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Abstract

This thesis is a study of the legitimation of economic and political power in Tonga as a critique of Kauhala'uta and Kauhalalalo social moieties. It adopts a socio-historical method of approach but logical considerations inform every aspect of the analysis. This is done in the conviction that logic and fact do not clash but converge and concur at every point such that when they clash we should take it as a sign that either our logical theory needs revision or our observation of the actual process has been amiss. In this, I follow the main lines of the critique of illusions, romanticism, and personalism developed in the philosophical realism of John Anderson.

As the central issue of my thesis is legitimation, I have asked whether the evidence and logic square with each other. First, whether the development of legitimation language is later than the social facts, for example, later than the power which the language is designed to legitimate, as seems to be the implication in the relevant literature, or, second, whether the legitimation language has an origin different from that of the social reality it is usually associated with.

I have chosen to begin with a brief introductory history of Tongan society based on my interpretation of the origin myth of the first local putative Tu'i Tonga "King of Tonga". The myth introduces the fact that the history of Tonga is what the
senior chiefs say. This is shown in the myth through the household advice given to the local Tu'i Tonga by his Samoan older half brothers, Faleua and Falefaa, on how to rule. But, this household advice is just the inverse of an actual event recounted in the myth whereby the younger local Tu'i Tonga is murdered by his senior half brothers. So, the myth, then, is about committing a wrongdoing which leads to a socio-political reformation. Household advice in practice is murdering, so as to build a new nation.

To illustrate this new nation building process, I take into consideration the works of the 19th Tu'i Kanokupolu, King George Taufa'aahau Tupou I (-1797-1893), and the 21st Tu'i Kanokupolu, Queen Salote Mafilo Pilolevu Tupou III (1900-1965), showing a Tu'i Kanokupolu implosion of his senior Tu'i Tonga and Tu'i Ha'atakalaua power. The main indication of this implosion is the replacement of the senior Tu'i Tonga household advisory system with the nineteenth-twentieth century Tupou dynasty's manipulated written history. King George Taufa'aahau Tupou I, the subject of chapter 2, presented his written version with the introduction of his 1875 Constitution. Similarly, in chapter 3, Queen Salote Tupou III reinforced her great, great grandfather's Constitutional principles in her confused lau 'eiki and fie 'eiki styles of genealogical poetry.

The theme, of course, promoted in this thesis, is a historical study of the struggle for power, in various forms of dualism, between the Tu'i Tonga and his people on top and the Tu'i Kanokupolu and their people below. The situation, as always
many-to-one, has been perpetuated by the synthesizing universal role of moiety division in constantly igniting the perilous conflict of interests between the two.
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Figure 1
(Bott 1982:153, Figure 31)
Figure 1(b)
(Bott 1982:154, Figure 31[b])

Tamah Lārūfuipeka's marriage to Tuita Kahomovailahi

Tamah Lārūfuipeka, d Tu'ilakepa Lalānupulu and TTF Nanisipau'u
- Tuita Kahomovailahi, s Tuve Polutele & 'Anaaukhesina, d Ngalumoeauulu and Siu'uluva

- Makahokovalu
  - Q Tupou
    - Fangasa, d TT Lauflilonga & Siulolovao
  - Yuki
    - O Mafihape
  - Q Lātūnuiua
    - (1) TK Tupoumalohi
      - (2) TT Lauflilonga
  - Lātō'dusia
    - Talia'uli
  - Q Lātō'alafo'ouika
    - (1) Vaka'utapela, s Tupouha'a'apai & Fatafehi Ho'oeva
      - (2) 'Anaaukhesina, s TK Tu'i'ihalafasi

- Tuita
  - 'Ulukivaiola
    - Aiu Ha'a'apai, d Avaalu Naufauhu, s Finaufini
  - Malakai
    - Lauulou
      - O Halaeva, s Mata'aho
  - Setauki Mūmūi (1)
    - O Tu'i-fangaturia, d TT Lauflilonga
  - Manumata'onga (2)
    - Moalapau'u

- Q'Anakaihe
  - Tui Tafua, s Fetafehi
  - Q'Anakaihe
    - Tui Tafua, s Fetafehi

- Q'Anakeini Q'Anakeini
  - FP Matekitonga
    - Utemolipala
      - O Melepuiasi, d FP Matekitonga & Tupou'ahau
  - Q'Anakeini Q'Anakeini
    - FP Matekitonga
      - Utemolipala
        - O Melepuiasi, d FP Matekitonga & Tupou'ahau

- Tuita 'Isi'ihi
  - Tikiau, s Fanta & Fangasa
    - Q Sinioa
      - V'ehala, s Fatafehi
  - Q Vika
    - Tui Tafua, s Fetafehi

- Tuita Lauflilonga
  - Fetafehi, d Vilai
    - V'ehala, s Fetafehi
  - Leleia
    - Hahano, d Tp
  - Tungi'ahalaga
    - TK Siaosi Ha'amea, d Vaea (no children)
  - Ma'ulupeko'oofoa
    - Q Piolevu, s TK Tu'ipou'ahau
      - Tupou IV & Halaeva, s Mata'aho

- Ma'ulupeko'oofoa
  - Q Piolevu, s TK Tu'ipou'ahau
    - Tupou IV & Halaeva, s Mata'aho

- Ma'ulupeko'oofoa
  - Q Piolevu, s TK Tu'ipou'ahau
    - Tupou IV & Halaeva, s Mata'aho
Figure 1(c)
(Bott 1982:155, Figure 31[c])

Tamah Látufuipeka’s marriage to Leka Kiuve’etaha (Tu’alau)

- Tamah Látufuipeka, d Tu’ila’akepa Látúnipulu and TTF Nanisipau’u = Leka Kiuve’etaha (also called Tu’alau)

- Látuhóleva = TP ‘Uluvalu, s TP Lekauamoana & To’e’umu

- Tuputupu = FU-‘i-Puono, “Tuapasi”

- Fanetupouvava’u = Sunia Mafile’o, s Ulakai

- Melesi’ilikutapu = Tuku’a’ho, s Tungi Halatuituia and ‘Anaseini Tupouveihola

- Tungi Mailefihi = TK Sālote Pilolevu, Tupou III

- TK Tāufa’āhau Tupou IV
  Tu’i Kanokupolu
  Tungi
  Tupouto’a

- TP Sione Ngu

- Sione Lamipeti = Q’Alilia, d Tapuelelelu, s Avala Naufahu, s Finau Fisi and Afu, d Niukapu, s Luani

- Anaukihesina = Siosaia Lausi’i, s Ma’afu Siotami

- Ma’afu ‘Unga = Peti
Succession of Tu'i Tonga from 'Ulukaikima (Tele'a) to Laufili Tonga (The male foot are italicised. Note that Tu'i Tonga Paulaho succeeded before his elder brother Malau'aekotoa. Tu'i Tonga are put at left regardless of a generation to the Tu'i Tonga Pefeni)

'ULUAKIMATA (TELE'A)

FATAFEI = Koloa/Toonga, d TH Mo'unga-o-tonga

KAL'ULLIFONUA = Ta'ale, d TH Porofili

'TULUAKIMATA = Tolofa

TU'IPULOTU'I-LANGITU'OFEFAA

PAKANA'ANA'U

TU'IPULOTU'I-LANGITU'OFEFAA

MA'ULUPEKOTOFA = Mo'unga'o-taka, d TH Fe'ako'mo'elangipu

MA'ULUPEKOTOFA = Mo'unga'o-taka, d TH Fe'ako'mo'elangipu

TAMAHU LA'I-FAKUIKO

LA'UFI'IPEKA = TK Tupou'atini

LEIKU'UEEA

LAUIFILI'TONGA = Lutepo'apu'u, d Malau'aekotoa (The Tama Taulaha)

UFEAI = Tupou'u, d Niu'ataihoaroa

KALAIevaha = 'Ungana, d Kioa

Suehi Pango = Fotofili

D 1935

KALAIevaha Fotofili
Figure 4

(Bott 1982:14, Figure 3)
Figure 5

(Bott 1982:130, Figure 21)

Origin of the titles of Ha'a Havea and Ha'a Havea Si'i (Ha'a Havea and Ha'a Havea Si'i titles underlined. Note membership of Lauke title through woman, Toafilimo'ungu)

TK MATAELTU'APIKO — 3rd TK

- Papa, d Tu'i Haka'mea
- 'Umuksia, d Tu'i ha'atungua
- Tali'hui Tu'ilimala
- Patafehi, d Tu'i Tonga
- 5 other wives

Ha'oka Ma'afatu'umalihi

- TK Vuna
- TK Mataeleha'amea
- Fohe
- Q Toafilimo'ungu
- Paleksa

Tu'ivakano

Longolongu-atumai
Fielakepa

Ika

Leava

Teceu

Mo'omotu—sent to Ha'a Ngala as representative of Ha'a Havea and got absorbed by Ha'a Ngala

Mohulamupangai

Ha'a Havea Si'i
Figure 6

(Bott 1982:152, Figure 30)

Senior and junior lines of Kanokupolu chiefs: Ngalumotutulu, Tupou'ila, Ma'aluaki, and Mumui (For reasons of space, siblings are put one underneath the other.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TK Ma'afu-Tu'iponga</th>
<th>TK Tupou'ila*</th>
<th>TK Ma'aluaki</th>
<th>TK 'Anaukhesina</th>
<th>TK Muli</th>
<th>Popua'uli'uli, d Paleisana and Toaifilome'unga (kisenome marriage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TK Mu'a</td>
<td>TK Mu'a</td>
<td>TK Mu'a</td>
<td>TK Mu'a</td>
<td>TK Mu'a</td>
<td>TK Mu'a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siu'ula, d Mafupu' ('Uliga)</td>
<td>(1) Founuku d Tokemoona</td>
<td>(1) Lupemetai, d THT Tungi-mana'ai</td>
<td>(1) Tupou'moheofofai</td>
<td>(1) 'Aleamotu'a</td>
<td>(1) Tu'imala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Lupemetai d THT Tungi-mana'ai</td>
<td>(2) Langilangi-ha'aluma</td>
<td>(2) Mu'a</td>
<td>(2) Mafu'u</td>
<td>(2) Lepolo, d Ala</td>
<td>(2) Tuku'aho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q'Ulukilupetea</td>
<td>Tu'i'hala'afatai</td>
<td>*Muli'kia'ahea</td>
<td><em>Feenow</em></td>
<td>'Ilangitu'oteau</td>
<td>Filitapu'ulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK Tuku'aho (1 &amp; others)</td>
<td>(Cook's)</td>
<td>(1) Ikaronga</td>
<td>(1) (6) Pe'e</td>
<td>Tangata-'o'lakepa</td>
<td>Halaeva Ju (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q'Anaukhesina</td>
<td>*Tutu Polotele</td>
<td>*Tutu Polotele</td>
<td>*Tupoumeiota</td>
<td>*Tupoumeiota</td>
<td>*Tupoumeiota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK Tuku'aho</td>
<td>TK Tu'ipulotu-1-Langitu'oneau</td>
<td>TK Tu'ipulotu-1-Langitu'oneau</td>
<td>TK Tu'ipulotu-1-Langitu'oneau</td>
<td>TK Tu'ipulotu-1-Langitu'oneau</td>
<td>TK Tu'ipulotu-1-Langitu'oneau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tupou'ila had many descendants, but they are "not well known".
** Mu'kia'ahea had many "well known" descendants. See Figure 19.
Figure 7

Tuʻi Kanokupolu Mataletuʻapiko

Tuʻi Kanokupolu  Toaflimoeʻunga
Mataelehaʻamea

Tuʻi Kanokupolu = Kavakipopua
Maʻafuʻo-Tuʻitonga

Tuʻi Kanokupolu
Mumui
Figure 8

(genealogy of the connection between Ma'afutukui'aulahi of Vainii, head title of Ha'a Havea, and Tu'i Kanokupolu Tupouto'a of Ha'a Ma'afu drawn from Bott 1982:14, [Figure 3], 130, [Figure 21], and Losaline Fatafehi's genealogy [pages 4, 21, 31], property of the Tonga Tradition Committee, a copy of it in my possession)

Tu'i Kanokupolu Mataeletu'apiko = Papa, daughter of Tu'i Ha'amea

   Hafoka Ma'afutukui'aulahi

   Mailemotomoto Ma'afutukui'aulahi = Simuoko, daughter of Tu'i Ha'ateiho Tue

   Tangata'ilavalu Ma'afutukui'aulahi = Makao'o, daughter of Tu'i Peleha'ke 'Ulualu and Lupemeitakui, daughter of Tu'i Ha'ateiho Tungii

   Maluotaufa Ma'afutuki'aulahi = Lataifale'aki

   Hoamofaleono = Tu'i Kanokupolu Tupouto'a

   Tu'i Kanokupolu George Taufa'aahau Tupou I
Figure 9

(Bott 1982:82, Figure13)

The Ho'a Ma'afu of Kauhola'ala

(a) The relation of TK Tuku'aho to TK Ma'afu-'o-i'i Tonga

TK Ma'afu-'o-i'i Tonga

Ngalumeututu TK Tupouahi TK & TH Massinaki Tupou'ilia TK Umui

Mulikiha'amua
(1) Hana Takalaau

(b) Derivation of the three branches of Ho'a Ma'afu from TK TUKU'aho
(Members of the ho'a are italicised)

TK TUKU'aho

= (1) 'Ulukilupenesa, d Ngalumeututu
= (2) Mariste, d (V'ehala)

TK Tupouto'a (1)

= (1) Tupou'alote'a
= (2) Taufa'ahutoa'ionese

Tuka'ilo (2)

= (1) Ngako
= (2) Tupoukolotou, d TK Tupouhia

TK Taufa'alato Tupou 1 (2)

= (1) Finau Kuanauga
= (2) Kalofofo
= (3) Paseko
= (4) Lupepa'ava'u (children died)

Paula Heateafo (1)

= (1) Fanaupou'ava'ava'u, d (3) Tuapasi
= (2) Siu

Silisoa Talo ('ave) (1)

= (1) Veisinia
= (2) Tala

Sunia Mafile'o (2)

= (1) Fanaupou'ava'ava'u, d (3) Tuapasi
= (2) Siu

Tea'e Tonga (1)

= (1) Veisinia
= (2) Tala

Sione Tupouto'a (1)

= (1) Fanaupou'ava'ava'u, d (3) Tuapasi
= (2) Siu

Tutu Tupou 1 (2)

= (1) Veisinia
= (2) Tala

Wa'afo 'io (1)

= (1) Veisinia
= (2) Tala

Mareilo'ono, (3) granted the only title of the Ha'a Ma'afu,
TUPOUTO'A
Figure 10

(Bott 1982:136, Figure 22)

The Vuna Line

TK Mataetu'apiko
   = Papa, d Tu'ih'a'amea of Tongatapu

TK VUNA
   = Leha'uku, a Ta'ohine of Tongatapu. Father was Tu'ionukuleve, s TH Kafoa. Mother was Toto'inukuo'osi, d TT Kau'ulufo'osi

VUNA Ngata
   = 'Ot'u'angū
   = Teukialupe
   = Sisters. Ordinary women of Ha'apai

VUNA Tu'i'otau
   = Tu'ifangatukia, d THNg Filitapuku & Ha'atere Matetume, d TK Mumui
   = 'Ulukilupetea, d Ngalumoetoetului

VUNA Takitakimalohi
   = Finau
   = Toe'umu, d Kafoa

Simulata

VUNA Tuku'aho
   = TK Tuku'aho
   = Fusipala Pangai
   = Po'i of Ha'apai
   = Taalumokafoa, bro. TT Paulahoe
   = Koate, s Tala'a'uli

Fatafehi
   = Ongo'alupe
   = Tongafa'alele
   = FU'i-Feletoa

Simulata

Tupouvaivai
   = Tupoupacanga

Ulakai

Kinahui

Osaiasi Veikune
Figure 11

(genealogy of Ha’a Ma’afu showing of how the royal sacred blood had been sucked in through the practice of kitetama cross-cousin marriage, drawn from Bott 1982:152, Figure 30)
Figure 12
(Bott 1982:147, Figure 24)

Descendants of Tu'i Kanokupolu Maatele'a'amea: Fusipala, daughter of Maatele'a'amea, and the development and elevation of the title of Tu'ipelehake

TK Maatele'a'amea
  ↘ Fusipala
 ências a powerful leader of low rank in eastern Tongatapu

TP Lekuzumoana
  → Mateitalo, d THT Mapa & Mafi'utu'i, d TT Fakana'ana'a
  → Toe'umu & Ka'oa, s TK Maatele'a'amea and Hahanokifanga'uta, d TT Fakana'ana'a

Maleati'amai (disgraced himself by seducing Lātūfuipeka and was exiled to Fiji)

TP 'Ululahu
  → Tupouveitonga, d TK Mumui
  = Lātūfuipeka, d (Leka) Kirve Isaiah and Lātūfuipeka

TP Fuinapuleli
  = Salote Pilolevu
  d TK Taufa'ahau

TP Falefili Toauvokoroka
  = Fusipala Taukionetu, d Tevia 'Unga, s TK Taufa'ahau (Kiterame)

Taufa'ahau Tupou II
  = Lavini Va'ongo, d Kupo & Tokanga
  = Taipō, d Ula & 'Utematua

Salote Pilolevu Tupou III

Taufa'ahau Tupou IV

TP Falefili
Figure 13

genealogy showing the relation of Po’oi to the Ha’a Ma’afu drawn from Bott 1982:142 [Figure 29], 152 [Figure 30])

Tu’i Kanokupolu Ma’afu-‘o-Tonga

= Ate of Ha’afeva, Ha’apai

Ngalumoetutulu (Ha’apai)  Tu’i Kanokupolu Mumui (Nuku’alofa)

= Siu’ulua, daughter of Malupoo (‘Uiha)  = Lepolo, daughter of Ata

‘Ulikilupetea  Tu’i Kanokupolu Tuku’aho

‘Anaukihesina

‘Po’oi

Sisifaa

Tu’i Kanokupolu Tupouto’a
MAP 1: Pacific (Micronesia, Melanesia and Polynesia) and South East Asia

(Mahina 1992)
MAP 2: Western Polynesia

(Mahina 1992)
MAP 4: Tongan Islands

(Mahina 1992)
MAP 5: Tongatapu Group (‘Eueki, ‘Eua,’ Ata and small off-shore islands)

(Mahina 1992)
MAP 6: Vava'u Group

(Mahina 1992)
MAP 7: Ha'apai Group

(Mahina 1992)
MAP 8: Ongō Niua Group (Niuafo'ou and Niuatoputapu)

(Mahina 1992)
GLOSSARY OF TONGAN TERMS

afo: width of a single course of thatch on the roof of the house

aitu: cannibal god, as in Malietoa 'Ae'o'ainu'u, "'Ae 'Mr Sh it' who devours the people", (see Kramer 1994:318, Vol. I)

aka: root; tuber

'Asiilagi: Tongan for Samoan Atiilagi title name “to speak plainly in the sky”, (see Kramer 1994:533, Vol. I)

faa: to procure workers

fahu: institutionalized ceremonial high ranking status recognized with the sister's child who is the carrier of the (royal) family sacred blood. As being sacred, the sister's child is the connector between the child's high rank father's sister and the child's low rank mother's brother. He/she receives the best mats and barkcloth and highest ranking cuts of meat at funerals, weddings, and birthdays and, has the right to decide on the distribution of presents and food. In Fijian, it is known as vasu, (see Hocart 1924).

fahuloa or fatuloa:

ancestral maker-ghost of genealogy is a reference to the sister as the blood carrier

fai: to have sexual intercourse. In its proper Tongan sense, fai, as in feitama “pregnant”, is ngaahi-tama “making a child”.
fakahokohoko hingoa 'a tangata:

men carry the title names

fakafelepuipui:

curtained-off enclosure of a secret kava ceremony

fakafotu: fruit, (see Pratt 1982:162); the sister requesting from the brother

fakahokohoko toto 'a fafine:

women carry the blood

fakakaukau: meditation; self-reflection; immersing for cleansing purpose of the
mind; intention

fakatei'ulu: to cut off the tuber of a yam plant and leave the plant where it is so
that it may produce another tuber

fakatou'ia: to impregnate

fale: house; to advice

fale-a-folau: house-of-navigators

Falefaa: house of four servants who guard and direct the funeral of the Tu'ī
Tonga on his death

Fale faka-Manu'a:

House in a Manu'a-style of 'to wounding'

fale-a-lea: house-of-speakers

Fale kano'imata:

House lined with eye balls of the god of the Underworld

Faleua: house that is raised up
Fale'ula: Samoan concept for “House as shiny dwelling of Tagaloa, the sun-god”, (see Kramer 1994:660, Vol.I), in Tongan, is Falekula “House-red”
faliki: floor
fao: stretching tight
Faasi'apule: personal name of Tu'i Tonga Taatui’s half brother who was a skillful trickster
fata: litter; loft; to carry
fatu: to appoint
faa’ataa: to open more widely, width
fau: fibre from the bark of the giant hibiscus
fa’ee: mother; she, by giving birth (faa’ele), is providing her male sexual partner land
fa’ee tangata:
children speaking, “male mother” who is the brother of the children’s mother
fefine: female; woman
feilaulau: to do sacrifice
fekai: savage; ferocious; habitually devouring living creatures
fena: piece of “over-mature yam” which, having been planted and begun to grow, may be broken off from the new plant and planted again
fie ‘eiki: denying chiefliness
fohe: oars
Folaha: Tongan for Samoan Folasa, a title name of the Tangaloa family which can have two possible meanings. Firstly, as ‘o le fofoa a papaa “the voice at the title [Tonumaipe’a of Savai’i]”, Folasa is likely a corruption of folofola haa “word sacred/divine”. Secondly, as in Asoaitu le Folasas, Folasas is the name referring to the sacrifice with pola saa or pola haa “food-tray sacred” to Tangaloa, the Tūi Manu’a. In Tumbou proper in Lakemba Island in the Lau Group, Fiji, Folasas is Poasa, the senior branch of the Cekena clan, of which the Vakavanua (Fakafanua in Tongan) title holder is Tione Mbiu, (see Hocart 1929:16). Poa, in Tongan, means “fish”. It thus makes the sacred food-tray of Tangaloa as of “fish”. [My grandfather, Sione Piu ‘o Folaha, is a namesake as Vakavanua Tione Mbiu.]

fono: food served with kava
fonu: turtle; storage pit full of food
fonua: land; placenta
fua: mullet; from fua’a “jealous” (see Appendix 3, page 257)
fue: creeper plant; to swish away flies or people; a tyrant; yam plant.

Story of the first three men of Tonga, namely, Kohai, Koau, and Momo, in connection to the fue being rotten, is a record of a family struggle for power between Kohai, Koau, and their younger relation, Momo. It is a story of disintegration of the family power.
Fusifonua: Lo'au's title name in recognition of his skill in hauling up or founding a land

fu'u tuna: big eel

haa: Tongan for Samoan saa "sacred"; Tongan for Fijian ca "bad" as in Cakombau "evil in Mba'li", (see Scarr 1976; Derrick 1946)

Hahake: East

hala: wrongdoing; presentation of articles of value of a descent to a funeral; pathway

Hau 'o Momo:

Food of Momo; Sovereignty of Momo

Havea Hikule'o:

Tongan of Samoan Saavea Si'ule'o "Havea, the guarding tail sons of Vea"

ha'a: descent group; group of younger sons protecting or challenging the Tu'i Tonga title

Ha'angata: Tongan for Samoan Saafata origin of Ngata's mother, Tohui'a, from Saafata in 'Upolu

Ha'avea: Tongan for Samoan Saavea 'descendants of Vea'

heketala: tradition of shuffling along on the posteriors

hii: semen

Hihifo: West

Hikule'o: "Tail-guard" of the Underworld

hingoa: name; title; known as (i'iloa)
hoi: a wild poisonous yam bearing fruit as well as tubers
hoko: to join two things; genealogy
hoko e fau moe polata:
   a saying referring to the cutting of chief Lufe's body of Folaha into
two halves for the lower part (legs) being joined with the abandoned
upper part of Tu'i Tonga Havea before giving Havea a proper
burial, thus, “join the solid giant hibiscus tree and the soft trunk of
plantain plant”.
holoi'ufi: procession of people with yam-tubers
huli: shot; scion
ivi e fonua: resources of land
kai: to eat; food; people
kaiha’a: Tongan for Samoan ‘aisaa “to steal by eating the inside content of
the ha’a’
kainga: place to eat food; kinship group; occupancy of the house by
strangers in connection to alliance through marriage
kakai: people
kakava: perspiration
kato: basket
kau: sign of plural denoting persons; hook for fishing, (see Clark 1994)
kauhala: wrongdoers
Kauhalalalo: social moiety of the wrongdoers from underworld to which belongs
   the Tu'i Ha'atakalaua and Tu'i Kanokupolu and their people
Kauhala’uta: social moiety of the wrongdoers on land to which belongs the Tu’i Tonga and his people

Kauvandra: mountains on the eastern side of Vitilevu of the Rewa District where Mbau has a shrine to whose residing god the Mbau people’s leading chiefs traced their ancestry, (see Scarr 1976); Kaufana title in ‘Eua, either Kaufata or Kaulala “carriers of the King’s litter”.

kava: Tongan for Fijian kawa “descent, cross relation” (see Sahlins 1962:168). In Tongan kava is the fatungamotu’a “old custom or institution which is regarded as that which binds the community together”

kele: dirt

kiato: sticks connecting the outrigger of a canoe with the canoe itself. The term is short for kia toho “neck pulling along” usually as ‘akau toho “wood-puller, shafts”.

kisukava: enigmatic request method of uncovering the storage pit full of food as the Hau ‘o Momo

kitetama: causing to appear of a high ranking child

Koau: is Lo’au of Oahu in Hawaii and Mbau in Fiji

Kohai: is Lafai of Sava’i

konga: section; part

kongokonga: mutilated body parts

konga ‘ufi: yam-pieces

Laatuu: Fijian title for a chief
laulau: sacrifice; plaited coconut leaf food-tray
lau ‘eiki: praising ‘eikiness connection
lea: words; to speak; to speak to by way of reproof, admonition, encouragement, or exhortation; air that makes the sounds
Lekau: Fijian “the tree”
leleva: yam silage
limu: seaweed
loto: inside the house
Lo’au: personal name meaning “an axe and fishhook” in connection to his being a “land hauler/founder” and “canoe/house builder”. Also, it is Lou’akau “leaves of plants”

Lo’au Tuputoka:
The punisher who bewitches to sleep (die) of the sun

Lo’au Tongafusifonua:
Lo’au who pulls up land from the underworld

maka’one: my Tongan interpretation of Samoan ma’atoe in Tuitogama’atoe, maiden name of the Salevalasi in Atua, ‘Upolu, in reference to her committing adultery to steal the Malietoa title, to mark the place in Savai‘i where they had sex as the “coastal layer of flat hard sandstone”

Malae o Vava'u.
In my interpretation, it is a Samoan “farewell meeting place of sacrifice”. Samoan malae is mala‘e in Tongan. As place of burial, it is where maavae “to be separated from one of you leaving”.

**maana‘ia**: young man of especially attractive to young women and skillful

**mapa**: maiden symbolic sweet-smelling flower of Talafale of Pelehake

**mata**: eyes; symbol for house (see Gell 1998) and fishhook

**mataapule**: eyes of the authority; ceremonial attendant speaking on behalf of chief, all forms of social groups

**mehikitanga**: father’s sister. As corruption of mahiki‘anga, the institutionalized father’s sister stands as the person on who the sister’s child’s high social status is lifted.

**me’akai**: food; literally, thing as food/person/to be eaten

**me’e**: or eke is Tongan for Fijian meke “dance of persecution”. Eke is title name in Kolovai

**mohe**: to sleep; honorific for going to bed and have sexual intercourse

**moheoto**: old marriage practice in which the eldest daughter of Tu‘i Ha’atakalaua and Tu‘i Kanokupolu presented as chief wife of the Tu‘i Tonga and mother of the heir. There are two possible meanings to this term. First, it is mohehoko “sleeping to secure a royal genealogical connection” or, second, moheo‘o, as a regal for fakao‘o “(of a rooster) to copulate with”.

**Momo**: from temomo “young relative of Kohai and Koau”, the first three maggoty men in Tonga
motu’a: first; old; most senior
mo’unga: person to who one looks for protection
Mo’ungaamotu’a:
Name of the first Tu’i Ha’atakalaua “First person to whom Tu’i Tonga Kau’ulufonuafekai looks for protection”
mutu: to amputate
Niuatoputapu:
Head/Coconut-of-sacredness
Niukapu: title name as “Head/coconut-sacred”
niuiui: formal calling for “home” by planting coconuts in olden days
Nuku: title name; islet; district; people, (see Pratt 1982:233)
nunu’a: penal consequence
ngaohi: to adopt and bring up a child; to make, construct, build, manufacture. The same term spelled gaoi in Samoan means “to steal”.
Ngata: personal name meaning “the Tail”, (see Kramer 1994:313, Vol.1)
palepale: shelter
pali: vagina
peito: cooking house
pola: food enclosed in plaited coconut-leaf and baked
polata: trunk of plaintain
poopao: canoe
pour: post
pule: authority; governor; to control

pulega: Samoan for Tongan pule'anga “decision making council to take care of the Tu'i Tonga tributary belongings from the people of the land”

pule'anga: government

pulopula: seed-yam for planting; over-mature yam

Rewa: Fijian for Tongan ‘Eua

Samoa’aatoa:

“all Samoa” including Samoa, Tonga, Fiji, Rarotonga, Tahiti, Wahua, which had to bring Tui Manu’a seafood tributes


sika’ulutoa: spearing the head of the casuarina/cassowary, a reference to ‘Aho’eitu’s head, as a member of the Samoa or Ha‘amoa, by his own half older brothers. My translation here disputes the translation as “spear with a head made of ironwood”, (see Churchward 1959:429)

Si’usei’a: Samoan of Tongan Hikuhekeika “tail-dislocated-fish” (see Kramer 1994:313, Vol.I). The Tongan form means “the eel (fish) that had its tail cut off” (Dr Wendy Pond’s translation), a reference to the story of Hina and the origin of the coconut. (See the text and translation of the myth in the Appendix 5, page 279.)

Taeotagalaoa:
“Shit of Tagaloa, the persecutor ghost”

tala: traditions

Talafale: tradition of fale; household adviser

Talakite: tradition of making the royal sacred blood

tala o le Vavau:

tradition of the propitiatory sacrifice, (see Powell 1892:186)

tama: male of chiefly rank; male and female child of a woman or couple

Tamahaa: child of Tu’i Tonga Fefine; literally means in Samoan as “sacred child”, in Fijian as “bad child”

tama tu’u he fa’ee:

child standing on mother

Tangaloa: (from fakatanga) god who persecutes people; persecutor ghost

tangata: male; man

tapu: forbidden; sacred

Tapuhia: Sacred-wrongdoing mount

tau: war; to fight; to arrive; to moor a boat; to angle for fish with a line and hook; to hang; to set a trap; to win a race; to copulate with

taufa: war

Taufa’aahau: personal name meaning “fight of ‘Aahau, traditional residence of the Tu’i Kanokupolu’. The name originally has connection with Tu’i ‘Aahau of Ha’atafu in Hihifo, Tongatapu, a cannibal god who was given jealous ‘Ila’s daughter with chief Na’a’anamoana (Tu’i Tonga
Fatafehi in other version) to be his wife. This information can be obtained from the tradition of the Fua (Appendix 3, page 257).

taule’ale’a: Samoan of Tongan toulekeleka “untitled young men”, (see Mead 1930)

taumafa kava: formal ceremony of drinking the kava
taumaata’u: surfacing of the sacred fish from the deep with the hook, (see Lieber 1994)

Tau’angahoi: the clump of hoi yams place in Folaha said to be where ‘Aho’eitu’s head discarded. It could be tanu’angahoi “burying place of hoi”. Hoi, therefore, could be ohi “sucker”.

tau’ataaina: fight to get freed

ta’ata’a: regal for blood. In Fijian the spelling is ndra, (see Hocart 1924).

ta’ata’a tapu: sacred blood

ta’okete: older sibling of the same sex as speaker
tehina: younger sibling of the same sex as speaker
toa: casuarina tree; used in calling fowls, moa, of large flightless cassowary from the resemblance between branches and feathers.
tofi: dividing
tofinga: yam piece cut off

Tokelau: North
tokoni: to assist; polite for “to eat”

Tonga: South; as corruption of konga in Tu’i Tonga, it means “half”
Tongafusifonua:
  Harvesting of the fish/yam tubers

Tongatapu:  Section-prohibited

toputapu:  sacred; divine

toto:  blood

totoʻi ʻeiki:  blood of high ranking person

toume:  coconut spathes bundled together and lighted used as a torch

toʻa:  big strong man of whom others are afraid

Toʻukupu kekekele:
  legs earth-bound

Tufunga fonua:
  carpenters of the country; the founders of customs and the regulators of social life

tuofefine:  from man speaking, sister; his female half.

tuongaʻane:  from woman speaking, brother; her male half.

tupu:  grow; “King” in Samoan

Tuputoka:  Loʻau’s title name in recognition of his canoe/house construction for resting place of the dead; planting of yam-piece

Tuʻa:  commoner; outside the house

Tuʻi Haʻatakalaua:
  Kingly title of Haʻatakalaua meaning “Takalaua’s junior sons as protectors of their older brother, successor to the Tuʻi Tonga title”

Tuʻi Kanokupolu:
Kingly title of Kanokupolu meaning "flesh of outstanding value of 'Upolu"

Tu'i Tonga: King of Tonga title derived from tu'usi konga meaning "to cut into half"

Tu'i Tonga Fefine:

Female Tu'i Tonga; older sister of the Tu'i Tonga title holder; institution based on fahu

Tu'i Tonga Momo:

Dated as the 10th Tu'i Tonga title holder, Momo means crumb of a rotten fue "creeper plant", of a disintegrated swisher. He had been cut into three pieces. Momo, as in temomo, is a relation of the tyrant Fue.

Tu'i Tonga Taatui:

King of Tonga who strikes the knees of the people

Tu'i Tonga ‘Aho‘eitu:

‘Aho‘eitu, the first putative Tu'i Tonga title holder

tu'u: to stand; to cut; to ease the bowels
tu'usi: to cut down
tu'usi konga: to cut down into half

Tu’utolu: three standing districts
tu’utu’ur: to mutilate
tu’u ua: to cut into two
‘uhiki: offspring
**uho taha:** one umbilical cord; sons of same mother and different fathers always tend to support each other

**uho tau:** fighting umbilical cord; sons of different mothers and same father prone to be in fighting against each other

**uho:** pith; centre; umbilical cord

**ule:** une in the language of Uvea (see Clark 1994) as “penis”

**Ulunivuaka:** Pig’s head as former name of Mbau, the small offshore island of Vitilevu, in Fiji, (see Scarr 1976)

**uma:** in Samoan “wide chest”; in Tongan “shoulder”

**umatagata:** Samoan concept for “wide chest-person”, (see Pratt 1984:102); “shoulder person”, (see Schultz 1985)

**utu-ta’u:** yam harvesting

**Vaheloto:** Central District

**vahe taumata ‘oe fono:**

food at kava distributing

**vaka:** canoe; boat; canoe hull

**vaka Leitana:**

another poetical version of fale kano’imata “boat decorated with human eye balls”. Leitana possibly is leitagata “human eye balls”.

**valai:** creeper

**Vava’u:** in Samoan, Vavau, as in feilaulau, “to do the long fishing-net made of the stems of the creeper and coconut leaves connected with the trunks of plantain as victuals of fish”
va'e: legs

Va'epopua: personal name of 'Aho'eitu's mother meaning "Legs (body) of punishment"

vea: overripe (see Hocart 1929:240); decaying from over-exposure to the sun

vuka: small fish that fly out of the water into the air

'aho: Tongan for aso in Samoan meaning "day's offering of a human victim to a chief", (see Pratt 1984:77)

'Ahome'e: title name "persecution dance of the daily food sacrifice"

'Aho'eitu: Tongan for Samoan Asoaitu, "human sacrifice of yams to a spirit" (Tangaloa 'Eitumatupu'a)

'Ata: Island to the south of Tonga and Rotuman for "upper end of yam"

'akau: a tree; in Samoan as la'a'u, it also means "a club", "a small axe used to behead in war", (see Pratt 1984:173); "fishhook", (see Clark 1994)

'api: home

'atamai: to appear as a shadow of the mind

'ato: roof; thatch

'eiki: translated in English as "chief", "high ranking person", "aristocrat". It is honorific for the son of an outside high ranking person or for female sibling in connection to the brother-sister relationship principle. Etymology of 'eiki refers to a person who tete'e "sticks out, outstanding in rank", thus an 'eiki tete'e. 'Eiki, therefore, could
be a corruption of *te'eiki* “very young person” which is thus connected to life transition from babyhood to adulthood, compare with the life transition of “mullet” in Churchward (1959:250). Another use, but in a more direct informal denigration of *'eiki*, is *te'efehi'i* meaning “to burst out in one place”. The “very young one” is the *te’e* “dreg” who oozes out through his/her common mother’s vagina.

*‘eitu*: Tongan for *aitu* in Samoan meaning “god” or “spirit” rather than “chief” (see Pratt 1984:58). Richard Moyle (1984:68, footnote 105) adds on a likeable explanation, that *Faueaa* had been taken for dead on account of his long absence from Samoa and was initially thought of and referred to as an *aitu* (spirit) of his real self, an incident occurring in 1832.

*‘Eitumatupu’a*: (from Samoan *‘ainu’uu-ma-tupua*) devouring places/people and guessing answers to riddles

*‘ila*: having an unfortunate circumstance; a chief who is one of his/her parents being a commoner

*‘Ilahaeva*: personal name of *Aho’eitu’s* mother meaning “Chieftess partly commoner-wrongdoer”

*‘Ilamutu*: brother’s sister’s child, who is a chief, on his/her father’s side, partly commoner, on his/her mother’s side. The child is the abandoned amputated upper part (chief of local mother) being connected onto
the land resting on his/her mother's brother as post, thus he/she becomes whole again.

'ilō: honorific for "to eat"; to know

'inasi: food tributes to the Tu'i Tonga

'uanga: worm

'uangahia: maggoty

'ufi: yam tubers

'uhiki: offspring

'ula: Samoan for Tongan kula as in Fale'ula "bleeding head from smashing"

'ulu: head; leader


'Ulutolu: three heads; three men in one

'ulu'i 'ufi: yam-top

'umisi (umiti in Samoan):

tributes of sea food of the Tu'i Manu'a brought to him from Samoa, Tonga, Fiji, Rarotonga, Tahiti, and Wahua

'umru: ground-oven

'Upolu: three heads in one body, (see Bott 1982:115); in my interpretation, the term refers to the three districts in 'Upolu, namely, Aana (western district of Tui Aana), Tuamasaga (central district of Malietoa), Atua (eastern district of Tui Atua)

'uta: land; advice resulting from careful consideration; above the sea
CHAPTER 1

Method, Theory and “Indigenous Anthropology”

Introduction
I have been intrigued with the problem of power in Tongan society. How does the legitimation of economic and political power work in Tonga? The aim is to understand the nature of social inequality and Tongan hierarchical and stratified society. One of the themes discussed to show this socio-hierarchical stratification is the mataapule system, how this system overcomes the outsiders’ use of the rationalistic principle of dualism as a method of approach to the analysis of Tongan society. Focussing on the mataapule system is a way of summarising the legitimation of power in terms of the heliaki rhetoric of the mataapule “chief’s attendant” used when receiving the people on behalf of the chief. An important aspect of the mataapule system in action which is so central to the discussion of the legitimation of power is the double nature of power, firstly, as to destroy and, secondly, as a protection. Food is a metaphor central to the nature of power in Tongan society. As part of the objective of critiquing dualism in action in the Tongan case of the mataapule system, I present it in contrast to some selected scholars’ treatments of the principle of dualism, namely, the Saussurean distinction between langue and parole, the diarchy theory of Valeri and James, and the Tu‘i Tonga and Tu‘i Ha‘atakalaua dualism. Also, I demonstrate my method of analysis rooted in logic and philosophy as to make contrast with anthropologists Marshall Sahlin’s and Christina Toens’ opposing views on sea-land distinction in Fiji, Phyllis Herda’s discussion of Tongan genealogy as another aspect of looking at the subject of food. In particular, my discussion of the sea-land distinction and genealogy is part of my analysis of the socio-political principle of hoko “join” in connection with the discussion of the origin myths of the fale “house” and ‘Aho‘eitu, the first Tu‘i Tonga “King of Tonga”. Insider-outsider paradox is central to the contrast made here. The insider-outsider paradox is also explored in the context of indigenous anthropology. Lastly, the place of ‘Atenisi contribution to the analysis of Tongan history has to be pointed out in contrast to Roger Green’s, Patrick Kirch’s, and Andrew Pawley’s reconstructionist position in terms of the hoko between Tonga and Samoa. My criticism of the Austronesian reconstructionist methodology rejects the argument that Tongan and Samoan are dialects of a proto-Polynesian language.
Reading and writing on the oral history of Tonga is always reflex interpretations of the past records of legends and myths. Written history of Tonga since then replaces the oral recounts of the Tongan people’s practices at every specific point in time from generation to generation. And pertinent to this practice is the employment of the traditional *heliaki*, saying one thing and meaning another, method, in which one’s subjective interest is forced over another. *Heliaki* method is the characteristic use of selected poetic words to effectuate an aesthetic distinct Tongan way of thinking about themselves in relation to their surroundings. Thus, the central focus of this thesis is an attempt to provide a critique of this poetic way of thinking of the Tongans. As meaning is the point of departure in the situation when the subject, $X$ (moiety division), being described as $Y$ (the legitimation of economic and political power in Tonga), the issue being specifically dealt with in this thesis, then, is how that connection between the subject and its description is discovered? The question, then, about connection is specifically a dissertation on the oral and written history of Tonga rather than, as George Grace¹ argues, a linguistic reconstruction of the connection as purely a linguistic reality.

Legends and myths are *heliaki* stories made to recite by the people about their social places in the socio-political hierarchy of Tonga. In my interpretation, they basically reflect an ideological and political program that is generally connected to a system of persecution conducted by a sun-god, namely, *Tangaloa*, in this

---

¹ Grace 1983
socio-political region of Samoa’aatoa “all Samoa including Samoa, Tonga, Fiji, Rarotonga, Tahiti, and Wahua, which had to bring Tu’i Manu’a ‘umiti ‘food tributes of sea food”\(^2\). The occasion not only that all these islands of Samoa, or Ha’amo in Tongan, as tribes when coming together forcefully opposing one another as each one trying to establish a social recognition within the dominion of the Tu’i Manu’a, they came to pay their dues for a wrongdoing that had been committed. It originated from this hierarchical structural system a Tongan value of fatongia “social duty”, properly translated as fetongia, fetongi, from tongi, as in totongi, “to exchange, in this context, for something bad being done”. Because of its specific allusion to the Samoa-Tonga connection and the social construction of the system of exchanging in Tonga, I consider the origin myth of ‘Aho’eitu to be central in this thesis.

The origin myth of ‘Aho’eitu has been a standard source quoted by scholars whose subject is the history and culture of Tonga. It serves as an original source supporting the idea of Tu’i Tonga as meaning “King of Tonga”. This is one of the issues as a cornerstone of my critique of the legitimation of economic and political power in Tonga. As a preface to my critique of the myth in the following chapters of this thesis, I need to clarify some small points in connection to the above statement about the myth. What has been quoted and referred to by scholars in their writing on the history and culture of Tonga as “the origin myth of ‘Aho’eitu” is problematic.

In my interpretation, “the origin myth of ‘Aho‘eitu’ is a Tongatapu's version. In fact, “the origin myth of ‘Aho‘eitu’ is a part which has been separated from its other half. This Tongatapu's version specifically tells about the punishment of wrongdoers and the setting up on land a system of government based on a council of advisors.

The other half is a Niutoputapu's version, the farthest island to the north of the mainland Tongatapu, which is about the origin of Seketoa who turned into a fish and his daughter named 'Ilaheva'. This version provides the backbone reason for the wrongdoing. It is only when the two halves are joined together that the nature of the wrongdoing becomes obvious with the contrast between the two islands, Niutoputapu and Tongatapu. Niu-a-toputapu means “Coconut/head-of-sacred" and Tonga-tapu “food-prohibited”.

The relevancy of mentioning these two versions is connected to how Dr ‘Okusitino Mahina records the whole myth (Niutoputapu and Tongatapu versions) and then calls it “the origin myth of ‘Aho‘eitu’, (the Tongatapu version). Whether Dr Mahina appreciates or not this separation argument is difficult to see in his thesis. My point, still, is Dr Mahina’s telling of the story in its wholeness and, I applaud Dr Mahina for stating this new dimension showing the whole story different from the others who have quoted this myth (the Tongatapu version) in their respective annotations of the history of Tonga. On that basis, I directly quote here Dr Mahina’s record of the
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1 Full prosaic version of the myth of Seketoa can be found in Gifford 1924:83-84 as told by John Panuve Ma‘atu, lord of Niutoputapu; Collocott 1928:56-58.
2 Mahina 1992:91-92
3 Biersack 1990a:83; Gifford 1924:25-38; Herda 1988:28-29; Wood 1945:5
story to be the reference to my critique of the legitimation of power in Tonga, (see it in the next chapter). I would rather call it “the origin myth of fish god Seketoa and ‘Aho’eitu”, instead of “the origin myth of ‘Aho’eitu”, to highlight the two parts of the full story.

First relevant point in my critique of the persecution theme in connection with the myth is that the voyage from Niutoputapu on landing in Tongatapu found of the Talafale “Tradition of fale ‘house’”. Talafale is about the building in Tonga of a Tangaloa “advisory” government of two dimensions, Faleua and Falefaa. It is “advisory” government that had been (fale)ua “levered up” from the sea and fulihi “turned upside down” to resting on the (fale)faa (or fata) “loft” of the uma “shoulders” of the cannibal murderers of ‘Aho’eitu, the youngest son of the sun-god Tangaloa. In short, these dimensions, in other words, express a semantic field of historical meaning in connection with persecution and the appointment of the title of Tu’i Tonga “King of Tonga”. The Tu’i Tonga title is derived from the tu’usi konga “to cut into half” of ‘Aho’eitu for his lower part as the “prohibited food” of the high chief, thus, the Tu’i Tonga title is the tradition of “halving or sharing”.

To the extent of this Samoan Talafale colonization, the locals, following their being forced to serve the paramount tyrannical persecutor, were made to recount these legends and myths as both an affirmation of the historical identity of origin and legitimacy of the Samoan persecutor’s economic and political authority in Tonga. In which case, legends and myths are heliaki “saying one thing and meaning
another" inventions constructed for the purpose to legitimate the occupation of Tonga by the Samoan persecutor and his wrongdoer sons.

Given that the scope of the thesis covering the historical connection between the islands of Samoa and Tonga, the dissertation on the legitimation of economic and political power in Tonga is, thus, also a critique of *Kauhala'uta* and *Kauhalalalo* social moieties. Historically, as recorded in the origin myth of 'Aho'eitu, this idea of *Kauhala'uta* and *Kauhalalalo* moiety division, as a universal socio-political determiner to all forms of dualism, thinking and speaking alike, in Tongan society, thus also conveys an inverted path of a journey of the kauhala "wrongdoers" going from *lalo* "sea below" on to *lunga'/uta* "land above" and back from above to below. The argument of the universality of the moiety division is therefore connected to the *hoko* "join" of the upturned boat as *'ato* "roof" and the carriers as *pou* "posts" on land.

Since the focus of this thesis is the Samoa-Tonga connection, viewed with the *fale* institution brought from *Manu'a*, the emphasis is a consideration of the protection and double nature of power in terms of the *heliaki* exchanges outside the *pule*’s house between the *mata* "eyes" of the *pule* "authority" and the locals. Rather, the focus is on the power relations involved in the tripartite relationship between the *mata*, who sits outside the front part of the house to receive and speak to the people on behalf of the *pule*, who dwells inside the house, and the locals, living on and tilling of the land. Reservation of the *pule*’s authority behind the actual daily
routine of the land is to maintain the sacredness of the *pule* which, in turn, symbolically gives some power of control to the *mata* over the locals. One would tend to see that since *mata*, practically, has some control over the secular affairs of the community, he is the most powerful person on who the inactive *pule* seems to rely for his social existence. This is not to say that the power relations in this situation simply involve the *pule* and the *mata*, but, the contestation between the two is about who is powerful in the eyes of the locals. Because of his desperation to save his social status and to be still recognized as the supreme *pule* of the community, the *pule* would likewise popularize his program and redirect his focus on to the people for the reason to bring the people's attention closer on to him. Of course, this manipulation is easy to see that the *pule* is otherwise signalling to the people for a replacement of his current contested *mata*. The tripartite relationship, then, in this context, is not so simple to be some kind of a social system of teaching people of how to behave and to know certain etiquettes. Realistically, it is rather a context of contestation for power where the *mata* and *pule*, in the expense of the locals, oppose one another in trying to protect and find a social standing.

This local historical socio-political tripartite *mataapule* system discussed here, for example, can easily be seen to overcome the application of certain commonest anthropological and linguistic dualism, for example, of Levi-Strauss\(^6\), Ferdinand de Saussure\(^7\), Valeri\(^8\), James\(^9\), Torens\(^10\), Sahlin\(^s\)\(^11\), and Herda\(^12\). In connection, their

\(^6\) Levi-Strauss 1963
\(^7\) See Harris 1983
\(^8\) Valeri 1993
dualism, as a simplistic straightforward principle asserting engagement of two extremes in a one to one exchange of roles, confuses the protection and double nature of power. In the mataapule power relationship of heliaki, in the sense of concealing and revealing at the same time, the ambiguity and confusion of dualism shows as a form of usage where the mata acts to protect himself and as well to destroy the pule. Ambiguity and confusion of dualism is then connected to the mata as a Kauhala'uta invented ideological synthetic appeaser who is supposed to uphold the social order within the Tu'i Tonga regime. An example would be the case of the Tu'i Tonga human sacrifice institution of 'Aho'eitu, as a ceremony of food presentation from the locals to their foreign new ruler. The ceremony shows a history of the power in conflict involved in the devolution of the old Tu'i Tonga title of sun-god Tangaloa as now defunct and being replaced by the later Tu'i Tonga youngest descendant, the Tu'i Kanokupolu. Human sacrifice as tradition of sharing of food has revealed as a centre of power conflict. Regionally and locally, for example, power conflict is central between the Samoa'aatoa islands, between the Tu'i Tonga, Tu'i Ha'atakalaua, and Tu'i Kanokupolu dynasties of Tonga. Thus, food, as me'akai “thing eatable”, becomes the primal reason for the contestation for power specifically in the region compromising of Tonga, Samoa, and Fiji. Having secured full control of the food resource is an outcome of one being able to subordinate certain group of people as one’s kakai “people”, a polite form of ta’e “shit”. The interpretation of people as shit is taken from the heliaki of the
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9 James 1991
10 Torens 1990
11 Sahlins 1962
“Persecutor-god” by the persecutor’s Samoan and Tongan subjects respectively as Taeotagaloa “Shit-of-Tagaloa”\textsuperscript{13} and Folaha kai ta’e “Folaha eats shit”.

As to the personalization of “shit” in names, Kramer\textsuperscript{14} also gives an example with the name Malietoa as ‘Ae’o’ainu’u “‘Ae, who devours the people”. I propose that Tangaloa ‘Eitumatupu’a in the Tongan version, by comparison, is Tangaloa ‘Ae’o’-‘ainu’u-mate tupu’a “Mr Shit-who-devours the people-[who] rightly guess the answers to riddles”. His devouring behaviour was derived from his ability to know/tell the secrecy or whereabouts of the food being hidden through the method of playing rhetoric.

If there is something important to stress in relation to the question of meaning, it is ideology. In connection here to the relationship between thought and language is the Hegelian Zizek’s\textsuperscript{15} negative conception of ideology. Ideology, according to Zizek, is not just a system of ideas, not just an illusion or an abstract idea, but a form of social behaviour, a particular masquerading as a universal. Further to the negative conception of ideology is Zizek’s thesis of ideology as a “negation of negation” tool for disclosing the dynamic of society, which thus opens a new way for understanding of social conflict.

\textsuperscript{12} Herda 1988

\textsuperscript{13} Kramer 1994, Vol. I


\textsuperscript{15} Zizek 1993:230-231
I would interpret this theory of “negation of negation” in the same semantic field as the Tongan philosophy of ‘ikai ke ‘iai “not that there is”. Thus, the assertion [of existence] in a Tongan context contradictorily shows it to be a form of a denial. As a Tongan philosophical rule, we simply negate, ‘oku ‘ikai, the assertion that there is, ‘oku ‘iai, thus, ‘oku ‘ikai ke ‘iai. To understand the case in question, a real communication thus goes through a process of negation of negation. Even the Cartesian cogito, it is subjected to the same procedure of examination.

The ideology of the Kauhala'uta-Kauhalalalo moiety division, for example, directly refers in the origin myth of ‘Aho'eitu to the struggle for power between the sons of different mothers of sun-god Tangaloa ‘Eitumatupu'a, between Tangaloa's older sons with a Samoan woman and Tangaloa's youngest son with a Tongan woman. It is then these mothers and their respective children outside the house fighting for the husband’s-father’s divine power that which defines the focus of my analysis and interpretation of the legends and myths considered in this thesis. Thus, in terms of Zizek’s theory of ideology, Kauhala'uta-Kauhalalalo moiety division is a kind of very powerful subjective political tool of heliaki with an “objective status”, via one’s own “spontaneous” synthetic activity, that which changes the representations into the objects of his experience. Again, power, in this context of heliaki, is both the rhetorical ability of the mata, for example, to represent his own Kauhalalalo covert personal ambition in the expense of the pule’s objectives of the Kauhala'uta division. On this perspective, not only that the critique of ideology enables us to understand the social conflict as implicit in the mataapule system,
the philosophical principle of *Kauhala'uta-Kauhalalalo* dualism is thus overcome. The struggle of separate individual interests for power is an example of intersubjective ideological legitimization which is, again, a fundamental mechanism of legitimizing "the existing order by presenting it as a realization of a dream- not of our dream, but of the Other's, the dead ancestor's dream, the dream of previous generations". In other words, by means of their struggle, both the mata and pule "realize the ancient dreams of their [respective] oppressed ancestors".

Me'akai, as the central idea historically woven into the conjunction of *Kauhala'uta* and *Kauhalalalo* moiety division and the *Tu'i Tonga* title, can be seen as the inversion of honge "famine". For it as "something extraordinary nice to eat", the tempting of the me'akai becomes a subject of contestation, a reason, for example, for the *Tu'i Tonga* fleet led by Fasi'apule, the master crafter, to directly challenge the Samoan 'aokai "food beggar" who kaiha'a "steals by eating the prohibited food [of turtle meat] of the ha'a 'family' [of Tu'i Tonga]". Contestation of this nature is a detective game of rhetoric conducted by Fasi'apule upon the people of Sangone in Savai'i, Samoa, which subsequently brings forward the stealer, Lafai his name, for inquiry into the whereabouts of the 'uno "shell" of the fonu "turtle". In my interpretation, Lafai, the great chief and founder of Savai'i, stole the fonu "storage pit full of food" from Tonga. Thus, the story is an example showing the danger of food when it comes to fighting over it, the Samoans are hiding it while Fasi'apule
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\(^{16}\) Zizek 1993:153; also see Mahina 1992:10 for his version of this issue.

\(^{17}\) Zizek 1993:117; [respective] is mine. I am addressing Zizek's position here in terms of mine as if this is what he means.
plays the detective game of rhetoric, using the *kisukava* enigmatic request fishing method, to find it. Entitled as the story of *Sangone*, (see in the Appendix 6, pages 278-281), in the uncovering of the *Hau’o Momo* “Food as the Conquest of Momo”, the story is about food stealing as a famine problem due to the subjugation of the islands people with the ‘*inasi*’ tradition of sharing.

The question of meaning as an ideological problem of contradiction, again, disputes George W. Grace’s theory of “the linguistic construction of reality”\(^{19}\), which is a subject I first introduced in my MA thesis\(^{20}\). Grace’s theory is simply a variant of the Sapir-Whorf theory of linguistic relativity, advocating a structuralist linguistic methodology where the study of meaning, I argue, proceeds on from a question of the meaning of meaning (of words)\(^{21}\). The structuralist linguistic methodology is hereby taken as to be based on searching for the regressive synthetic solution to the language-induced differences in thought to generate different realities.

Recapping the argument again, the question of meaning is not about the thinker who thinks, but, about what the thinker thinks about. It is what the thinker takes to be the case is the issue at stake. Meaning, in other words, is that *ontological what the speaker refers to*, as opposed to the *epistemological how what the speaker*
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\(^{19}\) Grace 1987

\(^{20}\) Taliai 1989

\(^{21}\) See Ogden and Richards (1949)
says is said\textsuperscript{22}. While the latter is interested in the subjective formulation of language use, the former in the objective statement of thought. Furthermore, the formal question of meaning is connected to the propositional logic of $X$, the location, and $Y$, the description of the location connected by the copula\textsuperscript{23}.

In the case of the moiety division, it is part of the social system structured by the *hala* “wrongdoing” of wounding the *Tu'i Manu'a* in Samoa and leading on to the appointment in Tonga of the *Tu'i Tonga* tribute system of ‘*inasi*’ as payment for the wrongdoing committed. Contrary to the meaning of dualism employed by Edward Gifford\textsuperscript{24}, his interpretation of the *Kauhala'uta-Kauhalalalo* moiety division is based on what he was told about the *Tu'i Ha'atakalaua* context in the 1920's when the *Tu'i Ha'atakalaua* was living. The means used to define this division is said to be a *hala* “road”, the inland side of the *hala* being the residence of the *Tu'i Tonga* and his people and the sea side being the residence of *Tu'i Ha'atakalaua* and the *Tu'i Kanokupolu* and their people. As the focus of this thesis is on the legitimation of economic and political power in Tonga within the wider historical context of Samoa-Tonga connection, Gifford's *Kauhala'uta-Kauhalalalo* moiety idea should be about the *hala* “procession” of the wrongdoers who murdered *Tu'i Tonga Takalaua*, the founder of the *Tu'i Ha'atakalaua* office, going on to ‘*uta*”land above” from *lalo* “underneath the land above” with their *laulau* “sacrifice” to beg for pardon. If conducted in the same historical analytical method as outlined, Gifford’s moiety

\textsuperscript{22} Taliai 1989:iii-iv

\textsuperscript{23} See Anderson 1962; Armstrong 1997; Baker 1986

\textsuperscript{24} Gifford 1929:159
idea will have presented the logical connection of the moiety from the literal sea-land division to the historical human sacrifice of hoko “joining” of the ‘ulu (umatagata in Samoan) of the abandoned murdered high chief and the retributive va’e (sino) of the low rank murderer. Again, it will reveal Gifford’s Tu’i Ha’atakalaua moiety idea as simply a version of the old meaning of the Tu’i Tonga moiety system. The historical meaning of the moiety system of every dynastic period then conveys a consistent history of continuity of the moiety division throughout from Samoa into Tonga.

Further to the discussion on the issue of meaning is the emphasis on the dialectic of dualism in action in Tonga in contrast to Ferdinand de Saussure’s dualism of langue and parole. As the discussion of dualisms in Tonga shows, the unity of the two opposing extremes consists, not in their co-dependence, but, in the dialectical reversal, for example, of the universal will into its opposite. Insofar as the universal will is opposed to the multitude of particular wills, it turns into the utmost particular will of those who pretend to embody it (since it excludes the wealth of particular wills).

_Heliaki_ or Tongan dualism in action of saying one thing and meaning another, as discussed here, is different from Ferdinand de Saussure’s dualism of langue and parole. Different in the sense that to conduct an analytical study of Tongan language of _heliaki_ one has to take into consideration the historical circumstances.
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25 See Sahlins 1962; Toren 1990
26 See Zizek 1993:123
relevant to what is being said before one is able to see the meaning. One cannot use the history of the method of Saussure’s dualism, again, for it is not directed at what is being said but at how *what is being said* is said. Since the history of Saussure’s dualism originates from an epistemological question of how knowledge, or language to be specific, comes about, the question of meaning is very much an ontological one. Again, Saussure’s dualism is a divine construction of an evolutionary plan that which determines the nature of social human relationships.\(^{27}\)

In Roy Harris’ summary of Saussure’s dualism showing the contrast between Saussure’s “Copernican” point of view and my critique of dualism in Tonga, “For instead of men’s words being seen as peripheral to men’s understanding of reality, men’s understanding of reality came to be seen as revolving about their social use of verbal signs...Words are not vocal labels which have come to be attached to things and qualities already given in advance by Nature, or to ideas already grasped independently by the human mind. On the contrary languages themselves, collective products of social interaction, supply the essential conceptual frameworks for men’s analysis of reality and, simultaneously, the verbal equipment for their description of it. The concepts we use are creations of the language we speak.”\(^{28}\) Further to my argument, the relationship that holds, even the *langue* and the *parole*, together does not necessarily imply that the *parole* only participates in the *langue*. Rather, the relationship refers to the convenient use of a universal idea to dominate a particular engagement in war of words between the thinker/speaker and his/her opponent. Once again, the relationship collapses the distinction of

\(^{27}\) Passmore 1985

\(^{28}\) Harris 1983.ix
Saussure between the conceptual world (langue) and the actual world (parole) in so far as to reveal the actual nature of the distinction as not distinction within another bigger distinction but it ("the language we speak") is simply situational proposition of \( X \) is \( Y \).

Further to my critique of dualism in Tonga in contrast to the opposing theories on the diarchy system between Valerio Valeri's "father-son, elder brother-younger brother rivalries"\(^{29}\) and Kerry E. James' "brother-sister relationship"\(^{30}\), the shortcoming of the two theories is their common failure to give an account of the history of Tonga from a unilineal perspective. Starting with the shortcoming of James' theory, it is James basing her account on the ambiguous "respect one another" message in connection to the brother-sister relationship principle. James' position appears to me to have been formulated out of Elizabeth Bott's quotation of Queen Salote\(^{31}\) of a history of Tonga based on the gender relationship in association with the female titles of Tu'i Tonga Fefine "Female Tu'i Tonga or sister of the Tu'i Tonga" and Tamahaa "Sacred child". It is, in other words, a history in connection to the high rank fahu "sister's child"\(^{32}\). I add that James' position as a guise of a late Tongan feminist interpretation of brother-sister relationship muddles up, thus, ignores to discuss the contradictoriness of all dualities in Tongan society.

Valeri\(^{33}\), on the other hand, sets out to attack James' thesis arguing its shortcoming to have derived from her taking a Malinowskian syllogism of

\(^{29}\) Valeri 1990, 1993, 1994

\(^{30}\) James 1991

\(^{31}\) Bott 1982

\(^{32}\) Ibid 1982:169; Rogers 1977
“matrilineal complex” for granted without attempting to justify the major premise of this syllogism. But, Valeri’s counterchallenge of James’ matrilineal perspective falls in the same defect for his as being patrilineal.

One aspect of my concern about these two theories of diarchy in Tonga is their perceptions of the terms of female and male. In Tongan, the use of female and male is, of course, contextual in accordance with one’s many respective duties. For example, the same female person who is a *tuofefine* “sister” can be, at the same time, a *fa’ee* “mother”. Again, the same person can also be recognised as a *mehikitanga* “father’s sister”, a *tehina* “younger sister”, as opposed to *ta’okete* “older sister”. Similarly, the same male person who is a *tuonga’ane* “brother” can be a *tamai* “father”, even, as a *fa’ee tangata* “mother male”, etc. On another dimension of this kind of female-male social distinction as dialectical is when the brother, for example, refers to his sister as his *tuofefine* “female pair” and, the sister to her brother as her *tuonga’ane* “male pair”. In other words, in saying my *tuofefine* “sister”, it would mean she is part of me as female. Similarly, in saying my *tuonga’ane* “brother”, it means my sister is referring to me as her male part. (I am not sure whether common terms of reference like *fakafefine* “(to a man) behave like a woman” and *fakatangata* “(to a woman) behave like a man (tomboy)” in use in Tonga are later development of *tuonga’ane* and *tuofefine*, respectively.)

*Tuonga’ane-tuofefine* is a dialectical distinction in the arena of sibling supporting, when one is taking the other for his/her own advantage. It is a female-male
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33 Valeri 1994:75
complexity as viewed with the distinction between *uho tau* “quarrelling sons of different mothers” and *uho taha* “supporting sons of the same mother”. Such complexity in the arena of sibling supporting is shown, for example, when ‘Aho’eitu’s Tongan mother, supported by her brothers, and ‘Aho’eitu’s older half Samoan brothers’ mother, supported by her Samoan brothers, entering into war over the respective two mothers’ husband’s title. The *tuonga’ane* supports the *tuofefine*’s aspiration after the biggest *Tu’i* “share” title, which, if success, is given to the *tuonga’ane*’s son.

On the positive side of Valeri’s treatise on the socio-political history of power in Tonga, however, it points to the centrality and internal danger implicit in the Tongan society’s structural hierarchical moiety system. In carefully analysing the socio-political history of power, it can be a starting point to read, for example, the historical emergence of the *Tu’i Tonga-Tu’i Ha’atakalaua* dualism. Valeri’s treatise, of course, does not have great depth in analysis of the ‘Aho’eitu myth and the *kava* rite, thus missing out completely the connection between Samoa and Tonga in his interpretation.

*Tu’i Ha’atakalaua* office is an advanced new socio-political reformation from the failure of the preceded *Tu’i Tonga* rule, especially, of younger sons becoming strong leaders in the outer islands of Tonga and, as well, in Samoa. These younger *Ha’atakalaua* sons, in turn, created a strong supporting network of their older *Tu’i Tonga* brother who was based at *Tongatapu*. They became their older brother’s
mataapule, which was further reinforced with the moheofo marriage between their oldest daughters as principal wives of the successive older brother Tu'i Tonga. Elder brother-younger brother rivalry in the Tu'i Tonga dynasty, then, becomes an elder brother-younger brother support in the Tu'i Ha'atakalaua dynasty.

"Eyes of pule" system in the time of the Tu'i Ha'atakalaua regime refers to a reverse of the role of protection and the Tu'i title holder. In the preceding Tu'i Tonga regime the title holder was the younger brother 'Aho'eiitu and his protectors were his older half Samoan brothers. During that time there were several tragedies, of several Tu'i Tonga title holders who were murdered and mutilated. These tragedies had probably to do with continuous violent rivalries between the older brothers as who amongst the brothers the oldest of all. As likely one of several things addressed by the new Tu'i Ha'atakalaua office, the older brother became the Tu'i Tonga successor after their father Takalaua who was murdered and mutilated while his younger brothers became his protectors. Perhaps it is a valid statement that from this new reverse, the use of mataapule, in the context of brother-sister supporting relationship, between the husband and his wife's brother, so as between the wife and her husband's sister, then becomes a term of reference to one another in the situation of marriage. In other words, in the moheofo marriage between the Tu'i Ha'atakalaua's sister and the Tu'i Tonga, the Tu'i Tonga refers to his wife's Tu'i Ha'atakalaua brother as his mataapule and, vice versa, the Tu'i Ha'atakalaua to his sister's husband's Tu'i Tonga his mataapule. Mataapule, in other words, becomes the confused supporting reference of
protection between brother and sister. Brother and sister are respectively both eyes and authorities to one another. Brother’s speaking- I am *pule*, my sister is my *mata*. Sister’s speaking- I am *pule*, my brother is my *mata*.

Another aspect to show the origin of the senior *Tu’i Tonga*– junior *Tu’i Ha’atakalauna* dualism as a *mataapule* case in action is the use of the *toa* tree as a *hala* “pathway” between earth and sky in the myth of ‘Aho’eitu. The *toa* tree is a metaphorical reference of *totola* “hard-fleshed yams” as the contents of the ‘*inasi*’ food tribute of the *Tu’i Manu’a* from the people of Tonga given via his tutelary *Tu’i Tonga*. In other words, descending of sky-god Tangaloa ‘Eitumatupu’a to cohabit with Va’epopua on earth and ascending of son ‘Aho’eitu to meet his father up in the sky via the *toa* tree indicates this exchange between the landward sky-god supreme *pule* and his seaward land cultivator *mata* of “hard-fleshed yams” and protection. Thus, the *toa* tree stands as not only a “pathway” but also a “procession of taking the ‘*inasi*’ from *Ma’ufanga*, where was the yam plantation of ‘Aho’eitu, to Folaha village of Tangaloa ‘Eitumatupu’a in the mainland of Tongatapu Island. The division of Kauhala’uta “landward side at the top” and Kauhalalalo “seaward side at the bottom” is division originated from this ‘*inasi* procession between chief Folaha and *Ma’ufanga*, the beach where Tangaloa copulated with Va’epopua.

Exchanging of food as one’s seeking pardon for wrongdoing committed is at the same time contracting inevitable danger because of the expectations involved in the formal request. While the wrongdoer expects pardon the pardon is given with
expectation that the wrongdoer will be assisting him in his war with another chief elsewhere. So, food becomes an ambiguous commodity because of its double nature as a source of freedom and, as well, a source of power. And, because of this ambiguity of food danger, that, in connection to the marine history of Samoa’aatoa in the Pacific region, the Tangaloa tribe began to set up some strict socio-political measures to control and protect the food resources for themselves. These measures immediately caused scarcity of food and constant wars in the region.

The associated implicit danger of food is connected to an ideological contradiction when, for example, Tangaloa ‘Eitumatup’a sought food and was given Va’epopua as a moheofo to eat, cohabit with, while, at the same time, the giving of moheofo was a seeking to ngaohi “adopt”34, gaoi “steal”35 in Samoan, the conceived high social rank young successor as the seat of power. The destructive implication of food refers to the impregnation of the local chieftess thus creating a local descent group and a genealogical connection of support with the impregnator. In historical terms, food is a socio-political means of personal struggle for power. Like fishing, the moheofo food of Va’epopua is bait which was used to catch the highest sacred royal blood of the Tu’i Manu’a. But at the cost of making the local Tongan descent group the peito, the low-ranking, seaward providers of food in a penal system of providing even human sacrifice.

34 Churchward 1959:385
Fale as upturned boat, for example, is a historical statement concerning constant wars over food resources. The victorious boat reverses its role on land to become a house of advisers focussing on the issues of security and distribution of food. It should be common knowledge that every socio-political reformation is for the fale architect’s personal protection reason. To turning his back from the Tu’i Tonga-Tu’i Ha’atakalaua combined force by overthrowing the barbaric ‘Aho’eitu human sacrifice, the current Tu’i Tonga title holder has replaced it, again, with a joyous ‘Ahome’e feasting. Food is the driving factor to the collapse of the pule-mata moiety division thus allowing the free flow between the patrician and plebeian to and fro from one side to another, one replacing another. Somehow, we could argue that this concept of food as “thing eatable” would be the hidden source of freedom that would testify to the mobility of civilization and people in space and time.

Again, the issue here, (not critiqued clearly by Toren in her addressing of Marshall Sahlins on the issue of sexual division of labour in Fiji using the complementary symbolism of “sea” and “land” by taking men to be associated with the “sea” and women with “land”), is Toren’s notion of equality, “as given by balanced reciprocity in exchange relations”, since she claims both sexes are associated with the land and with the sea. Toren’s interest in “what the Fijian idea of hierarchy might be and how it is brought into being, both at the level of the group
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and of the person" is as confusing as Sahlins' complementary symbolism. Instead, as I have repeatedly emphasized, the question of social hierarchy has to do with people of all social strata struggling for economic and political power, such as between Tangaloa 'Eitumatupu'a and local Va'epopua, between the sons of the same father (*uho tau*) and of the same mother (*uho taha*). The story of 'Aho'eitu is not a fiction but a record of a real political struggle. Social hierarchy, once again, is the historical inverse taking place in a new socio-political reformation of a new ruler's boat being turned upside down on land to replace the defeated ruler's house roof. Thus, the replacement is correctly referred to the replacing of the leadership on land of the defeated who has been decapitated and his head abandoned into the sea.

*Moheofo* marriage, later known in the *Tu'i Kanokupolu* period as *kitetama*, becomes a new factor of general significance mediated by individual hunger for power. It is a universal socio-political practice to which all individuals must succumb in the game of *hoko* "joining genealogical aristocratic lines of succession to the ruling titles". The interpretation here, in fact, disputes Kaeppler's circulating connubium theory of intermarriages between Tonga-Fiji-Samoa. Kaeppler's theory, I suspect, sets the direction for the work of Herda in her PhD thesis on "The transformation of the traditional Tongan polity: a genealogical consideration of Tonga's past".  
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Herda’s work is significant in many ways in relation to her use of Queen Salote’s saying that “the genealogies are the key that opens the door. To try to do anything without knowing the genealogies is like scratching around the door without the key.” Transformation of the traditional Tongan polity is a wide area with its own distinct complexity. Opening the door into the general genealogical house of Tonga means one must also be able to discern the socio-historical implications of the genealogy. For Queen Salote to say that “genealogies are the key” she is hinting at a specific understanding of the legitimation of the Tupou dynasty’s economic and political power in Tonga. Her statement to Bott is a reference to the Tupou genealogical construction of the history of Tonga, beginning with Tu’i Tonga ‘Uluakimata, Tu’i Ha’atakalaua Mo’ungaatonga, and Mo’ungaatonga’s son, Tu’i Kanokupolu Ngata. In other words, it is Queen Salote’s acknowledgement of the long historical socio-political struggle for power of the Tu’i Kanokupolu that ended with the Tupou dynasty, in her. She even composed a lakalaka, known as the Takafalu, (see the texts and translation in the Appendix 8, pages 288-295), danced by her husband’s people at Tatakomotonga to commemorate this historical feat of the long haul into Tonga of the vasu/fahu sacred royal blood that unites the three kingly lines.

Dissension that gave rise to discord in the socio-political arena of Tongan elites has been responsible for the recent emergence of personalised or biographical
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history. Thus, the question of “how the past should be constructed and how that construction is to be interpreted” put forth by Herda is an issue at stake. I would rather replace the term “construction” in favour of discovery, thus, the question should read, “how the past should be discovered and how that discovery is to be interpreted”.

The vasu/fahu sacred royal blood in connection to genealogy as a breeding place for contestation for power is fundamentally the hidden political secrecy of the moheofo institution practice at the time of Tu'i Ha'atakalaua Mo'ungaatonga. The associated idea is to eclipse the Tu'i Tonga representative of Tu'i Manu'a in Tonga. The implementation of the idea is an ‘Upolu cause by paramount chief and commander in war of Safata, Ama, giving his daughter, Tohuia, to be wife of Mo'ungaatonga. Mo'ungaatonga, again, gives his daughter, Kaloafutuutonga, as moheofo to Tu'i Tonga 'Uluakimata, which, I think, was a spontaneous action following the ‘Upolu's presentation of moheofo to Mo'ungaatonga. Since then, the moheofo adoption practice has become a prime occupation of the Tu'i Kanokupolu line in Tonga. As a socio-political principle of adopting, this distinct operational behaviour of the Tu'i Kanokupolu moheofo institution is thus marked in the social division of male and female, thus, fakahokohoko toto 'a fatine, kae fakahokohoko hingoa 'a tangata “carrying blood the women, but carrying titles the men”. Carrying of the sacred royal blood makes women the weavers of the aristocratic kinship
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network in Tonga and, carrying of the titles makes men known as the keepers of the ancestral tradition of political power.

Following this argument, overlooking historical criticism of the genealogical culture as a system of symbols a gap will be created, therefore, causing lack of knowledge about the important role of genealogy in the legitimation of economic and political power in Tonga. Unlocking the door, then, is to consider the personalised genealogy structuring events as *hohoko* of blood and titles. The history of *hohoko* began as an invention of the ruling dynasty in connection to marriage alliance, primarily for economic and political colonization and protection purposes. Consequential problems associated with this genealogical power-focused institution of joining led on to dispute over land and power between the ruler’s sons with different mothers at the same time as a socio-political reformation was taking place.

The polygynous practice of having several wives is a case of interest in connection with genealogy structuring events. Its advantage, not only supplying the conqueror with fighting men and sustenance, definitely gives the conqueror, and his councillors, better options in selecting the suitable conqueror’s representative in the new subjugated land. The disadvantage, of course, is the instability in the power structure, leading on to ferocious struggle between the sons of different mothers. Again, we can use the myth of ‘Aho’eitu as an example to show this.
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instability of power in the contesting sense of hoko when Tangaloa ‘Eitumatupu’a’s sons of different mothers fought for the title.

Herda’s genealogical consideration of Tonga’s past can be a relevant guide to the understanding of the history of Tonga only when the question of genealogy is about hoko of two contesting parties, each taking the other for an advantage. It is commonly heard that the hoko is the joining of a weak party and a strong party. The traditions of Umatagata and chief Folasa of Falelima in Savai’i, Western Samoa, and chief Lufe of Folaha in Tonga are recorded cases, which have never analyzed elsewhere, so far as I know, except here, upholding this common view. But, the weakness of chiefs Folasa and Lufe were too influential enough to weaken, regardless of the heavy burden laid on their shoulders, the mighty Tu’i Manu’a ferocious persecution in Samoa’aatoa. Therefore, I suggest that in the case of the transformation of the traditional Tongan polity, Herda’s study should have highlighted the fact that the transformation had always involved human sacrifice of a low ranking person, (for example, Folasa), being cut into half and his lower part taken to be joined on to an abandoned upper part of a murdered high ranking person (Tu’i Manu’a).

My hoko interpretation of Herda’s thesis should likewise be a point of critique of Levi-Strauss’ notion of “house society” taken to be the centre of social
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organization. This is a notion fascinated me so much that somehow “house society” as “centre of social organization” suspiciously clicks a parallel in meaning to the Tongan *fale* as “inside, centre” where the head of the family dwells and makes decisions for the whole family members. Levi-Strauss’ “house society” of feudal Europe would then in Tonga collectively refer to the land title holders, or, the nobility class and their dependent people. But, I would argue, quite frankly, that, because Levi-Strauss’ social analysis of “house society” was based on the feudal system of Europe, its application by the Austronesianists to their study of it in Oceania commits a contextual error of relativizing the explanation of it in the different local areas in Oceania. The application, for example, by Patrick Kirch, one of the leading archaeologists in this big Austronesian comparative project, of Levi-Strauss’ method of social analysis is focussing on the reconstructing of the proto-“holy house” of the high chief. Thus, the testing of Levi-Strauss’ notion of “house society” misses out the concrete reality of house in Oceania, particularly in Tonga, as a centre of social organization.

Kirch’s claim is tested with the *paito* of Polynesian outlier Tikopia for “house” that, to him, it “reveals all the core characteristics originally pointed to by Levi-Strauss,” such as a corporate body holding an estate of land, the persistence of the house name over time (and its transmission to the principal occupants of the house), varying methods of kinship affiliation to the house, the transmission of titles,
valuables, heirlooms, and rituals, and of course, the central role of eponymous founding ancestors\textsuperscript{52}. Actually, the term \textit{paito} has a broader semantic referent than simply dwelling house, for it explicitly encompasses the concept of household, family, lineage, and thus truly represents the house in Levi-Strauss’s sense\textsuperscript{53}.

It would be a useful enterprise for Patrick Kirch’s interest in the notion of “house society” if Kirch digs deeper into the socio-historical traditions of connection between \textit{Tikopia} and Tonga. Possibly, the \textit{Tikopian paito} is an adoption of the Tongan \textit{peito}, or vice versa. The interesting connection, then, of the \textit{peito} is it where the sacrificial fire for the high chief’s food being prepared and cooked. Thus, the idea of \textit{peito} is connected to the wider practice in Oceania of tribute system of human victims as food of propitiatory offering because of a wrongdoing committed.

My concern with this Austronesian kind of reconstruction method is twofold. First, the proto-form focus prevents a Tongan-Samoan understanding of the relationship between the house and human body because it is only if we understand the connection between the house and the sea that we can understand the association between the upper part of the body and the house as shown in the Samoan concept of \textit{umatagata} “wide chest-person”\textsuperscript{54} and Tongan \textit{hoko} “join”\textsuperscript{55}. Second, unlike the case of Tonga that I am presenting here, there is no historical and social analysis of the \textit{fale} “house” concept or even of the use of the sacred-secular

\textsuperscript{52} Kirch 2000:107
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid, 2000:107; also see Firth 1985:326
\textsuperscript{54} Pratt 1984:102; Schultz 1985
\textsuperscript{55} Also see my criticism of the reconstruction method on Taliai (1989).
dualism. Specifically, Kirch’s methodology has not even critically progressed as far as unmasking what is behind the “masked/holy” and the relationship between fare/fale and paito/peito in both Tonga and Tikopia. In Tonga, for example, the relationship between fale and peito is the duty of preparing food of the latter as the “kitchen”\(^{56}\) of the former, of the dwelling of the ‘eiki “small sacred child”. The ‘eiki is the grown hii “sem en”\(^{57}\) of the ‘ulu “head” of the fare/fale being nurtured and destined inside the fare/fale to be the pule “governor”\(^{58}\) of the land.

My interest in the ideology of hoko came about from undertaking what started as a personal curiosity to find out more about the sociopolitical history of Tongan society. The question central to my interest is why and how Tongan society was basically divided up into two social groups and, then, later on, became imploded into one. One of the basic constituents that which is significantly and directly connected to the make-up of Tongan society and must be discussed in relation to the ideology of hoko is the kainga institution. Tongan society, in accordance with my critique here, is a hoko history of a royal murder and a commoner human sacrifice of propitiation, of an abandoned Tu’i Manu’a tonga or konga “half (upper body)” and Folasas’s va’e “legs (lower part)”. From this early body connection between eastern Samoan Manu’a and western Samoan Savai’i, based on tuofe fine-tuonga’ane relationship of respect involved, the hoko appears to be a cultural practice originated from the tama tu’u he fa’ee “child stands on mother”\(^{59}\)

\(^{56}\) Churchward 1959:407  
\(^{57}\) Ibid., 1959:221  
\(^{58}\) Ibid., 1959:419
principle. In the case of the abandoned *Tu’i Manu’a* “half”, he is the other upper body-part of the murdered child of chief Folasa’s sister. Thus, socio-culturally, chief Folasa is fulfilling his social duty of respecting his sister by mutilating his body so that his lower part can be joined on to his nephew’s upper body for a proper burial.

In the origin myth of *Aho’eitu*, this *hoko* ideology is as recorded the Talafale “tradition of *fale*”, the upturned boat. *Fale*, in that context, is the *hoko* of the mutilated head (*fau* “strong hibiscus fibre” in the tradition of *Umatagata* “shoulder-person” in the Samoan version) and legs (*polata* “trunk of banana plant” in the *Lufe*’s tradition). In terms of the brother-sister relationship principle, the Talafale tradition is the sister’s sacrificed brother becoming the *pou* “post” on which the sister’s child’s decapitated abandoned head placed. The sister’s decapitated child becomes the replaced ‘*ulu* “head” of the sister’s headless *pou* brother on land. This join of two human parts thus gives a symbolic meaning of *fale* as the sister’s brother (*pou*) supporting the sister’s son (*’ato* “roof”).

Being able to critically read and analyze Tongan oral traditions is owed to my formal training at ‘*Atenisi* Institute’ in Tonga under the advice and teaching of the founder-director of the Institute, philosopher and ethno-scientist, Professor ‘Ilaisa Futa-ki-Ha’angana Helu. ‘Atenisi’, Tonganized form of Athens in Greece where the first Academy founded by Plato, becomes the first Institute in the Pacific to teach a
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curriculum based on the Greek traditionalist-classical education of criticism. Its primary objective is to prepare the students to be critical in the way they see things. From this early formal induction, I was directed to have recognized the Greek philosophy of realism that considers things, though are related to one another, as existing independently. With this critical apparatus, I was, then, able to analyse the distinction and relation of things as one state of culture and history affairs of Tonga. This is a point which marks the turn from the realm of explaining something in terms of one’s interests (mythology) into explaining something in its own terms (science).

This ‘Atenisi adopted unique traditionalist classical Greek stance of explaining things as they are has, firstly, been used in my MA thesis\textsuperscript{61}. Therein, I offer a critique of the linguistic historical reconstruction method. Further to that critique is the point on hoko between Tonga and Samoa discussed in this thesis. The flaw associated with the reconstruction method is its attempt to presuppose the proto-form from comparison of the existing dialects. Proto-form then becomes conceptualised as a void from which sprung these several dialects and, thus, making the reconstruction objective of linguistic science as to specify the void of origin with the existing dialects. The phylogenetic work by Roger Green and Andrew Pawley in their demonstration of the correlations between the archaeological and linguistic evidence of early Oceanic architectural forms and


\textsuperscript{61} Taliai 1989
settlement patterns, combined with evidence of comparative ethnology\textsuperscript{62}, is an example. Regrettably, they ignore the local circumstances which, I think, are relevant in giving the phylogenetic method some historical sense. For example, the architectural connection between Samoa and Tonga is not, like the phylogenetic implication of their interest, whether these islands both have “raised timber pole houses” or some houses having an “area underneath” as found in Western Oceanic and “houses built on the ground” in Eastern Oceanic. House in Samoa and Tonga has a local origin myth. It is related as an upturned boat connected by some standing posts on to earth. The metaphoricality of this myth should be the common methodical ground for the discussion of the subject of house\textsuperscript{63}. We need to penetrate through the oracularity and metaphoricity of the people’s way of talking about them and their environments. The objective of locating the place of origin of a particular culture\textsuperscript{64}, using the phylogenetic techniques, needs revision in Pacific scholarship! The ‘Atenisi method of criticism stands to oppose the phylogenetic structuralist proposal of locating the rule-governed language system which produces the utterances we make\textsuperscript{65} by focussing only on the elucidation of the relationships involved in the statement, $X$ is $Y$. To combat against dualism of this nature, from a realist point of view, the void has to have some real characters of its own, apart from it being spoken of, with which the void can be known.

\textsuperscript{62} Green and Pawley 1999
\textsuperscript{63} See Frye (1990) about his discussion of metaphor and his distinction between “underthought and overthought”.
\textsuperscript{64} Bellwood 1991; Pawley and Ross 1995; Bellwood \textit{et al} 1995; Blench 1999; Kirch 2000; Hurles \textit{et al} 2003
\textsuperscript{65} See Culler 1973:21; McTaggart 1964; Rosen 1982:1-2
Similarly, Valeri’s “father-son” dissertation in the context of the ‘Aho’eitu myth should be about a relationship of the son as progeny of the father or, of the toa tree as the connector of above (sky-father) and below (earthly mother). The toa as the son also means the son is the father’s foha “yam tuber” that grows out of the father’s decapitated ‘ulu “head” as metaphorically represented in the fakatei’ulu “cutting off the tuber of a growing yam and leave the plant where it was so that it may produce another tuber”. In other words, father-son relationship is conceptualised as a propitiatory hoko because of a murder that had been committed and, thus, the sacrificed son was appointed with the title of Tu‘i Tonga. Thus, in terms of the Samoa-Tonga connection, Valeri’s thesis should show the moiety division between above and below as joining relationship of the two sides of the wrongdoing in seeking for pardon.

The void kept intact in the phylogenetic reconstruction methodology. For example, the erroneous interpretation and use of the Hegelian triadic philosophy of realism, thesis-antithesis-synthesis, by Green and Pawley in their demonstration of the correlations between the archaeological and linguistic, combined with evidence of comparative ethnology, of early Oceanic architectural forms and settlement patterns, taking the point of departure from the words back to how they are linguistically made, can only be seen as some kind of archaeolinguistic/genetic composition of the void. Archaeolinguistic reconstruction of this nature is surely reflex form of the doctrine of idealism.
Idealism should be the doctrine of ideology, the platform for analysis of the associated meanings of people’s ideas. What the people’s ideas are about is what the Hegelian system set out to discover. Ideology, as not so much a particular body of ideas, is the normal natural way of perceiving and analysing reality and, at the same time, an instrument of oppression. Its activity is very much synthetic in the sense of it as the resolving stage of the opposed thesis. Being the synthesis, it affirms only the difference between thesis and antithesis. Ideology, as their very difference, links up the elements of a signifying network. Only on this critical apparatus that phylogenetic method of linguistic analysis, testing the “evolution of cultural diversity”, of speaker’s saying \( X \) is \( Y \), can have a real test.

Interdisciplinary relations between special sciences, for example, archaeology, linguistics, and ethnology, must all be incorporated in the one logic of analysis described with the Hegelian system in Zizek’s interpretation.

How the economic and political power is legitimated is not an archaeogenetic question takes it to be. Once again, it is because archaeogenetics, as an evolutionary theory, fails to recognise the social contradictions associated with the question of legitimization of power in Tonga. Its failure is implicated in my critique of the origin myth of the house in Tonga and Samoa, which suggests that linguistic preoccupation must take into consideration house as a historical record of power.
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As an idea of State in Hegel’s philosophy, Tongan *fale* is a socio-political reconstitution in an imagination of a coherent solution beyond the real world in order to do away with the contradictions in the real world. Part of the contradictions is the sense that Tongan *fale* as the royal architectural building which encloses within the thinker-adviser of Tongan society is a protected area under the *mataapule* system. And, also, Tongan *fale* serves to secure the adhesion of the individual with the appropriate formal protocol and, thus, to preserve the power of the dominant class in society. Tongan *fale* is the transitionally State of inverted two houses, the banished *fale-a-folau* “house-of-navigators” in the sea and the protected *fale-a-lea* “house-of-speakers” on land, that are contradictorily reinforcing one another. In that regard, my commitment to explaining the contraditoriness of *fale* ideology is also to reveal the difficulty of this task since it is impossible to reconcile the existence of a revolutionary ideology with the assertion that all ideology subjects individuals to the dominant system. Once turned upside down on land to become a shelter, the navigators’ house (*fale-a-folau*) was converted into becoming the protected parliamentarian house (*fale-a-lea*) of *mataapule* representatives. It is thus one house converted from carrying navigators (downside up) in the ocean, thus a *kato* “basket”, to sheltering them (upside down) on land, thus ‘*ato* “roof”, from *folau* “navigation” to *polau* “rhetoric”. It
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is house, thus the abandoned upper part, of *Umatangata* "Shoulder-persons" paddling in the ocean and, on land, of *tanga* "mouths" talking.

Once again, as the issue of my thesis is legitimation, the discussion of the following indicates whether or not they square with the evidence or logic. First, whether the development of legitimation language is later than the social facts, for example, power, which it is designed to legitimate, as seems to be the implication of the relevant literature, or, second, whether the legitimation language has an origin different from that of the social reality it is usually associated with.

The methodological tools I employ include some standard approaches in social historical critical analysis but logical considerations inform every aspect of my analysis. This is done in the conviction that logic and fact do not clash but converge and concur at every point such that when they clash we should take it as a sign that either our logical theory needs revision or our observation of the actual process has been amiss. In this, I follow the main lines of the critique of illusions, romanticism, and personalism developed in the philosophical realism of John Anderson.  

In the following Chapters 2, 3, and 4, the question of the legitimation of economic and political power in Tonga will begin with a brief introduction to how the Samoan *matai, tamai* in Tongan, system of government had been reinforced in Tonga. I
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discuss this early invasion in Chapter 2 in terms of the myth of the propitiatory offering of ‘Aho’eitu to Folaha with the appointment of the Tu’i Tonga title and of the exile myth of the fale, as in Talafale, with the appointment of the Falefā service to the Tu’i Tonga title holder in Tonga. Chapter 2 will be a brief summary of the history of connection between Samoa and Tonga, precisely, the interest is on the discussion of the concept of hoko “join, genealogy” in connection to the legitimation of economic and political power in Tonga.

This early rough period of struggle to establish in Tonga of the Samoan fale faka-Manu’a government system, originated from the island of Manu’a in east Samoa, had eased down when George Taufa’aahau Tupou I later settled the quarrel over the Tu’i Tonga title with the Ha’a Ma’afu in the nineteenth century. George Taufa’aahau Tupou I did this with the assistance of Christianity and missionary Shirley Baker. The latter helped George Taufa’aahau Tupou I in the drafting of the Tongan Constitution. As a palladium of Ha’a Ma’afu, Tongan Constitution becomes the main theme of discussion in Chapter 3 of George Taufa’aahau Tupou I’s fight to protect the powerful rank of the Ma’afu descent group in Tonga. Thus, the granting of the Constitution, which is a case of junior manager (Taufa’ahau Tupou I) taking action against his powerful uncle and brother-in-law, Tu’i Tonga Laufilitonga, in my view, is a written document particularly served to protect the Tupou dynasty of Ha’a Ma’afu. His taking action is reminisced in his invading the central house of Tu’i Tonga power in the main island
of Tongatapu with the fighting men from the outer small islands of the Ha'apai and Vava'u Groups. Thus, it is the invasion of Tongatapu by the fale-a-folau.

His great, great granddaughter, Queen Salote Tupou III, the subject of Chapter 4, at the time the Ha'a Ma'afu had already firmly secured the top socio-political rank in Tongatapu Island, reinforced the Constitution of George Taufa'ahau Tupou I with her artistic skill in speaking poetic and rhetoric. In her time, navigation became less importance as a way of life, whereas, the art of poetry, music, and dance was emphasized. Finally, people are being constituted with legal precepts and moral responsibilities to their King/Queen and his/her chiefly representatives. People are disciplined to respect and honour their superiors. Both these Chapters, 3 and 4, are examples of successful legitimation of economic and political power in Tonga, in the way these two important political figures have done to implode the two senior kingly lines, Tu'i Tonga and Tu'i Ha'atakalaua, into the one Tu'i Kanokupolu kingly line.

The main aim of these two political figures' in terms of legitimizing the economic and political power is to persecute the “sacred blood” as the fundamental seat of power. Queen Salote, in particular, conducts this persecution method with the marriage arrangements of her children and her immediate Tupou family members to the descendants of the last holder of the Tamahaa title, Laatuufuipeka. For this

71 Bott 1982:153-154, Figures 31(a),(b),(c)
conduct to get recognized is greatly owed to the Taufa‘ahau Tupou I’s 1875 Constitution. Thus, the preservation of the “sacred blood” has constitutionally been recognised with the practice of kitetama “causing to appear of a chiefly child” pertaining to marriage of cousins. Tupou I calls this course as the tau'ataaina “fight to get freed” from the Tu’i Tonga rule.

Tu’i Kanokupolu line to which the Ha’a Ma’afu belongs becomes a synthetic difference opposing the persecution element of the Tu’i Manu’a tribute system with the conversion of Tonga into Christianity. Christianity, I am arguing, is no longer an opposing difference, but, like fale faka-Manu’a, Christianity is just another political instrument of persecution. The holders of position in the government are changed, but, the core socio-political structure still remains hierarchical and ruggedly stratified.

**Conclusion**

In contrast to Levi-Strauss’ question, do dual organisations exist? the emphasis of my dissertation on moiety system lies in my inside knowledge of dualities in Tonga. It is not an exercise, as would an outsider, like Levi-Strauss, do, of finding out whether dual organisations exist in Tonga. Again, my thesis does not either set out with the intention of promoting a theory of dualism, of two independent underlying principles. It, in other words, sets out to critically discuss dualities as common phenomena of Tongan society and, historically examine how they
operate and come about. As differed from the philosophical use of dualism, the
real examination of dualities here is a question dealt directly with the historical
connection between dualities and the legitimation of economic and political power
in Tonga. So, I am taking the historical connection of the moiety system, as a
particular masquerading as a universal, to be a social ideology, for example, of
foreign conqueror (Tangaloa) in his political and economic establishment in Tonga.
Once again, social moieties or the moiety system is, thus, a historical result of the
fusion of an exile Samoan Tangaloa clan who sought refuge in Tonga and who
brought with them the advisory system of Faleua and Falefaa to assist their
youngest half brother of Tongan mother who became the first Tu’i Tonga “King of
Tonga”\textsuperscript{73}. Historically, as the argument goes, these moieties worked both ways,
dual and asymmetrical at the same time. My discussion is not a commentary
located at the level of current political debates but rather in the critique of social
moieties in Tonga.

\textsuperscript{72} Levi-Strauss 1963
CHAPTER 2

Tongan Fale: “Household Advice” to a Junior Manager

Introduction

In this chapter the focus is on the historical connection between Samoa and Tonga. How this tyrannical Tangaloa system of persecution from Samoa eventually established itself as a form of ruling dynasty in Tonga is the subject matter of discussion in this chapter. The history of Samoa-Tonga connection is introduced in terms of my criticism of Queen Salote’s beginning the history of Tonga with the joint reigns of the twenty ninth Tu’i Tonga ‘Uluakimata and the sixth Tu’i Ha’atakalaua as transcribed by anthropologist Elizabeth Bott in the middle of the twentieth century in her book on Tongan society. Discussion of the Samoa-Tonga connection is enlightened with my analysis of the origin myth of Seketoa of Niuatoputapu and ‘Aho’eitu of Tongatapu, highlighting the idea of hoko of the abandoned head of the former and the local legs of the latter. Hoko, in other words, is the ideological expression of the establishment in Tonga of the Tongan fale “household advice (Faleua and Falefaa) to a junior manager (Tu’i Tonga ‘Aho’eitu)”. Some cases are cited to illustrate the socio-political implications in association with this social practice of hoko. One is the cutting-into-half sacrifice of chief Lute of Folaha, the village named after Tangaloa ‘Eitumatu’u’a’s title name, father of Tu’i Tonga ‘Aho’eitu. Another is the moheofu, which is an ‘Upolu social institution of adopting the sacred royal blood of the Tu’i Tonga during Tu’i Tonga ‘Uluakimata. Stealing and usurpation of power was the common practice leading up to the localization of power in Tonga. Discussion of the origin of the moiety division and of the changing features of the Falefaa system of protection throughout the three kingly lines, from Tu’i Tonga to Tu’i Ha’atakalaua to the present Tu’i Kanokupolu is an introduction to the next chapters.

73 Compare with Rivers’ discussion of moiety system idea (1920)
The discussion hereon is my review of Queen Salote's history of Tonga going from a point with no preceding history. The argument presented here will refer to the late Queen Salote's first written local history of Tonga, as transcribed by anthropologist Elizabeth Bott, following discussions with her Majesty in the final years of her reign. As I will show in the discussions to follow, Queen Salote's version of the local history of Tonga is her confirmative interpretation of a socio-political reformation in Tonga during the joint reigns of the twenty ninth Tu'i Tonga 'Uluakimata and the sixth Tu'i Ha'atakalaua Mo'ungaatonga. Queen Salote's version focuses on a Tupou dynasty's ambition to localize the history of Tonga. It is an ambition, I strongly believe, based on my interpretation of the name Tupou, reflected in Tupou decapitating the Tu'i Tonga line to let the Kanokupolu "Flesh of 'Upolu 'three heads'" tu'u "stands" in Tonga. (My interpretation of 'Upolu is derived from the story of the making of Ngata, son of Mo'ungaatonga and Tohuia of 'Upolu, as the Tu'i "King" of the Hihifo "West" District of Tongatapu Island. Ngata is the 'Ulutolu "three men in one". 'Upolu, in fact, is a concept referring to the island as having only "three standing districts", thus Tu'utolu, namely, Aana [west belonging to the Tui Aana], Tuamasaga [central to the Malietoa family], and Atua [east to the Tui Atua]. These are the most powerful chiefs holding the overall ruling power in Samoa. In Tongatapu, Aana is Hihifo [Tu'i Kanokupolu], Tuamasaga Vaheloto [Tu'i Ha'atakalaua], and Atua Hahake [Tu'i Tonga].) Queen Salote reinforces the "three men in one" working theme in Tonga focusing on the old ethno-biological
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belief in the *fahu* social institution\textsuperscript{77}. More of the discussion on how the *fahu* works can also be viewed in Chapter 4.

The refutation of Queen *Salote*’s local history, I must emphasize, which, of course, is the subject of the discussion in this chapter, is a fuller critique of the local history, using the concept of *hoko* “join”, to produce an original account of the processes preceding the present. *Hoko* is a central concept and practice in the legitimation of power as implicit in the history of the relationship between *Kauhala’uta* and *Kauhalalalo* in the period when they were most significant, before the *Kanokupolu* and their reduction to sides of the road at *Lapaha*. The relationship was from the start based on some kind of tension between sea and land, male and female, upper and lower, as expressed in bodily terms further reflected in the dynamics of the relationships between *vaka* “canoe” and *fale* “house”.

Starting this historical analysis of the changing meaning of *hoko* in Samoa shows that the unity of *Samoa’aatoa* “Samoan-all”\textsuperscript{78} culture was not simply military empire but a concept of power based on the contradictory relationship of theft and protection as aspects of the same political relationship.

The concrete analysis of the myth of ‘*Aho’eitu* portrays the *hoko* relationships between Tonga and Samoa, male and female, sons of different mothers, as a myth

\textsuperscript{76} Kramer 1994:193, Vol 1

\textsuperscript{77} See Mahina (1992: Figure 2.1) which shows these incestuous sexual relationships in the beginning as founding ancestors of the kingly lines of Tonga.
of human sacrifice to a "cannibal" spirit and of Talafale tradition consisted of Faleua, Falefaa, and Tu'i Tonga titles. Following here is Dr Mahina's relation of the myth, thus

The Origin Myth of 'Aho'eitu

(as told and translated by Dr Mahina79)

"Seketo'a, chief of Niuatoputapu, had a beautiful daughter, 'Ilaheva. Since there was no man of comparable rank to marry her in Niuatoputapu, Niutao'ou, and Samoa, Seketo'a ordered his people to take her in a canoe to look for a husband in Vava'u and Ha'apai. She refused to land in those islands because of Vava'u rugged features and the active volcano of Kao in Ha'apai. Thus, they set sailed for Tongatapu, where she was put ashore at Popua in Ma'ofanga. Unfamiliar with the place, 'Ilaheva hid behind the woods. Occasionally, she would sneak out of hiding to collect shellfish in the lagoon, so the people of Popua had only a glimpse of her. Struck by her great beauty, they named her Va'epopua. But on one offshore island, To'onangakava, grew a huge toa tree reaching Langi, the abode of Tangaloa 'Eiki and his children. Tangaloa 'Eitumatupu'a used to climb down the tree from Langi to Maama, where on one occasion he sighted Va'epopua collecting shellfish. They then had sex in a particular spot of one island, afterward named Mohenga and the island Ha'angakafa. The couple overslept in one island, when long after dawn a flying tern woke them by its cries, and on another island they slept till late, waking up to find the light of day. As a commemoration of their sleep, the respective islands were named Talakite and Mata'aho. In time, Va'epopua got pregnant, then gave birth to a male child, whom his father named 'Aho'eitu. On returning to Langi, his father poured down clay forming a mount called Holohiufi for his son's garden, then brought a yam named heketala for 'Aho'eitu to cultivate. One day 'Aho'eitu said to his mother that he wanted to see his father. Va'epopua anointed him with oil, then gave him a piece of bark cloth to take as a present. She advised 'Aho'eitu that, by climbing up the toa tree to Langi, he would find his father snaring pigeons on a roadside mound. Overcome by handsome 'Aho'eitu, Tangaloa 'Eitumatupu'a sat down in obeisance, but he told him to rise because he was his son form Maama. Food and kava were prepared for his reception. Afterwards he sent 'Aho'eitu to meet his brothers, who were playing sika'ulutoa on the mala'e. His beautiful physique and skills in the sport sparked jealousy in his brothers, who killed and ate him, then threw his head into a clump of hoi plants. When they returned, 'Aho'eitu was without them. So Tangaloa 'Eitumatupu'a suspecting 'Aho'eitu to have been

78 Kramer 1994:9; the culture stands for all surrounding islands of Samoa including Tonga, Fiji, Rarotonga, Tahiti, Wahua, (in my interpretation, this is Ewa in Oahu, Hawaii, ['Eua Island in Tonga]), all of which had to bring Tuimanu’a food tributes (umiti, 'umisi in Tongan).
79 Mahina 1992:91-92
murdered summoned his sons before him. They were made to vomit, throwing up 'Aho'eitu's flesh and blood into a bowl. The head was added, and the bowl covered with nonu leaves. After a few days, 'Aho'eitu's dismembered body reunited and came back to life. As a consequence, he ordered that 'Aho'eitu had to descend to Maama and become the first Tu'i Tonga, while his Langi brothers, Talafale, Matakehe, Maliepoo, Tu'iloloko and Tu'ifolaha were to form the first Falefaa. While Matakehe and Maliepoo were to guard the Tu'i Tonga, Tu'iloloko and Tu'ifolaha were to help him govern and conduct his funeral."

My interpretation of the myth is that it is a tradition of a decapitated upper part chief (Tu'i Manu'a) abandoned into the sea and drifted from Samoa (fale faka-Manu'a) as a boat (kato) and, eventually, landed in Tonga and turned upside down to rest on a mutilated lower part of the decapitated chief's female relation as the posts (fale), thus becoming the roof ('ato) to shelter the whole jointed two-part-body title of Tu'i Tonga. The fundamental implication conveyed in the myth tells of the support and protection in Tonga of a wrongdoing committed in Samoa. Thus, in order to institutionalize a secured protection system for the life and political and economic privileges of this abandoned wounded Tu'i Manu'a in Tonga, a representative local Tu'i Tonga title holder with his Falefaa murderers made up of his Samoan older half brothers had to be appointed. Up to this point of the appointment of a Tu'i Tonga office in Tonga, a significant aspect can be observed about the supporting service of the Falefaa showing a contradiction in the nature of hoko between the Samoan fale form of government and the locals. The members of the Falefaa were entirely made of Samoan men as the local Tu'i Tonga title holder's protectors. They were in fact the wrongdoers who fled Samoa with the royal 'ula of paramount sun-god Tagaloa, thus known in Samoa as the stealing of
the Fale'ula into 'Upolu\textsuperscript{80}. They were thieves and actors of their own theft building up a new colony of Samoa'aatoa in Tonga.

Stealing of the high ranking title and protecting it from being seized in this historical context of Samoa-Tonga connection are clues to finding the original meaning of the title Tu'i Tonga "King of Tonga". In the myth of 'Aho'eitu, for example, Tangaloa 'Eitumatupu'a's youngest son with 'Ilaheva Va'epopua of Tonga was mutilated and, his lower part being cooked and eaten while the upper part (head) abandoned to decompose in a clump of hoi yams. Mutilated as tu'usi konga "to cut into half" is the closest we can have as the probable translation for Tu'i Tonga. Thus, Tu'i Tonga is Tu'i Konga "Cutting into half". It then became a kingly title in recognition of his sacrifice, to also means, sacrifice by offering his konga "share which is his lower part" to an abandoned decapitated loving one. Thus, the concept of Tu'i is, therefore, directly connected to the name 'Aho'eitu as "Human sacrifice [share]-[to]-cannibal spirit" and founding principle of 'inasi tribute system. It suggests that the institutionalization of the Fale'aa protection system of the Tu'i Tonga office in Tonga is a Tu'i Manu'a interest in absorption of the local resources.

(In connection and, I think, it is important, but, will not be divulged here any further, is Jacques Lacan's designations of Hegel's system as "hysteric, master, university" as a case of illustration. As Hegel the representative of the discourse of university, for Lacan, "what reigns in what one calls the Union of the Soviet

\textsuperscript{80} Personal communication with Dr Morgan Tuimaleali'iifano in 1999, historian and lecturer in the University of the South Pacific in Fiji. Also, see Kramer 1994, Vol. I, on the mythical accounts in Manu'a in connection to the Fale'ula.
Socialist Republics is University", that is, in the USSR, "knowledge is the king"\textsuperscript{81}. Knowledge, in Tongan, is 'ilo. Also, 'ilo is honorific for "to eat" of an aristocrat. This latter meaning provides an interesting hint to the connection in between the regal concept of Tu'i and its consumptive reflex in the human sacrifice.)

The \textit{hoko} of \textit{Lufe} of Folaha and \textit{Tu'i Tonga Havea}, as in the saying, \textit{hoko e fau moe polata} "join of fau and polata", on the other hand, gives another perspective of human sacrifice, highlighting, in my view, the value and impact of the brother-sister relationship principle. As the name \textit{Lufe}, the title at the village of Folaha, derived from a devoted action of Havea's mother's people to their kinrelation's decapitated "child"\textsuperscript{82}, the devotion, in relation to the "secret cult" of \textit{Luve ni Wai} "Offspring of the Water"\textsuperscript{83} in Fiji, could be reference to the sacredness of the brother-sister relationship commonly practiced in Tonga as \textit{fahu}, known in Fiji as \textit{vasu}. It is "one medium by which individuals, disgruntled at the new social order, can gain social prestige in the community"\textsuperscript{84}.

The story of \textit{Lufe}'s cutting into half has been related in connection to this \textit{Tu'i Tonga} named \textit{Havea} who was murdered while having a bath at a pool named Tolopona in 'Alaki, a tract in the village of Pelehake. Havea was decapitated and the upper body part was thrown in to the sea and floated until founded by chief \textit{Lufe}'s people of Folaha at a beach called Fangaloto. Once chief \textit{Lufe} realised that

\textsuperscript{81} Zizek 2004:57
\textsuperscript{82} Bott 1982:94
\textsuperscript{83} Thompson 1940:117
the upper body part belonged to Havea, chief Lufe immediately commanded his people to cut his body into half, thus the place where it happened still now called Tu'utu'u, and Havea's upper part be brought up from the water on to the land and joined together with his lower part, thus that place it happened called Hikihoko, before Havea, once again, in full body, was given a proper burial. Tui Tonga Havea's burial place (Langi) since then has become known as Fangaloto.

For Lufe to go to that extreme of sacrificing himself, Havea's mother, in the fahu relationship, must be chief Lufe's sister. Subsequently, the sacrifice must have been a form of disgruntlement that earned him the title Lufe. What was that new social order as the subject of chief Lufe's disgruntlement is a question I will come back to it as the discussion hereon unfolds.

The same kind of disgruntlement is shown in connection to the outrageousness of the Samoa'aatoa culture of persecution recorded in Tonga with several attempted and successive assassinations of some, most probably, tyrannical Tu'i Tonga title holders. Notable cases are the assassinations of Tu'i Tonga Havea I, Havea II, and Takalaua, which were carried out by Fijian and 'Uvean men. Not only that, the disgruntlement is reflected in the recurrent reformation of the Faletaa protection system for the sake of the Tui Tonga safety. Recurrent assassinations and reformations of the Faletaa protection system show the attempt to control the contestation for the power vested in the Tu'i Tonga title. The Ha'atakalaua Faletaa,

84 Thompson 1940:117. Further, one should also consult Brewster 1922; Williams and Calvert 1852.
85 See Bott 1982:95
for example, made up of the younger brothers, has the role of protecting their
oldest brother and successor to the title of Tu’i Tonga after the murder of their Tu’i
Tonga father, Takalau, by men from ‘Uvea86.

The Fiji connection to Tonga at the time of Tele’a is a revival of the constant war
between the children of the sun-god in the place where the sun sets (Savai’i) and
those in the place where the sun rises (Manu’a). The Fiji connection, then, focuses
on the disturbances of localization of power in Tonga, as evidenced in the several
assassinations of Tu’i Tonga title holders mentioned above, and the founding and
regulating of Tongan customs and social life by Lo’au. Lo’au is ‘akau in two senses
relevant in the discussion here. It means, in Samoan, “a small axe”87 and, in
Oceania, “fishhook”88. Lo’au, as an axe and fishhook, in my interpretation, refers to
his work as a tuputoka “canoe/house builder” and fusifonua “land hauler/founder”.
Thus, localization of power in Tonga is marked with the renaming of Tele’a as Tu’i
Tonga, the ‘Uluakimata “First Eye”. Mata is also symbol of house89 and fishhook.

Also, the localization of power in Tonga refers to the hoko by means of moheofu
practice between Tu’i Tonga ‘Uluakimata, Tu’i Ha’atakalaaua Mo’ungaatonga, and
Safata of ‘Upolu. The hoko of moheofu is the central turning point of contestation of
the sacred blood which later becomes a different contestation. At this point, the
discussion will lead on to the following chapter on Queen Salote’s affirmation of the
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86 Confirmation of the involvement of Fijian and ‘Uvean men in the assassinations of the Tu’i Tonga comes
from my own interpretation of the event as recorded by Bott (1982:95) and the history and culture of the
lagoon area in the Tongatapu Island.
87 Pratt 1984:173
political ascendency of the *Tu'i Kanokupolu* status in her genealogical poetry.

Socio-political reformation at the time of ‘Uluakimata and Mo‘ungaatonga is ‘Upolu localization by means of usurping the power of the *Tu'i Manu'a* and the *Tu'i Manu'a* representative *Tu'i Tonga* “King-[of]-*Tonga*” title in Tonga. How the usurpation of the *Tu'i Manu'a*’s power is done, of course, has not been seriously taken as a subject of discussion. Historically, political usurpation of power has been an old practice that had to do with establishment by means of replacing an old political system. The commonest political method used from time immemorial, and which is still in practice up to present day in Tonga, is the *moheofo* “to enter into an incestuous sexual intercourse-[for]-joining purposes”\(^\text{90}\) institution. Given that the socio-political use of *moheofo* has historically been part of nation building in the region of Tonga, there is another important implication of Queen *Salote*’s local history as recorded by Bott in association with the localization and centralization theme of marriage arrangements between cruel savage ‘Ahome’e of Hihifo and his young brother, *Lavaka vao-leleva*, and *Tu'i Ha'atakalaua Mo'ungaatonga*\(^\text{91}\). It is the economic implication. For instance, Kaloafutonga, Mo‘ungaatonga’s daughter, became the first *moheofo* wife of Lavaka-vaoleleva’s grandson, *Tele’a*, later given the name, ‘Uluakimata. ‘Uluakimata, literally, the “First-eye”\(^\text{92}\), became the first local *Tu'i Tonga* title holder. The reason being, as Gifford has already
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\(^{88}\) Clark 1994

\(^{89}\) See Gell 1998

\(^{90}\) Churchward 1959:361,227. I take *moheofo* to be a variant of *mohehoko*.

\(^{91}\) Gifford 1929:35-36. The interpretation for the political implication of this genealogy provided herewith is my own. Also see Bott (1982:120) mentioning the savage Hihifo people.

\(^{92}\) Kramer 1995:357-361, Vol. II
pointed out, is because of Lavaka’s hospitality to the Tu‘i Tonga during a great famine in Tongatapu. Lavaka prepared some meals of leleva yam-silages from his two great storage pits for the Tu‘i Tonga and his voyaging party on their short stay in Tongatapu before leaving for Vava‘u.

This case of transformed political legitimation, the moheofo practice as a new cultural trait, will be the focus of this chapter. It has never been adequately discussed as a strategy of an ascending group brought into play at a particular juncture, with the outcome of a new beginning of history, that of Tonga as summarized as the history merely of the Kanokupolu. New institutions were the practical political culture of a new ruling class. The moheofo practice has been introduced at the same time as the social institutions of Tamahaa “Child-sacred” and Tu‘i Tonga Fefine “Tu‘i Tonga Female”.

This turning point marked by the introduction of moheofo in exactly this strategic way marks the end of an earlier relationship between Samoa (Manu‘a) and Tonga (Savai‘i) as parts of an older whole. This older relationship was dominated by the dualism of sacred and profane, ‘uta “above” and lalo “below”, hahake “east” and hihifo “west”, upper and lower parts of the fale-body, tangata “male” and fefine “female”. The point is that the beginning of official history at Lapaha is commonly taken to be the start of the opposition between Kauhala ‘uta and Kauhalalalo. The present discussion will suggest that the advent of Tele‘a and the official ancestors of the Kanokupolu give undue prominence to the distinction between the seaward
and inland sides of the road. The distinction is rather a formulaic expression of an older and much more subtle and complex set of distinctions centering on the power dynamics of the *fale* in the period marked by the closer relationship between the *Tu'i Tonga* and *Manu'a* represented by the *Talafale*. The classic distinction between the moieties dominant at the time of the presence of the ancestral line of the *Kanokupolu* is a simplistic one, simply marking the beginning of the decline of the archaic opposition between Tonga and *Manu'a*. The opposition between rivals to power is now marked by the social spaces brought by *moheofo* and *fahu* whereas once it was marked by the distance between the inside and the outside of the house.

Just as the simplistic phase of opposition between moieties is not representative of their whole history so too the practice of Kaeppler in construing the marriages between Samoa, Tonga and Fiji as an eternal circulating connubial hides a truth. This is the revolutionary transitional nature of the phase of intermarriage between the *Tu'i Tonga*, *Tu'i Ha'atakalaua* and *'Upolu* expressed in the relationships between the main island groups.

Before I trace the change taking place, I want, as part of my critique of moiety division idea, to bring to the fore an update of the progress of a new focus in doing research in Oceania which takes “house”, based on the feudal European noble “house society” theory of social anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss, as the centre

---
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of social organization. I feel that updating this progress will then enable us to make sense of Queen Salote’s obscure localizing history theory of Tongan society.

With special relevance to this new focus in doing research is an article, written by a notable Oceanic archaeologist, Patrick Kirch, on “Holy Houses: The Transformation of Ritual Architecture in Traditional Polynesian Societies”. Therein, Patrick Kirch, in reviewing Raymond Firth’s ethnographic analysis of paito “house” in Tikopia, argues that it “reveals all the core characteristics originally pointed to by Levi-Strauss, such as a corporate body holding an estate of land, the persistence of the house name over time (and its transmission to the principal occupants of the house), varying methods of kinship affiliation to the house, the transmission of titles, valuables, heirlooms, and rituals, and of course, the central role of eponymous founding ancestors”. Kirch’s hypothesis, as regarding the linkage between Polynesian houses and temples, very much based on the linguistic reconstruction method, states that “the Tikopia term fare is, of course, a reflex of the Proto-Polynesian term *fare/fa/e, cognate reflexes of which are the usual term for ‘dwelling house’ throughout Polynesia (e.g., Hawaiian hale, Tongan fa/e). Thus the Tikopia have retained the older Polynesian term for ‘house’ as their word for ‘temple’, while innovating a new term, paito, for the residential structure. (Actually, the term paito has a broader semantic referent than simply ‘dwelling house’, for it explicitly encompasses the concept of ‘household, family, lineage’, and thus truly

94 Carsten and Hugh-Jones 1995; Joyce and Gillespie 2000
95 Kirch 2000
96 Levi-Strauss 1982:174
97 Kirch 2000:107
represents ‘the house’ in Levi-Strauss’s sense.)" The *fare/fale-paito* distinction is based on the use of the two houses but not specifically on the historical relationships of *fare/fale* and *paito* in space and time. The object of his experiment is reconstruction of the transformation of *fare* “holy houses” of traditional Polynesian societies into residential *paito*.

My concern with this kind of reconstruction method is twofold. First, the proto-form focus prevents the Tongan-Samoan understanding of the relationship between the house and human body because it is only if we understand the connection between the house and the sea that we can understand the association between the upper part of the body and the house as shown in the Samoan concept of *umatagata* “wide chest-person” and Tongan *hoko* “join”. Second, based on the case of Tonga that I am presenting here, there is no historical and social analysis of the *fale* “house” concept or even of the use of the sacred-secular dualism. Specifically, Kirch’s methodology has not even critically discussed, let alone unmasked, what is behind the “masked/holy” and the relationship between *fare/fale* and *paito*. In Tonga, the relationship between *fale* and *peito* is the duty of preparing food of the latter as the “kitchen” of the former, the dwelling of the ‘*eiki* “small sacred child”. The ‘*eiki* is the grown *hii* “semen” of the ‘*ulu* “head” of the *fare/fale* nurtured and destined to be the *pule* “governor” of the land.
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98 Kirch: 2000:107; also see Firth 1985:326
99 Pratt 1984:102
100 Also see my criticism of the reconstruction method on Taliai (1987).
101 Churchward 1959:407
It would be a useful enterprise for Patrick Kirch's interest in the notion of house society if Kirch digs deeper into the socio-historical traditions of connection between Tikopia and Tonga. Possibly, the Tikopian paito is adoption of the Tongan peito, or vice versa. The interesting connection of peito is the sacrificial fire of the high chief's food preparation. The idea of peito is thus connected to the wider practice in Oceania of tribute system of human victims as food of propitiatory offering because of a wrongdoing committed.

Discussing the relationship between the sacred dwelling fare/fale-secular kitchen paito/peito in Samoa and Tonga is another way of showing how the body sets the scene to house\textsuperscript{104}. The Samoan story of the Umatagata “Shoulder-person” is a case study. It is about a boy born with no legs who had been carried around Samoa on a boat from Manu’a in the east looking for some legs. The search finally ended at the village of Falelima in Savai’i at the west, originally known as Aopo, where chief Folasale ‘i’ite, the prophet, offered legless Umatagata his youngest son’s legs. This hoko of the Umatagata with chief Folasa’s lower part, in my interpretation, is connected to a war in Tauu, the main island in the Manu’a Group, between two wives of Taeotagaloa over the Tu’i Manu’a title\textsuperscript{105}. While Taeotagaloa was away, Laulaualefolasa, the first wife of Taeotagaloa and daughter of chief Folasa, had immediately proclaimed her son the Tu’i Manu’a at Lefaga Bay, the

\textsuperscript{102} Churchward: 1959:221
\textsuperscript{103} Ibid., 1959:419
\textsuperscript{104} See Schultz 1985
\textsuperscript{105} See Fraser (1897:67-69) for the full story. Also see Kramer (1994:533) for duplication of the story.
original home of the Tagaloa’s Fale’ula “House-red”\textsuperscript{106}. The proclamation was partly also for the reason that Laulaualefola\textasep; first gave birth before Sina, the other wife. In my interpretation, Taeotagalaoa took Laulaualefola\textasep;’s claim of the title to be an official declaration of him as dead. He returned from Fiji in a state of fury and, instead, appointed Fa’aeanuu, Sina’s son, to be the Tu’i Manu’a. Following this, Laulaualefola\textasep; carried her wounded son from Manu’a to Savai’i and buried him at Vaisala. At the same time, the Fale’ula was shifted inland to Fitiuta, the home of Ta’eotagalaoa. But, Laulaualefola\textasep;’s son, on chief Fola\textasep;’s prophetic instruction, was to be given a title of Asilangi “(to speak) plainly in the sky”\textsuperscript{107} in the midst of sky-god Tagaloa.

Umatagata the abandoned upper part is the vaka “canoe” being carried over the uma “shoulders”\textsuperscript{108} of two or more upper bodied tangata “men”\textsuperscript{109}. They are themselves the fohe “oars”\textsuperscript{110} that pretend, while in action, to be swimming in the ocean. On landing, the voyaging vaka is lifted and turned upside down to be a palepale “shelter”\textsuperscript{111}, a fale, from the sun and rain, resting on headless lower bodied persons va’e “legs”\textsuperscript{112} as pou “posts”\textsuperscript{113} of his sacrificed mother’s male brothers. This event is a recognition of the Umatagata as a fahu, derived from

\textsuperscript{106} Kramer (1994:660, Vol.1) translates Fale’ula as “the shiny red house”.
\textsuperscript{107} Kramer 1994:533, Vol.1. I add on the Tongan meaning of the term as in lea ‘asi “to speak plainly” (Churchward 1959:551) instead of Kramer’s translation, “to talk in heaven”, with the implication that chief Fola\textasep;’s proclamation of his grandson to the title of Tu’i Manu’a was purely attempt to steal the title belonging to the sky royal family (Tagaloa). In other words, chief Fola\textasep; was to appear in front of the sky-god for an explanation as to wrongdoing.
\textsuperscript{108} Churchward 1959:526; Pratt 1984:102
\textsuperscript{109} Ibid., 1959:454; Ibid., 1984:294
\textsuperscript{110} Ibid., 1959:193
\textsuperscript{111} Ibid., 1959:400
\textsuperscript{112} Ibid., 1959:536
\textsuperscript{113} Ibid., 1959:417
Fijian dra tabu, in Tongan, ta’ata’a tapu, meaning “blood foetus/sacred”\textsuperscript{114}, a representation of the mother’s brother’s “descent”\textsuperscript{115}, kawa in Fijian, kava in Tongan. The junction on land represents a new group, a new source of aid, of protection, of support of his mother’s “cross-relative”\textsuperscript{116} brother, Tapuna. It means that chief Folasa of Falelima is recognized as the supporter/cook of the wounded voyaging Umatagata, thus his dwelling becomes known as the fale faka-Manu’a “house of the Manu’a ‘Wounded’”\textsuperscript{117}. As chief of the upper part “fare/fale that had been carried in the ocean with the hands” village, Folasa became the “Word-divine” at the paito/peito preparation of the fire for the human feilaulau “sacrifice”\textsuperscript{118}. In Savai’i, Folasa is known as ‘o le fofoga a papaa “the voice at the title”\textsuperscript{119}, meaning, he has the right to confer the Tonumaipe’a title following the death of the title-holder. In terms of the hoko of the Umatagata (Manu’a) and the va’e (Savai’i) the former, represented in the latter by the Folasa title, becomes the ‘ulumotu’a “head of the Tonumaipe’a in Savai’i”.

While the telling of the Umatagata centers on the head, the upper part of the human body, the origin myth of ‘Aho’eitu in Tonga emphasizes, for example, the paito/peito preparation of chief Folasa, also known in the Tongan narrative as Tu’i Folaha, sacrifice. This theme of sacrifice is fully expressed in Samoan as Asoaitu

\textsuperscript{114} Churchward 1959:473,457 \\
\textsuperscript{115} Sahlin 1962:168 \\
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid., 1962:168-169 \\
\textsuperscript{117} Churchward 1959:82. Fale faka-Manu’a is fale fakamonuka, thus implying the name of the Manu’a Group in east Samoa after this Tagaloa family dispute between the sons. \\
\textsuperscript{118} Ibid., 1959:158 \\
\textsuperscript{119} Kramer 1994:106
le Fofasa “daily human tributes-[to]-underworld god, Folasa”\textsuperscript{120}. In this sense, Folasa is a cannibal. Tongan historian, Dr Okusitino Mahina\textsuperscript{121}, tells the origin myth of ‘Aho'eitu beginning with a voyage from Niuatoputapu Island of ‘Ilaheva, daughter of chief Seketoa, to look for a husband who she met and cohabited with in Tongatapu Island. Dr Mahina through his analysis of the myth finally makes some relevant points that I would like to pursue particularly in this chapter, firstly, about tributary relationships to Tongatapu, the seat of the Tu‘i Tonga power and, secondly, the weakening of the power of the Tu‘i Manu‘a over Niuatoputapu\textsuperscript{122}.

I will start my analysis with the consideration of implications of specific terms used in the myth, such as the toa tree connecting the sky above and the earth and the yam plantation. These two points are very much interconnected in the sense that one explains the other. For example, as the toa tree, in my interpretation, refers to the weakening of the power of the Tu‘i Manu‘a, the yam plantation provides the explanation for it. The interconnection in relation to the theme of sacrifice is the yam plantation of heketala at Holoi‘ufi in Ma‘ufanga where ‘Aho'eitu and his mother, Va‘epopua, lived. Some clay soil was poured down from the sky, home of ‘Aho'eitu’s father, Tangaloa ‘Eitumatupu‘a, on to the sandy soil of Ma‘ufanga for the preparation of ‘Aho'eitu’s garden of yams.

The preparation of a yam plantation is an indication, as suggested in the name of

\textsuperscript{121} Mahina 1992:91-92
\textsuperscript{122} Mahina: 1992:97
the place, Holoi'ufi, of a “procession of people-with-'ufi 'yam-tubers”¹²³ as food tributes to Tangaloa 'Eitumatupu'a. Procession with yam tributes is otherwise known as the heketala “tradition of shuffling along on the posteriors”¹²⁴ of decapitated people as victims. Cannibalism in this sense simply refers to the eating of the ‘ufi “yam-tubers”¹²⁵, from huli “shoot, scion”¹²⁶, that have been fakatei'ulu “cut off leaving the ‘ulu ‘heads’, with the plants stuck on, so that they may tupu ‘grow’¹²⁷ again to produce some tubers”¹²⁸. From this yam culture, the Tongan Tu'i and the Samoan Tupu for “King” and “to grow”, respectively, is derived. The Tongan concept of “King” is derived from the “cutting off”, whereas, the Samoan King is from “shoot, scion”.

The dismembering of ‘Aho'eitu by his half Samoan older brothers was an effect following on from ‘Aho'eitu outplaying his brothers in their game of sika “stick throwing”¹²⁹ competition. Sika is a game where champions are only a person, like the toa ironwood tree, of to’a “big strong man of whom others are afraid”¹³⁰. He would be, for example, the person who has been fighting his way up the social hierarchy of the Manu’a sovereignty, with the intention to liberate his people from constant violent domination.

¹²³ Churchward 1959:229
¹²⁴ Ibid, 1959:218,446
¹²⁵ Ibid, 1959:568
¹²⁶ Ibid, 1959:235
¹²⁸ Ibid, 1959:109
¹³⁰ Churchward 1959:502
The other aspect of the *sika* competition is ‘Aho’eitu climbing up the *toa* tree to Samoa from Tonga as a *uho tau* “war of challenging his half Samoan brothers of different mother”. ‘Aho’eitu’s extraordinary powerfulness showed in his daring pressing on with no fear to meet his father and his tyrannical half brothers also became his fatal destiny. As part of his climbing up, ‘Aho’eitu was there to protect his father, Tangaloa ‘Eitumatupu’a, who I presume to be also known in Samoa as Ta’eotagaloa and Folasa le i’ite, during a big war between Fitiuta (Ta’eotagaloa) and Tauu (Lefanoga, younger brother of Ta’eotagaloa) for predominance in Manu’a. This war took place at the time when the Fale‘ula had been shifted from Lefagaa Bay by Ta‘eotagaloa inland to his home, Fitiuta. In this war, ‘Aho’eitu got murdered and descended into *malae-o-Vavau* “farewell meeting of sacrifice” at Tauu. His half Samoan brothers ate his body and, they threw his head into a clump of poisonous *hoi* yams.

Socially, abandoning and poisoning is, again, reference to the *uho tau* opposition between ‘Aho’eitu and his half Samoan brothers. The opposition is then explained in terms of the clump of *hoi* yams wherein ‘Aho’eitu’s head was discarded as a *tau‘angahoi* “hanging-place-of-*hoi*”. This meaning is associated with the *hoi* as a wild (poisonous) yam bearing fruit. *Hoi*, as also bearing tubers, would therefore suggest that *tau‘angahoi*, as a place in Folaha, can also be a *tanu‘angahoi* “burying place of *hoi*”. In this sense, *hoi* is *ohi* “sucker” from which the tuber has

---

131 Kramer 1994:554
132 Ibid 1994:510,537
grown. It, then, thus, implies that 'Aho'eitu's fault has given 'Aho'eitu no place in the upper social rank, and, that his lower part (tuber) has become food of sacrifice in the 'umu "ground oven"\textsuperscript{134} of the Tu'i Manu'a. In this respect, 'Aho'eitu is a ohi "adopted", which, giving a reason as to why he was murdered. One half of him is 'eiki, for he is an iki "younger (son)", (compare with 'uhiki "offspring"), of sky-god Tangaloa 'Eitumatupu'a, and the other half of him is tu'a "commoner" with his mother "outside" the fale preparing the 'umu of the sky-god. Once again, 'Aho'eitu is a tu'usi konga "cut of a poisonous head-of yam", thus Tu'i Tonga.

The tyranny-sacrifice relationship between Tangaloa and 'Aho'eitu, in this context, can also be viewed as reflecting a similar kind of distinction to that between the Samoan tradition of tofi "dividing" and the Tongan tradition of tau "warring"\textsuperscript{135}. Thus, for example, the murdering of 'Aho'eitu by his Samoan half brothers means, as a hoi yam, he is a tofinga "yam piece cut off" or pulopula "seed-yam for planting". On the other side of the same event (murdering), 'Aho'eitu is sacrificed. It means that 'Aho'eitu's Tongan mother's people were forced to pay the food prize of the sika competition regardless of 'Aho'eitu defeating the Samoans. Thus, the food prize has been recognized, especially in the history of Samoa-Tonga connections, as an 'llaheva "Chieftess partly commoner-wrongdoer"\textsuperscript{136}, as Va'epopua "Legs (body) of

\textsuperscript{134} Churchward 1959:572

\textsuperscript{135} Taken from the Samoan saying, e tala tau Tonga, ae tala tofi Samoa "Tongan stories are about warfare while Samoan stories are about divisions", cited by Malama Meleisea (1987).

\textsuperscript{136} Also see Kamakau (1991) for Hawaiian hewa, as heva in Tonga, means "sin".
punishment"\textsuperscript{137}. Marriage, therefore, in this context, is “dividing” and “war” at the same time.

My interpretation here of the name ‘Ilaheva Va’epopua, mother of ‘Aho’eitu and daughter of Seketoa of Niuatoputapu, is an alternative to Mahina’s aesthetic analysis that promoting a circulating intermarriage between Fiji, Samoa, and Tonga. I would prefer to show its connection to the tribute system of the Tu’i Manu’a in Samoa’aatoa. Mahina centres his analysis on the va’e “legs” of the Niuatoputapu astray beauty which attracted Tangaloa ‘Eitumatupu’a to cohabit with her. “Legs”, in my view, are to’ukupu kekeke, supporting structures for the upturned canoe on land. Her punitive lower part, as a Tapuhia “Sacred-crime”\textsuperscript{138}, then becomes a Tongatapu “section-prohibited” on which rests the Niu-a-toputapu “Head-of-sacredness”\textsuperscript{139}. The head is sacred, for it touches the sky, so that the legs, which stand in contact with the earth, become sacred, too. In other words, the wrongdoing of Va’epopua is pardoned by her intimate sexual relationship with Tangaloa ‘Eitumatupu’a.

The tradition of chief Lufe in Tonga is different from the two human sacrifice stories previously discussed, in being about cutting his body into half to have his lower part joined with the decapitated upper part of his descendant, Tu’i Tonga Havea I,

\textsuperscript{137} See Churchward (1959:469,416) under tautea and poopula. “Punishment”, in terms of food, refers to the lower part of the mutilated body, the yam tuber cut off from the yam-top, taken to the aitu.

\textsuperscript{138} Tapuhia is a big petrified stone of wrongdoers Seketoa and Va’epopua in Folaha which has been quarried for road construction in Tongatapu and now a dumping hole of Tongatapu’s rubbish.

\textsuperscript{139} Tonga is konga “section”, the lower member of the whole body. “South” for Tonga in Samoan means “below Samoa”, thus, Samoa-Tonga connection is a whole body of ’ulu and va’e joined together.
to complete the body of the *Tu'i Tonga*\textsuperscript{140}. Although this event genealogically happened very much later than the previous two stories, it is important to note that the same theme of body cutting persists in the three versions.

My analysis of the story hereon is that, firstly, *Lute*'s sacrifice, like the other two cases, is a case showing the social principle of jointly working together of brother and sister, in protecting (brother's role) the burying/nurturing (sister's role) of the sacred blood of *Tangaloa*. It thus also means that the social importance of this protected and buried sacred blood means the 'eiki born is recognized as the *fahuloa*, or, *fatuloa*. He is, in other words, the ancestral "maker-ghost" of his genealogical line of connection. And because of that he, also, as the successor to the *Tu'i Tonga* title, becomes a superior person in rank over his mother and her people of Tonga.

Thus, *Lute*'s sacrifice can be taken to indicate the working in Tonga of the social, political and economic institution of *fahu* genealogy-making system. The marriage into the *Tu'i Tonga* line, for example, of *Lute* of *Folaha* is the latter being politically and economically woven into the high rank genealogical mat of the *Tu'i Tonga*. In this context, *Tu'i Tonga Havea* becomes the ancestral descendant of his maternal *Lute* of *Tonga*. His high rank has made him as the ancestral founder of the name *Lute* and the people of *Folaha*. To understand this kind of reasoning, there is a need to consider the implication of the name *Havea*.

---

Mythologically, *niu* "coconut" is the "head" of the *tuna* "eel" that its lower part being cut off, thus *'ulu* and *niu* are doublets. Thus, *Niutoputapu* is compound of *ni-'ulu-a-toputapu* "head-of-sacredness".
Havea, in Samoan Saavea, the founding ancestor of the Malietoa family of Tuamasaga in central 'Upolu, is Ha'avea “descendants of Vea”. Vea, as “overripe” in Fijian, is *fena* “piece of *pulopula* ‘over-mature yam’ which, having been planted and begun to grow, may be broken off the new plant and planted again”\(^\text{142}\).

The implication here refers to an attempt to usurp the *Tu'i Tonga* title with the marriage of *Tu'i Tonga Puipui* to Lufe's female relative, who is probably a daughter or sister to Lufe. Puipui is successor of *Tu'i Tonga Ma'akatoe*, who appears in the Malietoa's genealogy as a woman, daughter of *Tu'i Aana Tamaalelagi*.

(*Tamaalelagi* is also the father of Queen Salamasina. Her mother, Vaetoeifaga, is daughter of *Tu'i Tonga Fa'a'ulufanua*. *Fa'a'ulufanua* is son of *Tu'i Tonga Faisautele*. Both these *Tu'i Tonga* are *Kau'ulufonua I*, *fekai* “the savage”, and *Kau'ulufonua II* in Mahina’s list\(^\text{143}\). Thus, Queen Salamasina and *Tu'itongama'atoe*\(^\text{144}\), [possibly *Tu'i Tonga Ma'akatoe* in Tongan], are half sisters. Bott\(^\text{145}\) mentions Vaitoifanga [possibly Vaetoe-'i-Fanga], a Samoan woman as wife of *Falefaa Maliepoo*, from who Lauaki, the royal undertaker, originated.) Seemingly, this genealogy therefore suggests the reason for the assassination of *Tu'i Tonga Havea*, was to stop the ambitious advance of the Malietoa family to take over the rule of Tonga. Following from the successful historic victory of driving *Tu'i Tonga Talakai'aki* out of Samoa,

---

\(^{140}\) See Bott 1982:94; Gifford 1929
\(^{141}\) Hocart 1929:240
\(^{142}\) Churchward 1959:169. *Pulopula* seems to be a derivation from the Fijian *mbula* “greeting for to live”, cognate of Tongan *muka* "to have young leaves, to send out shoot”. Stealing of the *kahokaho* yam from Fiji in the *Folau ki Pulotu* points out this derivation.
\(^{143}\) Kramer 1994:32,222-224,317,394; Mahina 1992: Figure 3.1
\(^{144}\) Ibid, 1994:223
\(^{145}\) Bott 1982:116
Malietoa Savea\(^{146}\), I suspect, begins his planning to seize the *Tu'i Tonga* title in Tonga.

This part of my historical analysis of Havea introduced here provides an additional reading to the *Tu'i Tonga* List of Mahina\(^{147}\). That is, all the *Tu'i Tonga* title holders, from the 17\(^{th}\) *Tu'i Tonga* Ma'akatoe to the 28\(^{th}\) *Tu'i Tonga* Tapu'osi, are people from the high chiefs of 'Upolu- *Tu'i Aana, Malietoa, and Tu'i Atua*. Thus, I say that this is a period in the history of Tonga in which these 'Upolu chiefs together attempted to take over Tonga, especially from the *Tu'i Manu'a* and its representative *Tu'i Tonga*. Surely, this 'Upolu's war in Tonga had followed 'Upolu's successful victory over *Tu'i Tonga* Talakai faiki's terrorizing in Samoa.

The invasion of the *Malietoa* family in Tonga gives rise to two important events. First, it essentially contributes to the several consecutive murders of the 19\(^{th}\) *Tu'i Tonga* Havea I, 22\(^{nd}\) *Tu'i Tonga* Havea II, and 23\(^{rd}\) *Tu'i Tonga* Takalaua, organized and directed by the head representative of the *Tu'i Manu'a*, Talafale. Second, after the murder of Takalaua, a new office of *Tu'i Ha'atakalaua* was created, headed by the second oldest son of Takalaua and the oldest son, Kau'ulu fonu na faikai, succeeded to the title of *Tu'i Tonga*. As has already been stated above, Talafale's mission to assassinate these successive *Tu'i Tonga* title holders is twofold. It is very much Talafale's retaliation to 'Upolu's advance on Tonga and, Talafale's war against 'Upolu, the island trickster of titles. One of the 'Upolu notorious tricks in

\(^{146}\) Kramer 1994:314,322
Tonga, for example, is the establishment of the "Three-heads"- *Tu'i Kanokupolu Ngata* which terrifies the fierce people of Hihifo.

Recapitulating the point of the argument stated so far, the old war-division relationship between Tonga and Samoa has established in Tonga the blood of the invading *Tangaloa* as the most valued and sanctified prize. The prize has, therefore, become a precious treasure passed down into the local population from *Tangaloa* through his daughter(s) only. Thus, this ethno-biological idea of the ancestral sacred blood passing through the female offspring is an interpretation of sexual reproduction between the outside invader and the local chieftess. It means that the *hii* "sperm" which has ejected out of the invader into the local woman's *pali* "vagina", is the sap of an *uhiki with no to'ukupu kelekele* "earthly legs". Thus, the ethno-biological idea of blood transference is an old philosophy of cause (sexual intercourse) and effect (birth of a child). In other words, the sexual intercourse is planting of the seed (sperm) by burying it inside the woman's *fonua* "placenta", which is "land", where the seed/sperm grows into a yam/body to be eventually harvested. Perhaps one can say that the philosophy of ethno-biological cause and effect is the elitist idea of *fahu* in association with the practice of the brother-sister incestuous relationship. This is explicitly recorded as part of the Tongan creation myth**148**.

In my brief summary of Mahina's version of the Tongan creation myth, it conveys

---

147 Mahina 1992: Figure 3.1
148 See Mahina 1992: Figure 2.1
the theme of hoko “to join” of male outsider as a fu’u tuna “big eel”, referring to his ule, une “snake” in Uvean149, “penis”, which has fakatou’ia “impregnated” a female local chieftess. In Mahina’s version, it tells of a couple, Limu “sea weed” and Kele “dirt”, drifting “in the middle of Vahanoa ‘wide expanse of sea’. [They] separated [and] came out a huge rock, Touia-o-Futuna150. I interpret the “floating in the middle of the sea” as a tranquil formal statement of Limu and Kele, a hoisted sailing canoe. It means that the canoe is a floating kele on which grows up a limu. On coming out of the water and turning upside down on land, the canoe symbolizes a situation of becoming pregnant. So, my interpretation of “a huge rock came out” suggests that it is a reference to a very heavy pregnancy. Mahina continues on to tell us that “[Tou’ia o Futuna] angrily shook causing a series of tremors, which split open Tou’ia o Futuna, and from it emerged four pairs of twins, male and female...Each of the brother-sister twins committed incest....”151.

Shaking and splitting open, in my interpretation, refer to laboring and giving birth, respectively. Thus, the hoko theme in this myth is the sexual reproduction of a politico-economic network for the purpose of preserving the source of power within the house of the absolute supreme ruler of Samoa’aatoa. A clear case of such preservation purpose is the common cross-cousin incestuous marriage relationships. All twins are four mixed pairs.

The Tongan incestuous creation myth is a record of an old politico-economic

149 Clark 1994
150 Mahina 1992:59
151 Ibid, 1992:59
covenant system of preservation of the genealogical blood between Tángaloa and the local chief. The female offspring, in this context, are the carriers of the blood of the genealogy. They, in other words, are the fonua on which planting is conducted. Thus, the incestuous covenant of the brother and sister is a development aiming at reinforcing the establishment of the centralization of the control of the national resources. Interestingly, the current royal aristocratic Tu’ikanokupolu dynasty of Tonga can be seen to tap itself on to this old politico-economic system of preservation. Surely, it is an effective method which thus guarantees the ruling dynasty surety of prosperity and well-being. Obviously, this is a case of history repeating itself.

Another interpretative version of the Tou’ia-‘o-Futuna creation myth is connected to the origin of the coconut. (See the text and translation of the myth in Appendix 5, pages 277-278.) In this version the impregnator tuna is punished for the crime of adultery, resulting in his head being cut off and buried while his lower body (the tail) gets eaten. In time, a plant grows out of the buried head which is the coconut. The retribution of the crime committed, which is the coconut, means that it remains to provide for the victim a livelihood in terms of food and shelter.

In this connection, the right approach to the meaning of the Tongan creation myth, as about committing the crime of adultery, originally highlights the theme of mohehoko “sleeping (having sexual intercourse) to join”. It thus also highlights the theme of war and division between Tonga and Samoa.
The other point to remember here is that the planting of coconut reminds us of an old practice of niuui “(one’s) calling by planting coconuts (for ‘api ‘home’)”\textsuperscript{152}. This point thus reveals a double meaning of the myth that is contradictory. While the coconut is a form of retribution for the wrongdoing committed, it also represents an ambiguity associated with self-sacrifice. As the action is a way that the wrongdoer begs pardon for his own image, the transferred young one already in the local woman’s womb, the planting of coconut, at the same time, is the wrongdoer’s calling for land as his home. The case of Lufe’s self-sacrifice, for example, is his calling Navai to be his home, after the murder of Tu'i Tonga Havea in the pool of Tolopona near ‘Alaki, the residence of Talatale, and abandoning his upper body to Folaha.

On the whole, the fundamental basis of incest clearly shows it to be the founding principle of ha’a social formation as an elitist niuui method of the Tu’imanu’a regional expropriation in spreading out its imperial supremacy. Since the war originates from an internal quarrel between the sons of the original Tangaloa over the title and resources in Samoa’aatoa, the practice of cross-cousin marriage, a wider extended application of the closed brother-sister incest, enables the formation of contested alliances. Rival brothers become disoriented into marrying their own classificatory female relatives, offspring of their own sisters who have married and lived with their husbands’ people outside their own patrilocal home.

\textsuperscript{152} Gifford 1923:8, lines 58-62
These female relatives, as wives, immediately step in as assistant conciliators, but, at the same time, become rival partners.

On reconsidering the connection between Lufe’s self-sacrifice and the niuui practice, I want to introduce a point inviting further discussion. To do this I go back to the Malietoa war in Tonga against the Tu’i Manu’a people, and consider again the challenging from the Si’usei’a “Tail-dislocated-[of] fish (sea eel)” people for the power. Si’usei’a’s mother is daughter of a Tu’i Manu’a and is considered to be the founder of the Malietoa line. Alliance with Lufe of Folaha defines the contestation as connected to a dilemma, faced by the Tu’imanu’a, of how to surmount the fundamental problem of hypergamous systems, of what to do with the highly honourary position of his sister’s son. Assassination of Havea was Talafale firming up his role of protecting the old fight of the Tu’imanu’a regime to prohibit the Tu’imanu’a’s high ranking sister’s descendants from acceding to the Tu’imanu’a title for they were destined to remain tauale’a’a “untitled young men”.

Since Lufe’s fighting is for the protection of Havea and Talafale’s is for the protection of the Tu’imanu’a, Talafale’s reasoning makes allegation that Lufe’s involvement is supporting a female fraudulent practice using the Tangaloa sacred

---

153 Kramer 1994:313, Vol. 1. Si’usei’a is Si’useia, in Tongan, it should be Hikuhekeika and that is how I derive the meaning as “tail-dislocated-[of] fish”. This meaning is explicitly spelled out in Fison’s record of tales from old Fiji, especially the story about “the beginning of death” (1907:139-161), of Tangaloa twisting Hikule’o’s tail.

154 Kramer 1994:312-313, Vol. 1

155 Compare with the discussions on hypergamous systems of “what to do with sisters and sister’s children of the highest ranking male titleholders” cited by Gell (1993:109). The Tu’i Manu’a’s sister’s son was “an anomalous and highly honourary position” Mead (1930:185). “He was ‘titular heir’ of the Tu’i Manu’a, absolutely prohibited from acceding to the Tu’i Manu’a title and was destined to remain a tauale’a’a ‘untitled young man’” (Gell 1993:109).

156 Mead 1930
blood rationality. But, for *Lufe*'s participation, the *Tangaloa* sacred blood rationality is a revival of the sister's fighting for her claim that she, as the land, is the blood carrier, thus, should be the power holder. She is the ancestral goddess of the land. It is thus a revival of a movement towards independence from the *Tu'i Manu'a* patriarchal rule and localisation of power. As will be further shown later in the chapters on the *Tu'i Kanokupolu* movement in Tonga to follow this chapter, it is a continuation of the war of the *Savea Si'ule'o* or *Havea Hikule'o* "Havea, the guarding tail" sons of *Vea* in Tonga. The first *Tu'i Kanokupolu* title holder, *Ngata*, means "the Tail"\(^{157}\), indicating the genealogical connection to *Si'usei'a* of the *Malietoa* family.

Centring my analysis of the history of the *Tu'i Tonga* genealogy on legitimation of economic and political power rather than reading out a lineal history of succession from father to son\(^{158}\), I take the *Tu'i Tonga* genealogy, especially as a case in point. With reference to 'Okusitino Mahina's *Tu'i Tonga* List and to Phyllis Herda's genealogical consideration of Tonga's past, to the argument that there was "some kind of treaty negotiated, for the next three *kau Tu'i Tonga*, [*Tu'i Tonga-Ma'akatoe, Tu'i Tonga Puipuiifatu, Havea I*], are said to have married high-ranking Samoan women"\(^{159}\), I submit that these views must be rejected. During this period, even up to *Tapu'osi I*, (refer to Mahina's *Tu'i Tonga* List), it is, what I call, the *Talafaaitae*, recorded in the List as *Talafaapite*. It refers to an *'Upolu* culture of their women.

\(^{157}\) Kramer 1994:313, Vol. 1. *Ngata* also means "snake", but, I think, the conception of "tail" has been used to refer to the actual crawling reptile. As a matter of fact, the conception includes the association of the idea of crawling with a tail being dislocated, thus making that creature to shuffle along on its posterior.

\(^{158}\) For example, see Herda 1980; Mahina 1992
fighting a commoner course to retain their traditional power over the land which had been taken under control by their opposite sex. It is an old culture as the fundamental content of the Samoan creation myth, preserved in Tonga as the moheof institution of the Tu’i Tonga. These women significantly represent the Tu’i Tonga stealing trademark of adultery and murdering to secure the adoption of the royal blood into the local female line. This is a period giving rise to various significant Tala “traditions” from Talatama, recorded in the List as successor of Tu’i Taatui. Tu’i Tonga Ma’akatoe is Tuitogama’atoe, indicating the presence of Tamaalelagi, with the same mission as the Malietoa later, of the Tu’i Aana family ruling Tonga. The women’s traditional connection to this Tu’i Tonga is the maka’one “coastal layer of flat hard sandstone”, as a reference to her committing of adultery and running away from the Faleata people (Malietoa family) to Salelologa in Savai’i. She steals the title of Malietoa and gives it to her son, Taulapapa, named after the place, Saletagaloa, her canoe tied to in Salelologa. The meaning then of Taulapapa refers to the cliff in Saletagaloa where the canoe of Tu’itogama’atoe and her young lover had tied up. Tu’i Tonga Puipuifatu, the successor of Tu’i Tonga-Ma’akatoe, is a name after a tradition, in connection to the Tu’i Tonga [fakafale-] puipui “curtained-off enclosure of a secret kava ceremony”, when fatu “appointing” Taufaitoa’s son to the Tu’i Tonga title over Popoa’s sons,

159 Herda 1980:46
160 Kramer 1994:16, 35, 223, 317, 346-347, 384-385. Tuitogama’atoe is maiden name of the Salevalasi of Lotofaga in Atua founded by Queen Salamasina in honour of her mother by adoption, So’oa’emalelagi. Levalasi also becomes the maiden name of the Tonumaip’a line in Satupa’itea from which So’oa’e descends. Another Tuitogama’atoe, daughter of Tuiamaa Tamaalelagi, committed adultery causing the falsification of the Malietoa pedigree. Her son with her husband’s first cousin became Malietoa Taulapapa. Tamaalelagi’s mother, Vaeatamasoa, is Malietoa La’auli’s granddaughter.
Tuiavi'i and Tongialelei. Because of this secret appointment, the older sons waged a taufa “war” against their youngest brother at Toa in Folaha which ended with the spearing to death of Tongialelei by these sons’ mothers’ brother, Tufele of Fitiuta.

The main point implicated in this discussion is about this contestation between the women of the Samoan aristocrats over the rival Tu'i Tonga representatives. Thus, the war history of Tonga-Samoan-Fiji connection is also about the women of respective islands performing the ‘umiti of appetizing the Tu'i Manu’a/Tu'i Tonga, the ‘inasi of gratifying the Tu'i Tonga’s wishes with the most food and material items one can offer. This presentation of victuals is in support of one’s proposition for a marriage. ‘Aho’eitu’s story can therefore be interpreted as ‘Ilaheva Va’epopua’s presentation of victuals as her marriage proposal to Tangaloa ‘Eitumatupu’a. Taufaitoa’s accepted gift of food becomes the basis of jealousy, leading on to the loser’s sons challenging the favourite son to a war. The tradition of the fua “mullet” (Appendix 3, pages 256-264) is another example of ‘inasi. So is the story of Sinaitakala-i-Langileka, the first Tu'i Tonga Fefine, and is another example of marriage proposal with victuals to Tu'i Lakemba Tapu’osi of Fiji.

Another example is the origin of the name ‘Ahome’e of Hihifo in connection with the presentation of victuals for marriage to Tu'i Kanokupolu Ngata.

Va’epopua’s victuals of ‘Aho’eitu to Tangaloa ‘Eitumatupu’a lead on to the

---

development of a system of *pulega*\(^{164}\) "decision making council" to take care of the *Tu‘i Tonga* tributary belongings from the people of the land. Seeking marriage is of utmost importance as the presentation is a contesting show between the female contestants for the mighty sacred substance of the supreme ruler of *Samoa‘aatoa*. This mighty sacred substance means, to the contestants, the crown head of *Samoa‘aatoa*. For a young attractive girl to become the *Tu‘i Manu‘a*’s *moheofo* will mean she and her people will be on the top rank to have control of the main regional source of wealth. The main regional source of wealth refers to the *‘umiti* (the *Manu‘a* term), to the *‘inasi* (the general Polynesian term) brought in from the *Tu‘i Manu‘a*’s subjugated colonies.

Thus, this consumptive-productive constitution of *pulega* system, known in Tonga as *pule‘anga* “government”, is basically the house of both the *Tu‘i Manu‘a* representative, *Talafale*, the oldest son of *Tangaloa ‘Eitumatupu‘a*, and *Tu‘i Tonga* representative, *‘Aho‘eitu*, the youngest son. Similarly, in contemporary Tonga, this *pule‘anga* is both the *Tu‘i Pelehake*, representative of the *Tu‘i Manu‘a Talafale* in Tonga, and *Tu‘i Kanokupolu Taufa‘aahau Tupou IV*, the *Tu‘i Tonga* *‘Aho‘eitu* representative. Interestingly, today, the traditional dual relationship of consumption and production is collapsed into one running the show. Now it is the *Tu‘i Kanokupolu* of the *Tupou* dynasty who is both the consumer and producer. The collapse can be viewed also with the reverse of senior-junior hierarchy. In the old system, the *Tu‘i Pelehake* is the title of oldest *Talafale* in the children of *Tangaloa ‘Eitumatupu‘a*. In the context of today’s organization, the senior-junior

\(^{164}\) Pratt 1982:250
division is reshuffled. Queen Salote appointed her youngest son, Sione Nguu, to the Tu'i Pelehake title and, her oldest son, Taufa'aahau, to the Tu'i Kanokupolu title. In reversal, Tu'i Kanokupolu now becomes the supreme Tu'i Manu'a title of oldest Talafale, Tu'i Pelehake the secondary Tu'i Tonga title of youngest 'Aho'eitu. It is a reversal that had been manipulated much earlier by Tu'i Kanokupolu Mataeleha'amea with the coerced separation of his daughter, Fusipala, from her husband, Tu'i Ha'atakalaua Tongatangakitaulupekilaha, to marry the Fisilaumaali of Lafalafa and created the title of Tu'i Pelehake. Thus, has been the manipulation of the two important big titles in Tonga, since Queen Salote, so that they are now within the house of Queen Salote's children who then run the Tongan government of today.

Furthermore, pulega is also the fale of fua "four workers". They are responsible for guarding the Tu'i Tonga, a task of the first two servants and, the last two, assisting the Tu'i Tonga in governing and conducting his funeral. Historically, together the Faleua and Falefua, they have been an establishment which caters for specific demands of a Samoan gang of brothers who jealously murder their talented, favourite younger half Tongan brother as part of contesting for the power to rule over Tonga. Pulega, then, in this context, as the joining together of these two fale, is a sociopolitical body of outside wrongdoers evading their sinful immoral action with the services they offer to help their decapitated half brother with respect to the affairs of his mother's land. But, such clever manipulation further confuses

---

165 Faa means "four" and "to procure workers"; see Churchward 1959:18.
166 Bott 1982:91; Gifford 1924:25-29
the value of help in relation to the question of who helps who. In this case, the wrongdoers-turned-leaders are only helping themselves to the local resources as made easier with their own system of protection that they themselves set up.

Take, as an example of this traditional pulega setting, the ‘Aho’eitu yam plantation. The yam plantation, itself, represents Va’epopua’s victuals and, at the same time, it exemplifies the execution of punishment. In planting the konga ‘ufi “yam-pieces”, (kongokonga “mutilated body parts”), Va’epopua and her people bury them in the ground and, when these buried yam-pieces grow, they, who are punished, shuffle along on their posteriors on the ground, as their punishment, pulling out the weeds. Generally, such duty of punishment reflects an ongoing lifetime obligation of the punished to take meticulous care of the yam plants, just as anyone has a duty to the growth of his own genealogy. Thus, punishment, in the context of ‘Aho’eitu story, as a consequence of a quarrel between brothers of different mothers over power, is that that keeps the pulega staying afloat up above the chaotic social reality. The connection between above and below is that of pule, in pulega, governing “to control”, and tau “fighting” to control. In terms of the common denominator in this “control-fight” dialectic, it is the same kakai “people” who control and fight for the resources.

An important aspect deeper in meaning that we need to be aware of with regard to this dialectic, is the practical implication of the fahu social institution, of the relationship between the mothers, including their people, and their respective
children with the same father. In connection, the children are properly regarded as
descendants, not of their father, but of their respective mothers' brothers of the
land. What conditions this internal scrambling for the crown of father's head is the
fahu "foetal" relationship that these brothers have with their respective people of
the land. The object of fighting is one protecting his land from getting robbed by his
half brothers of different mothers.

The dialectic also goes like this. People of the land stand to protect their property,
the nurturing place of their fahu right, from getting usurped. But, at the same time,
the invader father, on trying to occupy the land, has turned his canoe upside down
to rest on the shoulders of his local wife's brothers. It means his marriage to the
local chieftess has immediately made his wife's brothers as his supporters.
Therefore, the protection of the land has become protection of the sister's husband,
a fugitive wrongdoer fleeing away from his homeland to hide from his pursuers. So,
the fahu status gets muddled up in an ambiguous and contradictory dialectic.
Where the son is socially high rank fahu and real descendant of his mother's local
people, he is, at the same time, the local people's 'ilamutu "commoner child's
mutilated [lower part]" to the father's people. As 'ilamutu, the son is food offering
presented, particularly, to the father's sister as her fakafotu "fruit". This provides
the explanation for why there is a feeling of hatred between 'Aho'eitu and his half
Samoan brothers. They, as fahu-'ilamutu at the same time, have no other options
to sort out their own respective freedom but themselves to engage in a bloody

167 Pratt 1982:162
battle, with the support of their respective mothers’ people, in order to obtain recognition of supremacy. But, any truce would still become a new beginning for the next quarrel. So, fighting is the normal procedure of continuously seeking for the universal solution to the social chaotic exchanges in society. But, the fact of the matter is, the solution is just as anti as any original anti, just as well confirming the chaos of the universal. It thus provides the general outline of my critique of the politico-economic dimension of brother-sister relationship in Tonga.

The first Falefaa institution is made up of ‘Aho’eitu’s murderers, his older half brothers, Matakehe, Maliepoo, Tu’i Lolo, Tu’i Folaha. Thus the whole setting of Tangaloa ‘Eitumatu’u’a in Tonga during this time states that the first Falefaa is primarily for protection of their oldest brother, Talafale, the representative of the Tu’i Manu’a in Tonga. His role, then, makes him into the “household adviser”, acting more like a king himself, “residing most of the time inside the house”.

Talafale’s younger brothers, Matakehe, Maliepoo, Tu’i Lolo, Tu’i Folaha, in that respect, have been appointed to guard and help him in governing of Tonga and, of course, in his funeral. The murdering of ‘Aho’eitu is an example. In other words, as I have tried to explain above, the dialectic involving punishment and wrongdoing implies that the murdering of ‘Aho’eitu is ‘Aho’eitu himself as the “day’s offering of food to Folaha (Tangaloa ‘Eitumatu’u’a)”.

He is the victim and wrongdoer at the same time, thus the origin of the title, Tu’i Tonga “Cutting in Half”. The division of duties in the Falefaa may have derived from the spatial division into loto “inside” and tu’a “outside” of the Fale Faka-Manu’a tradition of advice to wounding.
“inside” lies the Tu’i Manu’a and, at his side, sit and listen Tu’i Loloko and Tu’i Folaha, “outside” stand Matakehe and Maliepoo to guard the dwelling house of the Tu’i Manu’a from the locals. Matakehe and Maliepoo form up the Tu’i Tonga regiment of protection, while Tu’i Loloko and Tu’i Folaha form the undertakers and advisers. With respect to the Tu’i Kanokupolu’s house, “inside” is lying the Tu’i Kanokupolu and, at his side, his Privy Council and the Cabinet Ministers (Tu’i Loloko and Tu’i Folaha) and, “outside” he is guarded by his royal nobles (Matakehe and Maliepoo). From this analysis, a meaning of the Falefaa social institution, then, has got to be connected with the general idea of protection of the power holder, Talafale and then later Tu’i Kanokupolu.

The meaning of this protection and advising/burial idea of the Falefaa institution can logically suggest something concealing why the Tu’i Manu’a needs to be protected. I am establishing here a theme of the protection which is kaiha’a “[stealing by] eating-[within the]-ha’a [of the sacred]”. In Kramer’s history of Samoa168, there it talks about the “stealing”, as gaoi in Samoan, of the Fale’ula “House-red” of the Tu’i Manu’a. In Tongan, gaoi is ngaohi, meaning “adoption”. “Stealing” is a situation about the “smashed bleeding head” Tu’i Manu’a who has been carried away across the sea and becomes a refugee in Tonga. When it gets into Tonga, the fleeing canoe of the stolen wounded Tu’i Manu’a’s head is then turned upside down and covered with coconut fronds on top and, as well, the sides, hiding the ‘ula “sacred bleeding head” inside. ‘Ula in fale’ula as “red house” being stolen symbolizes the liberation from continuous subjugating to tyranny. As nu’a,
so as in nunu'a, 'ula is "penal consequence"\(^{169}\) following a long duration of tyrannical rule in Samoa'aatoa. The Fale'ula then becomes the conqueror's trophy of triumph at his home.

Thus, the notion of the "house of the bleeding head" has given rise to the nemesis system known in Samoa as tala o le Vavau "tradition of the propitiatory sacrifice"\(^{170}\). The tradition is about the wrapping of the human victim, as a fish, with a laulau "plaited coconut leaf" as offering to Le Folasa "The Sacred voice at the title"\(^{171}\) for pardoning of the wrongdoing. Vavau, as in fau, is a kind of long fishing-net made of the stem of the valai "creeper" and coconut leaves connected with the polata "trunk of plantain". Lufi's sacrifice of hoko e fau moe polata is an example of tala o le Vavau. It is the joining of the fishing-net with plantain's trunk in the tradition of bringing into the mala'e of Le Folasa's victuals of fish, represented by the plantain's trunk.

The connection of stealing to assassination then marks a turning point in the ruling system. In Samoa, it is commonly known that the Fale'ula royal house was stolen from Manu'a to 'Upolu\(^{172}\), suggesting that the Tu'i Manu'a rule came to an end.

\(^{168}\) Kramer 1994, Vol 1  
\(^{169}\) Churchward 1959:366, 382; monuka or manuka, manu'a in Samoan, means "to be wounded".  
\(^{170}\) T. Powell (1892:186). I interpret Vavau as the old tradition of feilaulau, meaning in Samoa as "doing of the laying out of food, (including human victims), on the tray (ready for offering to god for pardon)" (Pratt 1982:176).  
\(^{171}\) Kramer 1994:106,529  
\(^{172}\) "Royal house". to me, looks to be another expression for the sacredness of the head, probably derived from an old perception linking to the voyaging era of men as professional navigators and conquerors, in which, in the open space, they situationally exist in a geometrical relationship with respect to the celestial objects and their canoes' immediate surrounding elements. Head, as the faculty of reasoning, is the connector to the sky above and to earth below.
under the hands of 'Upolu liberators.

The problem as to when the reorganization of the Falefaa institution of the Tu'i Tonga happened is open for discussion. Bott\textsuperscript{173} cites one possibility as going back to the time of Tu'i Tonga Momo and his son and successor, Tu'i Tonga Taatui. This claim is suspicious and Bott never investigates further. As Bott\textsuperscript{174} continues, Tu'i Tonga Momo who lived at Toloa, not far from Pelehake in the central region of Tongatapu, was at war with the people of Talafale (Ha'a Talafale), who, at the time, were living at Pelehake. They were driven out of Toloa to Heketaa in Niutoua at the eastern end of Tongatapu. The reason for the war is not stated. I can only draw out some presumptions based on the origin myth of the first men in Tonga who grew out of a 'uanga "worm" of a decayed fue "creeper plant"\textsuperscript{175}.

Similar theme to the origin myth of 'Aho'ei tu as a tuber-son offering to Tangaloa, the second reorganization of the Tu'i Tonga Falefaa has to do with the mutilation of the Fue yam plant\textsuperscript{176} by cutting off of its aka "root, tuber" causing the plant to become 'uangahia "maggoty". The story is told about the first men in Tonga as three maggots, Kohai, Koau, mo Momo, of the mutilated Fue of 'Ata Island, the "upper end of yam"\textsuperscript{177} in Tonga. In other words, these men are parts of the rotten Fue's maggot that being broken off, namely, Kohai as Lafai (Savai'i Island in

\textsuperscript{173} Bott 1982:98
\textsuperscript{174} Ibid., 1982:92
\textsuperscript{175} See Bott 1982:89-90 for the version of this myth.
\textsuperscript{176} Fue "creeper" as yam plant is my interpretation based on the generic classification of it as belonging to the vine species.
\textsuperscript{177} Churchward 1959:551, 'Ata is Tongan of Rotuman ata.
Samoa\textsuperscript{178}, Koau as Lo'au (Oahu Island in Hawaii and Mbau in Fiji), and Momo, as in temomo, “young relative” of the first two. As the first reformation in Tonga, the story is about murdering of the Fue “Tyrant” and, consequently, Lo’au’s nation building following the disconnection of Fue’s to’ukupu kelekele “legs earth-bound”.

My interpretation of Lo’au differs quite markedly from the annotative and symbolic descriptions given by Bott and Mahina\textsuperscript{179}. Bott recorded what she was told by various mataapule in 1959 that Lo’au was “an important figure in Tongan tradition. There appear to have been at least two, and perhaps three, Lo’au: one in the time of Momo, another in the time of Tui Tonga Kau’ulutonuafekai, and another much later, in the time of the second or third Tui’i Kanokupolu. All are said to have been tufunga fonua, literally ‘carpenters of the country’, meaning the founders of customs and the regulators of social life\textsuperscript{180}. Similarly, Mahina records Lo’au as a foreigner and disputes reports that there were possibly three Lo’au. He, with certainty, reports that there are only two, Lo’au Tuputoka and Lo’au Tongafisifonua. He goes on to say that “the names Lo’au Tuputoka and Lo’au Tongafisifonua were probably symbolic of hegemony and counter-hegemony, effected through long distance voyaging”\textsuperscript{181}.

Lo’au is ‘Akau “Tree, Plant”\textsuperscript{182}, in Fijian Lekau “The-tree”\textsuperscript{183}. Specifically, the name refers to the identical coexistent relationship between yam planting and land

\textsuperscript{178} Kramer 1994:52
\textsuperscript{179} See particularly Bott 1982 and Mahina 1992
\textsuperscript{180} Bott 1982:92
\textsuperscript{181} Mahina 1992:114
fishing with kau "hook"\(^{184}\). The relationship is conceptualized with the harvesting of the yam tuber from underworld with a kau, known as utu-ta’u, and, with the surfacing of the sacred fish from the deep underwater with a hook as tau-maa-ta’u\(^{185}\). Furthermore, the creeper plant on the ground is conceptualized as the fishing line and, its tuber underground, the long oval fish. And, Tuputoka and Tongafisifonua are terms of reference of Lo’au in connection to death and life, respectively. In other words, Tuputoka is Lo’au, the punisher, who “bewitches to sleep (die)” of the sun. In putting it to death with the kava cast method (Sangone, line 28, Appendix 6, pages 279-282), Lo’au is unearthing a hidden treasure of importance in Samoa as “the inmost content of Tonga’s traditions” (Sangone, line 37) by way of introducing the treasure to Tonga. This is, for example, the vahe taumafa ‘oe fono “fono at kava distributing” (Sangone, line 35). Sangone is a detective story using the manipulative kava cast method (Sangone, lines 30-34) to adopt from Samoa the custom of food distribution of the taumafa kava. Tongafisifonua, on the other hand, is Lo’au, the Tonga, who “fusi ‘pulls up’ land” from underworld. It is a reference to seeking new land, a new source of food. Tuputoka is about burying of a yam-piece to grow (planting) and Tongafusifonua pulling up the fish/yam tuber (harvesting) to eat.

Thus, Lo’au’s nation building, with the appointment of young relative Momo to the title of Tu’i Tonga, marks a new era of beginning in Tonga known as the Hau ‘o

\(^{182}\) Churchward 1959:545  
\(^{183}\) Ibid, 1959:254  
\(^{184}\) See Clark 1994
Momo “Sovereignty of Momo”. Obviously a consequential replacement of the Tangaloa thievish tyrannical system, it has the intention to reverse the protection of the resources under this Momo sovereignty. The reverse, though, is connected to Lo’au’s introduction of a land tenure system, of a food tributes system based on the yam cultivation. Somehow, this yam culture, because of the correlation between the yam planting and harvesting with the monthly period of Faimalie who stole the kahokaho yam from Pulotu (Ko Faimalie, lines 127-134, Appendix 1, pages 228-242), highlights the fundamental theme of hoko incestuous marriage between the royalties of Tonga, Fiji, and Samoa. It thus includes the marriage, for example, between Momo and Nua, Lo’au’s daughter. Such marriage, in my interpretation, is to keep alive, especially with a view to preserving a particular breed. Unfortunately, the marriage, based on a talakite tradition of making of the royal sacred blood, fails. Nua and Momo had a boy, named Tu’i Taatui. In other words, the generation of the royal blood dies out, because the child born should have been a female carrier of the royal sacred blood. Part of the reformation, though, consequently leads on to the replacement of Talafale in the Tu’i Tonga advisory council.

Planting-harvesting Lo’au, the nation builder, is a contradictory phenomenon described as a kind of yam known as kahokaho tefau (Ko Faimalie, lines 161-162) of ‘ulu loa “big head” (Ko Faimalie, line 147) who produces royal descendants (Ko Faimalie, line 163). As adopted from Fiji, the new Lo’au-Momo sociopolitical allied system has a Tu’i Tonga Falefaa membership made up of Fijian protectors.

185 Myth of the bringing of the yam from Pulotu bears similar analysis to the given interpretation here. For the fishing analogy, see Lieber (1994) study of Kapingamarangi fishing community in Outlier Polynesia.
Providing, in this analysis of Lo’au, that it is a female, the *Falefaa* organization, then, seems to be focusing on the brother-sister supporting relationship. This is in contrast to the first *Falefaa* organization of senior-junior supporting system. The sister-brother supporting relationship of the Lo’au-Momo alliance is a system which treats the foetal blood as the most sacred substance that connects everyone into one big *kainga* social network. So, in this context, the original male senior-junior hierarchical structure of the first *Falefaa* is intersected by this localized one-of-two egalitarian ideology of the Lo’au-Momo *Falefaa* system. The egalitarian basis of the latter *Falefaa* is connected to the correlative identity within the brother-sister relationship. A brother, for example, to the sister is her *tuo-ngä’ane* “other half-male”. On the other hand, a sister to the brother is his *tuo-fefine* “other half-female”. Thus, the Fijian *Falefaa* of Lo’au-Momo is an organization of men who, historically, have been assassinsators obviously directed by Lo’au, the new Talafale, since Tu’i Taatui.

With the separation from east Samoan Manu’a, a move that led to the appointment by Lo’au of his adopted Tu’i Tonga son-in-law, Momo, (Sangone, lines 11-14, Appendix 6, pages 279-282), there started to build up a population of Fijians in Tonga. And, it was not only the influx of the Fijians, but, assassinations of the Tu’i Tonga also started to build up. Like his tyrant grandfather, Fue, Tu’i Taatui, I believe, was mutilated, under Lo’au’s instruction, by some Fijian assassins.

---

186 Churchward 1959:522; Gifford 1924:45, *Tu’utu’u* “to mutilate”, as my interpretation of Gifford’s transcription of *Tutu*, a place in ‘Eua, lighted up, where Tu’i Taatui’s funeral taken place. Consult with Mariner’s account of the ceremony of burying the Tu’i Tonga (Martin 1991:324-352), an occasion where
Mahina states that in the closing stages of Tu'i Taatui's reign he fled to 'Eua and later died there after having been pursued by his unknown brothers for committing incest with their sister, Laatuutama. I think Tu'i Taatui was taken there for his punishment by mutilation, thus the name of Tapuhia "Sacred-wrongdoing" mount. Fasi'apule's snatched returning of his half younger brother's dead body to Tongatapu for a proper family burial by replacing it with the dead body of his Fijian friend who he killed for that purpose is indication of Tu'i Taatui's mutilated fate.

An aspect of the Fijian influx is a connection of 'Eua which looks to me to have been occupied by a chiefly family from Rewa of mainland Vitilevu of Fiji. In Fiji, it is a historical connection directly related to the emergence of the great Cakombau title of Fiji. This Rewa chiefly family must be a very powerful family that has reached Hawaii as indicated by the place name, Ewa, in the island of Oahu. In 'Eua, the connection is the Kautana title, to me, a name derived from the Kauvandra mountains on the main island of Vitilevu where Mbau has a shrine, to whose residing god the Mbau people's leading chiefs traced their ancestry. Kautana, I think, could be Kaufata, the carriers of a dead high chief's litter. The small offshore island of Mbau is named after the shrine, replacing the original name, Ulunivuaaka "Pig's Head". Possibly, there was a tributary relationship between the fishing every man, woman, and child were provided with a toume "coconut spathes bundled together as torch" and a piece of polata "stem of plantain".

It is quite an interesting comparison and similar incident to the murder of Tu'i Tonga Havea I and Lufe's sacrifice for him. In Folaha there is a place where the mutilation of Lufe is called Tu'utu'u. There is also the Tapuhia mount and, the decapitated Havea floating from Talafale's home to Folaha. Is it the same incident being separated by historians? If so, then Tu'i Taatui is Havea, Fasi'apule Lufe, 'Eua Folaha, and Lo'au Folasa le 'Ite (title name of Tu'i Manu'a Tangaloaui, see Kramer 1994:554).
people of Ulunivuaka and the mainland Rewa chiefly family, from which the former received from the latter delicacies of pigs' heads. But, not until the fishing community was found out to have surreptitiously eaten a catch of fish without firstly taken it to the Rewa high chief, were the fisherman Lasakau and his people banished to Lakemba. Secondly, Laatuu, in Laatuutama, is a Fijian title of high chief. The lady Tu'i Taatui raped might have been a tama "daughter" of a great Fijian Laatuu.

Following the mutilation of Tu'i Taatui, three Tu'i Tonga, namely, Havea I, Havea II, and Takalaua, all fell under the counsel of Lo'au. Following the assassination of Tu'i Tonga Takalaua, and his revenge by Takalaua's son and successor, Kau'ulufonuafekai, the Tu'i Tonga Falefaa organization, again, had to be restructured.

Firstly, protection of the Tu'i Tonga entirely was assigned as the role of the younger brothers of the Tu'i Tonga, forming up the new office of the Tu'i Ha'atakalaua line. And, secondly, the burial rite of the Tu'i Tonga was to be conducted by foreigners of Fijian, Rotuman, and Samoan origin, who organized themselves into two-paired houses. They are Fale-'o-Tu'i Loloko and Fale-'o-Tu'i Matahau of the right of the Tu'i Tonga and, Fale-'o-Tu'i Talau and Fale-'o-Tu'i 'Amanave of the left of the Tu'i Tonga. Their roles include food distribution, burial, and receiving of people coming to see the Tu'i Tonga.

189 Scarr 1976:96; Derrick 1946. Since Oahu, recorded by Kramer (1994, vol. 1) as Wahua, one of the dominions of Samoa'atoa of sun-god Tangaloa, the connection to Rewa in Fiji is not coincidental.
For the first time since ‘Aho’eitu, separating the protection and burial functions is localizing and centralizing of the power with the local sons of Takalaua. The role of protection assigned to the younger brothers, in other words, is to combat the outside traditional controlling of Tongan affairs as was with the older brothers protecting their younger brother ‘Aho’eitu of the first Falefaa. In that case, local ‘Aho’eitu was being used and directed by his Samoan older brothers-protectors for their own politico-economic motives and interests. Burial, as a farewell rite of the dead on his journey to Pulotu, having been dealt with by these foreign undertakers, is, thus, symbolically appropriated with them as people who know where to take the dead.

As the Ha’atakalaua protective role to stabilise the local rivalries and contestations for the Tu’i Tonga title, it is part of Kau’ulufonuafekai’s agenda to reverse the leadership in Tonga. Mo’ungamotu’a, Kau’ulufonuafekai’s younger brother, was appointed to the title of Tu’i Ha’atakalaua, as the motu’a “first” mo’unga “person to whom Tu’i Tonga Kau’ulufonuafekai looks for protection”.

I have briefly shown the historical background to the development towards localisation of power in Tonga from the dualistic connection between Samoa and Tonga to an official history of Tonga beginning at Lapaha of an internal opposition between Kauhala’uta and Kauhalalalo social moieties. In the brief development of the Tu’i Tonga (Kauhala’uta moiety) and Tu’i Ha’atakalaua (Kauhalalalo moiety)
di vision, for reasons of protection, the sixth Tu'i Ha'atakalaua Mo'ungaatonga reinforces the original Tu'i Ha'atakalaua's role of protecting the Tu'i Tonga Kau'ulufonuafekai local Kauhala'uta-Kauhalalalo social moieties. The strengthening means of the Ha'atakalaua protection role at the time of Mo'ungaatonga is demonstrated by the use of the Samoan ritual of cutting in half a male person, sometimes a young banana plant, for the lower part to be taken as food (of yam tuber) to complete the moheofo joining in cohabitation between the local chief's daughter and a cannibal tyrant. Mo'ungaatonga, in reinforcing the Ha'atakalaua's support of the Tu'i Tonga, gives away his daughter, Kaloafuutonga, to be the moheofo of Tu'i Tonga Fatafehi. Thus, the exchange of support in this context is between the older brother Tu'i Tonga's son (Fatafehi) and his younger brother Tu'i Ha'atakalaua's daughter (Kaloafuutonga). And, on the other hand, the exchange of support is between the Tu'i Tonga's daughter ('Ekutongapipiki) and the Tu'i Tonga's sister's son (Fonomanu), or, of anyone from the Ha'a Falefisi "descendants of House of Fijians (mainly Tu'i Lakepa and Tu'i Ha'ateiho)."

Building up a close knit house of support, in association with the Tu'i Ha'atakalaua protection role of Mo'ungaatonga, by means of joining the low ranked woman (Kaloafuutonga) of the land on to the high ranked abandoned "shoulder-person" from the sky, can also be seen as a reversed process of the same marriage exchange pattern. Mo'ungaatonga throws himself into the sea to become a high ranked abandoned shoulder-person, found and taken into refuge in the house of chief commander-in-war Ama of Safata, Southwestern 'Upolu. He, subsequently,
marries chief Ama’s daughter, Tohuia. The marriage, then, like the Ha’atakalaua protection role to Tu’i Tonga, is a means of seeking support from chief Ama in Mo’ungaatonga’s fighting in Tongatapu Island against the ferocious chief ‘Ahome’e of the Hiihifo District.

But, known as the ‘Ulutolu “Heads-three” or “three-men-in-one”, the war has been reminiscent of a trick performed by the Safata people to terrify the fierce people of chief ‘Ahome’e. ‘Ulutolu refers to the wrapping up with a big tapa cloth of cannibal chief ‘Ahome’e’s daily food of human victims consisting of Ngata and his older brother, Halakitaua, the Niukapu “Head-sacred”, and his uncle, Vaoloa, the Nuku “Islet”. The wrapping creates a one person with three heads: Ngata in the middle and, on his right, Halakitaua’s head, on his left, Vaoloa’s head. But, the presentation, in the eyes of the cannibal and his fierce people, was enough to terrify them into totally surrendering to Ngata, the “tail” with three heads, of Safata. Formerly known in the early Tu’i Tonga history as the ‘Aho’eitu daily food presentation of human victims to le Folasa, title name of Taeotagaloa, the first putative Tu’i Manu’a 190, since the ‘Ulutolu trick, the ritual, then, becomes known as ‘Ahome’e “daily food of joy”. Chief ‘Ahome’e’s two daughters, Hifo and Kaufo’ou, were given as wives of Ngata as part of the joyful celebration of Tonga’s liberation from chief ‘Ahome’e’s craving for human flesh.

---

190 Kramer 1994:9,529
Bott’s interpretation of the event as being about the settling of Ngata in Hihifo\textsuperscript{191}, therefore, in my interpretation, should be about Mo’ungaatonga’s alliance with Tohuia’s father to take over the Hihifo District from fierce chief ‘Ahome’e. Tohuia’s son, Ngata, to Mo’ungaatonga represents her mother being the “tail” of the “shoulder-person” (Mo’ungaatonga) on land. Tohuia’s people, because of Tohuia’s relationship to Mo’ungaatonga, become protectors of the latter, and, of course, ultimately, of the Tu’i Tonga. But, the war against chief ‘Ahome’e, as the discussion unfolds, can also be seen as an ongoing ‘Upolu’s struggle for supremacy in Samoa’aatoa. That means, ‘Upolu’s localization in Tonga is meant to make Tongatapu its centre.

Again, moheofo, as joining to support, means that Kau’ulufonua, the first Tu’i Tonga son of a Ha’atakalaua mother, is the real descendant of Kaloafuutonga’s brothers, Tu’i Ha’atakalaua Fotofili and Tu’i Kanokupolu Ngata and, thus, the head of both the Tu’i Ha’atakalaua and Tu’i Kanokupolu lines in Tonga. Fotofili and Ngata are Kau’ulufonua’s legs in Tonga. They become Kau’ulufonua’s vaka “canoe” in the sea, Kau’ulufonua’s fata “carriers” on land.

This makes Queen Salote’s local history of old ethno-biological fahu idea of moheofo into a reference to this Tonga-‘Upolu joined rule. It can then also mean that the Tongan local history is a version of the ‘Upolu story of liberty from east Samoan Manu’a in Samoa. So, the common cause of Tonga-‘Upolu combination

\textsuperscript{191} Bott 1982:115
then results in the formation of a local political structure independent of Manu’a in Tonga. The attempt to localize the power base, of course, is, historically, not a smooth process. Mo’ungaatonga’s intention to localize the power base and to be independent from the Tu’i Manu’a rule, for example, is just as hazardous as the efforts of others before him.

How this ethno-biological principle of fahu works in forming a new social descent group can be viewed through the successive ascents of the Tu’i Kanokupolu title over the two local titles of Tonga, since Tu’i Tonga ‘Uluakimata and Tu’i Ha’atakalaua Mo’ungaatonga. I argue, as the Tongan cases used show, that this old meaning of fahu refers to brother and sister, of both Tu’i Ha’atakalaua and Tu’i Kanokupolu, engaging in an incestuous alliance, the latter assisting the former. Local history, then, in this sense, is the incestuous method of enclosing the resources, from which power is derived, by the siblings of the same founding parents. The key term is “assisting”, in Tongan, tokoni. Tokoni also means “to eat”. The logical implication of assisting, then, in this context, refers to incest as an old institution of “eating of the sacred”, the source of power, of the Tu’i Tonga. Which, of course, is the whole basis of the practice of moheofo by the lesser two kingly lines, first, the Tu’i Ha’atakalaua, but for not much longer until confiscated by the current kingly line of Tu’i Kanokupolu. In other words, moheofo is stealing the sacred blood by way of eating/swallowing it up and running away with it, (compare with the story of Folau ki Pulotu, lines 127-134 [Appendix 1, pages 228-242]. In the same story, the stealing is described earlier on as replacement of Hikule’o’s fale
From time immemorial, politics in the region of Samoa’aatoa has been about the government of kai “people and food”. Both these two elements make up the central feature of politics in the region. Naturally so, because of the smallness of these island states, the scarcity of food and people thus becomes a real determining factor towards the making up of a leader. The appointment is not based on a popular democratic selection process, instead, to become a leader one has to fight for it. To become a leader means an aitu, “[one] who devours the people”192. It is he to whom tributes of food are brought from his dominions, tribute known in old days as the umiti of the Tu’i Manu’a and, later, ‘inasi of the Tu’i Tonga. People fight over who will have the right to eat from the others. The story of ‘Aho’eitu is an example of the stealing of the umiti brought from Tonga to Taeotaga’oa, recorded in Tonga as Tangleoa ‘Eitumatupu’a, by ‘Eitumatupu’a’s sons with a Samoan wife. As a result, ‘Eitumatupu’a punished them with serving their youngest half brother, ‘Aho’eitu, as the Tu’i Tonga. Taeotaga’oa is the “Shit-of-ghost-persecutor”.

This ambiguity involved with the concept of stealing can only be understood with a critique of the idea of hoko. Hoko, in the traditional sense of marriage referring to the reconciliatory intervention of the female, actually means deceiving her powerful

192 Compare with Sir Frazer’s theory of incest (1949).
193 I interpret aitu as ‘ainu’u, as in Malietoa ‘Ae o’ainu’u (Kramer 1994:318, Vol. 1). This Malietoa has a son named Lauaufolasa, a name linked to the wife of Taeotaga’oa, as a daughter of Folasa (Kramer 1994:533,
male partner to steal from him. The most conspicuous illustration of how this idea of hoko works is the situation of having sexual intercourse. While the male partner is concentrating in masturbating himself, the female busily focuses on extracting the hii “sperm” from the male scrotum. The hii is the sacred iki “young (one)”, as in ‘eiki “chief”, who hiki “carries on his shoulders” the fale’ula of Tangaloa, the Tu’i Manu’a, on land. Fale’ula, as “shiny dwelling of Tangaloa, the sun-god”, also refers to it as the source of power, where the ‘inasi of Tangaloa collected.

In house part terms, this sexual intercourse situation of the male on top of the female on earth joined together by the penis inside the vagina is respectively represented as the ‘ato, faliki, and pou. The penis as pou “post” mediates between the male ‘ato “roof” and the female faliki “floor”. This original house division between male and female is where the ‘eiki and tu’a “commoner” social statuses of children derived. Children are at the same time ‘eiki and tu’a with respect to their father’s upturned canoe on top joined on to the mother’s floor-mat earth below. Thus, the dialectical of the ‘eiki-tu’a distinction is somehow related to the social relationships between the brother (as father and husband) and his sister (as wife and mother). The brother refers to the children of his sister as ‘ilamutu “chiefs of partly commoner” based on their sky father and earthly mother status relationships. And, on the other hand, the sister refers to her brother’s children as her fakafotu “requests” for something that the latter wants. Sister’s children refer to their mother’s brother as their fa’ee tangata “mother male” whereas, brother’s children

Vol. 1). In Folaha, Tongatapu, there is a personal name as ‘Ainu’u and, of course, the curse of Folaha as kai ta’e “eat shit”, all allude to “shitty eating shits/food”.
to their father’s sister as their mehikitanga “god of underworld”.

The important thing to note, in connection with the analysis of the myth of fale, is that the sacrifice of hoko is a Samoan tactic of kaiha’a fonua. Therefore, joining is a way of stealing. The subtle connection somehow is missed out in Tongan written history, thus kaiha’a translated as “stealing”. I can only presume that it is one of the influences of Taufa‘ahau Tupou I’s constitutional changes made in his monarchical government. Kahi’a, in its traditional Samoan sense, as “eating of the sacred”, is consumption of the ivi e fonua “resources of land”. The objective is to make that land full of resources politically controlled and economically productive as one’s own source of consumption. Kai is fai “having sexual intercourse”. It implies, for example, that ‘Eitumatupu’a’s having sexual intercourse with Va’epopua of Tongatapu is the “exclusive use of Tonga”, thus Tonga-tapu Island, politically and economically. The people of Tonga become a productive source of power for ‘Eitumatupu’a and Manu’a. Hoko, as genealogy, is, therefore, kaiha’a.

From this historical dimension of the politics of food as source of power, the shortfall of Mo‘ungaatonga’s personal striving for power even becomes worse at the time of his marriage to Tohuia of ‘Upolu. Taking it to be seeking for help in his cause to localize and centralize the power of control over Tonga under him, Tohuia’s father, on the other hand, comes into the alliance with some confidential unfinished business to complete. In other words, as given by my analysis of the
history of liberty in Samoa and Tonga, the marriage arrangement of Tohuia to Mo'ungaatonga can be seen as the continuation of Upolu fighting for liberty from Tongan dominance in Samoa, following the expulsion from Samoa, round about the sixteenth century, of Tu'i Tonga Talakaifaiki by the twin brothers, Fata and Tuna. To complete the task on his hands, Ama must offer his service to assist Mo'ungaatonga in his local war against cannibal 'Ahome'e and 'Ahome'e's brother Lavaka-vaoleleva.

We have here a case of the politics of food where these men, Ama, Mo'ungaatonga, 'Ahome'e, and Lavaka engage in war for power in Tonga. Lavaka, because of his hospitality to the Tu'i Tonga while in Tongatapu during a great famine with meals of ensilaged leva yams from his storage pits\(^{194}\), was then rewarded. His grandson, Tele'a, succeeded to the Tu'i Tonga title\(^{195}\). Quite obvious that this reward instilled jealousy in 'Ahome'e, thus he, and his followers, moved and settled in Hihifo. He became a fierce cannibal person, as did his people.

Ama's evil intention, then, is to eclipse Mo'ungaatonga's local Tu'itonga establishment and to replace it with the establishment of a stronghold in Tonga of Safata, under the leadership of his grandson, Ngata, thus, in Tongan, Ha'angata. It must have been so hard for the people of Fata to have full independence, regardless of the successful driving out of Talakaifaiki from Samoa, to even break

---

\(^{194}\) Gifford 1929:179  
\(^{195}\) Ibid, 1929:57
through inside Tonga with the objective of completely seizing the power to control resources from the hands of the Tongans.

The secrecy of this marriage contract lies in the associated ambiguity and contradiction of the practice of *moheofo*, that, while it was commonly done in former times as of a young woman of the village sleeping with a visiting chief\(^{196}\), it is a form of power usurpation, as mentioned earlier on, ending up with Tonga being ruled by a person of *kanokupolu* “flesh-of-‘Upolu’. That person, Ngata, who has been recognized, due to the support of *Mo’ungaatonga* given to Ama, as the *Tu’i Kanokupolu* title holder, takes the place of his mother’s displaced brother as high chief of the land. He registers his status and title within Tonga as a Tongan high chief by marrying voracious chief ‘Ahome’e’s daughters. At the same time, *Mo’ungaatonga* gave his daughter, Kaloafuutonga, half sister of *Tu’i Kanokupolu Ngata*, away as *moheofo* to *Tu’i Tonga Fatafehi*, son and successor of *Tu’i Tonga ‘Uluakimata* I, for the same purpose to *ohi* “adopt” the *hii* “sperm”, or the *toto* “blood”, of the *Tu’i Tonga* so as to be the high chief of the land. *Mo’ungaatonga’s* ambitious plan, which thus also envelopes Ama’s hidden personal agenda in the local sociopolitical affairs of Tonga, is to adopt, as polite form of to steal, the highest supreme *Tu’i Tonga* title. With *Kaloafuutonga’s* son to *Fatafehi* becoming a high chief of the land and displacing *Kaloafuutonga’s* brother *Tu’i Ha’atakalaua*, the logical strategy of marrying into ‘Upolu is to hire Ama as a technical adviser to complete *Mo’ungaatonga’s* ambition. But, as I have said earlier on,

\(^{196}\) Churchward 1959:361
Mo'ungaatonga's strategies fail to work effectively for Mo'ungaatonga. In fact, these strategies, as we can see, have been working, as has always been with the institution of Falefāa, for the benefit of the adviser.

Failure of Mo'ungaatonga's plan officially becomes exposed during the time of Mo'ungaatonga's grandson, Tu'i Ha'atakalaua Vaea, the last in the Tu'i Ha'atakalaua line to provide the Tu'i Tonga ('Uluakimata II) with moheofo. It was an era when politics tended to become personalized, culminating in the fourth Tu'i Kanokupolu Mataeleha'amea, with the backing of his mother's people of Ha'amea. Mataeleha'amea has been instrumental in revealing and activating Ama's original secret plan to have Tonga under his rule. Again, it is not until this Tu'i Kanokupolu Mataeleha'amea, that the first serious plan to eclipse the Tu'i Ha'atakalaua line as the moheofo consoler of the visiting Tu'i Tonga results in that role being seized by the Tu'i Kanokupolu line. The notoriety of the Ha'amea people in fishing and occupation of lands is a very important factor in the recent political and economic development in the local history of Tonga since the split from Samoa. Once again, as with the earliest case of cross-relative moheofo of Nua to Momo, the activity of the Ha'amea people in Tonga since then has always had a connection to reformation by joining to adopt.

Demoralizing the Tu'i Ha'atakalaua line, Mataeleha'amea or Mataele of Ha'amea has to engage in war with Vaea's sons with the intention to steer the Tu'i Kanokupolu ship into full control without the Tu'i Ha'atakalaua. As would have
been noted, Mataeleha'amea's course has been conducted in the same way that the Hau 'o Momo "Reign of Momo" became confiscated by Lo'au of Ha'amea. Moheofo practice, again, has been the main strategy with which to consolidate the political boundaries of the Tu'i Kanokupolu line in Tonga. Firstly, Mataeleha'amea seizes from the Tu'i Ha'atakalaua line the traditional role of providing moheofo by giving his two daughters, Halaevalu and Tongotea, respectively, as the first Tu'i Kanokupolu moheofo, to the Tu'i Tonga (Tu'ipulotu-i-langitu'ofeafa and his son and successor, Fakana'an'a'a). Halaevalu did not have children with Tu'i Tonga Tu'ipulotu-i-langitu'ofeafa. So, an arrangement with the chief of Mo'ungaone for a girl to be sent to live with and have children by the Tu'i Tonga was then organised in the place of Halaevalu. This can easily be done because of Ha'amea's relationship to Mo'unga'one Island in Ha'apai through Lo'au. Chief Kavamo'unga'one or Kava of Mo'unga'one, so as Taufatofua or Taufa of Tofua Island and Fanualofanga or Fanua of Lofanga Island, were offspring of Lo'au of Ha'amea sent to live as representatives in Ha'apai.

The manipulativeness of the Ha'amea people's struggle, on behalf of their descendant Tu'i Kanokupolu Mataeleha'amea, clearly shows in marrying Halaevalu's sister, Tongotea, with Halaevalu's adopted son, Fakana'an'a'a, to produce the first proper Tu'i Tonga son with a Tu'i Kanokupolu moheofo. Fakana'an'a'a is Halevalu's adopted son by Tu'i Tonga Tu'ipulotu with Manunaa of Mo'unga'one. Bott, following what Queen Salote had said, based on the literal

197 Bott 1982:137-139,172
198 Gifford 1929:130
meaning of the name *Fakana‘ana’a*, describes *Halaevalu*'s adoption as a sad story of “consolation of her [*Halaevalu*] worry”199. The sad aspect must be viewed rather in terms of the political manipulation of power by the people of *Lo’au*, who, as I have argued here, are fish-hookers. Queen *Salote* is the *Lo’au* today, as suggested in 1959 by various *mataapule*200. By means of her *moheofo* status, *Halaevalu*’s practice of adoption is to complete the stealing of the *Tu’i Tonga*’s sacred blood.

Another case is *Tu’i Tonga Tu’ipulotu-‘i-Langitu’oteau*, son of *Tu’i Tonga Fakana‘ana’a* by *Tongotea*, taking his own female cross-cousin relative, the daughter of *Tu’i Kanokupolu Ma’afu-‘o-Tu’itonga*, as his *moheofo*. *Ma’afu-‘o-Tu’itonga* is the brother of *Halaevalu* and *Tongotea*. This arrangement seems to be perfectly all right since *Ma’afu-‘o-Tu’itonga*, as blood descendant of the *Tu’i Ha’atakalaua* line, on his mother’s side, only becomes recognized, on his father’s side, as *Tu’i Kanokupolu*. The focus is *Tu’i Kanokupolu*, and, the cross-relative *moheofo* marriage between *Tu’i Kanokupolu* (*Ma’afu*)’s daughter, and *Tu’i Kanokupolu*’s sister’s (*Tongotea*) *Tu’i Tonga* son, confirms that.

Another case of demoralisation of the *Tu’i Ha’atakalaua* is the establishment of a connection between the *Tu’i Kanokupolu* and industrious land-owner, *Fisilaumaali* of *Lafalafa*. This was done with the taking by force of *Tu’i Kanokupolu* *Ma’afu-‘o-Tu’itonga*’s full sister, *Fusipala*, away from her husband-nephew, *Tu’i*

199 Bott 1982:137
200 Ibid., 1982:92
Ha'atakalaua Tongatangakitaulupekifolaha, by Ma'afu's untitled younger half brothers, to marry her again to Fisilaumaali. Through this union, the chiefless "flat" status of Lafalafa, former name of Fisilaumaali's home, since then, has been elevated to a chiefly "hierarchical" status of Pelehake "Beloved jumping porpoise"\(^{201}\). The historical aspect of this elevation is a reference to the child born from the union, Lekaumoana\(^{202}\). He is a moana "deep sea (fish)"\(^{203}\) caught in the kau "fishhook (of Ha'amea)"\(^{204}\), making him to the first Tu'i Pelehake title-holder.

Separating Fusipala from her Tu'i Ha'atakalaua husband reflects the true nature of (Mataeleha'amea's) personalised politics as to where power is genealogically calculated and manipulated. Genealogical calculation thus involves division into sides competing for the championship title. For example, Mataeleha'amea's marriage with Kaloafuutonga, daughter of Vaea and a blood descendant of her Fijian connection through her mother, Sungu, from Lakemba Island in the Lau Group\(^{205}\), quite clearly, demonstrates Mataeleha'amea's intention to centralise the localization of power under himself with the coercive marriage of Fusipala to Fisilaumaali.

The calculative mindfulness of Mataeleha'amea's socio-political strategy has been well displayed in the later big fracas between the Fijian descendant grandsons of Ma'afu-'o-Tu'itonga over the Tu'i Kanokupolu title. This fracas also sets up the

---

\(^{201}\) Churchward 1959:408  
\(^{202}\) Bott 1982:147, Fig.24  
\(^{203}\) Churchward 1959:359  
\(^{204}\) See Clark (1994) for his linguistic reconstruction of fishhook in Oceania
preliminary transitional change in the history of government system from Samoa into Tonga to Fiji. The analysis here comes from my reading of the genealogy of the succession of the Tu'i Kanokupolu as recorded in Bott.  

Ma'afu-'o-Tu’itonga’s marriages, first to Laatuutama, daughter of Tu'i Ha'ateiho Fakatakatu'u and, then, to Kavakipopua, daughter of Paleisasa, son of Tu'i Neau of Lakemba, with Toafilimo'unga, are the sources of the rivalry. The rivalry between these two Fijian families is over who is higher in rank. Tu'i Ha'ateiho is second in rank to the Tu'i Lakepa of the Fale Fisi “House of Fijians” to who the Tu'i Tonga Fefine marry. Since Ma'afu first married into the Tu'i Ha'ateiho line to Laatuutama, his son, Tupoulahi, succeeded to the Tu'i Kanokupolu title. Ma'afu later married Kavakipopua of the Tu'i Lakepa line and had the son, Mumui. Because Mumui is directly descended from the head of the Fale Fisi, he is higher in rank than his older half brother and heir to the Tu'i Kanokupolu title, Tupoulahi. The rivalry, then, within the Fale Fisi actually blew out between Tupoumoheofo, eldest daughter of Tupoulahi, and Tuku’aho, eldest son of Mumui, over the Tu'i Kanokupolu title. Specifically, the rivalry is between Tuku’aho, the true descendant of Mataeleha’amea, because of his father, Mumui, and Tupoumoheofo, on the other hand, a Tu'i Tonga descendant. Toafilimo'unga, mother of Kavakipopua, is daughter of Tu'i Kanokupolu Mataeletu'apiko, father of Mataeleha’amea. In other words, Toafilimo'unga and Mataeleha’amea are sister and brother. On the other
hand, Founuku, mother of Tupoumoheofo, is daughter of Tokemoana, son of Tu’i Tonga ‘Uluakimata II and younger brother of Tu’i Tonga Tu’ipulotu-i-Langitu’ofefafa. Tupoumoheofo, the Tu’i Kanokupolu moheofo to Tu’i Tonga Paulaho, after her cousin, Tu’i Kanokupolu Mulikiha’amea died, appointed herself as Tu’i Kanokupolu. She wanted to bring back the title to the line of Tupoulahi, but, of course, her action immediately nudged Tuku’aaho into reaction. To Tuku’aaho, Tupoumoheofo’s action was a mere sign of disrespectful, selfish, and greedy gesture of usurpation of the power that the children of Ma’afu-’o-Tu’itonga all have rights to.

In relation to the question of social ranking, Tuku’aaho’s seizure of the Tu’i Kanokupolu title from his cousin Tupoumoheofo and giving it to his elderly father, Mumui, is Tuku’aaho’s rectification of the conflict over the title. His action is justified with his personal ambition wrapped up underneath the original socio-political intention of Mataeleha’amea outlined earlier on. Following the death of Tu’i Kanokupolu Mumui, his son, Tuku’aaho, succeeds to the Tu’i Kanokupolu title. Unfortunately, Tuku’aaho’s rectification becomes a preparation for his own death. He was successfully murdered by Tupoumoheofo’s Tu’i Tonga husband’s relatives, an event that led on to the great civil war in Tonga in the mid nineteenth century.

One can say that, actually, the civil war is between the Tu’i Ha’ateiho Havea-Tu’i Tonga alliance and the other alliance of Tu’i Lakepa Tu’i Neau-Tu’i Kanokupolu.

209 Bott 1982:118
210 Koe Tohi Hohoko ‘a Losaline Fatafehi, pp.39,47
Throughout the line of the *Tu’i Ha’ateiho Havea* clan to the younger brother of *Tu’i Kanokupolu Tupoulahi, Maeaniuaki*, is the *Tungii* title and, of the *Tu’i Neau* clan to *Mumui*, the *Tupou* title. *Mumui*’s great grandson, *Taufa’aahau*, as the nineteenth *Tu’i Kanokupolu*, is the first *Tupou*. The *Tupou* title is connected to *Tumbou* village of the Tongans in *Lakemba* Island under the reign of *Tu’i Nayau (Tu’i Neau) Taliai* during the middle of the nineteenth century. The significance of the end of this civil war is its part in a later *Tu’i Kanokupolu*’s secret political manipulation to formalize an end to the rivalry between the *Tu’i Ha’ateiho Havea-Tu’i Tonga* and *Tu’i Lakepa Tu’i Neau-Tu’i Kanokupolu*’s bloody and long war. This is the marriage of *Tungii Mailefihi* and *Tu’i Kanokupolu* Queen *Salote Tupou III*. Their son, *Tu’i Kanokupolu* George *Taufa’aahau Tupou IV*, also has the other titles of *Tungii* and *Tu’i Tonga* through his father.

**Conclusion**

Part of the thesis can be summarized as a sequence of two phases. In the first period (the *Kanokupolu* replacement of the *Ha’atakalaaua*) there is a process whereby the supporter of power through marriage, draws that power to themselves. This is the historical outcome of the emphasis on the *moheofo*. In this period the sons of different mothers are contestants for power which complicates the usurpation. Also, the role of *mataapule* became institutionalized in Tonga and,
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inherent in this institution, there was always a conflicting tendency, apparent also in the *moheofo*, whereby the supporter acting on behalf of power is put in a position where he relegates the dominant power he represents to a subordinate position at the back. When the work of *moheofo* in undermining the alliance is completed, the parallel development of the *mataapule* usurping power comes to the fore.

Speaking on behalf of the protected becomes speaking on behalf of the supposed protector/representative of power. Once the failure of the marriage alliance is transparent by the end of the first period, the two edged nature of rhetoric becomes highlighted. In the second period, the language of the Constitution and the poetry of Queen *Salote* highlight the difference internal to *heliaki*- the inherent difference between revealing and concealing. In these languages, the power of the affirmation of freedom is accompanied by the denial of freedom. The transformation of outward respect for the power of others into the assertion of concealed usurpation of that power is reinforced and highlighted in the languages of this later period once the alliance based on *moheofo* is terminated.

*Moheofo* at its peak in the earlier periods served as a marriage alliance whereby the *Ha’atakalaua* served as supporter of the *Tu’i Tonga*. Even at its peak, *Mo’ungaatonga* began a shift in the balance of the alliance where the supporter drew power away from the *Tu’i Tonga* who was the supported. This assumption of power through the manipulation of the very power that was supposed to be protected marked the ascendancy of the *Kanokupolu*. 
The collapse of the alliance was followed by the supremacy of the *mataapule*. The power originally represented and protected has been removed and a new front is presented.

The language of internationalism replaces the symbolic representation of alliance between upper and lower which is gone completely. The arrival age of individual self interest is marked by the removal of support for allies and the turning inward of marriage- *kitetama* is prevalent. Language is the nostalgic acknowledgement of power which was once preserved as external and independent- an independent ally which is past and its power is now appropriated and internalized.

These changes in the relationship between *Kauhala'uta* and *Kauhalalalo* could never have been understood on the basis of Gifford's explanation. The developments in the nature of the relationship help to understand the theory of language and history in this thesis. As a Tongan, my exploration of linguistics has been primarily a study of semantics. But there is no model of essential meanings to be discovered. Meanings are historical outcomes and meanings are always a matter of conflict. The special nature of that conflict can only be understood in the case of Queen *Salote* by understanding the outcome at that point of ongoing conflicting social processes. Queen *Salote'*s language which can be taken as quintessentially Tongan is an historical outcome where the ambiguity of language is brought to the front and the real meanings of historical *tala* are suppressed and

\[212\] Anderson 1963
hidden in a rhetoric which is famous for the subtleties of metaphor. The ambivalence of concealing and revealing are continuous with the past but have a special historical emphasis in the movement between lau‘eiki and fie‘eiki. Queen Salote takes dualities, the head and tail of the fish, to mask the shift in power relations.
CHAPTER 3

Konisituutone “Constitution”: A Palladium of Ha’a Ma’afu in Tonga

Introduction

The main theme of the 1875 Constitution of George Taufa’aahau Tupou I discussed in this chapter is a turning point in the war history between the three kingly lines, Tu’i Tonga, Tu’i Ha’atakalaua, and Tu’i Kanokupolu, for the highest social rank which legitimates one with the ultimate political control over the economic resources in Tonga. Up to that point of the construction of the Constitution, the war in Tonga had been reduced down to war between the main social ha’a of the Kanokupolu line, particularly, between senior Ha’a Havea brothers and junior Ha’a Ma’afu brothers. Both the senior Tu’i Tonga and Tu’i Ha’atakalaua kingly lines had been imploded into the junior Tu’i Kanokupolu kingly line by means of the moheofo practice. Another important theme in connection to the great force of influence of the Constitution is the joint forces of King George Taufa’aahau Tupou I and the Christian religion, (the Methodist Church in particular), the former as the local standing post on which the latter as the upturned drifting boat rests. Christianity and the Constitutional Monarchy become one body of two interests reinforcing one another. An important ruling of the Constitution acting as the palladium of the victorious Ha’a Ma’afu is the allowing of incestuous relationships within the Ha’a Ma’afu enclosure as a kitetama cross cousin inbreeding of the fahu sacred blood. “King of Tonga” title is now a pure bred Ha’a Ma’afu being a legal conception of the sacred blood.
I take the intention of the construction of the Constitution by George Taufa’ahau Tupou I with Queen Salote’s salutation of announcing her own son-to-be-successor, Crown Prince Tupouto’a, then King George Taufa’ahau Tupou IV, that George Taufa’ahau Tupou is the palatiume ’o Ha’a Ma’afu “palladium of Ha’a Ma’afu”. In other words, as Crown Prince Tupouto’a, his takafalu “genealogical descent” is traced back to the founder of the Constitutional Monarchy and grandson of the founder of Ha’a Ma’afu, George Taufa’ahau Tupou I. George Taufa’ahau Tupou I’s father, Tu’i Kanokupolu Tupouto’a, is son of Tu’i Kanokupolu Tuku’aho, the ancestor of Ha’a Ma’afu. Their translation as “an instrument of measurement”\textsuperscript{213}, according to Mahina and Taumoefolau of the Tongan text, palatiume ’o Ha’a Ma’afu as “platinum of Ha’a Ma’afu”, (see Takafalu, Appendix 8, lines 1-16, pages 288-295), is still problematic. I first learnt this word, “platinum”, from Mahina’s comments on my draft. In his PhD thesis\textsuperscript{214}, he used the word “platinum” for palatiniume. I can only presume that Mahina and Taumoefolau were discussing this point based on the Tongan text, palatiniume, as the Tonganization for English “platinum”. They did not seriously take into consideration the historical context of the line, or even the whole poem, to determine the proper translation. They seemed to focus only on the pragmatic use of the word, in music, for example, it is palatiniume for “platinum”. My argument, to start with, there is no such word as “platinum”. There is, though, the word,

\textsuperscript{213} Personal communication with Mahina in his comments on the draft of this chapter where he said, I quote, “Queen Salote uses the ‘platinum’ as a heliaki for Tupou IV as the head of Ha’a Ma’afu; ‘platinum’ is deployed here by QS as an instrument of measurement, likening Tupou IV as the measure of Ha’a Ma’afu”.

\textsuperscript{214} Mahina 1992:193-194
"platinum", Tonganized as *palatine*, as one of the six metals, including "palladium", having similar physical and chemical properties. I, then, cannot even imagine a connection of translation between "measurement" and a non-existent word, "platinium". And, even with "platinum", I still cannot see any connection as "a device of standard measurement". Further to my conversation with Mahina, sorting out this kind of translation problem, the best way to do it, as I have said above, is to clarify the problem in terms of the history of the *Ha'a Ma'afu* appointment in the wider context of the history of *Tu'i Kanokupolu*. I take "palladium" to be the most probable term employed by Queen *Salote* and, it fits perfectly well with the historical interpretation I take of the political dialectical inversion of *Ha'a Ma'afu* replacing the *Ha'a Havea-Tu'i Tonga* combination in time and space. Therefore, Mahina's translation of *palatiniume* for "platinum", I suggest, should be *palatiume* for palladium, thus the line, *palatiume 'o Ha'a Ma'afu*.

An aspect of the protective character of *Ha'a Ma'afu* "palladium" is strongly featured in the historical *tau 'i Folaha* "taking and placing in *Folaha*" of the *Tuku'ahe* "presentation of the conciliatory sacrifice", from *Tuku'ahe*, after the confiscation of the *Tu'i Kanokupolu* title from self-appointed *Tupoumoheofo*, daughter of *Tu'i Kanokupolu Tupoulahi*, and conferring it on his own father, *Mumui* of *Kolomotu'a*. This war over the title between *Tuku'ahe* and his first cousin, *Tupoumoheofo*, I feel, partly contributed to the building up to the main civil war between *Taufa'aahau Tupou I* and the *Ha'a Havea* later on. In-depth knowledge of

---

215 Mahina 1992:193
the history is the key which enables one to see through the language layers to the fossilized naked truth of the subject under investigation\textsuperscript{216}. The point made here is taken from Emerson’s theory of the origin of language framed by comparison with the geological formation of a new land, beginning with a long period of accumulation of layer upon layer of different varieties of dead shells and organisms in the bottom of the ocean, keep building and building until it emerges out of the water. Likewise, the national language of this new land is a by-product of this long ecological and social interaction between the people and their environment. Doing research involves clarification of ambiguous and irrational statements to show the logical connections, for example, of the successive \textit{Tu’i Kanokupolu} events. The logical criterion of the clarification is that one has got to follow the implications of $X$ is $Y$, but, not what one thinks that $X$ is $Y$.

The Constitution as a form of protection is connected to the usurpation of the sacred royal blood in marriages to the carrier, \textit{Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka}. In Figure 1, which is a direct duplication of Figure 31 in Bott’s Tongan Society’s discussion with Her Majesty Queen \textit{Salote Tupou}\textsuperscript{217}, the flow of the sacred royal blood only through the senior female line is shown from \textit{Laatuufuipeka} (married to \textit{Tu’i Kanokupolu Tupolahisi’i}) to \textit{Tupou’ahome’e} (married to \textit{Tu’i Kanokupolu Tupouto’a}) to \textit{Halaevalu Mata’aho} (married to \textit{Tu’i Tonga Laufilitonga}) to \textit{Lavinia Veiongo} (married to ‘Isileli Tupou, son of \textit{Tu’i Kanokupolu George Taufa’ahau}

\textsuperscript{216} Compare with Emerson’s theory of language as “the archives of history….fossil poetry” (Chubb 1888:178).
Tupou I) to Tupoumoheofo (married to Siale'ataongo, son of Ma'afu "Fiji") to Vaohoi (married to Veikune [Fotu]) to Heu’ifanga (married to ‘Ahome’e) to Halaevalu Mata’aho (married to Tu’i Kanokupolu George Taufa’ahau Tupou IV) to Salote Mafilo Pilolevu (married to Tuita [Ma’ulupekotofa]) to Salote Lupepau’u Tuita (married to Mata’i’ulua Fusitu’a) to the present carrier, Phaedra Fusitu’a. And, also, the usurped sacred blood is getting protection by means of an endogamous system of incestuous marriage and the idea is to enclose/bury the sacred royal blood in the Ha’a Ma’afu descent group, see Figures 1 (b) and (c).

Ha’a Ma’afu is the late inversion of the Tu’i Kanokupolu voyage turned upside down with genealogical connection to Tumbou Village of Lakemba Island in Fiji. Really, the Constitution, as “a palladium of Ha’a Ma’afu”, shows it to be an instrument of social control which only defines the relationship between the Ha’a Ma’afu and the people as purely oppression and domination. This is the main theme addressed in this chapter.

To begin the discussion I need to recapitulate the main points from the historical analysis of the Tonga-Samoa connection given in the previous chapter, in relation to the advent of the Samoan fale faka-Manu’a “house wounded” government system in Tonga. The important point in connection with this analysis that the first government introduced into Tonga from Samoa was a house administered by wrongdoers who originally stole the royal Fale’ula of the Tu’i Manu’a from Manu’a.

217 See Bott 1982:153
In fact, the literal meaning here, as "seat of the gods, the royal house of the Tu'i Manu'a"\textsuperscript{218}, suggests that Fale'ula is the old name for the modern institution of moheofo. It is the house wherein an uncivilized girl being placed to be sexually tamed and become connected with the Tu'i Manu'a in what is called a muitau "young girl getting served". Multau also implies a relationship which shows itself as an exchanging of services whereby the young girl offers her body in exchange for the foreign invader allying the local chief in war. The getting served of the young girl then recognizes the Fale'ula to be a tu'ula "house for temporary resting"\textsuperscript{219} of the foreign invader's upturned boat on land. Thus, we can use the same interpretation for the origin myth of 'Aho'eitu. He is a son from a sexual copulation by Tangaloa 'Eitumatupu'a with young 'Ilaheva Va'epopua in her endeavour to steal the traditional Tu'i Manu'a Fale'ula into Tonga. It is an action expressed in Samoan with the idea of umatagata, an abandoned half "upper body" which was faa or fata "carried across the shoulders" (Falefaa), from Manu'a in the east and, finally, landed in Savai'i in the west, at the village of Falelima. And, it was in Falelima that the "upper body" then joined with the tino "lower body part" of chief Folas'a's youngest son. Again, this is an event that I take to be the historical semantic criterion for the Tongan version of the origin myth of 'Aho'eitu, the first putative Tu'i Tonga "King of Tonga". A theory, then, of the "King of Tonga" could be read as a translation of the sacrificial tu'usi konga "cut in half" of a lafalafa "low rank commoner" (Folas'a), a term of reference to the people of Savai'i, as mentioned in

\textsuperscript{218} Kramer 1994:660, Vol. 1

\textsuperscript{219} Churchward 1959:519
the previous chapter. The "King of Tonga" is, therefore, a universal representation of the Samoa (umatagata)-Tonga (sino) joining as one ally. In connection to stealing, the Tū'i Tonga concept refers to Va'epopua of Tonga and Tangaloa 'Eitumatupu'a of Samoa joining in sex to procreate a new elitist ideology of economic and political domination in Tonga. The domination is reflected in the murdering of 'Aho'eitu and the establishment of the government administered by the murderers. It emerged as an architectural design in Tonga for the intention of covering the stolen sacred blood of domination with the turning upside down of the boat and, then, completely covering it with pola "plaited coconut leaves". Stealing, in this sense, means sacrifice and burial.

The old concept of murdering, in my interpretation, is the means whereby the protected gets protected from attempted assassination on his life. In the origin myth of 'Aho'eitu, for example, Talafale, a murderer himself and representative of the Tu'i Manu'a in Tonga, again, gets protection from his younger brothers Falefāa who stand face to face with murdered 'Aho'eitu's local Tongan relations. Thus, the meaning, then, of this protection system is recognised as a social duty of junior brothers by becoming mataapule "eyes-of-[the] authority" of their senior brother. The senior brother, Talafale in this case, is the pule "authority", while the junior brothers are mata "eyes". The latter, in that regard, stand outside the former's house to guard and speak on behalf of the Tu'i Tonga government, representative of Tangaloa 'Eitumatupu'a in Tonga. It would be clearer if we referred to this early socio-political arrangement as a mataapule system of government. The obvious
function of this system is to protect by concealing its own immoral and illegal usurpation of power as the fundamental substance of the Talafale "tradition of fale ‘advice’". Talafale is covered inside his upturned boat in hiding from his pursuers while his younger brothers stand as his eye-protectors. It is the same traditional "protective" theme that has been adopted by the Tu’i Kanokupolu sovereignty, but with a different historical make-up, that I am about to discuss from hereon, firstly, with Taufa’aahau and his Constitution and, to be followed with Queen Salote’s ambivalence in poetry.

Thus, I want to discuss this case of the junior mataapule system of protection. This presentation, I must emphasize, will start with a brief on the historical background to the socio-political reformation of King George Taufa’aahau Tupou I, the first constitutional monarch of modern Tonga in 1875. In the context of the traditional mataapule organization, Taufa’aahau, as the youngest newcomer Tu’i Kanokupolu, employed a Constitution, as part of the Tu’i Kanokupolu fighting to get out of its enslavement from the Tu’i Tonga, shows his desire for protection, thus, for power. He shows that with the introduction of his Constitution drafted out for him mainly with the assistance of his close friend and mentor, Shirley Baker. The critique, then, of Taufa’aahau’s constitutional manipulation of the power will be outlined according to two perspectives. First, it will be based on the genealogy of successive Tu’i Tonga, Tu’i Ha’atakalaua, Tu’i Kanokupolu, given in Bott’s book on Tongan society220 and, the devolution of power between these three kingly lines.

220 Bott 1982:12-14, Figures 1,2,3
My idea in connection with the genealogy of succession is closely connected to my socio-political interpretation of the emergence of these kingly lines one after another. Thus, the succession is based on an authoritative response to fear of assassination that has cleverly been organised with the introduction of the divine-secular distinction. But, this organisation is often misunderstood to supposedly imply that society has a religious origin. Critias wrote on this point that the origins of society were purely non-religious and that the gods were a clever invention to keep men from misbehaving when no one was watching them\textsuperscript{221}. I highly regard this view to be the correct approach especially in the case of the historical culture of Tonga as treated here in this thesis. Religion is merely a human invention with a clear terrifying function, as shown in the joint reinforcement between Baker and Taufa‘ahau mainly to protect a certain interest of the ruling order which they both represented. And, only with that terrifying function would there be, on behalf of Baker and Taufa‘ahau, a feeling of being secured, reinforced later with the introduction of the Constitution. Particularly, the statutes of the Constitution regarding the ownership right to the land have served to reconcile a long history of disputation amongst the people of the land. One aspect of this reconciliation is the appointment of a nobility system, made up of a few selected hand-picked men who stood by ambitious Taufa‘ahau in his war for power in Tonga. Religion and Constitution are tools used in a partnership of the founders

\textsuperscript{221} Guthrie 1956:27
reinforcing one another to commit wrongdoing. I will come back to this point as the discussion unfolds.

In particular, I will dwell on those aspects of the Constitution that specifically indicate the connection of this chapter to the general theme of protection. In other words, the focus will be on how the protective aspect of the Constitution has been concocted by Taufa’aahau of the Tu’i Kanokupolu to appear to be handed down from the Tu’i Tonga. Secondly, the use of the Constitution by Taufa’aahau as protection for the Ha’a Ma’afu from the Ha’a Havea gives another perspective to the meaning of the construction of the Constitution. Thirdly, the focus is on the conspiratorial aspect of the Constitution used as an instrument for self-protection by the Ha’a Ma’afu and its Fijian ally. Lastly, the ultimate aim associated with the construction of the Constitution to legally implode the three kingly lines into one kingly line, has been the grand universal idea which Taufa’aahau carried throughout his ruling career.

While fale was the Kauhala’uta protection for the absolutism of the Tu’i Tonga and his local mother’s people, its replacement, Tupou I’s Constitution, is the Kauhalalalo protection for the freedom of the Tupou dynasty and Ha’a Ma’afu from the Tu’i Tonga. The Constitution, therefore, becomes the new language for the Tu’i Tonga’s upturned boat, held up on the shoulders of the Tupou dynasty. Protector Falefaa of the Tu’i Tonga, so as Ha’atakalaua of the Tu’i Ha’atakalaua, has now been George Tupou I’s Constitution of the Tu’i Kanokupolu line. It must be
remembered that the *Tu'i Kanokupolu* is now taking the leading role of protecting the universal *Tu'i Tonga* royal blood. *Tupou*, the “standing pillar”, the title name of *Taufa’aaahau* of *Ha’apai*, is the first Constitutional Monarch to represent the “*Tu'i Tonga* royal blood” in Tonga.

This old *Tu'i Tonga* Constitution of younger brother(s) carrying the older brother on their shoulders persists in the *Tu'i Kanokupolu* Constitution, veneered with the contradictory Christian inclusivist notion of ‘ofa “love”. Thus, the *Tu'i Kanokupolu* “house of protection” means that the carriers are legally bounded to “love”, as in ‘ofa ho kaungaa’api “love thy neighbour”, ho famili “your family”, ho *Tu'i* “your king”, ho tamai/ta’ee/tuofefine/tuonga’a’ane “your father/mother/sister/brother”, ho fonua “your country”, etc., etc. The contradiction lies in the double meanings of the Christian universalism of ‘ofa “to love” as toofaa “to die”. Saying ‘ofa “to love” in the context of including others, really, is the *Tupou* dynasty’s rhetoric of saying toofaa “regal for saying goodbye”. It is, in other words, the *Tupou* dynasty’s way of excluding the *Tu'i Tonga* people, done by concealing the traditional *Tu'i Tonga* Fale-foa system as a Fale-‘ofa “loving house”.

Engineered with the assistance of the renegade missionary Shirley Baker, a close friend of *Taufa’aahau*, the 1875 Constitution is, thus, the *Tupou* Christian universal “love”. But, Christian love is contradictorily a fierce craving of perversion to desecrate the natural prohibition of the *Tu'i Tonga* royal blood. Doing Christian love in that regard would be an example of Wyndham Lewis’ theme of the art of
being ruled as discussed by poet Samuel Butler with his themes of love and the romance of destruction of the man of science²²². That is, Christian love is a Tupou dynasty's scientific experiment of romance that can become a rage. In other words, with the Constitutional Monarch, "drunken with the notion of the power he is handling, of the vastness of the forces he is tapping, of the smallness of the individual destiny, of the puniness of the human will, briefness of life, meanness of human knowledge, etc., [his] romance of destruction can easily pass over into sadism and homicide²²³.

Based on my interpretation of the genealogy of succession of the Tu’i Kanokupolu, the protection theme of the construction of the 1875 Konisitutone "Constitution", following Taufa’ahau’s successful ending of the Tu’i Tonga line, is historically connected to the formation of the Ha’a Havea clan. The Ha’a Havea formation, I claim, started from a bitter disappointment in the appointment of younger Mataeleha’amea, and not eldest Hafoka, to the title of Tu’i Kanokupolu, after the death of their father, Mataeletu’apiko. It is rather an unusual claim for me to make, for they look to be uho taha sons of the same mother and are expected to work together by supporting each other. This is the point emphasized by Bott²²⁴. My claim that this is quarrel between the uho tau untitled brothers of different mothers, Hafoka and the other younger half brothers, namely, Fohe, Longolongoatumaı,

²²² Tomlin 1969:204-209
²²³ Ibid 1969:206-207
²²⁴ Bott 1982
Lavaka, Tu’ivakanoo, and Vaea, and their titled brother, Mataeleha’amea\(^{225}\), (see Figure 4, page xvi). Hafoka and the others, then, moved out of the Tu’i Kanokupolu’s residence in Hihifo to live with their wives’ Tu’i Tonga people in the central part of the main Tongatapu Island. Allying with their wives’ Tu’i Tonga, they together fought for absolute power over the Tu’i Kanokupolu.

How Taufa’aaahau ended the ruling Tu’i Tonga line in Tonga was not a feat achieved entirely by fighting on his own. As fortunate as he was, the Tu’i Kanokupolu genealogical network, made up with the other kingly lines, had already been connected up since the installation of the first Tu’i Kanokupolu “Flesh-of-Kupolu/Upolu” in Tonga. This flesh of ‘Upolu is Ngata, son of Tu’i Ha’atakalaua Mo’ungaatonga in marriage with Tohuia, daughter of chief Ama of Safata in ‘Upolu. Further to the weaving of the Tu’i Kanokupolu kin network was the distribution of the Tu’i Kanokupolu’s brothers and their sons, as representatives of the Tu’i Kanokupolu, within the main island of Tongatapu, and to the outlying smaller islands to the north of Tongatapu. Through this distribution, these Tu’i Kanokupolu representatives respectively married the local women of these places. From this early genealogical weaving of all Tonga, a rich stock of fighting men and food was laid ready for Taufa’aaahau to rely on in his personal war for supreme power.

\(^{225}\) See Ibid 1982:130, Figure 21
After his successful war, and learning from the weakness and fall of the *Tu'i Tonga* sovereignty, *Taufa'aaahau* had to find a way that would not only secure him and his family with the legal right as *Tu'i Kanokupolu* to be the "King of Tonga", but, also make the *Tupou* dynasty internationally recognized. In this personal pursuit for supreme power at the level of lawfulness, *Taufa'aaahau* had to look west, particularly to Shirley Baker to be his political advisor. His affiliation to the Methodist religion through his political association with Baker that this western religion eventually became *Taufa'aaahau*'s advisors on matters concerning government. The affiliation with the London Missionary Society was the beginning of establishing a replacement of the traditional advisory house of *Falefaa* of the *Tu'i Tonga*.

Such a move can also be seen as an indication of *Taufa'aaahau* attributing the weakness and the fall of the *Tu'i Tonga* sovereignty to the *Tu'i Tonga* not making the transformation to comply with the new phase of modernization Tonga was going through at the time of contact with the west. With regard to the advantage of having a foreign advisory organisational setting, it thus provides the ruler, *Taufa'aaahau* in this case, with more options to play his power game efficiently within Tonga.

This replacement is not new of course. One can see that the traditional advisory body for the King of Tonga has always been filled by some foreign group of migrants. For example, in the *Tu'i Tonga 'Aho'eitu* reign, the *Falefaa* was made up
of Samoan men, in the Tuʻi Haʻatakalaua office, of Fijian, Rotuman, and Samoan men. And, now, in the time of Taufaʻaaahau, statesmen, disguised as the London missionaries, advised George Taufaʻaaahau Tupou I on how to protect him under the human right rules and the British Parliament model of government.

Of course, there are always some problems associated with the advisory system of foreigners. Advising the local people, for example, on things relating to how to live, always engages in a dialectical process of destruction and exploitation\(^{226}\). I argue, in the case of George Taufaʻaaahau Tupou I, that an advisory council of London missionaries is thus an establishment of some kind of leeway controlling mechanism over the local people and the land. It does immediately open the door to this new British political system disguised as a Christian religion to walk inside and immediately assume the administrative role of conducting the internal political affairs of Tonga. This secret political invasion began with, for example, the destruction of the old religion of Tonga associated with the Tuʻi Tonga reign\(^{227}\).

Further, there is this universal link between Taufaʻaaahauʻs and Christianity's authentic popular longings for true community and social solidarity which, in fact, is a distortion just to legitimize the continuation of social domination and exploitation. Tongan people in this modern Christian movement are still kept under constraint, but they are no longer restrained under the old Tuʻi Tonga ʻinasi ceremony, but, in the new ruling order of misinale “missionary” offerings of money and items to the

\(^{226}\) Compare with the recent brilliant application of Hegel’s dialectics theory by Herbert Marcuse in “towards a critical theory of society” (2001).
one god, they are restrained under the new Tu‘i Tonga, who is Taufa‘aahau himself. As a result of this combination, Taufa‘aahau and Christianity both became the ruling reinforced ideologies. In order for them to be able to achieve the distortion of the authentic longings for true community and social solidarity, they, first, have to incorporate together. Zizek’s statement about the role played by Christianity— in incorporating a series of crucial motifs and aspirations of the oppressed, so that truth stands on the side of the suffering and humiliated, power corrupts and so on, and in rearticulating the motifs and aspirations in such a way that they became compatible with the existing relations of domination—sums up the political legitimation process of the Taufa‘aahau-Christianity working combination in Tonga.

Again, my critique of this outside political intervention in terms of advice reveals the nonsensicality of the Tongan myth of independence which says that only Tonga in the Pacific was never colonised, even by the Europeans. History states that Tonga has always been colonized, even way back in time, for example, by Samoa and Fiji and, of course, of these two by Tonga. But, on the part of the missionaries, their colonisation has been a clever ruse to conceal the colonising effect of their engagement in the writing of the 1875 Tongan Constitution from being seen as altogether a wrongdoing of plagiarism. One dare to ask, then, about the proper role of historiography because, in this case, one can see the tendency to record the case in accordance with how Christians think the case should be. From a Christian

---

227 Gifford 1929
228 Zizek 2005
point of view, for example, the Tu’i Tonga ceremony of fai’aho “human sacrifice” is taken to be a barbarian practice, (see discussion of the ‘Aho’eitu myth in the previous chapter). In the Tu’i Kanokupolu context, the fai’aho practice is still retained but with a veneered translation as “birthday”. The emphasis is on the significance of the individual birthday of the King with a tremendous amount of slaughtered sacrificed animals, as substitutes for human beings in the Tu’i Tonga time, as if to evade the Tu’itonga denigratory label of the sacrificed person as insignificant. Regardless of the Christian reconciliation of substituting human with animal sacrifice, modern Christian Tu’i Kanokupolu rule can still be seen to be practicing the Tu’i Tonga style of oppressing the people as by commandeering their resources.

In a twisting way of trying to conceal the obvious colonization of Tonga by the British Empire, Reverend Wood\textsuperscript{229} cleverly presented this method with the question- are the intermittent wars in Tongatapu civil or wars of religion between the Methodist and Catholic? Of course, the answer is well understood by Reverend Wood as shown in the way he structures the question. His position as a member of the London Missionary Society and a statesman is shown in his attempt to protect the religious guild of his organisation. The formulation of the question is itself dualistic, functioning to confuse the issue, and therefore, discouraging the curiosity to find out who is responsible for the intermittent wars in Tongatapu.

\textsuperscript{229} Wood 1975
In response to Reverend Wood's question, I want to emphasise that civil wars in Tonga, really, had always been about struggle for political and economic power. The landing of the Methodist and Catholic missionaries in Tonga, in the historical context of legitimisation of power, in my view, is a political upturned boat of invasion. In that context, I see the initial presence of Methodist and Catholic in Tonga as dialectically a perpetuated inversion of the old struggle between the Kauhala’uta and Kauhalalalo social moieties. Christianity's coming into Tonga with the mission of establishing a worldwide British Imperial icon of colonization, in this sense, then, can be seen as a legitimate contestant in the local arena of power struggles. The conception, then, of civil war, in this context, is tau “to fight” to ‘ataaina “get freed”. “To get freed” means one is trying to declare individual recognition in the new colonial socio-political reformation. It also implies this is war demanding change to the current system. Therefore, by implication, once again, Christianity's connection to the Tonga civil war is not only as an ally, but, it is there fighting for its own political advantage. Christianity is fighting for its own recognition in Tongan society. It achieves that by helping its ally, the powerful Tupou ruling family, as the only way with which Christianity has a hope of getting its own individual freedom. In this connection, exchanging services and colonization (missionization) may be argued to be two different processes, but, somehow, Taufa’aahau Tupou and Christianity do get tangled up in a confusing relationship of one representing the other. The confusion arises when Methodist and Catholic separately formed respective alliances with the Kauhalalalo and Kauhala’uta social moieties, thus, the traditional opposition between Kauhala’uta and Kauhalalalo had been further expanded. The
Methodist Church joined with Kauhalalalo, to which belongs the Ha'a Ma'afu and the Catholic with Kauhala'uta, to which belongs the Tu'i Tonga. Victory at the end, Taufa'ahau (Kauhalalalo) and Methodist became one complementary colonial ruling body and Tu'itonga (Kauhala'uta) and Catholic, on the other hand, became deposed and replaced with no dramatic changes made in the socio-political hierarchical structure of Tongan society.

The alliance between the Methodists and Taufa'ahau's Ha'apai and Vava'u fighting men as the Tu'i Kanokupolu Kauhalalalo in opposition to inland Tu'itonga Kauhala'uta strikes an important dimension to Christian colonisation in relation to the local fale distinction between tu'a "outside, commoner" and 'eiki "inside sacred child of the land". In connection to the local fale distinction, the Tu'i Kanokupolu Kauhalalalo's place is "outside" of the Tu'i Tonga Kauhala'uta's "inside" dwelling. Such connection is thus reflected in the Tongan Christian written history of Tonga as the Tu'i Kanokupolu Kauhalalalo's outside reports on the Tu'i Tonga Kauhala'uta inside socio-political structure. In this sense, Taufa'ahau's socio-political reformation, with the granting of the Constitution in 1875, is dubbed as a symbol of the emancipation of the tu'a outside commoners. It was presented as a fight to get freed from the Tu'itonga Kauhala'uta's oppressive and domineering environment. So, the Tu'i Kanokupolu Kauhalalalo had to initiate a socio-political version of an inverted freedom.

---

I must call to mind Sione Latukefu's short biography of *Taufa’aahau*\(^{232}\) from his early conception when his mother, *Taufahoamofaleono*, craved for human blood while she was pregnant with him, to make this point of emancipation of the commoners clear. This ferocious desire for human blood is a reference to the freeing of commoners from slavery. It is craving for power. Or, in other words, it is *Ha’a Ma’afu’s* challenging (father's side) the *Ha’a Havea* (mother's side) in war. War for independence in Tonga is always conceptualised as *lingi toto* “shedding blood”, involving human sacrifice either for individual fulfilment of personal obligation or for propitiatory purpose.

My socio-historical interpretation of the biography is also a challenge to Latukefu’s biblical reading of it. As a Methodist Church Minister, Latukefu begins the biography with *Tupouto’a* fleeing away with pregnant *Taufahoamofaleono* to his island of *Ha’apai* to avoid *Taufahoamofaleono*’s father’s order to kill the baby for fear of danger to come to Tonga. This is told exactly as the biblical story of Jesus’s parents fleeing from the order of *Herod* to kill all male babies. Husband *Tupouto’a* is Joseph, wife *Taufahoamofaleono* Mary, and father *Ma’afutukui’aulahi* Herod\(^{233}\).

The biblical character of Latukefu's biography of *Taufa’aahau’s* early life might have influenced his whole attitude to think of *Taufa’aahau* as the Tongan Jesus Christ whose blood was spilled at Mount Calvary, typified with *Taufa’aahau’s*
granting of the 1875 Constitution. Given the biblical character of his way of thinking, the publication of “State and Church in Tonga”\textsuperscript{234} could be a motive. But, socio-historically, the relationship between State and Church is a contradiction of one taking advantage of the other, where the two reinforce one another. And, since it is individualistic and conflicting, the reinforcement relationship is between the two ideologies, Taufa‘aahau’s Constitutional revolution and Christianity’s plebeian struggle for liberation of commoners in Tonga. But, only to the extent, that the cooperation between the two had this ultimate objective to displace the paramount divinity of the Tu‘i Tonga. Thus, the situation shows Christianity, as an interested individual reflex, playing an individual role in reinforcing the motivation to change. In that context, Christianity shows itself as the initiator of change. Good or bad is not the issue but the role of Christianity as an outside element in bringing about change in Tonga has to be acknowledged and historically evaluated.

Morality of power obtained a new direction due largely to the presence of Christianity in Tonga. As I have said, power was no longer fought for, after the civil war, when it became the legal property of ownership inherent in Taufa‘aahau’s printed 1875 Constitution of Tonga as the standard Tupou, from tu‘u pou, “standing-post”. Historically, this power “standing-post” concept is an allusion to the Tupou as the post on which the fata “loft, roof part” of the Tu‘i Kanokupolu rests. The “standing-post” is the support of the founding Tu‘i Kanokupolu’s ‘Ulutolu “Head-three” with Tu‘i Ha‘atakalaaua Mo’ungaatonga’s son, Ngata. It became the

\textsuperscript{233} Latukefu 1976
\textsuperscript{234} Latukefu 1974
new *fata* of the *Tu'i Kanokupolu* sovereignty at Hihifo in Tongatapu, completed with

the presentation of the ‘*Ahome*e “Sacrificial food-of-rejoicing”, ‘*Ahome*e’s two
daughters as *Ngata*’s wives. The sacrifice of rejoicing has ever since remained a

traditional normative custom of the *Hihifo* people in remembrance of their king

“flesh of ‘*Upolū*’ and grandson of their local chief ‘*Ahome*e’. It is such a tradition

marked, for example, with the marriage of Queen *Halaevalu Mata’a*ho, daughter of

chief ‘*Ahome*e’, to *Tu'i Kanokupolu* George *Taufa’aahau Tupou* IV. The *Tu'i

*Kanokupolu* is still a *Hihifo* proper and social duty of the people of *Hihifo* to carry

him on their shoulders.


*Ngata*’s untitled sons formed up the *Safata*, in Tongan, *Ha’a Ngata*, who became

the vanguard of their older brother *Tu'i Kanokupolu* in Tonga\(^235\). In this historical

context, the 1875 Constitution, then, can be the vanguard of the *Ha’a Ma’afu*

house of the modern *Tu'i Kanokupolu* line in Tonga, (see Figure 6, page xviii).


Based on the meaning of *Ha’a Ma’afu*, which I will talk about later on, I would refer

to the reinforced relationship between Christianity and *Taufa’aahau* as a special

conception of two parts in one working together for the same end. Perhaps I could

borrow Zizek’s theme of *Hegelian buggery of Deleuze*\(^236\), it may be a wrong use of

his idea, but, somehow, the buggery idea draws me to an interesting possible

\(^{235}\) Bott 1982:120

\(^{236}\) I borrow this notion from Slavoj Zizek’s introduction to the practice of the *Hegelian buggery of Deleuze* in

“organs without bodies: on Deleuze and consequences” (Zizek 2004), “while Deleuze himself does the act of

buggery, Hegel and Lacan adopt the position of a perverse observer who stages the spectacle of buggery and

then watches for what the outcome will be. Lacan thus stages the scene of Sade taking Kant from behind—this

is how one has to read ‘Kant with Sade’—to see the monster of Kant-Sade being born; and Hegel also is the
connection to the meaning of *Ha'a Ma'afu*. There are two interpretations of the meaning of *Ma'afu*. First, *Ma'afu*, for the Magellanic clouds\(^{237}\), from *'ahu*, as in *faka'ahu'ahu*, means "smoky-looking clouds". In this sense, *Ha'a Ma'afu*, as descendants of *Mumui*, youngest son of *Tu'i Kanokupolu Ma'afu-'o-Tu'itonga*, when required to contribute to a funeral bereavement, will prepare the food for the *'umu* "earth-oven"\(^{238}\). Second, as descendants of *Mumui* and chiefly considered to be members of the *Ha'a Ma'afu*, by meaning correspondence, the latter are descendants of the *mui*, as in *muimui*, "buttocks, tail-stand". This second meaning was further elaborated in Queen Salote's disputation of the patrilineal claim of *ha'a* membership with a fish proverb saying: "the fish is not likely to swim backwards", meaning that membership in the *ha'a* is not likely to go through the woman. But, as Queen Salote emphatically put it: "if the tail is strong, the fish will swim any way the tail wants to go"\(^{239}\). Generating a new *ha'a* membership is a cause determined by how strong and skillful in navigation is the *finemui* "lady at the back", at the rudder. *Mumui*'s mother, *Kavakipopua*, is the daughter of *Toafilimoe'unga*, who is the sister of *Mataeleha'amea*, father of *Ma'afu-'o-Tu'itonga*, *Mumui*’s father. *Mataeleha'amea* and *Toafilimoe'unga* are brother and sister, son and daughter of *Mataelelu'apiko*. The marriage of *Ma'afu-'o-Tu'itonga* and *Kavakipopua* is a *kitetama*. *Mumui*, then, is somewhat a direct descendant of the *vasu* sacred blood of *Vuanirewa* of *Lakemba* in Fiji, for his mother’s father, *Paleisaasaa*, is a direct descendant of the *Vuanirewa* royal family. Thus, the connection also points to the

---

\(^{237}\) Velt 1990:101-102

\(^{238}\) See Bott 1982:82
alliance first established between Mataele'utu'apiko and Tu'ineu Taliai Tupou. The outcome, then, of Taufa'aahau's perverse observation of the Christian “brotherhood culture” buggering itself, in this context, is the generation of the monster of an individualistic consumerism/capitalism in Tonga. The perception is that this living worm-like vasu, as long it is preserved within the family, has the power to suck in all the resources.

The objective of the Ha'a Ma'afu to preserve within the vasu sacred blood was sealed with the last moheofo provision by Tu'ikanokupolu Tupouto'a of his daughter, Halaevalu Mata'aho, half sister of Taufa'aahau Tupou I, to Tu'i Tonga Laufilitonga. The relevance of this last moheofo provision thus also marked the establishment of the foundation of the kitetama marriage as palladium of Ha'a Ma'afu. Kitetama marriage was practiced long before Tupouto'a, but not specifically used by one family, like the Ha'a Ma'afu, for political purpose. Until this time, marriage had always been assumed as an institution of support. Kitetama marriage, on the other hand, is a confinement of the seat of power in Tonga within the Ha'a Ma'afu, as the classic case of kaiha'a, stealing by eating of the power commonly belonging to the ha'a of the three dynasties of Tonga, (see Figures 7 and 6, pages xix and xviii, respectively)240.

Ma'afu-'o-Tu'itonga, in the extreme sense of consumerism discussed here, can be a conceptual parallel of the Samoan cruel Taeotagaloa mentioned in the previous

239 Bott 1982:83
chapter. Once again, the two names allude to the cruel aspect of the vasu
cannibalism, in the case of the former, in connection to the eclipsing of the head
Tu'i Tonga by this strong determination of rear Ha'a Ma'afu joining with [Tu'ineau]
Taliai [of] Tupou
Cannibalism, then, is a cruel reference of the 'inasi
presentation of food from the senior kingly lines, Tu'i Tonga and Tu'i Ha'atakalaua,
formalising their submission to their junior Tu'i Kanokupolu Ha'a Ma'afu descent.
People of the Tu'i Tonga and Tu'i Ha'atakalaua are now enslaved to pay tributes to
the new “King of Tonga” socio-political system, justified by the win in the civil war of
the Ha'a Ma'afu.

This group of untitled sons of Ma'afu is variously known by where they lived in
Tonga with names like Folaha “to cut the hair of the Tu'i Tonga”, Kinikinilau “cutting
of the hair” (Ma'ufanga), Houma'utulau “cut of the hair”, Pakilau “plucking of the
hair/head” (Vaini), paki mangamanga “cut off of the forked-tails of
dolphins/sharks” (in ‘Uliha, Ha'apai), etc. Really, the situation is about this
relationship between the consumer tyrant and his cooks who grow food crops for
the tyrant's 'umu “hot oven”. Generally speaking, in terms of the commoner
people's duties, they grow and prepare the food of their king, including cleaning up
his backside and the area where he lies after passing a motion and urinating.
Originating from this traditional historical situation is the custom of fua e fatonga
“carrying one's social duties” to their king and the chiefs of the nation. Church has

---

240 Compare with Bott's description of kitetama (1982:171)
241 See Koe Tohi Hohoko 'a Afikaipo 'uli, (Tonga Tradition Committee in my possession). In brackets are my
own suggestions which are left out in the given reference. Tupou is Tumbou village in Lakemba Island of the
Lau Group, Fiji, where lived Tu'ineau Taliai.
recently been included in addition to family (king and chiefs) and country, thus three kiato “shafts” to which ordinary people are obligated.

The historical origin of this cruel behaviour is connected to the traditional legitimation of power in the physical and mental aspects of contest in the region of Tonga. The one who wins is ikuna, meaning his claim is the right and true one over the others’. After all the fuss and blood-shed, it has iku “ended up” with the winner’s claim. He is, then, recognised with the role as the iku “tail, rudder” steering the boat of the State.

Both Christianity and Taufa’aahau of Ha’a Ma’afu together make up this producing-consuming connection in their attempt to overthrow the Tu’itonga system. How does this transformation come to be where it is? In other words, how does the old democratic Samoan council system of chiefly brothers eventually transform into the present monarchical dictatorship system? Part of the answers to these questions has to do with the introduction of western imperialist capitalism\(^{242}\), brought in to Tonga by way of the London Missionary Society.

But, the transformation really begins, in my view, from a Tu’i Kanokupolu revolution secretly arranged between Tu’i Kanokupolu Mataeluta’apiko, Lo’au of the Ha’amea fishing people to whom the former allied in marriage and, Fiamee of Safata, as ‘Ahome’e of Hihifo, from whom Mataeluta’apiko was genealogically
descended. Safata or Ha'angata is made up of the untitled sons of Ngata with daughters of 'Ahome'e. They are fatal/ngata “carriers/tails”, semantically corresponding to the perception of “boat/snake” swimming/ floating in the water. The implication of the semantic correspondence suggests the main responsibilities of the Safata including the appointment, carrying, and protection of the Tu'i Kanokupolu. In addition to those responsibilities, they, thus, have the responsibility of sinking the Tu'i Tonga canoe and eclipsing the Tu'i Tonga title.

Instrumental to the Tu'i Kanokupolu revolution, in my interpretation, is Lo'au's advice, the law-giver, founder of customs, and regulator of social life. Lo'au's advice, in other words, is clearly an indication of Ha'amea applying its ambitious executive role of directing and organizing the localization of the Tu'i Kanokupolu supremacy in Tonga. Furthermore, the advice is to the advantage of the Ha'amea fishing people as indicated with the appointment of Mataeleha'amea over his older brothers to the Tu'i Kanokupolu title, following the death of their father, Mataelelo'apiko. As Bott writes of this appointment, Mataeleha'amea is said to be the favourite son of his mother, Papa, daughter of Tu'i Ha'amea Aakatoa, son of Lo'au. On this localization purpose, the secrecy of the Ha'amea individual intention to annex Tonga would easily be done by working together with the younger, inexperienced son, instead of the older mature son. For that latter reason,

---

242 My use of this concept is derived from Lenin's thesis of “imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism” (1917)
243 Bott 1982:92,108
244 Ibid, 1982:132-135
245 Bott 1982:131
Hafoka, the oldest who should succeed to the Tu’i Kanokupolu title, had to be abandoned.

As part of Lo’au’s localization of the Tu’i Kanokupolu in Tonga, the intention failed to extend further support of the Tu’i Kanokupolu out to the northernmost groups of Tonga with the appointment of Vuna, already living in Vava’u Island, to the Tu’i Kanokupolu title after Mataeleha’amea. Vuna was older than Mataeleha’amea but still younger than Hafoka. The reason for the failure, as rightly pointed out by Bott, was due to lack of support in Vava’u, for Vuna’s wife and mother were from Tongatapu.

Ha’amea’s personal executive interest in Tonga’s politics, as reminded in the name of Mataeleha’amea, is one dimension of a bigger problem in connection with the power struggle between the sons of the Tu’i Kanokupolu. In the case of the Ha’amea’s imperialistic movement to annex Tonga under Tu’i Kanokupolu Mataeleha’amea, Hafoka led the other discontented brothers and formed up a new Ha’a Havea. With this new Ha’a Havea formation, contestation for the overall power in Tonga begins between the sons of Tu’i Kanokupolu Mataelehu’apiko. Again, it continues through into the sons of Mataeleha’amea.

The nature of the contestation is twofold. First is Hafoka’s claim to the title based on seniority and, second, Hafoka’s dissident younger untitled half brothers of Tu’i Tonga mothers based on their high social rank in contrast to Mataele of Ha’amea.
Specifically, these younger brothers are Fielakepa and Lavaka. Fielakepa’s mother, Tamahaa Tu‘imala, is Tu‘i Tonga Fefine ‘Ekutongapipiki’s daughter. Likewise, Lavaka’s mother, Fatafehi, is Tu‘i Tonga Kau‘ulufonua’s daughter. ‘Ekutongapipiki and Kau‘ulufonua are sister and brother. Both mothers, ‘Ekutongapipiki and Fatafehi, in other words, are from the upper Kauhala‘uta-Tu‘i Tonga section of the Tongan society. Forming the new Ha‘a Havea, senior Hafoka, backed up by his alliance with the two high rank younger brothers, Longolongoatumai (Fielakepa) and Lavaka, is thus a case of two claims coming together into a one reinforced cause against the Ha’amea cause. The reinforcement is even strengthened with the Ha‘a Havea marrying the women of the upper Kauhala‘uta-Tu‘i Tonga section in the central region of Tongatapu Island. Thus, the union, then, became a logical alliance of senior men (Hafoka and the Kauhala‘uta-Tu‘i Tonga high rank men) in a similar situation fighting against their respective own junior counterpart (Mataeleha‘amea). The perverted appointment of Mataeleha‘amea certainly was the outcome of the objective secrecy of Lo‘au’s (of Ha‘amea) advice.

‘Inoke Hu’akau\textsuperscript{246}, president and co-founder of the Lo‘au Society of Research, argues that Havea in Ha‘a Havea is Mataeletu‘apiko’s first name. Hu’akau’s argument is based on some kind of logical naming etiquette of the Tu‘i Kanokupolu Ha‘a using the first name of the holder of the Tu‘i Kanokupolu title. According to

\textsuperscript{246} Hu’akau 2001:3
Hu'akau, Ha'a Havea is the formation of the untitled sons of Havea, nicknamed as Mataeletu'apiko.

Interpretation of the history of Ha'a Havea is the problem. Had the explanation about the status of the Ha'a Havea, as to why it was called by that name247, been fully provided in the first place, in the way I do here, the full picture of the history of devolution of power later in Tonga would have also revealed the secrecy of the Tu'ikanokupolu revolution of usurpation and preservation of power. That secrecy can first be demonstrated with the idea of folo "swallowing", in its marriage terms, of the sacred royal blood institution of social ranking from Fiji by the Tu'i Kanokupolu into Tonga. In Samoa, people speak of this event as the stealing of the Fale'ula from Manu'a into 'Upolu, whereas, in Tonga, the stealing is from Fiji into Tonga by the 'Upolu people. While in Samoa the geographical reference of stealing is from east Manu'a, in Tonga, it is from west Fiji, thus, giving us a conclusion that Tonga and 'Upolu are respectively the final places of the stolen house of the 'ula/kula "sacred royal blood". This folo idea is mentioned in the story of voyaging to Pulotu, (see Appendix 1, pages 228-242, lines 133-134), where it also means fakafeitama "impregnation". Clarification of the interpretation must be made in connection to the Safata people of Tohui'a of 'Upolu, who married Tu'i Ha'atakalaua Mo'ungaatonga and was mother of the latter's son, Ngata. Making available that information should also be a ratification of Hu'akau's argument.

247 Bott 1982:133
The problem to me, as different from Hu’akau’s argument, is what Ha’a Havea, as a name, stands for. What does the name mean? The meaning of the name, in this context, must at least be traced within the holistic history of Samoa-Tonga connection. And, with the availability of the full historical meaning of Ha’a Havea, we can, then, understand the historical basis of the later coming into existence of the Ha’a Ma’afu.

In the context of the Samoa-Tonga historical connection, the meaning of Ha’a Havea can be seen in the historical working partnership between Ha’a Ngata (the untitled younger brothers of Tu’i Kanokupolu Atamata’ila), Lo’au, and Tu’i Kanokupolu Mataeleha’amea. Mataeleha’amea and his untitled brothers are the grandchildren of Atamata’ila, son and successor of the first Tu’i Kanokupolu Ngata. Ha’a Ngata, in this relationship, has the voice in the appointment of the Tu’i Kanokupolu title. In Ha’a Ngata’s appointing of Mataeleha’amea to the title of Tu’i Kanokupolu, Mataeleha’amea’s oldest brother who should be the successor, Hafoka, and Mataeleha’amea’s other untitled brothers felt deprived and lavea “psychologically injured from that strike”. An explanation for that is the then congregation of these dejected brothers at Lavaka’s mother’s people of Pea who are Kauhala’uta relations. It was, by implication, an unacceptable strike on the face, because, to Ha’a Havea-Kauhala’uta section point of view, the whole appointment of younger Mataeleha’amea had been historically determined by a selective advisory council of junior members of the Tu’i Kanokupolu regime to start with. It thus also instigated a historical fate to the unfortunate situation of these
abandoned brothers that marked the beginning of the later destruction of Ha‘a Havea. Their removal to central Tongatapu can be seen as a sign of reaction from the lower Ha‘amea-Kauhalalalo camp of the Hihifo district to the old leadership system of Tu‘i Tonga-Kauhala‘uta, represented in central Tongatapu by the then Ha‘a Havea formation at the fort in Lavaka’s village of Pea. Their being cut off from Hihifo followed their joining by marriage to the eastern Tu‘i Tonga-Kauhala‘uta women. Thus known as the Ha‘a Havea, or should be Ha‘a Vea, as my proper Tongan translation from Samoan Savea, the implication, from the Ha‘amea-Kauhalalalo section point of view, is that senior Tu‘i Tonga-Kauhala‘uta social moiety had gone past its best. In other words, the moiety had been vea “overripe”\(^{248}\), added to which, its sacredness had faded away with Tu‘i Kanokupolu Mataeletu‘apiko’s marriage of wanting to be Lakemba to Tamahaa Tu‘imala and, her daughter’s marriage, Toafilimoe‘unga, to Paleisaasaa, son of the Tu‘i Nayau of Lakemba.

Wanting to be Lakemba was Mataeletu‘apiko’s aspiring after the Navuanirewa “fruit of rewa”\(^{249}\), a reference to the island of Nayau from which the Tu‘i Lakemba royal family descended. Aspiration for the fruit of Rewa, which I Tonganize as ‘Eua, the small offshore island to the east of Tongatapu Island, is the original beginning of the joining on to Fiji, thus the emergence of Fale Fisi, of the Tu‘i Ha‘atakala‘ua, in the time of Mo‘ungaatonga, and the Tu‘i Kanokupolu, in the time of

\(^{248}\) Hocart 1929:240
Mo'ungaatonga's son, Ngata. Interestingly, the proverb, koe 'uli'uli 'a fine 'Eua “the blackness of 'Eua women”, may be a reference to this connection of marriage between the Fale Fisi men and Tu'i Tonga Fefine, the Tamahaa (oldest daughter of the first marriage) and Tu'i Kanokupolu. It is in other words, the dirtying of the high ranking women of Rewa/'Eua with the Tu'i Kanokupolu of the Tamahaa. The aspiration is a figurative reference to the Tu'i Kanokupolu trying to reach for the vasu, fahu universal sacred blood which determines one's socio-political rank and economic prosperity in Tongan society.

This is intriguingly interesting from the point of view of the Constitutional framework drafted by Taufa'ahau Tupou I, a snatched away mother's child of Ha'a Havea people in Tongatapu by his Ha'a Ma'afu father of Ha'apai and, who later came back to destroy his mother's Ha'a Havea connection. We can learn from this perspective of the fundamental contradiction that is the essence of the Constitution as a patriarchal dialectic of negating his maternal connection. The essence here is considered as a gender issue, which can otherwise be interpreted as a dialectical negation of one by the other in their common fight towards one's respective freedom from the other. I am referring here to when the common judicial decision of the Constitution becomes controversial especially when the prosecuted is from the aristocratic circle. For at this level that we can witness the real prejudicial control of the Constitution as protector of the aristocratic centre of authority. At this level, in other words, the vasu/fahu is the real content and measure of the

249 See Hocart 1929
Constitution. Thus, what simply said to be a patriarchal (Tupouto'a)-matriarchal (Taufahoamofaleono) contradiction, the Constitution has been created as a universal place where every one can take his/her claim for a judicial decision. Once again, in reality, it is the new established source and cause of a new socio-political chaotic Tonga. The new chaos still maintains the old traditional moiety division but the only connection between the two is the strictly selective vasu/fahu sacred blood, reinforced by the late introduction of the ultimate prejudicial constitutional system of Taufa‘aahau Tupou I. Simple patriarchal-matriarchal opposition is Tupouto’a negation of the Ha‘a Havea striving for power. Thus, freedom, in this context, is not only striving for supremacy, but, also, is the searching for exemption from paying tributes commonly executed by the debtor, for example, the Ha‘a Ma‘afu, firstly, by marrying into the Ha‘a Havea-Tu‘i Tonga compound.

It is thus freedom, for example, of Tu‘i Tonga ‘Uluakimata, entering into a formal alliance with the collector, the Tu‘i Lakemba. ‘Uluakimata’s daughter, the Tu‘i Tonga Fefine Sinaitakala’ilangileka, married the collector’s son, Tu‘i Lakemba Tapu’osi of the Fale Fisi. Thus, the alliance not only exempted Tonga, but, it was a sign of Tonga’s conquering its own subservience to the Rewa’s enslaving vasu, (fahu in Tongan), tributary system. We can read, then, from this analysis of an interpretation as to the way new institutions such as Tu‘i Tonga Fefine, Tamahaa, and Fale Fisi came about. Fale Fisi became the Tu‘i Lakemba royal house in Tonga. It is where the daughter of the Tu‘i Tonga married into. Vasu is a reference
to the residing shrine of the *Kumbuna* people’s ancestral god at a place called *Mbau* in the *Kauvandra* Mountains in *Rewa*. But, after a clever buggering of the *Ha’a Ma’afu*, the usurpation of the vasu “sacred blood” later became institutionalised as a *kitetama* property of the *Ha’a Ma’afu*.

So, the cultural logic of the Constitution is this historical construction of political and economic contradictory elements associated with the marriage exchange of levy payments. Once, it started with *Va’epopua* of Tonga to the *Tu’i Manu’a* of eastern Samoan *Manu’a*, as recorded in the myth of ‘*Aho’eitu* and, then, with *Tohuia* of western Samoan ‘*Upolu* to *Tu’i Ha’atakalaua Mo’ungaatonga* of Tonga and, then, with *Tu’i Tonga Fefine Sinaitakala’ilangileka* of Tonga to the *Tu’i Lakemba Tapu’osi* of western Fijian *Lakemba* and, then, with the *Tamahaa Tu’imala* of *Lakemba* to the Tongan nationalised *Tu’i Kanokupolu Mataele Tu’apiko* and, lastly, with the Tongan nationalised *Tu’i Kanokupolu Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka* to the Tongan individualised *Ha’a Ma’afu* enclosure. Once again, freedom is the individual fight to unrealistically get freed from the rot of paying dues and, marriage is part and parcel of that enterprise.

The marriage of *Tohuia* to *Tu’i Ha’atakalaua Mo’ungaatonga* was the beginning of ‘*Upolu* eclipsing the *Tu’i Ha’atakalaua* in the institution of *moheofo* (adopting of the sacred royal blood from the *Tu’i Tonga*) by assuming the adopting role. The new emerging *Tu’i Kanokupolu* title from this marriage made the move to set up a new set of paired brother (*Tu’i Tonga*) and sister (*Tu’i Tonga Fefine*) of ‘*Upolu* parents.
This objective did not eventuate until the marriage of Tu'i Tonga Tu'ipulotu'ilangitu'oateau with ‘Anaukihesina, daughter of Tu'i Kanokupolu Ma'afu-'o-Tu'itonga. Tu'ipulotu'ilangitu'oateau's mother, Tongotea, is a sister of Ma'afu-'o-Tu’itonga. So, Tu'ipulotu'ilangitu'oateau and ‘Anaukihesina’s marriage is a kitetama case. Their daughter, Nanasipau'u, became the first real ‘Upolu Tu’i Tonga Fefine and her brother, Ma’ulupekotofa, the ‘Upolu Tu’i Tonga. The kitetama method is an incestuous practice concealed by the Samoan as saa, in Tongan as haa, “sacred”. But, the Fijians protest to it as a caa “bad”250. The Fijian interpretation expresses a Lakemban ill-feeling for they are supposed to have the utmost right to the high status vasu blood. Instead, it has been usurped by the Safata people of ‘Upolu through their moheofo practice.

Usurpation clearly showed after the birth of the two legitimate Tu’i Kanokupolu Tamahaa, namely, Laatuufuipeka and ‘Amelia Fakahiku’o’uiha, by Tu’i Tonga Fefine Nanasipau’u to the two important men of the House of Fijians, Tu’i Lakepa Laatuuniipulu and Tu’i Ha’ateiho Haveatungua, respectively (see Figure 2, page xiv). The consecration of the Tu’i Kanokupolu line with the usurped royal blood really begins with ‘Anaukihesina, daughter of Tu’i Kanokupolu Ma’afu-‘o-Tu’itonga, as moheofo of Tu’i Tonga Tu’ipulotu-’i-Langitu’oateau. The marriage as a cross-cousin kitetama is a sign of the ‘Upolu tradition of gaoi “stealing”, ngaohi “adoption” in Tongan, of the Tu’i Tonga sacred royal blood.

250 Churchward 1959:205
The usurpation aspect of the Tu‘i Kanokupolu moheofo institution in the kitetama case can be seen to be an exceptional case in the Constitution ultimately for no reason but justification of the preservation of the sacred blood within the victorious enclosure of Ha‘a Ma‘afu. Such exception has constitutionally been connected by the architectural symbolisation of the champion wearing an ao “turban” with the building of his Fale‘ula/Falekula royal palace as the upturning of his supreme poopao “war canoe” used in his war for power in Tonga. As the conqueror, he, constitutionally, has the right to the championship title, disputing his being accused of being a usurper. Again, constitutionally, might, instead of right, rules. In this context, the Constitution draws out a standard legal right of the vasu sacred blood with the explanation based on the concept of tau‘ataaina translated as “freedom”. Vasu is the reward given from the aftermath of war, for example, between the children of Tu‘i Kanokupolu Tupoulahi (Tupoumoheofo) and Mumui (Tuku‘aho), in recognition of the Ha‘a Ma‘afu victory in getting freed from being subservient, first, with the use of moheofo (exogamous marriage across the kingly lines, for example, Tu‘i Kanokupolu to Tu‘i Tonga) and, then, finally, with the use of kitetama (endogamous marriage within a particular ruling kingly line, example, Tupou dynasty), (see Figures 1, 1[b], 1 [c], pages xi-xiii). Another possible perspective on the Constitutional sanctification of the Tu‘i Kanokupolu moheofo alleged usurpation of the sacred blood can somehow be explained, for example, with the Fijian “bad” and Samoan “sacred” references to the adopted vasu blood. The vasu blood, as a subject of a bad thing happening and leading to war in Fiji, is recalled in

251 Bott 1982:153-155
the story of the voyage to Pulotu as something (a yam) that had been snatched and run away with, sanctified as sacred in Tonga by the ‘Upolu stealers.

Securing of this political and economic measure of rank and wealth and making sure it was safe within the enclosure of the Tupou dynasty was the main concern of Tu'i Kanokupolu Tupouto'a, the first offspring of the founder of Ha’a Ma’afu, Tu’i Kanokupolu Tuku’aho. He expressed his concern to his son, Taufa’aaahau, “the Ha’a Havea must be destroyed”\textsuperscript{252}. I take it that he meant for his son to destroy the demon, Havea Hikule’o, the vanguard of Tangaloa ‘Eitumatupu’a in Tonga. These dying words of Tupouto’a to his son, Taufa’aaahau, to stand up and fight for the Ha’a Ma’afu’s freedom from the Ha’a Havea-Tu’i Tonga combination, I am arguing, have established the stand of the Ha’a Ma’afu’s Constitution in Tongatapu Island, the home of Ha’a Havea, as the only standard governing document for all Tonga.

Following the murder of his father, Tuku’aho, founder of the Ha’a Ma’afu, Tupouto’a’s dying words reminded his son of the political and economic power of the Ha’a Havea and to seize it is his first and foremost role.

This father’s command to son is an interesting case that seems to express the realistic nature of the contrary relationship between uho taha and uho tau. In this particular case, because it is a fight between two head-male-led Ha’a, the father’s-command-to-son refers to the order given by the male leader of each Ha’a to his respective followers. Tupouto’a, the leader of the Ha’a Ma’afu, instructed Taufa’aahau to destroy his mother’s Ha’a Havea. Ma’afutukui’aulahi (Maluotaufa),
on the other hand, the leader of the *Ha’a Havea*, prior to *Tupouto’a*’s order, ordered his people to kill his grandchild if it was a boy\(^{253}\).

My interpretation of the rationale for this *uhō tau* fighting father-son relationship, call it a *Tupouto’a*’s point of view, that *Ma’afutuku’i’aulahi*’s (*Maluotaufa*) action was an indication of his attempt to claim back the *Tu’i Kanokupolu* title which he had always argued should have been his in the first place. The claim is based on the senior-junior sibling rivalry between the eldest *Hafoka* and his younger brother, *Mataeleha’amea*, between *Ma’afutuku’i’aulahi* (*Maluotaufa*), *Hafoka*’s descendant and, *Tupouto’a*, *Mataeleha’amea*’s descendant. Thus, based on this argument, *Ma’afutuku’i’aulahi* (*Maluotaufa*) might have considered *Tupouto’a*’s action to be an indication of usurpation of power by the junior line (*Ha’a Ma’afu*) from the senior line (*Ha’a Havea*), (see Figure 8, page xx). Would that be the case, it thus encouraged *Tupouto’a* to give his son, *Taufa’ahau*, a paternal piece of advice, warning him about the political and economic implications of *Ma’afutuku’i’aulahi*’s (*Maluotaufa*) personal agenda prior to his instruction to his people to kill his daughter’s baby if it was a boy. It was an instruction that had hastened *Tupouto’a* to take his pregnant wife with him to his home at ‘Uiha Island in *Ha’apai*.

*Ma’afutuku’i’aulahi* (*Maluotaufa*) instruction came about when *Hoamofaleono*, during her pregnancy, craved for human blood. *Ma’afutuku’i’aulahi* (*Maluotaufa*) interpreted the craving as a bad omen, an indication that there will be bloodshed in *Tongatapu*, consequently leading on to the fall of the *Ha’a Havea* under the hands

\(^{252}\) Latukefu 1976:57

\(^{253}\) Ibid, 1976:57
of the Ha'a Ma'afu. Tupouto'a's advice directly challenged the uho taha working-together-as-one mother-son relationship between Taufahoamofaleono and Taufa'aahau.

As a result of this contrary nature involving the uho tau father's command to son, the mothering role of the child as traditionally done by the wife's people had been taken over by the father's mother's people in Ha'apai ('Uiha). As it was the intention, Tupouto'a wanted Taufa'aahau, the future king of Tonga, to be raised and instructed to lead the Ha'apai Group (Kauhalalalo moiety) out of slavery from the main Tongatapu Island (Kauhala'uta moiety), the Tu'i Tonga residence. It was an arrangement that prepared the scene for the war against the Tu'i Tonga and the Ha'a Havea of Tongatapu, otherwise known as the war of the tautahi "sea people" (Kauhalalalo) of the smaller islands to get freed from their divine master Tu'i Tonga (Kauhala'uta) on the main island of Tongatapu.

This historical building up provides for the revolutionary dimension of the Constitution to even break this traditional expectation of the marriage praxis of support that the son-in-law, Tupouto'a, has to fulfil to his father-in-law, Ma'afutuku'i'aulahi (Maluotaufa). Traditionally, Tupouto'a and Ma'afutuku'i'aulahi (Maluotaufa) should be an ally connected in marriage by Taufahoamofaleono. It did not work out that way according to the relevant historical determination laid out above. The expectation, of course, was opposed by Tupouto'a's own ambitious
cause, that the marriage to the Ha’a Havea was strategically to obtain the special social recognition to be able to enter into the consolidated social network of Ha’a Havea and cause it to split open. His son, Taufa’aahau with the chieftess woman of Ha’a Havea, Taufahoamofaleono, became the vasu sacred blood, the destructive spoiler of Ha’a Havea. It thus presents an argument that this calculated strategic marriage arrangement of Ma’afutuku’i’aulahi and his right hand warrior Taakai of the Ha’a Havea fell short of their intention, thus they, without any choice, had to fight back and, eventually, gave in. In the ending of the civil war, Taufa’aahau derogatorily expressed his anger towards his troublemaking opponents, his maternal grandfather, Ma’afutuku’i’aulahi of Vainii and chief Lufe of Folaha, as Vainii vale, Folaha kai ta’e “Vainii fool, Folaha shit”. Ma’afutuku’i’aulahi and Lufe are both fool and contemptible. When the people of these head villages of Ha’a Havea did not dare to support their daughter and her child, Taufahoamofaleono and Taufa’aahau, and, instead, supported the Tu’i Tonga, Taufa’aahau subsequently felt he had been disowned and abandoned by Ha’a Havea and became the adopted child of the Ha’a Ma’afu.

The whole discussion of Ha’a Ma’afu’s challenge of Ha’a Havea can ultimately be summed up with the historical event of tau ‘i Folaha already mentioned earlier on. Because of their “lukewarm character”, Queen Salote’s characterization of Ha’a Havea as quoted by Bott255, in not supporting Tuku’aho during the war of chief ‘Ulukalala of Vava’u, the murdering of Tuku’aho by ‘Ulukalala and his men could

255 Latukefu 1976
implicate the involvement in the murder of the Ha’a Havea. Immediately after the murder of Tuku‘aho, Hafoka and Lufe, and the Ha’a Havea, appointed Ma’afu-‘o-Limuloa to the Tu‘i Kanokupolu title, an event which prompted the Ha’a Ngata to subsequently murder Ma’afu-‘o-Limuloa before completing his one day in office. Ha’a Ngata’s anger had turned into the Tupou-leva “Tupou at once” title name in Folaha, as a reminder of the Ha’a Havea’s unlicensed conferring of the Tupou title while the title was still accessible to some other candidates in the Ha’a Ma’afu family. Ha’a Ngata then appointed Tuku‘aho’s younger brother, Tupoumalahi, to the Tu‘i Kanokupolu title. Probably at this time, Tuku‘aho’s son, Tupouto‘a, was still young and immature. Taufa‘ahau’s derogative remarks upon Ma’afutuku‘iaulahi of Vainii and Lufe of Folaha, therefore, were expressions of his confusion as to why these people did not support his cause, for he was as much a Vainii and Folaha man as they were. Both Taufa‘ahau’s father, Tupouto‘a, and grandfather, Tuku‘aho, had married Vainii and Folaha women, respectively. Tuku‘aho’s second wife, Mataele, is daughter of Tu‘ihakavalu, the name listed in the genealogy of the Vuna line by Bott256, cited in Afuha’alafulufi’s book of genealogy (in my possession) as Tupouleva of Folaha. Tuku‘aho’s son with Mataele is Ulakai. Descendants of Ulakai, of ‘Isileli Tupou, son of Taufa‘ahau Tupou I, of Uelingatoni Nguu and Laifone, grandsons of Taufa‘ahau Tupou I, are the main groups of Ha’a Ma’afu, (see Figure 9, page xxi).

255 Bott 1982:134
256 Ibid, 1982:136. In Figure 13(b), page 82, Bott has Mataele as daughter of Ve‘ehala. Afuha’alafulufi stated that Mataele was adopted as a daughter for Ve‘ehala, probably by an aunt who could not conceive a child to Ve‘ehala.
Perhaps a summary of this discussion addressing the socio-historical dimension of the Constitution can be finalized as a self-referencing universal charter. Its function and purpose for what it was made for, the Constitution has become the universal socio-political body of the maker himself. It means that while it is divided up into three main sections—rights, government, and land—as those areas covered by the Constitution, these are really the references of the maker himself. Quoting then of the Constitution in court is to use it as one’s reference for defending of his/her case. But, in the case of the legislator, himself/herself as the ultimate monarch and creator of the socio-political system, he/she plays the major role of amending the Constitution, if necessary, to make sure that it carries its primary function to protect the maker himself/herself.

Such universal protective character of the Constitution of referring to itself can thus be recognized as a *heliaki*, saying one thing and meaning another, with, of course, the emphasis on the maker himself. And, because of the uncertain inclination of the Constitution to ultimately serve the monarch and his descendants, that we find in the genealogical history of the *Tu’i Kanokupolu* line a consequential constructed historical pattern of the *uhu tau* brothers individually ganging up and contesting against one another for the title. The contest is who is going to be at the helm of the Constitutional Monarchy. This kind of analysis does away with the argument that the *Tu’i Kanokupolu* title is any longer a shared property of the royal brothers, as it supposedly appears to be in Bott’s schematic drawing of the succession of *Tu’i Kanokupolu*, (see Figure 4, page xvi). They appear to have an equal right to the
*Tu'i Kanokupolu* title, but, the equal right, in fact, is a genealogical corruption disguising the ultimate social reality of *uhu tau* rivalry of the royal brothers.

This multifaceted nature of Tongan social relationships of fighting over power, as, in fact, connected to the early *Tu'i Kanokupolu* localisation, undoubtedly influenced Taufa‘ahau's frame of mind in the construction of the Constitution. It contributed to the making and centralising of power with the Constitution.

Constitution, in this sense, as symbolizing centralisation of power, marks the birth of a totalitarian state that is worthwhile considering with Hegel’s critique of individualism.\(^{257}\)

Hegel’s critique takes Taufa‘ahau’s Constitution, for example, as an abstraction of the individual by alienating him from his land. In this sense, the Constitution has always been a means to distract the individual while his property gets invaded. Thus, the Constitution, as a symbol of totalitarian authority with absolute control, functions to dispossess, to impoverish the people. In this Hegelian view, the traditional relationship between community and state gets disconnected, resulting in the loss of community traditional values as they give way to modernization. The parochial local interested society and Tonga become citizens. They have no particular interests but abstract universal interests. *Taufa‘ahau’s* Constitution

\(^{257}\) Zizek 2005
suppresses the local interests, so as the marriage arrangements between group dynasties, to bring about the end of the community of dynastic interrelationships.

*Taufa‘aahau’s* modernisation has created a nation no longer part of a traditional community. For example, in the Constitution, there is no reference to traditional village titles. They have been replaced by the nobility system of few selected nobles referred to as landowners, having this role to collect levies and presentations from the people who work the land. The Constitution, then, in this context, establishes the general rule for individuals subject to noble title. Individuals are entitled to an allotment. With the constitutional replacement, land is taken from its traditional *kaainga* formation, as still retained in Samoa, into an estate leasing formation of investment of *Tupou* and his nobles. So, allotment is defined in the land tenure system of *Taufa‘aahau*, as a misconception of the old *kaainga* common ownership of land and a revival of the old principle of ‘*inasi*’ practice. Division and distribution of land to the people is one way of obligating them with social duties to the landowners and the supreme ruler of the nation. People would then grow food on their given pieces of land firstly to fulfil their social duties with the best crops and, then, the second best will be for themselves. So, the Constitution has explicit recognition to social class which is defined more narrowly and recognised to certain need of number of titles and establish the general relationship first to the titles too, the monarchy and ordinary citizens.
The recent case of the *Taimi 'o Tonga* newspaper being banned from distribution in Tonga in 2004 is an example showing the political essential function of the use of the Constitution to control and to be amended when conflict emerged. It is a case showing the contradictoriness of the protection status of the Constitution as a legal charter. Because of the urgency to control the newspaper’s way of “printing the minds and opinions of people” to be lawful, the advisory Ministers of the King of Tonga moved a motion to amend the freedom of speech clause in order to justify the banning proposal. Such a move was later declared unconstitutional with reference to clause 7 of the declaration of rights\textsuperscript{258} by the chief justice who presided on the case in court. In a special interview by the owner and editor of the *Matangi Tonga* newspaper, Mr Justice Gordon Ward stressed the point that laws are there to protect the people who have no power. This sums up the position of Constitution in Tonga suggesting that there is no justice in Tonga, for it simply stands to protect the king and his chiefs. Quite clearly, as noted by the Chief Justice, Tonga’s law is the exercise of the king’s prerogative power\textsuperscript{259}. Justice Ward’s statement has to be carefully examined because of its sense of irony, in saying one thing but meaning another.

Law and Constitution are simply political tools constructed by the king and his advisers, used to protect themselves from the people. The king and his advisers do not have power. Their power originates from the laws that they make. Power of the

\textsuperscript{258} Latukefu 1974:253

\textsuperscript{259} *Matangi Tonga*. 2\textsuperscript{nd} July, 2004
“people”, on the other hand, lies in their natural abilities as *kakai* to *kai* “eat”, to *keina* “wear away”\(^{260}\) the sovereign crown of the kingdom of Tonga. So, to counter the people’s power, the established institution of *pule’anga* “government” of the Cabinet Ministers, Legislative Assembly, and the Judiciary is the structural hierarchy under which “people are thrashed” with *fatonga* “social duties” as their forever presumed destinies. *Pule’anga*, in other words, is a sacrosanct establishment that stands as protection of the King and his chief councillors.

I want to reiterate the point on *Taufa’aahau Tupou* I’s Constitution as “a palladium of *Ha’a Ma’afu*”, that it is “a palladium of freedom”. In this sense, it is a document with some degrees of ambivalence. As a moderate oligarchical policy appearing shifty and revolutionary, it is thus a combination of oligarchic and democratic elements. In connection to Critias’ oligarchical view of the origins of society as “purely non-religious, that the gods are a clever invention to keep men from misbehaving when no one is watching them”\(^{261}\), the Constitution is the god, provider and ruler abstracted to be the ultimate justice of the real concrete world of complex social interrelationships. Thus, stability and integrity of Tongan society is a situation held together by the necessary opposing oligarchical and democratic elements. Therefore, freedom is never given but a product of *taufa*, of pulling one against another between the oligarchic and democratic elements. *Tau’ataaina*, then, as the Tongan translation for “freedom”, confirms the Constitution’s double

---

\(^{260}\) Churchward 1959:260  
\(^{261}\) Guthrie 1956:27. Compare with the theme of “totalitarian State” as a “Big Brother” in George Orwell’s novel, *Nineteen Eighty-four*. 
functions as one's source of protection and one's tool to control social disorderliness/opposition.

Concept of “freedom”, therefore, is so problematic and, often, in the situation of the Kingdom of Tonga's political economy, there is no such thing as “free” from social obligations. Translated into Tongan as *tau'ataaina*, “freedom” must be understood as a case of *heliaki* implying “one can boast that he is free to *tau* ‘fight’ in order to get ‘ataaina ‘freed’”. So, *Taufa'aaahau* might have been making the Constitution, not only as a palladium of his successors, but, as a personal message to all Tongans, like him, who managed to get rid of the *Tu'itonga* system, that they could also do it. Fighting to get oneself freed is an essential feature of the Constitution declaring despotism. In Hart’s reading of Mill’s and de Tocqueville’s critical study of democracy, as a good further expression of the point I am making here regarding the proper Tongan interpretation of “freedom”, thus stating that “it is fatally easy to confuse the democratic principle that power should be in the hands of the majority with the utterly different claim that the majority, with power in their hands, need respect no limits”. Clearly from this statement and further to my argument that the fundamental cause of social conflict is differences of interests, everyone has different wants from another. Disorder is therefore a common denominator in all situations of social grouping, a force that brings together various things and, at the same time, disperses them.
False image of democracy as part of a constitutional revolution used as a political vehicle for possession of power, tau'ataaina has to be understood as a war phenomenon. Taufa'aahau, the one who championed this movement, himself once explained this phenomenon to his relation, Afuha'alaululi of Vava'u Island, thus as-

Ka 'iai ha taha 'e fiema'u fakamaau ho kelekele, pe'a ke fekau ke ne 'alu ki ho fa'itoka 'o fakata'ane ai he 'oku 'iai ha mata'ifika laki kuo lesisita ho kelekele, 'aia na'e pahi 'a e ta'e moe mimi pe'a toki ma'u.

If there is adjudication to your land, you must tell that person to go to your family grave and sit cross-legged there, that there is a lucky number showing the registration of your land, which means shit and urine squirited before [you] got it²⁶².

The war phenomenon of tau'ataaina, fighting for one's freedom, is highlighted to Afuha'alaululi by Taufa'aahau, for him to understand that land, as the object of conflict, results in death, complete dry-out of the body. As land, like any system of government, alienable, it is, thus, a reward of those who really give everything for it. In fact, Taufa'aahau actually recites back to Afuha'alaululi the meaning of his name as afu "squirting" of ha'alaululi "one's all". It is also a qualifying statement highlighting the individual state of absolute loyalty.

²⁶² Koe Tohi Hohoko 'a Afukai'opouli, page 238.
Part of the new establishment of the *Tu’i Kanokupolu* Constitution means that the old *Tu’i Tonga* is collapsed into the *Tu’i Kanokupolu* and, from the *Tu’i Kanokupolu moheofo* practice, there is *Tu’i Kanokupolu Fefine*. In the beginning, it was the *Tu’i Manu’a*, then known in Tonga as *Tu’i Tonga*. The *Tu’i Tonga*, then, now became known as the *Tu’i Kanokupolu*. Thus, the new establishment, then, means that the *Tu’i Kanokupolu* has now assumed the *taualunga* “ridgepole on top of the roof”. Being on the top, the *Tu’i Kanokupolu* has turned upside down on the *Tamahaa* “Sacred daughter” of the *Tu’i Tonga Fefine* “*Tu’i Tonga sister*”. Once again, formerly, the *Tu’i Tonga* was the ridgepole on the *Tu’i Kanokupolu moheofo*. Now, the *Tu’i Tonga* sister’s daughter becomes *moheofo* to the *Tu’i Kanokupolu*. An example of the new reversal is the third *Tu’i Kanokupolu Mataeletu’apiko*, who first assumes the *taualunga* status, engaging in sexual relationship with the first *Tamahaa Tu’imala*, (see Figure 2, page xiv).

The reversal means, not returning the stolen crown from the *Tu’i Kanokupolu*, but, enclosing the sacred blood carrier, who is the *Tamahaa*, as the sacred food to be partaken only by the *Tu’i Kanokupolu* line. I will talk more on this political and economic implication of this divine consumptive ethic in the next chapter.

Again, this new reversal of *Tu’i Kanokupolu* on top of the *Tu’i Tonga* has since then been marked with the choreography of *taualunga* as *tau’olunga* dance. It is performed by a *taupoou*, “Samoan for young female virgin as the central post of
the house", of Samoan tamasaa "person sacred", as sex symbol of Tupou. The performance is the formality of lifting of the taupoou to the loft of the house where the champion Tu’i Kanokupolu Tupou waits, ready to deflower her. For example, the daughter of the last Tamahaa Laatuufufipeka, Tupou’ahome’e, who carried the sacred blood, married Tu’i Kanokupolu Tupouto’a, father of Taufa’ahau. From that marriage, the sacred blood has been able to be carried right down to the Tupou dynasty and, the current carrier is the wife of the present king, Tu’i Kanokupolu George Taufa’ahau Tupou IV, Ha’alaevalu Mata’aho, (see Figure 1, page xi).

Constitutionally, the new reversal, once again, is a moral declaration of the totonu "rights", the form of pule’anga “government”, and the kelekele “land”. Moral declaration can only mean the Constitutional monarch makes known his Constitutional mind to the people on the rights, government, and land. People, for example, constitutionally have the moral right to be free as “the Will of God”263. But, “Will of God”, translated as loto ‘oe ‘Otua, is a duplicitous phrase of Taufa’ahau, the creator of the Constitution, dubbing himself as the ‘Otua “God”. By revealing the structural-functional God of the Constitution to be George Tupou, then, those three bodies of Privy Council and Cabinet, The Legislative Assembly and, The Judiciary264, in my interpretation, should foremost be recognized as simply created empty functionaries, primarily, for protection purpose. Traditionally, these official bodies merely become the mataapule of George Tupou. They are his councillors,

263 Latukefu 1974:252
legislators, and judges who speak to the people on behalf of the will of the absent "God", George Tupou.

"God" as 'otua, atua in Samoan, is simply a reference to an important motu'a, matu'a "ancestor(s)". Poetically, the "God" refers to the one who has instigated a major socio-political reformation that affects the lives of people and society as a whole. Thus, Taufa’aaahau, in that sense, is a "God" and, constitutionally, recognised as the "Father of [modern] Tonga". Again, the form of government is Taufa’aaahau himself as the Hau "Champion" who has fue "beaten up" the Tu’i Tonga sovereignty. He is at the top rank of Tonga Government as the King, supported and advised by his appointed mouthpieces, the Privy Council and Cabinet Ministers. And, the land is now Tupou, Taufa’aaahau title, as everyone’s tofi’a "heritage".

The invention of the 1875 Constitution leads on to the death of duality and creation of monism of monarchy. Localization of power has come to completion which means the traditional moheofo and Falefaa institutions, as part of the socio-political and economic makeup of the Tu’i Tonga and Tu’i Ha’atakalaaua positions in Tonga, have collapsed and merged under a new direction mainly advocated by English statesmen disguised as missionaries. For the benefit of the founder of the constitutional monarchy, traditional inter-moheofo marriages

---

264 The Constitution of Tonga [Revised Edition 1988], pp.9-10. University of the South Pacific, School of Law
between the *Tu'i Tonga*, *Tu'i Ha'atakalaua*, and *Tu'i Kanokupolu* lines have imploded into one kind of marriage. This idea of implosion, in fact, was conceived in practice since *Mataeleha'amea*. It had to do with cross-cousin marriage arrangement between children of the brother and sister of the *Ha'a Ma'afu* known as *kitetama*. Slowly the *Tu'i Tonga* and the *Tu'i Ha'atakalaua* lines would have to converge into the *Tu'i Kanokupolu* line.

The practice of *kitetama* cross-cousin marriage refers to the *Tu'i Kanokupolu*, the *Tu'i Tonga*’s *moheoto*’s brother, marrying the daughter of the *Tu'i Tonga*’s sister, who carries the sacred blood of royalty. Take for example, *Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka* marrying her third cousin, *Tu'i Kanokupolu Tupoulahisi'i*. *Laatuufuipeka*’s mother, *Nanasipau'u*, and *Tupoulahisi'i*’s father, *Tu'i Kanokupolu Tu'ihalafatai*, are second cousins. That is, *Nanasipau'u*’s mother, *‘Anaukihesina*, is sister of *Tu'ihalafatai*’s father, *Tu'i Kanokupolu Tupoulahi*. *‘Anaukihesina*’s and *Tupoulahi*’s father, *Tu'i Kanokupolu Ma'afu-'o-Tu'itonga*, is the founding ancestor of the *Ha'a Ma'afu* (see Figure 11, page xxiii).

The idea of implosion, then, in this context, shows it being practically derived from the old traditional belief of brother and sister as one incestuous pair of a working partnership. That is, the brother is the sister’s *tuonga'ane* “other male-part” and, sister the brother’s *tuofefine* “other female-part”. The sister’s “other male-part”, for example, refers to the family name she inherits as her maiden name. On the other

---
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hand, the brother’s “other female-part” is the family blood to which he belongs as his descent. Thus, we have in Tonga the saying, *fakahokohoko toto ’a fefine, kae fakahokohoko hingoa ’a tangata* “joining/carrying blood is sister, but joining/carrying title is brother”. From this special exchange between brother and sister of name and blood thus leads on to the institutionalisation of the female-*fahu* “foetus” and male-*ulumotu’a* “head-first” titles.

Again, the implosive idea of *kitetama* marriage specifically spells out the *hoko* activity of the *Ha’a Ma’afu* to enclose the sacred *toto’i ‘eiki* “chiefly blood (sperm)” of the *Tu’i Tonga Tu’ipulotu-’i-Langitu’oteau* within the *Tupou* family. This particular *hoko* enclosing is connected to the successive joining in reproduction beginning with the *Tu’i Kanokupolu Tupoulahi*’s moheofo sister (‘Anaukihesina) and the sacred *Tu’i Tonga Tu’ipulotu-’i-Langitu’oteau*. And, then, ‘Anaukihesina’s daughter, *Tu’i Tonga Fefine Nanasiapa‘u‘u*, joins with two men from the *Fale Fisi, Tu’i Lakepa Laatuunipulu* and *Tu’i Ha’ateiho Haveatungua*. Nanasiapa‘u‘u’s daughters, *Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka* (with Laatuunipulu) and *Tamahaa ‘ Amelia Fakahiko‘u‘iha* (with Haveatungua), respectively join with *Tu’i Kanokupolu Tupoulahisi‘i* and *Tu’i Kanokupolu Tuku‘aho*. Tamahaa ‘ Amelia Fakahiko‘u‘iha did not produce any children with *Tu’i Kanokupolu Tuku‘aho*, so the royal blood died out with her, (see Figure 2, page xiv).

But, the royal blood was able to be passed down from *Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka* who produced some female royal blood carriers with *Tu’i Kanokupolu Tupoulahisi‘i*. 
Figure 1 (page xi) shows Halaevalu Mata’aho, wife of Tu’i Kanokupolu Taufa’aahau Tupou IV, as the carrier of the royal blood. I must add that it is now Mata’aho’s granddaughter’s daughter, Phaedra Fusitu’a, the current carrier. The pattern, then, of this successive joining is that the sacred Tama is hooked into land, first, from the Tu’i Tonga by the Tu’i Kanokupolu moheofo, second, from the Tu’i Lakepa by the Tu’i Tonga Fefine and, third, from the Tu’i Kanokupolu by the Tamahaa. It thus means that finally the Tu’i Kanokupolu has been able to produce its kitetama “foretold sacred Tama”, Tupou’ahome’e, and, the sacred blood, then, passed down through five females to now Mata’aho’s granddaughter’s daughter.

Since the last Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka, the sacred blood has become a scarce pulopula “seed-yam” that the current carrier, Phaedra Fusitu’a, is still mulomula “immature”. It is especially needed to be carefully preserved for the breeding legitimation of the power of the Tupou monarchy. The preservation of the toto’i ‘eiki, as a mark of the three Tamahaa, namely, Tu’imala, Laatuufuipeka, and ‘Amelia Fakahikuo’uiha, is connected to major changes to the social and political system of Tonga. The first Tamahaa Tu’imala is linked to the change from the Tu’i Tonga Fefine ‘Ekutongapipiki-Tu’i Lakepa Fonomanu kitetama marriage of the fono “food relish” of the taumafa kava “drinking kava” ceremony of the Tu’i Tonga, from raw fish of ‘ulu ‘a full-sized trevally” and fai “sting-ray” (Koe Folau ki Pulotu, Appendix 1, pages 228-242, line 105) to cooked food of manu “animals”, as in the name of Fonomanu, the father of Tu’imala, plantains, young taro leaves with coconut milk, chicken, and a big pig, in a ‘umu “earth-oven” (Koe Folau ki Pulotu, Appendix 1,
Thus, the sacredness of Tu’imala, because of this change initiated in the incestuous marriage between her parents of first cousins, indicates a move inland from seashore marine economy. Inland people started to cultivate the land with the planting of the kahokaho yams stolen from Pulotu, of the plantains brought from Samoa (documented in the poem of Sangone, Appendix 6, line 31, pages 279-282) and, the domesticating of puaka “pigs” and moa “chickens” brought from Samoa.

Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka is linked to the addition, from the Tu’i Tonga Fefine Nanasipau’u-Tu’i Lakepa Laatuunipulu kitetama marriage, of the Ha’a Ma’afu and the Tupou title of Lakemba in the Lau Group, Fiji. The addition involves the persistent request of mischievous Nanasipau’u for the fuipeka “flock of bats” of Kandavu Island in Fiji, Ha’atafu in Tonga (Koe Folau ki Pulotu, Appendix 1, line 5, pages 228-242), thus the name of the kanokato of kahokaho yam (Koe Folau ki Pulotu, Appendix 1, line 131) child as Laatuufuipeka, to have adopted in Tonga (Koe Folau ki Pulotu, Appendix 1, lines 149-156). She is going to be a kahokaho tefau which will multiply, (Koe Folau ki Pulotu, Appendix 1, lines 162-163).

The historical aspect of the request is related in association with an unpleasant arrangement to reinvigorate the social status of the Tu’i Tonga Fefine, first, with the Tu’i Tonga title being demoted to the second son of Tu’i Tonga Tu’ipulotu-’i-Langitu’oteau, Paulaho, while his first son, Ma’ulupekotofa, instead, to marry Tu’i Lakepa Fehokomoelangi-’i-Fisi’s would-be-Tamahaa daughter,
Mo’unga-’o-Lakepa, and Tu’i Tonga Fefine Nanasipau’u marrying Fehokomoelangi’s son and successor, Tu’i Lakepa Laatuunipulu. Nanasipau’u’s half sister cousin, Siutuama'uta, real sister of Tu’i Tonga Paulaho, also becomes a secondary wife to Tu’i Lakepa Laatuunipulu. Both the rightful incumbents to the Tu’i Tonga title (Ma’ulupekotofa) and Tamahaa (Mo’unga-’o-Lakepa) are impoverished, thus low rank. Whereas, Tu’i Tonga Fefine Nanasipau’u, the troublemaker, becomes the high rank person in Tonga, as opposed to the Tu’i Tonga title, held by Paulaho, a younger brother. Of course, her daughter by Laatuunipulu, Laatuufuipeka becomes the Tamahaa after all that calculated stealing of the kanokato with the assistance of Nanasipau’u’s brothers (Ma’ulupekotofa and Paulaho) and sister (Siutuama’uta).

This has become a classic stealing of Hikule’o’s fale kano’imata “house of eyeballs” or the kanokato “flesh-basket” from Fiji to Tonga by the Ha’a Ma’afu women told as the voyage to Pulotu. The story is about change which has successfully come into fruition only because of the Tu’i Tonga Fefine Nanasipau’u’s “mischievous character (Appendix 1, line 21, pages 228-242), being old (Appendix 1, line 37), foolish (Appendix 1, line 45), and crafty (Appendix 1, line 51)”. It is about Nanasipau’u’s Faimalie “good hostile dealing with [Hikule’o of Pulotu]”, referring to Fehokomoelangi-’i-Fisi, the Tu’i Lakepa. Nanasipau’u is the first and the only Tu’i Tonga Fefine of the Tu’i Kanokupolu line, as a Ha’a Ma’afu fruit from ‘Aaukihesina, Tu’i Kanokupolu Ma’aafu-’o-Tu’itonga’s daughter, fishing for the Tu’ipulotu at the Langitu’oteau “hundredth sky”. Sending Nanasipau’u to the
house of Fijians, to the Tu'i Lakepa and Tu'i Ha'ateiho, is Tu'i Kanokupolu's final leg of fishing for the Tamahaa from Lakepa, where the home of Lo'au, Ha'amea, is located in central Tongatapu. In the end, the power holding status is reversed, thus Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka, Nanasi's daughter, occupies the divine high rank position, while Tu'i Tonga Fuanunuiava, son of Tu'i Tonga Paulaho, holds the secular low position. In other words, the reverse is that, instead of the Tu'i Kanokupolu giving moheof to the Tu'i Tonga, the latter's sister (Tu'i Tonga Fefine) arranges the marriage of her daughter Tamahaa and her cross-cousin's son (Tu'i Kanokupolu). The arrangement is specifically a Ha'a Ma'afu legitimation of power as a way of reinforcing the protection of the Tupou dynasty. Known as kitetama cross-cousin marriage, it is Nanasipau'u's kite or tala "asking" her father's sister's son (Tu'i Lakepa Laatuunipulu) for the tama "(divine) child". This child is, of course, the Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka. The same procedure applied in Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka's marriage to Tu'i Kanokupolu Tupoulahisi'i. Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka asks her grandmother's brother's grandson for the sacred tama, named Tupou'ahome'e. The protection of the Tupou dynasty really started from here as a redressing of the Ha'a Ma'afu source of power and how it should be distributed.

The Tupou dynasty as a title was added on by Taufa'aahau to the Tu'i Kanokupolu, presumably to mark Taufa’aahau's reform of the Ha’a Ma’afu’s management of the Tu'i Kanokupolu sovereignty. He, then, became the first Tupou, succeeded by the second, third, fourth, and now the fifth, marking the “standing pillar” of the United
Kingdom of Tonga. Because of the constant support provided by the English missionaries who were stationed in Tonga during Taufa‘ahau’s war of unification, Taufa‘ahau, I believe, had to make a humble gesture in recognition of the protectorate role of the British Empire in his taumata kava ceremony of victory. Taufa‘ahau, in his installation to the title of Tu‘i Kanokupolu, demanded the replacement of the Tu‘i Kanokupolu ancestral god of war Taliai with the British Royal Family name, George\textsuperscript{266}, as his modern taumata kava name when his kava is called out.

Adopting the name George very much reflects Taufa‘ahau’s appreciation of the way the English political and economic system works and his recommendation for Tonga to become a modern Christian nation. Taufa‘ahau’s reformation really is a tidy up the aftermath of the contestation between his grandfather, Tuku‘aho, son of youngest Mumui, and Tuku‘aho’s first cousin, Tupoumoheofo, daughter of oldest Tupoulahi, over the Tu‘i Kanokupolu title. The contestation becomes prejudicially sexist to the extent that Tuku‘aho has to abolish Tupoumoheofo’s appointment of herself to the title of Tu‘i Kanokupolu and banish her to Vava’u. He further reminds to her, being a moheofo, of the impossibility of being a pali “vagina” wanting, at the same time, to be a ule “penis”\textsuperscript{267}. Because of the harshness of his remarks, Tuku‘aho got murdered, which erupted into the great civil war in Tonga. Taufa‘ahau’s grandfather and his father had to protect the Tu‘i Kanokupolu title
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from the possibility of going astray to the _Tu'i Tonga_ line, and thus, the _Ha'a Ma'afu_ missing out.

On the part of _Taufa'aaahau's_ Constitution, as to protect the _Ha'a Ma'afu_ sovereignty, there has been a need to address the subject of _tonotama_ “taking somebody else’s adopted child and keeping it as one’s own”\(^{268}\) in relation to _kitetama_. The difference, in my interpretation, is, in principle, one of a contradiction. In clause 125 of the Constitution, on the law of inheritance\(^{269}\), _Taufa'aaahau_ states that it is lawful for those only born in marriage to inherit\(^{270}\). His amendment of the subject of _tonotama_ as theft, adultery, fornication (in the Code of _Vava'u_, 1839\(^{271}\)), man and wife, adultery, fornication, illegitimate children (in the Code of Laws, 1850\(^{272}\)), marriage, adultery, fornication (in the Code of Laws, 1862\(^{273}\)) refers to the practice of _tonotama_ as unlawful. But, the amendment also suggests a replacement, _tonotama_ has become legalised as _kitetama_ cross-cousin marriage of the _Tu'i Kanokupolu Ha'a Ma'afu_. _Kitetama_ is cross-cousin marriage within the _Ha'a Ma'afu_ to “causing to emerge a high chief _Tu'i Kanokupolu_ successor”. That high chief successor is George _Taufa'aaahau Tupou_ IV.

It took that long since George _Taufa'aaahau Tupou_ I’s construction of the 1875 Constitution for the _Ha'a Ma'afu_ to finally merge the blood of the three kingly lines into one person through several _kitetama-tonotama_ marriages. _Tupouto'a_, son of
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Tu’i Kanokupolu Tuku’aho, said to be the founder of Ha’a Ma’afu\textsuperscript{274}, began the foraging for the sacred blood by marrying the blood carrier, Tupuo’ahome’e, daughter of Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka and Tu’i Kanokupolu Tupoulahisi’i. Tupouto’a’s daughter, Halaevalu Mata’a’aho, the next sacred blood carrier, was given as wife of Tu’i Tonga Laufilitonga, grandson of Tu’i Tonga Paulaho and Tupoumoheofo, daughter of Tu’i Kanokupolu Tupoulahi and first cousin of Tuku’aho. Halaevalu Mata’a’aho’s daughter, Lavinia Veiongo, the next carrier, became wife of ‘Isileli Tupou, son of George Taufa’ahau Tupou I. From Tupoumoheofo, the sacred blood had been passed down to her daughter, Vaohoi, to daughter Heu’ifanga, and to daughter Halaevalu Mata’a’aho, wife of George Taufa’ahau Tupou IV. (See the genealogy in Figure 1, page xi.) Quite obvious from this long sequence of joined marriages of stealing the sacred blood across from the Tu’i Tonga line to Tu’i Kanokupolu via the Tu’i Ha’atakalaua and, at last, to Tu’i Kanokupolu George Taufa’ahau Tupou IV, that George Taufa’ahau Tupou IV’s great granddaughter (Phaedra Fusitu’a) is now the carrier of the sacred blood.

In both cases, either cross-cousin or adultery, the objective is always about the emergence of the sacred tama through an engagement in sex with the high ranking female royal blood carrier. In other words, both tonotama and kitetama are equally aristocratic crimes of political and economic struggle for the royal blood as source of power legitimated and covered by law. The legalised kitetama of the
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Ha’a Ma’afu is as much an unlawful action as tonotama. However, the point here is not about constitutional and Christian morality surrounding promiscuity, but the historical scramble for the highest social rank and political power in Tonga.

Conclusion

Hegel (1770-1831) theorised the constitutional monarchies of his day, monarchies which are copied but contradicted by Tonga’s. He, in Zizek’s view, says that a King is an irrational remainder, an anomaly in the process of cultural rationalisation which produces civil society which replaces (natural) traditional society based on family. In my semantic historical analysis of Tu’i, in the previous chapter, as contraction of tu’usi “to sever” for “King”, there seems to be a semantic correspondence between my interpretation of King in Tonga and Hegel’s “irrational remainder”. Further, in Tonga, this severable idea of King of the family is spoken of with the top part of the human body as ‘ulu “head”. (Historically, in Tonga, the one who was “cut into half” [chief Folasas youngest son taking the place of his father] was a relation, thus, is it possible, then, that “king”, as “kin”, is a title appropriated to a “bodyguard, chief commander” [chief Folasas in recognition of his devotion to die for his master [Tu’i Manu’a Taeotagaloa or Tangaloa Eitumatupu’a].)

Kingship, Hegel says, is the exception where nature is preserved. That is, based on biological succession, kingship is a remnant of natural, rather than social, determination of legitimate status, where everyone else is free to make themselves
as a king. Once installed, the king's position in society is fixed regardless of personal capacities. There is no substance. He is a name/word only, a signature on a piece of paper.

Hegel seems inconsistent when he is taken to advocate that the decision as to who should be head of state should depend on a non-rational, biological fact of descent. To be effective the unity of the state must be embodied in an individual in whose existence alone achieves immediate existence as a result of lineage. In fact, Hegel argues that constitutional monarchy is a rationally articulated organic whole at the head of which there is an irrational element, the person of the king. The rational state is separated from the person who embodies supreme power, that is, the person through whom the state assumes the form of subjectivity. The personal qualities and competence of the king do not matter, as long as he can put his name to the law.

In Hegel's terms, but contrary to Hegel's analysis of modernism, Tupou I unilaterally rationalises what is natural, imploding the traditional alliance into an individualistic model based on a new culture of kingship. Kingship of the constitution is not natural nor does it represent the whole social organism regulated by law that Hegel believed monarchy should.

The law does not express the rights of civil society but imposes universal obligations and universal rights upon those which the law divests of particular
rights. In Hegel's theory, modern rational society is not imposed but is seen in the historical growth of individualistic civil society, replacing traditional community. But, in Tupou I, II, III, IV, and V, the constitution itself has imposed abstract universal rights and suppressed traditional communities. Individualism was not a historical growth of "modern" rationality as Hegel imagined in Europe. It was imposed by the single event of the abstract theoretical removal of particular individual obligations within a community, replaced by freedom and emancipation.

The constitution therefore reinforces the Protestant ethic of individual enterprise and universal self-interested accumulation introduced at the same time. Hegel saw that there was an apparent contradiction between the criterion of natural biological/inherited status for the ruler and the individual freedom for citizens. But, he believed that this was workable only if the monarch had no real/substantial power and had only a formal right to put his name to laws formulated elsewhere. In Tupou I's case, the contradiction was real because his status as ruler was not natural but artificial and he ignored the traditional communities of which citizens were a part. In Europe, unlike Athens, Hegel thought that the traditional communities of citizens had been lost.

In all instances, the granting of abstract universal rights through emancipation is meaningless because there are no particular rights acknowledged that can be exercised. This is parallel to Zizek's argument that Christianity only gives salvation
to those who always (still) have no place in society and he extends this to argue for the same in “democracy”.

The following Chapter 4 will again show the ambiguity and irrationality in connection with kingship in how the Ha’a Ma’afu Tupou politics of self-referencing is strengthened by Queen Salote’s ambivalence with her distinctive method of composing the art of to rule and being ruled known as lau ‘eiki “praising ‘eiki ‘chiefliness’” and fie ‘eiki “denying ‘eiki”. Queen Salote cleverly fuses together these contradictory statements by positioning the performers according to the ranking in society and then they sing and perform her composition of genealogical ranking back to her as the high ranking person sitting graciously in front from her shelter. Art as faiva is the commandeering of the people to hiva “sing” and tau’olunga “dance” to the fa’u “poetry” of the framework of the house of the Ha’a Ma’afu Tupou dynasty. She is a master rhetorician having the ability to pun her meanings with words of her selection. Playing with words is a game so relevant and appropriate to child rearing. Queen Salote as a mother is playing the role of teaching her children, her subjects alike, the etiquette of respect and submission to one’s superior.
CHAPTER 4

Ambivalence in Queen Salote's Poetry

Introduction

In this chapter, the main theme discussed is Queen Salote Tupou III's rhetoric as shown in her poetic styles of composition, namely lau 'eiki "praising chiefliness" and fie 'eiki "denying chiefliness". Employing such poetic styles shows the ambivalent character of Queen Salote as a female ruler undertaking the male duty of rowing the royal boat of the "King of Tonga". The subtlety of her ambivalence as being a joint of two parts shows in her use of lau 'eiki and fie 'eiki that she is creating this space in her composition making it easy for her to move back and forth between the Kauhala'uta (chief) and Kauhalalalo (commoner) moiety division. Precisely, her ambivalent styles show her to be a crafty and heretical poetic Queen who her subjects learned to love dearly. Politically, her styles continue to maintain the Tu'i Kanokupolu cause of Ha'a Ma'afu bashing the old senior kingly lines and their supporters in the Kanokupolu enclosure. It is a bashing to which she proudly acknowledges in her poetry the seat of power in the backside or rudder of the Tu'i Tonga's boat occupied by the Ha'a Ma'afu.
The question dealt with in this chapter is how is Queen Salote representative of the Tupou rhetoric started by Taufa‘aahau Tupou I and, yet, how is she distinctive within that line? The foremost unique characteristic is her poetry. She shares this with her contemporaries but her Tupou position makes her rhetoric different from other poets. Her poetry is characteristically heretical. She is like Taufa‘aahau Tupou I in that she consistently and explicitly counters the position of the Kauhala‘uta. Taufa‘aahau Tupou I replaced the moiety system with monarchy. Whereas Taufa‘aahau Tupou I did this through war and the law and outlawing further usurpation, Queen Salote does the same thing through reconstructing history especially through poetry. She, like Taufa‘aahau Tupou I, is directly aggressive in abusing the allies of the Tu‘i Tonga, but there is more to her that is unique.

Apart from the Constitutional derivation of her right to be ruler, Queen Salote’s direct genealogical link to the vasu sacred blood made her as the connection between the Tu‘i Tonga Fefine-vasu tradition and the modern Constitution of Taufa‘aahau Tupou I. Queen Salote is the fortunate descendant of a fortunate struggle of the first Tu‘i Tonga Fefine, Sinaitakala-‘i-Langleka, who was offered as part of the Tu‘i Tonga propitiatory sacrifice to Tu‘i Lakemba “Tapu‘osi” of Pulotu in Fiji. Bott’s interpretation of the meeting of Sinaitakala-‘i-Langleka and Tapu‘osi
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as a romantic story is Bott’s unconscious awareness of the story, in my interpretation, as part of the story of the voyage to Pulotu. To me, the voyage to Pulotu is a Tongan version of the Tu’i Tonga sovereignty, ‘Uluakimata in this case, coming to a full independent kingdom from the Tu’i Pulotu of Fiji. Likewise, the Tongan version, as mentioned and discussed in chapter 2, of the exile from Samoa of a boat of wrongdoers is the wrongdoers coming into independence from the tyrant sun god Tangaloa. All in all, I argue that the question of legitimation of economic and political power has been a historical mythologisation of the stealing to adopt the tyrant’s scared blood, as an appeasement by means of the marriage of the subjugated wife giver to the tyrant. From here, the vasu ideology was institutionalised simply for the purpose of preserving this historical triumph and of securing social recognition of the sacred blood.

Queen Salote Tupou III is Tu’i Kanokupolu George Taufa’aahau Tupou I’s great, great granddaughter and was only heir to the throne when her father, Tu’i Kanokupolu George Taufa’aahau Tupou II, died, (see Figure 4, page xvi). Queen Salote’s half brothers could not succeed to the Tu’i Kanokupolu title when their father died, because they were illegitimate under Tupou I’s Constitution.

She became the first female monarch after the 1875 Constitution. Not only that, Queen Salote was the first high rank monarch of the Tu’i Kanokupolu line since the start of fishing for the vasu sacred blood from the Tu’i Lakemba of Fiji with Tu’i Kanokupolu Mataeletu'apiko marrying with Tamahaa Tu’imala. This fishing for the
sacred blood had also been the cause of the splitting of Mataeletu’apiko’s uhotau sons, as mentioned in the preceding chapter, and the emerging of the rival Ha’a Havea and Ha’a Ma’afu. But, it was not until Tu’i Kanokopolu Tupouto’a of the Ha’a Ma’afu married the first Tu’i Kanokopolu female carrier of the vasu sacred blood, Tupou’ahome’e, daughter of Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka and Tu’i Kanokopolu Tupoulahisi’i, that the catching and landing of the sacred blood became preserved in the Ha’a Ma’afu as its social and political indicator of high rank and power. Queen Salote is the great, great, great granddaughter of Tupou’ahome’e.

Following the landing of the vasu sacred blood by Tu’i Kanokopolu Tupouto’a, the Ha’a Ma’afu relied heavily on the use of the kitetama cross-cousin marriage method to securely enclose the sacred blood within. Tupouto’a’s daughter’s daughter, Lavinia Veiongo, and Tupouto’a’s son’s son, ‘Isileli Tupou, were the first kitetama case, giving birth to the next carrier of the sacred blood, Tupoumoheoto 11. Lavinia Veiongo’s mother, Halaevalu Mata’aho, is the carrier from her mother, Tupou’ahome’e, and half sister of ‘Isileli Tupou’s father, Taufa’aahau Tupou I. Since Taufa’aahau Tupou I outlived his son, Tevita ‘Unga, and daughter, Salote Pilolevu, a kitetama marriage between his grandchildren had to be arranged in order to produce an heir to succeed aging Taufa’aahau Tupou I, (see Figure 4, page xvi)276. In other words, Taufa’aahau Tupou I’s son’s daughter, Fusipala, and Taufa’aahau Tupou I’s daughter’s son, Fatafehi Tu’i Pelehake, were married to beget the successor, Tu’i Kanokopolu George Taufa’aahau Tupou II. Taufa’aahau
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Tupou II was later inducted into the Ha’a Ma’afu sexual orgy kitetama to keep the preservation of the vasu sacred blood line of high rank status. He was paired off with Taufa’aahau Tupou I’s niece’s daughter, Tupoumoheofo, and granddaughter, Lavinia Veiongo junior. Lavinia Veiongo junior is Queen Salote’s mother.

Ambivalence in her poetry is a special method of rhetoric by Queen Salote when stressing her dutifulness to the Tupou system of government. She does it with the movement characteristic of her by switching from fie ‘eiki “denying ‘eiki” to lau ‘eiki “praising ‘eiki”.

Tongan ethno-scientist, Futa Helu, quoted by Mahina, spoke of Queen Salote’s method of composition as basically lau ‘eiki, thus, her poetry is mainly laumaatanga ”Tongan Nature poetry”. Precisely, in connection with the point made by Helu and Mahina, Queen Salote’s poetry “praises scenic beauty-spots because of their historical associations”. So, my main problem with this lau ‘eiki argument is the tendency to ignore the foundation from which praising stems. We do, of course, talk about something that we love in a praising manner and, yet, at the same time, since we are all real human beings with real feelings, we wish to be praised alike. Precisely, as implicit in the use of lau ‘eiki-fie ‘eiki in Queen Salote’s poetry, use of one’s style is not necessary praising one’s genealogical connection to high chiefly families. Stylistic usage, one must not forget the Tongan heliaki, is the tendency for the user to convey his/her discontentment with something by literally degrading himself/herself. Self-degradation is indication of one’s being low, not only in rank,
but, also, in feeling. The issue at stake here is the question, necessitated for what? It points at the complexity of interaction of our motives with one another and with outside things. It thus seems then to hold on to a view that there is no such thing as a dualism consisting of two pure extremities, one is the "praised" and the other "praiser". It, thus, points to the fact that self-degrading is one pressuring the superior into doing something to be able to maintain his/her position as being "praised" by becoming a "praiser". Once a "praised" is now a "praiser" and vice versa. Therefore, by "praising 'eiki", Queen Salote is in denial of the other's claim to higher rank than herself. By "denying 'eiki", Queen Salote is praising her claim of high rank status. So, there is a continuous dialectic, in Hegelian terms, of negation of negation.

Analysis of Queen Salote's styles of composition is thus an exposition of the internal dialectic of Tongan language as perfectly heliaki "saying one thing, and meaning another". That is, when using the lau 'eiki style, Queen Salote is "praising her sacredness" as her fie 'eiki "denying the other's claim to sacredness". And, when using fie 'eiki style, she is "denying her sacredness" as her lau 'eiki "praising other's claim to sacredness". Again, with the fie 'eiki style, Queen Salote is putting herself down while elevating the other to the top. Similarly, with the lau 'eiki style, on the other hand, Queen Salote is oppressing the other by elevating herself. Thus, the dialectical process of saying one thing and meaning another always reinforces
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a space in between to allow the actual lively external contradiction in between the
agents' claims and internal contradiction of the agent's ideology itself to resonate
back and forth. The idea, then, of vaa "space" also means "estrangement". In
space is where personal grievances coming into ferocious combat as the way they
sort out their differences. In old days, it was the recognized public place where the
two parties would meet up, with food offerings, to settle their problem.

An example of heliaki as contradiction of negation of negation is its character on
presentation to be confusing. In the lau 'eiki style, Queen Salote is rowing towards
the family-centred ethos of the Tupou dynasty, while, at the same time, looking
back to the tu'a commoners. Looking back to the tu'a, she is elevating herself and,
thus, the equation now reads that the Tu'i Kanokupolu and 'eiki titles are equal. In
the fie 'eiki style, on the other hand, Queen Salote, again, is rowing towards the
ideology of the Tupou dynasty and, this time, looking back to the Tu'i Tonga.
Salote is denying the 'eiki-ness of the Tu'i Tonga. The equation thus reads that the
Tu'i Tonga and the tu'a are equal and, together, they are making up the outcaste
class of Tonga. Therefore, in a more revealing manner of the heliaki confusion, in
this context, Queen Salote two styles draw out a social space of interaction
between tu'a "outside" and loto "inside" with reference to the high chief's dwelling
house. Moving back and forth in this social space is rhetorician Queen Salote
repeatedly arguing the case of the Tu'i Kanokupolu, referring to herself, to be the
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high rank status and inside sacred dweller in Tonga. She, as the argument goes, is the only ‘eiki in Tonga.

Take her composition of Peato (Appendix 7, pages 283-287) as a classic example showing these dialectical exchanges between lau ‘eiki and fie ‘eiki styles. Queen Salote is, firstly, alluding to her dutiful-ness, as ruler of Tonga, to the land of Tupou and his family, with her superiority complex towards the boasting unnecessary behaviour of her granduncle, Sioeli Pangia, grandson heir of the last Tu‘i Tonga Laufilitonga. She, in the Peato, is playing the fie ‘eiki role by condemning her granduncle as a Tu‘i Tonga tu’a “outside Tu‘i Tonga” descendant for his habitual pretentious behaviour as a high ranking ‘eiki. As a descendant of a Samoan fleeing wrongdoer who turned upside down in Tonga and became Tu‘i Tonga, Sioeli Pangia’s Tu‘i Tonga privilege and rank came to an end when his grandfather, Laufilitonga, was defeated by Taufa‘ahau Tupou I in the battle of Velata at Lifuka. Queen Salote is asserting her ‘eiki-ness over the lau ‘eiki of her granduncle by reminding to him of the defeat at Velata and the victory of her great, great, grandfather, Taufa‘ahau Tupou I. She recites this reversal of power in Peato thus as,

\[\text{ko 'ena ee lopa 'oe Hifofua “there is the rope of the Hifofua”,}\]
\[\text{lolutonga no'o he ‘Ovava “still tied to the ‘ovava”,}\]
\[\text{‘o tau he Langi Taetaea “and berthed at the Langi Taetaea”,}\]
\[(\text{Peato, Appendix 7, lines 12-14, pages 283-287}).\]
Hifofua is symbol of Taufa‘aahau Tupou I, while ‘Ovava, the dock at Lapaha, and Langi Taetaea, the incomprehensible royal tomb, are references of the Tui Tonga. Further to the ambiguity involved in these heliaki lines that Queen Salote looks as if treating her granduncle as an unrelated foreign person to her and Taufa‘aahau Tupou I. But, Sioeli Pangia’s grandmother, Halaevalu Mata‘aho, is also Queen Salote’s great, great, grandmother and Taufa‘aahau Tupou I’s half sister. Sioeli Pangia’s father, Kalaniuvalu, is Halaevalu Mata‘aho’s son and Taufa’aahau Tupou I’s nephew. So, the issue Queen Salote is raising here is connected to the vasu sacred blood as something that has been passed down through the female line from the Tamahaa. Halaevalu Mata‘aho, in Queen Salote’s argument, is a vasu sacred blood carrier and, the next carrier, Halaevalu Mata‘aho’s first daughter, Lavinia Veiongo, is Queen Salote’s great grandmother. Lavinia Veiongo is sister of Sioeli Pangia’s father, Kalaniuvalu. Therefore, Queen Salote, as a direct descendant of a vasu sacred blood carrier, while Sioeli Pangia is not, has the rank and authority, (see Figures 1 and 2, pages xi and xiv, respectively).

Fakahokohoko toto ‘a fatine “blood connection of the women”, is a theme, as opposed to fakahokohoko hingoa ‘a tangata “name connection of the men”, featured strongly in Queen Salote’s struggle for power. Following her marriage to Tungii Mailefihi, Queen Salote began the restructuring of the political system of Tonga in accordance with the core principle of social organization, which is the tuonga‘ane “brother”-tuofefine “sister” relationship. The pragmatic application of
this Tongan traditional female role leads to the wider implications of Queen Salote’s presentation of a particular perspective as a universal perspective which pretends to incorporate the Kauhala’uta moiety.

In what way does fakahokohoko toto become an important application in the case of Queen Salote struggling for power in Tongan society? The answer to this question lies in the implication of what the pair of tuonga’ane-tuofefine social relationship means. The traditions of ‘Aho’eitu in Tonga and le Aso o le Laa “Meals of human flesh of the Sun” in Samoa280 are sources which can be viewed in relation to the brother-sister paradox. These traditions feature the sister (Ui in the Samoan version, Va’epopua in Tongan), after consultation with her brother (Lua in the Samoan version), who seduces Tagaloa-laa “Tagaloa, the Sun” to save herself and her son to the Sun, Tagaloa-a-ui “Tagaloa [junior Sun] of Ui”, by subsequently fleeing from the Sun281, [death in Pulotu (Savai’i)].

Tuonga’ane and tuofefine are terms for “brother” and “sister”, respectively. Nga’ane “male” and fefine “female”, as the root words, are generic terms for tangata “man” and fefine “woman”. In the special use for “brother” and “sister”, with the compound, tuo, the speaker (Ui) refers to her “brother” as her “equal in rank”. For example, when the Ui refers to Lua as her tuo-ng’a’ane “brother”, Lua is to Ui as her “equal in rank”. Lua is the part of Ui as being nga’ane or ta’ane “male”. Similarly,
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Lua refers to his “sister” as his “equal in rank”. Ui is the part of Lua as being fefine “female”. Further, Queen Salote, as the “King of Tonga”, is showing part of her brother, (for example, Vilai), as being female. But, in the context of the argument discussed here, her husband, Tungii Mailefihi, is a classificatory brother of Queen Salote, even though he is to Queen Salote categorically a fa’ee tangata “mother male”. It may also be categorically right that Tungii Mailefihi is Queen Salote’s classificatory brother for Tungii Mailefihi and Vilai are classificatory brothers. Vilai’s mother, Tupoumoheofoto, and Tungii Mailefihi’s father, Tuku’aho, are first cousins. But, to read Tungii Mailefihi as a classificatory brother of Queen Salote can also follow from Queen Salote’s mother and Tungii Mailefihi as standing in a classificatory sister-brother relation. Queen Salote’s mother’s father, Kupu, and Tungii Mailefihi’s father are, again, first cousins.

Thus, the seeming inseparability of the sister and brother as a supporting relationship can only be interpreted as a particular masquerading as a universal. In fact, the relationship as started by the speaker, is really a one person show of one using the other part of him/her for his/her own advantage. Therefore, “equal in rank” is a misnomer. Logically, it should rather be “difference in rank”, for example, Tungii Mailefihi is higher in rank than Queen Salote, for he is directly descended from Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka, (see Figure 1[c], page xiii)\(^{282}\). The duality, then, of brother-sister relationship is the real contradiction thereby produced by Queen Salote’s individual pursuit of the vasu sacred blood.

\(^{282}\) See Bott 1982:155, Figure 31(c)
Queen Salote's method of fakahokohoko toto, arranging after another in immediate succession of the toto or kainga “relations”, is directly associated with the idea of kaiha’a “stealing” as kai “eating” of the ha’a, saa in Samoan, “sacred”. “Sacred” can be a general statement to all things prohibited as belonging to the supreme ruler. No one is allowed to touch or eat any prohibited, sanctified thing. It is a me’a “thing” that no one has the right to know or even to try to find out what it is. But that is what Queen Salote, and her great, great, grandfather, Taufa’aahau Tupou I, set out to break this custom with the fakahokohoko toto method.

“Sacred” etymologically refers here to the hii “sperm” of the ta’ane, nga’ane as in tuonga’ane, “strong fighter” who has become the ‘eiki, ali’i in Samoan, “young chief” and the “father/head” of the land. The sacred hii is the toto that eventually develops into foetus. Once again, eating, in this sense, refers to swallowing with the intention to steal the ta’ane’s sacred hii for the purpose of preserving it as a particular breed multiplying into many hou’eiki “young chiefs” in Tonga. Thus, kai is fai “having sexual intercourse” or folo fakapetetangi “swallowing when about to cry” (Koe Folau ki Pulotu, Appendix 1, line 133, pages 228-242) of the hii. One must recognize from the Tu’i Tonga-Tu’i Ha’atakalaaua-Tu’i Kanokupolu genealogy that this fakahokohoko toto is an elitist method of sexual intercourse activity involving the senior Tu’i Tonga and his own classificatory sisters, daughters of his mother’s brother, first, as Tu’i Ha’atakalaaua and, then, Tu’i Kanokupolu. Tu’i Tonga Kau’ulufonua, for example, is the ta’ane whose hii is sought after by his
classificatory sister and wife, Takala. Takala's father, Tu'i Ha'atakala Fofil, is Tu'i Tonga Kau'ulufonua's mother's brother. I interpret this method in chapter 2 based on the Samoan gaoi "stealing" of the Fale'ula as ngaohi "adopting" in Tongan as a formalization of the straightforward immoral incestuous relationship with new adopted words, moheofo and, later, kitetama. In the story of the voyage to Pulotu, this formalization, somehow implicit as a cornerstone of the 1875 Constitution, is interpreted as having to do mainly with the purpose of protecting the stolen kanokato "sacred flesh [as substance] of the basket" within the Tu'i Kanokupolu family. Kanokato is a poetic term for the vasu sacred blood stolen from Fiji to Tonga, (Folau ki Pulotu, Appendix 1, lines 125-134).

The story of this adoption of the "sacred prohibited flesh" of the Tu'i Tonga into the Tu'i Kanokupolu line actually began with Mataeleha'amea's two moheofo daughters, Halaevalu and Tongotea, to the Tu'i Tonga. Tu'i Kanokupolu Atamata'ila, grandfather of Mataeleha'amea, tried with his daughter, Tu'utangahunuhunu, as the Tu'i Kanokupolu moheofo to Tu'i Tonga Kau'ulufonua and was not successful. But, the adoption actually started with Mataeleha'amea's warlike moheofo daughter, Tongotea, marrying her oldest sister's adopted son and successor, Tu'i Tonga Fakana'ana'a. And, this is the marriage that marks the new beginning of establishing an absolute Tu'i Kanokupolu sovereignty in Tonga, one that began with moheofo Tongotea and lasted until Tu'i Kanokupolu Tupoulahisi'i married the Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka. By implication, this new beginning, as an outcome of scrambling for the "sacred flesh" of the Tu'i Tonga between the three
kingly lines, means that only the Tu'i Kanokupolu marries the Tamahaa. This kind of reasoning led to Queen Salote maintaining, from what she was told that there were three Tamahaa, namely, Tu'imala marrying Tu'i Kanokupolu Mataeletu'apiko, Laatuufuipeka marrying Tu'i Kanokupolu Tupoulahisi'i and 'Amelie Fakahiku'o'uiha marrying Tu'i Kanokupolu Tuku'aho. Because of this kind of reasoning, Tamahaa is a Tu'i Kanokupolu prohibited marriage property. It means she is no longer recognized as a reproductive partner of any other line. Thus, for this reason, for example, Hoko'iamailangi, daughter of Tu'i Ha'ateiho Tungiiman'a'iia with Tu'i Tonga Fefine Sinaitakala-'i-Lotunofo, is not a Tamahaa. For that reason, again, that is why she married to Tu'i Ha'atakalaua Tatafu. In the same reasoning, marriage of Mo'unga-'o-Lakepa, daughter of Tu'i Tonga Fefine Sinaitakala-'i-Fanakavakilangi to Tu'i Lakepa Fehokomoelangi, (see Figure 2, page xiv), to Tu'i Tonga Ma'ulupeketofa deposes her, too, from being recognized as a Tamahaa.

The marriage to the Tamahaa is where the legitimization of economic and political power of the Tupou dynasty begins and ends. In particular, it refers specifically to the marriage between Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka and Tu'i Kanokupolu Tupoulahisi'i. In fact, this marriage begins another scrambling for power within the Ha'a Ma'afu, particularly that between the daughter of Tupoulahi, Tupoumoheofo, and the son of Tupoulahi's youngest brother, Mumui. During this contestation, Mumui's son, Tuku'aho, was able to confiscate the Tu'i Kanokupolu title from Tupoulahi's
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daughter, Tupoumoheofato, thus, making it a Ha’a Ma’afu inherited property down the line of Tu’i Kanokupolu Tuku’aho. Following the success his father did to secure the Tu’i Kanokupolu title, Tupouto’á secured the vasu sacred blood through his marriage with Tupou’a’home’e, the blood carrier and daughter of Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka and Tu’i Kanokupolu Tupoulahisi’í. From this perspective, the reason for Tupoumoheofato’s self appointment to the Tu’i Kanokupolu title probably was to secure the Tu’i Kanokupolu title as the vasu sacred blood was as already within the enclosure of Tu’i Kanokupolu Tupoulahi, her father. Tupoulahisi’í “junior Tupoulahi”, grandson of Tupoulahi and nephew of Tupoumoheofato, had secured the vasu sacred blood in his marriage with Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka. Their daughter Tupuo’a’home’e gave birth to Halaevalu Mata’aho I, the next blood carrier of Ha’a Ma’afu. Halaevalu Mata’aho I is the granddaughter of Tu’i Kanokupolu Tuku’aho, the founder of the Ha’a Ma’afu. The establishment of the Ha’a Ma’afu in the marriage of Tu’i Kanokupolu Tupouto’a with Tupou’a’home’e after the failure of Tupouto’a’s father, Tu’i Kanokupolu Tuku’aho, to have children with Tamahaa ‘Amelia Fakahikuo’uiha, (see Figure 1, page xi)\(^{285}\), makes the Ha’a Ma’afu as a beginning and an ending of high social status in Tongan society.

In the following, Halaevalu Mata’aho I becomes the path of offering to establish sources of food for the Ha’a Ma’afu. She was given as wife to three men of high social distinction, first, to Tu’i Ha’ateiho Afiafolaha, grandson of Tu’i Tonga Fefine Nanasiapau’u and Tu’i Ha’ateiho Haveatungua. Second, Halaevalu Mata’aho I

\(^{285}\) See Bott 1982:153 as Figure 31
married Tu'i Tonga Laufilitonga. And, third, she married Malakai Lavulo, grandson of Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka. Of all these marriages, Halaevalu Mata'aho I's marriage to Tu'i Tonga Laufilitonga that really grows and, of course, through which the vasu sacred blood from Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka being passed down to Halaevalu Mata'aho II, wife of Tu'i Kanokupolu Taufa'ahau Tupou IV and mother of the present Tu'i Kanokupolu Taufa'ahau Tupou V, (see Figure 1, page xi).

This leads to the wider implications of Queen Salote's presentation of a particular perspective as a universal perspective which pretends to incorporate the kauhala'uta. She pretends that that particular perspective stands for and includes the whole. Of course this kind of presentation can be seen to be an immediate direct natural response to a situation when the power is challenged. As we can see from her composition of Peato, for example, and her genealogical connection of people, Queen Salote's consistent support of the Ha'a Ma'afu's superior position as part of its struggle for power in Tonga has targeted the replacement of the upper Kauhala'uta with the Ha'a Ma'afu of Kauhalalalo. Such action on her part is indicated by the simple gesture to banish Sioeli Pangia of Kauhala'uta away from Tonga. The nature of Sioeli Pangia's banishment is represented in Peato as a langi tataea “incomprehensible raised and terraced burial place of Tu'i Tonga” (line 14, Peato, Appendix 7, pages 283-287) of Ha'angongo “ terns” (line 24, Peato) who has kapakau 'o Tafahi “wings that cut” (line 36, Peato). This is a prosecution of Sioeli Pangia to the meeting (line 1, Peato) as a very tall langi taataaae/kaakaaea “Tu'i Tonga cemetery stealer” who, as a marine bird with a long forked tail, flies
around above the ocean looking for land to steal by leveraging up. Interestingly, in this prosecution, Queen Salote plays all the roles as prosecutor, judge, and the chair of the meeting. But, because the central issue here is about power and land, the prosecution reflects Queen Salote’s fundamental role as protector of the Tu’i Kanokupolu Ha’a Ma’afu’s political and economic interests. Her reaction to Sioeli Pangia is interpreted as her counterchallenging of Sioeli Pangia’s claims of the lands including the Tu’i Tonga graves lay in Mu’a (line 14, Peato, Appendix 7, pages 283-287), the Ha’amonga-a-Maui (line 7, Peato), and some other matters specifically relating to distribution of food and kojca according to ranks. Queen Salote’s response, of course, was taken from the genealogy of the vasu sacred blood stressing the fact, as Wood-Ellem states, the mana of the Tu’i Tonga had already been relinquished to the Tu’i Kanokupolu as now the only “king” in Tonga.

This raises the resurrection of the moheofa perspective. Again this is a particular institution with a specific role in the past which takes on general implications in the twentieth century. Briefly, in the past, the moheofa institution, as basically tono “adultery”, thus mohetono the alternative of moheofa, was a common practice as part of the rival competition of people for political dominance and economic wealth. For example, Tangaloa ‘Eitumatupu’a at first tohotohoi “raped” Va’epopua and, then, they lived together as an adulterous couple. From this immoral relationship, Tangaloa, the ‘Eitumatupu’a, achieved the supreme political rank in Tonga,
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recognized with the ceremonial aso “human sacrifice” from Va’epopua’s people. From this ceremonial recognition is derived the personal name for his son with Va’epopua as ‘Aho’eitu, in Samoan as Asoa itu le Folasa. Le Folasa is Tangaloa’s title name as the “sacred ordainer”, who appointed the Faleua and the Falefaa, the latter as protectors of the former. Faleua was the “representative king”, of the Tu’i Manu’a in Tonga.

Formally saluted with the Ha’a Moheofo in public speech, the Tu’i Kanokupolu is formally recognized with this old custom of committing adultery. Of course, it was not until the formation of the Ha’a Ma’afu descendants of Ma’afu-‘o-Tu’itonga, son and successor of Tu’i Kanokupolu Mataeleha’amea, with the descendants of Tuku’aho, that the moheofo practice took a new turn to be commonly known as kitetama “marriage of brother’s daughter and sister’s son”. What had been clearly implied in the moheofo “adulterous copulation” as an incestuous practice between the children of a brother-sister sibling, kitetama, the twentieth century replacement, took a Christian heliaki of the incestuous ethnobiological construction of power. Thus, kitetama, standing for moheofo, is the (immoral incestuous) marriage to presage the birth of the male chiefly rank Tu’i Kanokupolu. It becomes the most practical way of securing and protecting the original male sacred blood of the Tu’i Lakemba, now in the line of the Tu’i Kanokupolu. It may have looked to be a system implemented to avoid the local tension within the Tu’i Kanokupolu line of the royal children fighting over the Tu’i Kanokupolu title. My interpretation offers to
deepen the perspective of Bott's interpretation of *kitetama* marriage as reinforcing “the existing pattern of obligation and alliance”\(^{288}\).

I still ask the question, how does that pattern come about in the first place in order for Bott to be able to speak about it. For what is being called “obligation and alliance” is different from what is referred to. Elsewhere in her book, Bott mentions the *takai fala* custom as a further illustration of the pattern of obligation and duty involved in marriage where the brother’s daughter has the duty of rolling the sister’s son’s mat. This is just the literal translation of *kitetama* marriage. The situation, to me, no doubt, looks to be a repetition of the *Tu'i Tonga* period where power seated in the sacred blood is up for everyone to grab. Once again, while in the past the object of competition was to find out who was the most skilful, *Tu'i Kanokupolu Ha'a Ma'afu* had to secure its supremacy by developing a strong and tight genealogical network into which all other families in the whole of Tonga are drawn. The bait is the sacred blood. This is a clever manipulation of power taking it to the level of wider social recognition and acceptance. Then, politics of power has become the politics of recognition. For example, in public, a powerful politician is one who is skilful in saying one thing and meaning another. Whereas, in the local level, a powerful leader is one who is connected by blood to everyone in the community. But, this is only a differentiation of one person, for example, *Tu'i Kanokupolu* Queen *Salote Tupou* III, appears as two in two different contexts. Also, herself, she is of many characters, a *Tu'i Kanokupolu*, a Queen, a *Tupou*, and the

\(^{288}\) Bott 1982:162
third in rank. The longer duration of one’s name, the more universal is the existence of that person in terms of unifying the whole of Tonga.

Her poem of Takafalu, although it was recited for the investiture of her son, then her successor, Tu‘i Kanokupolu George Taufa‘ahau Tupou IV, to the title of Tupouto‘a, is Queen Salote’s record of the ascendancy of the Ha‘a Ma‘afu clan in its struggle for power in the history of Tongan society with an in-depth metaphor of adultery. As an interpretation of the first eight lines, Ha‘a Ma‘afu’s ascent to the top was by way of the old custom of muitau “backside-copulation, prostitution” of the women of ‘Upolu by men of the three kingly lines. In terms of the tapatolu (Takafalu, Appendix 8, pages 288-295, line 3) “triangulated adulterous relationships between the Tu‘i Tonga (Appendix 8, line 5), Tu‘i Ha‘atakala‘u (Appendix 8, line 6), and Tu‘i Kanokupolu (Appendix 8, line 7)”, the political ascendancy of the Ha‘a Ma‘afu came to a full stop in Pangai (Appendix 8, line 8). At Pangai, the formalisation of the ending of the long struggle is marked with the formation of the faka-Pangai “to do [it] in the manner of Pangai” a ceremony presided over by Queen Salote’s son. Pangai is paakai, the open gathering grass-field where the formality of receiving various ha‘a coming from all over Tonga to the occasion of investiture with their contributions of food and women’s koloa of mats and ngatu takes place. As a compound of paa “enclosure” and ngai, corruption of kai, the concept signifies an occasion of an economic and political paa kakai “enclosure of people” as food of the “King of Tonga”.
Adultery started, of course, with Tu'utangahunuhunu, daughter of Tu'i Kanokupolu Atamata'ila but somehow was not successful. Then, later, with Halaevalu and Tongotea, daughters of Tu'i Kanokupolu Mataeleha'amea, they were the first Ha'a Ma'afu women to have committed adultery with Tu'i Tonga Tu'ipulotu-'i-Langitu'ofetafa and Tu'i Tonga Fakana'ana'a. Muitau is the old sexual position of ramming the penis from behind, socially perceived as mohetoo “stabbing the local chieftess at night during a habitual visit for immoral purpose”.

But, really, it was the moheofo of ‘Anaukihesina, daughter of Tu'i Kanokupolu Ma'afu-'o-Tu'itonga, to Tu'i Tonga Tu'ipulotu-'i-Langitu'oteau that was the beginning of the raising of the social status of Ha'a Ma'afu. In other words, the moheofo of ‘Anaukihesina to Tu'ipulotu-'i-Langitu'oteau was the first Ha'a Ma'afu kitetama. ‘Anaukihesina is the daughter of Ma'afu-'o-Tu'itonga and Tu'ipulotu-'i-Langitu'oteau is the son of Tongotea. Ma'afu-'o-Tu'itonga and Tongotea are brother and sister.

Queen Salote explains this Ha'a Ma'afu political strategy showing, in terms of her marriage to Tungii, why and how their son got appointed with the title of Tupouto’a.

As the Tupouto’a, Taufa’aahau Tupou IV is the palladium of Ha’a Ma’afu (line 16, Takafalu, Appendix 8, pages 288-295). He is recognized as the protector of Ha’a Ma’afu, referring to his father, Tungii Mailefihi, a direct descendant of the sacred blood from Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka, granddaughter of the first Tu'i Kanokupolu
Ha’a Ma’afu kitetama ‘Anaukihesina (lines 17-20, Takafulu), (see Figure 14, page xxvi).

To look at this protective role of Taufa’aahau Tupou IV (Tupouto’a) through the eyes of Queen Salote, we can interpret it in terms of her marriage to Tungii Mailefihi. Wood-Ellem quoted from agent and consul Neill recording about Tungii Mailefihi, as “defined by Tongan custom”, as Queen Salote’s “political ‘brother’”, who “respected and deferred to his ‘sister’”. His duty “was to protect the sacred ruler”289. It obviously appears from Queen Salote’s perspective in both Elizabeth Bott’s and Elizabeth Wood-Ellem’s biographies of the Queen that her idea of support is based on a socio-architectural structure of two persons joined together in a reinforced working relationship. One as the ‘ulu “head” (Queen Salote, for example) is the fale‘i “advisor” and the other the sino “body” (Tungii Mailefihi) the poupou “supports”, as in pou “posts”. Queen Salote’s argument is always expressed in the context of kitetama marriage. The sister’s son and the brother’s daughter union is likened to a voyaging canoe of the high chief (sister’s son) paddled by the high chief’s wife (brother’s daughter). On land, as a fale, the high chief on the fata is carried by his wife’s people as the pou. This is shown in the genealogy of Queen Salote and Tungii Mailefihi from the same ancestor, Tu‘i Pelehake ‘Uluvalu, (see Figure 12, page xxiv).

‘Uluvalu married two Ha’a Ma’afu women. The first, Tupouveiongo, daughter of Mumui, is who Queen Salote is descended from. Queen Salote’s father,
Taufa’aahau Tupou II, is the son of a kitetama union. The second wife of ‘Uluvalu, Laatuuhooleva, is who Tungii Mailefihi is descended from. Laatuuhooleva’s father, Kiuve’etaha (also known as Leka), and ‘Uluvalu’s mother, Toe‘umu, are brother and sister. Their daughter, Tuputupu-‘o-Pulotu, great grandmother of Tungii Mailefihi, is from a kitetama union. ‘Uluvalu’s son and daughter, Tu‘i Pelehake Filiaipulotu and Tuputupu-‘o-Pulotu, are Queen Salote’s great grandfather and Tungii Mailefihi’s great grandmother, respectively, (see Figure 9, page xxi)\(^{290}\). In accordance with this new twist in the principle of brother-sister relationship in the context of Queen Salote’s marriage to Tungii Mailefihi, the genealogy clearly shows the sacredness of Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka being reversed where her high status is equated with the role of carrying the high rank “King of Tonga” (Queen Salote) sitting on the fata.

In the analysis of the new meaning of reversal, Queen Salote indirectly uses her marriage to Tungii Mailefihi, showing the final move to unify the whole of Tonga since Taufa’aahau Tupou I under one rule of the Ha’a Ma’afu Tupou dynasty. It is a marriage which not only consolidates this Ha’a Ma’afu enclosing of the sacred blood but it inversely brings together the two social moieties, Kauhala’uta and Kauhalalalo, thus, haifine e ongo kauhala “joining of the two sides” (line 26, Takafalu, Appendix 8, pages 288-295) into a new implosive meaning relationship.

\(^{289}\) Wood-Ellem 1999:155

\(^{290}\) See Bott 1982:147 as Figure 24
An interesting dimension of Queen Salote's argument is her discussion of the concept of ha'a in relation to the meaning of Ha'a Ma'afu with the fish proverb which says, "the fish is not likely to swim backwards", by saying, "if the tail is strong, the fish will swim any way the tail wants to go". Actually, her discussion specifically refers to her husband, Tungii Mailefihi, that the fish is her canoe rowed by Tungii Mailefihi, the navigator, sitting at the backside where the tail is, and facing opposite from the front bow sits Queen Salote, the head. Tungii Mailefihi, Queen Salote's political "brother", to Queen Salote, is the sacred head navigator of the Ha'a Ma'afu. As a direct descendant of the long line of female carriers of the sacred blood from Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka to Laatuuhoooleva to Tuputupu'-o-Pulotu to Fanetupouvava'u to Melesiu'ilikutapu, mother of Tungii Mailefihi, Tungii in accordance with Queen Salote's new reversal argument is not higher in rank than Queen Salote. Because, by the rule of kitetama marriage, 'Uluvalu, from whom Queen Salote descends, is still higher in rank than his sister's wife, Laatuuhoooleva, from whom Tungii Mailefihi is descended. In other words, 'Uluvalu's higher rank is derived from his mother, Toe'umu, the sister of Kiuve'etaha (Leka), father of Laatuuhoooleva. Laatuuhoooleva's mother, Laatuufuipeka, even though a high rank Tamahaa, she is outranked by her husband's sister, Toe'umu. So, even though on the genealogy that descendants of Toe'umu are all males until Queen Salote and, on the other hand, that the descendants of Kiuve'etaha females until Tungii Mailefihi, high rank is read from the original brother (Kiuve'etaha)-sister (Toe'umu) pair of the kitetama marriage.
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Also, in this sense, Ha’a Ma’afu, descendants of Tu’i Kanokupolu Ma’afu-o-Tu’itonga, are the Tu’i Tonga navigators. In that respect, Queen Salote is the Tu’i Tonga.

Queen Salote’s marriage to Tungii Mailefihi, once again, recapitulates the role of the principal antagonists of the Ha’atakalaua. The eclipsing implication this time is not against the hau but the Kauhala’uta.

In contrast to her fie ‘eiki composition of Peato, Queen Salote’s composition of Takafalu can also be read as her lau ‘eiki eclipsing of the Kauhala’uta by her marriage in alliance to the Ha’atakalaua. Tungii Mailefihi would have been a Tu’i Ha’atakalaua if the Tu’i Ha’atakalaua title had continued to be conferred down the line of his father’s side. The beginning of the eclipsing of the Kauhala’uta was really a mission implicit in the marriage of Tu’i Kanokupolu Mataeleha’amea with Kaloafuutonga, younger daughter of Tu’i Ha’atakalaua Vaea and Sungu, daughter of Tu’i Tumbou of Lakemba in the Lau Group. It is connected to when the Tu’i Ha’atakalaua office was carrying its duty as the moheofo giver in correspondence to protection of the Tu’i Tonga. At that time, Mataeleha’amea, in correspondence to his moheofo giving to the Tu’i Tonga, manipulated a clever moheofo offering of his daughter, Fusipala, to Tu’i Ha’atakalaua Tongatangakitaulupekiolaha. The move was as subtle as a weakening of the Tu’i Tonga-Tu’i Ha’atakalaua connection, for Fusipala was later taken away by force from her husband to be the wife of Fisilumaali of Lafalafa (Pelehake). It had been a unique move in the
history of legitimation of power in Tonga for this was a case of coercion of power using marriage with powerful leaders in Tonga to create a *kaainga* network for *Mataeleha‘amea*’s own advantage. The *Tu‘i Ha‘atakala‘aua* title was brought into the *Ha‘a Ma‘afu* after *Fuatakifolaha* who was the fifteenth *Tu‘i Ha‘atakala‘aua* title holder, son of *Fusipala* to *Tongatangakitaulupeki‘ofolaha*. After *Fuatakifolaha* died, the *Tu‘i Ha‘atakala‘aua* title was and given to the eighth *Tu‘i Kanokupolu Ma‘ealiuaki*, son of *Tu‘i Kanokupolu Ma‘afu-o-Tu‘itonaga*. Captain Cook met *Ma‘ealiuaki* as an old man in 1777, so the transfer of the *Tu‘i Ha‘atakala‘aua* title to the *Tu‘i Kanokupolu* must have happened in the 1760s or 1770s. So, the marriage of *Fusipala* to *Tu‘i Ha‘atakala‘aua Tongatangakitaulupeki‘ofolaha* was the eclipsing of the *Tu‘i Tonga Kauhala‘uta* to start building up the new *Tu‘i Kanokupolu Tupou* dynasty. The *Ha‘atakala‘aua*, in other words, had been appointed with a new direction as to protect the *Tupou* dynasty. The *Veikune* title was created in the line of the old *Tu‘i Ha‘atakala‘aua*, most probably to recognize its blood connection to *Fusipala*, later with ‘Osaiasi, great grandson of *Tu‘i Ha‘atakala‘aua Fuatakifolaha*. *Veikune*’s son, ‘Inoke Fotu, married *Lavinia Veiongo I*, (great grandmother of Queen Salote and aunt of Sioeli Pangi), who carried the *vasu* sacred blood from her mother, *Halaevalu Mata‘aho I*, half sister of *Taufa‘aahau Tupou I*. From this intermarriage, the *Tu‘i Ha‘atakala‘aua*, and the *Tu‘i Tonga* alike, had been immersed into the *Tu‘i Kanokupolu* line in the marriage, for example, of *Tu‘i Kanokupolu Tupou II* with the granddaughter of *Lavinia Veiongo I* and ‘Inoke Fotu. In this connection, *Lavinia Veiongo*’s father is *Tu‘i Tonga Laufilitonga*, the last *Tu‘i Tonga* title holder.
Fusipala's coerced marriage to Fisilaumaali created another new title conceptually in connection to a pet jumping porpoise that was caught from the deep sea, thus the name of their child, the first Tu'i Pelehake Lekaumoana. The name Lekaumoana is suspicious. Firstly, his father's name, Fisilaumaali, would suggest that he was a Fisi "Fijian". Secondly, if his father was Fijian, which I believe so, then, Lekaumoana could probably be a namesake of Lasakau, the fishermen and navigators who used to live on the island of Mbau, fishing and navigating for the Kubuna people of mainland Vitilevu, before they were banished for surreptitious eating of a catch. This newly created title of Tu'i Pelehake, in my interpretation, thus, then, marks a Fijian connection as originated from a ngaahi tama "to make a high ranking person" of Fusipala for Fisilaumaali. The creation can be taken as a presentiment in the time of Tu'i Kanokupolu Mataeleha'amea which, significantly, became valuable later in the political war for supremacy of the Ha'a Ma'afu. The Fijian connection is further implicated in the naming of Lekaumoana's son, 'Uluvalu, and Lekaumoana's grandchildren, Filiaipulotu and Tuputupu-'o-Pulotu. Also, it is implicated in the exile of Lekaumoana's eldest son, Mailelatamai, to Fiji and started the village of Ndroga (Tonga) in mainland Vitilevu. 'Uluvalu, or, in Fijian, the Vunivalu, is title name of the paramount chief of Mbau (Bau) in Tonga. The naming of his children in reference to Pulotu indicates his origination from the abode of death. Because of this allege connection to Fiji, the Tu'i Pelehake title, then, is a mark of the establishment in Tonga of this Pulotu abode of death of the Vunivalu. It is also an established reduplication of the original history of the Fijian vasu sacred
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blood in Tonga. ‘Uluvalu’s son, Filaipulotu, with Tupuvoeiongo, is Filia-'i-Pulotu meaning “Selected-in-Pulotu”. The name of ‘Uluvalu’s daughter, Tuputupu-'o-Pulotu, with Laatuuhooleva, bears the meaning of “Growing little by little-of-Pulotu”. The implications of ‘Uluvalu’s children’s names show in Queen Salote, a direct descendant of Tu’i Pelehake Filaipulotu, that she is a “selected” one (vasu sacred blood) of Pulotu, whereas, in her husband that he comes from a family in Pulotu that “grow all over the place”.

The Tupouto’a title, the subject matter of Takafalu, is connected via a connection of Ma’afu-‘o-Tu’itonga to Ha’apai (Ha’afeva and ‘Uiha Islands) by means of Ma’afu’s copulation with Ate of Ha’afeva and, his son’s union, Ngalumoetutulu, with Siu’ulua of ‘Uiha. Ngalumoetutulu’s daughter’s son, Tupouto’a, was made by his mother’s people the Tu’i Ha’apai “Leader of Ha’apai”, (see Figure 13, page xxv). It was a case of Tupouto’a’s mother’s brother, Po’oi, recognising his sister’s son as his real descendant and that made Tupouto’a the palladium of the Ha’a Ma’afu. In other words, the appointment to the Tu’i Ha’apai title was Po’ois submission of his support for the Ha’a Ma’afu’s cause. Title and marriage are shown in this context as one consequential political engagement of brother and sister in name and blood confirmation.

Having lived and died in his mother’s land, ‘Uiha, Tupouto’a was the only Tu’i Kanokupolu to have lived outside of the Tu’i Kanokupolu’s traditional residence in
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Hihifo, Tongatapu Island. After his death, Tupouto’a’s son, Taufa’aahau Tupou I, brought back the Tu’i Kanokupolu residence from ‘Uliha to Nuku’alofa, in central Tongatapu. Obviously, the bringing back of the Tu’i Kanokupolu residence has to do with Taufa’aahau Tupou I wanting to protect weak Tu’i Kanokupolu Aleamotu’a at Nuku’alofa, the uncle and successor of Taufa’aahau Tupou I’s father, Tu’i Kanokupolu Tupouto’a, from the Ha’a Havea. It was also his time to prepare for his own installation to the Tu’i Kanokupolu title. Tu’i Kanokupolu title was first granted to Tu’i Kanokupolu Taufa’aahau Tupou I’s grandson, Mateialona. And, it was reinstated as the Crown Prince title (Taufa’aahau Tupouto’a) before he takes on the Tu’i Kanokupolu title as George Taufa’aahau Tupou IV.

From line 17 to the end of the Takafalu poem, the political and economic association of power with the local woman of the land is explained by Queen Salote through the genealogy of Crown Prince Tupouto’a in relation to certain important places and people in the whole of Tonga. For example, on his father’s mother’s side, Melesiu’ilikutapu, Crown Prince Tupouto’a is genealogically a high ranking faahina “white pandanus” from Neiafu in Vava’u Island (Appendix 8, Takafalu, line 17, pages 288-295) because Melesiu’ilikutapu is the last carrier of the vasu sacred blood from her great grandmother’s mother, Tamahaa Laatuutuipeka, the granddaughter of Tu’itonga Tu’ipulotu-‘i-Langitu’oteau, who was buried at Langitu’oteau royal tomb in Lapaha294 (Appendix 8, line 18). Having blood connection to the house of Tu’itonga, in this case, makes one’s status a sacred high chief, thus, Queen Salote’s son, in that context, is therefore a true ‘eiki.
The Crown Prince Tupouto’a, again, rose at the Tu’alikutapu “sacred weather shore” of Fua’amotu (Takafalu, Appendix 8, line 19, pages 288-295), where his father’s great grandfather, Fatukimotulalo, belonged and radiated the Houma ‘Utulau (Appendix 8, line 20). Here, Queen Salote is showing the Ha’a Ma’afu navigator connection of Crown Prince Tupouto’a through the imagery of the sun’s ray as some kind of a paahulu “trail blazer”. Paahulu then became a taumafa kava name of Tungii I when he receives his kava drinks. By the vasu/fahu sacred blood argument, the sacred blood does not flow through the Crown Prince Tupouto’a, then Tu’i Kanokupolu George Taufa’aahau Tupou IV, down the Tungi line. As he is a male, the title name goes to him. It is a rule that men connect names and women connect blood. But, through Taufa’aahau Tupou IV’s marriage with Ha’aeva Mata’aho, the sacred blood is reclaimed, since Ha’aeva Mata’aho is a direct descendant of the last Tu’i Tonga Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka295, (see Figure 1, page xi), and carrier of the royal blood.

In another interpretation of Queen Salote’s genealogical connection of her son to Ha’a Ma’afu, that while her son is a white pandanus and sacred, he is a birth of Tu’alikutapu, a reference to her ‘Uiha connection, to Tungii Mailefihi, to Houma ‘Utulau connection. For that double connection through his mother and father, Taufa’aahau Tupou IV has thus been appointed to the title names of Tupouto’a (‘Uiha connection) and Tungii (Houma ‘Utulau connection). Uniting the two title
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names in the person of Queen Salote’s son means that the Kanokupolu and Ha’atakalauna titles have jointly merged into the palladium of the Ha’a Ma’afu.

Queen Salote would not have composed Takafalu if it was not for the commemoration of the investiture of the Tupouto’a title on her son. The composition also is her recording of the Ha’a Ma’afu palladium of Tupou, no longer of the Tui Tonga as in Ma’afu-ʻo-Tu’itonga, since Tuku’aho. It is of course her marriage to Tungii Maietihi and, secondly, her son, Taufa’aahau Tupou IV, to Halaevalu Mata’aho that the Tungii title and the sacred blood from the last Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka had been secured to support the Ha’a Ma’afu of Tupou.

This special assignment to fully secure the protection of Tupou is again expressed in Queen Salote’s lament at the death of her son, Tuku’aho Tau-ʻi-Folaha, younger brother of Taufa’aahau Tupou IV. Queen Salote expresses her thoughts about Tuku’aho, anticipating him to be of use to Tungii and his people, to be Taufa’aahau Tupou IV’s more serviceable younger brother. If he was alive today, he would
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297 In Wood-Ellem (1999:164-165), Melenaite Taumoefolau’s translations are as follows:

Tuku’aho Tau-ʻi-Folaha
Neu nonga pe ʻo fiefa
(I lived in glad anticipation)
‘o lau ʻeau teke ʻaonga
(of the day you would be of service)
kia Tungii mo hono kainga
(to Tungii and his people.)

Hoku ʻofa ʻoku, hoku ʻofa fau
(Oh, how great is my love)
He tehina ʻo Taufa’aahau
(for the younger brother of Taufa’aahau.)
Na’e lau pe tokua ʻeau
(I always thought he would one day be)
have been the next appointment for the title of Tungii. The title, instead, went to Taufa‘aahau Tupou IV, (see Figure 14, page xxvi).

It is important to note that the ambivalence in Queen Salote’s poetry expresses a Hegelian language of dialectical contradictions in connection to Queen Salote’s personal struggle to secure the Tupou dynasty. Thus, the whole scenario of lau ‘eiki-fie ‘eiki dialectic of praising and denying/blaming is Queen Salote’s political affirmation of seeking to ensure posthumous fame for herself, and the Tupou dynasty, so that her subjects continue to toe the line. Her extraordinary skill in rhetoric and in-depth knowledge of Tongan culture and genealogy has provided her poetry’s unique ability to immortalise what is transient, thus making the political profit she, as the ruler, advantageously earns. Her poetry, like the Constitution to Taufa‘aahau Tupou I, takes, then, the place of a mataapule sitting in between her and her subjects and, thus, controls them. People singing and dancing to her compositions is all about the drill of learning by heart their ruler’s genealogical connections to both above (Kauha‘uta) and below (Kauhalalalo). Simply, the drill is repeating the ‘uhinga “genealogy” after her, the mataapule-poet.

The controlling aspect of Queen Salote’s poetry features in the torture and oppression of her subjects with her heretical moral and cultural constructed values supported by her rhetoric for security and social recognition reasons. It is a heresy originated specifically from the historical seizure of the Tu‘i Kanokupolu title by Tu‘i
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‘E mo‘ui ko hono to‘omata‘u...
(his main support...)

Kanokupo Tuku’aho, head of the descent group of Tu’i Kanokupolu

Ma’afu-’o-Tu’itonga, thus, of the Ha’a Ma’afu. At this point is the beginning of the founding of the Tupou dynasty, in association with the inheritance of the Tu’i Ha’apai title via Tuku’aho’s wife’s father, Ngalumoetutulu, the eldest untitled son of Ma’afu-’o-Tu’itonga, who is also Tuku’aho’s uncle. Again, the founding of the dynasty is also the beginning of Ha’a Ma’afu kitetama adopting of the three main titles, Tu’i Tonga, Tu’i Ha’atakalaua, and Tu’i Kanokupolu.

The nature of the torture and oppression is related to Queen Salote being mataapule-poet while, at the same time, on top of the traditional mataapule system. So, for example, her personal mataapule will get together the people on to the pangai and, then, her poetry will get the people to recite and perform with bodies’ movements to the texts. Her poetry plays the part as, a Ha’a Ma’afu member, the face of Tupou. And, because, she is the Tupou III, her compositions serve to protect her, as the pule, from her own subjects. Rhythmical movement of the bodies is a classic situation of the Queen Salote’s dumb subjects beating jubilantly the texts in music back to her, along with the constant beckoning of the heads in compliance with the Queen’s genealogical instructions. The expression showing appreciation of the genealogical links has, vice versa, been also a sign of a successful oppressive use that thus cunningly makes the people tick. With appreciation of this sign it often goes out from the Queen with a big appreciatory smile. In other words, the Queen’s smile is indication of certainty of the effect of her
poetry as a way of expressing the power of her genealogy. In the words of Butler\(^{298}\), it is smile of a romance of destruction. Being able to enclose the people genealogically into *pangai*, the Queen has successfully gathered together the people of Tonga into the “food enclosure” of the *Tupou* dynasty.

Romance of destruction is connected to the craving for the sacred blood with the using of the *kitetama* cross-cousin marriage system by *Tu'i Kanokupolu Ma'afu-'o-Tu'itonga*, the “steersman” of the canoe of the *Tu'i Tonga*. Wanting the scared blood is a romance. So, loving it means one wants to eat it, thus, *kaiha'a* “eating of the sacred flesh”. From this conceptual perspective of romance as destruction, *kitetama* marriage is an example of *kaiha'a* as a means for social elevation, the correct interpretation of *'ofa* “love”. Precisely, marriage, in this sense, is romance of *toofaa* “putting to sleep”\(^{299}\). In two of her compositions, Queen *Salote* illustrates this stealing by “putting to sleep” in her poems of *Sangone* and *Peato*. In *Sangone*, she alludes to the success of the *Tu'i Kanokupolu* with the putting to sleep of *Lafaipana* (line 5, *Sangone*, Appendix 6, pages 279-282) by *Ulamoleka*, a nickname of the two navigators brothers, *Fasi'apule* and *Tu'itaatui*, (Appendix 6, line 22), and of *Sioeli Pangia* (line 15, *Peato*, Appendix 7, pages 283-287) by *Hifofua*, a nickname of *Taufa'aahau*, (Appendix 7, line 12). As part of their punishment, *Lafaipana* and *Sioeli Pangia* missed out on the titles which then went to their respective sisters’ descendants. The *Tangaloa* title of *Lafai* of Samoa went to *Va'epopua’s* child as the *Tu'i Tonga* and, later, the *Tu'i Tonga* title being


\(^{299}\) Compare with Kavaliku’s analysis of *'ofa* (1961)
replaced as Kalanivalu to Afaa's son, Semisi Fonua. The critique of the transformation that Tangaloa "Persecutor-god" becomes "cut into half" (Tu'i Tonga) at Folaha and, then, finally, "struggle with no result" (Kalanivalu) at Lifuka.

All these stealing of titles are aspects of lau 'eiki-fie 'eiki in which Queen Salote contradictorily expresses her superiority-inferiority complexes in terms of her actions of saving/protecting and disposing of the object of stealing. For her survival, Queen Salote practices the romantic destruction of 'ofa "love", thus creating in her a psychology of accepting death as a fate. In such a way that has created a work ethic of support of oneself with the dedication to die if need be. The importance of it is Tu'i Kanokupolu's sacrificial attitude to die in order to protect the only sacred flesh of Laatuufuipeka, the last Tamahaa, from being snatched away.

I wonder how far that protection is going to sustain in a globalised economy without the collapse of the monarchical system. One way of looking at this question is the fact that the Tongan royal children have begun operating and controlling of local big businesses which can be seen as a royal move towards business partnerships with the world wide big business bullies. This means that a new form of contestation takes on to stage, now between the global elite capitalism and the local commoner people. Politics and economics merge at the top level to protect themselves from the lower level commoner people crying for democracy. The real contestation, as shown in the commoner-elite debate between poets William
Wordsworth and his friend, Samuel Taylor Coleridge\textsuperscript{300}, shows that the enthusiastic movement of the former toward the creative identity of the real common people is explicitly political as the elitist movement of the latter. When Queen Salote denies the 'eiki of her old great granduncle, Sioeli Pangia, for example, she is, at the same time, praising her 'eiki-ness over him. Her denial means that she is putting him to sleep so that she can "eat up" her favourite dish of the 'eiki and Tu'i Tonga that she loves most. Her action upon Sioeli Pangia is nothing but a political romanticisation of securing the Tupou family-centred ethos, as a constant struggle for, and conflict over, power and security.

Anyway, one can see in Queen Salote's own poetry, in her ambivalent styles of lau 'eiki and fie 'eiki, this same kind of mentality of saying one thing but meaning another, preaching truth and history as that coming from the mouth of the chief\textsuperscript{301}. In reality, truth and history do not come as the guarantee of the powerful but they are integral parts of the historical dialectics that go on in the daily social exchanges of real people doing real things in real time. In this sense, Queen Salote, in a way, is seen to challenge the conservative view that power works out the truth, when she, for example, refers to the idle lifestyle of Sioeli Pangia in the poem of Peato. He is a Catholic pieta who Queen Salote criticizes, obviously, from her Methodist belief, as a taka "wander about" looking for a hia 'i Fanakava "offence which cannot be punished since there is no law against it" (\textit{Peato}, Appendix 7, line 4, pages

\textsuperscript{300} See Thompson (1997) on the debate between Wordsworth and Coleridge

\textsuperscript{301} Wood-Ellem 1999
His charges are that because he is an emerald who comes to an end (Appendix 7, line 6) and a *tamatou* "parasite" (Appendix 7, line 7) who rides on Queen *Salote*s back, sleeping doing nothing useful (Appendix 7, line 15) but living dependently on the works of the *Tu'i Kanokupolu* and her people (Appendix 7, lines 19-20) and, waking up to drinking *kava* (Appendix 7, line 33), *Sioeli* has to be banished out of *Tongatapu* to where he originally comes from. Queen *Salote* even specifies the nature of *Sioeli*’s offence, as his name, *Pangia*, suggests, as someone who *alaalanoa* “habitually takes things belonging to other people”.

Queen *Salote* alludes this behaviour to the story of stealing of the top of *Niuatoputapu* at night by some Samoan demigods and, on being spotted with the light emitted from *Seketoa*’s arse hole, the stealers dropped the top in the ocean, thus the island of *Tafahi*, and ran away as quickly as possible. *Sioeli* has been dubbed in this context as a bird which has *kapakau ‘o Tafahi* “wings to cut the top off” (Appendix 7, line 36-37). This is generally characterized as parasitic that which became a central theme of the building of the *Ha’amonga ‘a Maui* trillithon (*tamatou na’e tafa*, Appendix 7, line 7) under the order of *Tu’i Tonga Taatui*. It symbolizes the slave morality of the commoner people carrying the *Tu’i Tonga* on their shoulders, like *ha’amo* “carrying” the food of the *Tu’i Tonga*. In that psychological moralist critique, *Sioeli* is an extinct emerald. For someone, like *Sioeli*, who regards himself as being a *pieta* cannot be truthful, therefore, not dutiful. In that regard, the *Kanokupolu* can now dare to dispute what comes from the mouth of the chief.
Queen Salote’s denying of Sioeli Pangia’s ’eiki with her praising of her own ’eiki is, once again, a revision of the received truth and history. Thus, this contradiction shows that her and her followers’ claims to truth and history are as much references to the contest of others’ economic and political power. Authority as the spring from which truth flows is often an idea of colonizers who challenge local power. In situations like this we can see that contesting claims to truth emerge historically. The authority of the ’eiki is being revised by Queen Salote because she is trying to define this authority as a result of industry and individual effort as opposed to ancient Tu’i Tonga interpretation of it as the continuing right of the ruler to be idle and consume. Queen Salote’s producer ethic of ’eiki is as expressed with imageries like tui ‘a e ongo Ha’angana “plaiting of the two Ha’angana” (Peato, Appendix 7, line 10, pages 283-287), a reference to Halaevalu Mata’aho, mother of twin Kalanivalu, Sioeli Pangia’s father, and Lavinia Veiongo, Queen Salote’s great grandmother, koka nofo’anga “staining of tapa cloths for sitting on” (Appendix 7, line 20), and Tongafuesia “carrying the burden of Tonga” (Appendix 7, line 32), both references to Tu’ikanokupolu.

But, the ambiguity in association with making a distinction between production (Tu’i Kanokupolu Kauhalalalo) and consumption (Tu’i Tonga Kauhala’uta) is connected to the difficulty of drawing the line in an inverted system of one replacing the other. Tu’i Kanokupolu Queen Salote Tupou III’s frustration at being a producer is only her wish, that yet to happen, to be a consumer like Sioeli Pangia. Even the conception of kaaininga as gathering of kakai “people”, as in pangai, exchanging
and eating of food and ko'o'a one another, should fall in the same interpretation. Any pangai is a public gathering of the dominant leader exercising his/her universal status to where all things flow, but, at the same time, a place where contestation for the supreme power will start brewing.

An argument put forward to me when I first presented this chapter to the Tongan History Association conference in 1999 in Tonga was that Queen Salote's denying Sioeli Pangia's 'eiki is a reference to Sioeli Pangia's impotence and uselessness. Also, according to her, Sioeli Pangia should not inherit his father's title that ought to come down to him but should, instead, go to his sister, Afaa, so it did, for she is producing, thus, she should accordingly be rewarded. But, this cannot be held as the sole reason for Sioeli Pangia missing out of the Kalanivalu title. Take note that this is Queen Salote punishing Sioeli Pangia after his appearance at Fanakava for surreptitiously eating the food presented to him.

**Conclusion**

The new form of power which has to do with individual industry has helped in securing the position of the ruler to stay firm as a post in the ground. But, that is only an interpretation rhetorically good enough to efficaciously arouse an emotional feeling of support from the commoner people while Queen Salote steps up to assume the traditional seat of tyranny. Tyrannical of the competition for power, again, between opposite sex, did happen during the time of Tuku'a ho, the
14th Tu'i Kanokupolu. He is Queen Salote's great, great, great, grandfather. Tuku‘aho showed no reverence for his first cousin Tupoumoheofo who installed herself to the Tu‘i Kanokupolu title when he deposed the title off her and put on his own father, Mumui. He told her off and said that she should remain as a pali "female genitals" and not acting to be a ule "penis". Tuku‘aho's harsh words to Tupoumoheofo cannot be taken that he is a typical Tongan paternalist female basher. Rather, his action is a clear representation of socio-political contestation for the title power mainly between the title holder's children and his brothers' children. Tuku‘aho's bitterness towards his first cousin arose from his concern with the joint action between Tupoumoheofo and her Tu‘itonga husband, Paulaho, who seized the Tu‘itonga title from his half older brother, Ma‘ulupekotofa, leaving him poor.

The basis of such impression of course is derived from a kind of self-assertion that is grounded on a claim of the Tu‘i Kanokupolu as to his servicing role to the Tu‘i Tonga in terms of food and people.

Power must be, therefore, a question of fie ‘eiki, who claims what with the support of people. Because, Sioeli Pangia may have a legitimate claim on ‘eiki, but, in Queen Salote's retaliation, at the same time, she is suggesting that she does, too, have one. This dialectical denying by Queen Salote of Sioeli Pangia's social status can be seen as a dimension of the competition for power between the two, which, again, perpetuated by their respective affiliation to the Methodist and Catholic
Churches. The symbolic presentation of the conflict between the two Churches is also a conceptualisation of an inner conflict between *kauhala'uta* and *kauhalalalo* moieties. It is the kind of ambivalent behaviour that shows integration and separation of very unequal moiety divisions. He, as a mere stone structure, a symbolic Polynesian Olympian vicar on earth\(^{302}\), lies on his back in *Lapaha*, home of idols, while being fed and taken care of by the poor people who have to work extra hard to be able to fulfill their duties to him.

\(^{302}\) Luke 1954:178
CHAPTER 5

Conclusions and suggestions for further research

As suggested in this thesis, historically, Kauhala'uta and Kauhalalo social moieties are particularly seen as part of the general working theme of the legitimization of economic and political power in Tonga. The idea that Kauhala'uta and Kauhalalo are divisions in Tonga later coming to mean between the people of the Tu'i Tonga and the Tu'i Kanokupolu and his people\(^3\) is what I take to be a clear indication of writing a history of Tonga from a structuralist perspective. Based on my critique of the history of struggle for power in the Samoa-Tonga connection, my position, on the other hand, takes the moiety division to be an idea originated from the joining (hoko) of a “sky” wrongdoer (Tangaloa) and an “underworld” wrongdoer (Va’epopua), thus the two wrongdoers (Kauhala) together form up a one Tu'i Tonga system of ‘inasi tribute ('Aho'eitu) to Folaha in Tonga. Thus, in terms of fale as upturned canoe, the moiety division is the joining fale of upper body part (roof) and lower body part (posts) which then becomes a new centre on land occupied by the fale advisors with the role to direct the Tu'i Tonga tribute of food of the wounded Tu'i Manu'a victim in Tonga. In the myth of ‘Aho'eitu, it shows the moiety division as the socio-political turning point in Tonga of an inversion of

\(^3\) See Bott 1982:156
the sky wrongdoers (Tangaloa and his sky sons, the Kauhala’uta) who have fallen down on to earth via the toa tree and become the Kauhalalalo supporters of their new promoted Kauhala’uta successor from earth. In this connection, the idea of moiety division suggests it as a universal idea representing the particular actual situation of power struggle and the political and economic management of power and resources. It is not specifically about a social organisation of a chief-commoner welfare system. It is rather about power seizure relationship where Kauhalalalo Tu’i Kanokupolu George Taufa’aahau Tupou I, for example, seizes the power and authority of the Kauhala’uta Tu’i Tonga circle. In reverse, Kauhala’uta Tu’i Tonga people become the stand of Kauhalalalo Tu’i Kanokupolu Tupou dynasty. (See pages 102-105 for the historical critique of this reverse.)

With the successful feat of the lower ranked Tu’i Kanokupolu kingly line in seizing the power and authority of the Tu’i Tonga, Tu’i Kanokupolu George Taufa’aahau Tupou I and his great, great granddaughter, Tu’i Kanokupolu Queen Salote Tupou III, together made it recognised with their respective legalistic 1875 Constitution and artistic emphasis on music, dance, and poetry. It is such a success that of course came into effect after a long time of manipulated struggle of the Safata people of ‘Upolu with the moheofo institution to enclose the ‘eiki sacred blood of the Tu’i Tonga, which, also, opened the door for the power hungry Safata to implode the traditional dual Tu’i Tonga-Tu’i Ha’atakala’ua brotherly system into the one Kanokupolu “flesh of ‘Upolu’. In fact, the struggle for the social rank and power continued on, this time within the Kanokupolu circle between the royal ha’a
brothers and, at last, it came to a period in the pangai of Ha’a Ma’afu (Ma’afu brothers). Ha’a Ma’afu triumphantly enclosed the sacred blood within to become a legal socio-political form of legitimacy of the Ma’afu brothers’ ranks and statuses. At last, the Ha’a Ma’afu of the Tu’i Kanokupolu line now takes over the divine right of kings of the old Tu’i Tonga who has been demoted to the lowest base of Tonga’s socio-political hierarchy. As had been the tail of the fish, the Ha’a Ma’afu has now also assumed the head role of the Tu’i Tonga. They become the legitimate ‘Ulu’i Tonga as “Heads/Kings of Tonga” being placed on the offerings of va’e poopula “legs of punishment” as their stands. “Head/King of Tonga” concept is a reference to the symbolic tradition of hoko human sacrifice in connection with the decapitation of a tyrant whose abandoned ‘ulu “head” has been provided a tu’ula, tu’unga, tu’anga “stand” of the punished local va’e “legs” on land. In the Maori culture of New Zealand, this concept of “Head/King” is clearly reminisced with the name of the royal residence of the Maori King called Turangawaewae which, in Tongan, the same concept is tu’u’angava’e “legs (of chief Lute of Folaha) as stand (of abandoned Tu’i Tonga Havea’s head)”.

This human sacrifice as the proper origin of the moiety division of Kauhala’uta and Kauhalalalo branched itself from an old ethnobiological belief in the hoko “genealogical blood” that had been connected through the moheofo practice of women of Ha’atakalaaua and, then, later of Kanokupolu, being sent to be the divine Tu’i Tonga’s sexual partners. The child being born from such moheofo union, because of his descending from a divine blood, marks the turning point of the two
senior kingly lines, *Tu'i Tonga* and *Tu'i Ha'atakalaaua*, becoming imploded inwardly towards the lower ranked *Tu'i Kanokupolu* kingly line. The economic and political power of the *Tu'i Tonga* over the resources had slowly oozed into the centre of *'Upolu*, the *Muifonua* “Land end”, the *Hikule’o* “Guarding tail” of Tonga.

Realistically, the *moheofo* practice, later known as the *kitetama* cross-cousin marriage in the time of the *Ha'a Ma'afu*, is not only an affirmation of the socio-political connection between *Kauhala'uta* and *Kauhalalalo*, but, it also shows the moiety division to be a permanent single inversion process of one being carried on the shoulder of the loser. The latter is punished to be the carrier of the next successful victor. His punishment also means the loser is made to be the loser's new master's protector. In this historical sense, the theory of dualism (*Kauhala'uta* and *Kauhalalalo*) can be understood in terms of opposition triangulated into three parts- *Tu'i Tonga*, *Tu'i Ha'atakalaaua*, *Tu'i Kanokupolu* - and, the third party (*Tu'i Kanokupolu*) is the synthetic connecting link between the other two opposing social forces (*Tu'i Tonga* and *Tu'i Ha'atakalaaua*).

This discussion of the *moheofo-kitetama* practice brings to the fore Elizabeth Bott's writing on rank and power\(^{304}\) as a feminist dissertation that revolves around the Tongan principle of brother-sister relationship. In Bott's interpretation, using, for example, the *Tu'i Tonga Fefine* and the *Tamahaa*, the sister is “a compensatory development counterbalancing the development of the powerful *Tu'i Kanokupolu*,

\(^{304}\) Bott 1982:68
but much lower rank". Bott’s conception of sister, generally, as *fefine* “woman” or “a compensatory development”, cannot be more precise than my critique of it in terms of the history of struggle between the two junior kingly lines, *Tu’i Ha’atakalaua* and *Tu’i Kanokupolu*, for the sacred blood of the *Tu’i Tonga* as the seat of power.

Brother-sister principle is the particular conception of the universal *Kauhala’uta-Kauhalalalo* social moieties. Thus, the *Tu’i Tonga* (brother) and *Tu’i Tonga Fefine* (brother’s daughter) distinction is some kind of a particularisation of the *Tu’i Kanokupolu* historical struggle for economic and political power. In connection, the nature, then, of this historical struggle is the *Kanokupolu* practicing of the *moheofo*, then *kitetama*, system of stealing/adopting of the source of power. The *tuofefine* “sister” and *tuonga’ane* “brother” distinction highlights a mutual cooperation by engaging in an incestuous persecuting relationship to enclose the seed of power of the impregnating *Tu’i Tonga*.

Use as an example the real beginning of the *Tu’i Kanokupolu moheofo* practice, that is, ‘Anaukihesina, daughter of *Tu’i Kanokupolu Ma’afu-’o-Tu’itonga*, sent as *moheofo* to be served by *Tu’i Tonga Tu’ipulotu-’i-Langitu’oteau*. ‘Anaukihesina and *Tu’ipulotu-’i-Langitu’oteau* are first cousins. Their marriage is a cross-cousin. ‘Anaukihesina’s father and *Tu’ipulotu-’i-Langitu’oteau*’s mother, Tongotea, are brother and sister. Consequently, this cross-cousin marriage led on to the persecution of the sacred blood inwardly toward the *Tu’i Tonga*.

*Tu’ipulotu-’i-Langitu’oteau*’s daughter, *Tu’i Tonga Fefine Nanasipau’u*. Again,
Nanasipau’u was married to her cross-cousin auntie’s son, Tu’i Lakepa Laatuunipulu, giving birth to Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka who started the Tu’i Kanokupolu Ha’a Ma’afu incestuous internalization of the sacred child, Tungii Mailefihi his name. He is a tangled alyxia plant grown on the seashore. Mailefihi is a heliaki referring to the entangling of many ranks in him by his ancestral lines of descent. It is also a heliaki to his navigation origin on his father’s side, as the Pahulu of the Tu’i Tonga voyage.

The implication of the gender study, therefore, is connected to the development in Tonga of the kaainga social organization as the mainstay securing the Tupou dynasty at the helm of power in Tonga. Generally, kaainga is the gathering of people related to one another by blood and marriage. It is thus a genealogical connection into one people, a significant key to the Tupou dynasty’s success. But, despite this ideological egalitarian implication of the kaainga social organization sharing in eating with one another, where no one is higher but of equal status, the reality of the relationship between Tupou and his kaainga reveals the opposite of one section as the defeated producer (tu’a-commoners) and, the other, the victorious consumer (hou’eiki-Chiefs). Thus, this central theme of kai “to eat”, of kakai “people”, in the kaainga politico-economic organization, is connected to the contesting aspect of eating of the source (kahokaho yam) of power, the kanokato of the occupier’s canoe. The kahokaho yam, though socially high ranked, is the natural symbolic oblong coagulated foetus of a foha “son, tuber” being nurtured and grown up in the local woman’s fonua “placenta, land”.

Gender study is study not only of who begets who but, also, of the given names as themselves the recorded actual events. In order to understand these recorded events, this kind of gender study takes us both outside and inside researchers to the common subject of investigation, which is the revealing and concealing double nature of Tongan *heliaki* mode of saying one thing and meaning another.

Genealogy is a subject of talking about events in the family’s history. Literally, Tongans do speak about who they are descended from. But, they relate these events emphasising the historical question of how a particular person as $X$ came to be $X$. In other words, it is the $Y$ (description of the subject $X$) being the focal point of the conversation. *Who begets who* is a later theme introduced into Tonga by the missionaries, thus, the written format on the Tongan history is emphasised with the idea of ancestral origin. Such research methodology prevalent in the anthropology of Tonga, in the Austronesian comparative study in Oceania, for example, has taken research with the emphasis on a unilineal evolutionary explanation. The *hoko* methodology employed in this thesis collapses that unilineal “scaffolding” evolutionary methodology$^{305}$ to focus only on the historical relationships of real people engaging in real historical struggle to build their own respective social system of livelihood.

Like *Kauhala’uta* and *Kauhalalalo* as opposition of two halves being joined together, rank and power as a gender focus is connected with the view of society

$^{305}$ See Groves 1963
as a socio-political arena where individual interests are perpetually in conflict. Rank and power are not strictly means of gender division, thus, female with rank and male with power. There are cases of powerful women with low rank and high ranked men with less power in the Tongan history. Women become so powerful from being married to powerful men supporters, (for example, Queen Salote Tupou III). So as high ranked men, (for example, Sioeli Pangia), who become powerless from being too self-praised and highly tyrannical. In some cases, rank is a reward for one who has carried out a personal sacrifice on behalf of his/her other male/female part. Chief Lute of Folaha is one case who should have been rewarded but it did not eventuate. The reason being, I think, as connected with the later personal politics of Tu'i Kanokupolu Mataeleha'a'amea in taking away his daughter, Fusipala, from Tu'i Ha'atakalaua Tongatanga'itaupekiholaha to live as wife of low ranked Fisilau'amaali of Pe'ehake, that this is a case where the intention is to reverse the paramount Tu'i Tonga title inwardly towards his (Mataeleha'a'amea) own enclosure, later on, towards the Ha'a Ma'afu. (See the relevant discussion of this point on pages 102-105.)

Because of the subjective nature of people in building a safety net for the objective reason of protection that the Tongan heliaki mode of speaking and thinking is a historical unique way of the speakers demonstrating their objective method of controlling the situation of contact with the outside. Subject to Grice's theory of intention and uncertainty\(^\text{306}\), of idealism\(^\text{307}\), the pragmatic use of heliaki shows the

\(^{306}\) Grice 1972
natural ability of the speaker/thinker to be on defensive to maintain this protection theme. This is true in the situation of the *mataapule* "spokesman" mediating between the authority and the people with the fear of possible assassination. This arouses in me a special interest in the study of thinking, of what is meant, of the connection between the subject $X$ and the predicate $Y$ of proposition $X$ is $Y$. Thus, the revealing-concealing character of the Tongan *tala* is what one is thinking about. For example, the *tala* of the origin of *fale* as an upturned canoe is a *heliaki* case about the concept of kingship as the abandoned head of a tyrant being given a stand by his mother's brother. The legitimation of economic and political power in Tonga, then, is explained in terms of an abandoned head of a murdered king and legs of a sacrificed commoner being connected, thus, the latter, in fulfilling his social duty, assists the former in his war.

History then of the Tongan society is always about the struggle for economic and political power in connection with a chiefly fleeing canoe seeking help. As this is a derived interpretation of the *heliaki* of the "shoulder-person's" canoe from *Manu'a* which sailed around Samoa looking for legs and finally got them from chief *Folasa* of *Falelima* (formerly of *Aopo*), of the abandoned *Tu'i Tonga Havea*'s upper part being floated down to *Folaha* from *Pelehake* to be joined with chief *Lufē*'s legs, the two halves have come back together to the original social relationship of one (*Tu'i Tonga* son's mother's brother) as the stand of the other (sister's *Tu'i Tonga* son). In

---

307 Zizek 2006:206
both cases, Folaha is the sinker of fau log that holds down the Tu'i Tonga/Tu'i Manu'a floater of polata stem in the water from drifting away, on land to stay permanently. In other words, their being joined together in the sea is the making of the net used to ensnare the ferocious enemy who wounded the Tu'i Tonga/Tu'i Manu'a, on land, is the making of the fale into which the pardoning sacrifice of 'inasi tributes are presented. Once again, the interpretation thus provides another aspect to understanding the idea of the moiety division which is simply a case of the weak (polata) abandoned head being inverted to be joined with the strong (fau) lower legs as standing supporter.

In accordance with the critique of the moiety division idea in this thesis, a shift of emphasis can be noticed in the study of the legitimation of economic and political power in Tonga from exogamous (moheofo) to endogamous (kitetama) sexual relationships due to the Tupou family of the Ha'a Ma'afu imploding of the three kingly lines' blood connection inwardly towards them. My amendment to this type of anthropological shift from exogamous to endogamous is an example of Tongan anthropologists missing the full historical account of the subject of power in Tonga. Sexual relationships from the past had always been endogamous until the establishment of the kingly lines that marriage became exogamous when women of lower ranked kingly line (Tu'i Ha'atakalaua and Tu'i Kanokupolu) married into men of high ranked kingly line (Tu'i Tonga). But, even that intermarriage arrangement of moheofo, from the commoner point of view, it is still endogamous,
meaning incestuous, because, to the commoner's viewpoint, the people of these kingly lines are genealogically one of the same parents.

How does toto "blood" become hoko "genealogy" should be the guide and focus of the study of the legitimation of economic and political power in Tonga. If we consider the shift from exogamous to endogamous in terms of fishing with hook and line, then sexual intercourse is an ethnobiological activity of pulling into land (placenta) the coagulated blood of the sacred sky-god navigator which, then, becomes the legitimate keeper's food source of rank and power. From the Tongan point of view, this sexual ethnobiological activity is the Tongan female sexual partner's adoption of both her Samoan and Fijian male sexual lovers' offspring. From the Samoan and Fijian points of view, it is the Tongan female sexual partner's stealing of their source of power. To the Samoan, the child of the sexual union is a stolen one (gao) and, to the Fijian, is a bad one (ca), thus Tamahaa. The murder of 'Aho'eitu by his older Samoan half brothers is an example. Being the determiner of rank and power, genealogy has to be constitutionally legalised and, in contrary to the constitutional legality, incestuously guarded to remain an inside subject of the keeper's enclosure. Stealing and adoption, no longer a distinction, are respective points of view of one (Tonga) gaining and the others (Samoa and Fiji) losing social rank and power. Genealogical connection is the universal Tongan legitimation method of gaining economic and political power within and outside Tonga.
By emphasising the central significance of moiety system and power in Tongan society we begin to gain a significant insight to that space created in *heliaki* between what people say and what they intend to mean. That space being created has given the readers a greater insight into the socio-political significance of formal *heliaki* language.
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This is my re-translation of Miss Beatrice Shirley Baker's translation of the original Tongan as compiled and published in Edward Winslow Gifford's *Tongan Myths and Tales* [1924:164-167].

This is a chant about a clever struggle (*faimaalie*) of three Tongan thieves who went to *Pulotu*, the abode of death, from Tonga, evaded (the test of) death and, fled back with the *kahokaho* yam (lines 147, 151) as the *kano* "flesh" of the *kato* "basket" (line 131). They did it with their skills in disguising (lines 84-99), with their extravagant habit in eating (lines 101-115) and having sex (lines 120-125). The errand was to steal from *Pulotu* the *fale kano'imatata* "house of eye-balls" (line 80), a reference to the adoption of the child of high social status to Tonga (*Tamahaa*) (lines 130-132) through the absorption of *'eiki*, thus, *tala 'a fai* "tradition of sexual intercourse" (lines 133-136).
KO FAIMAALIE: KOE LAVE ‘A

MOHULAMU

‘Amusia ‘a Tepa, koe maau;
Na’e lave ki Pulotu Tu’uma’u,
Ha fonua e ongolelei fau!
Tupa!

Tu’u e ta’alo mei Ha’atafu
“Fakafu’umaka, ke u hu atu,
Ke ke ha’u mu’a ke ta oo folau
‘O mamata ki Pulotu atu fau,
Ha fonua e ongo hoha’a fau!”
Tupa!

Tu’u e ta’alo ‘i Muifonua,
“Alaa ee, pale mai mu’a.”
“Pale atu, ke ta oo kitaua,
Pe ‘alu ki fee mo e faakaua.”
Tupa!

IT IS FAIMAALIE: THE CHANT BY

MOHULAMU

I envy the Tepa, it was a poem;
It was a chant on the subject of Pulotu
Tu’uma’u,
A land of very great renown!

Clap!

Stood and beckoned from Ha’atafu
“Fakafu’umaka, let me enter,
For you to come for us to voyage
To go and look at Pulotu.
A land of dubious repute!”

Clap!

Stood and beckoned at Land’s End.
“Oh dear, do paddle here.”
“Paddle on, you and I go,
Where does she want to go and be sea-sick.”

Clap!
Pea tuku e vaka mei Nuku, And the canoe left Nuku,
Ko honau 'oho e niu mot'u, Their provisions old coconuts,
Ko hono tata e ng'esi kuku. Its bail the shell of the kuku shell-fish.

Tu'u e ta'alo mei Muikuku Stood and beckoned from Muikuku
"Pale atu, 'alaa, ko Vakafuhu, "Paddle on, dear, it's Vakafuhu
Ha finemotu'a ka mata pau'u!" Such an old mischievous-eyed woman!" 308

Tupa! Clap!

Pea fai 'enau fetapa'aki And they greeted each other
"Fakafu'umaka, 'alaa, ko Fai" "Fakafu'umaka, dear, it's Fai" 309
"E, ta ko koe, pei lea mai." "Why is it you, well speak to me."
"Pe kofutu s'eku viku 'i tahi. "For how long have I been wet in

Ko 'ena e va'a fau to'o mai!" the sea.
Talu ai 'ene hekeheka ai, There's that fau branch bring it! 310
'O kiato tolu 'ae vaka ni From then on she sat on it 311,
Ka na'e kiato ua 'a Tonga ni Thus this canoe had three sticks to

the outrigger

Ka na'e kiato ua 'a Tonga ni. When Tonga had only two sticks to

the outrigger.

308 The woman referred to is Faimaalie not Vakafuhu
309 Faimaalie
310 Miss Baker's translation—"there is a branch of the fau tree which bring!"
Tupa!

Pale hifo honau vaka ki Fisi;
They paddled their canoe down to Fiji;

Pea hokosia e tahi fifisi,
And came to the angry sea\(^{312}\),

Tutula tangi fakatekefili-
Tutula cried and rolled about-

"Ko hotau vaka e kuo hili.
"Our vessel is piled up on the reef.

Kuo tau ma'u hangee ne hiki."
We are fast held as though lifted."

Lea mai 'a Fai fine'eiki.
Then the old woman Fai spoke.

"Fakahekeheka mo tau fifili."
"Bring on board our thinking mind."

Pea angi mo tu'oni havili.
Then came a gust of wind.

"He papatea 'ene tongafisi!"
"And came true her predictions!"\(^{313}\)

Tupa!

Clap!

Tutula tangi fakafo'ohake,
Tutula cried lying on his back,

"Ko hotau vaka e ka mamate,
"Our vessel will be swamped,

'O tau maalooloo 'i he tahi 'o Mate."
And we will die in the sea of Death.\(^{314}\)

Lea mai 'a Fai koe vale,
Then spoke Fai the ignorant,

\(^{311}\) Miss Baker’s translation—“After that she sat on it”. In the following line I replace Miss Baker’s “and” with “thus” in order to produce a logical consistency along the successive lines.

\(^{312}\) I replace Miss Baker’s “stormy” with “angry” to reflect the human dimension of the place Pulotu rather than the condition out in the sea.

\(^{313}\) Miss Baker was obviously misled by the misprint pepetea, thus translated as “white butterfly” (line 55). It should be papatea. Papatea could be Papa, the wife of Mataeleutu 'apiko, so, thus, an indication that this story is about the marriage of Mataeleutu 'apiko with Tamahaa Tu’imala, daughter of Tu’i Lakemba Fonomanu and Tu’i Tonga Fefine ‘Ekutongapipiki. Papa is daughter of the Tu’i Ha’amea, a family renown for their soothsaying.
"Kehe pe ke maaloo e pale, "The one thing that matters is that you paddle,

Kau taaliu mo lakuna hake." While I bail and throw out the water."^315

Tupa! Clap!

Fakafu’umaka ‘ene tangi ia Fakafu’umaka who was crying

“Ko hotau vaka e hilifakia.” “Hey, our vessel will be piled up.”

Lea mai ‘a Fai faasi’a Then spoke Fai the crafty

“Pea kehe pe ke mo ‘alofia, “Anyway you keep on paddling,

Kau ‘ai fakahekehekesia While I pretend to lighten the vessel by

Peau lakuna moe kanikita.” Throwing out the sandstone ballast.”

He papatea ‘ene anga ia! The cripple who acted deceitfully^316

Pepa fai mai ‘ene tala. Then she spoke and said,

“Tutula, heu e vaka ki ama. “Tutula, ward off the vessel from the port side.

^314 Misprint as Fate. Baker might have thought of fate as “death”.

^315 My translations may not make any much difference from Miss Baker’s-

“Anyway thank the paddlers,
I will bail out the water.”

^316 This is a verse with descriptions of “Fai the crafty” (line 51) as one who “pretends” and “acts deceitfully”. Interestingly, this is also a Tongan perception of what a mamatea “cripple person” is. Crippled people in
Kuo ofi e vaka 'i taulanga." The vessel is nearly at the anchorage."

Tupa! Clap!

Pea nau tau 'i tu'a hakau, And they anchored outside the reef,

Kae hola 'a Tutula 'o kakau, And Tutula deserted and swam on shore,

Tu'uta ki he vai fakalanu, Landed at the fresh water to rinse off the salt,

Koe vai 'i Pulotu Tu'uma'u, A water (hole) at Pulotu Standing Firm,

Ko hono hingoa ko Fufuutau. Thus, its name was Fufuutau317.

Pea faka'asi ki alafolau, And he went and looked in the canoe house,

'Oku laalanga 'a 'Elelovalu, Was weaving there Eight Tongues,

He kui 'a Hikule'o Fakahau. Poor grandmother of Hikule'o the tyrannical.

Tupa! Clap!

---

Tonga are generally perceived as pau'u "mischievous, cunning, childish, etc" (compare with line 21). So, Papatea, as crafty, acts like a mamatea.

317. This line talks about the ritual procedure of landing at Pulotu, one has to perform the fufuutau "concealing oneself once arriving" in the vai fakalanu "rinsing in fresh water" (line 63). In Fiji, vai fakalanu is well known as vakadraunikau, in Tongan fakalou'akau, so fufuutau is the rite of fakalou'akau "counteracting by means of counter-magic". One is drinking a concoction of selected lou'akau "leaves" brewed together which thus makes that person changing lanu "colours". The effect of vai fakalanu, as related in lines (86-99), that the people of Pulotu could not find, thus gave up searching for the Tongan voyagers. They were hidden from the people of Pulotu.
Pea hifo mai ki mataafanga,
Then he came down to the beachfront,
'O ta'alo Fai ke hao e vaka:
And beckoned Fai to direct in the vessel:
Pea mei hiki fakaapaapa,
And nearly lifted it out of respect,
Hu atu Fai 'o 'omi e vaka,
Entered Fai and brought out (Hikule'o's) vessel,
'O lii ki tu'a 'o mahalahala.
And threw it outside so it was smashed to pieces.
He mamate e vaka Leitana,
Was wrecked the boat Leitana,
E lalahia hono malamala!
And intense its being trampled! 318

Tupa!
Clap!

Tu'u ai Hikule'o 'o kalanga,
Stood up Hikule'o and shouted,
"Kuo fa'ao e langotangata."
"The human canoe-rests have been seized." 319

Nofo'ia e fale kano'imata.
On which sat the eyeball-

---

318. Miss Baker's translation of this line is "And many were its chips of wood!" Where our translations become conflict is the different angles that we take the word *lalahia* to mean. Miss Baker takes the root word *lalali* "big" to also mean "many" of *malamala* "chips of wood". I take *lalahia* to also refer to the physical "intensity" or "impact" that the boat gets from *malamala* "trampling, treading, stamping on". In other words, in addition to my interpretation in footnote 9, the Tongan voyagers actually demolished the Vaka Leitana, which is a *Va'a Polata* (boat of two banana trunks) of Hikule'o, his house, joined by a *Va'a Fau* or Vava'u (line 27) from Tonga, thus *hoko e fau meo polata* "join the hibiscus branch and banana trunk".

319. The criterion here of Miss Baker's translation, "Where are the human canoe-rests", seems to have been taken from the "searching" theme in the following lines (86-90). But, as the term *kalanga* "announcing by calling out loudly and publicly (especially in the open air)" in line 78 implies, it is different from the situation of *fehu'i* "asking". That is, *kalanga* is shouting out in the open air a public announcement of Hikule'o about the Tongan occupation by force of the fale kano'imatia "house of eyeballs" (line 80). *Fehu'i* or fekumi "inquiring" is emphatically distinguished in the poem to have followed the preceding line of *kalanga* as *vakule* "searching" (line 78).
Femakila'i 'ene fakalava.
All glaring as they lay alongside.

He taleilei si'ene malama!
And the whites (of the eyes) how they shone. 321

"Oku mou maia pe e kava,"
"Are you abashed or will you have kava," 322

Ka 'oku 'ikai 'ilo ai ha taha.
But no one was to be found.

Tupa!
Clap!

"Osi mai Ha'afakananamu,"
"Come all the smellers,"

'O mei vakule he lalo 'akau.
About to rummage about under the tree.

"Kuo teefee? Tonga, kuo tau?"
"How are you going? Tongans,
have they arrived?

Hono mole e vaka ta'ofi ha'u,
The perish of the vessel that prevents invasion,

320. Fale Kano'imata is the house of 'Uluakimata, the Tu'itonga who, Queen Salote claims, is the founding ancestor of the "King of Tonga", (see Bott 1982:12, Figure 1, in this thesis as Figure 2, page xii). By implication, it was at the time of 'Uluakimata that Tonga was able to commit a kaiha'a fa'itoka "eating one's own family property [crown] by way of putting down [extinguishing the current ruler] to sleep". Traditionally from 'Aho'eitu, the first Tu'itonga, Tonga had been ruled by a chiefly Samoan family known as the Tangaloa. 'Uluakimata's other name in Fiji is Niumataniwalu, translated into Tongan as Niu or 'Ulu­­mata-'oe-tau "head-beginning-of-the-war". Niumataniwalu is the ancestor of the Tu'ikanokupolu's tutelary god Talai Tupou, who is Hikule'o "watching tail", vanguard of Tu'i Tonga 'Uluakimata.

321. Miss Baker translated this line as "And the whites (of the eyes) how they shone!" It is very hard for me to work out how she comes out with the meaning "whites of the eyes" for taleilei. I suspect that she takes leilei, from lei, referring to the white rounded ball, like a marble, used in pool table. If that is so then she is mixing up lei for marble as derived from foo lelei "well shaped". Lei is Fijian for "whale tooth". I can only work out in connection to the previous line that taleilei is a misprint of tane 'ine 'i, as a reference to the alongside glaring of the fale kano'imata.

322. Miss Baker translated this line as "Are you abashed or will you have kava". Maia is durational form of 'omai or 'omi "to bring". The last two lines (83-84) talk about the remorse of the people of Pulotu at what
While this very bad vessel is anchored."

**Tupa!**

Then *Hikule'o* said to them,

"Are tired all our people here, 

Come and let us meet."

Split the post and a voice spoke,

Poor *Tutula* came waddling along,

Poor *Fakafu'umaka* came rolling along,

Who sat at his legs side,

Sat straight up at once and smiled.

**Tupa!**

And *Hikule'o* spoke to them,

"You all go and stay inside the big house. 

We will hold there the ceremony of gathering. 

Uproot the *kava* and bring it here, 

Drag here the *'ulua* (fish) and the

happened by coming in peace to *Hikule'o* with some *kava*. The people were told to keep on searching in order to earn a place in his *kava* drinking circle.
stingray.

_Fonotaki e vii fuolalahi,_

The relish will be the big vii fruits,

_Taku ia koe vai kau'aki._

Call it the vai kau'aki._

_Tupa!_ Clap!

_Tuku atu 'a Pulotu 'o fei'umu,_

Dispersed Pulotu to do the 'umu,

_Fakahunga, ha'amo, haumatutu,_

Fakahunga, ha'amo, haumatutu,

_Pea 'omi pe moe 'ulu'ulu,_

And brought it with the (coconut) leaves.

_Taanaki 'e Fai ki hono ngutu,_

Collected everything by Fai into her mouth,

_Fesi moe ha'amo 'o pakangungu._

Broke the shoulder-sticks and crunched them.

_"Osi mai Pulotu 'oku ngutu." _

"Is finished Pulotu into my mouth."

_"Toki ai e folau e pau'u!" _

"Are there ever such mischievous voyagers!"

_Tupa!_ Clap!

---

323. Spondias dulcis (Churchward 1959:540)
324. Vaikau 'aki is a term referring to a kind of drink made from mixture of water and scraped sweet vii fruits, as a drink of equal ability in fighting against the kona "bitter" of the kava drink, of the taking by force of the fale kano'imata of Pulotu by the Tongans. Bitterness of the kava taste is symbolic drink of sea voyaging usurpers as opposed to sweetness taste of vii fruits of the land.
325. The first three lines (109-111) were translated by Miss Baker as thus-
   "The people of Pulotu went to prepare food;"
   "They brought food in baskets and on poles;"
   "And brought it with the (coconut) leaves."

'Umu is food cooked on hot stones in an earth oven and then gets distributed into three lots- 'umu fakahunga in baskets carried on a sledge, 'umu ha'amo carried by two men with a stick on their shoulders, and 'umu haumatutu in basket carried on a coconut trunk. Ceremonial gathering of competition is claimed here as an event where Fai as both the _loto_ "centre" of _fale lahi_ (line 102) and _tu'unga uu_ "very centre" of the 'umu (line 94), as a ngutu "hollow" (line 97) through which everything enters, outclasses Pulotu's competitors.
Fai mai ‘e Hikule’o motu’a, Spoke old Hikule’o and said, “Kuo ‘osi e me’a homa fonua; “Everything in our land is finished; Kei toe pe ko ongo ‘otua, The only chance left is the two gods, Ko ‘otua uku ki Lolofonua.” One is the god of divers to the Underworld.326 Ko si’ena uku na’e poo ua. They dived for two nights. Talitali pea mate Lihamu’a: Waited till Lihamu’a died.327 Nga’eke’eke mo mapunopuna: Waddled and shot out: Kuo hekeheka ai ‘a Tutula- Kuo hekeheka ai ‘a Tutula- “Keu ‘ai tangitautau mu’a.” “I’ll cry to lay the blame on another.” Tupa! Clap! Teu ke nau foki ki Tonga ni, Preparing for their return to Tonga, Moe fotuaki ‘ae ‘aho lahi, And the Big Day draws near, Kamo atu Tutula kia Fai. Tutula makes signs to Fai.

326 Miss Baker’s translation of this line is “The god of the divers in the Underworld”. In my translation, one of the two gods is the god of the underworld who dived with Fai, meaning they were having sex as part of the divine sex of retribution. 327 Lihamu’a is the name of the first month in the old Tongan calendar and is the Tongan equivalent of Janus in Roman mythology. Lihamu’a or Hilamu’a is “the front face that looks forwards” and Lihamui or Hilamui “the back face looking backwards”. This line suggests the time of the story was during the reign of Tu’itonga ‘Uluakimata and the tradition of hila ki Tapana “glancing in the direction of Tapana” and the fo’ui tree. Tapana is “lightening” and fo’ui “misfortune caused by one’s own wrongdoing”. The tradition is about ‘Uluakimata’s wife, Talahiva, who had an affair with another chief and as a result her children were officially excluded from the Tu’itonga privileges, thus why Mata’ukipaa’s children, Fatafehi and Sinaikitaka ‘ilangileka, succeeded to the Tu’itonga and Tu’itonga Fefine titles respectively. Mata’u is “right (not left)”, ki “to”, and paa, short for tapana “lightening”, meaning the right is prohibited.
"Ke ke ha’u mu’a ‘o ‘alu ki ai,
‘O ‘omi ‘ae kanokato ke vakai."

You better come and go to him,
And fetch the whole works for a squiz."

‘Omi leva ia ‘o holataki,
No sooner brought than absconded with it,

Pea mei folo fakapetetangi.
Almost choked to death.

Talu ai ‘ene fakafeitama ai.
That’s how she was impregnated.

Tupa!
Clap!

Fai mei ai e tala ‘a Fai,
That’s the origin of Fai’s saying:

328. Kanokato literally means “substance of basket”. This is in fact the central substance of the poem. It is about a voyage from ‘Eua in Tonga to Pulotu looking at its fale kano’imata and ends up running away with it back to Tonga. Fale refers specifically to the ‘ato “roof” or the upturned vaka “boat” that while initially floating on the water from Pulotu it is a kato “basket”. Thus, kanokato or kano’ato is another word for kanofale “main part of the fale”, which also refers to the lotofale “centre of the fale”. Who is the centre of the fale called the ‘alu “head”. As a tamai he is the “father of” his son who is called foha “tuber” or hako “descendant”. The “substance” then “of the basket” is this foha, this hako orakahoko “lit. multiple descendants” (line 142) yam. It means for oneakahoko yam further more pula “seedlings” to plant and more and moreakahoko yams. Notion of kanokato, in other words, implies a philosophy of ola “life” with the social status foha, a regal term for ‘ula “to be alight”, a philosophy which is at the same time commonly adopted into the phylogenetic study of the evolutionary development of an organism or groups of organisms. See more of this in my discussion of fale (Chapter 2) and puko Lea (Chapter 1).

329. Folo “swallow” is a Tongan metaphysical notion of dialectics between absorption by earth of maama “sunlight” and evaporation by the sun of vai “water”. In metaphysics folo is the process of inumia “to consume by evaporation or by absorption; to drink; to undergo or experience pain or suffering”, the process of kai “to experience as the result of what one has done”. That is, food, and water alike, is stuffed in through the ngutu “orifice” or ‘utu “rock-face of coast” falling down into the kete “pit of the stomach”, also known the kele “earth”, where they get fermented. Derived from this context of kai is the sexual activity of fai “to do”. Sexual engagement of man and woman is thus perceived as an experience of pain on behalf of the woman as the result of what the man has done, as consumption by mimisi “absorption” by the woman of the hii “sperm” or iki “small thing” as in ‘eiki or tama “child” as in maama or mata “eye” or tenga “seed” coming from the man’s laho “scrotum”. Laholaho is the body-part equivalent of tonumanga “seed-bed”, for example, ofakahoko yam, thus a descendant source. See Chapters 1 and 2.

330. Tala ‘a Fai “tradition of Fai” is the telling of the absorption of the ‘eiki by Faimalie (lines 112-114) through a sexual intercourse. The telling begins with the allegory of uku ki Lolofo’ua “divining to Lolofo’ua” (line 104) which is a symbol of fai “sex”, a situation referring to the penetration of the ule “penis” inside the woman’s pali “manger, vagina”, as in kai pali “oral sex”. And, as Fai the person, the telling also refers to distribution of roles in relation to pregnancy where the brothers, Fakafu umaka and Tutula, by “coming by the sea” (line 119) fish on the way for some fish and shellfish for their pregnant sister’s umisi “craving for seafood” (line 121). In connection, the significance of collecting salty-sourced food is the need for the presence of preservative agent inside the womb to freshening and flourishing the baby. This practice is known fakatolonga “to preserve, to embalm”, to make the person tu’uloa “standing for a long time” both in the realms of death and life. Fai therefore in death remains as to tapuekina e mapa na’a tuungia mo
"Ke mo 'alo ua 'o 'uhi 'i tahi
You two paddle and come by the
sea

Ka u hala 'uta 'o tatali mai
While I go by land and wait for you

He 'oku mo 'ilo si'oku mahaki."
As you both know my sickness."

Tupa!
Clap!

"Ke mo 'alo ua 'o hiki 'i 'Oa,
"You paddle you two and lift out at
'Oa,

Koe'uhi ke ofi ki fa'itoka,
So as to be near the grave yard,

Ko Ha'amotuku 'ae konga vao na."
Ha'amotuku, that piece of bush is
called."

Maalooloo ai e fononga;
Rest there the journey,

'O fa'aki ki he fu'u masikoka;
Leaning on to the big masikoka
tree;

'O fanau ai Fai Loaloa;
And gave birth there Fai Loaloa;

Ta koe kahokaho 'ulu loa.
So it was a kahokaho 'ulu loa.

Tupa!
Clap!

"Kuo hao pe ho'omo omi na,
"You have got clear away with it,

Ko 'ena tamasi'i mo ohia."
There is a child for you to adopt."

malakia "bestow blessing upon the mapa lest be set on fire and trampled" (lines 133-135) whereas the mapa "garland worn by the fahu", as symbol here of the first Tamahaa, Fonomanu, a kahokaho'ufi hina "white yam" (line 131) from Fiji, will remain as a kahokaho 'ulu loa or kahokaho tu'uloa "long-standing progeny" (line 128).

331 Miss Baker's translation was "Well done our journey", based on taking maalooloo as maalo 'well done'. Again, she misinterpreted faki in the original Tongan text (line 126) as fa'aki "went on" but it should be fa'aki "leaning against".
Ta koe tu'u kahokaho hina.
So it was a big white kahokaho yam.

"Pea kehe pe ke mo ngaohia,
"As long you take care of it,

Ka u nofo keu tapuekina,
While I remain to bestow blessing upon,

'A hoku 'akau na'a tuungia:
Lest my plant be set on fire:

Ke tapu e mapa na'a malakia."
Forbidden the mapa (tree) from getting trampled."

'A ena na'e tapu ai ia.
That is why that was sacred.

Tupa!
Clap!

Pea mei kakave 'e he hahau,
And was nearly moistened by the dew.332

Kae fakalave mei 'Utulau;
But fortunately 'Utulau led them free;

'E homau kainga laukau.
For they were our proud relatives.

332 Line 132 says of the holataki from Fiji to Tonga in the night. 'Utulau, a place at the western windward side of Tongatapu Island, is 'Otulau, the long group of islands at the eastern part of Fiji. As if to say that the same sun to the people of western Fiji rising for them from 'Otulau is now to the people of Tonga a falling pelehae "porpoise" over the 'utu "coastal cliff" down below the horizon at the west and a tamahaa "decaying child". Specifically, 'utu can also be a metathesis of tu'u "to cut" of lau "hair (of the head)", thus 'Utulau is sacrificial place where heads cut off. Therefore, mythical Pulotu to the hihifo "west" is a sacrificial place of tu'usi "cutting off" of heads, origin of Tu'i "King". It is a place of fakahifo "deposition from office" and "to give birth to", as opposed to kahake "east", place of fakanofo "installation to office". It is a situation of the universal sun rises and falls. Lines 161 and 162 were translated by Miss Baker as "the kahokaho was ever scraped, if planted dirty (unweeded) it will not increase." which, I think, the problem is the contextual use of 'umu tefau in line 162. 'Umu is another word for tunu or hunu "singing food", and tefau, from fau, "the dragging of this singed food by force". The whole verse is a summary of the voyage to Fiji as a case of kaiha'a involving killing (line 125) and run away with the child of high social status to Tonga (lines 130-132). Also, tefau is a name for a kind of kahokaho yam and this is the meaning, I think, Miss Baker adopted in her translation. But, this kahokaho tefau is just named after the event
Koe kahokaho ‘a hai ne vau, Whose kahokaho that was scraped,  
Kae too’uli e ‘umu tefau, Planted the uncooked ‘umu that  
was hauled in,  
Kae vave he koe tama fanau. And be quick for this child would  
multiply.  

_Tupa!_ Clap!

_of clever political manipulation by Tongans in Fiji which being ritually reminded in Tonga in the planting, cooking and eating of it, that’s all!’_
APPENDIX 2

(This is my re-translation of Miss Beatrice Shirley Baker’s translation published in Gifford Tongan Myths and Tales, 1924:145-148.)

This poem recounts the exit of Lo’au, the socio-political builder of Tongan society, from Tonga, following a recount of a misdeed by Kae for stealing of the tambua “whale tooth” (line 139) belonged to a Fijian chief Sinilau who married and lived in Samoa (line 155) and had twin whales with his own father’s sister (lines 70-76). He is being addressed as “the voyage of Kae” or “the death of Mr Shit” as a result of his stealing.

KO E FOLAU ‘A KAE                                                     THE VOYAGE OF KAE

Vaka ne fa’u ‘i Ha’amea,                                           Vessel was built in
                      Ha’amea,
Fai laa uta pea fakaheka;                                           Hoisted sail, loaded and boarded;333

He vaka ne ha’i ‘uta ki he lepa.                                  The vessel that was moored in
                                                               land, in a pool334.

333. Miss Baker’s translation is “hoisted sail inland and loaded” based on taking uta of the original Tongan text as ‘uta “inland”. Her translation is of the Tongan text as fai laa ‘i ‘uta pea fakaheka.
"He fonua ko'eni e fakahela,
This land here is tiresome,
Taki taha ngaohi ha'ane me'a
Each person prepare his own
Ka tau folau ki he puko lea;
And let's voyage to the talking puko
Tuku Tongatapu ka tau lelea.”
Leave Tongatapu and let's run
before the wind.”

Tupa!
Clap!

Ha'apai e ka fotuaki,
Ha'apai was sighted,
Vava'u e ka fotuaki,
Vava'u was sighted,
Fai mai e tala ‘a toutai.
Reported the navigators.
Kalo mai pe Lo’au, “Ikaia,
Shook the head of Lo’au, “No,
Koe loi e tu’unga toutai.
The lies of the navigators.
Tau ‘ave e kaaining ni,
Let's take these friends,
Ke tuku ki Tafatafa’akilangi.”
And leave (them) at the horizon.”

Tupa!
Clap!

Pea ‘uli hifo honau vaka;
And steered down their vessel;
Pea hokosia e tahi tea,
And arrived at the white sea,
Pea moe tahi fuofuanga,
And the floating pumice sea,
Moe tahi pupulu na’e tala.
And the slimy sea that was foretold

334. Again, confusion as to the right Tongan texts, Miss Baker translated this line as “the vessel that took cargo in a pool”. This time, as correction to her translation, the original Tongan text should be he vaka ne ha’i
"Tutu'u 'i tahi mo 'Eua! "Tutu'u- 'i- tahi and 'Eua 335
Koe ha ho'omou tangi na? Why are you crying?
Kai 'ikai ko honau kaakaa Is not the treachery of the
Pea tau mole tua ai al' Whereby we will all be lost!"

Clap!

Fokihanga folau e tu'u faa; Turning place of voyage is the great
Pea fahi ai honau fanaa. There became entangled their

Longopoa mo Kae e kaka; Longopoa and Kae climbed;
Ne na fe'ohofi ki hono va'a, They swarmed into its branches,
Pea na tekena ai 'o 'ataa. And they pushed the vessel free.
Mole ai 'i he langi na'e ava, It was lost through the sky opening,
Koe potu fonua 'oe vavaa; Into the land of space;
Koe mole'anga ia 'oe vaka. That was the cause of the loss of

the vessel.

Clap!

Tupa!

i 'uta 'i he lepa.
335. Miss Baker translated this line as “stand to sea and ward off!” Tutu'u- 'i-tahi is a beloved pele "porpoise" in the sea whose other name in the poem is Longopoa (lines 28, 35). Tutu'u- 'i- tahi and Longopoa suggest that this pet fish is used by shark-catchers as a fakapoa "means of attracting the longo 'shoal of sharks". Its nature as liking to tutu'u "stand up" as if performing a "jumping" show that which this pet fish's real role is to call up the sharks closer to the shark-catchers' boat. 'Eua is Te-ula "the ingenious person" (lines 35-37), or Kae "The Shit" (lines 28, 35). The phrase is a reference of the Lo'au fishing-people (Lasakau in Fijian version, see Scarr 1976) being banished from Tonga for katpoo "surreptitiously eating of a catch", of Folaha
Longopoa mo Kae, ongo 'otua, Longopoa and Kae, two gods, 
Ha ongo siana koia e ula, Those two men were clever, 
Kuo maalie 'ena faka'uta. Well done their hunch. 
"Ha'u ta talia e tahi ka hu'a, "Come let us await the flooding 
Pea ta kakau ai kitaua, And we two swim in it, 
Taki taha kumi hano fonua." Each seeking a land of his own." 
Tupa! Clap!

Too hake 'a Kae 'ene kakau; Came up Kae from his swim; 
Tu'uta he motu ko Kanivatu, Landing at the island of Kanivatu, 
'Oku 'one'one 'ikai hakau. Was sandy with no reef. 
'Oku toka e tofua'a 'e valu, Aground were eight whales, 
Moe neiufi 'apee 'e teau. And neiufi fish about a hundred. 
"Hoto fakapoo, heto maumau! "Good gracious, what a waste! 
Na'a ma'u kita 'e he Kanivatu." I may be caught by the bird 
Kanivatu." 
Tupa! Clap!

Mohe Kae he vaha'a tofua'a. Slept Kae between two whales. 
Ha'u e manu 'ene siutaka. Came the bird from its fishing. 

and 'Eua, two offshore islands of main Tongatapu Island, as kai ta'e “eating shit”. Eua was executed to death and, Folaha, impoverished of its land.
Ta'omia Kae pea katakata, Lay under (it) Kae and smiled, “Toki 'iai ha manu kafakafa. "Was there ever such a bird enormous.

Ma'u hifo ma'a te mu'aavaka, I wish that I might seize it for my token,

Ke 'ilo 'e Tonga e me'a taha.” To let Tonga know one thing.”

Tupa! Clap!

Teitei mafoa mai e ata, Preparing the break of dawn, Tuutuufulu pea ‘aka’aka, Preening and stretching, Teitei puna pea kapakapa; Preparing to fly and fluttering; Piki ai Kae hono fatafata. Kae held on to its breast.

Siu pe manu he loto moana, Fished the bird over mid-ocean, Kae taaupe e fu'u tangata; While hanging the big man,336

Tepa hifo ki he 'one'one pata, Glancing down to the coarse sand, Fakatoopatuu 'i 'Aakana. Falling with a thud at 'Aakana337.

Pea 'alu ai 'ene uhu kava And went to get his morning kava Kia Sinilau, pea na takanga, With Sinilau, who befriended him,

Tupu ai hono mataatangata; And gave him social standing; Kae na'e 'ikai 'alofo ha kava. But Kae did not sit in a kava ring.

336. The sense of fu'u as "big" is consistently connected to Kae as a tu'a "commoner" (line 161) who had been made a mataapule "petty chief" (lines 67-68, 157).
337. 'Aakana, 'Aa'ana in 'Upolu, Western Samoa, as Ha'angana of Ha'ano Island in the eastern Ha'apai Group, where Sinilau dwelt. Fakatoopatuu 'i 'Akana is another expression of kuhu te 'elo patuu te 'emo "disliking the smell yet liking the taste", meaning though Sinilau disliked Kae's own bad smell he liked the taste of Kae's ingenious advice. It refers to Kae's fakatoopatuu "dropping of his big shit" (the Kanivatu, line 48) in 'Akana.
Clap!

**Tupa!**

- Fish of Samoa were fed,
- A longo'uli and a whale,
- Escorted to the turbid water to get unsettled.
- (Whale) caught by Samoa and cut,
- And brought its whole upper leg,
- Taken and hung in the house loft.
- The adopted daughter of Sinilau's father's sister
- Swallowed it then at a mouthful,
- And went away pregnant;
- Gave birth to twin (whales),
- Tonga and Tununga-tofua'a.

---

338 Miss Baker’s translation, “In a small muddy water hole which they unsettled”, excluded momoi. I am not sure whether the exclusion is a tactic style of translation or simply Miss Baker was not so sure about the word and its meaning.

339 Miss Baker translated alanga as “shoulder”. In accordance with my translation together with the previous line and the following line thus present an etymological derivation of Taulanga in the sense of the hung-up-cut-off whole upper leg as a form of “human offering” in the house loft, (see Tamasese 1994:73). This kind of offering is based on the brother-sister faka'apa'apa relationship principle. Somehow this “cut-off” tradition of the alanga is related to the birth of theanga “custom” of brother-sister faka'apa'apa or fakatapatapa, from tapa, as in tautapa, “urgent calling upon in need of immediate help”, of the sister to her brother especially in the time of war. In other words, the social origin of this custom is derived from the common practice of tama too he mehikitanga or ngaahi tama ‘a mehikitanga ‘child rearing of the mehikitanga [father’s sister] (line 76)’’. By means of this child rearing custom a habitual halanga “place used as a hala ‘path’” of legitimation of economic and political power common in the region of Tonga, Samoa, and Fiji has been erected with the alanga “leg” of the brother. The brother’s leg was snatched away by means of the sister then swallowing it in one mouthful, thus she is known as mehikitanga “taking hold of everything”. Alangafale “framework of house” means the posts (legs) on which rests the fale'ulu, see discussion in Chapter 2. Also related to this discussion is my theory of mehikitanga as tono “adultery”, implicated in the old custom of cross-cousin marriage of royalties.
Tupa!

Nofo ai Kae pea fie 'alu;
Dwelt there Kae and longed to go;
Fai 'ene tala kia Sinilau,
And he asked Sinilau,
"Ke 'omai ha maahanga tatau,
"To bring the twins alike,
Keu 'ai heka ange ai au,
For me to ride on,
Ke tala ki Tongatapu,
And I will tell Tongatapu,
Koe taulua 'a Sinilau
That the yoke of Sinilau's
Koe me'a malohi anga fau."
Is wonderfully strong."

Tupa!

Fai ai e tala 'e Sinilau,
Then spoke Sinilau,
"Tununga mo Tonga, ke mo fekau;
"Tununga mo Tonga, you go on an
errand; \(^{341}\)
'Ave 'a Kae ki Tongatapu,
Take Kae to Tongatapu, \(^{342}\)

---

\(^{340}\): The twin whales, Tonga and Tununga, refer to exact counterpart of social exchanges that went sour when Tonga ate the prohibited pungopunga or tutu ‘u “dolphin” and Tonga escaped, meaning, without the contents (lines 95-96) of the order from Sinilau of Samoa. Toonga is koloa “treasures” of mats and ngatu “tapa cloths”. What was consumed in Tonga refers to the stealing of the tambua (line 139).

\(^{341}\): In this context, the use of Tununga mo Tonga suggests a celestial object of voyage for Tonga from Samoa thus known as Tuukunga mo ‘o Tonga in the form of two pair of whales, the taulua (line 87), also means, the fakatoukatea “canoe formed of equal katea ‘portion’” in between stands Kae’s sleeping fale vaka “deck-house” (line 50).

\(^{342}\): Miss Baker translated these lines from here as thus-

"Take Kae to Tongatapu,
But remember to return for me.
Stand up and go.
Bring a bunch of coconuts and scented oil,
And uncolored tapa and coconut mats;
And leave satiated for our voyage,
Returning for me to come."

My translation tries to be consistent with the texts and the following explanation given of these lines on (Gifford 1924:149). It is a custom both in Samoa and Tonga of presents of coconuts, scented oil, tapa cloth, tapakau, being organised to give Kae as friend who leaves for his land after living among them for some time.
Pea mo 'iloa mai foki au. And by that means [Tongatapu] will recognize me.

Tutu'u leva 'o tofusi atu. Stand up at once and go.

'Omi e fuhi niu moe fangu, Bring a bunch of coconuts and

Moe feta'aki moe takapau; And unstained tapa cloth and coconut mats;

Ho tuku meesi ni 'etau folau, And leave merciful our voyage.

'Omia keu 'alu atu." Returning for me to come."

Tupa! Clap!

Ko Vava'u e, teletele vaka; Vava'u glided by;

Ha'apai e, teletele vaka; Ha'apai glided by;

Fotu Tongatapu i taumu'a na: Appeared Tongatapu at the prow:

"Tununga mo Tonga, ki he toa, "Tununga mo Tonga, to the shallow water,

Kau 'alu ki Ha'amea 'o tala, While I go to Ha'amea and tell,

'Oku ma oomai moe mahanga, That I have come with the twins,

Ko Tonga mo Tununga-tofua'a." Tonga and Tununga-tofua'a."

Line 93 implies Sinilau's wish that Tongatapu would take what he had done to Kae with great respect and be thankful. Lines 95 and 96 point to the two cultural significant plants, niu "coconut" and hiapo, siapo in Samoa, "paper-mulberry", the bark of which is used for making tapa cloth, the former as symbolising the male head provider of society and the latter the female skin-wrapper of society. These items given as kind-hearted presents to Kae stress his double social standing given in Sinilau's power.

Meesi "mercy" is manava 'ofa "kind-hearted", a theme that expects social interactions at all levels to be intact and active amongst the islands of the Pacific region. Sinilau already had the knowledge about the rebellious character of the Tongans, but because of Kae's ingenuity that Sinilau had to try and domesticate
Tupa!

Tu'uta Kae ‘o kave kalanga,
“Osi mai Ha’amea, ‘o mamata,
Mou taanaki huo to'o-alanga,
Fofoa kofe pea ‘aulala,
Ke tau toho na atu hoku vaka.”

Tupa!

Tu'uta Kae ‘o kave kalanga,
Landed Kae and kept shouting,
Come all Ha’amea and see,
Collect your spades for limb-
removal,344
Bamboo lancers and come in a
mass,
For us to drag out my vessel.”

Clap!

Pea hao ‘a Tonga ‘o tala.
And escaped Tonga and told.

Noto mai Sinilau ‘o fetapa,
Sat Sinilau and greeted,
“Tonga e, komaa ‘a Tununga?”
“Tonga, where is Tununga?”
“Me’a mai koe ki hoku tu’a;
“Observe you my back;
Ne fele e tao mei ‘olunga.
Cumbered with spears coming from
above.
‘Ikai ne taofia kimaua?
Were we two speared?345
Pea kuo mo’ua ai Tununga,
And Tununga was overtaken,
Kae hao mai Tonga koe ula.”
But escaped Tonga for he is

Kae with begging humbly. The use of this term could suggest therefore that the date of this composition is about 1850 early missionary.

344 Miss Baker translated this line as “collect your weeding sticks” based on a Tongan text of mou tanaki huo toalanga. The Tongan text given in Gifford’s collection has been misprinted.

345 Miss Baker translated the following two lines 118 and 119 as thus—
“It is thick with lances.
Were we two not challenged?”
Nofo Sinilau pea laaunga,
"Ha’amoa, taanaki e ‘otua,
Pea taanaki ki Hunga mo Hunga;
Pea mou langa kato ai mu’a,
‘Ae polopola ‘oku loua,
Pea fakakavei ‘o tui ua,
Fakalooloa ki mui mo mu’a,
Pea tuku leva koe fakahunga."

Tupa!

Sat Sinilau and complained,
“Samoa, call the gods,”
And assemble them at Hunga and Hunga;
And you plait a basket of coconut-leaves,
The two-layered food-tray,
With straps threaded twice,
Lengthen fore and aft,
And leave it as a Hunga basket.”

Miss Baker took taofia to be ta’ofia “to be held back”, thus having “challenged” in the translation. From here Sinilau’s complaint as translated by Miss Baker goes like this—
“Samoa, collect the gods,
And assemble at Hunga and Hunga;
And plait a basket first,
The large double basket,
With handles threaded double,
Made long fore and aft,
And call it a Hunga basket.”

Fakahunga, as the key word in Sinilau’s complaint (line 130), is commonly known as fakaua or fakakavei tui ua “to be done a second time”. The implication is that Kae was ordered to be brought back again to Samoa in the state where he is being threaded inside the plaited basket of fakahunga to the rear (of his legs) and to the front (of his head) to be fakata‘ane “sat with legs crossed” and tuutuukape “cursed” (lines 163, 164). Thus,
Pea fa’o ai ‘a Fangale’ounga,  
And fill in Fangale’ounga,  
Pea fa’o ai mo Hihifo fua,  
And fill in also all of Hihifo,  
Pea fakamui fa’o ‘a Napua,  
And lastly fill in Napua,  
Pea hili ai Kae ‘i ‘olunga.”  
And put there Kae on top.”  
Pea toki oo tu’unga ‘otua,  
And then went the gods,  
Kae ngalo e nifo ‘i loto Mu’a.  
But forgot the (whale’s) tooth at central Mu’a.  

Tupa!  
Clap!

“Sinilau, ko kimautolu eni;  
“Sinilau, here we are;  
‘Oku mau ‘omi ‘ae tangata ni.”  
We have brought this man.”  
Tu’u hake leva ‘o fakafeta’i.  
Stood at once (Sinilau) and gave thanks.  

“Tukuua hena kuo too mai;  
“Leave him there as you have brought him;  
Mou oo pea mou uhu mai;  
You go and come in the early morning;  
‘Oua ke ‘aho pea tau fai,  
Until day then we will deal with him,  
Ta na’e ha’u ko ‘ene lavaki.”  
Obviously he came to betray.”  

Tupa!  
Clap!

kato fakahunga alludes to kato polopola “plaited coconut basket as food-tray”. As kato of kavei tui ua and polopola is “basket” for Kae or ta’e “shit” on which Kae is being fa’o “put”.
Crowed the cocks-dreaming of,  

"Those cocks have voices like 

The pair of Sinilau."

Obviously he was wishing, 

While he was lying at nemesis of wrongdoing.

At early morn he looked out, 

And saw sitting there Sinilau with his turban on.

"This petty chief is a fool," 

Wearing turban on the head was a Fijian symbol of one as a champion. In this context the implication is that Sinilau by wearing turban on round his head indicates a sort of person who behaved like a bully and whose action as his name suggests that he by coercing kini "struck down" the lau "hair of the head" of others by fear. In Tongan legend, Sinilau is said to be a heroic attractive young man with who heroine Hina escaped and ran away. He must have been a Fijian bully-boy who dwelt in Ma'ufanga-Folaha area of the Fangakakau Lagoon. Two instances alluded to holataki "escape and run off with" in this area are, one, by Kinikiniilau of Ma'ufanga of moheof Tu'utangahunuhunu, daughter of Tu'ikanokupolu Atamata'ilā, and the other, by Tongatangitaulupekifolaha of Folaha of moheof Fusipala, daughter of Tu'ikanokupolu Mataeleha'amea. Folaha also means "to cut the Tu'itonga's hair".

Miss Baker's translation of this line is "whereas he was lying at (Sinilau's) boat shed". Alafolau as "boat shed" carries the original meaning of fale, as in fale faka-Mu'a, "wounded head snatched and fled away with". The action of wounding and taking away of the ruler's head, in this case of Kae, of wounding and
"Osi foki neu toka talaange, Especially after my telling him,
Naiaku fa’ee na’a mamate. Lest my mother be sterile.
Tapuange mo Tongatapu mo Kae, With all respect to Tongatapu, to
Kae,
Koe tu’a ena he vaka mamate. A commoner from a swamped
vessel.

‘Oku keli hono luo ‘i mala’e.” Is digging his grave at the yard.”
Pea toki ‘omi ‘o fakata’ane, And he was brought and sat with
legs crossed,
Kae fai kiai e tuutuukape. While he was cursed.

Tupa!

‘Omi he kumete ‘o fakatasilo. Brought the bowl and made clear

Nofo ai Tuununga pea kio, (the water).
Sat (up in it) Tuununga and
chirped,

Ka kuo ‘ikai naiono nifo. But he lacked one tooth.

“Pe koehaa koaa ke lilo! ‘What is that to conceal!
Toki fakamaau ‘oka melino I will arrange when at peace
Kae kehe ko Kae ke tuli sino.” While Kae is seeking a body.”

Tupa! Clap!

eating Sinilau’s fish, makes Kae a a la or hala “wrongdoer” who goes on a retributive folau “voyage” to his
death.
APPENDIX 3

(This is my re-translation of the translation by Beatrice Shirley Baker of the tradition of the Fua “Mullet” published in Edward Winslow Gifford’s Tongan Myths and Tales [1924:91-95] taken from the Koe Makasini ‘a Koliji, Vol. 2, pp. 156-158, 1875.)

The account of the Fua “Mullet” is a depiction of fua’a “jealousy” (line 6) developed between two sisters, ʻIla and Hava, who lived together as wives of a chief named Na’a-ʻa-namoana of Fungakupolu near Nukuhetulu, Tongatapu. ʻIla the favourite was toppled by her younger sister’s catch of mullets which then became Na’a’s favourite delicacy. Because of Na’a’s preference to love Hava, ʻIla had to trick Hava one night fishing to follow Hava to the secret cave where lived and reproduced the mullets. After Hava left the cave, ʻIla filled her basket but she was angry at the want of love of her younger sister that she opened the cave to let the fish come out and go. As a result of not being able to prevent the fish from going, Hava (of anger), Na’a (for his love of Hava), and ʻIla (feeling despair) all turned into stones standing together.
KOE FUA: KOE LAVE MEI METEVA'E

THE MULLET: THE CHANT FROM

METEVA'E

Fanongo mai e loto matala,

Listen you of enlightened minds,

Kau 'ai talanoa ki he fanga.

While I tell you a tale of the shore.

He fine nonofo 'a 'Ila mo Hava,

Two women that dwelt together 'Ila and Hava,

Ne 'unoho mo Na'a'anamoana.

They were wives of Na'a'anamoana.

Nonofo nonofo pea ke anga,

They dwelt together then quarrelled,

He me'a mamahi koe fua'a.

What a sorrowful thing is jealousy.

'Alaa!

Awaken!

Pea fai 'ena ha'iha'i ama,

They tied their torches together,

Ke na oo he fakangofua fanga.

At the annulment of the tapu of the shores.

Hiki hake pea taki taha hala;

Each lifted her torch and went her own road;

Pea 'alu 'a 'Ila he loto fanga.

And went 'Ila to the middle of the

350. Baker's translation is "The consequence: the chant of Meteva 'e", taken from the sense of fua as "consequence" of anger of the old couple who owned the cave where lived and reproduced the mullets in the discovery by the people of the village of their secret food supply. The couple chased the fish from the cave to
Pea 'alu 'a Hava he 'au tafa, And went Hava arriving at a crevice,
Pea ha'u leva ia 'o tatala, And she came and opened it,
'O lau 'e ia ha ava'i paka; She thought that it was a crab hole;
Sio hifo ki he ika 'ene nganga; Looking down she saw the fish gaping;
'Omi 'ene kato pea fakamanga, She brought her basket and opened wide,
'O fili ki ai e ika kakafa, And selected the large fish,
Pea hiki hake 'ene 'efihanga; And she lifted up her load;
Fie ma'uma'u ki he 'ohoana. Wishing to get the affections of her husband.
Ka ko Veiuu 'eni 'a e fanga, At Veiuu the name of the shore,
Na'e ai e vai moe 'ana. There was the pool and the cave.
 'Ala'a! Awaken!

Pea 'alu 'a 'Ila 'i he loto tahi; And 'Ila went in the middle of the sea;
Ka ka 'alu 'a Hava 'i he tafa'aki, While Hava went along the beach,
Pea mei tamate'i 'ene ahi, And nearly out was her torch,
Ka ka foki ki mui 'o 'eteaki. When she turned back and was

the ocean consequently filling it with mullets. Tradition of faa really is about the “mullets” that do carry inside their stomachs the “yellow roes” look-alike of the lump of blood as the sacred foetus.
Pea ha'u leva ia 'o tangaki,  
careful.

'Omi 'ene kato pea fakatali,  
And then she ('lla) came and opened the hole,

'O fili kiai e ika lalahi,  
And brought her basket and held it up,

Pea fai mo 'ene taliaki:  
When done then she said:

"Ha'u koe ika 'o 'alu ki tahi,  
"Come fish and go into the sea,

He me'a mamahi e u'akai!"  
It is grievous to be greedy!"

'Alaa!  
Awaken!

Hu atu 'a Hava 'o pulupulu;  
Entered (the house) Hava and wrapped up;

Fanongo mai ia 'ae 'u'ulu;  
Heard the noise of something in motion;

Pea hu ki tu'a 'o tumutumu,  
Went outside and wondered,

Tuva'e mo ke langa tu'u:  
Standing up and complaining:

Toki ai hao'anga e pau'u.  
Were there ever such mischievous ways.

Kuo fonu e kato pea pupunu.  
Filled the basket then closed it.

'Tofusi ki mu'a 'o hele tutu'u,  
Run to the front and cut off,
Toho mai Kanatea mo Nuku,
Faloo mai mo Nukuhetulu
Ke fema'utaki mono pupunu,
Kalo e ika he potu 'o Futu,
'A e ne leke ai Mokohunu.

'Alaa!

Na'e mei toho mai e Toa;
Kalo e ika he fakatonga,
'A e ne leke ai Lifuka;
Pea leke ai Faihavataa,
Pea moe fanga he Fatufala.

'Alaa!

Toho mai 'a Ha'aloausi;
Kalo e ika he potu vai,
'A e ne leke ai 'Umusii.
Ne ofi he maka Tu'ungasili,

Pulled Kanatea and Nuku,
And stretched out also Nukuhetulu
For them to meet to close up the
passage,
Turned the fish to the direction of
Futu,
Which caused the inlet at
Mokohunu.
Awaken!

Was nearly dragged along the
casuarina tree;
But the fish turned southerly,
Which caused the inlet at Lifuka;
And the inlet at Faihavataa,
And the beach at Fatufala.
Awaken!

Pulled out Ha'aloausi;
Turned the fish to the other side of
the water,
Which caused the inlet at 'Umusii.
Near to the stone called
Afterwards called by the name Tu'i.
Awaken!

Pulled along Houmatoloa,
And Tongololoto and Fonuamo.
Pulled along Mata'aho and it went along aground;

Turned the fish (and swam) to the south;

Which caused the inlet at Fetoa,
And the inlet at Faihavafoa.

Turned the fish and swam about in play,
And made their home at Folokotoa.

Pulled and pulled till it was day:
And called to her relations:

At Ngau'unoho and Fasi'a,

"There are the fish, you receive them"
While I turn into a stone."

'Alaa! Awaken!

Nukunukumotu ko 'ena e fua,

Nukunukumotu there is the fua.\(^{351}\)

He 'oku kakave 'e he tahi hu'a.

It is taken away by the high tide.

Ka hili 'a Mulimu mo Houma.

After Mulimu and Houma.

Pea pa ha ui ki 'Olunga;

Then send a call to 'Olunga.\(^{352}\)

Pale mai e folau tafua

Then paddle the fleet of small canoes.

Ha'ele ai 'eiki ki Mu'a.

And the chief will go to Mu'a.

Ko'ena e ika kuo ha 'uta:

The fish that have escaped into the lagoon:

Ka hao 'anai, ka hao ki tu'a,

If they escape presently, if they escape into the sea,

Pea vete ai homou fonua.

Then conquered will be your land.

'Alaa! Awaken!

"Ha'afakanapa mo Ha'amatangi, "Ha'afakanapa and Ha'amatangi.\(^{353}\)

\(^{351}\) Again, Baker translated fua in this line and the next line as “measure”, thus Nukunukumotu this is the measure, To widen out at the high tide. It should be clear from line 81 that fua in line 75 is a ika “fish”.

\(^{352}\) 'Olunga or Ma'olunga “Up” is reference to the home of the Tu' i Tonga at Lapaha in Mu'a (line 80). 'Uta “land” and ('olunga “up” are two different ways of saying the same thing. So, 'uta and lunga are doublets. As opposed to lalo “down, below”, which is vao “uncultivated bushland”, 'uta is the cultivated land. The tradition of fua is a topographical description of the coastal small vao tracts of fishfolks in the lagoon area who mainly fish for 'Olunga. Kauhala'uta moiety is mainly land cultivators whereas Kauhalalalo sea fishermen. Interrelationship between marriage and stealing between the two moieties is women of the former marrying to the men of the latter, men of the latter stealing food from the former. But, in the case of women,
Ko'ena e ika ke talia mai, There are the fish for you to keep back,

He 'oku velenga 'i hono mamahi, Is pained to the uttermost,

He fie fanau ki honau 'api." With the wish to give birth in their home."354

'Alaa! Awaken!

Mai 'a 'IIa, mai 'a Hava? Where is 'IIa, where is Hava?355

Ko fe 'a Na'a'anamoana? And where is Na'a'anamoana?

Kuo hao e ika 'i he mamaha, The fish have escaped in the ebbing tide,

Kuo hili moe funga Manavanga; They have gone passed Manavanga356.

like this story of the fua, marrying to men of "up", there is always jealousy, leading on to ana "quarrel" (line 5) between the concubines.

353. Ha'a'akanaapa and Ha'amatangi are both tracts of Tungii in Tatakomotonga suggest that the use of 'uta in line 81 is reference of that end part of the lagoon area, namely, Tatakomotonga, 'Alaki, Holonga, Malapo, Vaini, and Longotome, as "inland", with the warning that their land will be plundered if the fish get away (lines 82-83).

354. Baker translated this line as "With the wish for children in their home", based on the text faanau "children". The warning is related to a tonotama "stealing of an adopted child of another (Hava's to Na'a, a Tu'i Aana of Samoa [lines 56-58]) as one's own ('IIa to Tu'i 'Aahau [lines 101-105])". 'IIa is short for Tohu'ia, daughter of Ama ia Pesetaa, (Pesetaa of Ma'ufanga who has the title Kama), who adopted the boy, Ngata, for Tu'i Ha'atakalaua Mo'ungaatonga. Ama's adopted daughter, Poto Taumulime'ia, said to have a taumuli "backside" of i'a "fish", looks to be the Tohu'ia in the Tongan version. With the stolen boy, they built the first local ruling order with chief 'Ahome'e of Hihiho. (See descendants of Ama ia Fiamee in Kramer [1994:327-328]). Muilimu (line 77) looks to be Tuiilimu, young brother of Ama ia Fiamee, Ha'a'afakanapa (line 85) to be Sa'anapu in war with son of Ama ia Pesetaa, Ameteolepala, another son of Ama ia Pesetaa, to be Meteva'e, a connection to the nickname of the people of Fitiuta, home of the Taetagalaloa Folasa le i'ite in Manu', as vaepapala "stench foot" (Kramer 1994:510), thus mete, Fijian mbete, or pete "rash" and pala have correspondent meaning. The lagoon area is the place of stealing and intermarriages between the Aana vao invaders and the local 'uta people.

355. Baker translated this line as "Where is 'IIa, where is Hava?" is based on the story teller wondering of the where about of these people. It is indicative form of frustration and anxiety of the mind as shown in line 101. Turning into stones (line 73) is form of suicide as the inevitable and acceptable action to do because of the impact of shame upon these people's kinrelations. Shame culture has been a tradition of this lagoon area, especially Folaha, thus the stone of Tapuhia.
Prepare to cast the net from Ma'ufanga.

Awaken!

Tell them to let the fish go,

They have passed Mounu and 'Utupatu:

And entered the deep ocean;

Prepare to cast the net from Ha'atafu.

Awaken!

Tell them to let the fish go,

They have passed Mounu and 'Utupatu:

And entered the deep ocean;

Prepare to cast the net from Ha'atafu.

Awaken!

Oh the mind of the fish!

It lived like a chief,

And was prepared her child and went;

As a present to Tu'i 'Aahau.

Then increased there and returned.

Awaken!

Baker’s translation, “they have the place Manavanga”, is suspicious, because she translated line 97 in the same way I do with this line. Both lines have the same structure. Manavanga is a dangerous passage on the way by sea from Nuku'alofa to Mu'a, proverbially, it is lost forever if you fall into it. So, Baker’s translation, as indicated by the previous line 92, heralds a successful fleeing through the danger of Manavanga only because the tide was ebbing away. What is dubbed proverbially must be a danger condition only when it is high tide. Funga Manavanga, Manavanga coming up to funga “the surface” of the water, is another expression of mamaha “ebbing tide”.

----

356
APPENDIX 4

(This is my edited version of this chant composed by Tutui and translated by Beatrice Shirley Baker in Gifford, Tonga Place Names, 1923:8-11, and edited by Futa Helu357.)

The significance of this poem to the thesis is the relevance of the lagoon and the small offshore islands of Tongatapu as a map to the myths considered such as the origin myth of 'Aho'eitu and Folau ki Pulotu and as a specific reference, for example, to certain custom of asking for a piece of land in old days (line 58) used in my analysis of the origin myth of the coconut.

KOE NGAAHI MOTU 'O TONGATAPU: KOE LAVEOFO
(THE ISLANDS OF TONGATAPU: THE WONDER-CHANT)

Ke fanongo mai ee kanokano na Listen, oh, alto singers
Kau lave motu pe te ke 'iloa I will sing of the islands and see if
you know them
Ki homautolu Fangalongonoa About our own Fangalongonoa358
Ne fua 'i 'Onevai he totoka It was first at 'Onevai of peaceful

357 Helu used this chant in a paper he presented at the University of Hawaii in 1986 on the theme of laumaatanga "pride of locality" in Tonga. See Mahina 1992:245-249
Koe motu lelei ia 'o Tonga
That is the best island of Tonga

Lata'anga 'oe fakahakonoa
Where the chiefs loved to go for pleasure trips

Angi 'ae matangi Tonga
Blow ye south wind

He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!
He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!

He-he-i-a-he-he-a!
He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

Mokotu'u 'ena, mo Velitoa
Mokotu'u there and Velitoa

Hanghee ha vakatou kuo hola
Like a vessel that has absconded

'Ae toomohopo 'a Malinoa
The falling and rising of Malinoa

'Oka tu'u matahavili 'a Tonga
When Tonga stands menaced by strong winds

Angi 'ae matangi Tonga
Blow ye south wind

He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!
He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!

He-he-i-a-he-he-a!
He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

Velitoa'ihifo mo Monuafe
Velitoa-west and Monuafe

Ngata mei Tanoa mo Fele'ave
Ending with Tanoa and Fele'ave

Na'a 'ita 'i loto 'oe punake
Lest becomes angry the mind of

358. Baker's translation: "yonder the beach of Fangalongonoa"
359. "it was made by 'Onevai to be calm"
360. "the place allures for a pleasure trip". Fakahakonoa as "pleasure trips" is poetic for the family custom of fakahako "to cause to have descendants".
He’eku vikia ‘ae mata hangale
Because I praise the coast of
hangale trees

Kau foki pee au ki Hahake
I will return to the east district

Angi ‘ae matangi Tonga
Blow ye south wind

He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!
He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!

He-he-i-a-he-he-a!
He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

Ko ‘Ata koe motu’a fonua
‘Ata is the oldest land

Mo ‘Eueiki pea mo ‘Eua
And ‘Eueiki and ‘Eua

Na’e fusi ‘e Maui ki ‘olunga
Were pulled up by Maui

Ko Kalau, e motu ngali niua
Kalau, an island appearing to have
plenty of coconuts

Ne feke’i ai ‘ae ongo ‘otua
Quarrelled over by two gods

Ta koe fingota e fiemu’a
Why it was a shellfish and cunning

Kuo tuku hono nge’esi ‘i ‘uta
Which left its empty shell on shore362

Ka ka ‘alu ‘o heke telefua
While it went and crawled naked

Angi ‘ae matangi Tonga
Blow ye south wind

He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!
He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!

He-he-i-a-he-he-a!
He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

361. "when Tonga stands facing the wind"
362. "And left its empty shell on shore"
Ko Lotuma mo Folokolupe  Lotuma and Folokolupe
Ko Lekiafaitau nofo pe  Lekiafaitau stands tucked away here\textsuperscript{363}
Tangaloa e tu'u makehe pe  There stands Tangaloa apart\textsuperscript{364}
Ko Puleniafi mo Ongolate  Puleniafi and Ongolate
Angi 'ae matangi Tonga  Blow ye south wind
He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!  He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!
He-he-i-a-he-he-a!  He-he-i-a-he-he-a!
Nukuhe'elili pea mo Nuku  Nukuhe'elili and Nuku\textsuperscript{365}
Na'e hola ki ai 'ae nofo huu  Fled there the refugee\textsuperscript{366}
'Oka mohe hake e Faka'tupu  When the Cannibal went to sleep there\textsuperscript{367}
Ki he hoko 'oe toenga 'umu  To finish the 'umu remains

\textsuperscript{363} “Lekiafaitau stands here”
\textsuperscript{364} “There stands Tangaloa sliding”. Translating makehe with “sliding” must have been a simple mistake, taking the text as paheke instead.
\textsuperscript{365} “Nuku, Hee, Lili, and to Nuku”
\textsuperscript{366} “Fled there the suer for pardon”
\textsuperscript{367} “When the Creator went to sleep above”. Baker’s and Helu’s translations do not clash but both saying the same idea. In connection to my discussion of this notion of hoko “join” (in the next line) in chapter 2, the traditional sense of Faka'tupu here as “cannibal-creator” is taken by Baker as the god “Creator” in the bible and, by Helu as “Cannibal”. Faka'tupu originates from the sense of kai “eating” as fa'i “having sex”. Mohe in the line also means “having sex”. Thus, creation as “engaging in sex” is the woman partaking in “eating” or folo “swallowing” the hii “sacred child, sperm”. In the next line, hoko 'oe toenga 'umu should literally translated as “join [in sex] of the ‘umu remains”.

Angi 'ae matangi Tonga  Blow ye south wind
He-e-i-a-ho-la! He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!
He-he-i-a-he-he-a! He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

Ko Pangaimotu mo Makaha'a
The islands Pangaimotu and Makaha'a

Tu'u mai 'ae motu ko Fafaa
And springs up the island of Fafaa

Na'e fai ai 'ae taa maka
The cutting of stone was done there

'O uta ki Langi Taetaea
And taken (the stones) to the royal tomb Taetaea

Moe 'otu langi fua 'o Mu'a
And all the royal tombs at Mu'a

Angi 'ae matangi Tonga
Blow ye south wind

He-e-i-a-ho-la! He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!
He-he-i-a-he-he-a! He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

Niuui, hoo ke fakafofofo! Niuui, displaying defiance for the swelling up

Na'e tala hinoa 'i he fono
Your name was told at the council

368 Both Baker and Helu translate this line as “And stands forward the island of Fafaa”. My translation of tu'u mai as “springs up” is connected to the idea of Fafaa further away from Pangaimotu and Makaha'a and as well from the main island of Tongatapu, that Fafaa only barely appears.

369 Both Baker and Helu translate this line as “Niuui/Niu'ui, you are beautiful!” My translation given is based on my interpretation of the whole stanza as about an old method of tala 'api “asking for land”, also known as niu ui “calling [with] coconuts (already planted)”. The poet here is bringing a case of “calling
Pea mao ai e lea ki loto
And penetrated the words into the meeting

"Oku ia 'ae niu fuongongoo"
"That is mine the coconuts of large size"

Ta 'oku 'ikai ha fo'i ngono
But there are not even young nuts

Angi 'ae matangi Tonga
Blow ye south wind

He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!
He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!

He-he-i-a-he-he-a!
He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

'Ooneata fetaki mo Manima
'Ooneata is hand in hand with Manima

Kau a'a keu mohe ki Faasi'a
While I ford to go and sleep at Faasi'a

'O mamata he lafo'i 'oe ika
To watch the throwing of the nets for the fish

'Oku 'alu kovi, koe mala'ia!
The catch is not good, there must be a curse!

Ta koe 'inasi pe ia
Yet that may be the willed portion

coconuts" that was not done the proper way and, as a result, the land stealer ended up having fakaofooro
"swelling abdomen".
370. "Your name was told at the proclamation".
371. "And penetrated the words into the mind".
372. "There are there coconuts of large size".
373. "If it goes wrong, it is accursed!" This translation of Baker would be correct if the Tongan text was 'oku 'alu kovi, koe mala'ia!
Angi 'ae matangi Tonga
Blow ye south wind

He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!
He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!

He-he-i-a-he-he-a!
He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

Kuo puli ai 'a Ngaa’unoho
Which causes Ngaa’unoho to disappear

Pe ha 'esi pe muitolotolo
Is it mound or promontory?[^375]

Nukunukumotu mo Fu’umilo
Nukunukumotu and Fu’umilo

Ko hai e a’a moe ‘ungakoo?
Who will ford on the spiny ‘ungakoo?[^376]

Utuloa, pe ha ‘esi pe ha motu
Utuloa, is it a mound or is it an island

Nukunave pea Motu Fo’ou
Nukunave and the New Island

Ne lele’i fakafuonounou
It only takes a short time[^377]

Koe vaka e ka ‘alu ki motu
There is a vessel that will go to the

[^374]: “But that is the portion”.
[^375]: “And only the mound at the promontory is seen”.
[^376]: “Who will ford with the spiny ‘ungakoo?” ‘Ungakoo is a small sessile animal with spines dangerous to human feet (Gifford 1923:9). Churchward (1959:573) records it as “small shell-fish with long sharp projections (not edible)”.
Ki Mounu ki he taumafa fonu

To the reef Mounu to fish for the
king's turtle

Angi 'ae matangi Tonga

Blow ye south wind

He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!

He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!

He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

Ko Motutala mo Mata'aho

Motutala and Mata’aho

Ha’angakafa ne mei ngalo

Ha’angakafa was nearly forgotten

Ta'akite feangai mo Moho

Ta'akite opposite to Moho

Na’e tu’u ai ‘ae toa ongo

There stood the casuarina tree of
sounds

Na’e holo ai pee e ‘ao

Over which the clouds passed in
quick succession

Angi ‘ae matangi Tonga

Blow ye south wind

He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!

He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!

He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

Ko Niumotu’u mo Nukulave

Niumotu’u and Nukulave

377. Both Baker and Helu translate this line as “Which was only nice a short time”, taking the Tongan text of Ne lelei fakafuonounou. The stanza is about a fishing boat for the king’s turtle that goes to Mounu reef passing Utuloa, Nukunave, and Motu Fo’ou that only lelei fakafuonounou “takes a short time”.

378. “To the reef Mo’unu for the chief’s turtle”. Motu is translated as “reef” and “island”.

376
Pea tolu'aki Vaomaile

E motu ko Fanakava'a'otua

Na'e tu'u pee 'i he loto Kouta

Angi 'ae matangi Tonga

He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!

He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

Tongomotu pea mo Ngofonua!

Namolimu e tu'u potu ki 'uta

Na'e tu'u ai e hamatefua

Na'e 'uli 'o taaimu'omu'a

Angi 'ae matangi Tonga

He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!

He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

Muikuku feangai mo Nahafu

E motu lelei ko Mo'ungatapu

And Vaomaile makes a third

The island of Fanakava'a'otua

Which stood in the middle of Kouta

Blow ye south wind

He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!

He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

Tongomotu and Ngofonua!

Namolimu stands nearest the shore

There stood a single hulled canoe

Which sailed and took the lead

Blow ye south wind

He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!

He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

Muikuku which stands opposite Nahafu

A delightful island is Mo'ungatapu

379. "Which stood in the middle of the mangroves". Kouta is large pool that dries up in dry weather.
380. "There stood there a small sailing canoe".
Na'e nofo ai Putukafatau
There dwelt Putukafatau

Ko si'ono motu too 'i he hau
His island given to him by the ruler

Angi 'ae matangi Tonga
Blow ye south wind

He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!
He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!

He-he-i-a-he-he-a!
He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

Ko Nuku mo Kanatea ta'e'ofa
Nuku and Kanatea unkind

Na'e nofo ai Mapafieto'a
There dwelt Mapafieto'a

Na'a ne tau'i Tu'i Lalotonga
He fought the Tu'i Lalotonga

Na'e 'ikai tali mai ka ka hola
Who did not wait for him but fled

Angi 'ae matangi Tonga
Blow ye south wind

He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!
He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!

He-he-i-a-he-he-a!
He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

Lau ai moe motu ko Pakola
Count also the island of Pakola

Na'e tu'u pe 'ikai 'iloa
Which appeared and then disappeared

'I he muivai 'o Veitoloa
At the end of the pond of Veitoloa

381. Baker and Helu translated this line as “Which sailed and struck Mu’omu’a”. They mistook the compound word, taaimu’omu’a, as ta’i “to strike” and Mu’omu’a, a place. This stanza is about a berthing place of a leader’s canoe.

382. “His poor island given to him by the ruler”

383. “Nuku and Kanatea the unkind”

384. “Counting in the island of Pakola”

385. “At the end of the water of Veitoloa”
Koe nofo'anga 'oe Tu'i Tonga

Angi 'ae matangi Tonga
He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!
He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

Fakimamana te mau tala

Koe'uhi pe ko hono hingoa-
Ka kuo 'ikai hono tu'unga
Na'e tu'u 'i 'Atele he puna
Ne holoki 'i he tau 'otua

The dwelling place of a Tu'i Tonga
Blow ye south wind
He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!
He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

Fakimamana we will mention
Because of its name-
Why it has no place
It stood at 'Atele at the spring
Then it was thrown down in the war of the gods

Angi a'e matangi Tonga
He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!
He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

Blow ye south wind
He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!
He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

Vakautaika, Vakautanguu

Na'e tu'u 'i he fanga 'i Pahu
Ke fanongo mai ho maau
Koe ngata'anga ia 'oe motu
Ka 'ikai tau'i pea ke huu

They stood at the beach of Pahu
Listen to me you, poet
These are all the islands
If not contested, then sue for

386. "It stood at Atele then flew away". Punu means "to fly" and "spring".
Angi 'ae matangi Tonga
Blow ye south wind

He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!
He-a-e-i-a-ho-la!

He-he-i-a-he-he-a!
He-he-i-a-he-he-a!

387. "The vessel that sank the fish and the vessel loaded with yams". Baker's translation was based on the texts, Vakangotoika, Vakautanguu.
APPENDIX 5

(This is my edited version of Miss Beatrice Shirley Baker’s translation from the Tongan of a tale recorded by the Rev. Dr. J. E. Moulton in Gifford, *Tongan Myths and Tales*, 1924:181.)

**HINA AND THE ORIGIN OF THE COCONUT**

_Kaloafu mo Teuhie,_
Lau foki ko'ena tama pele,
Pea ta koe fa'ahikehe.
Hoko vale 'i hona manavahee.

_Tupaheo!_  
Beat quickly!

'Ona hopo he moana vavale.
Koe tuna ne hola ki Ha'amoa
'O nofo he Vaiola 'o Hina;

_Nofonofono Hina pea feitama._  
By-and-by _Hina_ became

---

388 Baker’s translation: “They fled into the foaming sea”. _Moana vavale_ literally means “slimy deep sea”.
389 Baker’s translation: “The eel went to Samoa”.
390
"Hina ee! ke tala hao tangata
Kohai?" "Ko Tuna Olemalama."
Hiki mai 'a Ha'amoa o tata,
Pea nau ohuohu pea maha;
Pea hiki hake a tuna o tafa,
Tafa pe mo kai 'a loi'mata.
"Hiki mai e 'ulu ma'aku na'a,
Pea tanutanu he tanu'anga."
Poo nima pea malangalanga:
Mu'a hifo e toume moe kaka;
Koe me'a hulu 'ena keina;
Pea moe niu pulu ma'am'a
Koe me'a fa lolo 'ena tama;
Ta hono sino koe fale fakaho'ataa.

pregnant.

"O Hina! you tell your man
Who?" "It's Eel the human being."
Came all Samoa and cleaned,
And bailed the pool till it was empty;
Lifted out the eel and cut (to pieces),
Cutting up while she cries.
”Bring here the head for me please,”
And bury it in the burying-place.”
For five nights and then it appeared:
First came the spathe and fibre;
It was plentiful the way they grew;
And the coconuts with light husks
Were for making oil for their child;
Cut down its body for a sun shelter.

390 Baker’s translation: “And lived in Hina’s water of life.”
391 Baker’s translation: “Bring here the head for me.”
392 Baker’s translation: “Nights five passed and then it appeared:”
393 Baker’s translation: “First came leaf pod and fibre;”
394 Baker’s translation: “It was wonderful the way it grew;”
395 Baker’s translation: “Were heavy with oil for their child;”
396 This is the important line about the connection between the coconut tree, originated from the eel’s head, and fale as are shelters. The body of the fale, from the floor to the roof, is all coconut materials. And, vice versa, the body of the coconut tree is a standing tuna on its lower part while from its head growing leaves and spathe of coconuts. When the body of the coconut tree (tuna) is cut down for fale construction (food) the coconut (head) makes contact with the earth and grows again.
APPENDIX 6

(This *lakalaka* was composed by Her Majesty Queen *Salote Tupou* III and translated by *Futa Helu*. This is the story about the stealing and bringing into Tonga of the 'uno/uho "kava" [line 4] found in Samoa [line 14], of the ceremony of the *taumafa kava* "drinking of the kava/ngafa ‘duties’ and eating of the fono ‘food’" [lines 28-35].)

*SANGONE*  

No wonder the south was freshening

And lightening lashed the western skies

In thunders roared the *Feingakotone*

‘Twas the unloading of the shell of *Sangone*

*Ha! Ha! Lafaipana e pe’ike mohe aa*  
*Ha! Ha! sleep well Lafaipana*

*Ha! Ha! kae tuku mai aa si’oto faiva*  
*Ha! Ha! to me the crown you’ve*
‘E Ulamoleka poto ‘i he lau

Oh Ulamoleka you man of many words

Hono ‘ikai ke malie kia au

How sweetly to me they sound

Ho‘o tala ‘ae vaha mama‘o

Prophesying that vast distances shall

Kuo vaofi hotau ‘aho

Come together one and all

Kakala talaa kakala mo‘oni

High ranking flowers, real flowers

‘Oku laifio toki manongi

Blended together in perfumes supreme

Kisu kava e mei Ha‘amoa

Kava cast from Samoa

Na‘e talihapo he me’a kotoa

But none was allowed to fall

Kisu e fufuu-mo-kokohu

Now, there’s a fufuu-mo-kokohu

‘Ae kau poongia-‘i-vao

The kau-poongia-‘i-vao

‘Ae lou tangia-mo-kokii

The lou tangia-mo-kokii

Pea moe kapakau tatangi

And the kapakau tatangi

Kau ai e ngulungulu-mo-tokoto

The ngulungulu-mo-tokoto including

Moe vahe taumafa ‘oe fono

And fono at kava distributing

Pea toki ‘ilo ai e koloa

Then the treasure was found

Koe kanokato e tala ‘o Tonga

The inmost content of Tonga’s traditions

Talu ai pe hono fakaili

Since then it’s been in jealous
cherishing

Proud vestments for our hou'eiki

An expert would certainly know

The outcome of Takaipomana

Kalía of the vast open sea, but

finally came to 'One

Bonito fishing on the way at

Siangahu

Raising its head a denizen of the deep

Came up on land at Fonuamotu

The bonito are surfacing at Hakautapu

Tying on to the sacred koka

Such grand finale I'm talking about

I proudly relate in hot contention

Let's string falahola for they fastly ripen

The vaha'akolo with women and men
APPENDIX 7

(This is my own edited version of Queen Salote’s poem of Peato and of ‘Okusitino Mahina’s translation of it. The poem is about Queen Salote’s war with Sioeli Pangia, who is symbolised as a Peato “Pieta”, and, as well, with Catholicism, the religion of the Tu’i Tonga dynasty. Queen Salote is taking Sioeli Pangia as an offender [line 4] challenging her reign by eating surreptitiously some food without giving it to her first [lines 14, 24]. She banishes Sioeli Pangia from Tonga back to his origin [line 36].)

PEATO

Tapu ange mo ‘etau fakataha
‘ae ‘alo’i na pea moe taka
ka maheikau atu ‘ae tala
koe hia ka ‘oku ‘i Fanakava

teu talanoa ka mou silapa

My deep respect to our meeting

to the ‘alo’i and the wanderer

if worn-out the announcement

it is the offender in Fanakava

I shall relate while you articulate

397. Mahina’s translation is "sacred be our celebrated gathering"
398. "for both circle of chiefs and strangers"
399. "lest this verse goes astray"
ki he 'oomeka 'oe 'emalata
koe tamatou he na'e fafa
pea moe kakala too 'i hala
na'e tuitu'u pea lavalava
koe tui 'ae ongo Ha'angana

about the omega of the emerald
an unweaned child for he was carried
and a kakala falling into
once a tuitu'u and a lavalava
the plait of the two Ha'angana

koe Sina'e 'oku ne tala
ko 'ena e lopa 'oe Hifofua
lolotonga no'o 'i he 'ovava
'o tau he langi taetaea

it is the Sina'e who warns
there is the rope of the Hifofua
still berthing at the 'ovava
and tied to the langi taetaea

koe Peato fatangu ke 'aa
pea tu'u 'a Filimoemaka
he 'oku matangi si'ono vuna

it is the Peato, wake him up
and Filimoemaka is standing
for his vuna is stormy

---

400. "the wrongdoer has been to Fanakava". Sioeli Pangia, the offender, is seeking refuge in Fanakava from Queen Salote.
401. "I shall talk but you interpret".
402. "about the omega and emerald". Sioeli Pangia is the emerald who has come to an end.
403. "yes, the Tamatou was carried on the back".
404. "and the kakala dropped along the way"
405. "yes, it was strung while walking and worn"
406. "a plaited-kakala by the two Ha'angana"
407. "and the Sina'e who tells"
408. "it's now tied at the 'ovava". The translations of this line and the next are mixed up by Mahina and Taumoepefolau (2004:263) as I have suggested above. Hifofua refers to Taufa'ahau's boat, berthing at 'Ovava, the dock area in Lapaha where a big banyan tree by the bank, with its rope tied up to the highest ranking tomb of all the Tu'i Tonga tombs. Taufa'ahau won the war, meaning he now owns the head of the Tu'i Tonga residence in Lapaha.
409. "and berthed at Langi Taetaea"
410. "there is the Peato, wake him up"
he taapuaki monuu'ia
what advantageous privileges

'ae hou'eiki 'i Falefaa
these hou'eiki 'i Falefaa

'o falala he koka nofo'anga
to depend on the koka nofo'anga

he na'e mana pea 'uhila takai
it thundered and lightened all

kae taakatu'u 'a hoku loto
while my mind looked at it with

pea u fifili koe haa nai?
curiosity

'ekte 'e he paa 'a Ha'angongo
and I wonder what's that for

pea tala 'e he moli ko mamali
the claim of the enclosure of

koe naanunga hotau 'aho
Ha'angongo

he koe popoto mo manu fekai
for the moli ko mamali informs

koe fetaa'aki 'ae helo
that the characteristic way of

today

kata pe hoku 'atamai
since it is friendship with a

ravenous animal

it is the hero's fighting with foils

my mind just laughs

411. “and stand you Filimoemaka”
412. “for it has been fair winds”
413. “as the blessed luck”
414. “of chiefs to the Falefāa”
415. “leaning on the sitting-investing koka”
416. “it was thunder and lightening around”
417. “with worries unsettling my heart”
418. “and I wondered what and why?”
419. “asked by the shield of Ha’angongo”
420. “and told by the moli ko mamali”
421. “the observance of today’s celebration”
422. “like befriended to ravenous animals”
423. “it is the rivals of the heroes”
424. “but I smile in my mind”
he‘eku ‘ofa ‘i he Vaha‘akolo
‘i he ‘ikale ‘o e ‘ataa
pea moe laione le‘o Tongafuesia
he ‘oku ‘ikai tau mai ‘a ‘Aakiheuho
ke mo takitaha ‘o heka ai
ka tau folau he kuo hako
‘o muia e Kapakau ‘o Tafahi
ka kumi ‘a Tofua mo Kao
fuipaa ke taumu’a kiai
‘o fetau he tatau-mo-‘alo
ke mo ‘eva fa‘iteliha ai
kau lave ‘o tu‘ulaahoko
‘o vakai ha tafatafa‘akilangi
‘o salute ki he manuao

425. “my love for Vaha‘akolo”
426. “and the eagle flying above”
427. “and the guarding-lion Tongafuesia”
428. “‘Aakiheuho is not at the dock”
429. “that you each take and ride on”
430. “but let’s voyage for it’s gusty”
431. “and follow Kapakau‘otofahi”
432. “searching for Tofua and Kao”
433. “Fuipaa to which we steer”
434. “and rival at Tataumu‘alo”
435. “therein you two freely walk about”
436. “while I steer away from the wind to set sail”
437. “looking for the tafatafa‘akilangi”
438. “and saluting to the man-o-war”
ka ai ha vaka 'e fie folau
‘unu ke mama’o he kaupeau
he ‘ikai teke ola he ta’au
koe fakapoo he Lomipeau
‘aa he! ‘aa he! tama faka’ofa

if there is any boat wager to sail
keep away from the waves
for you will not survive the wake
I feel pity for the Lomipeau
alas! alas! pitiable aristocrat

437. “and search for a horizon”
438. “and salute to the warship”
439. “but if a ship wants to voyage”
440. “withstand you not the crests”
APPENDIX 8

(This is my own edited version of Kaeppler’s\textsuperscript{443}, Taumoefolau’s\textsuperscript{444}, and Mahina’s\textsuperscript{445} translations of Takafalu, composed by Queen Salote for her son’s inauguration to the title of Tupouto’a. Titled Takafalu as Queen Salote’s proud acknowledgement of a long struggle for power, literally, “coming from behind”, of the Ha’a Ma’afu, to which her husband and her, so as their son, belong. Tupouto’a is the only title of the Ha’a Ma’afu in recognition of Taufa’aahau Tupou I’s grandfather, Tupouto’a, as the palladium of the Ha’a, who perverts the source of power from Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka into the Ha’a. Tupouto’a married Laatuufuipeka’s daughter, the carrier of the sacred blood which was passed on to their daughter, Halaevalu Mata’aho, who married the last Tu’i Tonga Laufilitonga and Malakai Lavulo, grandson of Laatuufuipeka. Queen Salote is descended from Halaevalu’s first marriage and her husband from the second marriage. Queen Salote is Halaevalu’s great, great, great granddaughter and her husband Halaevalu’s great grandson. Queen Salote was only seventeen when she married her thirty year old husband, Tungii Mailefihi, in 1917.

\textsuperscript{441} “pity be the Lomipeau”
\textsuperscript{442} “alas! alas! poor high chief”
\textsuperscript{443} Kaeppler 1990
\textsuperscript{444} Wood-Ell 2004:260-262
TAKAFALU

Ke fakatulou moe Takafalu
moe 'otu laine topupapu
ne fetaulaki 'o tapotolu
holo pe nofo kae lau atu
ne kamata 'ia 'Aho'eitu
ate he tuliki Fonuamotu
tu'u moe tapa 'i 'Aahau
piliote 'i Pangai e fa'u
tukuatu e fonua moe tala
Lauaki e Motu'apuaka

Bowing in homage to the
Takafalu\textsuperscript{446}
to the past sacred row of lines
that converged to form the future
King\textsuperscript{447}
you remain sitting while I relate\textsuperscript{448}
it began with 'Aho'eitu (the first
Tu'i Tonga)
turned at the corner Fonuamotu
(seat of Ha'atakalaua)
stopped and flashed at 'Aahau
(first home of the Tu'i Kanokupolu)
Drawing history to a close at Pangai
hand over the land and traditions
to Lauaki and Motu'apuaka\textsuperscript{449} (two

\textsuperscript{445} Mahina, 1992:193-196
\textsuperscript{446} "Bowing in homage" is my translation of fakatulou, from tulou. I think that the word is tuulolo,
contraction of tukulolo, referring to the two sides, for example, Tu'i Tonga-Kauhala'uta and Tu'i Kanokupolu/Tu'i Ha'atakalaua-Kauhalalo, reconciling. Takafalu, regal for "back (of a sovereign)" (Churchward, 1959:443), is fakatalu, transposition of sounds, as in fakatalutalu 'aki "to continually hark back
to as a time to be remembered or to date things from" (Churchward, 1959:103). This is obvious from the first
two lines when Queen Salote uses takafalu in the first line and, then, repeats it in different words what she
means in the second line. Kaeppler (1990) and Mahina (1992:193) translations here look lost, simply because
of lacking this historical derivation of the meaning of the terms.

\textsuperscript{447} I am quoting here Kaeppler's translation of this line (Ibid 1990:210), which, I think, a complete one as to
the meaning that this line is conveying, in contrast to Mahina's (Ibid, 1992:193) translation as "to form a
triangle".
chief ceremonial protocol

attendants)

ka teu faiva mo tukuhua

while I dance and make

pleasantries\textsuperscript{450}

he tangata 'o e Kauhala'uta

over this man of Kauhala'uta

'oku taku 'i he tala e fonua

who is mentioned in the tradition of

land

'oku fio 'i he 'alofi tupu'a

to have blended in the ancient

kava circle

hoto 'ofa he 'aho fakamanatu

my love on this day of

commemoration

he palatiume 'o Ha'a Ma'afu

of the palladium of Ha'a Ma'afu\textsuperscript{451}

faahina 'o loto Neiafu

[the] white pandanus fruit of

central Neiafu (village in Vava'u

Island)\textsuperscript{452}

\textsuperscript{448} Mahina (1992:193) gets the texts as \textit{lau 'otu} “row counting”, originated from his taking the composition as a dance, as about the organisation of the performers in the dance. Where I, like Kaeppler (1990:210), taking the line as \textit{lau atu} the Queen is talking in lines 5-8 about genealogical connection.

\textsuperscript{449} This line and the previous line indicate the Queen’s leaving her royal seat up the top of the Pangai flanked by her two attendants to bow and dance to the back seat of Tupouto’a behind the tou’a “kava mixer”. Indicating her departure, she puts these lines in a calling manner of these attendants during the protocol-

\textsuperscript{450} From here (lines 11-14) Kaeppler’s translations treat the texts in the plural form, thus going astray from the singular thematic subject, Queen Salote’s son. The composition is really the Queen talking about her elation at her son’s inauguration. Kaeppler has \textit{tau “we”} instead of \textit{teu “I”} (line 11), \textit{he tangata “the men”} instead of “the man”.

\textsuperscript{451} Both Mahina and Taumoefolau take \textit{palatiume} as Tonganisation of “platinum”. I take the Tonganisation to be “palladium”. It fits well with my discussion of the protection theme. It can be a reference to the Greek protecting deity, Pallas (Athene), from where Queen Salote borrowed the term. Is this the Greek equivalent of the Tongan \textit{Tamahaa}?

\textsuperscript{452} As part of Queen Salote’s genealogical recount of her son’s father’s origin, this line tells of his relation to Neiafu of Vava’u where her husband’s mother, Melesi’ilikutapu, through her mother’s father, Finau ‘Ulukalala Tuapasi. Queen Salote’s son is only a low rank faahina but from a powerful family. Neiafu is a
Emerging at the Langi-tu’oteau it dismounts at Tu’alikutapu (in ‘Uiha)

Lightening up the Houma‘utulau

The lightening flashed at mid-day

Bidding me to go and tell

The deep love of the Futu-ko-Vuna

Of the royal tombs and the flower bushes

To the ancestor of Angitoa

Hyphen of the two Kauhala

The term is really a metathesis of ‘uhila “lightening” in association to the Tu’alikutapu “sacred backside”. “Lightening” in this context is said to have come from the “backside”. The meaning is connected to the part played by the “lightening” as a malupoo “protection-night”, like the iku “tail”, in ila “to be awake”, fue “swishing away, striking the people” who conduct evil actions in the night time, particularly stealing and murdering. Thus, the connection then is the flashing of ‘Uiha and lightening Houma‘utulau, the “backside” of Tongatapu Island, where houma or haau “beating about” in the sense of the ‘utulau or tu’ulau “beheading” human sacrifice. This connection specifically shows a genealogical human sacrifice relationship between Malupoo, Tungii, Ma’a of Vainii, Vau of ‘Utolau, Vaea of Houma, and Lufe (from fue) of Folaha.

Houma‘utulau is the Tupouto’a title holder’s estate, really the estate of the Tungii (from tuungia “set on fire”) family, who also known as the Paahulu “Trail-blazer”.

Taukei e Angitoa is a reference to Queen Salote’s maternal and Tungii’s maternal connections through strong willed Toe‘umu to chief Afo of Ha’alaufui in Vava’u. Queen Salote is acknowledging here her husband’s high rank over her. Tungii is great, great grandson of the Tamahaa Laatufuipeka, (see Bott 1982:147, Figure 24 and, in this thesis as Figure 12, page xxii). Queen Salote uses taukei, in its Fijian sense, as in taukei ni vanua “spiritual owner of the ground” (see Derrick 1950:15, Vol. 1).

Following the preceding line, the “hyphen” stands for Tu‘i Pelehake ‘Uluvalu, son of Toe‘umu, from who Queen Salote and Tungii commonly descended. These two are great, great, great grandchildren of Toe‘umu. Therefore, the two Kauhala refer to the paternal Tu‘i Kanokupolu (Queen Salote) and maternal Tu‘i Tonga Fefine Laatufuipeka (Tungii). In another respect, the two Kauhala (Queen Salote of ‘Uiha and

453. Langitu’oteau is reference to Tamahaa Laatufuipeka’s grandfather’s royal tomb, Tu‘i Tonga Tu’ipulotu ‘i-Langitu’oteau, in the Tu‘i Tonga cemetery in Lapaha.

454. ‘Uiha is Tupouto’ a’s mother’s place of origin in the Ha’apai Group, north of the main Tongatapu Island. The term is really a metathesis of ‘uhila “lightening” in association to the Tu’alikutapu “sacred backside”.

455. Houma‘utulau is the Tu‘ipulotu ‘i-Langitu’oteau, in the Tu‘i Tonga cemetery in Lapaha.

456. Taueki e Angitoa is a reference to Queen Salote’s paternal and Tungii’s maternal connections through strong willed Toe‘umu to chief Afo of Ha’alaufui in Vava’u. Queen Salote is acknowledging here her husband’s high rank over her. Tungii is great, great grandson of the Tamahaa Laatufuipeka, (see Bott 1982:147, Figure 24 and, in this thesis as Figure 12, page xxii). Queen Salote uses taukei, in its Fijian sense, as in taukei ni vanua “spiritual owner of the ground” (see Derrick 1950:15, Vol. 1).

457. Following the preceding line, the “hyphen” stands for Tu‘i Pelehake ‘Uluvalu, son of Toe‘umu, from who Queen Salote and Tungii commonly descended. These two are great, great, great grandchildren of Toe‘umu. Therefore, the two Kauhala refer to the paternal Tu‘i Kanokupolu (Queen Salote) and maternal Tu‘i Tonga Fefine Laatufuipeka (Tungii). In another respect, the two Kauhala (Queen Salote of ‘Uiha and

Name after the island of Nayau in the Lau Group, to the north of the royal island of the Tu‘i Lakemba. It is the island of the Vakavanua “chief of the land who in charge of food crops” and kitchen of the royal Tu‘i Lakemba, (see Hocart 1929).
pe'i langatoli mai si'a fine 'o Lapaha  so come flower-picking women of 

Lapaha

mo ha taha taukei mei he Kolokakala  and an experienced flower stringer 
of the Kolokakala

he kuo oso 'ae Hau moe Pangai kuo tava  for the Hau is merry and Pangai is 
crowded

koe ha'ofanga e luva'anga e kakala  it is the chiefly gathering for the 
yielding of kakala

he ko Molimohe'a mo hono siale moto  the Molimohe'a and its budding 
gardenias

pea moe langakali e 'api ko Lotunofo  and the langakali of tract 
Lotunofo

'a 'Utulifuka moe huni kautoto  'Utulifuka and its red-stalked huni 
feehee 'a Namoala moe pulu tomomoho  how's Namoala and its pulu too 
momoho

si'i 'api ko Malila mo hono paongo  the dear tract Malila and its 

Tungii of Houma'utulau) are joined together by their inaugurated son, the palladium Tupouto'a of Ha'a Ma'afu.

Kolokakala “village of sweet smelling flowers”, symbol of Mu’a village in the eastern part of Tongatapu where the residence of the Tu'i Tonga, Lapaha, is situated, indicates specific Fatongia “duty” of the women of this village as tui kahoa kakala “stringing garlands of sweet smelling flowers” for dancing performances to the Tu'i Tonga and, also, for other purposes as well.

Queen Salote is inverting here the traditional ranking system of Tu'i Tonga-Kauhala'uta (Lapaha) opposed to Tu'i Kanokupolu-Kauhalalalo (Nuku'alofa), bringing the latter up to the top as the Hau and the former down as Kolokakala. Like her great, great grandfather, Taufa‘a‘ahau Tupou I, Queen Salote had this feeling of hatred towards the consumptive lifestyle of the Tu'i Tonga, as reflected in her use of words, for example, in lines 27-28.

Following from the precedent line, the celebration is also about the traditional Tu'i Tonga has to luva “strip of” his dignity and all social privileges (lines 31-38) in Pangai to be distributed out as shown in the following lines (39-44). In other words, Tonga is undergoing major restructure.

Lotunofo is short for the Tu'i Tonga Fefine Sinaikakala-‘i-Lotunofo, the last female descendant of the Tu'i Ha'atakalaua moheofo institution. She was the last during a war between the Ha'atakalaua and the
paaongo

matala e kukuvalu he vai 'o Moheofo blooming of the kukuvalu at the spring of Moheofo

'ofa 'i Takuilau heilala kili toto my love of Takuilau and its heilala kilitoto

si'i faa'onelua papai ha taha hoko dear faa'onelua the necklace for a successor

teu tui 'ae alamea ki he taukei 'o Lelea I will string the alamea for the chief of Lelea (Neiafu in Vava'u)

Tuitu'u pe teu luva kihe maka ko Loupua Tuitu'u I will render to the maka ko Loupua (Nomuka in Ha'apai)

kae ve'eve'e pe si'i Makamaile ve'eve'e only is for poor Makamaile (Nuku'alofa)

kae tuku e lavalava mo'o Nu'useilala and reserve the lavalava for Nu'useilala (Lifuka in Ha'apai)

koe fakaofilani kakala 'o Vailahi the fakaofilani is kakala for Vailahi (Niufo'ou)

koe tuinga hea fakamalu 'o katea the string of hea is hat of the Katea 462

Sia-ko-Veiongo koau teu lele Sia-ko-Veiongo (Kolomoto'a in

Nuku'alofa) I will run

Kanokupolu people. The next Tu'i Tonga Fefine is daughter of Tongotea, daughter of Tu'i Kanokupolu Mataeleha'amea to Lotunofo's nephew, Tu'i Tonga Fakana'ana'a.
I yield the kakala for you to decide staying at the Paepae\textsuperscript{463} worrying me

it causes a nuisance of my love to ʻOlotele\textsuperscript{464}

who can dare withstand the pleasantly calm early morn

the company with the strong smell of the kakala in central Muʻa

descending and standing on the deserted dockyard

standing and observing what an eye-pleasing view

flock of birds rising to the air from Halakakala

alighting from the air to stand on the rock at Heketaa

oh my friend who is my favourite

\textsuperscript{462} Katea is the main canoe as distinguished from the outrigger of the King or high chief covered with strings of hea while on voyaging. Dr Wendy Pond suggests that the line could mean “the string of hea is an umbrella of Aunt Seini”, that Katea refers to Seini. I do not know who this Aunt Seini.

\textsuperscript{463} Paepae-ʻo-Teleʻa is the grave-mound of Tuʻi Tonga ʻUluakimata in Lapaha, taken to be the “First Eye” of Tonga, first “Royal House” in Tonga, brought into Tonga by a Safata chiefly family in ʻUpolu through intermarriage to the Haʻatakalaua chiefs of Tonga. Queen Salote argues that the correct history of the “King of Tonga” begins with ʻUluakimata, with the connection to ʻUpolu, (see Bott 1982 and my discussion here in this thesis).

\textsuperscript{464} Queen Salote expresses her humble feeling that she, as low rank, does not wish to cause any trouble for the people of Lapaha after the big day, that she wants to go back to her origin. But, it is a contradiction, for when she mentions her origin, ʻUiha, it means to counter the high rank of traditional ʻOlotele “bigness” of Lapaha.
one

he uini e tanga hahake hopo'anga e la'aa  the winds of Fanga Hahake and

the rising sun

he 'oku 'ilo 'e he poto 'ae mo'oni 'oe fika for the wise knows the answer to

the problem

he ko si'i 'aho 'eni e vale 'ia tama for it is this day of madness for

my child
APPENDIX 9

(This is my own edited version of the lament of Queen Salote at the death of her younger sister, Fusipala. Queen Salote is taking here the subjects on death and gender and, demonstrating the confusion and complexity of the brother-sister relationship. In death, the dead person becomes highly respected no matter who you are and what rank he/she in the family hierarchy. But, because of the political status of genealogical construction in the aristocratic circle focussing on power one can be powerful and powerless at the same time. It is a system which simply shows affection and, at the same time, being aggressive, as part of being a political animal. Compare Figures 19, 24 and 31 in Bott [1982:88,147,153] and lines 44-65. The lament is published in Wood-Ellem et al 2004:232-233. The date of the composition is stated as August 1933 that the lament was first published in Ko e Tohi Fanongonongo.)

KOE TUTULU ‘A ‘ENE ‘AFIO HE PEKIA ‘A FUSIPALA
(QUEEN SALOTE’S LAMENT AT THE DEATH OF FUSIPALA)

Talanoa mai ‘ou fanongo

Tofu kii pea huni e lolo

Announcement that I heard of⁴⁶⁵

sea calming and oil floating on

⁴⁶⁵ Taumoefolau’s translations of this composition will be hereafter quoted in the footnotes. Her translation of this line is “I heard tell that”
top\textsuperscript{466} 

\textit{‘o kakapu ‘a Ha’afuluhao} creating fogs to cover up

\textit{peau nofo ‘o fakalongolongo} and, then, I sat in silence\textsuperscript{467}

\textit{tu’u e ‘umata vaeuapoo} rising the rainbow in the middle

\textit{loovai e ‘uha ‘ene too} pouring of water as the rain heavily

\textit{‘u’ulu e toa ‘i Ha’alako} droning loudly the toa in Ha’alako\textsuperscript{467}

\textit{pea ‘ilo leva ‘e hoku loto} my mind, then, understood\textsuperscript{471}

\textit{koe mana ‘oe Ha’amohoefo} it was the loved one of the

\textit{Ha’amohoefo}\textsuperscript{473}

\textit{pongipongi hake he Falaite} on Friday, in the morning\textsuperscript{474}

\textit{kuo talanoa mai ‘o pehee} word came through saying\textsuperscript{475}

\textit{koeni e tau kuo fakatee} the war had paraded\textsuperscript{476}

\textsuperscript{466} \textit{“The waters stilled and turned into oil”}

\textsuperscript{467} \textit{“Fog covered Ha’afuluhao”. Ha’afuluhao is a genealogical reference of the people of Vava’u as children of some Tongan high ranked chiefs who frequented and, in most cases, lived in Vava’u for the enjoyment of having sex with the Vava’uan most beautiful Samoan women (fuluhao “best genitals”).}

\textsuperscript{468} \textit{“I sat and contemplated”}

\textsuperscript{469} \textit{“The rainbow rose in the deep of night”}

\textsuperscript{470} \textit{“The rain fell heavy and unceasing”}

\textsuperscript{471} \textit{“The stones of Ha’alako droned”. Taumoefolau corrects the text of toa as tokal, thus “stones”, probably referring to the stone graves at Ha’alako. I still retain toa, a reference to the casuarinas trees at Ha’alako when blown hard by the wind they make droning sounds.}

\textsuperscript{472} \textit{“And then I understood”}

\textsuperscript{473} \textit{“It was the visitation of Ha’a Moheofo”. Mana is short of mamana, that this sense is highlighted by Queen Salote in the following lines in her praising, as part of respecting, her younger sister’s death.}

\textsuperscript{474} \textit{“Friday dawned”}

\textsuperscript{475} \textit{“And word came”}

\textsuperscript{476} \textit{“The war had begun”}
efiafi ‘o faka’ohovale

at evening came the shock

kuo kapa e tau ‘a mate

the war of death had taken

‘o veteki si’oku loto fale

and plundered the inside of my

poor house

hoku mate ‘ofa hoku tehina ni

my fathomless love of this younger

sister of mine

ko si’i fefine mei Ha’apai

she is a dear girl from Ha’apai

kuo nofo lata ‘i Tongalahi

who had lived at ease in

Tonga Lahi

he ‘oiuae ‘e ‘Elisiva

oh I cry dear ‘Elisiva

pau ho’o nofo Mala’ekula

surely you will live at Mala’ekula

pe’i tu’u hake mu’a ta hola

please get up and let’s flee

keke ‘eva he fanga ‘i ‘Uiha

for you to walk on the beach of

‘Uiha

keke nofo ho ngaahi tupu’anga

for you to dwell where your origins

are

he fefine ‘o loto Ha’angana

the woman of central Ha’angana

477. “The army of death had won”
478. “Disbanding the centre of my pitiful house”
479. “I will die for love of this younger sister of mine”. Mate, meaning “to die”, also connotes “the fathomless depth of love”.
480. “Dear woman of Ha’apai”
481. “Who sojourned happily in Tonga Lahi”
482. “Ah me, dear ‘Elisiva”
483. “Arise now and let us flee, you and I”
484. “To walk upon the beach of ‘Uiha”
uoiaue Fusipala e

'ofa 'i he toe homau fale

si'i fale 'o Lopa'aione

na'e loto fale 'a fefine pe

oh I cry Fusipala

love this youngest of our house

dear house of Lopa'aione

the inside was dwelt only by

women

'e Tauki'onetuku e

'Elisiva pe'i ke tu'u hake

keke 'eva 'i hota lotofale

na'e kasa 'aki pe ho va'e

dear Tauki'onetuku

'Elisiva you stand up

take a walk inside our house

with your legs to give light

mate 'ofa fau hoku tehina

I deeply love very much my

younger sister

koe moto 'oe Pule'anga Tonga

na'aku ngaohi ke ngeia

the budding flower of all Tonga

I brought her up to be grandeur

to be known by the islands of

Tonga

---

485 "To dwell where your origins are"
486 "Woman of central Ha'angana"
487 "Ah me, dear Fusipala"
488 "How I love this youngest of our house"
489 "At whose centre only women may abide"
489 "Elisiva, arise now"
490 "And stroll within the centre of our house"
491 "Whose only light were your feet"
493 "I will die for love of my younger sister"
494 "I bestowed honours upon you"
495 "For all lands to see and know"
he uoiaue 'e Fusipala

ho'o ako kuo ta'e'aonga

'o fa 'i ho sino manakoa

mo ho tu'unga laulotaha

kuo puli 'o 'ikai kei haa

he uoiaue, 'e Taufa

faa'ele 'ae 'ulutefua

kuo 'aaavea hoku tehina

'o 'ikai si'aotu'otu'a

Tuku'aho 'alu 'oua 'e ha'u

he 'oku ke liongi pea ke tapu

he mokopuna 'o Tupou 'Aahau

oh I cry dear Fusipala

your education has gone to waste

I treasure your being popular

and your standing alone rank

have gone and no longer evident

oh I cry dear Taufa

birth of the only one still living

my younger sister has been taken away

leaving you with no assistance

Tuku'aho, go, and don't come

for you are liongi and prohibited

to the granddaughter of Tupou

496 "Your mind has gone to waste"

497 "How I treasure your well-loved person"

498 "And your peerless rank"

499 "Now gone from sight"

500 Taufa is short for Tu'i Kanokupolu George Taufa'aahau Tupou IV, oldest son of Tungii Mailefihi and Queen Salote.

501 "Offspring of an only child". 'Ulutefua refers to Queen Salote.

502 "My younger sister has been taken"

503 "You have no other support"

504 "Tuku'aho, go, do not come close". Tuku'aho is Queen Salote's second son who died before Fusipala.

505 "For your lowly presence is prohibited here". Tuku'aho, as a liongi, wears a big old tom mat as sign of mourning at the sister's descendant's funeral. See Bott 1982:88, Figure 19, in this thesis as Figure 14, page xxiv. Tuku'aho's great grandfather, Tungii Halatuituia, is Fusipala's great, grandmother, Tupou'aahau, brother. Genealogically, then, Fusipala and Tuku'aho are classificatory sister and brother.
ta kuo ngalo 'ia au e

lo and behold I have forgotten that

koe mokopuna koe 'o Fane

you are the grandchild of Fane

koe fahu ki loto Pelehake

the fahu to central Pelehake

kuo 'ahoia e takipoo

daylight has come upon the wake

pe'i ui 'a Manumataongo

call hither Manumataongo

lavenoa'a 'i hono lolo

to signal the end of the vigil

Taufa ho'o nofo mama'o

acting for Taufa while being away

Vilai, Vuna mo Tungii e

Vilai, Vuna and Tungii

he toe 'a maatu'a tangata pe

remainders of men only

506 "Beside the grandchild of Tupou 'Aahau"
507 "Ah, but I forgot"
508 "You are also Fane's descendant". Fane is short for Fanetupouwava'u, grandmother of Tungii Mailefhi, father of Tuku'aho. But, Queen Salote is reminding here of the high rank of Tuku'aho in relation to Fane as the great granddaughter of Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka. In this connection, Tuku'aho is higher in rank to Fusipala.
509 "Summit of central Pelehake". Tuku'aho, in spite of his liongi, low rank, to Fusipala, also, is the fahu "summit of central Pelehake". Central Pelehake is reference to Tu'i Pelehake 'Uluvalu and his children, Filia-i-Pulotu, (mother is Tupouveiongo, daughter of Tu'i Kanokupolu Mumui), and Tuputupu-o-Pulotu, (mother is Laatuuholevea, daughter of Tamahaa Laatuufuipeka and Kiuve'etaha). Tuku'aho tau'i-Folaha, his full name, is connected to this centrality in Pulotu, to the 'Uluvalu "Head-of-sacrifice" or Tuku'aho "presentation-of-offering of human victim" that was tau'iFolaha "taken to Folaha". In my interpretation, Folaha, as Folasal'e 'iti in Samoa, is Tangaloa 'Eitumatumu'a title name, the chief of the village of Pelehake, and, of course, of Folaha. (For this genealogy, refer to Bott 1982:147, Figure 24 and, in this thesis, Figure 12 on page xxii.)
510 Manumataongo is Queen Salote's youngest son, Sione Nguu, then, the Tu'i Pelehake title holder. See Bott 1982:147, Figure 24 (in this thesis as Figure 12, page xxii), 154, Figure 31 (b) [in this thesis as Figure 1(b), page x].
511 The meaning of this line refers to line 55, as Taufa, at the time, was away overseas, so Manumataongo, his younger brother, took over his place.
512 "Acting for you, Taufa, in your absence". Taufa'aahau, at the time, was at school in Australia.
Men only are left now

Your sister has lost your sister has lost

who would have governed your

children

pity is the pedigree that has been

wasted

tribute of Hihifo to Takuilau

tribute of Tungii to the King

tribute of Niukapu to Pelehake

Tribute from Hihifo, the residence of the Tu‘i Kanokupolu, to Takuilau, symbol of the Tu‘i Tonga was brought to Her Majesty Queen Salote, for her mother, Lavinia Veiongo, is the great granddaughter of the last Tu‘i Tonga Laufilitonga. As granddaughter of Ula Afuha‘amango, Fusipala is tribute of Niukapu, a name of the Afuha‘amango’s family, going back to an original Niukapu who sought refuge at god Kautai’s house in Mu‘a from Taufa‘a‘ahau Tupou I. See Bott 1982:147, Figure 24 and, in this thesis as Figure 12, page xxii. Tupou II is son of Tu‘i Pelehake Toutaitokotaha and Fusipala Tauki‘onetuku, daughter of Tevita ‘Unga, son of Taufa‘a‘ahau Tupou I.

Tribute of Tungii to the Monarch”. On the death of Fusipala, Tungii Mailefihi took some food and koloa to Queen Salote. Tungii’s relation to Fusipala goes back to Tungii’s grandfather and Fusipala’s great grandmother as brother and sister. So, Fusipala’s mother, Takipo, and Tungii Mailefihi are classificatory sister and brother.

The pity of the tie that has been lost
APPENDIX 10

(This is an edited version of Melenaite Taumoefolau's translation of Queen Salote's lament at the death of her son, Tuku'aho, appearing in the Songs & Poems of Queen Salote, recently published by the Vava'u Press, Tonga, and edited by Elizabeth Wood-Ellem [2004:237-238]. The Queen is revealing here the relationships between certain ha'a with their respective duties to Tuku'aho. Again, she recites the intertwining of male duties, thus line 24, and female ranks, line 27, in the body of her son. The poem is really recitation of Tuku'aho-tau-'i-Folaha, supporting given by the Tungi family in "cutting off of the 'aho 'offering of food to an 'eitu/aitu or Tu'i Tonga' with war at Folaha" [line 5]. The Tungi originally of Ha'angana of Ha'ano Island is who making the island of 'Uiha one of Ha'angana, thus Ongo Ha'angana [line 15]. In line 25, Queen Salote is citing the coming together of the two lines as one, as Tuku'aho [Tungi] and Taufale [Queen Salote]. The date of this composition is 1936.)

520 “Tribute of Niukapu to Pelehake” is from Fusipala’s mother’s relations to Taufa‘ahau Tupou II’s mother, Fusipala Tauki’onetuku, and wife of Tu’i Pelehake Toutaitokotaha.
KOE TUTULU 'A 'ENE AFIO 'I HE PEKIA 'A TUKU'AHO

(THE LAMENT OF QUEEN SALOTE AT THE DEATH OF TUKU'AHO)

'E Tungii, ke fakamolemole Tungii, please forgive me521
'i he faakatu'a e faa'ele for the commoner-like of birth522
kuo 'ikai nofo 'a Taufale Taufale has not sat523
ke tali fekau kiate koe to accept the commands of you524
Tuku'aho-tau-'i-Folaha Tuku'aho-tau-'i-Folaha
neu nofo pe 'o fiefia I lived and anticipated525
'o lau 'e au te ke 'aonga thinking you would be useful
kia Tungii mo hono kaalinga to Tungii and his people
hoku 'ofa 'oku, hoku 'ofa fau how I love, how I dearly love
he tehina 'o Taufa'aahau this younger brother of
Taufa'aahau
na'e lau pe tokua 'e au I had certainly thought526
'e mo'ui ko hono to'omata'u he would live to be his main
support
hoku 'ofa fau si'eku tama oh, how I love this dear child of
mine
na'e maalie hono 'uhinga his genealogy was neatly

521 Taumoefolau’s translation has it as “Forgive me, Tungii”
522 In Taumoefolau’s version, it is translated as “For the rudeness of the child I bore you”
523 “Taufale has not stayed”
524 “To do your bidding”
fua 'ae Ongo Ha'angana  
fruit of the Ongo Ha'angana

moto 'oe Ha'atakalaua  
flower-bud of the Ha'atakalaua

'oiaue, si'e'ku tama  
oh-me, dear child of mine

he 'eiki e ongo Ha'a Ngata  
the high chief of both Ha'a Ngata

mokopuna 'o 'Ulukalala  
grandson of 'Ulukalala

mokopuna e motu'a ko Ata  
grandson of the old man Ata

Tuku'aho e Uiliami  
Tuku'aho, oh, Uiliami

hoku 'ofa 'i hono sino 'eiki  
how I love his high rank body

'eiki tu'unga ho'o tamai  
high rank derived from your

father

fihi'anga 'oe ngaahi tu'i  
in whom kingly titles mingle

Tuku'aho e, 'e Taufale  
Tuku'aho, oh, Taufale

ko si'ete tama tu'u he fa'ee  
it's my child who stands on the

mother

taha'anga 'oe ongo laine  
in whom the two lines merge

527. “I lived happily in anticipation”
528. “I thought vainly”
529. “his was a regal birth”
530. “tribute of both Ha'angana”. Ongo Ha'angana is reference to Tu'ihanga Ha'ano and Malupoo of 'Uiha. Ongo Ha'angana is Halaevalu Mata'aho, great, great grandmother of Queen Salote and sacred blood carrier.
531. “lord of both Ha'a Ngata”. Both Ha'a Ngata refer to Ha'a Ngata Motu'a and Ha'a Ngata Tupu, Ata as the head of the former and 'Ulukalala of the latter.
532. “progeny of 'Ulukalala”
533. “progeny of the old man Ata”
534. Uiliami is Queen Salote's husband's first name, William.
535. “how precious is his chief's body”. “His” in the translation stands for Tuku'aho.
536. “derived from your father”. “Your father” here stands for Uiliami's, Tuku'aho, a direct descendant from Tamahau Laatufuipeka. See Bott 1982:88, Figure 19 and, in this thesis as Figure 14, page xxiv.
537. “In whom the kings' lineages mingle”
538. “my dear child who ruled over his mother”. It looks like that Taufale is tu'u he fa'ee.
muka 'oe Konisitutone
leaf-bud of the Constitution\textsuperscript{537}

tuku keu tangi 'o lau'aitu
let me weep and recite the spirits\textsuperscript{538}

'i he siana ni mei Halaliku
for this man from Halaliku\textsuperscript{539}

pe feefee'i hano liliu
how am I to make the change

'ae tohi lisi 'o Maka-'a-Kiu
of the registration of Maka-'a-Kiu\textsuperscript{540}

hoku 'ofa fau si'eke tama ni
how I love this dear child of mine

koe fua 'a Ha' a Havea Lahi
he is fruit of the senior Ha'a

Havea\textsuperscript{541}

'eiki 'o loto Nuku'alofa ni
sacred child of central

Nuku'alofa\textsuperscript{542}

na'e tu'a ki he kolo Ngatuvai
who was commoner to the Kolo

Ngatuvai

'ofa 'i he tangi 'a Sione
how I pity Sione's weeping\textsuperscript{543}

ho'o li'a'aki ke feefee
you've left not knowing what may happen to him\textsuperscript{544}

ha fua kavenga 'a e vale
will have to carry burdens the

incapable\textsuperscript{545}

maheni falala kiate koe
he who is accustomed to leaning on

\textsuperscript{537} "sprouting leaf of the Constitution"
\textsuperscript{538} "let me weep inconsolably"
\textsuperscript{539} "for this young man from Halaliku". This is a reference to the southern part starting from the eastern end of Tongatapu Island, also known as Houma'utulau, discussion of this in chapter 4, stretch of land belonging to the Tungii family. Halaliku is the hala "road" running parallel along the coast, the liku or iku "backside".
\textsuperscript{540} Maka-'a-Kiu is a place on the coast of Fua'amotu, Tungii's estate.
\textsuperscript{541} "this offering of Ha'a Havea Lahi"
\textsuperscript{542} "lord of the heart of Nuku'alofa"
\textsuperscript{543} Sione is short for Sione Nguu, youngest brother of Tuku'aho.
\textsuperscript{544} "to what end did you leave him"
\textsuperscript{545} "the infant will carry burdens"
he neongo pee 'eku mahi
kau 'ilo koe nofo pule'i
kau laulotoa ho'o mo'ui
hoko ko hoku vaikau'aki

but though I am grieving
I know this living is subordinate to
I will repeat from memory your
which will be my source of
you546

kau 'ilo koe nofo pule'i
kau laulotoa ho'o mo'ui
hoko ko hoku vaikau'aki

I know this living is subordinate to
I will repeat from memory your
which will be my source of

546. "he who was accustomed to leaning on you"
547. "I know Who reigns"
548. "so I will just reflect on your life"
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