in Samoa, the two major lineages [Sa Tupua and Sa Malietoa] and the distributors of the major titles.\textsuperscript{55}

The problem of Carruthers, Gurr, and Tanumafili supporters was overcome on the penultimate day of the trial. The above-named submitted a copy of the Berlin Treaty ‘together with the Protocols of the nine sessions of the Conference in Berlin at which the Treaty was enacted’. The point of this was to exclude Tupua Mata’afa from eligibility for kingship as a result of Count von Bismark’s explicit banning of Mata’afa as a possible candidate for future consideration as king. ‘This change in tactics seemed to surprise even the Chief Justice’.\textsuperscript{56} Krämer, as noted above, stated that this was the motive all along and continually berates the Court for not conducting the case on the basis of Samoan laws and customs. Krämer, however, was writing after the event. In any case the result was the same. There was only one candidate now left for consideration and, almost by default,\textsuperscript{57} Tanumafili was declared king by Chambers – with obviously disastrous results.

On 1 January 1899 war broke out. It was called le tauta o le aso tasi, or ‘the one day war’, even though it lasted considerably longer. All sources seem to agree that by the end of this day, however, Mata’afa and his supporters had essentially won. Tanumafili
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and Tamasese were beaten by Mata’aфа with the support of Fa’alata, who I’iga Pisa refers to as representing Sa Malietoa. 58 Fa’alata would remain a strong ally of Mata’aфа. Fa’alata was the son of Malietoa Talavou Tonumaipe’a and the daughter of Leilatu’o of Manono. This union represented the two strong parties of the old Malo: Manono and the rival Malietoa claims against Malietoa Moli and his son Laupepa. Fa’alata had fought alongside Mata’aфа and would eventually be considered by Mata’aфа as his successor. He had the right genealogical claims from both his mother and father’s side of the family. He was the successor to the old Malo with its power base in Manono.

The actual beginning of this war, according to two Samoan sources, Faleto’ese and Te’o Tuvale, was due to a deception or betrayal by Safotulafai who indicated that there was to ‘be a unity of the two factions’. ‘Therefore Iva, Saleimoa and Sapapali’i came down carelessly. But when Muliaga, the leoleo [policeman] fired his gun, and a chief of Saleloga died, war raged’. 59 According to Te’o Tuvale the war began in Mulivai, near the Catholic mission. Leauanae and Papali’i Folau and others of Iva were betrayed and the war commenced. 60

Interestingly, despite the often-assumed notion that the Samoan factions were forever changing sides in war, Mata’aфа, with Fa’alata in his camp, were opposed by Iva, Sapapali’i and Saleimoa. As noted earlier these were all villages that Krämer stated did not support Mata’aфа immediately upon his return from exile, giving some credence to the account he relays. There is a greater degree of consistency in the support for the two divisions within Sa Malietoa than is normally recognized. For example, in June 1877, when Laupepa was appointed king, his support came from Saleimoa, Iva, Sapapali’i, Sagaga, Safata, and Safotulafai. Talavou or Pe’a support came from Tuamasaga, Fa’asaleleaga and Manono. 61 The supporters of the alo o ali’i or the son of Laupepa remained fairly firm, apart from a change in direction from Safotulafai. The supporters of the son of Malietoa Tonumaipe’a, or toe o le uso, was also consistent with the support for Mata’aфа, with Pe’a’s son being in Mata’aфа’s camp.

The day the war broke out, most of the British and American residents, along with Tanumafili supporters, sought protection at the London Mission compound. HMS
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Porpoise protected the Mission and it was the safest place on land. The greatest danger to the Mission was that Malietoa, the newly elected king, was sheltering there, and some of the fine mats had been stored in the building for safekeeping. Reports had been received that ‘the fine mats were likely to be sought by the Mataʻafans’. An English customs worker gives a fairly full account of the time and the actions of the rebellious Mataʻafans. But even he wrote on that first day of warfare: ‘It was clear that the Malietoa Party would be defeated, and that the best thing to do would be to get Malietoa out of the Mission both for his own and our safety. About nine o’clock in the evening there was a lull in the fighting, and advantage was taken of the lull to rush Malietoa to the beach and place him aboard the Porpoise … and the dinghy put off to the warship with the young king who had never really reigned’. He was soon joined by Tamasese and numerous others of his supporters, who also swam out to the Porpoise for protection.

For those supporters of Malietoa Tanumafili remaining ashore in the vicinity, the churches seemed to be respected by those fighting as safe places for those seeking refuge. Westbrook saw a crowd of ‘native women and children in the LMS Church at Matafele’. After some days, when the number of Samoans aboard the Porpoise grew too large the Churches again became places of sanctuary. ‘The Catholics aboard were sent to the Catholic compound, while the majority were sent to Mulinu’u’. The churches themselves were places of sanctuary but church lands were not respected by either faction. Father Forester complained to the Consuls in April about the damage done to Catholic lands. He noted especially that the village of Saleufi, which was on mission land, had been entirely destroyed. He also noted that the ‘secondary chapels [i.e. not main churches] at Vaiusu and Fagali’i had been burnt and stated that ‘never before has so much material damage been caused since the mission was established’. A noted addendum to the letter from the German Consul Rose indicates who the perpetrators of the damage were. The addendum reads: ‘I presume my British and American colleagues can do something about this’.

---
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Catholic invective against the actions of both the British and the LMS mission became public. One example was a report published in a newspaper by a Catholic priest. He wrote that ‘from the verandah of his presbytery he saw, through his binoculars, natives in a distressed condition hanging on to the sides of the Porpoise praying to be taken on board, and how the cruel British Captain took no heed to their prayer. He further stated that the natives became exhausted and dropped off, disappearing into the sea’. 68

Mata’aafa supporters looted many of the houses occupied by the English. The ‘most properly looted houses’ were those of the Chief Justice and Gurr and ‘all documents and papers that had been found were torn up into shreds’. 69 The distrust that the majority had of the court process and the ‘lies of the opposition party’ 70 were no doubt considerable grounds for these actions. How much evidence is missing from Gurr’s collection is impossible to determine. The fight, however, was won outside the court and a Provisional Government under Mata’aafa’s leadership was established. A key player in this government was Lauaki who wrote to Chambers asking him to respect the sacred relationship (feagaiga) between the Samoan Malo and the treaty powers. He wrote also that the two lawyers, Misi Kea (Gurr) and Misi Kalaka (Carruthers), had ‘rejected our Pule’. The above mentioned had ‘played tricks on people and had done some very bad things’. The worst thing they had done was to ‘expose genealogies, which was forbidden by Samoan custom and could cause illness’. He also wrote that it was not possible for a Chief Justice to choose a king. 71 The best option for the Treaty powers was to respect Samoan custom and the new Malo.

The Germans and the DPHG chartered ships ‘to take the vanquished leaders to Tutuila’. 72 Many were indeed exiled there. Tutuila was not ‘neutral territory’ however. In 1889 the acting US Consul Blacklock reported to the Department of State that an American half-caste, Edward Ripley, who was also a chief in his village of Leone, was ‘encouraging the people of Leone … which is a Tamasese settlement, to hold out and not acknowledge Malietaa’. 73 Mauga Lei who had been exiled with Malietao Laupepa had stayed in Upolu. By not supporting Malietao, there was a possibility to challenge
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the status quo in Leone. Meanwhile the major village of Pagopago — which received most of the exiles, remained loyal to the Malietoa cause, while ‘Fagatoga, which kept in constant contact with Mata’afa, joined with Aua in an attempt to oust [the above-named] Mauga Lei’.  

The consuls, with a reluctant Rose, decided to push ahead with honouring the decision of the Chief Justice. Warships began to arrive. The first of these was the American warship, the Philadelphia. Its commander, Admiral Koutz led the combined British and American fleet in bombarding Mata’afan forces. Mata’afa refused to give up. The bombardments did not appear to have the impact desired. For Samoans the fight was between the American and British, predominantly LMS supporters of the Tanumafili faction against the Mata’afa faction with the support of the majority of Samoa. Even Samoan recorders of this historical period discuss the battles in this way. For example, Faleto’ese noted the casualties in the Battle of Atua in Fagali’i and Saga on 1 April. He noted ‘Tanu’s troops lost 6 Americans, one Samoan (Manono), and one woman. Mata’afa lost 8 killed (5 Lepa, 2 Lotofaga, and 1 Lau’i)’. At the battle of Vailiele, the Mata’afa party also left a number of English and Americans dead.

A Catholic account of the war is much more detailed about campaigns than Samoan sources. The Catholic account is useful in that it indicates that campaigns did occur in earnest after 23 March when Tanu was crowned king. A gain the account is detailed about the ceremony: ‘The procession was headed by the band of the Philadelphia followed by approximately 200 native warriors and a hundred marines English and American. Next came carriages containing the Chief Justice, the English and American consuls, the captains of the men of war, the admiral, and lastly Tanumafili accompanied by Tamasese, vice-king’. The account also notes that ‘the Germans took no part in the ceremony’.

The account details also the damage to the village of Vaiusu, mentioned earlier as a letter of complaint by Forrester to the consuls. The damage is explained in detail. It also adds that the damage was ‘all done by the Tanuites since the withdrawal of

---
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Mata’afa to Faleula’. It also mentions that Mata’afa’s ‘guns’ were at Malie, although later he went home to Amaile.77

This state of war continued until 25 April, but the Malietoa Tanu/Tamasese faction was severely beaten, even with the support of American and English marines and naval power. As a result, the consuls met and finally made some decisions to end the affair. Among the decisions of the Commission of the three foreign Powers was accepting the resignation of Malietoa Tanumafili and the abolition of the kingship. Tanumafili had remained on board the Porpoise until the termination of the war. Westbrook, who seems to have admired this young king, nevertheless records that after the war ‘he was taken to Fiji, where he remained for some years. Subsequent events showed that he was forgotten by the people of Samoa, for there was no agitation to have him returned to his kingdom, nor when some years afterwards was there any demonstration of welcome when he did eventually return to his homeland’.78

Mata’afa was the victor. He was not named Tupu – as this title had been abolished, but Ali’i Sili, the ‘highest of chiefs’. The English and the Americans had, like Tanumafili, played their cards and lost in Western Samoa. The resulting decisions of the Treaty Powers were ample compensation for them however. America was delighted to get sole territorial rights over Tutuila and Manu’a, while the British received international responsibility for Tonga. The tripartite power was dissolved amicably. No individual foreign Power was willing to annex the islands anyway. In reality each of the treaty powers acted to avoid the others having sole rights to the territory, rather than a genuine desire to annex Samoa. The Flag raising celebrating the German victory in Samoa and the appointing of Mata’afa as Ali’i Sili took place on the 1 March 1900. At the flag raising the German Administration showed its support for the Catholic mission. Bishop Broyer was given precedence over his protestant counterparts as it was he ‘who was invited to bless the flag and to say a prayer in honour of the occasion ahead of the Reverend J E Newell of the LMS. ‘The natives’, reported Broyer remarked that, ‘the Catholic religion is put in the first place’.79 The effect on the LMS on the appointment of Mata’afa appears significant. In the Report of the A’ana District for the year ending in 1900, Newell complains of ‘not much to be happy about in a district notoriously in
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favour of the Mata’afa faction’. The district, however, did not lose too many adherents ‘despite the blatant condemnation our Society received at the hands of the members of that party during the early months of the year’.  

Mata’afa, meanwhile, was to begin trying to achieve Tupu status, even though Solf and the German Administration had reduced his title to ali’i sili or ‘highest chief’. With regard to the missions, Mata’afa had written to the LMS mission house saying that there was to be a lotu fa’afetai or religious celebration of thanksgiving on 24 April. This ‘thanksgiving’ was to be celebrated by all the various churches in Samoa on the above date. The LMS, perhaps feeling there was not much to thank the Lord for, protested to the Governor, Solf. As a result Solf wrote back to the LMS noting that Mata’afa’s proclamation was ‘injudicious’, and Solf declared Mata’afa’s proclamation ‘null and void’.  

The mat distribution, which is the final phase in the acceptance of the high titles Mata’afa had received, was very much controlled by the German governor, Solf, but it did not proceed according to his plans. A major problem occurred in early July within the Tuamasaga district. Solf sent a Proclamation to the district on 2 July. He had ‘heard reports that certain Tuamasaga chiefs were causing problems’ by declining to attend at Mulinu’u and receive their mats under the title ‘the high chief Mata’afa but they should receive their mats under the title Malietoa.’ Solf understood this action as ‘a means by which some Tuamasaga chiefs’, namely Auimatagi and the Faleono, conspired to ‘obtain more fine mats’. The real reason was that Mata’afa was also Malietoa and the Tuamasaga chiefs had the right to receive their mats in this way. Solf reveals this in an Order to the Tuamasaga chiefs. He wrote: ‘Again I order that it is strictly forbidden for the people of Tuismau (who must consult with Palauali) or Safata or Faleata to obtain fine mats after the manner of Auimatagi ma le Faleono under the Malietoa style for these mats are only in honour of Mata’afa’s position as Ali’i Sili.’  

The reference to the Auimatagi and the Faleono, which Solf indicated were causing problems in order to gain more mats was a reference to the orator group in Malie
(Auimatagi) and the villages of Falefa, Vaimauga and Siumu (the Faleono), all of which are keys players in the Malietoa title. The ‘people of Tuisamau’ refers to the orators of Afega, another key Malietoa area. Safata has the right to bestow the papa, Tamosoali‘i, the tamafafine papa. Their chosen candidate, Mata‘afa should give the mats to Safata in return for receiving the Tamosoali‘i title. It would be insulting to give mats after the style of any of Mata‘afa’s other titles. Similarly those who were involved in the ao of the Malietoa would expect to receive fine mats in return for them bestowing the title on Mata‘afa. The Malietoa areas have no authority in the Tuiatua or Tuia’ana titles. It would be an insult not to receive the fine mats after the Malietoa style.

An examination of Samoan government and German administration files reveal that the Malo was indeed strong. There are numerous letters of complaint to the Malo and to Solf, but there was no real threat to Mata‘afa as Ali’i Sili. Mata‘afa was never seriously challenged by a counter-candidate for leadership of the Malo. Trouble was brewing for Solf and the German Administration however. Also to be challenged was whether one candidate should retain all the titles once Mata‘afa passed away.

By mid-decade Solf was personally appointing the Faipule. He wrote that ‘they are Faipule during my pleasure. They will remain for a long time in office as long as they behave properly’. 86 Of greater concern was that Solf then abolished the position of Ta‘imua. This was an affront to these hereditary tama‘aiga, but also the orator groups of Tumua and Pule. Mata’afa himself was against abolishing the Ta‘imua and petitioned Solf for the re-establishment of the office and to install Tamasese, Tuimaleali‘ifano, Fa’alata and Tupua as Ta‘imua when Sapaia died in 1907. 87

The Mau of Lauaki was an indigenous attempt to restore the Tumua and Pule as well as the tama‘aiga to their rightful place. It began in 1905, the same year that Solf had reduced the position of these hereditary leaders. The support for the cause or Mau of Lauaki was widespread. Eventually Lauaki would be deported along with other ali‘i and tulafale from Savai‘i and Manono

In May 1909 the Governor wrote to Berlin that Mata‘afa ‘himself had made propaganda for the son of the late king Malietoa Talavou, Fa’alata, and that he is even said to have a
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testament ready in his favour”. The Governor reiterated that Lauaki’s plan was the revival of Tumua and Pule but also that he wished for Tanumafili as king. Lauaki had stood on Mata’afa’s side in 1898 because of Tanumafili’s youth but the indication in the letter is that upon Mata’afa’s death the kingship should return to the primogeniture Malietoa candidate, son of Laupepa, Tanumafili. The division seems clear. Malie were prepared to follow Mata’afa’s wishes for Fa’alata, Tanu’s cousin and Laupepa’s rival, as successor. However, at the same time ‘Lauaki’s own people from Savai’i were camping at Afega’! 88 Once again the division between the rival Malietoa candidates was revealed within Sa Malietoa.

Tumua remained strongly in support of the restoration of Tumua and Pule status. There was also a division in the support of Sa Malietoa support for Mata’afa (and Fa’alata) as well as the strong Sa Tupua areas in Upolu who were supporting Mata’afa versus Malietoa Tanumafili. The restoration of Malietoa Tanumafili to his former (brief) status as king, and how essential this was in the Mau movement needs some evaluation. The Mau of Lauaki would not have been able to gain the extended support of so many areas of Samoa if the restoration of Tanumafili was the key element. The key was to gain greater autonomy and control. The question of Tanumafili being set up, in opposition to Mata’afa is never referred to by Lauaki himself in any correspondence. Indeed Lauaki put the whole of the blame of the movement on Mata’afa himself, a fact reported by both Schultz and Solf. 89 Solf wrote that Lauaki ‘swore on the bible that everything he did was indicated to him by Mata’afa’. Lauaki also stated that ‘Mata’afa had given wrong information to the Governor, and had kept him purposely in the dark’ and it was Mata’afa who had ordered that Tumua and Pule assemble. Mata’afa, in a speech in 1909, did not deny Lauaki’s claims. 90 On 3 March, Broyer also wrote to Solf in regard to Mata’afa’s complicity in the Mau. Mata’afa’s closest European confidante was Broyer and the bishop poignantly noted that ‘one cannot find Mata’afa guilty because he consented to Lauati’s desiderata or was the originator of them’. 91

Solf was in a quandry and the German sources themselves contain flaws in terms of the opposition that the German Administration was facing. If Mata’afa was behind the movement, and if Upolu as well as Savai’i was against the actions of Solf in taking
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away the traditional social and political power of the orator groups and family heads in Samoa, it did not have much of a mandate to continue governing. Solf’s answer was to ask for three naval ‘Man of Wars’. He had also had brought over ‘black boys’, police from New Guinea. Lauaki was adamant that he would not give in voluntarily. On 25 March a war fono was held in Safotulafai ‘in which all the villages of Lauati decreed to fight sooner than give in’. Warfare was, however, avoided and Solf thanked the missions for this and noted that the missions ‘had put themselves at the Governor’s disposal and for the first time in Samoa all three of them pulled together’. Lauaki and the other perceived leaders of the Mau were exiled.

The choice of Fa’alata as Mata’afa’s successor was noted by Solf and he wrote to bishop Broyer informing him of a ‘far spreading rumour that’:

The Ali’i Sili is said to have made a last will in which he nominated the High Chief Fa’alata of the Malietoa family, the son of the late king Malietoa Talavou, as heir of his Papa and Ao and of his office of Ali’i Sili, under the conditions of him becoming a Catholic.

Solf also reported that after his own conversation with Mata’afa, Mata’afa admitted that he ‘had tried to convert him to the Catholic faith’. Broyer responded that he did not know of this ‘last will’, and does not agree with one who ‘would sacrifice his religious convictions for a temporal interest’. Broyer does add that:

It is my desire that Fa’alata would become Catholic just as I would desire that Tanu, Tamasese etc would turn Catholic...[Fa’alata] is not yet Catholic, but has he a velleity to become a Catholic? I am inclined to believe it. His father, Talavou, has been Catholic for some years – he married under the Catholics. Fa’alata also has some relations who are Catholics.

Broyer himself believed that Fa’alata lacked religious convictions and the affair was just about old jealousies. How guarded Broyer was in this regard to Solf is revealed in a report made by the German vice-admiral, Coerper, to the German Emperor in June
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1909. He wrote of a meeting between Solf and Fa’alata. The latter asked Solf’s advice as to whether he should become Catholic. Solf’s reply was that ‘one does not change one’s religion like a lavalava’. Coerper again notes that Mata’afa’s condition on naming Fa’alata as his successor depended on him becoming Catholic. He also notes Solf’s suspicions about Broyer’s real motivations and believed that ‘on account of the intimate connection between Mgr Broyer and Mata’afa’, he believed that the bishop was encouraging the conversion.  

Broyer was not so pleased when, as a result of Fa’alata’s death in 1910, Mata’afa named the Protestant, Tuimaleali’ifano, as his successor. Out of pique, Broyer did not attend Mata’afa’s own funeral in February 1912. Tuimaleali’ifano was not to accede him however. Malietoa Tanumafili had returned from Fiji and was to share the post of principal chief along with Tupua Tamasese Lealofi.

---
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CHAPTER 15

THE TRIUMPH OF THE NEW MALO OF NAFANUA

Upon the deaths of Mata’afa Iosefo and Fa’alata, the hopes of the opposing Malietoa faction for prominence in the Malo had effectively ended. In this sense the Malo predicted by Nafanua to Malietoa Fitiseimanu no longer had any effective opposition within Sa Malietoa itself. Since the time of Vainu’upo and Taimalelagi, there had been opposing Malietoa title-holders vying for control. After the death of Fa’alata, the beginnings of the Malo promised to the Malietoa family became a reality. The Malo was said to have come from heaven, and with LMS assistance, the primogeniture candidate, ending with Tanumafili, was to win out.

Mata’afa was only meant to hold the Malietoa title throughout his lifetime. His death – and Fa’alata’s did help strengthen the now mature Tanumafili’s claims. Also strengthening his claim was his father’s marriage to Sisavai’i, a direct descendant of Galumalemana. Malietoa Tanumafili was also eligible to claim aloali’i status.

The decision by the German administration to install two candidates as Fautua or leading chiefs continued throughout the New Zealand administration of Samoa. Again some claimed that Malietoa Tanumafili was advantaged by the New Zealand administration. A German resident who lived in Samoa and continued to stay a short time after the New Zealanders came in at the beginning of the Great War and replaced the German administration noted the following:

After the death of Mata’afa in 1912 ... two at hand for the high titles, the chiefs of both parties were Tamasese and Tanumafili. Tamasese had remained true to the Germans, Tanumafili, on the other hand had been the ‘favoured one’ of the English and Americans and has continued to stay under British influence – through the mission. That the Tanumafili party would turn to the British is self-evident – how would it be anything but. They had always been under British influence, particularly in their main village in Savaii.  

Tupua Tamasese Lealofi died, however, in 1915 and was replaced first by his son, then his half-brother, known as Tamasese Lealofi III. Under the Germans and the New Zealanders these Fautua were merely advisors and did not have executive authority alone. But there were factors in Malietoa Tanumafili’s favour. Until his death he was always in the position of Fautua. After the death of Tamasese, Tuimaleali’ifano, another tama’aiga replaced him.

Tupua Tamasese Lealofi III was banished from his lands and titles by the New Zealand Administrator Richardson. Richardson ‘had also treated the position of Fautua as little more than an anachronism and had seldom sought the advice of its two title holders, Malietoa and Tuimaleali’ifano’. Instead he focused on his appointees, in the Fono o Faipule. Tuimaleali’ifano was later dismissed and replaced by Mata’aafa Salanoa. Both Tuimaleali’ifano and Tupua Tamasese played an active part in the Mau, for the desire for greater self-determination. They were both punished for this, and Tupua Tamasese, recognised as leader of the Mau, was fatally wounded and died at the hands of New Zealand forces. Tuimaleali’ifano was also injured – another high ranking chief and Mau leader. Malietoa himself was not actively involved in the Mau – and was looked upon favourably by the New Zealand administration.

Upon Mata’aafa Salanoa’s death, Tuimaleali’ifano was again appointed as Fautua. During all these changes in Fautua, Tanumafili remained. Then in 1937 Tuimaleali’ifano died, followed two years later by Tanumafili. Again Malietoa Tanumafili’s successor, Tanumafili II, has proved the prophecy in so many people’s eyes. Again there were changes to other member of the Fautua but he was to remain. On 27 March Mata’aafa, then Fautua died and was replaced by Tupua Tamasese Mea’ole. They both held the post until 1962 when Samoa finally became independent. The new constitution allowed both Fautua to be joint heads of state for life. On 5 April, just over a year after independence, His Highness Tupua Tamasese Mea’ole died and since then Malietoa Tanumafili II has been sole head of state. For forty years Malietoa Tanumafili II alone has been addressed as His Highness. By some, he is considered king. The prophecy of Nafanua that he would receive the Malo has evolved and solidified over these forty years. Tanumafili and his successor, Tanumafili II have been

---

2 Davidson, Samoa mo Samoa, 125.
3 Only during the Samoan Independence celebrations in this year, 2002, did the New Zealand administration, represented by Prime Minister, Helen Clark, apologise for New Zealand’s past behaviour during this period.
the only two Malietoa title-holders for nearly a century. A century is a long time and a large amount of myth making has taken place.

The Malo, loosely translated as government or the victorious party, is more complex than mere political power. Political power is concentrated in the Samoan government, and certainly other Tama’aiga have held the position of prime minister. Mata’afa Fiame Mulini’u was the first prime minister and Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese has also held this position. The Constitution provided for a council of deputies, that in terms of mana or sacred authority sat below the Head of State. HH Malietoa Tanumafili II has supreme mana and is in this sense the sacred chief as well as being able to exercise considerable temporal power despite him not being in government. The Malo of Nafanua meaning the Malo of Malietoa is set apart from the mundane pursuit of power and politics in the government. Indeed one hears occasional criticism of the choice of Tupua Tamasese to pursue a political career. Some members of Sa Tupua deem this decision to be below his status, as more mana is associated with the Council of Deputies.

This study has focused upon the relationship between temporal and spiritual power. It has also examined events as they happened and the events as they are perceived to have happened, and a manipulation of these events through myth-making and the retelling of events. Myth making as a process excludes and exalts to the detriment of others. It is also essentially the prerogative of the victorious party. Revision and exclusion are allowed precisely because the dominant party can dominate and reinvent the myth.

For the myth to have validity – i.e., be believed – the manipulations have to have ‘touchstones’ that make the myth reality. It is not just exclusion of counter-histories, but new dimensions are achieved as a result of these manipulations. In Samoan society, Nafanua is invoked as being the legitimizer of the Samoan polity in the key changes in the Samoan past. Nafanua plays an important role. She is ever present and a signifier of the sacred relationship between brother and sister – the sacred aunt who has spiritual power in contrast to the temporal power of the brother. Her reincarnations as a powerful aitu are rarely questioned. She is a warrior goddess who has validity through the ages. She is not unlike a King Arthur – a king who perhaps lived in the 6th century, but is a recurrent figure associated through many time periods and linked with national identity.
There are wider implications than just Samoa. All history is about events as they happened and how these are perceived. There are always victors whose voice is heard and those whose voices remain silent. In the Pacific this is no different. This study has focused upon the close relationship with Tonga, but in Samoa the Tongan connection is marginalized. In Tonga the same is true in the opposite direction – for in Tonga Samoa is marginalized. The Tupou dynasty marginalized or absorbed other dynastic lines. Samoa has retained distinctions in elite genealogical lines, but with Malietoa as Head of State, he is seen as a dynastic leader. Malietoa Tia’s marriage to the daughter of the aloali’i Taisi, gave subsequent Malietoa title holders like Fitisemanu and Vainu’upo aloali’i status, but the Malietoa line did not absorb the Tupua inheritance.4

In Samoa the genealogical dominance from Fitisemanu is seen as being a simple alo o ali’i or descent from father to son. This genealogical version dominates. Had Talavou instead of Laupepa become a strong LMS adherent, would the result have been different? Part of the proof of the myth – and proof of the prophecy was that the primogeniture candidate did become ardent members of the LMS Lotu.

The Malo was also achieved by the widespread acceptance of Christianity and the LMS Church in particular. This Lotu is still called the la-mo-sa, (LMS) by many Samoans. Officially it became the Samoan (LMS) Church, or the Samoan Congregational Church and its original association with Sa Malietoa is emphasised – another victory for the promised Malo. Most villages have more than one Lotu but traditional precedent is important. Most areas which were predominantly LMS by the end of the 20th century are still of the same Samoan Congregational Church. Again association of the Christian denominations with counter elites was common in the Pacific, and the Lotu associated with the victors is seen as a legitimizing force for the eventual winners. The Tupou dynasty, since the time of King George Tupou I, associated his new status with the Wesleyan mission. The Wesleyan mission in Samoa was also viewed as part of his victory over the Tuitoga line, which later associated with the Catholics.

In 1884, the stations listed as Catholic were Apia, Vaea, Failefa, Aleipata, Lotofaga, Safata, Leulumoega, Manono, Safotulafai, Lealatele, Safotu, Falealupo and Leone in

Tutuila.\textsuperscript{5} Today these are still the areas in which Catholicism is the strongest. New Lotu have arrived, most notably the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and one of Fa’alata’s sons became a member of this church.\textsuperscript{6}

Despite the fact that there is rarely dispute about denominational issues, there has been some distinct difficulties in challenging traditional allegiances between some villages and their Lotu. In Lalomanu in 1935, for example, a young girl, who had left the village and become a Catholic died some time later. She was returned to her village for burial. ‘Fr Schwer wanted to bury her’. But the Catholic burial ‘was opposed not by the LMS pastor, but the high chief Fuataga’.

Fuataga, in refusing to allow a Catholic burial within his village of Lalomanu was holding to the traditional sa ... So long as no chief with sufficient power dares to break the sa it will stand ... . It was practically a universal sa that confronted the first Catholic missionaries to Samoa [but] in the history of the Catholic mission in Samoa there are numerous stories of the breaking down of the sa in villages and districts.\textsuperscript{7}

Another case was heard before the acting Administrator on 1 December 1937 in regard to Falelatai. This was the home village of Tuimaleali’ifano, whose ancestor To’oa Sualauvi was one of the early strengths of the LMS Church and received one of the first missionaries from his uncle Malietoa Talavou. The case, somewhat like a mini court case, was instigated by the Catholic Bishop. The Bishop’s complaints were as follows:

\begin{itemize}
\item[i] Catholics [in Falelatai] were forbidden to have a missionary visit
\item[ii] Catholic chiefs not allowed successors of their own faith
\item[iii] Three newly appointed chiefs, on refusing to give up their Catholic faith, were deprived of their titles – and plantations belonging to the Catholics have been destroyed.\textsuperscript{8}
\end{itemize}

The replies to the bishop again relied on traditional precedent. Nanai S, replied that ‘the LMS has been in Falelatai for 100 years. Tuia’ana Sualauvi and his chiefs said that there would be no other Church in the district’. He also said the problem was due to marriages into the village and the chiefs were ‘given the choice between their faith and their titles’. He added that ‘our constitution is that if anyone goes against the village wish or misbehaves, he is banished, his houses burnt and crops destroyed’. These chiefs

\textsuperscript{5} Vicariate Apostolique des Navigateurs, 1 January-31 December 1884, in Oceania Navigatores (ON) (PMB 188).
\textsuperscript{6} Seiuli Le-Tagaloa tele Fitisemanu II.
\textsuperscript{7} Astride the Times (Catholic Newsletter), September 1935. OMPA 58, E.16.
\textsuperscript{8} Ibid, December 1937.
had been banished but were allowed to return as long as they did not practice their faith publicly. The key issue was one of pule or authority. Two other respondents noted that:

If there are seven holders of one title living on one piece of land, one who is a Catholic has no separate pule to hold service on it without the consent of all others who share this pule.  

The Samoan (LMS) Church was the Lotu promised to Malietoa and it was victorious. Other denominations associated with counter-elites. Again this is a common phenomenon. In Tonga, for example, the Tuitoga line associated with Catholicism after the Wesleyan faith of King George won out. Despite the different denominations, Christianity also won out over traditional religion.

One ramification of the new religion on the sacred chief was the breaking down of the pattern of descent among title-holders. The proliferation of title-holders among various important genealogical lines seems associated with the reduction in the sacred power associated with the passing of the title of the previous holder to a new single holder who inherited the sanctity and knowledge of his or her ancestors. By 1865, Dyson noted that the proliferation of the Tonumaine’a title had greatly reduced the influence of that title. He spoke similarly of the Lilomaiaava title, which was ‘hardly worth its value in fine mats’, the payment given after reception of the title. Ironically the strong affiliation of a few key elites with specific denominations encouraged a limited number of title-holders at any one time.

The impact of Christianity also greatly affected the status of the brother – sister relationship, or the feagaiga. A sister had the power to curse her brother, she could also heal him and his family of afflictions. For ensuring well-being, the brother or tamatane line of a family paid special dues to that of the sister and her line (the tamafafine line). The male female relationship was represented in many culturally significant parts of Samoan life. The genealogical line of descent in the female or tamafafine line, also known as ilamuta, formed a covenant of perpetual kinship (feagaiga) that was established by the founder of a certain male line and ‘his successors are pledged to pay respect, to render services and to observe certain obligations towards those descendants’.  

---

9 Ibid.
10 Milner, Samoan Dictionary, 83.
Also greatly transformed by the missionary message was the limiting of marriage obligations – and indeed the number of marriages that could be entered into. There were obligations for both the bridegroom’s and bride’s families at these unions. At these times the bride’s family brought *i’e toga* or fine mats, while the bridegroom’s family brought food and trade goods. The term for the latter was *‘oloa*. This did continue, but the pastor benefited tremendously. The *feagaiga* between the pastor and congregation meant that the *fa’ie’au* received food and goods rendered for spiritual services. The *fa’aaloaga* (from the base *oloa*) became the collection or salary for a pastor. It has also become customary for the *fa’ie’au* to be provided with a feast after the church service on Sunday. The new spiritual authority thus received rewards for services.¹¹

There is a reluctance in Samoa to speak of ‘heathen times’. This appears to be quite an early development. There certainly was no simple division between the days of darkness and days of light. Similarly the now ‘bad terms and words’ associated with pre-Christian times took some time to develop.¹² The missionary writings often downplay the persistence of belief, especially in published works that exalt the successes of their respective missions. Certain insights are to be obtained from the ethnologists Krämer and von Bülow.

Von Bülow in 1901, responded to a German publication by G. Kurze entitled *Die Samoaner in der heidnischen Zeit*, referring to ‘heathen Samoa’.¹³ Kurze’s work was based on the research of the LMS missionaries G Turner, I B Stair and A W Murray and portrays Samoa as providing a distinct contrast between the old days of pagan Samoa and the new Christian Samoa. Von Bülow notes that a number of practices mentioned are portrayed as belonging only to a distant ‘heathen past’ but were still being practiced in the early 20th century. A number of examples are discussed; for example, the last gift given to a house or boat builder upon completion of a net was called the *umusa*, meaning the sacred food from the baking oven. He notes that Kurze also refers to the first fish caught being called *ole ia o Tagaloa*, or the fish of Tagaloa and is offered upon completion of a newly built bonito canoe. When one is tattooed, the person is

---

¹¹ For a more in depth discussion on how Christianity had transformed the Samoan vocabulary and introduced new cultural forms, see Appendix I.

¹² For more on language change, see Appendix I.

sprinkled with coconut oil. The same sprinkling happens when a village confers an ao title. This stemmed from the gods. By doing this, the chief is then 'holy'.

Von Bülow also noted that Kurze speaks of gifts and offerings being placed in a net upon completion and prayers are recited for success in fishing. The goods are distributed in the same way as those of the umusa and the end of boat building. Von Bülow examines the words for 'priests' as being taulaitu, meaning the person who is the 'offerer' to the gods. The taulaitu or priests are not concerned with healing alone, but also were able to enter into personal communication with aitu and call upon the aitu for assistance. Von Bülow concludes that 'it is completely false to present these customs as being in the past while still now all of these practices, despite the missionaries, are still in vogue'.  

Krämer, in a different way regards the missions as being influential – this time not as portraying a false view in missionary writings, but decries the impact the missions have had on traditional Samoan society. A very clear case is that of Krämer's description of Leulumoega in the late 1890s. He states:

```
Leulumoega has two villages, Sasalue and Mataotao, the former...where the houses of Salamasina and of Samalaulu are said to have stood and where today Lemana lives. On the seaside of the road are the houses of So'o'a'emalelagi [Levalasi] ... the female cousin of Tuiaana Tamalelagi. The famous malae [of Leulumoega] is not in use because directly to the west of it begin the grounds of the Catholic sisters, the Catholic Pater himself living in the back of Sasalue ... . At Nu'uausala where Tuia'ana lived; today the English Mission occupies that area ... the famous Leulumoega, a place where every spot of historic significance, has been directly desecrated by the missions .... One has to say that they with a disheartening lack of understanding in an all but brutal way trod underfoot the historic traditions of the good hearted Samoan people. Thousand fold space all around, but they had to erect buildings right in the heart of sacred places of history.
```

Krämer, typical of the ethnologists of his time, had a rather romantic view of the 'idyllic' Samoan past and imagined that this past would soon be lost. The impact of the missions was already substantial by the 1890s, but this was not merely an enforced mission. In many instances it was the Samoans themselves who insisted on the mission establishing churches on lands that had a significant historical meaning. These additions were an extension of the mana of the village. They represent a continuity

14 Ibid., 26.  
from the old dimensions of spiritual life to spirituality in a transformed guise, Christianity.

Certain traditional beliefs continue and the belief in *aitu* still exists among a large percentage of the populace. *Taulaitu* also exist but in a slightly different form. Often the outcome of a problem that is seen to be caused by an ancestral spirit, is that one is advised to go to the grave and pray. Nearly all Samoans *lotu* on Sunday and a number of villages have formal prayer times for families at night.

Christianity is an integral part of Samoan culture and Malietoa received the triumphant Christian prophet John Williams and his Lotu. The Malietoas, like the Tupous of Tonga, are seen as the patrons of Christianity. Furthermore the insignia adopted at independence reinforces this message. Tanumafili II is the Head of State and the State emblem has a Christian cross as its crest. The banner below the shield reads ‘*Fa’avae i le Atua Samoa*’, or Samoa is founded on God. That God, as Atua may be envisaged as Tagaloalagi, the apical ancestor from the heavens, but the prophecy was from the *aitu* Nafanua. The myth has become reality and Malietoa received his Malo from the heavens.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gen.</th>
<th>Malietoa Line (IV,B,b,1,p.310)</th>
<th>Tuiasana Line (IV,A,b,2,p.220)</th>
<th>Tuiatua line (IV,C,b,1+2, III,c,2), through Tuiasana and Salemuliega to Mata'a'afa (p.111,380,386)</th>
<th>Tonumaip'e'a Line (III, b, 9, p.123)</th>
<th>Tagaloa line (III,b,4,p.115)</th>
<th>Gen.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Malamagaga'e - Malamagagaifo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lupe - Papatu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A'ala'u - Papamau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Papafaoagia - Ma'a'ata'anoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Papa'ele - Palapala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Papamavea - 'Imoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Salasa - Tagaloamimonomo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tupufua - Leletaimalie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Leopili - Lesapoupolai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tuiatua Mose - Itegata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tuiatua Talutele - Sinaatua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tuiatua Malaetel - Samalaelu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Taepipitele - Taemo'otele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tuiatua Leutele Ti'e Tetuafaleo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Saveasi'uleo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tuiatua Aumuaeluia'i - Fe'esaga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tuiatua Muaetel - Matagaitusu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tuiatua Polaleva - Titala'afa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tuiatua Polaleva (Tt. Fas'asotele I Titala'afa - Momo I Fullatu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tp. Sauoaga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tagaloaef'aatautele - Fagalilo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taulliili</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tagaloaef'aafonuu - Letolesa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# THE SAMOAN MAIN LINES OF SAVAI’I AND UPOLU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tuiiana Tamalaegi - Seanatoe</td>
<td>Tn. Tamalaegi - Vaetoeifaga</td>
<td>(f)Mata'utia Le Valasi (So'o'a'emialegi)</td>
<td>Tp. Saumape'a</td>
<td>Tagaloa saunifanua - Tafeutuola</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tuitogama'atoe - Lemafaite'uuga</td>
<td>(f)Salamasina t. 4 - Tapumanaia</td>
<td>(f)Salamasina t. 4 - Tapumanaia</td>
<td>(f)Maisagamai</td>
<td>Tapumanaia</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Malietoa Taulapapa - Tonu'umataiwaiva</td>
<td>(f)Fofoaiafo'e Tn. - Taumataminiulaia</td>
<td>(f)Fofoaiafo'e Tn. - Taumataminiulaia</td>
<td>Tr(f) Fofoaiafo'e</td>
<td>Tagaloa'afesulu - Oloitoa</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>(M. Seiuli)(f) Taiapia - Anavao</td>
<td>Titoiafo'e</td>
<td>Taumataminiulaia</td>
<td>(f)Fofoaiafo'e</td>
<td>Tagaloa'afesulu - Oloitoa</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Malietoa Tuialaepe - Maisagamai</td>
<td>Fauimuina Tn. Tt. - Talaleomalae</td>
<td>Tupuvaio - Iliganoa Taulapapa</td>
<td>Tp. Faumina</td>
<td>Tu'omata - Tofoipupu</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Malietoa Toatuaipa - Tofoipupu</td>
<td>Fonoti. 4. - Fuatino</td>
<td>Luamanuva'e - Tumupu'e</td>
<td>Va'a'fusua'gaga</td>
<td>Amituana'i - Taina'ala</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Malietoa 'A'e'o'ainu'u - Siaepuame</td>
<td>Muagutulua'a t. 4. - Fenunuiva'oa</td>
<td>Falanaipupu - Talaopatina</td>
<td>Toleafosiolo</td>
<td>Leota'oga - Oiau</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Malietoa Laualauafolasa - Alli'iasi</td>
<td>Tupua t. 4. Tuaulupetu</td>
<td>Togafau - Suluo'o 1</td>
<td>Nonuma'alo</td>
<td>Lealamanu'a</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Malietoa ia T'a - Taufa'ilematagi</td>
<td>Galumalemalena t. 4. - Galuegapapa</td>
<td>Ililimoatafo'a - Leteletaneole'ova (Sala'valu)</td>
<td>Levaopili</td>
<td>Aumoegalo'g co Lagi</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Malietoa Filipemana - Palo</td>
<td>Nofoaasa'a Tn. (Tamafana'a)</td>
<td>Tulivavae - Salaina'aloa 2</td>
<td>Gisa</td>
<td>Loavaegogo - Lulua'ngaga</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Malietoa Vainiupu t. 4. (Mal. Taumalagi, Tumu o Salafa)</td>
<td>Leasiola'i - Usipua</td>
<td>Mata'a Fa'asusamale'ia'i</td>
<td>Lulua'lese'e</td>
<td>Lealamanu'a - Tuileafou</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Malietoa Laupepa - Sisav'ai</td>
<td>Moegagogo - Taeulemote</td>
<td>Leativa o Salafa 3</td>
<td>Tio'vaitafe</td>
<td>Va'amo'le'ana - af. O</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Malietoa Laupepa - Sisava'i</td>
<td>Tamasese t. 4. - Fuatino</td>
<td>Mata'a Fisouma'u - Fuatino</td>
<td>Pa'o'vai</td>
<td>Tagaloa I le Va'ai'iga</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Tanumafili</td>
<td>Tamasese t. 4. - Fuatino</td>
<td>Mata'a Tupa (Faife'au) t. 4.</td>
<td>Malaita'i Faumuina</td>
<td>Malaita'i Faumuina</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Kramer, *The Samoa Islands*, Vol 1, 646, 647.

1. Descendent of Tuifiti and Tuitoga (seqp. 387).
2. Granddaughter of King Tupua, gen 27; see 2nd column.
3. Daughter of Tagaloa Lealamanu'a, gen 28; see 4th column.
APPENDIX I

NEW MEANINGS FOR OLD WORDS: THE INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY ON THE SAMOAN VOCABULARY

This appendix examines briefly the transformation of concepts by giving new meanings to words. The translation of the Bible into Samoan by the LMS provided the missionaries with a stage to introduce a new Weltanschauung to Samoan society. The use of high chiefly and orator language forms, traditionally reserved for chiefs only but appropriated by missionaries, elevated the status of missionaries to that of the orator chief. These forms of address meant that the missionaries were of equal status to the matai. The term failauga was a polite word for tulafale or orators. This was the term used for a Methodist lay preacher. The oratory of the failauga or tulafale is termed läuga. A lauga by an orator was reserved specifically for that office; a common or untitled person’s speech was never termed a lauga. The Methodist lay preacher’s sermon was termed a lauga, portraying the status of both the preacher and his message. The wife of a pastor was termed falefau – the same address applied to the wives of orators. The term for a Wesleyan catechist came to be known as a leoleo. This term in common usage refers to the police force, but in former terms referred to guards. These guards protected the sacred chief. For example, the term, ‘o le leoleoga o le maota o le Tupu’, referred to the guards of the king’s house.\(^1\) Another form of address for an orator is fetalaiga, an orator. When the orator speaks, the term is fetalai. This term is used only for orators. In the Bible, when God or Jesus speaks, the term is fetalai, rather than other more common terms that mean ‘to speak’.

Other denominations use words for their missionaries that are transliterations from the original foreign source. For example, the word for a catholic priest is Patele, or father (pater) and the term for an LMS Deacon is it’akono. The Catholic nun, however, is termed tauousa. The tauou, or Sa’otama ‘ita’i refers to the high chiefly daughter of the village and is therefore already a titled woman who holds a sacred position in the village. The Catholic term for nun means, therefore, a sacred tauou. Interestingly, however, Tupua Tamasese calls that he, as a young man, remembers that only the

\(^1\) Milner, A Dictionary, 106.
senior older of the title or the sa’o, the matai member who actually sat at the post in the meeting house of Matai was called toea ‘ina. This was true whether the sa’o was twenty or seventy years old. Other more common or non-chiefly words are applied to missionaries, such as the term Misi – from the English word ‘mister, probably after the designation given to Protestant missionaries – who are referred to as either the Rev. Mr, or merely ‘mister’. The most common form of address to missionaries is faife ‘au, meaning to ‘do’ ‘the work’ of God. These latter two forms were presumably in common usage shortly after the arrival of the missionaries. Perhaps the elevation of the missionaries to a more exalted social and spiritual status was one that took some time. This can be checked, to some extent at least, by missionary writings.

The messengers of the word of God assume polite matai terms, but these are the terms associated with orators who serve the ali’i, or sacred chief. It is the Christian God who is referred to in high chiefly language. Again this is not too dissimilar to the relationship between orators and ali’i. The term Tofa, a polite form of address to as orator or an orator’s speech, can also mean the opinion of the ali’i. In this sense the orator speaks on behalf of the opinion of the chief. It is the orators who speak in council, while the ali’i remain silent. The orator expresses his chief’s opinion, just as the missionary expresses the opinion of the Christian God.

One of the most polite terms for high chiefs is tapa’au. The orators will refer to their chief(s) as tapa’au. It is also a polite form for the Christian God who is referred to as ‘God in heaven’ or ‘o le tapa’au i le lagi’. A more common word for chief is ali’i. This term is translated in the Bible as ‘lord’ – speaking of Jesus. The polite term of address for an ali’i is Afioga, and the term expressed in the recital of the fa’alupega. Afioga is also used of God. The feast for matai held at any time during the day is referred to as talisuaga hence talisuaga a ali’i. The talisuaga a le ali’i is also the term used for the Lord’s Supper. Another term for the Lord’s Supper or Holy Communion is taumafataga, another chiefly (orator) term for a feast. The term fautua refers to advice or the ‘advisors’ in an office created towards the end of the German administration in Samoa – the period in which this study comes to a close. The office of fautua was carried on by the New Zealand administration and can be translated as the head of state.

---

2 Personal communication., Tupua Tamasese.
3 Personal communication, Niel Gunson.
and the council of deputies. This term is also used in regard to Jesus meaning mediator, as in ‘mediator of sins’.

The above discussion reveals words that are appropriated for use by Christianity. There is a level where the biblical use becomes more than that of transformation. The greatest transformations are at three levels: The transformation of the traditional spirit world, the transformation of life and lineage, and the concepts related to death, salvation and the afterlife.

The terms for supernatural beings have been transformed. The use of Atua is reserved for God, and is essentially a positive term. Aitu, or deceased ancestors who have the ability to enter into the body and speak through this living person, became a negative term relating to evil spirits and possession (by Satan). Tupua became idol. Idolatry became ‘ifo i le tupua’ or worshipping an idol, while ifo i le atua became the term for worshipping God. Agaaga, which referred to the spirit of the body that could travel to the mirror world during the night, became the Christian word for soul, (as in body and soul). The Holy Spirit is referred to as the agaaga Pa’ia. Thus agaga/agaaga could mean disposition or soul as opposed to the disembodied spirit that is referred to traditionally.

Another great transformation was terms used for the sanctity and spiritual power of chiefs. The elevation of an individual to a chiefly title indicates that the new title-holder essentially became the living embodiment of his predecessors. The strong genealogical connection between the holder and those before him is as close to eternity as one could get.

The connection of a sacred chief to his or her genealogical line is what endows the present holder with sanctity. The term lagi is interesting in this sense. Lagi are titles that belong to genealogical lines. Thus it can be said that Sa Malietoa or the Malietoa family have only two lagi, namely the Malietoa title and the To’oa title. It is the right of this family to pass on these titles upon the death of the previous holder. Fa’alagi then means to address someone by his or her hereditary title. For example, ‘Ua fa’alagia o ia ‘o le Tuiatua. Lagi is also the term for funeral. Other associated terms also have lagi as their root, such as osilagi or wake and le ‘au osilagi, the party of

4 Milner Samoan Dictionary, 94.
women mourners at the vigil.\textsuperscript{5} The ceremonial installation of a *matai* is often referred to as a *saofa'i*, but also the actual installation is referred to as *o'o*. *O'otaga* is also the present given upon the death of a chief. The base *taga* itself means the removal of a taboo or sacred office, thus *o'otaga* has the meaning also of removing the sanctity of that chief — which would then be placed upon the next candidate when he assumed office. The same relationship between life and death and the passing on of one's line is clear in polite addressing of orators. In formal addresses, one says 'malu mai', meaning welcome. It is also the polite form for death. Furthermore, the notion of *aitu* being deceased ancestors\textsuperscript{6} is represented by the term *lauaitu* or wailing at the funeral service. The title-holder has died and becomes an *aitu*. But the *aitu* is able to participate in the real world, like Nafanua whose voice continues through her representatives who carry her genealogical line into the future. In Lands and Titles Court cases it is not unusual for a present title-holder to say 'I (not my ancestor) was responsible for securing hereditary rights', a right that historically could have occurred many generations before the title-holder currently living. The connection between life and death and the sacred genealogical line of chiefs was therefore one of the difficulties faced by the mission and the translation of the Bible.

Not surprisingly, therefore, the term for eternal life was a difficult one for the translators of the new Bible. In Western forms eternal life gives the impression of a better life extending forever into the future in heaven. In the Samoan Bible the term for everlasting life is *fa'avavau* (*lava*). The root *vavau* refers to ancient times or times extending into the distant past. The prefix *fa'a*, in this case means 'characteristic of'. *Lumana'i* or to 'be in the future', which has a limited time focus is not appropriate for the eternal. Thus the term for eternal life is *olaga fa'avavau*, or eternal life meaning 'like that of times extending into the distant past', or time immemorial.

Other sacred functions of *ali'i* were appropriated and transformed by the new religion, especially in regard to sacred rights and ability to place taboos. There are many words for taboos, or sacred actions. The most common of these are Tapu, *tapua'i* and *sa*. In transformations into English concepts a number of terms are used. The most common word for a Christian church is *falesa* — or sacred (*tapu*) house or place of worship. Even the word for traditional spirit houses or groves termed *malumalu*, is sometimes used as a

\textsuperscript{5} Milner, *Samoan Dictionary*, 167.
\textsuperscript{6} *Aitu* being deceased ancestors is the primary conclusion of Cain's *Aitu, Eine Untersuchung*.
polite term for the Christian churches. The introduced word Monday, in Samoan, is \textit{Asogafua}. The base \textit{gafua} means to free from restriction or taboo. The meaning of the new word \textit{Asogafua} thus means ‘the day (aso) on which the restrictions imposed on Sunday are lifted’.\footnote{Milner \textit{Samoan Dictionary}, 74.} The term \textit{fa’agafua le sa} (to remove a taboo) was still used in the 1860s, as was the placing of taboos by chiefs, but the introduction of the sacredness of the Sabbath, and the restrictions placed on working on this day feature prominently in the laws of the 1870s that were formulated by J C Williams, the son of the famous missionary.

A \textit{sa}, as stated, is something sacred or placed under taboo. To \textit{fa’asa}, as a verb, is to place under taboo. Only chiefs had the ability to place a \textit{sa} on objects and places. Many \textit{tala} speak of chiefs placing areas under taboo and to break this taboo could cause death. Again the new religion brought a new meaning to this word. It is the LMS term for acceptance of membership into the LMS church. Thus ‘\textit{na fa’asa le ali’i}’ means that the chief has accepted (LMS) church membership.\footnote{Ibid., 195.} \textit{Tapu}, or \textit{tapua’i} which means to place under taboo, has also received a Christian transformation in that \textit{tapua’iga} is a polite referral to a church service. The term for a traditional priest, \textit{taula} has also been incorporated into the Bible and common usage in the form of \textit{taulaga}, referring to an offering to the church.

The sacred chief and the traditional sacred power of women and priests were also ritually challenged in formal anointing to the position. To oil or anoint a high chief to a title ceremonially is to \textit{fa’au’u} the highest of chiefs. This same verb, \textit{fa’au’u} is used for the consecration or ordination of a priest or pastor, the ordination or consecration (as a noun) being \textit{Fa’au’uga}. Certainly the transformation of the language has revealed at least a dual spiritual authority between the new religion and the old, especially regarding the spiritual power that the sacred chief held. The discussion is limited and many other examples could have been given, but essentially the incorporation of new meanings to words formerly reserved for chiefs and priests began a process whereby the sacred chiefs had to contend with the new messengers of the sacred message of Christianity. Certainly by the end of the 19th century, many of these incorporated forms began to be reserved for the new God and the missions that represented him. The ‘old religion’, in terms of spiritual power of the chiefs and the traditional religion would
become significantly diminished. What did not diminish was the temporal power of the chiefs and their orators. The Pastors and Priests held spiritual authority, but political power lay in the village and district councils. The faife 'au were excluded from fono. Their role was to spiritually serve the populace, not to take part in village and district politics.

Perhaps one of the most obvious areas of change (which has been noted in the text) is the change in the feagaiga relationship, in which the sister, or maternal relatives held spiritual power and the brother temporal power. The new feagaiga relationship is between God and his people and more specifically a pastor with his flock. ‘The new feagaiga, i.e., the pastor, has assumed the status, the power and the mana of the cultural feagaiga, as well as the status, the power and the mana of the brother and his descendants’.9

---

9 Personal communication, Tupua Tamasese.
APPENDIX II

HARNESSING THE REALM OF THE SACRED. THE ROLE OF THE DIVINE
CHIEF BEFORE THE ARRIVAL OF CHRISTIANITY

Harnessing the realm of the sacred by means of shamanic practices and inversing the
social order serve to ensure fertility and well being. Ritualistic activity not only
highlights the spiritual dimensions of Samoan life, but also reveals the
interconnectedness of the spiritual and physical realms. Adhering to these rituals serves
to maintain the spiritual configurations evident in that society.

Samoan, accepts the ‘semi-divine’ nature of high chiefs. Oral tradition records stories of
the elite chieftains and genealogical lines. It does not, as a norm, record the mundane
and ordinary practices associated with every day life. The purpose of this exercise is to
try to recapture not only the sacredness of chiefs, but also to examine how the realm of
the sacred is harnessed in ‘every day life’ to ensure fertility and well being.

At the time a child was born, he or she is blessed and protected. The child would be
placed under the protection of the family aitu. The child would also be anointed with an
ointment made from coconut oil and turmeric. The yellow colour of the turmeric plant
was considered the favourite colour of the gods.1 ‘A young married couple also
celebrated their union by anointing with this liquid and bringing a pig as a libation
called tausamaga in order that the gods may bless the fertility of the couple’.2 It was not
just chiefs who were blessed by anointing but everyone. Aitu were to be feared but there
was also the realisation that they imparted fertility and well being. The anointing with
oil, like the anointing of oil when high chiefs were vested with a title indicates the desire
to be favoured by the gods and supernatural sanction. Before interment the body was
also blessed with an admixture of coconut oil and turmeric called sama and this also
protected the spirit. All people in Samoan society are subject to the forces of the

---

1 This colour was considered the favourite colour of the gods in many Pacific societies, for example in
Mangaia, c.f., Michael Reilly, PhD Thesis, ANU.
2 von Bülow, Beiträge, 72. The meaning of Tausamaga is recorded as meaning ‘coloured yellow with
turmeric (leg a)’.
supernatural world and at key periods of life, particularly rites of passage, supernatural support was called for and physical materials were used.

The preparation of the *lega* or turmeric was ritualised into certain strict rules of behaviour. Women and girls were responsible for the preparation of the turmeric. Before preparing it they anointed themselves with *lega*. According to von Bulow the preparation of *lega* was a specialised art, like house building and the skills of the leading fishermen, which, ‘since time immemorial was in the hands of particular families’. Thus the *lega* preparation, *muaga*, was in the hands of particular women who were called *taulaitu*. In this context *taulaitu* can be understood in terms of a less rigid priesthood than those who served chiefs, but their tasks of anointing and seeking benefit from supernatural forces for fertility and well being are constant. Also, as befits most ritualistic activity seeking supernatural favour, the preparation of the turmeric was followed by a celebration. In the morning turmeric was collected by the women. In the evening there was dancing and the physical place of the dance was surrounded with flowers and scented plants. The body was perfumed with coconut oil and the dance often lasted until well after midnight. On the next day the turmeric roots were washed and cleaned and this day also ended in dancing. On the third day the roots were pulverised and covered with water. Von Bülow says also that the practice still existed while he lived in Samoa except that imported tools had replaced the flat coral or *lapa* that had previously been used to pulverise the roots.

It is beyond the scope of this enquiry to examine in depth the multitude of rituals, games, celebrations and libations that formed part of pre-Christian and early ‘contact’ Samoa. It is of value however to focus on one particular activity to determine the impact of traditional spirituality on the lifestyle of Samoans. One obvious choice is that of fishing. Samoa relies heavily on the sea for physical sustenance and it is reasonable to assume that supernatural sustenance would also be prevalent. As an example of a more formalised ritual, the preparation of kava and the kava ceremony will be examined.

---

3 Ibid., 72.
4 Ibid., 72.
There are numerous stories involving fish and their origins in Samoan *tala*. In one Malietoa genealogy, the Tuitoga in the west married the daughter of the Tuitoga in the east. They had three children, one of these being a fish called the *Auanae*. Saveasi’uleo, the King of the ‘mirror world’, was half-human and half sea eel. There are stories, which record that Samoans got the knowledge of fishhook making from the *Tuifiti*, the king of Fiji. In this account one day when the Tuifiti came back from fishing some Samoans cut off the hook and said that the *saputu* fish had bitten it off. They then decided to run away with it. The Tuifiti cursed them and everyone died except the girl Sina, who brought the hook on shore at Falealupu. As discussed these stories indicate not only the value of these key material tools but they may also serve as an indication of origin. Also many materials used in the fishing process are foreign to Samoa and were noted in the early contact period, which is an indication of the existence of trade between the islands. For example there are many different types of mother of pearl used to make large spinners (*pa’atu*) including that imported from Tokelau called *pa’atu tio* made from a calcite shell not found in Samoa itself. Likewise the thick body of the *ma’ata’i fe’e*, the stone used to catch the octopus is a calcite stone from Niue, and is likewise not found in Samoa itself. It appears from the available literature that these stones were numerous and reasonably common also.

The most substantial source on fishing practices and rituals is Demandt’s *Die Fischerei in Samoa*. This is an extremely detailed work and one that details numerous methods of fishing and where these methods were practised in Samoa.

Again, as with the preparation of the turmeric there appears to be certain rules, which were followed, which were to ensure prosperity and well being. After a fishhook is made the fisherman blesses his hook. Demandt gives us the prayer ceremonial words used when a feather fishhook is blessed as follows:

---

5 Krämer, *Die Samoa-Inseln*, Bd. 2, 168.
7 Ibid., 87.
Fa'amalama mata o gatala,
Fa'amalamalama mata o moana,
Fa'amalamalama mata o matulau,
Fa'amalamalama mata o ata'ata
Fa'amalamalama mata o i'a eseese uma lava i le sami.

This prayer asks that the ‘eyes of the ocean’, certain fish and indeed all the fish in the sea, open their eyes and take the bait.\(^8\) Most of the lagoon fishing with basket nets is done by women. These baskets are likewise blessed before use. ‘After the basket has dried enough in the sun, the woman goes with it to the beach and sprinkles it with the blessing liquid of a frond and sea water, or she fills it for the first time with coral and says ... look here tu'u'u and other fish ... look here all you different fish. Enter within, enter all within, but don’t look here sea eels’.\(^9\)

The most labour intensive preparation for fishing is the making of large nets. These nets were traditionally made of different materials with the larger nets being twisted fau or the bast from the Soga tree. These would take many weeks to make and involved large numbers of people. Upon completion of these nets a great feast was prepared and this was called the umu sa or sacred feast. Demandt laments that this was rarely done in the 1880s but what did persist was the ceremony upon completion of the turtle nets. Turtle were the most commonly known i'a sa or sacred fish. Demandt explains the ceremony as follows:

After the tautai [fisherman/priest] had completed a net he decides upon the day of the official gau gau gau or blessing of the net. The Tautai of the neighbouring villages gather together as soon as they have heard of this. They arrive uninvited and bring with them a stick of kava. The host tests his guests in speech and relates the history and mythology of the Tautai titles and they must hold the staff at the correct times and in the right places to assure the host that they are really tautai.\(^10\)

This testing is indicative of priestly societies in that the membership is limited and the members possess ‘secret knowledge’. In this sense it is not true that Samoa was devoid of a distinctive priestly caste. Functionally however it appears that there were numbers of tautai and taulaitu who had certain ‘priestly’ functions over limited domains. It is probably this realisation that encouraged Stair to speak of classes of priests. What

---

\(^8\) Ibid., 33.
\(^9\) Ibid., 63.
\(^10\) Ibid., 34, for a full account.
seems more appropriate in defining this priesthood is rather that there is a great diversity of roles, which had some bearing on harnessing the realm of the sacred. Some, as above, were obviously related to specific activities; some, as we have seen are related to titles and the position these individuals have in their role of anointing and so on.

The *umu sa* is then ordered by the *tautai*. After the food has been distributed among those present, and laid before them in a small basket, the whole assembly proceeds in a long line to the house in which the net is lying in the middle of the floor. Each person holds his basket in his hand and proceeds left around the net. Upon a given signal they then place their baskets on the net and accompany this action with a drawn out cry – *ia*.\(^\text{11}\) This is most probably a call to lay down their baskets at the same time (*i – a*).\(^\text{12}\)

The long cry and the laying down of food are both actions, which seek to harness the realm of the sacred and incur spiritual blessing. There is a recognised leader with specialised functions and as such he also incurs benefit. One example of this is with the fishing of mullet (*o le seu anae*). Mullet are fished by using a net. Again the making of the net often involves the whole village. The fishing itself is led by the *tautai*. The flotilla follow the *tautai* beyond the reef. He is followed by great outrigger canoes, *soatau*, and behind these are the outriggers with individual fishermen. If the *tautai* notices that the fish are gathered in a particular place, he will hold up the blade of his oar as a sign and it is up to the flotilla to haul the fish in the net.\(^\text{13}\) The role of the *tautai* is to recognise where the fish are. He does not participate in the actual catching. This is clearer in the *lauloa*, which is a form of lagoon fishing in which the greater village takes part. The *tautai* however do not take part. They sit in a nearby house with kava. At the end of the fishing the largest fish is given to the *tautai* and the rest are distributed to the rest of the village. This practice has now been transformed and the ‘first fruits’ are given to the Christian pastor of a village.

Perhaps the method of fishing most regularly recorded by European observers and historians is that of bonito fishing. Bonito fishing is referred to as the sport of chiefs, although bonito themselves are not considered a ‘chiefly fish’. What is of interest,

\(^{11}\) Ibid., 34.
\(^{12}\) Personal Communication, Asofou Sa’o.
\(^{13}\) See ibid., 45.
however, is that bonito has taken a higher position than all other fish. Indeed they are not even classed as fish (i’a); rather the term used is tino, which is the same term used for the human body.\textsuperscript{14} This sort of chiefs is recorded by Demandt as being rarely practised at the time he was researching. The practice was still, however, regularly practised in Safata bay in Upolu.

The boat used for bonito fishing takes a full two months to build and the best times for bonito fishing (aloatu) are the end and beginning of the rainy season, namely in April/May and November. The bonito boat or va’alo is made from the planks of several trees. The finishing of this boat is accompanied by a feast also, which allows one to reconstruct a situation which is much more complex than what is normally done. In regard to fishing alone, the pattern appears that minor tasks, like baskets and fishhooks are blessed and a small, relatively formalised, form of blessing is used. Upon completion of larger tasks the ceremony is comparatively larger. Fertility and prosperity are called for by means of a celebration and offering. These seem to be formalised also.

In the case of the celebration of the bonito boat this is also the case. The first feast is called the fa’aiologa o le lagolago o le va’a. This is celebrated after the pieces of wood for the keel are hewn. Following further construction a smaller feast is celebrated and this is concluded with the great feast called the umu saga. The carpenter of the boat is paid in fine mats. He also receives a gift of bonito called the bonito of (the god) Tagaloa.\textsuperscript{15}

These practices confirm that the ritualistic ceremonies are designed to ensure well being and prosperity. The gods are acknowledged and the rituals seem fairly formalised, revealing a strict society, wherein specialists and chiefs receive the principal rewards.

Fishing rites are clearly established also. When a chief dies the sea is declared tabu and no fishing can take place. When the fish is divided up, the chiefs and orators receive the choicest bits. If a fish is caught, for example, at the mangrove beach of Faleata, the fish must be immediately taken to Mata’afa,\textsuperscript{16} and no i’a sa can be eaten by one who is not a chief.

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., 75.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 79.
\textsuperscript{16} Krämer, \textit{The Samoa Islands}, Vol 1, 283.
The question that needs to be addressed is whether Samoan society is so strict and formalised socially that rank is indeed the predetermining factor in all aspects of Samoan society and whether others, apart from those with specialised functions, can play a part in the harnessing of the realm of the sacred, or escape the strict rank system. Derek Freeman has emphasised the rigidity of the ‘rank system’ in society. The literature available on Samoa to the present has stressed a male dominated, rank oriented society.\textsuperscript{17} The reality however appears to be somewhat different. The following is an account wherein there is recognition of abilities that go beyond the strictures of rank.

According to Stuebel, there was a demon named Lili who was ‘worshipped in Falealili in June and sacrifices were rendered him out of gratitude that the fishes in the sea, so voracious in May and the demons in the forest had not caused any damage’.\textsuperscript{18} As noted above the beginning of the rainy season was a time of plenty. This is the best time of the year for many fish and the rain brings prosperity to the land.\textsuperscript{19}

The \textit{falealili} is a fishing competition\textsuperscript{20}. It took place every year from October to March but was most prevalent in October and November because this is a period of fertility and an overflow of foodstuffs. Stuebel’s account stresses the beginning of the rainy season while Schultz emphasises the end of the season, an anomaly that requires explanation. Schultz recounts that the competition was open not only to chiefs and orators, but also to untitled men who entered by bringing a gift of food. Chiefs also had to bring this gift of food to enter.

Tauava and Faimea are the leaders of the \textit{falealili}. These two are present in the \textit{fa'alupega of falealili}, and thus this detail allows us to go beyond Demandt, by associating actual title names with \textit{tautai}, or leading fishermen. These titles are hereditary in the same sense that other titles are hereditary. Their relationship with the chiefs, according to Schultz, is that they place their expertise in fishing and canoeing in

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{17} Even Mead, in her \textit{Ethnology of Manua}, stresses rank although her most famous publication, \textit{Coming of Age in Samoa} analyses Samoan Society as ‘free of the strictures of the Western World’, and one in which there is movement for people to be ‘free’ from the strictures of society.
\textsuperscript{18} Krämer, \textit{The Samoa Islands}, Vol 1, 375.
\textsuperscript{19} The account of the falealili is taken from Schultz, ‘Das Falealili’, \textit{Globus} Bd, XCVIII, 1910, 300ff. The account is given pretty much in full, however quotation marks have not been used as some parts have been merely summarised and the original is in German. For the full account, see the original as above.
\textsuperscript{20} Probably named from a village in Upolu, see below.
\end{flushleft}
the service of the chiefs. The Faimea occupy themselves with rod fishing, while the area of Tauava is the reef entrance, which is not only important for canoe travel, but also serves as an entrance for incoming fish at high tide. Every reef entrance comes under the control of a god, an aitu, with whom the Tauava, in the interest of his chiefs, concurs with. The word tau is an abbreviation of taula. Schultz makes the point that the Tautai is more that a mere fisherman, as he has concourse with the aitu and the Tauava is also a priest, tau(la). Both Faimea and Tauava have control over everything and through their mediation the falealili will be successful. Furthermore all participants are called ali’i ala whether they are chiefs or not.

The falealili begins on the day before the last quarter moon and ends at the new moon. The competition begins with a feast. The feast on this first day is called the pa. Schultz describes this as a blessing and food is distributed to the whole village. When this is finished the fishing begins. On this day all participants must go out to fish, no-one may remain behind. It begins at around three or four o’clock in the morning and lasts until seven or eight in the morning, or ‘bait fish’. The first day is called the fuigaumu, and signifies ‘the first dip of the rod’. After the fishing is concluded, everyone gathers in the Faitele and the kava is called the ava o le mafua, meaning small fish and figuratively refers to the fish caught in the morning. The first to drink are those who caught a fish. Even a very high chief must wait if he did not catch a fish. An untitled man would take precedence if he had caught a fish. This practice seems to dispel the idea of a rigid rank system, even if it is only in this specific context. The practice reveals not only the flexibility of the ranking matai system, but recognises skills and rewards for this. It is also reasonable to assume that this inversion of the social order had an important role in the upkeep of the title system. Traditionally the strongest candidate to accede to a title is by primogeniture. However other factors are also considered such as the amount of service rendered to the former title holder and physical and intellectual abilities. Skill in fishing and competitions such as this fishing festival would have been good indicators of those abilities. And indeed those who did catch fish received great praise.

The fish eaten are called the sami i’a. Schultz notes that this means ‘thanks for the fish’. Thanks are rendered by offering the food and asking for continued favour from the gods and is recognition that the gods have protected the fishermen through mediation by Faimea and Tauava.
Schultz stresses the religious significance of tattooing. He also states that the physical structure of a house represents fertility, with the design of posts representing the penis and the vulva. The symbolism that Schultz implies in these activities seems very tenuous. In the above translation of *sami i’a* this is may not be the case. ‘Sami can mean celebrating victory or achievement that brings honour. Schultz is right about *sami i’a* which is celebration of the catch’. Throughout the article Schultz does record the Samoan words associated with various events, like the thanksgiving meal. Most of these phrases used are very simple, in that the vocabulary is simple. Thus some examination into Schultz’ method and assumptions needs to be made. The German ethnography of the period has a lot of advantages over English missionary records, which are our other major archival source for reconstructing the past. The reason why the German material is often more useful is that in many instances, when a practice like this fishing competition is described, the original Samoan explanation is included in the publication and the German and Samoan texts are published side-by-side. In the translation of *sami i’a* Schultz has footnoted the additional explanation of the meaning being a ‘thanks’ to the gods, etc. In the original Samoan there is no accompanying explanation. Perhaps the best assumption one can make is that his understanding of this meal was that it was a meal of thanksgiving.

At midday the *falealili* gather again together for kava, which is called the *ava o le taumuli*. and means that success is hoped for on the following day. In the Samoan this statement is confirmed with the phrase ‘*o le tapuaiga lea*, which indicates that this is a blessing. In this kava ceremony both Tauava and Faimea are served the kava first.

Every other day continues much as this first one until the final feast, which is called the removal of the outrigger, as one does not fish again until the last quarter of the moon.

The next section, which is explained by Schultz, is the method of fishing in the *falealili*. The term used is *alagafaga* and he states that there are two fishing methods in the *alagafaga*, namely the *malauli* and the *taoto*. Demandt explains that the *alaga faga* is the great sport of chiefs (*o le faiva sili o ali’i, o le alagafaga*). He does not say that

---

21 Personal communication, Tupua Tamasese.
untitled men take part at all. However the method only is called alagafaga, so this particular competition is one that uses lures, which are dragged behind the canoe just as the normal alagafaga does. The two methods explained by Schultz are the malaule and the taoto. The malaule, according to Demandt is a type of fish, the caranx or black shark, although in modern Samoan, and presumably during Demandt's time, malaule are trevalli. The malaule likewise are considered great chiefly fish or i'a sa and they are caught in the lure method of fishing called the alagafaga. It is a deep-sea fishing method, and is very similar to Bonito fishing.

Both Demandt and Schultz explain the attaching of lures similarly. Schultz explains that three lures are thrown in by the ali'i a. Demandt says that there are up to seven lures used. One of these is tied to the right leg or thigh and follows along behind the right of the canoe. Another is tied to the left and travels behind the canoe in the space between the canoe and the outrigger. The third is tied onto the left arm. Schultz then explains that the bamboo fishing rod is rarely used. Of significance also is that he says only Tauava, the tautai, may use the rod. However a chief or orator may use the rod if Tauava allows it. Generally there are two parties involved. Those who get the least fish have to serve the other party with kava and do tasks like fetching water. The losers at the end must dance and sing and pay a fine of food to the winners. Again the stress is not on a strict social order but an inverse of that order. Untitled men may be served by titled men, and receive rewards from them. This removal of the normal strictures of Samoan society does not seem isolated. In this sense it serves to 'even up' the present representation of Samoa as being an extremely strict hierarchical society. Demandt notes that in Manono particularly there were many fishing expeditions to hunt for a particular shark called tanifa. One had to be extremely skilled to entrap the shark. The shark is hounded into the coastal waters and then beached. The person who first spears the fish is rewarded with the head of this fish. As stated, the normal practice is that those of superior rank receive this part of the shark. Here again physical excellence is rewarded, as are those with ability rather than rank.

---

22 Demandt, Die Fischerei, 32.
23 Demandt, Die Fischerei, 23.
In Stuebel’s account of the fishing festival in Falealili, he does not call the actual fishing the *falealili*. Falealili means literally the house of Lili.

In Falealili lives an *aitu* named Lili. He is praised in the month of June, because according to their beliefs, the fish of the sea were particularly voracious in May. The *aitu* in the forest were also particularly voracious and this could result in sickness. Offerings were made in June as a result of the fish and the *aitu* being good to them in May. The people made a *lauloa*, which was a type of fishing and searched for various forms of nourishment. Inland pigs and ripe bananas were collected, and sharks and bonito were fished for in the sea. In the daytime, offerings were made to Lili and the chiefs gathered in the *fale*. The chiefs made kava, which they drank together with the *aitu* Lili, who was offered kava and food in one corner of the house. When this was finished the whole village, men, women and children ate. This was at about eight o’clock in the morning. After the feasting the leftover food was buried in the earth and no-one ate a second meal on this day until evening. After this the children and women went to the *malae* and threw stones at one another. All the men fought with each other and many bleeding heads and bodies resulted. In the evening the offering feast was ended.

This account seems very confused. The *lauloa*, according to Demandt is a form of lagoon fishing and involves most members of the village taking part. The *falealili* fishing festival is deep-sea fishing with lures and rods. However the fish mentioned in the account by Stuebel are the shark and bonito. It is impossible to catch fish like these in the lagoon. Furthermore these fish are large and specialised skills are needed to catch them as has already been explained. Thus the term *lauloa* does not apply to these fish. However Demandt says that in this form of fishing the *tautai* did not take part. Rather they drank kava and were presented with the ‘first fruits’ of the catch, something that is now reserved for the Christian pastor of the village. The religious significance of the ritual seems consistent, i.e., that the fish were caught and offered as a food-offering to Lili, the village god. The fishing method remains unclear. Presumably Stuebel’s informant came from Falealili and the Samoan text is consistent with the German. What remains unclear then is whether there is any connection with the fishing method called

---

24 The village in Upolu. See above.
25 For the full account, see Stuebel, *Samoanische Texte*, 74.
falealili, in which the principal fish sought are shark and bonito, and this festival in Falealili where the god Lili was celebrated. Upon researching the available literature it appears that the falealili fishing competition was practised in many villages and each village had their different rules. The Falealili village may have been the origin of the festival, but this is impossible to determine. In Falealili the god is venerated. This is not the case with the falealili fishing competition.

The fish are treated, like aitu, as things to fear. They both can cause damage and sickness. The status of the fish themselves, particularly the shark and bonito are almost equated with aitu, although they are recognised as a different class of being. One would expect that this village would show other signs, which indicate the value of fish in their ordinary lives. Of particular note is the fa’alupega or honorary addresses of Faleulu, a sub-village of Falealili, which is as follows:

Greetings to Taitu’uga and Tuiloma Greetings to the birds of the mountain ridge who fish in two oceans; whether they bring little or much, they are the outriggers in the family, while Fanene’s sons are the boat.26

The imagery of the boat and the importance of food are encapsulated in this ceremonial address. Fanene is the founder of the village and in oral tradition he is viewed as having come from Fiji. Fanene, by being the village ‘founder’ takes precedence in ceremonial activities such as, kava and so on, as do his sons. They are supported by the outriggers who include other titled members of the village. Kramer also mentions that the god Lili was worshipped in the village in June and quotes Stuebel in support of this claim. No further mention is made of the aitu Lili. The festival appears to gather the best foodstuffs from the sea and land to offer in thanksgiving to the god. There is no particular emphasis on the fishing and the detail itself is obscure, when compared to other accounts.

The second section of Stuebel’s account deals with the feasting and the subsequent self-mutilation of men women and children. This is also consistent with practices associated with aitu. There are numerous accounts of self-mutilation when in the presence of or celebrating one’s own aitu. For example many aitu are perceived to be incarnate in

26 Krämer, The Samoa Islands, Vol 1, 378.
various animals. Turner recounts that if a person, whose aitu was incarnate in an owl, finding a dead owl then he would mutilate himself by severing his head with a stone.²⁷

Of interest in the self-mutilation is that it is also an inverse of the social order. It is an attempt to escape from one’s physical body and be in a different state. The pattern in the festival is to celebrate the power and protection of the aitu Lili by feasting with the best foods. This is followed by a strange act of mutilation. The ritual feasting and plentiful food celebrate physical well being. What follows is a ritual, which involves the participation of the whole assembly in a situation where spiritual well being is celebrated.

The classic work on ritual is probably that of van Gennep. He wrote that there were three phases to all ritual, which can be summarised as follows:

Separation The individual or group is separated from their normal activities and lifestyles

Liminality This is the ‘betwixt and between’ state. The individual or group in a sense do not belong to their society but do not fully belong to another. Rules are broken Gender swapping is common and many values are challenged or inverted. At this stage the person is often perceived to be dead, sacred or dangerous.

Reaggregation The individual or group rejoin the members of their society.²⁸

In Samoa the material and spiritual worlds are intimately connected. The aitu can affect the material world. In the normal situations of every day life going against the publicly accepted morality, for example stealing or not honouring the wishes of one’s sister can bring sickness or even death to the offender. There are however times when there appear to be publicly acceptable situations wherein one is allowed and even expected to invert the normal social order. A prime case relates to jesters. In the conferral of the Mata’aafa title in 1899 it is recorded that Mata’aafa’s jester sat on his right. The ceremony was very formal but when it came to the Salelesi to drink the kava at the end of the ceremony he ‘now drank, lying on the ground and having drunk, sang out long

²⁷ On the death of high chiefs also this practise was often present.
and loud, privileges which this jester and personal servant enjoys’. At the ceremony for the opening of the Catholic Cathedral a similar display of apparent ‘bad taste’ or controversial behaviour took place during the ceremonies. Churchward writes that these jesters:

suddenly stood upright and after emitting a string of the most horrid yells, rushed off the platform and commenced grotesquely capering amongst the piles of food, playing all sorts of absurd activities ... each selected what pleased them and retired with the plunder. These distinguished men were of a privileged town or family, who, for some great service in years gone by, enjoy the hereditary right of taking their choice of anything that may be seen at a ceremonial. It is said that they can take the best mat at a funeral meeting even from the corpse itself.

The most detailed account of this abrupt change from normally accepted formal behaviour to an equally acceptable behaviour which is not normally acceptable is recorded when Solf went to the King’s kava Ceremony in Fasito’outa.

The kava was made for Mata’afa and Solf saw the proceedings.

A native came quietly into the house and sat down by one of the first posts. Outside around a small rectangle of open ground sat the aumaga [group of untitled men] with tuiga [ceremonial head-dress] and nifooti [knife] a guard stood behind them .... After a preliminary rinsing of mouths the seated men began chewing ava and depositing the quids in bits of leaf. Several men, wearing headaddresses now appeared. At this point an elderly one-eyed man entered at the back of the house, and seeing the man who had previously seated himself at the front, he angrily crossed to this fellow, jerked him to his feet and forced him to the back. The old man then occupied this vacated place. The evicted man angrily expostulated: ‘Although you are my elder, yet that is my seat, Bad luck to you.’ ‘Now Charley’, exclaimed his Excellency [Solf]. You tell them that if they go a bit further with this I’ll have them both put out’. But this turned out to be a part of the performance .... During this altercation the ava was collected in the tanoa [bowl used for the mixing of Kava with water] was now brought into the house by four men wearing tuiga. Three of these sat by the bowl; the fourth squatted down directly in front of his Excellency and le Ali’i Sili [Mata’afa] with his back to them and held aloft a small cup .... Pa’o of Fasito’outa, now poured the water, standing up and holding the water shell breast high. When the infusion was completed, he crossed as though to pour the ava into the upheld cup, but merely touching the latter, without pouring the liquid and returned to the tanoa. Coming again he spilled it into it a few drops; the next time he poured about one third of the ava; and the fourth trip he filled the cup. The cupbearer now rose, crossed over to the tanoa and returned the ava with the usual long armed sweep to the Governor. The same ceremony followed with Mata’afa.

29 Krämer, The Samoa Islands, Vol 1, 220
30 Churchward, My Consulate in Samoa, 312.
The first part of the ceremony began with an altercation between an old blind man and a younger healthy one with the result that the younger man cursed the older. One of the most respectful tenets of Samoan society is respect for one's elders. In this case the man was also blind. However an inverse of the acceptable social order is present when the younger man cursed the older. Formalised ritual allows this inversion to take place and allows that the young man becomes 'someone different' in this context. Solf did not understand this. It appeared to him to be inappropriate. The formal ceremony was accompanied with formalised gestures as well. The ideal is to enhance the status of the Ali'i Sili Mata'afa. The ceremony ends with applause. However as with many other ceremonies it appears to end with an unusual ritual. This ritual was not witnessed by Solf but was explained to him. This ceremony was the ceremony of the rending and devouring of the live pig.

A leading A'ana chief [said to Solf]: 'it is too bad your Excellency cannot allow the sport. It is exceedingly funny to see the pig jumping about on three legs .... For the honour and glory of Fasito'outa, Ape secretes in his lava lava the whole saddle of pork, the last remaining piece. Then Tutuila, a new Tutuila, ... [who says] ... 'Where is the bloody pig?' Then he sees it in the fold of the siapo [lava lava] and a fierce struggle ensues between these two men. First one then the other tries to eat it ... until it is eaten or too sandy to eat'.31

The ceremony was not carried out due to Solf as it offended his sensibilities. We do, however, have a detailed explanation of the event. The formality of the proceedings at the actual distribution of the kava, and the subsequent devouring of a large pig, bear some resemblance to the feasting in the falealili festival being followed by self-mutilation. In both cases the second event is an attempt to go beyond what a normal human being is accepted as doing. The idea of this event is that the participants would be in a trance-like state, going beyond their bodies, and; as van Gennep would say, being in 'a betwixt and between state'. The participants are really in another dimension. They hurt themselves, but have the power to continue hurting themselves. The two who eat the pig have the power to eat raw uncooked meat straight from the live pig. In this sense there is a correlation between these rituals. In the first the people mutilating themselves serve to offset the sacred aitu; in the second they offset the sacredness of the high chief.

31 Ibid., 99f.
Both ceremonies also are integrally related to making a union between the physical and material world. The fruits of the earth are connected to the fruits of the supernatural world. Both kava and fish are physical elements that support the sustenance of the body. There are kava songs, which illustrate the importance of kava and fish. One kava song recalls. ‘Come now. What about the food, the serving of the kava is finished. Come hither, ye young men fetch the taro from Leva, buried bananas from Ma’afana and Afamasaga’s titbit of backbone and baked bundles of fish of the Taufa’asasa, let that be all the food of the kava’.

The highest ceremonial form of food presentation, is the ta’alolo. In the presentation the visitors approach the malae,

not in a single line or procession but in a single crowd, singing the appropriate songs and led by the Taupou or Manaia ... some or all may be armed with a typical hooked Samoan axe or knife and will advance and retire in front of the slowly approaching village ... . The leaders are sometimes accompanied by clowns or buffoons, old men and women who inject a light note into the proceedings and who act as foils to the formality and dignity of the leaders.33

In other forms of food presentation there is likewise a ‘foil’, which serves to emphasise the dignity of the assembly in rather strange ways. For example in the food presentation of the laualautasi, ‘fowls may be referred to as skinny or taro as very poor specimens. A cooked chicken may be held up and jokingly described as a rat’.34 The meaning of this is not just humour as Grattan writes, but also serves to compare the food to the company. The assembly is elevated while the food and presenters of the food are denigrated.

The clowns and buffoons are also active in times of dance. Grattan says that ‘some old lady with a leaf or twig switch will be in charge and on the watch to press forward ... before the coming of Christianity there was a great deal more licence than on these occasions’.35

32 According to Grattan, An Introduction to Samoan Custom, Western Samoa, 1948, 89.
33 Ibid.
34 Ibid., 93.
35 Ibid., 123.
During the ceremonies previously discussed, usually the day concluded with feasting or dancing. During the preparation of the turmeric, the day ends in dance. Similarly there are many instances, as outlined, where fishing nets, canoe building, festivals and so on are concluded with dance. It seems possible that these occasions of dance also serve as a ritual to harness the realm of the sacred. The situations where dances took place were often at the conclusion of a religious festival also. In this sense the jesters and buffoons may do more than serve as a foil to the dignity of the chiefs and visitors, but also lead the participants in a ritual to, in a sense, reach a liminal condition and participate in the supernatural world. The following account signifies this process. The clowns appear to mock the principal performer, in a tauluga for instance. The type of dancing of the clowns:

consists of arm, hand, finger, leg and foot movements, largely in one position, but there is no attempt of co-ordination as in group dancing. Facial gestures also figure ... and some performers produce a hissing sound. Others bend at the knees or bend over backwards, or stand on one leg while performing some of the evolutions, while a few add a clever display of knife twirling. The tempo of the music or clapping and the excitement of the performers rise as this dance nears its end or climax, and when the tauopou or other central figure considers it has gone on long enough, she bows and retires and the dance concludes. The clowning by this time has become very exaggerated in an endeavour to offset the dignity and grace of the principal performer.36

The clowning serves more than merely offsetting the principal dancer. With the clapping and excitement the participants are brought into a climactic, liminal state. It is little wonder that Grattan makes the point that prior to Christianity, gestures were more expansive than at the time he was writing. Missionary sources never give a complete account of the night dances called poula. There are however numerous references to the dance. It is described as lascivious and beyond sensibilities for publication. It is also intimately tied to what the LMS referred to as ‘heathen practices’. When the majority of missionaries write that there was a reversion to heathen ways, the reversion was embodied in reviving the poula or night dances. The available literature and archival sources do not allow a detailed account, but it can certainly be viewed as involving the participants reaching some kind of ecstasy through the dance. Turner gives an account of the drumming process in these dances. The drum is beaten with a short stick or mallet. Also employed is a ‘monotonous chant of a line or two repeated over and over

36 Ibid., 120.
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again, with no variety beyond two or three notes. They seek variety rather in time. They begin slow and gradually increase, until, at the end of ten or twenty minutes they are full of excitement.’.\textsuperscript{37}

To further the connection of some religious connection to dance and the beating of drums Turner proudly records a story in which he believed that Christianity had beaten the old ‘heathen ways’. In this case there was a fight between the pagan and the Christian party. Of note in the account is that the ‘pagan party’ did not want the drum beaten (which the Christian party were doing). The reason why this drum was not supposed to be beaten was that the ‘pagan party’ believed it would raise the ire of the gods.

The reconstruction of Samoan life in the early contact period has enabled a greater understanding of Samoan social life and rituals associated with everyday events in Samoan life. Also examined were formalised rituals like kava preparation and kava ceremonies. What appears of interest is that there exists both formal and informal practices, which relate to the supernatural world. There are formal feasts to the gods, and there is a close relationship between the material and supernatural realms. There also exist practices that allows equity in society; namely fishing competitions and so on wherein those who have talent are rewarded regardless of rank. Samoan society does value the sanctity of chiefs. However there are numerous opportunities for all members of society to harness the realm of the sacred, especially at the conclusion of festivals. Samoa was not a ‘godless’ society, but a complex society that believed not only in the sanctity of chiefs, but also a very close connection between the realms of the material and supernatural world.

\textsuperscript{37} Turner, \textit{Samoa a Hundred Years Ago and Long Before}, 211.
APPENDIX III

KRÄMER AND VON BÜLOW ON SAMOAN ORIGINS

In order to evaluate the Fijian presence, it seems appropriate to establish where the various authors do agree. Krämer and von Bülow both give accounts of Lautala who is referred to as either the Tuifiti, king of Fiji, or his son. These two sources, along with Stuebel and Turner also concur that Lautala had a great influence in Manono. The following account is from Stuebel.¹

The Samoans in Manono maintain that neither the land nor the people originate from Samoa. Rather they originate in Fiji. The inhabitants of Manono and Apolima were brought from Fiji by Lautala. He came to Samoa to make war and in the beginning his islands (Manono and Apolima) stood between Tutuila and Manu’a. When Lautala had fought a few wars he did not want to stay with his islands in this location because of the large distance between Tutuila and Manu’a. Therefore he set his islands between Tutuila and Upolu. But when Lautala saw that here likewise there was a large distance between these islands, he set his islands between Upolu and Savai’i.

Lautala had many wars with the Samoans and many Samoans were killed as Lautala was a great warrior. When Lautala and his people counted the slain Samoans, they found that there were ten thousand (Many more than could be counted) hence the saying ‘Ua gogo le Faitau’ – they could count no more. Therefore the origin of the island of Lautala was Managogo, hence Manono.

What is important in this account, apart from Lautala fighting and subduing the original Samoans, is the movement from east to west. This movement from the east (Manu’a) to the west (Savai’i) was the same direction that Pili, son of Tagaloalagi travelled in his settlement of Samoa.

In the creation story told by Sa’u, a chief of Apolima, Lautala is replaced by the Tuifiti. Sa’u states that once Samoa was like a giant or spirit. There was a king of Fiji named the Tuifiti who came to Samoa and took a wife. He returned to his homeland and his wife bore him two sons, Gogo and Sa’uma. Tuifiti became angry with his sons and they decided to return to Samoa. Salevao, the spirit, saw them and said he would go with them after swallowing up some rocks and stones of Fiji. He also swallowed some pigs

¹ Stuebel, Samoanische Texte, 105. This account was also published in Stuebel’s Tala o le Vavau: Myths and Legends of Samoa, which was translated by Brother Hermann. However in this account some detail has been excluded. Krämer in Die Samoa-Inseln also quotes heavily from Stuebel but likewise detail has been left out. The following is a more full translation of the text.
and that is how pigs came to Samoa. When they reached Samoa between the two big islands of Upolu and Savai’i, Tagaloalagi, the spirit of Samoa, suddenly came out of the water and stood before their boat and told Saolevao to ‘vomit up your soil here’. This became the home of Gogo, hence Manono. Sa’uma received Apolima. In the fa’alupega of Apolima today Sa’uma is the first to be greeted. It is this link to Fiji, which allows him this respect.

Other accounts also link Manono and Apolima to Fiji. Turner gives four different accounts. The first is that Lautala came from Fiji to war. He went to Manono first and then went to Upolu to subjugate it. Another account is similar to that of Stuebel wherein Lautala came to make war. He went first to Manu’a, then Tutuila, Upolu and finally Manono. Another tradition from Manono refers to Lautala as Tuilautala (King Lautala). His son, Nono, came with his father’s brother Sa’uma and the atua of Fiji, Tupuivao – presumably this is meant to be Saolevao – to Manono. They came because of an argument about fish in their country and arrived at an island between Upolu and Savai’i. Tagaloalagi told them not to land on Upolu or Savai’i so Tupuivao (the god), produced land that he had swallowed in Fiji and Manono and Apolima came to be. The final account he gives is that from Apolima which is similar to the account from Sa’u above. Its only major addition is that Manono made a sua (a presentation of food) for the Tuifiti and his brother chiefs. However they did not give him any fish, so the Tuifiti got angry with them. Apolima however managed to stay on the Tuifiti’s good side.

Turner says that Lautala slew the gods in Manono who had torn his fishing net to pieces. Again it must be understood that the gods are a symbolic way of representing the people who were the followers of, or were associated with the god of the area – in this case the previous people of Manono.

Krämer also concedes that Lautala came to Samoa, possibly in search of his wife, Laufafafetoga], who was now living again with her former husband Tupa’i. He found her living with Tupa’i and proclaimed war against him. Lautala was caught by the

---

2 Ronald Rose, South Seas Magic, (London, 1959), 53f.
3 Turner, Samoa a Hundred Years Ago. The Samoan translation can be found in Siaosi Tana, O Samoa Anamua – lomia i le Tausaga 1884, New Zealand, 1962, 167.
4 Turner, Samoa a Hundred Years Ago, 229
fisherwoman Sasa’umani in her net. He named the island Manono after the countless number of Samoans slain there.\(^5\)

Krämer does not take into account that Samoan explanations will refer to a single individual or god as a representative of a wider group of people. We should take that into account the success of Lautala’s warfare indicates more than one individual. Lautala here means Lautala, possibly the king of Fiji or his son, together with his retinue. Von Bülow recognises this form of historical representation and thus attributes a far larger invasion of Fijians. As with *tala* associated with Nafanua, Lautala is not an isolated individual. Historical happenings in *tala* are a form of historical presentation in ‘shortened form’. The listener is meant to understand the wider context associated with these individuals.

Another problem with Krämer’s account is with timing. He says that Lautala was caught in Sasa’umani’s net. Sasa’umani, according to Krämer, is the sister of Sinasa’umani. The latter had been caught with a net by Tagaloa aui.\(^6\) Krämer refers to Sinasa’umani as a demonic woman who married Tagaloaaui, and bore to him among others, the boy Taetagalao, the first Tuimanu’a according to Powell’s informant.\(^7\) Sasa’umani, according to this tradition lived at the time of the first Tuimanu’a. She is described as the great fisherwoman of olden times and the friend of the Fe’e who lived at Ta’u. How could it be that she also caught Lautala in her net? There is however another tradition of Sasa’umani, which Krämer does not record. Lealali united with Pugai and produced ten sons and one daughter all named Sasa’umani. The son of Puapunavai and Lefe’e joined the brothers and sister as an adopted brother and was named Sa’umani afa ese.\(^8\) As is common with stories relating to these key figures at the beginning of the genealogies, claims are made from rival factions. Lealali who seems to have originally been associated with Savai’i, is rivalled by the followers of Tagaloalagi.

There is yet another problem with timing. The most obvious answer is that the Fijian connection predated Lautala who married Laufalaetoga. Lautala, the historic being in the genealogy, is linked to events previous to his time. This is most clear in the link with Saolevao, said to be the Fijian god. Lautala is thus linked with an earlier migration

\(^5\) Krämer, *Die Samoan-Inseln*, Vol 1, 81. Krämer is here quoting the Stuebel account.
\(^6\) Krämer, *Die Samoan-Inseln*, Bd 2, 167.
\(^7\) Krämer, *Die Samoan Inseln*, Bd. 1, 15.
with Saolevao as the principal godhead. The other major version of the peopling of Manono refers to Saolevao. The apparent influence of the historical being, Lautala, is limited to Manono and his children to the villages in Savai‘i of Matautu, Sataua and the district of Salega. Saolevao, on the other hand, is known throughout most of Samoa. The movement of the island from east to west likewise gives some indication of the extent of influence of Lautala or more probably to a time preceding Lautala. It is also noteworthy that Tagaloalagi is threatened by him. This refers to Manu’a being threatened by this new migration and in the account mentioned Tagaloa reduces his movements.

As we have concluded that Saolevao is connected with Fiji, it would be helpful to test the Fijian migration thesis against Saolevao’s place in the genealogy and his range of influence. According to Krämer, Saolevao was originally venerated between Sataua and Asau, Savai‘i. He became the district god of Tuamasaga, Upolu, when he was brought over from Savai‘i by Li’o. Krämer furthermore states that Saolevao went into the body of Li’o like Nafanua into that of Auva’a at Falealupo.

Krämer’s main argument for the primacy of Manu’a is that Tagaloalagi halted in the mala‘e of Alamisi at Samata on the west coast of Savai‘i. Krämer considers therefore that Samata is one of the oldest settlements in Savai‘i as it is mentioned in the creation story, whereby Tagaloalagi is mentioned in connection to this mala‘e in the first Manua song. However Krämer also mentions that the guardian spirit of Samata is Saolevao.

Krämer also refers to Saolevao as the guardian spirit of Asau. The fa‘alupega of Asau begins; ‘Welcome to the difficult family of Lafai’. Krämer assumes that this refers to the founder of Asau, Tupap’ilaefao, the son of Lafai who ‘as a priest of Saolevao ruled very dreadfully’. Sataua likewise is recorded as the home of Saolevao and Krämer records that once when Saolevao was badly treated by a travelling party in Sataua, he caught all the souls of the travelling party in Sataua with his net in the night. As a result in the morning all those of the party were found lying dead on their headrests.

9 Krämer, Die Samoa-Inseln, Vol 1, 40.
10 Ibid., 41.
11 Ibid., 78.
12 Powell and Pratt, 111; Krämer, Die Samoa Inseln, 78.
13 Ibid., 135.
14 Turner, 23 and 49; Krämer, Die Samoa Inseln, Vol 1, 137.
The large village of Falealupo, according to Turner, was named by Saolevao. In this account a couple from Tonga lived in Falealupo together with their lame son. This son could only sit on a rock and catch Lupo fish therefore the *aitu* Saolevao named the place Falealupo.\(^{15}\)

The most obvious conclusion to be reached from this material is that Saolevao seems to be linked with Lautala and it was this god Saolevao who overtook protection of the villages of the Tupa’i brothers and Laufafaetonga, as well as the villages of their sons and grandsons. Krämer’s main evidence that Savai’i was settled from and organised by Manu’a is the connection of Tagaloa with Samata in the creation song. Yet we find the god Saolevao also appears as the guardian spirit at Samata. It is also possible to conclude that the Fijian connection is substantial with Lautala (or Saolevao) being responsible for a large amount of killing in Manono, Sataua and Safe’e, where Lautala originally landed.

The dating of Saolevao is difficult. Saolevao probably preceded Lautala at least in terms of the genealogies. In the Krämer genealogies Saolevao appears twice; once as the brother of Saveasi’uleo, father of Nafanua, and once in the very beginning of creation. In the creation story Saolevao features as the son of Moa, meaning centre of the earth. Moa is the result of the union of the rocks and the earth. In the explanation Saolevao is described as the god of the rocks who provided water for washing the newborn and made the water sacred.\(^{16}\)

In a genealogy recorded by Gurt,\(^{17}\) Saolevao becomes the brother of Pili, who is said to have gone to Aopo and organised Savai’i politically, thus well predating Lautala. What is even more surprising perhaps is that in this genealogy he is said to be one of the sons of Tagaloalagi. However this is not the only genealogy that records Saolevao as a son of Tagaloalagi. Another genealogy records Saolevao as being a descendant of Tagaloalagi. His sister is named Ilalegalega. Saolevao is described as the chief of Pulotu. Ilalegalega gave the staff to Leapaitausilinu’u, from which sprouted the stem of kava.

---

\(^{15}\) Turner, 227.
\(^{16}\) Turner, 10; Krämer, *Die Samoa-Inseln*, Bd. 1,14
\(^{17}\) MS – Papers – 0056 (Gurt) 28, 13 and 16, ATL.
In both these genealogies Saolevao is already deified and connected with the Tagaloa line. In both he is ancient, being placed very early on in the genealogy. He is removed in conceptual time from the historic human being, Lautala. Of interest also is that kava is said to have sprung from the staff of the sister of Saolevao. Normally the bringing of kava is reserved for Taema and Tilafaiga who swam over from Fiji with it. Also Saolevao in the latter genealogy has become the Tuipolotu or king of Pulotu, the place normally reserved for Saveasi’uleo.

Saveasiuleo, in the majority of genealogies I have consulted, is portrayed as the brother of Saolevao. Krämer also links the two as brothers. The major result of these versions is that powerful ancient ancestral figures are linked to other origin figures. The merging of traditions allows one to bring these powerful figures into one’s own genealogical tree at a very early date, whether or not they existed in any comparative period in an historical sense. The multiple claims by various Samoan tala for originary figures reveals that the primary aim is to claim these individual god-like ancestors as their own. Certainly Saolevao is one such figure. The ethnologists Krämer and von Bülow, as well as other ethnographers in the early 1900s were very concerned about establishing a typography of the Pacific and were concerned with linkages to try to prove certain connections to the wider Pacific. They were also concerned with attempting to establish a quite distinctive ‘historical’ time period. Saolevao is either said to be of Fijian origin, which would support the von Bülow thesis, or conversely as belonging to the line of Tagaloalagi which would support the Krämer thesis. If the latter were closer to the truth some problems would be resolved. If Saolevao was linked to Tagaloalagi then there is no problem with Samata, claimed by Krämer to be one of the first settlements in Savai’i – settled from Manu’a – and Saolevao being the godhead of this place. However there remain unsolved problems if he is the son of Tagaloalagi for as we have noted Saolevao, a godhead from Fiji linked with Lautala and Nonu, was confronted by Tagaloalagi and told to move his islands.

Another confusing possibility is that, according to Krämer, one of Lealali’s children, from his first marriage in A’ana, Upolu, was called Saolevaoononu which could well be a composite of the god of the Fijians, and the son of Lautala. Saolevaoononu in the fa’alupega today is one of the orators in the Faleupolu (Family of nine) who decide upon the high title Tui A’ana.

What is certain is that as a god, he was influential over a large geographical area. He is also one of the few gods who were still invoked during the wars of the 1870s and is recorded by missionary commentators. The followers of Saolevao consulted him in
times of war and he used the vessel of Li’o in Siumu to make his wishes known. Also by being claimed by rival factions indicates the importance of this god.

The genealogies, covering the time of both the first recorded human beings and the time of the gods are representative of a vast extension back in time. If one is searching for a lineal concept of time in these periods, or trying to prove true ‘facts’ of history, it will be a thankless task.

It is now commonly accepted that genealogies will be changed or added to in order to support the claim of one faction over another. The social or political basis of religious belief is likewise subject to this process. The evidence of a connection with Fiji seems to be strong and outweighs the position of Saolevao as son of Tagaloalagi. The fact that he is incorporated into the Tagaloa genealogy is not necessarily a major problem in terms of political religious belief. Saolevao, by being connected into the Tagaloa genealogy becomes a validation for the strength of the Tagaloa line. Saolevao, a god venerated in large parts of Samoa, while originally a Fijian god – or even possibly at one stage a real human migrant from Fiji, becomes transformed under the control of the dominant Tagaloalagi tradition.

Lautala likewise seems to be of Fijian origin and the major recorders of tradition refer to him as either the Tuifiti or simply Lautala. The Tuifiti’s status as a god seems to be limited to the village of Matautu. The Tuifiti represents a much wider range of people than Lautala but it does appear that there is a possibility that the earthly existence of Lautala carries on after his death in the form of the god Tuifiti.

Krämer, in following von Bülow, does concede that the children of Lautala, namely Utu (tauofiti), Taua and Lega established the villages of Matautu, Sataua and Salega. The village of Matautu, where the god Tuifiti is still venerated, provides an excellent example of how one group of Samoans recognise their ancient Fijian origins.

Matautu is a village on the itu o tane side of Savai’i. Krämer, in his massive work, Die Samoa-Inseln, gives us a short explanation of the area and the religious symbols and aitu venerated. Matautu was supposedly organised politically by Ututauofiti, the son of a Tongan woman, Laufafa, and the Fijian chief Lautala. Stuebel does not mention the aitu Tuifiti but Turner says that ‘the god Tuifiti also enjoyed special veneration here
and appeared like Sama'eafe of Saleimoa, in the form of a woman, of a man or even a dog. He dwelt in the ifilele tree'.

Krämer, to give further evidence of the existence of the Tuifiti, meaning ‘King of Fiji’ quotes the *fa’alupega* of Matautu which begins: Greetings to you shaggy body, which refers to the incarnation of the Tuifiti, who is said to appear in the form of a dog-like animal. This explanation, in which the major European published sources, except von Bülow, agree, does allow us to draw some conclusions. The evidence given does reveal that *aitu* play a physical role in the material world by, in this case, taking human form and secondly, there is respect given to the Tuifiti because he is in the *fa’alupega*.

The *fa’alupega* is basically a potted history of a village or area. It refers to the major personages and family lines that originally populated the village and those who came later to the village, often through marriage alliances. It also is an indication of rank in the village and must be recited correctly by *tulafale* when, for example, it is addressed publicly by one village to another.

The most comprehensive account of the Tuifiti is from von Bülow. He argues that under the Tuifiti’s control, the expedition of Taua, Utu and Lega came from Fiji to Papa, a village of Sataua Savai’i. They landed and carried on a great war in order to ‘get elbow room’. Regarding Matautu and the Tuifiti he says that ‘the place in which the fighting took place in Matautu is holy (*heilig*), who even now, through the family Aloaina is defended or represented’.

In this comprehensive account we can go a lot further in our understanding of the *aitu* Tuifiti. As mentioned, Turner says the god Tuifiti was venerated in Matautu. Von Bülow asserts that the Tuifiti – the King of Fiji – was at some stage alive or at the very least had a physical bodily existence. The assumption would however lend itself to the conclusion that the Tuifiti was a person and at some stage changed from a powerful human being to a powerful *aitu*.

---

18 Krämer, *Die Samoa – Inseln*, Bd. I, (1902), 158. Also see Turner, *Samoa; A Hundred Years Ago and Long Before*.
19 Ibid.
20 von Bülow, ‘Die Bemuhungen um die Feststellung der Urheimat der Polynesier’, *Globus*, 90, (1906) II.
In a letter to Solf the Governor during the German Administration of Samoa from 1900-1914, the tulafale or talking chief, Aloaina of Matautu, argues against the Ta’ita’i Itu\(^{21}\) of his area who was infringing on Aloaina’s traditional rights. He gives the history of Matautu and those inherited rights.\(^{22}\)

In this he explains that Laufafaetoga, daughter of the Tuitoga stayed with Lautala, son of the Tuifiti and had three children – Utu, Taua and Lega. These three children established the three villages of Matautu (Utu), Sataua (Taua), and Salega (Lega), on a trip through Savai’i with the Tuifiti. There ensued warfare with the original inhabitants and these people were superseded by the son of the Tuifiti. The Tuifiti is described then as an ao title – which means a title of very high rank associated with a district – like the Tuiatua (principal chief of the district of Atua) or the ao of the Tonumaip’a. Tuifiti is described here as being both part person and part aitu. The ground of the malae, meaning here residence is now the place of residence of Aloaina and it is his duty to respect the sacred grounds of the Tuifiti. Aloaina says that this duty continues to the present day (1902 the letter was written). Furthermore Aloaina describes himself as the ata or fa’atusa of the Tuifiti.

Given this information we can see a firm relationship between traditional leadership and aitu, by Aloaina describing himself as the ata\(^{23}\) or fa’atusa of the Tuifiti. He and Sava become the ‘shadow’ or the ‘same’ as the Tuifiti. Here Aloaina declares that he becomes the Tuifiti. When possessed by the Tuifiti he becomes a ‘shadow’ of him. He further argues that it is his responsibility to the present day to make known the will of the Tuifiti.

What can be ascertained in this letter by Aloaina himself is that he does become the Tuifiti, and that this is prestigious. He has certain rights because of this and that is why he complains to Solf. We also have a clear case of a title whose special function is interpreting the will of the Tuifiti. The problem with many stories and missionary

\(^{21}\)Ta’ita’i Itu being the elected Government official in the area.

\(^{22}\)German Administration Papers – GAP, XVII.c.3, Vol 1, o le tala Fa’amatautu in Gilson Papers, RSPAS, ANU.

\(^{23}\)Cain in Aitu, 28, describes ata along with aitu, Tupua, Atua, Agaga, Saual’i, Auo and Sa’au as different words for spirit. He quotes Otto Dempwolff to describe ata as being of Indonesian origin meaning man or slave – often means shadow and is used in everyday Samoan today for photo or picture and mirror. In this case I interpret it to mean shadow as stated in text.
evidence is that events are recorded but no names are given. In the above evidence we also have a name and explanation of the relationship between aitu and tagata.

In the fa'alupega that is used presently in Matautu, the Tuifiti is still acknowledged in the same form quoted by Krämer. In other words he is still very much part of the village. As a result of fieldwork the author found the place where the Tuifiti as aitu dwells is the Ifilele tree, which is about two hundred yards from the shore. He still enters the body of tulafale in the village and speaks to the village in this way.
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GLOSSARY

agaga- disembodied spirit which can enter the material world, the soul.

'aiga- the family, extended family or clan.

aitu – deceased ancestral spirit who can return to and play a part in the material world, e.g., Nanaua.

alataua- 1. Geographical districts. The alataua in Savai’i are Satupa’itea and the triple union of Neiafu, Falelima and Tu’ufuafoe. In Upolu there is an alataua in Safata. There is also a region in Tuvalu named alataua.
2. Term used for those orator – priests who have a spiritual function. The alataua are spirit mediums and are able to obtain counsel from the gods.

ali’i – Chief (genealogical descendant of ancestral founder of the title).

aloali’i- The ‘sons of the chief’, referring to all the sons of Galumalemana of Sa Tu’ua.

alo o ali’i- Term used to indicate inheritance of title based on primogeniture.

ao- District titles. Similar to the papa titles. The most well known of the ao titles are the Tonumaipe’a, Tagaloa, Lilomaia, Malietoa and Mata’a’afa titles.

fa’alupega Honorific or ceremonial address. Quoted publicly at village and district meetings. Includes the major title-holders and families of the village/district.

fagogo- celebrated stories which use both prose and song.

failauga- another term for orator or tulafale.

Faipule – Literally one who rules, district representatives, the lower house of parliament.

Fautua – Leading members of families. From 1913-1963, the Fautua were Tu’ua Tamasese, Mata’a’afa or Tuimaleali’ifano and Malietoa, representing Sa Tu’ua and Sa Malietoa.

feagaiga- A sacred relationship that exists between brother and sister, wherein the brother has temporal power and the sister spiritual power. The relationship extends to the aitu of the sister or wife’s family over that of her husband. The modern feagaiga relationship also extends to the relationship between God and
human beings, and most particularly between the Pastor and his flock.

fonofono - Council meeting of matai – held at village and district level.

gafa - genealogy or family tree.

ifoga - The ritual plea for forgiveness (essentially humiliating oneself before those you have offended and leaving it up to the offended party to accept your humble actions and pardon you).

Laumua- The principal place of influence of the orator groups in the Malietoa districts in Tuamasaga, namely Auimatagi (Malie) and Tuisamau (Afega). Also termed Tumua.

Lotu - Worship involving Christianity, including syncretist religions such as Siovili. The most common Lotu are Lotu Toga (Wesleyanism), Lotu Taiti (LMS) and Lotu Pope/Katoliko (Catholicism).

lotulotu - To worship or practice Christianity.

malae – The central meeting place of a village.

malaefono – Meeting of the chiefs of a village.

Malo – The dominant party or faction, victorious in war [as opposed to the Vaivai, the conquered] also seat of government.

matai – Titled head of a family.

Mau – Opinion/resolution. Can also be in opposition to the status quo, i.e., the Mau o Lauaki or Mau o Pule against the abolition of the Ta‘imua office in 1905, during the German Administration.

Mavaega- Last will and testament. The dying wishes of the title-holder are whispered to the successor to that title, indicative that there is a spiritual function in the passing of one title-holder to the nest. The new title-holder becomes, in a sense, the embodiment of his/her predecessor and all those who preceded him or her.

Nu‘u – Village.

Pa‘ia- ‘consecrated’ or holy, as in sacred chiefs (ali‘i pa‘ia).

papa- The four titles said to be needed to attain national leadership. These are the principal district titles of Atua and A‘ana entitled Tuiatua (Tui Atua) and Tuia‘ana (Tuia‘ana) respectively. The other to papa are the Gatoaitele and Tamosoali‘i.

papalagi – Europeans.
pule – Authority, Rule.

Pule – Leading orators of Savai’i.

Pulotu- The underworld or ‘mirrorworld’. The ‘king’ of this mirrorworld is Savea Si’uleo, the father of Nafanua.

Sa - Family as in (aiga) Sa Malietoa or (aiga) Sa Tupuā.

sa - taboo (tabu): Sacred; restricted.

tafai’fa – The holders of the four titles normally needed for national leadership namely the tamatane papa, Tuiatua and Tuia’ana, as well as the tamafafine papa, Gatoaitele and Tamasoalii. Traditionally the rights to bestow the papa are represented by the two orator-priests who sit to the right and left of the papa titleholder.

taupou- Village belle, the daughter of a chief who performs ceremonial functions.

Tupua – Sa Tupua, or lineage/family of the Tupua line. Heirs to the Salamasina/Tonumaipe’a a inheritance.

tupua - Ancestral spirit.

Ta’imua and Faipule - The Ta’imua were the highest ranking chiefs; both tulafale of Tumua and Pule as well as the tama’aiga. The Faipule were representatives of village and district areas. – Also high-ranking ali’i.

tama’aiga – Essentially royal sons. Fashioned after the alo’alii, also termed the ‘royal sons’ but includes chiefs of families in Sa Malietoa.

tamaha/tamas- Literally the ‘sacred child, who has rights and privileges due to this designation. Termed after the sister’s children and indicates an extension of the special spiritual rights of those children. The Tongan form tamaha indicates that this child outranks the Tuitoga and/or the Tuitoga fefine.

tulafale – Orator. (also tula)

tamafafine - Female genealogical line ensuring rights and privileges based upon traditional spiritual role of the sister and maternal relatives, having spiritual power. E.g., the female lines were granted the first fine mats (i.e., toga) after a burial.

tamafafine papa – The ‘female papa’. The origins lie with Sa Malietoa descendants Gatoaiteie and Tamasoali’i.
Tumua – Traditionally the orator groups of Leulumoega (the faleiva or the House of Nine) and Lufilufi (the faleono or the group of six) in A’ana and Atua respectively. Also now can include the Laumua, the orator groups of Malietoa; Aumatagi of Malie (House of seven (sometimes eight) and Afega, the Tuisamau of Tuamasaga.

Tupu – Literally the ‘grown one’, the regent, both male and female. Sometimes now applied to HH. Malietoa Tanumafili II as sole head of state.

va’a - Literally boat, also means Malo. Many of the honorific addresses refer to spiritual leadership of the government (Malo) e.g., in the Nafanua line, va’a’iti and va’a’afa’atau refer to councilors/orators who converse with Nafanua to ensure success and dominance in Samoan politics. Another term associated with a spiritual or shamanic role, especially in the curing of disease is taula’aitu (anchor of the spirits).

( va’a’iti, va’a’afa’atau, taula’aitu)

Notes 1. Long vowels have not been indicated in Samoan words throughout the text.
2. For a more comprehensive account relating to modern interpretations of terms due to the introduction of Christianity (see Appendix I).