

THE SOCIAL AND  
POLITICAL SYSTEMS  
OF  
CENTRAL POLYNESIA

*IN THREE VOLUMES*  
VOLUME I

THE SOCIAL AND  
POLITICAL SYSTEM  
OF  
CENTRAL POLYMER

BY  
J. W. B. WILSON

THE SOCIAL AND  
POLITICAL SYSTEMS  
OF  
CENTRAL POLYNESIA

BY

ROBERT W. WILLIAMSON, M.Sc.

*AUTHOR OF THE MAFULU MOUNTAIN  
PEOPLE OF BRITISH NEW GUINEA*

*IN THREE VOLUMES*

VOLUME I

1967

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS  
Oosterhout N.B. The Netherlands

Robert W. Williamson, The Social and Political  
Systems of Central Polynesia.

This photomechanic reprint after the edition of 1924 is  
published by arrangement with the Cambridge University  
Press, England.

68/3311

Bd 1

Exclusive distributor in the U.S.A., its possessions and  
territories, and Canada and Mexico:

HUMANITIES PRESS Inc.  
303 Park Avenue South  
New York, N.Y. 10010

Stadt- u. Univ.-Bibl.  
Frankfurt/Main

Printed in The Netherlands

## PREFACE

THE ethnology of Polynesia is the subject of an extensive and varied literature. For long past travellers, explorers, missionaries, government officials and others, and academic writers at home, have been accumulating ethnological material, and a large quantity of this is now at our disposal. It is, however, scattered in many books and articles in journals and other periodicals, and, though some of these are written in a more or less scientific method, many are mere collections of isolated and disconnected data; also the information is confined in most cases to specific islands or groups. The material has therefore been greatly in need of collection, arrangement and co-ordination. I must confess that, when Professor Seligman suggested that I should undertake the task, I hesitated to do so; and as the work proceeded, and the voluminous and complicated character of the evidence became more apparent, my fear that I had undertaken a duty which should have been discharged by a better qualified investigator became intensified.

I decided when, in the latter part of the year 1913, I commenced the work of collecting the material, not to attempt to include, in what I then anticipated would be one book, the whole of Polynesia, and I was supported in this proposal by the opinions of friends well qualified to advise. I therefore excluded Hawai'i to the north and New Zealand to the south, and confined my attention to the islands nearer the equator, though I included Easter Island. It is to designate this limited area that I use the term "Central Polynesia" in the title of the book; and when I refer from time to time to "Polynesia" and the "Polynesians," it must be understood that I do so only in this restricted sense.

Subsequent developments have impelled me to modify even this restricted scheme. The amount of available material proved to be much greater than I had anticipated; and an attempt to deal with it adequately requires more volumes than I had expected. I therefore decided to confine myself in this book

to certain portions of the whole subject, leaving other portions to be dealt with later. I shall refer to this matter again.

The Fijian islands are commonly regarded as forming part of Melanesia, and so do not, strictly speaking, come within the scope of my subject. Nevertheless, in view of the extensive intermixture of Polynesian elements among the people of parts of Fiji, this group can hardly be disregarded. Some of those elements may have had their origin in the distant past, when some of the Polynesian ancestors first reached the Pacific; others are doubtless of more recent origin, and that of some is comparatively modern, dating back only to historic or partly historic times. Dr B. Glanvill Corney kindly supplied me with useful information concerning the modern geographical distribution in the Fijian islands of the Melanesian and Polynesian ethnic elements; but unfortunately writers on Fiji do not always tell us in which portions of the group the information supplied by them was obtained, and even localized material loses some of its value through the absence of evidence by which we can connect Polynesian features with possible old associations, as distinguished from what may have been comparatively recent developments. In these circumstances I have not included Fiji as part of Polynesia, in the sense of introducing the systematically tabulated particulars which I have tried to include in the accounts of admittedly Polynesian islands. I have confined myself, as regards Fiji, to the introduction here and there of certain matters which seem to have been definitely Polynesian in character, or partly so, and which tend to illustrate or explain Polynesian systems and customs.

I have included in my material some data collected in islands outside the geographical limits of Polynesia proper, but in which more or less definite Polynesian elements have been found. The Ellice group, for example, was partly, but not entirely, Polynesian; Tikopian culture was largely so; but in the other Polynesian settlements, as they are sometimes called, in the neighbourhood of the Melanesian islands the interaction of Polynesian and Melanesian cultures was of a character that renders exact discrimination between the two difficult. This mixture has perhaps led me sometimes to introduce matters which should be regarded as Melanesian. I decided not to include the Gilbert Islands; but it has been suggested to me recently that I ought to have done so. It is now, however, too

late to correct the error, if such it be, as I should have to set to work to collect the necessary material, and probably every section of the book would have to be partly rewritten.

The recording of the numerous traditions and the histories of the several islands and island groups does not come within my purpose. I have therefore only introduced such legendary and historical material as seemed to be useful for the purpose of explaining, or illustrating, or at least adding interest to, the matters that form the subject of the book. I would point out, as regards legends, that the interest of a tradition does not necessarily depend solely upon its probable truth; true or untrue, it is of value if it discloses beliefs held by the people, and we may well think that any customs or practices to which a legend points were prevalent, or were believed to have been prevalent in days gone by.

My subject is Polynesia as it was, and not as it is; and I have tried to avoid the introduction of data that are probably modern and not truly indigenous—many of them perhaps due to white men's influence. I have therefore written throughout in the past tense, though many of the old systems and customs described, and even some of the beliefs, have survived to the present day; indeed some of the material of which I have availed myself has been of quite recent collection.

There are a few matters concerning which words of caution are desirable. The evidence to which I refer has been collected from the works of writers of different periods, some being quite recent and others written many years ago. During this stretch of time many changes must have occurred, and indeed we know that they have done so. Consequently the stringing together of material relating to any one subject may easily be misleading and produce an erroneous impression. I have in some cases tried to discriminate in this matter, and to avoid confusion in connecting and comparing matters that have been observed at dates more or less distant from one another; I fear, however, that I have often failed to do this, sometimes because I had no means of doing it, and that some of the apparent differences between the ideas and customs reported from the several islands may have been chronological, rather than geographical.

Then, again, it must be remembered that many of the observers, from whose works my materials have been collected,

have doubtless only recorded matters which they had actually seen, or of which they had been informed, and which it has occurred to them to mention. No doubt many specific ideas and practices, though only recorded as having been found in one or more of the several islands, have not been confined to them; they may have prevailed in others also; but in the absence of evidence of this I have had to confine my references to these customs to the islands from which they have been actually reported. Consequently comparisons of apparently differing customs may in some cases have been based upon inaccurate or incomplete data.

Another possible source of confusion and inaccuracy is geographical. The Polynesian islands have been arranged by travellers and students of geography in certain named groups; but, though there is in some cases a general probability, based on the proximity of the islands of these groups, that the ideas and customs found in one island of a group prevailed to a greater or less extent in the group generally, we can never be confident that they did so, especially in the case of the larger or more scattered groups. The ethnological grouping of the Polynesians may in places have differed substantially from the geographical grouping now adopted of the islands; in certain cases we know that this was so, and in particular that some, at all events, of the ancestors of the inhabitants of some of the eastern islands and island groups were migrants from more than one island or group of islands further west. Hence general comparative statements as to adjacent named groups, in which each is treated as a defined group, differing from the others, must often be inaccurate and misleading. Probably in some cases the ethnological differentiation between what I may call frontier islands of adjacent groups was small, and there was no hard and fast line of ethnological demarcation between the two groups. Perhaps some of the apparent inconsistencies and contradictions in the evidence are due to this cause.

A difficulty, somewhat similar to the above, arises from doubts as to the correct localization of information supplied by writers. Both Ellis and Moerenhout, for instance, collected the bulk of their material in Tahiti; and when, in referring to a custom, they speak of the Society Islands, it is often difficult to be sure of the extent to which they wish us to understand that this custom prevailed throughout that group. Similarly,



Gill sometimes talks of the Hervey Islands, leaving us in doubt as to whether he is supplying information collected only in Mangaia, which was the island specially studied by him, or whether we are to regard it as applying to Rarotonga and other islands also. Other examples of this difficulty might be given; for instance, the bulk of the information on the Tongan group, supplied by Mariner, was obtained elsewhere than in Tongatabu; the greater part of that relating to the Marquesas was collected in Nukuhiva; and Mangareva is our chief source of information in the Paumotu. For these reasons it has often been impossible for me to differentiate with any approach to accuracy, even between main islands of a group, and a regrettable looseness in writing has resulted.

It is difficult, and indeed impossible, for terminology to be exact and consistent in a book, the material for which has been collected from a large number of works, the authors of which use the same term for what were perhaps different things, and different terms for what may have been the same thing. It is impossible, for instance, to be clear in trying to distinguish by defined terminology between what would, perhaps, properly be called a village, a sub-district or a district; and sometimes I have used the term division for a large area, including several districts; though I can offer no scientific definition, applicable to all the islands, of this term. I have had, as regards each island, to use the terminology which seemed convenient for the purpose of explaining, so far as possible, the geographical division of that island. The same difficulty arose as to terms indicating the chiefs of these various areas, great and small, and I have had to content myself with meeting it in the same indefinite way. There were in some places great chiefs whose jurisdictions spread over comparatively large areas—whole islands, and even perhaps groups of islands—though I suspect that some very widespread rules have been of relatively recent origin; these head chiefs are frequently spoken of by writers as “kings”; and, though I dislike the term, mainly because I cannot define it, I had to use that or some other term to express the extended controlling jurisdiction which these people enjoyed; and the substitution of some more suitable term—such, perhaps, as “paramount chief”—would not have removed the difficulty of definition. I have therefore often used the term “king,” which has at least

the advantage of being short. The words "family," "clan," and "tribe," also are used by writers, sometimes as though they were interchangeable terms, and often with but little, if any, appreciation of any differences in meaning between them, or between a mere family of parents and children and a larger consanguine family; in this again I have been unable in quoting these writers to adopt a scientific system of terminology; and I fear a similar lack of exactitude has sometimes, almost necessarily, extended to my own comments. It must not be assumed that when I quote these terms, as used by writers, I adopt them as being correct.

It has been necessary for me to refer from time to time to family relationships, such as father, mother, son, daughter, brother and sister; and, in doing so, I have not as a rule stated whether I used these terms in the sense in which we understand them, or in the wider and different sense involved by a classificatory system of relationship. As it is generally recognized that this system prevailed widely in one form or another in Polynesia, this gross lack of exactitude is to be deplored; but it has been unavoidable, for most of the writers from whose works my materials have been collected do not deal with the question, and I could only quote their terminology as I found it. Some of the writers knew nothing of the classificatory system, and have no doubt been misled in their interpretation of what was told them by the natives. Others, and especially those who remained for lengthened periods in one place, and learnt the language of that place, and became intimate with the people, could hardly fail to be aware of the system, if it prevailed there, although in their time it had not become the subject of detailed scientific investigation. It is inconceivable that such a one should fail to note at least that the words used to denote father, brother, etc., included other relations; and yet as a rule they tell us nothing about it. I think we may believe that these authors, whatever they knew or did not know, have generally intended us, unless they tell us otherwise, to understand the terms used by them in the ordinary sense involved by our own system; in which case the difficulty is reduced to that of error on their part. The doubt as to this subject must, however, be borne constantly in mind in all places where these relationship terms are used; and it must, I fear, be assumed that their use is often wrong. Any attempt by me to investigate

and compare the classificatory systems of the different islands would obviously, in the circumstances, have been futile.

I have, as regards a few words, adopted throughout the book uniform methods of spelling, though these differed, in accordance with rules of dialectic interchanges of consonants and other local variations, in the several islands and island groups. For example, I have generally used the term *marae* for what is often translated into "temple," instead of altering it in places to *malae*; and I have always called the god Tangaroa by that name, though for some islands it should be spelt Tangaloo, Taaroo, etc. These are merely two illustrations of a method that I have adopted with reference to a few other words and names which appear frequently. I have done this because an attempt to discriminate and vary the spelling for each island or group would tend to be confusing, without offering any adequate compensating advantage. Moreover, some writers have at times adopted for certain islands modes of spelling that are wrong for those islands, having probably retained methods which they had learnt elsewhere. I have, in consequence of advice given to me, adopted for all islands the nasalized *ng* instead of the simple *g*; but very likely the latter has sometimes been introduced inadvertently, especially in quoting other writers who use it.

Then, again, there are, independently of dialectic variations, great differences in the spellings adopted by the numerous writers, and appearing in maps (including among the latter those of modern cartographers), for the names of islands, districts, mountains, villages, etc., and for those of gods, mythical and traditional personages, and even people of historical times, and indeed for the Polynesian words for all things. Under these circumstances it is difficult to preserve in a work of this character a correct, or even a uniform, Polynesian orthography, and this difficulty is specially great as regards the innumerable names, many of them of great length, of places, persons and gods throughout Polynesia. I fear that discrepancies will be found, and that some of these have been purely slips of my own.

There is an obvious lack of proportion in the book, some subjects of importance having been treated somewhat scantily, whilst other less important matters are discussed to a disproportionate extent. This has been inevitable, at all events as regards the former defect, which has arisen simply from lack of the requisite material.

It may be thought that I have lengthened some of my chapters needlessly by quoting separately a number of writers who refer to a specific matter, instead of quoting only one of them and giving foot-note references to the others; but I have had definite reasons for doing this. Although I have often made suggestions and offered probable or possible explanations of the meaning of the evidence, and sometimes have even indulged in hypotheses, my main object has been the collection of the facts. It often happens that different writers say practically the same thing, but do not state it in exactly the same way, and in these cases it is desirable that readers should have all the evidence before them, and so be able to form their own conclusions as to the deductions to be drawn from it. In some cases, which I regard as important, I have quoted a number of writers separately in order that the full cumulative value of their evidence may be secured.

I regret greatly that I have not given more maps. It had been my intention to have these of as many as possible of the different islands and groups; but the excessive cost of printing and publication at the present time has compelled me reluctantly to confine myself to such as seemed absolutely necessary for an understanding of the matter contained in the text. The general reference map of the islands has been prepared by Messrs Edward Stanford & Co., being a partial reproduction of their well known map of the Pacific Islands. The names of the persons of whose maps some of my other maps are reproductions, and who have kindly allowed me to use them, and the sources from which one or two maps have been prepared by me are stated in the chapters on "Political Areas and Systems" relating to the particular islands.

This book is confined, after a preliminary chapter on origin and migrations, to the subject of social and political systems. I hope to be able in the near future to produce a second instalment, which will probably deal with a number of myths of creation and concerning other subjects, the religions of the people, including their beliefs as to the soul and the after-life of the dead and their great army of gods and spirits, and beliefs and ideas relating to certain sacred places and objects, and other matters. We shall then have a fairly comprehensive basic material, in the light of which I hope, at a still later date, to be able to consider the religious and other rites and ceremonies

of the people, and their customs and practices. I also look forward to the further possibility of considering afterwards the subject of inter-island movements, for which purpose I should introduce a number of traditions, and more or less historical material and views of writers, relating to original migrations into some of the islands—in some cases movements from island to island—excluded for the present, as they throw no light on social and political organization; from a comparison of these, and of the differing religious, social, political and other cultural features of the people of the several islands, we might acquire some insight into past inter-island migrations. I fear I can hardly hope to be able, as I intended originally, to turn, after completing my investigation of Central Polynesia, to that of the Polynesians of Hawai'i and New Zealand.

The Bibliography includes all books from which I have collected material dealing with any part of the whole subject; and it is possible that they have not all been referred to in this book. My search for material in the *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, Man*, the *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, and English books, has been continued up to the middle of 1923. I have examined foreign and Colonial books, and all other journals and periodicals, only up to the time of the commencement of the war; as, owing to the large quantity of matter which I had collected already, the amount of work to be done with it, and my advanced age, I thought it wiser to push on with this, rather than occupy time in collecting further information, which can be done hereafter by someone else.

The limitation of the matters considered in this book to one branch only of the entire subject has made it necessary for me to refer sometimes to other matters with which I do not deal now, and to my views as to the effect of the evidence concerning those other matters, although that evidence itself is not quoted. This is an undesirable method; but I do not see how, under the circumstances, it can be avoided. It may be also that some of the references in passages, written before my change of plan had been made, to later chapters, though now inaccurate, have escaped my notice, and not been corrected.

In the chapter on "Origin and Migrations," adopting the late Mr S. Percy Smith's terminology, I have used the word "Rarotongans" to designate a group of people whose movements have been disclosed by the Rarotongan "logs" and other

legends, and their descendants, or a section of them, and who, as I contend, were the people who were specially the worshippers of the god Tangaroa. Originally I had continued to use this term "Rarotongans" throughout the book; but, in view of the possible misleading character of the term, and acting on advice, I altered it to "Tangaroans" in all chapters other than that on "Origin and Migrations." It is possible, however, that there are, here and there, places in which I have omitted to make the alteration.

I have not hesitated to ask friends for advice on points concerning which they could help me, and there are several of these to whom I am indebted for kind occasional assistance of this character. I wish, however, to express my specially grateful thanks to Professor C. G. Seligman, and the late Dr W. H. R. Rivers, whose never failing interest in my efforts was a constant source of encouragement and inspiration, and whose kind help and advice have always been at my disposal, and have been invaluable.

I am also much indebted to Mr Sidney H. Ray for help given from time to time in translating Polynesian words and passages; to Mrs Scoresby Routledge for information about Easter Island; to Sir Everard im Thurn for the very long continued loan of his Samoan and Tongan dictionaries; and to the Council of the London Missionary Society for having allowed my Secretary, Miss Campbell, to visit their rooms from time to time, and study and take notes from books in their possession—including that rare volume, Davies's *Dictionary*—and for the help which was given to her in doing so.

Finally, I desire to record the debt of gratitude which I owe to Miss Muriel Campbell, who has helped me in the collection and arrangement and tabulation of the materials, and in many other ways. Miss Campbell threw herself whole-heartedly into the work; and her enthusiasm, along with her unflinching industry, her great ability, her excellent memory, and the faculty of insight which she possesses, have been of the utmost value to me ever since I commenced my investigations.

ROBERT W. WILLIAMSON

THE COPSE, BROOK

WITLEY, SURREY

May 1924

# CONTENTS

		<i>Page</i>
	BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS (PART I) . . . . .	xvii
	"    "    "    (PART II) . . . . .	xxix
<i>Chap.</i>	I. ORIGIN AND MIGRATIONS . . . . .	I
	II. POLITICAL AREAS AND SYSTEMS (SAMOA) . . . . .	40
	III. SOME HYPOTHESES AS TO THE EARLIEST HISTORY OF SAMOA . . . . .	88
	IV. POLITICAL AREAS AND SYSTEMS (TONGA) . . . . .	131
	V.    "    "    "    (SOCIETY ISLANDS). . . . .	170
	VI. SOME POSSIBLE EARLY HISTORY OF THE SOCIETY ISLANDS . . . . .	218
	VII. POLITICAL AREAS AND SYSTEMS (HERVEY ISLANDS) . . . . .	250
VIII.	"    "    "    (MARQUESAS) . . . . .	300
IX.	"    "    "    (PAUMOTU) . . . . .	325
X.	"    "    "    (OTHER WESTERN ISLANDS) . . . . .	343
XI.	"    "    "    (OTHER EASTERN ISLANDS) . . . . .	381
XII.	"    "    "    (MELANESIAN ISLANDS) . . . . .	410
XIII.	"    "    "    (OBSERVATIONS) . . . . .	418

## LIST OF MAPS

	<i>Facing page</i>
GENERAL REFERENCE MAP . . . . .	I
UPOLU (SAMOA) } . . . . .	40
SAVAI'I (SAMOA) }	
TONGATABU . . . . .	131
TAHITI . . . . .	170
NUKUHIVA (MARQUESAS) . . . . .	300
EASTER ISLAND . . . . .	384

## ERRATA

### VOLUME I

- p. 129, ll. 3-4. For drawing *read* driving  
p. 254, l. 23. For *te arika karakia* read *te ariki karakia*  
p. 254, l. 27. For *te arika pa tai* read *te ariki pa tai*  
p. 273, l. 19. For *Tangaia read* Tangiia  
p. 284, l. 6. For *Kariki read* Karika  
p. 344, l. 7. For *Lakamba read* Lakemba  
p. 381, l. 6. For *Tapairo read* Tapairu  
p. 389, l. 42. For *Hoto-matua read* Hotu-matua



# BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

## (PART I)

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

### ABBREVIATIONS USED IN NOTES

- |  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
| <b>Agostini</b> , Jules. Tahiti. Paris: 1905   | Agostini                |
| <b>Arbousset</b> , M. Tahiti et les îles adjacentes... Paris: 1867   | Arbousset               |
| <b>Ari'itaimai</b> (Mrs Salmon). The Memoirs of Ari'i Taimai. Paris: 1901  | Ari'i Taimai            |
| <b>Baessler</b> , Dr Arthur. Neue Südsee Bilder. Berlin: 1900  | Baessler, <i>N.S.B.</i> |
| — Südsee Bilder. Berlin: 1895  | „ <i>S.B.</i>           |
| <b>Baker</b> , Rev. Shirley W. An English-Tongan Vocabulary... Auckland, N.Z.: 1897  | Baker                   |
| <b>Balfour</b> , Marie C. See <b>Stevenson</b> , Mrs M. I.   |                         |
| <b>Banks</b> , Sir Joseph. Journal of the Right Hon. Sir Joseph Banks, Bart.,...during Captain Cook's first voyage in H.M.S. <i>Endeavour</i> in 1768-71, etc. Edited by Sir Joseph D. Hooker. London: 1896                        | Banks                   |
| <b>Bastian</b> , Prof. Adolf. Die heilige Sage der Polynesier. Leipzig: 1881   | Bastian, <i>H.S.P.</i>  |
| — Inselgruppen in Oceanien... Berlin: 1883   | „ <i>I.O.</i>           |
| <b>Bays</b> , Peter. A narrative of the wreck of the Minerva Whaler of Port Jackson, New South Wales... Cambridge: 1831  | Bays                    |
| <b>Beechey</b> , Capt. F. W., R.N. Narrative of a voyage to the Pacific and Bering's Strait (etc.)...in the years 1825, 26, 27, 28. In two volumes. London: 1831   | Beechey                 |
| <b>Behrens</b> , Karl Friedrich. Reise durch die Süd-länder und um die Welt. Franckfurt und Leipzig: 1737  | Behrens                 |
| <b>Belcher</b> , Capt. Sir Edward, R.N. Narrative of a voyage round the world, performed in His Majesty's ship Sulphur, during the years 1836-1842. 2 vols. London: 1843   | Belcher                 |
| <b>Bennet</b> , George. Journal of voyages and travels by the Rev. Daniel Tyerman and George Bennet, Esq.,...in the South Sea Islands...between the years 1821 and 1829. 2 vols. London: 1831                                      | Tyerman                 |
| <b>Bennett</b> , Fred. Debell. Narrative of a whaling voyage round the globe, from the year 1833 to 1836... 2 vols. London: 1840   | Bennett                 |
| <b>Berchon</b> . Le tatouage aux îles marquises. Bulletins de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris, t. 1, 99. Paris: 1860   | Berchon                 |
| <b>Bille</b> , Steen. Bericht über die Reise der Corvette Galathea um die Welt in den Jahren 1845, 46 und 47. Aus dem Dänischen übersetzt, und theilweise bearbeitet von W. v. Rosen, Mitarbeiter am Original. 2 Bd. Leipzig: 1852 | Steen Bille             |
| <b>Bligh</b> , Lieut. William. A voyage to the South Sea. London: 1792   | Bligh                   |
| <b>Boisse</b> , E. Les îles Samoa, Nukunono, Fakaafo, Wallis et Hoorn. Bulletin de la Société de Géographie, etc. Sixième série, t. x, Juillet-Décembre, 1775, p. 428. Paris: 1875   | Boisse                  |
| <b>Bougainville</b> , Louis de. A voyage round the world. Performed by order of His most Christian Majesty, in the years 1766, 1767, 1768 and 1769. Translated from the French by John Reinhold Forster, F.A.S. London: 1772       | de Bougainville         |

xviii BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBREVIATIONS  
USED IN NOTES

- Bourdin**, le R. P. Vie du vénérable P. M. L. Chanel, prêtre de la Société de Marie. Paris: Lyon: 1867. Bourdin
- Bovis**, Lieut. de. Etat de la Société Taitienne, à l'arrivée des Européens. Annuaire des Etablissements français de l'Océanie...pour l'année commune 1863, p. 217. Papeete: 1863 de Bovis
- Brenchley**, Julius L. Jottings during the Cruise of H.M.S. Curacoa among the South Sea Islands in 1865. London: 1873 Brenchley
- Brigham**, William T. Index to the Islands of the Pacific. Memoirs of the B. P. Bishop Museum, vol. 1, No. 2. Honolulu: 1900 Brigham
- Brodie**, Walter. Pitcairn's Island, and the Islanders, in 1850. London: 1851 Brodie
- Brosses**, Ch. de. Histoire des Navigations aux Terres Australes. 2 t. Paris: 1756 de Brosses
- Brown**, George. Melanesians and Polynesians... London: 1910 Brown
- Burney**, Capt. James, R.N. A chronological history of the voyages and discoveries in the South Sea... 5 vols. London: 1817 Burney
- Buzacott**, Rev. A. Mission life in the islands of the Pacific. Being a narrative of the life and labours of the Rev. A. Buzacott... Edited by the Rev. J. P. Sunderland and the Rev. A. Buzacott, B.A. London: 1866 Buzacott
- Byron**, Hon. Commodore. An account of a voyage round the world, in the years 1764, 1765 and 1766. By the Honourable Commodore Byron, in his Majesty's Ship the Dolphin. (Hawkesworth, vol. 1.) See **Hawkesworth** Hawkesworth
- C.**, le Père A., Société de Marie. Dictionnaire Toga-Français. Paris: 1890 Père A. C.
- Caillot**, A. C. Eugène. Mythes, Légendes et Traditions des Polynésiens. Paris: 1914 Caillot, *Mythes*  
— Les Polynésiens orientaux au contact de la civilisation. „ *L.P.O.*  
Paris: 1909
- Calvert**, James and Williams, Thomas. Fiji and the Fijians. 2 vols. London: 1858 Williams and Calvert
- Campbell**, F. A. A year in the New Hebrides, Loyalty Islands and New Caledonia. Geelong: Melbourne: 1873. Campbell
- Carteret**, Philip. An account of a voyage round the world, in the years 1766, 1767, 1768 and 1769. By Philip Carteret, Esquire, Commander of his Majesty's sloop the Swallow. (Hawkesworth, vol. 1.) See **Hawkesworth** Hawkesworth
- Chalmers**, Rev. James. Journal of a missionary voyage among the out-stations of the Hervey Group, South Pacific, during the months of June and July, 1875. London: 1876 Chalmers
- Chamisso**, Adelbert von. Reise um die Welt mit der romanzoßfischen Entdeckungs-Expedition in den Jahren 1815-18 auf der Brigg Rurik, Kapitän Otto v. Kotzebue. 2 Bd. Leipzig: 1842 von Chamisso
- Cheyne**, Andrew. A Description of Islands in the Western Pacific Ocean.... London: 1852 Cheyne
- Christian**, F. W. The Caroline Islands. London: 1899 Christian
- Churchill**, William. Easter Island. Publication of the Carnegie Institute of Washington, 1912 Churchill, *E.I.*

# BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS xix

BIBLIOGRAPHY	ABBREVIATIONS USED IN NOTES
<b>Churchill, William.</b> The Polynesian Wanderings. Publication of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1911	Churchill, <i>P.W.</i>
— Sissano. Movements of Migration within and through Melanesia. The Carnegie Institute of Washington, 1916	" <i>S.</i>
<b>Churchward, William B.</b> My consulate in Samoa. London: 1887	Churchward
<b>Claret de Fleurieu, C. P.</b> A Voyage round the World, performed during the years 1790, 1791 and 1792, by Etienne Marchand.... Translated from the French of C. P. Claret Fleurieu. 2 vols. London: 1801	Marchand
<b>Codrington, R. H.</b> The Melanesians. Oxford: 1891	Codrington
<b>Colvin, Sir Sidney.</b> See <b>Stevenson, Robert Louis</b>	
<b>Cook, Capt. James.</b> The voyages of Captain James Cook round the world. Printed verbatim from the original editions. In seven volumes. London: 1813	Cook
<b>Cooper, H. Stonehewer.</b> Coral Lands. 2 vols. London: 1880	Cooper
<b>Coppinger, R. W., M.D.</b> Cruise of the "Alert"... London: 1883	Coppinger
<b>Corney, Dr Bolton Glanvill.</b> The Quest and Occupation of Tahiti by the Emissaries of Spain during the years 1772-1776... Translated into English and compiled with notes and an introduction by Bolton Glanvill Corney	Corney, <i>Tahiti</i>
Vol. I. London: 1913. (Hakluyt Society, series II, vol. xxxii)	
Vol. II. London: 1915. (Hakluyt Society, series II, vol. xxxvi)	
Vol. III. London: 1919. (Hakluyt Society, series II, vol. xliii)	
— The Voyage of Captain Don Felipe Gonzalez in the Ship of the Line San Lorenzo, with the Frigate Santa Rosalia in company, to Easter Island in 1770-1: Preceded by an Extract from Mynheer Jacob Roggeveen's Official Log of his discovery of and visit to Easter Island in 1722. Transcribed, translated, and edited by Bolton Glanvill Corney. Cambridge: 1908. (Hakluyt Society, series II, vol. xiii)	" <i>Easter</i>
<b>Coulter, John, M.D.</b> Adventures in the Pacific. Dublin: 1845	Coulter
<b>Crook, Rev. W. MS. Journal.</b> (London Missionary Society Library)	Crook
<b>Cuzent, Gilbert.</b> O'Taiti. Paris: 1860	Cuzent, <i>O.T.</i>
— Voyage aux îles Gambier (Archipel de Mangareva). Paris: 1872	" <i>V.I.G.</i>
<b>Dalrymple, Alexander.</b> An historical collection of the several voyages and discoveries in the South Pacific Ocean. 2 vols. London: 1770	Dalrymple
<b>Darwin, Chas.</b> Journal of researches into the natural history and geology of the countries visited during the voyage of H.M.S. "Beagle" round the world. London: 1884	Darwin, <i>Journal</i>
[ <b>Davies, Rev. John.</b> ] A grammar of the Tahitian Dialect of the Polynesian Language. Tahiti: 1823 (B.M. C 33 b 45. This copy contains MS. notes apparently by Orsmond, whose name is written on the title page)	Davies, <i>Grammar</i>
— A Tahitian and English Dictionary, with introductory remarks... Tahiti: 1851	" <i>Dict.</i>
<b>David, Mrs Edgeworth.</b> Funafuti... London: 1899	Mrs David
<b>Davin, Lieut. A.</b> 50,000 milles dans l'Océan Pacifique. Paris: [1886]	Davin

# XX BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

BIBLIOGRAPHY	ABBREVIATIONS USED IN NOTES
Deschamps, Emile. Les îles Wallis. Le Tour du Monde 1885. Premier semestre, t. XLIX, p. 273. Paris: 1885	Deschamps
Desgraz, C. and Vincendon-Dumoulin, C. A. Les Îles Marquises... Paris: 1843	Vincendon-Dumoulin, <i>I.M.</i>
— Les Îles Taiti. Paris: 1844	Vincendon-Dumoulin, <i>Taiti</i>
Dewar, J. Cumming. Voyage of the Nyanza R.N.Y.C.... Edinburgh: London: 1892.	Dewar
D'Ewes, J. China, Australia, and the Pacific Islands, in the years 1855-56. London: 1857	D'Ewes
Dillon, Chevalier Capt. P. Narrative and successful result of a voyage in the South Seas...to ascertain the actual fate of La Pérouse's expedition, etc. 2 vols. London: 1829	Dillon
Dumont d'Urville, J. Voyage de la Corvette l'Astrolabe... pendant les années 1826, 1827, 1828, 1829. Histoire du Voyage (t. I-V). Paris: 1830-4	d'Urville, <i>Astro.</i>
— Voyage pittoresque autour du monde. 2 t. Paris: 1834	,, <i>Voy. pitt.</i>
— Voyage au Pôle Sud et dans l'Océanie sur les corvettes l'Astrolabe et la Zélée...pendant les années 1837, 1838, 1839, 1840. Histoire du Voyage (t. I-V). Paris: 1841, etc.	,, <i>V.P.S.</i>
Duperrey, L. I. Voyage autour du monde pendant les années 1822, 1823, 1824 & 1825. [No date]	Duperrey
Edwards, Capt. E., R.N. Voyage of H.M.S. "Pandora" despatched to arrest the mutineers of the "Bounty" in the South Seas 1790-1. Being the narratives of Capt. Edwards, R.N., the Commander, and George Hamilton, the Surgeon, with introduction and notes by Basil Thomson. London: 1915	Edwards
Ehlers, Otto E. Samoa die Perle der Südsee... Berlin: 1895	Ehlers
Ellis, W. An authentic narrative of a voyage performed by Captain Cook and Captain Clerke, in His Majesty's ships Resolution and Discovery during the years 1776, 1777, 1778, 1779 and 1780...by W. Ellis, assistant surgeon to both vessels. 2 vols. London: 1785	Ellis (Cook)
Ellis, William. Polynesian Researches. Four volumes. Second edition. London: 1839	Ellis
Entrecasteaux, J. A. Bruni d'. Voyage de d'Entrecasteaux, envoyé à la recherche de La Pérouse...Rédigé par M. de Rossel, ancien capitaine de vaisseau. 2 t. Paris: 1808	d'Entrecasteaux
Erskine, Capt. John E. Journal of a cruise among the Islands of the Western Pacific. London: 1853	Erskine
Fanning, Capt. Edmund. Voyages round the world; with selected sketches of voyages to the South Seas... New York: 1833	Fanning
Farmer, Sarah S. Tonga and the Friendly Islands... London: 1854	S. Farmer
Fitzroy, Robert. Narrative of the surveying voyage of His Majesty's ships Adventure and Beagle, between the years 1826 and 1836. In 3 volumes. London: 1839	Fitzroy
[Foljambe.] Three years on the Australian Station. London: 1868	Foljambe
Fornander, Abraham. An Account of the Polynesian Race. 3 vols. London: 1878	Fornander
Forster, J. Reinhold. Observations made during a voyage round the world... London: 1778	Forster, <i>Obs.</i>
— See also Bougainville, Louis de	

# BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS xxi

BIBLIOGRAPHY	ABBREVIATIONS USED IN NOTES
<b>Forster, George.</b> A Voyage round the world in His Britannic Majesty's sloop <i>Resolution</i> , commanded by Capt. James Cook, during the years 1772, 3, 4 and 5. 2 vols. London: 1777	Forster, <i>Voy.</i>
<b>Frazer, Sir James George.</b> The Belief in Immortality. Vols. I and II. London: 1913, 1922	Frazer, <i>B.I.</i>
— The Golden Bough. Third edition. London: 1914-17	" <i>G.B.</i>
— Lectures on the early history of kingship. London: 1905	" <i>E.H.K.</i>
— <i>Psyche's Task</i> ... Second edition. London: 1913	" <i>P.T.</i>
— Totemism and Exogamy. In four volumes. London: 1910	" <i>T. &amp; E.</i>
<b>Freycinet, Capt. Louis de.</b> Voyage autour du monde... exécuté sur les corvettes... l'Uranie et la Physicienne, pendant les années 1817, 1818, 1819 et 1820. Paris: 1827-39	de Freycinet
<b>Friederici, Dr Georg.</b> Wissenschaftliche Beihefte zum Deutschen Kolonialblatte. Mittheilungen aus den Deutschen Schutzgebieten, Ergänzungsheft Nr. 5. Wissenschaftliche Ergebnisse einer amtlichen Forschungsreise nach dem Bismarck-Archipel im Jahre 1908. II Beiträge zur Völker- und Sprachkunde von Deutsch-Neuguinea. Berlin: 1912	Friederici (1)
— Wissenschaftliche Beihefte zum Deutschen Kolonialblatte. Mittheilungen aus den Deutschen Schutzgebieten, Ergänzungsheft Nr. 7. Wissenschaftliche Ergebnisse einer amtlichen Forschungsreise nach dem Bismarck-Archipel im Jahre 1908. III Untersuchungen über eine melanesische Wanderstrasse. Berlin: 1913	" (2)
<b>Garnier, Jules.</b> Excursion autour de l'île de Tahiti. Bulletin de la Société de Géographie... 5ième série, t. XVI, 447. Juillet-Décembre 1868. Paris: 1868	Garnier, <i>E.A.T.</i>
— Océanie. Paris: 1871	" <i>Océanie</i>
<b>Gaussin, le P. L. J. B.</b> Du dialecte de Tahiti, de celui des îles marquises, et, en général, de la langue polynésienne. Paris: 1853	Gaussin
<b>Geiseler, Kapitänlieutenant</b> (Kommandant S.M.Kbt. "Hyane"). Die Oster-Insel... Berlin: 1883	Geiseler
<b>Gerland, Dr Geo.</b> See <b>Waitz-Gerland</b>	
<b>Gill, Rev. William.</b> Gems from the Coral Islands. 2 vols. London: 1855	W. Gill, <i>Gems</i>
<b>Gill, Rev. William Wyatt.</b> From Darkness to Light in Polynesia... London: 1894	Gill, <i>D.L.P.</i>
— Historical sketches of Savage Life in Polynesia... Wellington: 1880	" <i>S.L.P.</i>
— Jottings from the Pacific. London: 1885	" <i>Jottings</i>
— Life in the Southern Isles... London [1876]	" <i>L.S.I.</i>
— Myths and songs from the South Pacific. London: 1876	" <i>Myths</i>
— The South Pacific and New Guinea... Sydney: 1892. Published by N.S.W. Commissioners for World's Columbian Exposition, 1893, Chicago	" <i>S.P.N.G.</i>
<b>Ginoux, Edmond de.</b> La Reine Pomare. Les femmes de Taiti et des Marquises. Nouvelles Annales des Voyages..., t. IV, 356. Paris: 1844	de Ginoux, vol. IV
<b>le Gobien, le P. Chas.</b> Histoire des Iles Marianes. Paris: 1700	le Gobien
<b>Gonzalez, Capt. Don Felipe.</b> The Voyage of Captain Don Felipe Gonzalez in the Ship of the Line <i>San Lorenzo</i> , with the Frigate <i>Santa Rosalia</i> in company, to Easter Island in 1770-1. (See <b>Corney</b> , Dr Bolton Glanvill)	Corney, <i>Easter</i>

# xxii BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

BIBLIOGRAPHY	ABBREVIATIONS USED IN NOTES
Goodenough, Commodore James G. <i>Journal of Commodore Goodenough...</i> Edited, with a memoir, by his widow. London: 1876	Goodenough
Grézel, le Père. <i>Dictionnaire Futunien-Français</i> . Paris: 1878	Grézel
Gunn, William. <i>The Gospel in Futuna</i> . London: [1914]	Gunn
Haddon, Dr A. C. <i>Evolution in Art</i> . London: 1895	Haddon
Hadfield, E. <i>Among the natives of the Loyalty Group</i> . London: 1920	Mrs Hadfield
Hale, Horatio. <i>United States Exploring Expedition during the years 1838-1842. Ethnology and Philology</i> . Philadelphia: 1846	Hale
Hamilton, George. <i>A Voyage round the world in His Majesty's frigate Pandora. Performed under the direction of Captain Edwards in the years 1790, 1791 and 1792</i> . Berwick: 1793	Hamilton
Harlez, C. de. <i>L'Ile de Pâques et ses monuments graphiques</i> . Le Muséon, t. xiv, 415; t. xv, 68. Louvain: 1895, 1896	de Harlez, vol. xiv, vol. xv
Hartland, Sidney. <i>Ritual and Belief</i> . London: 1914	Hartland
Hawkesworth, John. <i>An account of the voyages undertaken by the order of His Present Majesty for making discoveries in the Southern Hemisphere...</i> In three volumes. London: 1773	Hawkesworth
Hedley, Charles. <i>The Atoll of Funafuti, Ellice Group...</i> <i>Memoirs of the Australian Museum</i> , III, part 3: — <i>The Ethnology of Funafuti. Memoirs of the Australian Museum</i> , III, part 4. Sydney: 1896-7	Hedley ,,
Hesse-Wartegg, Ernst von. <i>Samoa, Bismarckarchipel und Neuguinea...</i> Leipzig: 1902	von Hesse-Wartegg
Home, Capt. Sir E., R.N. <i>Notes among the Islands of the Pacific. The Nautical Magazine and Naval Chronicle for 1849</i> , p. 450, 580, 631. London: 1849	Home
Hood, T. H. <i>Notes of a cruise in H.M.S. "Fawn" in the Western Pacific in the year 1862</i> . Edinburgh: 1863	Hood
Hooker, Sir Joseph D. <i>See Banks, Sir Joseph</i>	
Hoole, Rev. Elijah. <i>See Lawry, Rev. Walter</i>	
Hoppner, Richard Belgrave. <i>See Krusenstern, Capt. A. J. von</i>	
Hort, Dora. <i>Tahiti, the Garden of the Pacific</i> . London: 1891	Mrs Hort
Hübner, Baron von. <i>Through the British Empire</i> . In two volumes. London: 1886	von Hübner
Jardin, Edelstan. <i>Notice sur l'archipel de Mendana ou des Marquises 1853-1854. Mémoires de la Société Impériale Académique de Cherbourg 1856</i> , p. 173. Cherbourg: 1856	Jardin
Jaussen, Mgr. Tepano. <i>L'Ile de Pâques</i> . Paris: 1893	Jaussen
Kotzebue, Otto von. <i>A new voyage round the world in the years 1823, 24, 25 and 26</i> . 2 vols. London: 1830	von Kotzebue
Krämer, Prof. Dr Augustin. <i>Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa...</i> Stuttgart: 1906	Krämer, <i>H.O.S.</i>
— <i>Die Samoa-Inseln</i> . 2 Bd. Stuttgart: 1901-2	,, <i>S.I.</i>
Krusenstern, Capt. A. J. von. <i>Voyage round the world in the years 1803, 1804, 1805 and 1806</i> . Translated from the original German by Richard Belgrave Hoppner. 2 vols. London: 1913	von Krusenstern
Labillardière, J. J. Houton de. <i>Voyage in search of La Pérouse</i> . 2 vols. London: 1802	Labillardière

# BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS xxiii

BIBLIOGRAPHY	ABBREVIATIONS USED IN NOTES
<b>Lambert, C. and S.</b> The voyage of the "Wanderer." From the Journals and letters of C. and S. Lambert. Edited by Gerald Young. London: 1883	Lambert
<b>Lamont, E. H.</b> Wild life among the Pacific Islanders. London: 1867	Lamont
<b>Langley, S. P.</b> The Fire Walk Ceremony in Tahiti. From the Smithsonian Report for 1901, p. 539. Washington: 1902	Langley
<b>Langsdorff, G. H. von.</b> Bemerkungen auf einer Reise um die Welt in den Jahren 1803 bis 1807. 2 Bd. Frankfurt: 1813	von Langsdorff
<b>La Pérouse, Jean F. G.</b> Voyage de La Pérouse autour du monde. 4 t. Paris: 1798	La Pérouse
<b>La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, F. A. F. de.</b> Voyage dans les Etats-Unis d'Amérique fait en 1795, 1796 et 1797. 8 t. Paris: 1799	La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt
<b>Lawry, Rev. Walter.</b> The Friendly and Feejee Islands: a missionary visit...in the year 1847. Edited by Rev. Elijah Hoole. London: 1850	Lawry, <i>F.F.I.</i> (1)
— A second missionary visit to the Friendly and Feejee Islands in the year 1850. Edited by Rev. Elijah Hoole. London: 1851	„ <i>F.F.I.</i> (2)
<b>Lesson, Dr A.</b> Les Polynésiens. 4 t. Paris: 1880-4	Lesson, <i>Poly.</i>
<b>Lesson, P.</b> Voyage autour du monde...sur la corvette La Coquille. Paris: 1839	Lesson, <i>Voy.</i>
<b>Lisiansky, Urey.</b> A voyage round the world in the years 1803, 4, 5 and 6;...in the ship Neva. London: 1814	Lisiansky
<b>London Missionary Society.</b> The Quarterly Chronicle of the Transactions of the London Missionary Society in the years 1815-19. Vol. I. London: 1821	L.M.S., <i>Q.C.</i> , vol. I
— The Quarterly Chronicle of the Transactions of the London Missionary Society in the years 1820, 1821, 1822, 1823 and 1824. Vol. II. London: 1825	„ <i>Q.C.</i> , vol. II
— Transactions of the Missionary Society. Vols. I-IV. The second edition. London: 1804-18	„ <i>Trans.</i>
— Reports of the Missionary Society. London: 1814	„ <i>Rep.</i>
<b>Lundie, George Archibald.</b> Missionary Life in Samoa, as exhibited in the Journals of the late George Archibald Lundie during the revival in Tutuila in 1840-41. Edinburgh: 1846	Lundie
<b>Macdonald, Rev. D.</b> Oceania: Linguistic and Anthropological. Melbourne: 1889	Macdonald
<b>Mangeret, le R. P.</b> Mgr. Bataillon et les Missions de l'Océanie Centrale. 2 t. Lyon: 1895	Mangeret
<b>Marchand, Etienne.</b> See <b>Claret de Fleurieu, C. P.</b>	
<b>Mariner, William.</b> An account of the natives of the Tonga Islands, in the South Pacific Ocean. Compiled and arranged from the extensive communications of Mr William Mariner, several years resident in those islands. By John Martin, M.D. In 2 volumes. [3rd edition.] Edinburgh: 1827	Mariner
<b>Markham, Sir Clement.</b> See <b>Quiros, Pedro Fernandez de</b>	
<b>Marquardt, Carl.</b> Die Tätowirung beider Geschlechter in Samoa. Berlin: 1899	Marquardt
<b>Martin, Aylie.</b> Promenades en Océanie. Le Tour du Monde 1885. Deuxième semestre, t. L, p. 209, 214, 369, 376. Paris: 1885	Martin
<b>Martin, John, M.D.</b> See <b>Mariner, William</b>	

# xxiv BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

BIBLIOGRAPHY	ABBREVIATIONS USED IN NOTES
<b>Massachusetts Historical Society.</b> Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, vols. 1-IV. Reprinted. Boston: 1806-35	Mass. Hist. Soc.
<b>Mathias, le Père G.</b> Lettres sur les îles marquises. Paris: 1843	Mathias
<b>Meade, Lieut. the Hon. Herbert, R.N.</b> A ride through the disturbed districts of New Zealand; together with some account of the South Sea Islands. London: 1870	Meade
<b>Meinicke, Prof. C. E.</b> Die Inseln des Stillen Oceans. 2 Bd. Leipzig: 1875, 6	Meinicke
<b>Melville, Herman.</b> Typee... New edition. London: 1893	Melville
<b>Moerenhout, J. A.</b> Voyages aux îles du Grand Océan. 2 t. Paris: 1837	Moerenhout
<b>Monfat, le P. A.</b> Le Missionnaire des Samoa. Mgr. L. Elloy de la Société de Marie. Lyon: 1890	Monfat, <i>M.S.</i>
— Les Tonga, ou Archipel des Amis et le R. P. Joseph Chevron de la Société de Marie. Lyon: 1893	,, <i>Tonga</i>
<b>Montgomery, James.</b> Journal of voyages and travels by the Rev. Daniel Tyerman and George Bennet, Esq...in the South Sea Islands...between the years 1821 and 1829. 2 vols. London: 1831	Tyerman
<b>Montiton, le R. P. Albert.</b> Les Paumotous. Les Missions catholiques, t. VI, Jan.-Déc. 1874, p. 342, 354, 366, 378, 491, 502. Lyon: 1874	Montiton, vol. VI
<b>Morgan, L. H.</b> Ancient Society... New York: 1907	Morgan
<b>Moseley, H. N.</b> Notes by a Naturalist on the "Challenger," being an account of various observations made during the voyage of H.M.S. "Challenger"...in the years 1872-1876. London: 1879	Moseley
<b>Moss, Frederick J.</b> Through Atolls and Islands in the great South Sea. London: 1889	Moss
<b>Murray, Rev. A. W.</b> Forty Years' Mission Work in Polynesia and New Guinea from 1835 to 1875. London: 1876	Murray, 40 years
— The Martyrs of Polynesia. London: 1885	,, <i>Martyrs</i>
— Missions in Western Polynesia... London: 1863	,, <i>M.W.P.</i>
<b>Nicoll, M. J.</b> Three voyages of a naturalist. 2nd edition. London: 1909	Nicoll
<b>Orsmond, Rev. J. M. (?)</b> . See <b>Davies, Rev. John</b> , A grammar of the Tahitian dialect...	
<b>Parkinson, R.</b> Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee... Stuttgart: 1907	R. Parkinson
<b>Parkinson, Sydney.</b> A journal of a voyage to the South Seas, in His Majesty's ship the Endeavour. London: 1784	Parkinson (1)
[—?] A journal of a voyage round the world, in His Majesty's ship Endeavour, in the years 1768, 1769, 1770 and 1771. London: 1771	,, (2)
<b>Paton, John G.</b> John G. Paton, missionary to the New Hebrides. An autobiography. Edited by his brother. London: 1890	Paton
<b>Paton, Maggie Whitecross.</b> Letters and sketches from the New Hebrides. London: 1894	Mrs Paton
<b>Du Petit-Thouars, Capt. Abel.</b> Voyage autour du monde sur la frégate La Vénus, pendant les années 1836-1839. 4 t. Pare: 1840-1845	Du Petit-Thouars
<b>Pigeard, Ch.</b> Voyage dans l'Océanie centrale sur la corvette française Le Bucéphale. Nouvelles Annales des Voyages... Nouvelle série, année 1845, t. IV, 141. Paris: 1846	Pigeard, <i>N.A.V.</i> , vol.



# BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS xxv

BIBLIOGRAPHY	ABBREVIATIONS USED IN NOTES
<b>Pigeard</b> , Ch. Voyage dans l'Océanie centrale. Nouvelles Annales des Voyages... Nouvelle série, année 1846, t. 1, 181. Paris: 1846	Pigeard, <i>N.A.V.</i> , vol. 1
<b>Pinart</b> , Alphonse. Voyage à l'île de Pâques. Le Tour du Monde 1878. Deuxième semestre, t. xxxvi, 255. Paris: 1878	Pinart
<b>Porter</b> , Capt. David. Journal of a cruise made to the Pacific Ocean...in the United States Frigate Essex, in the years 1812, 1813 and 1814. 2 vols. 2nd edition. New York: 1822	Porter
[Pratt, Rev. Geo.] A Samoan Dictionary... Samoa: 1862	Pratt
<b>Pritchard</b> , W. T. Notes on certain anthropological matters respecting the South Sea Islanders. Memoirs read before the Anthropological Society of London, vol. 1, 1863-4	Pritchard, <i>A.S.</i> , vol. 1
— Polynesian Reminiscences. London: 1866	Pritchard
<b>Quatrefages</b> , A. de. Les Polynésiens et leurs migrations. Paris. [No date]	de Quatrefages
<b>Quiros</b> , Pedro Fernandez de. The Voyages of Pedro Fernandez de Quiros, 1595 to 1606. Translated and edited by Sir Clement Markham. In 2 volumes. London: 1904. (Hakluyt Society, series II, vols. XIV, XV)	de Quiros
<b>Radiguet</b> , Max. La Reine-Blanche dans les îles marquises... Revue des Deux Mondes, t. xxii, 431; t. xxiii, 607. Paris: 1859	Radiguet, vol. xxii „ vol. xxiii
<b>Reeves</b> , Edward. Brown Men and Women... London: 1895	Reeves
<b>Ribourt</b> , P. Etat de l'île Tahiti, pendant les années 1847, 1848. Annuaire des établissements français de l'Océanie... p. 302. Papeete: 1863	Ribourt
<b>Rivers</b> , Dr W. H. R. The History of Melanesian Society. In two volumes. Cambridge: 1914	Rivers, <i>H.M.S.</i>
— Sun-cult and megaliths in Oceania. American Anthropologist (N.S.), vol. xvii, No. 3, p. 431	„ <i>S. C. &amp; M.</i>
<b>Roggeveen</b> , Jacob. (Official log of his discovery of Easter Island in 1722. See <b>Corney</b> , Dr Bolton Glanvill)	
<b>Rosen</b> , W. von. See <b>Bille</b> , Steen	
<b>Rossel</b> , M. de. See <b>Entrecasteaux</b> , J. A. Bruni d'	
<b>Routledge</b> , Mrs Scoresby. The mystery of Easter Island. London: 1919	Mrs Routledge
<b>Rovings</b> in the Pacific, from 1837 to 1849... By a merchant long resident at Tahiti. In two volumes. London: 1851	<i>Rovings</i>
<b>Rowe</b> , G. Stringer. A Pioneer. A Memoir of the Rev. John Thomas, missionary to the Friendly Islands. London: 1885	Rowe
<b>Saffre</b> , Dr. Archipel des Tonga, des Samoa, des Wallis, île Futuna, des Fidji. Archives de Médecine Navale..., t. xli, 433. Paris: 1884	Saffre
<b>St Johnston</b> , Alfred. Camping among cannibals. London: 1883	St Johnston
<b>Salmon</b> , Mrs. See <b>Ari'itaimai</b>	
<b>Scherzer</b> , Dr Karl. Narrative of the circumnavigation of the globe by the Austrian frigate Novara...in the years 1857, 1858 and 1859. 3 vols. London: 1861-3	Scherzer
<b>Schmeltz</b> , J. D. E. Die ethnographisch-anthropologische Abteilung des Museums Godeffroy in Hamburg. Ein Beitrag zur Kunde der Südsee-Völker. Hamburg: 1881	Schmeltz
<b>Seligman</b> , Dr C. G. The Melanesians of British New Guinea. Cambridge: 1910	Seligman

xxvi BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

BIBLIOGRAPHY	ABBREVIATIONS USED IN NOTES
<b>Shillibeer</b> , Lieut. J., R.M. A narrative of the Briton's voyage to Pitcairn Island... Third edition. London: 1818	Shillibeer
<b>Smith</b> , S. Percy. Hawaiki. Christchurch: 1910	Smith
<b>Speiser</b> , Dr Felix. Two years with the natives in the Western Pacific. London: [1913]	Speiser
<b>Stair</b> , Rev. John B. Old Samoa... [London]: 1897	Stair
<b>Steinen</b> , Karl von den. Ein marquesanische Sarg. Ethnologisches Notizblatt. Herausgegeben von der Direktion des königlichen Museums für Völkerkunde in Berlin, Bd II, Heft 1, 22. Berlin: 1899	von den Steinen
<b>Stevenson</b> , Mrs M. I. From Saranac to the Marquesas and beyond. Being letters written by Mrs M. I. Stevenson during 1887-88... Edited by Marie Clothilde Balfour. London: 1903	Mrs Stevenson
<b>Stevenson</b> , Robert Louis. Ballads. London: 1902	Stevenson, <i>Ballads</i>
— A Footnote to History. London: 1892	„ <i>Footnote</i>
— The letters of Robert Louis Stevenson... Selected and edited with notes and introduction by Sidney Colvin. 2 vols. London: 1901	„ <i>Letters</i>
— In the South Seas... London: 1900	„ <i>S.S.</i>
— Vailima Letters. London: 1899	„ <i>V. Letters</i>
<b>Stevenson</b> , Mrs R. L. The Cruise of the "Janet Nichol" among the South Sea Islands. London: 1915	Mrs R. L. Stevenson
<b>Stewart</b> , C. S. A visit to the South Seas, in the United States' ship Vincennes, during the years 1829 and 1830... 2 vols. London: 1832	Stewart
<b>Stuebel</b> , O. Samoanische Texte. Unter Beihülfe von Eingeborenen gesammelt und übersetzt. Herausgegeben von F. W. K. Müller. Veröffentlichungen aus dem königlichen Museum für Völkerkunde, Bd IV, 2-4 Hefte, 59. Berlin: 1896	Stuebel
<b>Sunderland</b> , Rev. J. P. Mission Life in the Islands of the Pacific. Being a narrative of the life and labours of the Rev. A. Buzacott... Edited by the Rev. J. P. Sunderland and the Rev. A. Buzacott, B.A. London: 1886	Buzacott
" <b>Sundowner</b> " [Tichborne, Herbert]. Rambles in Polynesia. London: 1897	"Sundowner"
<b>Thomas</b> , Julian. Cannibals and Convicts. London: 1886	Thomas
<b>Thomson</b> , Sir Basil H. The Diversions of a Prime Minister. Edinburgh and London: 1894	Thomson, <i>D.P.M.</i>
— The Fijians... London: 1908	„ <i>Fijians</i>
— Savage Island. London: 1902	„ <i>S.I.</i>
— See also <b>Edwards</b> , Capt. E.	
<b>Thomson</b> , Wm J. Te Pito te Henua, or Easter Island. Report of the U.S. National Museum, under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution for the year ending June 30, 1889. Washington: 1891	W. J. Thomson
[Tichborne, Herbert.] See " <b>Sundowner</b> "	
<b>Tregear</b> , Edward. The Maori-Polynesian Comparative Dictionary. Wellington, N.Z.: 1891	Tregear
— The Maori Race. Wanganna, N.Z.: 1914	„ <i>Maori</i>
<b>Turnbull</b> , John. A voyage round the world, in the years 1800, 1801, 1802, 1803 and 1804... Second edition. London: 1813	Turnbull
<b>Turner</b> , Rev. Geo. Nineteen years in Polynesia... London: 1861	Turner, <i>19 years</i>
— Samoa. London: 1884	Turner

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBREVIATIONS  
USED IN NOTES

- Tyerman**, Rev. Daniel. Journal of voyages and travels by the Rev. Daniel Tyerman and George Bennet, Esq....in the South Sea Islands...between the years 1821 and 1829. 2 vols. London: 1831 Tyerman
- Vancouver**, Capt. Geo. A voyage of discovery to the North Pacific Ocean...performed in the years 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794 and 1795, in the Discovery...and...Chatham. 3 vols. London: 1798 Vancouver
- Veeson**, George. Authentic narrative of a four years' residence at Tongataboo. London: 1810 Veeson
- Vincendon-Dumoulin**, C. A. and Desgraz, C. Les îles marquises... Paris: 1843 Vincendon-Dumoulin,  
I.M.  
— Les îles Taiti. Paris: 1844 Vincendon-Dumoulin,  
Taiti
- Waitz-Gerland**. **Waitz**, Dr Theodor. Anthropologie der Naturvölker. Bd v. Leipzig: 1865 Waitz-Gerland  
— **Gerland**, Dr Geo. Anthropologie der Naturvölker. Bd vi. Mit Benutzung der Vorarbeiten des Verfassers fortgesetzt von Dr Geo. Gerland. Leipzig: 1872 Gerland
- Wallis**, Samuel. An account of a voyage round the world, in the years 1766, 1767, 1768. By Samuel Wallis, Esq., Commander of His Majesty's Ship the Dolphin. (Hawkesworth, vol. 1.) See **Hawkesworth**, John, LL.D. Hawkesworth
- Walpole**, Lieut. the Hon. Fred., R.N. Four years in the Pacific in Her Majesty's Ship "Collingwood." From 1844 to 1848. In 2 volumes. London: 1849 Walpole
- Waterhouse**, Rev. Joseph. The King and People of Fiji... London: 1866 Waterhouse
- Wesleyan Missionary Society**. Notices, vol. iv. For the years 1823, 1824, 1825. London. Miss. Notices, vol. iv  
— Notices, New Series, vol. 1. For the years 1839, 1840, 1841. London: 1842 " " N.S.,  
vol. 1  
— Notices, New Series, vol. II. For the years 1842, 1843, 1844. London: 1845 Miss. Notices, N.S.,  
vol. II
- West**, Rev. Thomas. Ten years in South-central Polynesia. London: 1865 West
- Westermarck**, Edward. The History of Human Marriage. 2nd edition. London: 1894 Westermarck
- Westervelt**, W. D. Legends of Ma-ui... Honolulu: 1910 Westervelt
- Wheeler**, Daniel. Extracts from the letters and journal of Daniel Wheeler... London: 1839 Wheeler
- Whitmee**, Rev. S. J. A missionary cruise in the S. Pacific... in the barque "John Williams," during 1870. 2nd edition. Sydney: 1871 Whitmee
- Wilkes**, Charles, U.S.N. Narrative of the U.S. Exploring Expedition during the years 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842. In 5 vols. Philadelphia: 1845 Wilkes
- Williams**, Rev. John. A narrative of missionary enterprises in the South Sea Islands. London: 1837 Williams
- Williams**, Thomas and Calvert, James. Fiji and the Fijians. 2 vols. London: 1858 Williams and Calvert
- Wilson**, William. A missionary visit to the Southern Pacific Ocean, performed in the years 1796, 1797, 1798, in the ship Duff, commanded by Captain James Wilson. Compiled from journals of the officers and the missionaries... London: 1799 Wilson

# xxviii BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## ABBREVIATIONS USED IN NOTES

- Wragge, Clement L. *The romance of the South Seas.* Wragge  
London: 1906
- Young, Gerald. *See* Lambert, C. and S.
- Young, J. L. *Remarks on Phallic Stones from Rapanui.* Young, P.S.  
Occasional papers of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum  
of Polynesian Ethnology and Natural History, vol. II, No.  
2, p. 31. Director's Report for 1903. Honolulu: 1904
- Young, Rev. Robert. *The Southern World...* London: 1854 Young, S.W.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

## (PART II)

(Articles from Journals, etc., from which quotations are seldom given are included in the Bibliography under the names of the Authors.)

LIST OF JOURNALS, TRANSACTIONS OF SOCIETIES, ETC.	ABBREVIATIONS
<b>Annales hydrographiques.</b> Paris	<i>Ann. hydro.</i>
<b>L'Anthropologie.</b> Paris	<i>L'Anthro.</i>
<b>Anthropos.</b> Wien, Salzburg	<i>Anthrop.</i>
<b>Association de la Propagation de la Foi,</b> Annales de l'. Lyon	<i>A.P.F.</i>
<b>Das Ausland.</b> Augsburg	<i>Ausland</i>
<b>Australian Association for the Advancement of Science.</b> Melbourne, Sydney, etc.	<i>A.A.A.S.</i>
<b>Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte.</b> Zeitschrift für Ethnologie. Berlin	<i>Z.f.E.</i>
<b>Ethnological Society of London,</b> Journal of the. London	<i>J.E.S.</i>
<b>Folk-lore Society.</b> Folk-lore. London	<i>Folk-lore</i>
<b>Die geographische Gesellschaft in Hamburg.</b> Mittheilungen. Hamburg	<i>M.G.G. Hamburg</i>
<b>Die Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin.</b> Verhandlungen. Berlin Zeitschrift. Berlin	<i>V.G.E. Z.G.E.</i>
<b>Globus.</b> Braunschweig	<i>Globus</i>
<b>Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie.</b> Leiden	<i>I.A.E.</i>
<b>Man.</b> See Royal Anthropological Institute <i>below</i>	
<b>Museum Godeffroy,</b> Journal. Hamburg	<i>J.M.G.</i>
<b>Nature.</b> London	<i>Nature</i>
<b>New Zealand Institute,</b> Transactions and Proceedings of the. Wellington, London	<i>N.Z.I.</i>
<b>Polynesian Society,</b> Journal of the. Wellington, New Plymouth, N.Z.	<i>J.P.S.</i>
<b>Revue d'Ethnographie.</b> Paris	<i>Rev. d'Eth.</i>
<b>Revue Maritime et Coloniale.</b> Paris	<i>R.M.C.</i>
<b>Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland,</b> Journal of the. London Man. London	<i>J.A.I. Man</i>
<b>Royal Geographical Society of London,</b> Journal of the. London	<i>J.R.G.S.</i>
<b>Royal Society of New South Wales,</b> Journal and Proceedings of the. Sydney, London	<i>R.S.N.S.W.</i>
<b>Das Verein für wissenschaftliche Unterhaltung zu Hamburg.</b> Verhandlungen. Hamburg	<i>V.V.U.</i>
<b>Victoria Institute, or Philosophical Society of Great Britain,</b> Journal of the Transactions of the. London	<i>J.V.I.</i>
<b>Zeitschrift für Ethnologie.</b> See Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie etc. <i>above</i>	



## CHAPTER I

### ORIGIN AND MIGRATIONS

THE questions as to the whereabouts of the original home or homes of the early ancestors of the people whom we call Polynesians, and the courses and characters of their migrations from those homes to the islands of the Pacific, and of subsequent inter-island movements in the Pacific, have been the subjects of considerable discussion. I propose to confine myself for the present to the fundamental question of the early migrations into the Pacific of at all events some of these ancestors; for, though I have collected material, legendary and otherwise, bearing on the subject of subsequent inter-island movements, a discussion of these matters must be postponed till we are in a position to regard them in the light of our knowledge of the points of difference and similarity between the social and political systems, religious and other beliefs and traditions, and customs and practices, found in the several islands. I shall, however, refer in subsequent chapters to a few of these inter-island movements and local traditions as to origin, which help to throw light upon other subjects with which those chapters deal. In dealing now with original migrations, I shall, speaking generally, confine myself to statements and hypotheses of some past writers on the subject; any attempt by me to enter into the discussion of these matters before I have collected the material available would also be premature.

The subject of the original migrations has been discussed by a number of the earlier writers, such as Hale, Quatrefages, Lesson (whose theory was that the Polynesians originated in New Zealand), and others; but their views were based largely on more or less local data, and had not behind them the weight of evidence afforded by the logs and legends to which I shall refer presently. It has also been discussed by a number of more modern writers. I propose, however, to content myself with a mere reference, in the first place, to the writings of Fornander and Percy Smith, and to pass on from them to a few more recent investigators, after which I shall return to Fornander and Smith.

Fornander approached the subject from the point of view of a Hawai'ian student, and his views were embodied in his classic

work on *The Polynesian Race*, published in 1878. Percy Smith, with special knowledge of the Maori, and of the earlier Polynesian people from whom they were descended, had at his disposal in 1910 a large store-house of fresh material, especially legends and logs; and his book *Hawaiki* forms a fitting sequel to, and continuation of, that of Fornander, dealing, as it does, with the earliest history of certain migrants, with which Fornander mainly occupied himself, and adding a large amount of fresh information as to the movements of the people after they had reached the Pacific.

The question has since been discussed by Churchill in 1911 and 1912<sup>1</sup>. He deals with it at considerable length; but as his data and arguments are almost entirely linguistic in character, I am not qualified to follow them. I will, however, draw attention to certain conclusions at which he arrives. He divides the ancestors of what we call the Polynesians into two groups or streams, the former of which he calls the Proto-Samoans, and the latter the Tongafiti folk. He treats both of them as having come from the Asiatic Archipelago, the former some 2000 years ago, and the latter some 1000 years later. He traces the supposed movements of these people on a chart; in this he shows by dotted lines certain movements of the Proto-Samoans among the islands of Indonesia; he then by continuous lines indicates two streams of the Proto-Samoans into the Pacific; one of these passes to the north of New Guinea, between New Britain and New Ireland, thence through the whole length of the Solomon group, and finally reaches Samoa as a termination; the other passes through the Torres Straits, south of New Guinea, and through the New Hebrides, and terminates in Viti Levu of the Fiji group. From Samoa he indicates by continuous lines further radiating movements to Tonga, Niue, Hawai'i, Mangareva, and southward to New Zealand. He makes no attempt to trace the movements of the Tongafiti migrations into the Pacific; but by means of dot and dash lines he indicates radiating movements from Samoa (not Fiji) to the Marquesas, Hervey Islands, Society Islands and elsewhere and further movements from these groups to other islands<sup>2</sup>.


Churchill thus credits the people whom we call Polynesians with a double ancestry, the two elements of which have reached the Pacific at different periods, one long before the other. It

<sup>1</sup> *Polynesian Wanderings, and Easter Island.*

<sup>2</sup> Churchill, *P.W.* p. v and map.



GENERAL REFERENCE MAP



Mercator's projection: Equatorial scale 275 Nautical miles to an inch.

Stanford's Geographical Establishment London.

has long been recognized that the Polynesians were a mixed race, and though this would not necessarily be inconsistent with a belief that they were all descended from one group or stream or succession of streams of migrants, the view has been held that this was not so. Writers have spoken of a conquering people, and have identified these as the ancestors of the families of the chiefs, this view being based in part upon the general superiority in physique of the chiefs, and the frequency among them of a skin fairer than that of the common people. This reason, taken by itself, would hardly be convincing, in view of the special care usually devoted to the upbringing and nurture of the chiefs' children, and the habit of artificially promoting fairness of skin among their daughters by protection from the scorching rays of the sun.

Another hypothesis to which I must refer is what Churchill calls the "sieve" theory and dismisses; it is that the islands of Melanesia and Polynesia were merely meshes of a net that caught drifts of castaways from Central Polynesia blown away from home and carried westward by the prevailing winds<sup>1</sup>. The contention that the Polynesians must have come from the east, and not the west, has, I think, been founded mainly on the basis of ocean physiography—upon the suggested impossibility of their distant ancestors having been able to accomplish migrations eastward in the teeth of the prevailing trade winds. This was a difficulty which could not be dismissed lightly, and Smith meets it by drawing attention to the extraordinary skill and daring of the people as navigators, as disclosed by recorded voyages, and to the belief that in days gone by, when the voyages under discussion were taken, they had larger and better sea-going vessels than those used by them in later days<sup>2</sup>. However sufficient or otherwise may be Smith's contentions on the question of navigation, we have to bear in mind the significant character of the ancient records of the migrations, the beliefs of the people as to the westward direction of the home of their ancestral gods and destination of the souls of their dead, the suggestive nature of many of their myths and legends, and their religious beliefs and customs. Whatever may be the answer to the navigation difficulty, I find it impossible to believe that the place of origin of at all events the ethnic elements in the Polynesians with which we must associate the bulk of our knowledge concerning them was eastward, and not westward,

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 14-19.

<sup>2</sup> Smith, pp. 166-89.

of their Pacific home; and I do not imagine that the contrary theory has now any substantial volume of support.

Tregear, writing in 1914, states his views on the migrations as follows. The Polynesians are a people who either originated in India or in Central Asia, and passed through India. Leaving the mainland, they journeyed eastward through the Malay Archipelago, occupying perhaps many generations in the voyages from island to island. At the time of their passage the Archipelago was not occupied by Malays, who are a subsequent migration from the Mongolian seaboard. The Maori expedition or expeditions passed by the Melanesian and Polynesian islands, inhabited by black people (New Guinea, New Caledonia, etc.), and reached the Fiji group, where they settled for a long time. From Fiji as a centre they colonized Samoa, Tonga, Hawai'i, the Marquesas, Mangareva, and extended their colonies even as far as Easter Island. In process of time they either hived off or were expelled from Fiji, and the waves of migration passed to and fro among the groups of the islands. On one of these waves an expedition, starting probably from Ra'iatea, landed at Rarotonga, and pushing on to the south-west, reached New Zealand, where the occupants of their large double canoes were known as the Maoris from Hawaiki<sup>1</sup>.

The general question of the origin of the Polynesians has been opened up on highly scientific lines, entirely different in character from those pursued by other writers, by Rivers in his great work, published in 1914, *The History of Melanesian Society*, a book which, though it deals primarily with Melanesia, necessarily involves, as will be seen, the discussion of Polynesia also.

Rivers's investigation of the matter carries us back to a period long before that dealt with definitely by Fornander and Smith. He has no direct evidence to adduce, such as the Polynesian "logs," to which Fornander and Smith refer so frequently. He is dealing with the unknown; and necessarily his evidence is largely circumstantial, a form often more to be relied upon than direct testimony. Under these circumstances he adopts the method of hypothesis, surveying his data in the first instance from one or two special points of view, such as that of systems of relationship, suggesting a hypothesis which seems to be in better accord than any other with the result of his scrutiny, and then putting his hypothesis to the test by examining it afresh in

<sup>1</sup> Tregear, *Maori*, p. 559.

the light of other matters; and thus finally accepting it, modifying it, or abandoning it and formulating a fresh hypothesis, according to the result of his tests. It is obvious that I cannot here reproduce Rivers's data and contentions; and I am in no way qualified to enter into a critical discussion of his views; but I may be allowed to say that, so far at least as his main fundamental propositions are concerned, the cumulative effect of his copious and widely different data, and of his minute and critical investigation and comparison is strong. He presents us with a past history of Melanesian and Polynesian society, based, it is true, on hypotheses, but upon hypotheses tested with considerable care, and from divergent points of view; and the way in which many and various features of Melanesian and Polynesian culture seem to fit into the compartments which these hypotheses provide for them is remarkable. At the very least it must be admitted that the general scheme of Rivers's theories—the only truly scientific theories yet evolved—seems to offer explanations of many of the puzzles and complications by which the study of Melanesian and Polynesian ethnology has been beset.

It may be my duty from time to time, in subsequent chapters of this book and in later books which I hope to write hereafter, to refer to specific matters discussed by Rivers, which I shall consider in the light of the purely Polynesian material I have collected; and with a view to this it is necessary that I should now refer to a few of the main points which enter into his scheme. The following are the conclusions to which I would draw attention<sup>1</sup>.

I. Melanesians and Polynesians are descendants of several different peoples, who have reached the Pacific at successive periods. These were

(1) An aboriginal people, about whom we know practically nothing, whose habitat was probably confined to Melanesia.

(2) Migrants into Melanesia and Polynesia. These were people who buried their dead in a sitting position. They were probably the original population of Polynesia. In Melanesia they fused with the aborigines, thus forming a dual people, with mutual exogamy and matrilineal descent.

(3) The kava people. These consisted of two groups of migrants, of which the earlier practised mummification, and the

<sup>1</sup> A few of the statements made here are based upon information supplied to me by Dr Rivers since the publication of his book.

later interment in the extended position. They spread over most parts of Melanesia and spread widely and had a predominating influence in Polynesia. The migrants spoken of by Percy Smith belong to these people, probably the later ones.

(4) The betel people, whose influence has been mainly confined to north-western Melanesia. They may have had some influence in Polynesia, but this is difficult to detect. They were head hunters.

(5) The cremation people, who reached north-western Melanesia.

II. It is probable that the kava migrants did not all arrive in one body; but that their influx was spread over a considerable period of time, band after band of the wanderers arriving, some settling permanently, others passing on after a time and settling elsewhere.

III. They were not a conquering people who reduced the earlier inhabitants to a condition of complete subservience. They were in relatively small bodies; but their reception by those inhabitants was peaceful. They were of higher culture, and were superior to the latter in material equipment and mental endowment, and so, in spite of their inferiority in numbers, were able to exercise great influence over the people among whom they settled, these being folk of but lowly culture, easily receptive of the new customs and beliefs which the migrants introduced. They brought with them few, if any, women; and so had to mate with the women of the earlier people, thus producing closer ties of intimacy and friendship between the two races, and causing further racial mixture of blood.

IV. The culture of the people in certain parts of Melanesia, especially Pentecost Island (in the New Hebrides) and also the Banks and Torres Islands, the mountainous interiors of Fiji, and Buin (in Bougainville Island) is relatively primitive and archaic. In other parts it is more advanced; it is especially so in the small island of Ulawa, near the southern extremity of Malaita, in the district of Saa in Malaita, and in Eddystone Island, near New Georgia. It is still further developed in Polynesia.

V. In places where the culture is relatively archaic the elements of that culture to be attributed to the dual people are relatively extensive and important; but where the culture is

more advanced, one or more of the later elements, including those of the kava people, predominates.

VI. The islands with the more archaic cultures are those in which the systems of relationship are the most complex, the relationship nomenclature the richest, and the special functions, rights, privileges, duties and restrictions associated with bonds of relationship most numerous, well defined and important. Advance in culture has been attended by simplification of systems of relationship, comparative poverty in nomenclature and disappearance to a greater or less extent, according to the degree of advance, of these special functions, etc.

VII. The dual people were influenced by a belief in magic rather than by religion; but it is possible that the existing magic of Melanesia is a product of the interaction between the dual and kava people. The beliefs of the kava people were based mainly on religion, and involved religious practices, that is, practices which were believed to bring them into relation with powers higher than themselves, to whom they appealed and offered sacrifices, whom they regarded with awe, wonder and love, and who were able to withhold that for which they were asked.

VIII. The beliefs of the dual people were centred mainly on spirits which had never been men, though it is possible that these spirits had an origin in ghosts. Those of the kava people were based largely upon ghosts; they were, or included, a cult of the dead.

IX. The dual people believed that the dead dwelt underground, the way to this home beneath the earth being sometimes through volcanic vents, volcanoes entering into their beliefs. The kava people thought that their dead passed to spots on earth or above it.

X. The dual people regarded the body of a dead man as a thing to be removed as completely as possible from all contact with the living. The kava people treated it as a thing to be preserved and cherished.

XI. Secret societies originated with the kava people, being instituted to enable them to engage in their religious rites without intrusion of the dual people among whom they were living. The cult of the dead formed an important part of these rites; and the beliefs as to this, stimulated by the secrecy and mystery in which the rites were enveloped, and the unearthly noises and apparitions by which in some of the societies those not initiated were terrified, were conducive to the privacy which the kava

people desired. The elements of secrecy, and fear on the part of outsiders, were most marked in the parts of Melanesia where the comparative strength of the kava people was weakest, because it was there that they were most needed. In other parts the kava people could engage in their religious devotions more openly, the need for secrecy and mystery was less, and the societies lost some of their supernatural importance.

XII. The social system of the dual people, so far as marriage was concerned, was one of gerontocracy, the old men of each moiety appropriating to themselves the young women of the other moiety. They had no chiefs, or, if they had, the position of these chiefs had not developed into importance. The kava people, with their more advanced social culture, had a system of definite hereditary chieftainship.

There are many other important questions raised by the book, to some of which I may refer hereafter, but those enumerated above are, I think, sufficient to give a broad idea of Rivers's views, so far as they affect the general question of Polynesian origin and migrations.

Setting aside the question of the betel people, we should expect, if Rivers's deductions are correct, to find in Polynesian culture features which he attributes to the kava people and to the sitting interment people, the former of these being perhaps specially associated with the chiefs and their families. Unfortunately we have but little material for dissecting the culture of the dual people of Melanesia, so as to eliminate from it features to be attributed to the Melanesian aborigines, who, according to Rivers's scheme, probably did not reach Polynesia, and confine it to that of the sitting interment people<sup>1</sup>.

Rivers refers to Churchill's scheme in a paragraph which I will quote verbatim as follows. "The other scheme recently put forward by W. Churchill has many points of resemblance with my own. Churchill deals especially with Polynesia and with Polynesian influence on Melanesia, and his general conception of the double nature of Polynesian culture, of the nature of the interaction between the two elements, and of the mechanism by which the Polynesian influenced the languages of Melanesia has many striking similarities with my own scheme. In one important respect, however, there is a profound difference. Churchill supposes the population of Polynesia to have been formed by the interaction between two peoples, whom he calls

<sup>1</sup> See Rivers's observations on this point (*H.M.S.* vol. II, chap. xxxviii).

the Proto-Samoans and the Tonga-fiti. If there is any correspondence between his scheme and mine, the Proto-Samoans should correspond with the people who interred their dead in a sitting posture and the Tonga-fiti with the kava people. Churchill is unable, however, to find any evidence for the influence of the Tonga-fiti upon Melanesian language. I can only hope that the scheme of this volume may act as a guide in the search for the influence of this Polynesian element in Melanesia. It may be noted that Churchill's treatment is largely based on a study of the language of Efate which, according to my scheme, is shown by its plant-totemism to occupy a peculiar position in Melanesian culture. If the Tonga-fiti are to be equated with the kava people, it is rather in places such as the matrilineal region of the Solomons and the Banks Islands that their influence should be sought." Rivers then proceeds to discuss Churchill's denial of the close relation between the Polynesian and Indonesian families of language<sup>1</sup>.

Two volumes by Friederici were published in 1912 and 1913<sup>2</sup>. These deal with the question of the migrations from Indonesia to New Guinea and Melanesia, and the conclusions arrived at are based mainly on linguistic data, though some technological material is introduced also. Friederici's tracing of the movements he discusses does not carry them further east than Melanesia; but certain linguistic and other data disclose Polynesian affinities. On this ground it is proper that I should refer to the books; but it would be out of the question to attempt to introduce into this chapter any discussion of their contents or the Melanesian conclusions at which the author arrives. It may be that at a later date it will be possible to dissect out from Polynesian cultures some elements which may seem to be conceivably attributable to the pre-kava people who, according to Rivers's hypotheses formed one of the two elements of his dual people of Melanesia, but who reached the islands of Polynesia; and when this stage of investigation is reached Friederici's data may afford material for comparison.

I have quoted Rivers's reference to Churchill's division of migration streams into Proto-Samoans and the Tonga-fiti people, and his suggestion that, if there is any correspondence between Churchill's scheme and his own, Churchill's Proto-Samoans should correspond with his (Rivers's) sitting interment people and Churchill's Tonga-fiti with Rivers's kava people. It

<sup>1</sup> Rivers, *H.M.S.* vol. II, p. 584.

<sup>2</sup> Friederici (1) and (2).



seems to me, however, that if we consider the general contents of Churchill's book, we may recognize that, setting aside the question of the interval suggested by him between the two migrations (obviously a highly speculative and uncertain matter), it is possible that both his sets of migrants might have been groups of people whom we should regard as typically Polynesian in character, in which case both groups might well be Rivers's kava people. This is, I think, suggested by Churchill's reference to the Proto-Samoans having been driven out of Indonesia by advancing Malaysians<sup>1</sup>; by his entry into the well-known discussion as to the division of the stream into two currents, of which one passed north and the other south, of New Guinea; by his reference to Polynesian traditions of their migrations and their idea of Bulotu<sup>2</sup>; by his quotations from Tregear<sup>3</sup> and Percy Smith<sup>4</sup>; and indeed by the whole contents of the book. As to this matter, I may refer to Rivers's suggestion that the migrants spoken of by Smith were probably the later of his own two migrating groups of kava people, and point out that the bulk of the information given by Smith seems to relate to the migrants whose movements eastward were recorded in the Rarotongan logs, who afterwards spread over and colonized the Pacific, and who appear to have been the last stream to enter the Pacific in the neighbourhood of Fiji, Tonga or Samoa. Smith suggests of these people that on reaching Samoa the people with whom they came in contact would be "the original migration of Samoans—Polynesians like themselves"<sup>5</sup>; and if he is right in this, might not these earlier Samoans have been Churchill's Proto-Samoans and Rivers's earlier kava migrants?

Churchill has extended his investigations, and has recorded the results in his more recent book *Sissano*. Here again his data are almost entirely linguistic, so I must only record some of his conclusions and their illustration in his chart No. 16. He still adheres to his two Proto-Samoan streams, of which what he calls the Samoa stream passed to the north, and his Viti Levu stream to the south, of New Guinea; and as to this he says that the Polynesian element in the speech records found along the south coast are appreciably nearer to the type normal to that speech family than are those found on the north coast<sup>6</sup>. In connection with this matter he discusses the suggestions that

<sup>1</sup> Churchill, *P.W.* pp. v sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 20.

<sup>3</sup> Smith, p. 156.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 13.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 21 sq.

<sup>6</sup> Churchill, *S.* p. 159.

have been made that the Polynesian elements found on the southern shores of British New Guinea may be due, not to remnants of original migrations travelling eastward along that coast, but to reflex movements of people whose original eastward movement has been north of the island, and who, rounding its eastern extremity, have passed westward along the southern coast; and he gives linguistic grounds for thinking that these suggestions are not supported by the evidence<sup>1</sup>. A feature of interest in his book is the introduction of a third line of migration from Indonesia to Samoa. Apparently he suggests that this migration started from the Southern Philippines<sup>2</sup>, and he traces on his chart 16 the course which he assigns to it. The region nearest to Indonesia in which he first identifies the track is north of the equator at Kapingamarangi and Nukuoro of the Caroline group; he then follows its course passing Tauu, Nugeria, Nukumanu, Liuanuia (Ongtong Java), Sikaiana, the Reef Islands (the northern Matema section of the Santa Cruz group), Tikopia, Anuda, Rotuma, Fotuna, Uvea, and thence to Samoa<sup>3</sup>. He indicates a branch line of migration, diverging from the main course at Liuanuia, and moving in a southerly direction between Ysabel and Malaita, then between Malaita and Guadalcanar, again between Guadalcanar and San Cristoval, and terminating at Moiki (Rennel) and Moova (Bellona) Islands<sup>4</sup>. In discussing this route, Churchill suggests that the wanderers found the islands by which they passed uninhabited and says, "we should expect to find the laggards of the migration, scattered along the course, speaking a pure, albeit archaic, Polynesian," and draws attention to this being the case as regards the islands specifically referred to<sup>5</sup>; and he again refers to what he calls the undiluted character of the Polynesians found dotted along a thread from the Carolines to nuclear Polynesia<sup>6</sup>. The whole meaning of his argument is, I take it, that the Polynesian languages found in the islands of this route are free from Melanesian admixture, such as would arise from contact with the people of New Guinea and the great chains of the Melanesian groups, and so their people must have had an origin in a direct and independent line of migration, such as he indicates. Churchill also discusses his suggested branch migration to Rennel and Bellona from the same standpoint; and as regards

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 168 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 169 and chart 16.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 169.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 160.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* chart 16.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 171.

this matter the evidence will, I should imagine, require specially careful scrutiny, because the branch route passes right through the Solomon group, between four of its largest islands. He refers to distinct evidence of Polynesian loan material in the languages of places on the channel between Malaita and Guadalcanar<sup>1</sup>, and to the more or less high degree of intermingling with strictly Melanesian material in the two channels between Malaita, Guadalcanar, and Malaita and San Cristoval<sup>2</sup>. I presume he regards this Polynesian linguistic material and that of Rennel and Bellona Islands as so far similar to the pure archaic Polynesian found on the main line of route as to justify his connecting it with that route; some such proof of identity seems to be necessary, as his northern New Guinea route passes right through the channels between the main islands of the Solomon Group, and is crossed by this suggested branch line of his Philippine migrants in this same inter-island area.

It must be clearly understood that I merely quote Churchill's contentions as forming a part of the more recent series of discussions as to the migrations. I have not the linguistic knowledge needed to form any opinion as to the accuracy of his data or the validity of his conclusions.

I must just refer to an article written in 1919, by Hocart on eastward movements among the Fijian islands, involving migrations from the eastern islands of that group towards Tonga and Samoa; though, as he fixes the date of the commencement of these movements at a period only about eight or nine generations ago, the discussion of the matter hardly comes within the purposes of this chapter<sup>3</sup>.

I now return to Fornander's *The Polynesian Race* and Percy Smith's *Hawaiki*, in both of which books it seems to be assumed that the Polynesians were descended from a succession of migrants from the west, who were ethnically substantially the same. I shall have to refer to the migrants by the term "Polynesians," used by Fornander and Smith, though, if the Polynesians of the Pacific were the result of the fusion of two or more peoples, of whom those whose movements these writers discuss were only one, the term is not quite correct.

Both Fornander and Smith supply us with information as to what they regard as the probable dates or approximate dates of the events which they record and the periods to which they

<sup>1</sup> Churchill, *S.* p. 155.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 169

<sup>3</sup> Hocart, *J.A.I.* vol. XLIX, p. 42.

refer, these dates being arrived at largely from the study of genealogies and the estimated length of the period of a generation. For this purpose Fornander adopts 30 years as the length of the period of a generation; but Smith, acting, he tells us, on the concensus of opinion of several Polynesian scholars who knew the race well, substitutes 25 years, and in quoting Fornander he converts his dates on the basis of a 25 years' scale<sup>1</sup>. It is obvious, as regards this subject, that the more vital matter is to ascertain the correct order in which recorded events have followed one another, and the actual lengths of periods and dates of events are not so important. Nevertheless they are interesting; and I am bound to say, with all humility, that, even as regards the period of 25 years adopted by Smith, I feel far from satisfied as to the matter.

I have before me, as I write, a considerable number of Polynesian genealogies, including several from Rarotonga, which latter are more especially important in connection with Smith's calculations. Many of these go a long way back, in illustration of which I refer to five Rarotongan genealogies introduced by Smith into *Hawaiki*. These are carried back for 95, 93, 57, 38 and 42 generations respectively; and they therefore, working on a 25 year basis, extend backwards for 2375, 2325, 1425, 950 and 1050 years respectively. As might well be expected, they consist in the main merely of columns of names representing, apparently, the several successors to the titles whose histories they record; in only a few cases do they indicate the relationship between each successor and his immediate predecessor.

Let us, for the purpose of considering this matter, assume for the moment that in each case the succession passed from a father to a son or nephew, so that they really were, broadly speaking, successions by members of consecutive generations. Which son or nephew was it that would presumably be the one who would in all probability be elected? Was it the eldest, or was it the most suitable, without reference to seniority? Customs as to this seem, so far as the evidence goes, to have varied somewhat in the different islands in the relatively modern times when the people were under observation; and it would be dangerous to speculate as to what they had been, say a thousand years ago. And yet this is a factor that has to be considered in estimating the average length of a generation, because the older

<sup>1</sup> Smith, pp. 25 sq.

the son or nephew selected was, the sooner, on the average, would be the time when he would die and a fresh successor would have to be found. We are therefore uncertain as to an important factor which might well make a difference of a few years in the average length of a generation, and so make a substantial difference in the calculation, on the basis of generations, of the periods of events of the far distant past.

Then there is, I think, another element of uncertainty, and possible source of inaccuracy. We shall see in a subsequent chapter that a system of matrilineal descent of family rank of blood or traces of it prevailed in some of the islands in comparatively recent times; whilst succession to the official position of group headship was—generally at all events—patrilineal. I imagine that we may assume that in the distant past (I do not venture to suggest how distant) matrilineal descent would be general, and would carry with it matrilineal succession; for the head of a social group would as a rule have to be a member of that group. Therefore, on the death of a chief, his presumed successor would be, not his own son, but the son of his sister. She might be older, or younger than he, so for the purpose of considering averages we may assume that they were the same age. On the other hand, I think that the balance of probability—I am only looking at the matter as one of average—is in favour of the belief that she had married and begun to give birth to children at a slightly younger age than he. One reason for this belief is that I understand that a girl commonly reaches the age of puberty, at which she is capable, practically, if not theoretically, of performing fully her part in the process of reproduction, a little earlier than does a boy; and this difference, if true now, presumably has been so in times past. The other reason is that there is some evidence of customs for girls to marry at a slightly younger age than did boys. It is said, for instance, that in Tahiti the usual marriageable age for a girl was about 12 or 13, whilst that of a boy was two or three years older<sup>1</sup>. So we are told that in Samoa girls of 10 or 11 often married boys of about 12<sup>2</sup>. I do not know whether, or how far, similar customs prevailed in other islands, but it is reasonable to imagine that a girl would be regarded as marriageable as soon as she was old enough to bear children, whilst a boy would not always be regarded as having become a man until a somewhat later date. So far as the question of custom, at all events,

<sup>1</sup> Ellis, vol. 1, p. 267.

<sup>2</sup> Von Bülow, *Globus*, vol. LXIX, p. 193.

is concerned, we cannot assume its prevalence in the distant past. If my balance of probability is accepted, we have to consider the question of the average length of a generation in the earlier periods of the genealogies, when perhaps matrilineal succession prevailed, in the light of the fact that the average age of the successor may then have been a year or two greater than it was afterwards when patrilineal succession had been established; and in that case the average period of the subsequent life of that successor would be reduced by a year or two, and to this extent the length of the generation would be reduced correspondingly. I admit that the difference is only small, but its cumulative effect upon the combined lengths of a large number of generations is a matter to be borne in mind.

Another marriage custom, reported from some of the islands, was for the son of a great chief to have in his early years a good deal of freedom in matrimonial matters, whilst at a later date, when the event of his succession was getting nearer, a wife of high rank had to be selected for him, whose child would be his presumptive successor on his death. It will be recognized that this practice would tend to lengthen the periods of successive reigns, and so lengthen those of what we are calling generations. It is impossible to say how far back this practice had extended.

I have, so far, been discussing the matter on the assumption that on the death of a chief the succession passed to his son, or perhaps a nephew; but the difficulty involved by counting periods of time in terms of generations does not end here. We shall see that on the death of a chief, the succession did not necessarily pass to a son or nephew; it might go to a brother, or some other person of his own or some other generation, including, for instance, an uncle; and I should imagine that any prior presumptive claim of a son of the previous chief would have been, if anything, weaker in earlier days, so that the number of successions by people of the same generation as that of the deceased chief, or even a prior generation, would be greater. Here, then, we seem to have a very probable and fruitful source of error in calculating time in the way adopted. It is here a matter of successions, but not necessarily of generations. The combined length of the periods of the reigns of a chief, and afterwards of his brother, which in Smith's calculations would be regarded as covering two generations, would only cover one. There are in some genealogies references to native statements that successions indicated by the genealogies were

from father to son; but such statements do not affect my mind in the least, so far as the older successions are concerned. How can we place reliance upon statements, based on traditions merely handed down from mouth to mouth, as to the relationships to one another of a number of successive chiefs of 1000 or 2000 years ago? But if there is any substantial doubt on this question of fact, then, even if we are assured as to the proper duration of time to be assigned to a generation, the method of calculating time on the assumption that each succession to the title represented a generation is unreliable; and it may well be that the periods of time ascertained in this way appear to have been longer—perhaps much longer—than they had really been.

Then again there is another point. Smith's estimate of the length of a generation is presumably based upon the average length of reigns, that is upon the period between the date of a chief's succession and that of his death. In a calculation of this sort we have to bear in mind the fact, not only that a chief's reign might terminate prematurely by abdication, deposition or death in battle or other violent death, but that very often it did so. It would, of course, be impossible for Smith or anyone else to prepare statistical calculations in which these elements of uncertainty were provided for; but the absence of such provision involves an obvious source of inaccuracy in the estimates. I have not material by which to consider the extent to which abdication and deposition might affect the calculation; but I have a few suggestive data concerning violent death. In Gill's list of twelve "rulers of food" in Mangaia, it is stated that one of them was drowned, and three others are stated to have been slain<sup>1</sup>. Out of nine Mangaian priests of Mоторо, two were slain. Out of nine priests of Tane, four were slain. Out of eleven priests of Turanga, two were slain and one was driven out of the island<sup>2</sup>. In a list of thirteen sacred chiefs or kings of Mangaia, one of them is stated to have been slain; and out of thirteen sacred chiefs of the second rank one is said to have had a violent death, two to have been slain, and one to have been drowned<sup>3</sup>. So, as regards the island of Nuie, in a list of seven kings one is said to have been killed, and another starved to death<sup>4</sup>. These are obviously merely scattered fragments of information, and cannot be regarded as proof of anything; but they do indicate

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* p. 228. Cf. Gill, *D.L.P.* p. 314.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* *D.L.P.* pp. 312 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 315 sqq.

<sup>4</sup> Thomson, *S.I.* p. 36.

possibilities of inaccuracies such as I have suggested, though I am not prepared to say that these more striking examples must be regarded as necessarily illustrative of the usual course of events, distant and recent, in Polynesia.

I confess, even in the face of so experienced and distinguished a student of the Polynesians as Mr Smith, that I think that for these purposes of chronology he relies too much on the genealogies. He himself discusses the matter. He disputes warmly the contention of Mr (now Sir) Basil Thomson that they "do not carry us back for more than seven or eight generations, and beyond this limit we are apt to step into the regions of mythology"<sup>1</sup>; and in this I agree with him up to a point, for I think Thomson underestimates the way in which Polynesian family histories and pedigrees were remembered, and passed down from generation to generation. But it is quite another thing to assume their accuracy for very long periods, as Smith appears to do. One argument used by Smith in support of his position is the result of the comparison of tables of different branches of the Polynesian people showing descent from a common ancestor; and in illustration of this he gives examples of such tables, showing Hawai'ian, Tahitian, Rarotongan and Maori descents from Hiro, the number of generations disclosed by the several tables being remarkably similar (25, 23, 26, 26)<sup>2</sup>. I can quite believe that, even assuming that my contentions are correct, this would often be so; sources of possible error might average themselves to a certain extent in the several comparative tables, and the difference between 23 and 26 might perhaps represent the extent to which they had failed to do so in the specific tables to which I have referred. One reply to Smith's argument is, that whilst considerable portions of these four genealogies may have been the subjects of traditions which had been kept more or less correctly, nevertheless the earlier parts must be regarded as of more doubtful accuracy; and when, instead of dealing with 26 so-called generations, we are dealing with 95, the element of uncertainty becomes infinitely greater. There is, however, another reply. Even if the inaccuracies of long genealogies average themselves for the purpose of comparing the probable length of one of them with that of another, this still leaves open the question of the length of time which each and all of these genealogies must be believed to have covered; this may have been less or greater than that at which Smith

<sup>1</sup> Smith, p. 26.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 27 sq.



arrives on his basis of successive generations of twenty-five years each.

But there is a further point to which I must draw attention. I have, rightly or wrongly, arrived at the suspicion that some of the very long family histories and genealogies of great Polynesian chiefs have been more or less doctored and lengthened out, and in parts, probably even invented, for the purpose of supporting competitive contentions of superiority in length of ancestry and sometimes in divine origin; and if this suspicion is justified it adds another element of uncertainty as to the trustworthiness of genealogies as measuring records of time. We certainly find in some of the islands lists of rulers, obtained by different people, which are far from being identical.

On the whole matter, I think that the long periods of time, to which I shall now have to refer, must be regarded as more or less uncertain; and that, looking at the various possibilities of error, the balance of probability is that the dates of the various occurrences were not so distant, perhaps not nearly so distant, as is suggested by Smith.

These questions, raised by me, obviously only affect the accuracy of the alleged dates of events, and in no way touch what for my present purpose is much more interesting and important—their sequence; I will therefore content myself with quoting the dates as I find them.

Fornander contends that the remote ancestors of the Polynesians at one period, in the far distant past, inhabited a land in north-western India and on the shores of the Persian Gulf; and he says that, when other traces here fail, yet the language points further north, to the Aryan stock in its earlier days, long before the Vedic irruption into India; and that for long ages the Polynesian family was the recipient of a Cushite civilization, and this to such an extent as almost entirely to obscure its own consciousness of parentage and kindred to the Aryan stock<sup>1</sup>. He supports this statement by a considerable quantity of evidence. It would be futile for me to attempt to recapitulate this evidence here, as any reader interested in the question must necessarily study Fornander's book; I may, however, refer shortly to the different types of evidence adduced. He calls to witness Polynesian legends, which he regards as truly ancient traditions, emanating from the period of their life in their original north-western home, including legends as to the crea-

<sup>1</sup> Fornander, vol. 1, p. 2.

tion of the world out of chaos, the killing of the younger by the elder of the sons of the first man, the flood, a tale somewhat similar to that of the tower of Babel, and traditions as to a family of twelve sons; and draws attention to the similarity between these and the Hebrew-Chaldean legends, suggesting in fact that they must be regarded as separate versions, carried down from early days, of the events recorded in the Bible. He endeavours to identify some of the heroes of Polynesian mythology with well-known Biblical personalities. He draws attention to a number of Polynesian customs, usages, rites, caste systems, modes of thought and beliefs, the origins of which he traces back to the period of this same original home. And lastly, he devotes an entire volume to linguistic evidence. This view of Fornander as to what I may call a pre-India origin of the Polynesians has been the subject of discussion, support and criticism; but I do not propose to make any attempt to deal with the question, though I should say that Smith seems to be in substantial agreement with Fornander<sup>1</sup>. I think, however, I am on fairly safe ground, if I start with the belief that the Polynesians (by which term I mean primarily the people whose movements Fornander and Smith discuss) may probably at all events be traced back to an early home in India; this is the view taken by Smith, he regarding it as fairly deducible from the traditions; though even he admits that it is a moot question whether they can be traced with any degree of certainty further back than to the period of their sojourn in Indonesia<sup>2</sup>.

Put in a few words, and starting with the supposition as to India, it may be said that, according to these writers, the migrations apparently commenced with movements from India to Indonesia and a gradual spreading over the islands of the latter; and this was afterwards followed by migrations from Indonesia to the Pacific, Fiji having apparently been at all events one of the final stopping places, from which the subsequent migrations to what are now known as the Polynesian islands radiated.

Before attempting to narrate the tale of these migrations, as told by Fornander and Smith, I would say something about what the latter calls the "names of the traditional fatherland"—the ancient dwelling places, occupied by the people in the remote past. The number of these names is great; but only a few of them are in Smith's opinion capable of identification<sup>3</sup>, and

<sup>1</sup> Smith, pp. 101-7, 127 *sqq.*, 201 *sq.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 86. <sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 46.

I believe that even the identities for which he contends are not all definitely accepted by students of Polynesian ethnography.

Foremost among these names he places "Hawaiki," a name known, either in that, its Maori form, or in some different form, to nearly every branch of the race, a circumstance to which he draws attention as evidence of its extreme age, and of the probability that it was the true name of the fatherland, the spot from which the ancestors of the Polynesians came, and to which passed the spirits of their dead<sup>1</sup>. Smith thinks that the evidence points to India as having been this fatherland<sup>2</sup>. This great name was carried away by the people in their wanderings, and applied by them to many of their later homes<sup>3</sup>. Under various forms, including Hawaiki, Havaiki, Hawai'i, Avaiki, Savaiki, Savai'i, Java and Jawa, he finds this name in Java, the Moluccas and Ceram, in New Guinea, and, among the Polynesian Islands, in the Fijian, Samoan, Tongan, Society, Marquesan and Paumotuian groups, in New Zealand and the Hawai'ian group, in Niue, Easter Island, and elsewhere<sup>4</sup>. The next name given by Smith is "Tawhiti," which he associates with a sacred mountain in the "Hawaiki" (Indian) fatherland. He gives various examples of the subsequent application of this name to new places, including Tafiti (a Samoan name for the Fiji group), Viti-levu (the largest island of that group), Tahiti (of the Society group), and Tahiti or Kahiki (a name appearing in the Hawai'ian traditions for all parts of Central Polynesia known to the Hawai'ians)<sup>5</sup>. Another name is "Wawau," the meaning of which, as suggested by Smith, is "happy," "free from care," or perhaps "open," "spacious"; this name is associated in an old Maori chant with their Paradise. The examples of its repetition, as given by Smith, include an island of Vavau, to the north of the Fiji group, but the identity of which is unknown, and Vavau of the Tongan group<sup>6</sup>. Other names, given and discussed by Smith, are "Mataora," "Raro" or "Roro," "Nukuroa," "Herangi," "Taranga," "Irihia," "Hora-nui-a-tau," and "Atia-te-varinganiui"<sup>7</sup>.

Turning now to the migrations, and giving Smith's dates of periods and events, the story, taken mainly from Rarotongan

<sup>1</sup> Smith, p. 46.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 62.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 55.

<sup>4</sup> For details see Smith, pp. 55 *sqq.* Cf. Fornander, vol. 1, p. 24; Gill, *Myths*, p. 166.

<sup>5</sup> Smith, pp. 62-6.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 66 *sqq.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 68-84.

traditions, begins with the period of about B.C. 450, when the fatherland in India, here called Atia-te-varinga-nui, was ruled over by a king or chief called Tu-te-rangi-marama. Some importance attaches itself to this commencement of the tale, especially on account of the great stone-walled temple, of many enclosures, built by this king—a sacred glorious place, of great space within, and filled with many beautiful and wonderful things. For this temple was built as a meeting-place for gods and men, and here the spirits of the ancients foregathered after death with the gods. Here also originated the *takurua-tapu*, or sacred feasts, to the gods Rongo, Tane, Rua-nuku, Tu, Tangaroa and Tongaiti; and it was here that the great chiefs and priests assembled to elect kings, and met in council to devise wise measures for men, slaves and children. It was in Atia-te-varinga-nui, and apparently at this period, that other *takurua*, feasts and games, were originated to dignify the land; also the *karioi* (the Rarotongan word for *areoi*), or houses of amusement, singing and dancing, and trumpets and drums, and many other things and customs<sup>1</sup>.

This Atia-te-varinga-nui was the most ancient land known to the Rarotongans, and under the variation Atia, is the first name mentioned in their *karakia*, in which the course of their migrations was recited<sup>2</sup>. Smith suggests that the meaning of the name may be translated "Great Atia-covered-with-rice"<sup>3</sup>. He tells us that its temple is the only instance in Polynesian traditions of the erection of such a large building<sup>4</sup>. He says that the king, Tu-te-rangi-marama, and other great people named as flourishing during his period, appear to have been deified at a subsequent time, but that they did not take the same place in the Polynesian Pantheon as did the greater gods, Tane, Tu, Rongo and Tangaroa<sup>5</sup>.

Between the period of Tu-te-rangi-marama (B.C. 450) and the time at which the first actual traces of migrations to Indonesia appear (B.C. 65) there is a long hiatus in the history<sup>6</sup>. But great wars occurred in Atia, in which these Polynesian ancestors apparently were defeated, and so were compelled to migrate from their fatherland<sup>7</sup>; and Smith thinks that for about

<sup>1</sup> Smith, pp. 123 sq. (*Karioi*, with its equivalent words, seems to have been a general Polynesian term, and not to have been confined to the *areoi* societies of Polynesia).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 76.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 126.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 129 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 78.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 129.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 124 sq.

300 years during this period there had been a movement from India, the people passing along the coasts, and down the Straits of Malacca, or along the west and south coasts of Sumatra, perhaps leaving a remnant of their people in the Mentawi islands, whose people, he says, are probably Polynesian in origin; and he suggests that, as these excursions extended, the wanderers would become more and more a race of navigators<sup>1</sup>. I am not clear whether or not, in suggesting this route, he specially has in mind, as their ultimate stopping place, the island of Java, which he regards as the halting ground of the recorded migration to which I shall next have to refer, or whether his suggestion is applicable to migration to Indonesia generally.

The first movement from India to Indonesia, of which we have any actual record, occurred, according to Smith, in about B.C. 65, when Te Kura-a-moo, in consequence of quarrels at home, migrated to Avaiki-te-varinga, which Smith believes to have been the island of Java<sup>2</sup>. I should mention that he also identifies Hawaiki with Java<sup>3</sup>; but this might arise from the adoption during the Polynesian wanderings of the name of their ancient home, to which I have already referred.

According to Fornander, the Polynesian immigrants into Indonesia must have found the islands already inhabited. He says that at some remote period the Papuans (in which expression he perhaps includes the ancestors of both the Papuans and the Melanesians, and possibly a dwarf or negrito race) inhabited the islands of the Asiatic archipelago as far west at least as Borneo, and probably extending up on the mainland on the side of Siam, the Malacca peninsula, and perhaps as far as Burmah; and they held these islands at a time previous to the arrival and occupation of them by the ante-Malay family, by which expression he means the Polynesians<sup>4</sup>. Smith also says that it is clear that the Polynesians were preceded in Indonesia by the Papuans or Melanesians, "branches of a negrito race," who, he thinks, also came originally from India<sup>5</sup>. He also refers to Maori traditions with incidental notices of an ancient people called Manahune, Manahua, or Makahua, known in Hawai'i as Menehune, who were by some supposed to be a diminutive race, somewhat like the elves of the old world stories<sup>6</sup>, a descrip-

<sup>1</sup> Smith, p. 130. Cf. pp. 86 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 135.

<sup>3</sup> Smith, p. 80.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 130.

<sup>5</sup> Fornander, vol. I, p. 32.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 139 sq.

tion which would seem to apply to negritos, rather than to either Papuans or Melanesians. He says that none of the accounts suggest that these people differed in colour from the brown Polynesians<sup>1</sup>, a fact which, if correct, is hardly in accord with their having been either Papuan, Melanesian or negrito; Fornander regards the name as having been a racial one, applied by the Polynesians to themselves in ancient times, and derived from a remote ancestor named Kalani-Menehune<sup>2</sup>. Smith, however, seems to have no doubt that these people were an alien race of Papuans or Melanesians (probably he would regard negritos as included in these terms). He refers to the vague notions of the Polynesians concerning them, to their habit of living in the mountains and forests and to the wonderful powers of sorcery with which they were credited<sup>3</sup>.

Whatever the truth may be as regards these Manahune people, it is possible that negroid races occupied Indonesia, or part of it, at the time of the Polynesian entry. Fornander says that, as the Polynesians advanced eastward through the archipelago, the Papuans (as he calls them) were driven before them, either out of the islands altogether, or into the interiors of the larger ones, where remnants of them remained; that, thus expelled or conquered, the Papuans found an asylum and a home in the Papuan archipelago (by which presumably he means what we now call New Guinea and Melanesia), unless indeed we assume that they had already spread so far east, before they came into hostile combat with the Polynesians in the west<sup>4</sup>. Smith also refers to the conquering and expelling by the Polynesians of the "negrito" race, who, he suggests, would often be enslaved.

According to Fornander the length of the sojourn of the Polynesians in Indonesia is unknown, and there are hardly any means of forming a conjecture on the subject<sup>5</sup>. Smith also speaks of it as unknown; but he suggests that it probably occupied 300 or 400 years<sup>6</sup>. I do not quite follow his exact meaning in this, and especially do not understand at what periods he considers this 300 or 400 years began and ended. As regards the date of commencement, we have seen that, though the first recorded migration from India was, in his opinion, in about B.C. 65, the people had apparently been

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 140 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Smith, p. 141.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 36.

<sup>2</sup> Fornander, vol. 1, p. 55.

<sup>4</sup> Fornander, vol. 1, p. 32.

<sup>6</sup> Smith, pp. 134, 136.

filtering through to Indonesia during some 300 years before that; and as to the date of ending, we shall see that, whilst the history of the movement is only definitely picked up in Fiji in about A.D. 450, there is a previous period during which Smith thinks the people had been moving on from Indonesia to Fiji. I think, however, that Smith's 300 or 400 years in Indonesia must be taken as beginning at the time of the period of the first recorded migration.

It would seem, however, that, according to the probabilities which the above accounts suggest, the period of Indonesian occupation, whatever may have been its length and approximate dates of commencement and ending, or a portion, probably a considerable portion, of it must have been a period of movement, probably gradual, and perhaps occasional and intermittent, in an easterly or south-easterly direction. This movement was perhaps due to a large extent to pressure from behind. We are told, for example, that during the Wakea period in Indonesia (about A.D. 390) the Malays, who apparently had entered the archipelago some 300 years previously, were probably pressing forward from Java and Sumatra, where they had first set foot, to Timor, Gilolo and the Philippines<sup>1</sup>. The Polynesians would thus, apparently, be subject to Malay pressure from behind, and Papuan or Melanesian resistance in front; but, overcoming the latter, they also advanced, and spread over the islands, advancing to the eastern groups, including Timor and Gilolo<sup>2</sup>. Then, still moving eastward, and reaching the areas of New Guinea and Melanesia, they still encountered the resistance of the people whom they were driving before them, and, being thus unable to effect permanent settlements there, they were constrained to push on further to the east, and so ultimately emerged into the open Pacific<sup>3</sup>. It seems clear, if the above accounts are correct, that during this long period of movement from India to the Pacific the Polynesians must have been in constant contact with other races, who would leave some mark upon the Polynesian physique, customs and traditions<sup>4</sup>.

I now draw attention to certain statements that bear upon the Indonesian and pre-Indonesian periods. I first refer to a general statement by Smith that, whilst the Polynesian race was homogeneous, there can be traced among them differences which

<sup>1</sup> Smith, pp. 151 *sq.* (in part quoting Fornander, vol. 1, p. 162). Cf. Fornander, vol. 1, p. 170.

<sup>2</sup> Fornander, vol. 1, p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> See Fornander, vol. 1, p. 32.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Smith, p. 18.

were not entirely due to environment, though the latter had served to emphasize the divergence from the common type. These variations from the type show that the race, as we know it, was not pure, and that it had been crossed by other races in the remote past. The fact that the variations in type were found amongst all branches of the race denotes that the crossings with other races took place in remote antiquity<sup>1</sup>. Fornander says that there is nothing positive by which to determine whether the dialectical and other differences which distinguished the Hawaiians from the southern and western groups, and each group from the other, existed as already formed tribal characteristics at the time of the migration, or were developed afterwards through dispersion and isolation; but he thinks they were probably due to both conditions. He adds that these differences must have been older than the first dispersion into the Pacific, though they may have been hardened and deepened by subsequent events<sup>2</sup>. Smith says that the tribal organization amongst the Polynesians appears to have been of very ancient date, and this was much emphasized, when the people occupied Indonesia, by the separation from one another of the several branches for generations in the numerous islands of the archipelago. Even supposing the race to have been one in speech, customs, beliefs, etc., at the time it left the fatherland, progress through, and settlement on the islands of the archipelago in places separated by many miles of ocean, must have tended, through local environment and lapse of time, to have caused a more or less tribal arrangement of the people. It thus came about that, when the time arrived for them to move on into the Pacific, each tribe under its own chiefs and priests formed a separate *heke*, or migration, carrying with it the ideas, modified customs, beliefs and speech, which it had acquired in its temporary home<sup>3</sup>. He carries the matter a trifle further when, in support of his view that the people were, when in Indonesia, divided into tribes, he says that we find the names mentioned of Ati-Apai and Ngati-Ataranga, and that both Ati and Ngati were tribal prenominals<sup>4</sup>.

Setting aside for the present the question of the possible origin of the Polynesians in two or more separate ethnic groups of migrants, there can be no doubt, I think, that a prolonged period

<sup>1</sup> Smith, pp. 14 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Fornander, vol. I, p. 169. See also vol. II, pp. 3 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Smith, pp. 108 sq.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 146 sq.



of movements such as is above described, and which is very probable, would inevitably produce variations of culture and beliefs. We can picture, during the migrations, intermittent movements of families (consanguine and perhaps domestic), or larger groups, crossing from the mainland (which I will for the moment assume to have been an earlier home) to, say, Sumatra or Java, some of them going in one direction and some perhaps in another; some reaching a spot which they found already occupied by people of their own ethnic group who had arrived before them, and having to move on elsewhere, or perhaps forcing its then present occupants to move on; sometimes these groups of people, great or small, may have passed and repassed one another; sometimes a group may have split up into sections which separated; sometimes two or more groups may have combined and wandered on together. We can then extend this picture to similar movements from island to island in Indonesia, and in each of the islands visited, and finally to the movements through Melanesia into the Pacific. We must remember that the life which I am depicting was probably not that of mere nomadic wanderers; and that the temporary haltings of separate groups of people may sometimes have lasted for years, perhaps for generations, during which periods some of them may have remained more or less separated from the others and isolated. We must thus recognize the wide differentiation (over and beyond any possible differentiation prior to departure from the mainland) which had probably developed before the Polynesians reached the Pacific, and add to this the further differentiation, which distribution and separation in the widely separated islands of that ocean would almost necessarily involve. We must also regard these people as having probably been subjected to many and various outside influences through contact with other peoples during the periods of these movements, and must bear in mind the probable variety, both in character and extent, of these outside influences. If we recognize all these factors, we can hardly be surprised at the differences between Samoans, Tongans, Society Islanders, Marquesans, Hervey Islanders, Paumotuans, Hawai'ians, Maori and others, which subsisted when, long after the periods of the migrations, they came under the observation of white men.

Returning now to the migrations, I must explain that our knowledge concerning them, as provided by Smith, is obtained mainly from the "logs," or records, which are found in the old

legends or recitations and chants of the people of some of the groups. The interpretation of these "logs," however, is attended with difficulty. They contain certain names of places which cannot be identified. A further difficulty as to names arises from the practice of the migrants, as they travelled eastward, and discovered fresh lands, in which they dwelt for more or less lengthy periods, of giving names to these lands. Separate parties would give names to places which they visited successively and independently, each party knowing nothing of the names given by those who had gone before them, and selecting their own names, which in turn were unknown by those who followed them<sup>1</sup>. The confusion which this would involve is obvious. Then, again, another difficulty in identification of islands and places arises from the Polynesian custom of altering them, as they altered the names of other things, whenever it happened that the name entered into that of one of their great chiefs, and so became taboo<sup>2</sup>. Hence are found confusing differences in the "logs" of the migrations; and it is not until we approach Fiji, which Smith regards as the general gathering ground of the race, that the names begin to accord more closely, the reason for this being that later migrations found the people of their own race in occupation of settled homes<sup>3</sup>.

The Samoans, apparently, had no official "log book"<sup>4</sup>; of the Tongan traditions we know but little<sup>5</sup>; the Tahitians, apparently, had no "log," though they had an extensive knowledge of the Pacific as it was prior to European intercourse<sup>6</sup>; the Paumotuan "log" says nothing of the places visited after leaving Indonesia prior to arrival at Fiji; and then, though it mentions Fiji and probably Tonga, and Tahiti, the next following reference is to the Paumotu<sup>7</sup>; the Maori "log" is extremely meagre<sup>8</sup>. The Rarotongan "log" is more full<sup>9</sup>; and the Marquesan "log" is the fullest of all<sup>10</sup>. I shall have to refer again presently to the two last-mentioned "logs."

Fornander, after discussing the difficulties in fixing the probable period of the migrations from Indonesia, suggests tentatively that it was at the close of the first and during the second century<sup>11</sup>. Smith, whose shortening of Fornander's presumed length of a generation would make his calculations of time shorter also, says that the Hawai'ian and Rarotongan branches

<sup>1</sup> Smith, p. 109.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 113.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 119 sqq.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* p. 108.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 109 sq.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 115.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 110.

<sup>11</sup> Fornander, vol. I, p. 168.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 109.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 111.

(including the Maoris) left between the first and fifth centuries; that the Samoans and Tongans probably preceded the others, and were the first to enter the Pacific; but that otherwise he cannot say when the Polynesians left Indonesia<sup>1</sup>.

As regards the routes believed to have been taken by the migrants, both Fornander and Smith suggest routes from the island of Gilolo or by the Gilolo passage and along the northern shores of New Guinea<sup>2</sup>. Fornander also suggests a route south of New Guinea, by Torres Straits<sup>3</sup>; but Smith, whilst he admits this to be possible, says that evidence of it is wanting<sup>4</sup>. I think that some evidence of this is perhaps supplied by the presence in the southern portion of British New Guinea, south-east of the mouth of the Angabunga or St Joseph River, of the Pokao, or Nara, people, described by Seligman as having among them many individuals with wavy, or almost straight, hair<sup>5</sup>, and of whom one (a woman) is figured by him<sup>6</sup>. When I was in New Guinea in 1910, I saw a number of these Pokao people, and was struck by the difference in appearance between some of them and the typical Melanesians—a difference which, so far as their general appearance went (I did not investigate the matter), would, I think, be consistent with an intermixture of Polynesian blood. Of course the origin of these people may have been a reflex westward movement from some part of Polynesia, and not the original line of migration eastward.

When we come to compare Fornander's and Smith's suggestions as to the routes followed by the people of specific Polynesian groups, we find some confusion, some of which may be due to want of identification of successive landings, followed by temporary or prolonged occupations, on the same island. Smith thinks that the Samoans and Tongans probably preceded the others, and were the first to enter the Pacific, basing his view upon the want of any direct traditions amongst them, a want which he attributes to their long continuance in those islands and the consequent loss of tradition as to their arrival there, and belief that they were autochthons<sup>7</sup>; I am not sure what Smith means by what he calls "direct" traditions; but I imagine he is referring to the absence of traditions as to original migrations from Indonesia, as distinguished from what may be

<sup>1</sup> Smith, pp. 152 *sq.*

<sup>2</sup> Fornander, vol. I, pp. 33, 170, 179; Smith, pp. 59, 153.

<sup>3</sup> Fornander, vol. I, pp. 33, 170, 173, 180.

<sup>4</sup> Smith, p. 155.

<sup>5</sup> Seligman, p. 374.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* Pl. I.

<sup>7</sup> Smith, p. 153. Cf. Fornander, vol. II, p. 5.

described as being apparently more or less local traditions, of which the Samoans and Tongans had plenty. He apparently thinks that their route would be *via* the Celebes, Ceram and Gilolo, and afterwards along the northern shores of New Guinea<sup>1</sup>. Fornander also thinks that the Samoans came this way<sup>2</sup>; but is of opinion that the Tongans came by Torres Straits<sup>3</sup>. Both writers appear to regard Fiji as the usual gathering ground, the first point of entry into the Pacific, of the several migrations<sup>4</sup>; but I cannot say whether this belief applies to this earliest migration.

I propose now to say something about the Rarotongan and Marquesan "logs" and the migrations which they record, though, in doing so, I may for the moment be anticipating the chronological order of events. The Rarotongan "log," and a statement as to the source from which it was obtained are given us by Smith<sup>5</sup>. The names appearing in this log, with Smith's interpretations of them, are as follows: Atia-te-varinga (probably India), Avaiki-te-varinga (probably Java), Iti-nui (probably one of the Indonesian islands), Papua (some unidentified island north of Fiji), Enuā-kura (perhaps New Guinea), Avaiki (the Samoan island of Savai'i), Kuporu (the Samoan island of Upolu), and Manuka (the Samoan island of Manu'a)<sup>6</sup>.

Smith, quoting J. R. Logan, says that the great island of Halmahera, or Gilolo (in Indonesia) was, in the oldest historical and traditional times, the seat of the predominant tribe, which included Ceram in its dominions, and had its chief colony there in the bay of Sawai'i. From Sawai'i, it is probable, the principal of the migrations went forth, and spreading along the northern coasts of the Melanesian chain, at last reached and colonized the Samoan islands, and thence diffused the S.W. Indonesian races throughout Polynesia<sup>7</sup>. I gather that the migration here referred to is that recorded in the Rarotongan "log"; and, if so, we shall see what an important part the descendants of these people took, according to Smith, in exploring the Pacific, and establishing Polynesian settlements there.

Smith gives a sketch of what he suggests was the probable course of this migration. The route was presumably from Gilolo and along the north shore of New Guinea; but he thinks these Rarotongans (as he here calls them) must then have

<sup>1</sup> Smith, p. 153.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 180.

<sup>5</sup> Smith, pp. 111 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Fornander, vol. 1, p. 179.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*; Smith, p. 109.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 112 sq.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 59.

branched off past New Britain and the Solomon Islands, and that one line of migrations probably struck off in the direction of the Kingsmill Islands, and after making this group, passed by the Gilbert and Ellice Islands. He points out that there must have been many migrations, which did not all follow the same route; but, in saying this, he refers, I take it, to migrations generally, and not to the specific Rarotongan migration recorded in the "log"<sup>1</sup>.

I think it desirable that I should here explain a matter of terminology. Smith frequently uses the expressions the "Rarotongans" or the "Rarotongan ancestors," or similar terms; and he sometimes couples with these the names of the Hawai'ians, or the Maori, or both. As I am *here* adopting Smith's use of the word "Rarotongans," it is necessary that we should know what it means; for, taken by itself, it is, perhaps, apt to mislead. It does not mean merely the people whose descendants ultimately settled in Rarotonga. It refers to the stream of migrants whose movements are recorded in the Rarotongan "log" and traditions, and to their descendants, people whose leaders can be identified by reference to the Rarotongan genealogies. According to Smith, those adventurers spread, as we shall see, nearly all over Polynesia. I may say that I believe that these "Rarotongans," or an important group of them, were the people who introduced the worship of the god Tangaroa into the Pacific, and that, as this is a matter which I shall have to discuss from time to time, I propose, whilst following Smith's terminology in this chapter, to avoid in future chapters the somewhat misleading name of "Rarotongans," and call the people, or this important group of them, and their descendants by what is, if my hypothesis is correct, the more convenient and descriptive term of the "Tangaroans."

The Marquesan "log" is tabulated by Fornander and Smith<sup>2</sup>. There were thirteen different chants relating to the stopping places in the migrations recorded by these people; but only two of these appear to have been preserved—namely the Tani or Tane account and the Atea account<sup>3</sup>. Fornander, commenting upon these two, points out that, while they agree entirely in the earlier and later stages of the journey, they differ materially in the middle portions. He suggests that they were representations or reminiscences of two tribes or branches of the same family,

<sup>1</sup> Smith, pp. 153 *sq.* Cf. Fornander, vol. 1, pp. 179 *sq.*

<sup>2</sup> Fornander, vol. 1, p. 174; Smith, pp. 116 *sq.*

<sup>3</sup> Smith, pp. 115 *sq.*

travelling together, or following each other, over the earlier portions of the journey, then separating for several stages, and finally uniting again, or striking the same trail, so to speak, until they reached the Marquesas; and he apparently regards Tani and Atea as being the names of the principal personages of the migrations, or of the ancestors claimed by the travellers<sup>1</sup>. We must not assume that Tane (Tani) and Atea here mentioned were the Polynesian gods of those names. They may have been the worshippers of those gods called by their names; or it would be quite in accord with Polynesian customs for them to have been the chiefs of the two bands of migrants, they having adopted the names of the gods. An important feature of one, at all events, of these chants is that it not only gives names of stopping places, but tells us something about them; and the information thus provided is discussed by both Fornander and Smith<sup>2</sup>. Fornander declines to offer an opinion as to the time when the migrations recorded in these chants took place<sup>3</sup>; but some possible clue may, perhaps, be obtained from Smith's statement that Atea was the name of the ruling chief of Papa-nui, the fourth place mentioned in both chants, and presumably, I should imagine, somewhere in Indonesia, and that he lived at about the beginning of the Christian era<sup>4</sup>. The Atea account contains fifteen names of places, and the Tani account contains nineteen; and Smith says that in each case all the names, except the last five or six, refer to Indonesia, New Guinea, the Solomon Islands and the New Hebrides<sup>5</sup>. Taking subsequent names, and adopting Smith's interpretation, we find references to Great Fiji, Tonga-tabu, two or three other unidentified islands, and finally the Marquesas<sup>6</sup>.

We now come to the commencement of the occupation by these Polynesians of the islands of the Pacific, including Fiji. The information as to this is taken entirely from *Hawaiki*; but there are matters concerning which I have not been quite clear as to Smith's meaning. Since first writing this chapter, I had been fortunate in having some correspondence with him before his death on points as to which I was in doubt and one or two other matters, and he was very kind in explaining his views further to me. I have, however, decided that the simplest and least confusing plan will be to let the chapter remain as written,

<sup>1</sup> Fornander, vol. 1, pp. 173 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 174-180; Smith, pp. 117-19.

<sup>3</sup> Fornander, vol. 1, p. 178.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 117.

<sup>5</sup> Smith, pp. 118 sq.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 118.

and to give the effect of the further information supplied by Mr Smith to me separately at the end of it.

The first actual record of Polynesian residence in Fiji seems to occur in the time of Tu-tarangi, whom we find there, according to Smith, in about A.D. 450 and who was evidently one of the Rarotongans<sup>1</sup>. It will be noticed that this period is about five centuries later than the time of the first recorded migration from India to Indonesia. But, just as this last-mentioned migration had probably been preceded for some hundreds of years by unrecorded movements, so it is possible that between B.C. 65 and A.D. 450 the movements southward and eastward in Indonesia, and the further movements eastward into the Pacific and to Fiji, some of which are recorded in the "logs," had been taking place. This is the view taken by Smith, who tells us that it is obvious from incidental references in the legends that the people were then (A.D. 450) in considerable numbers in the Fiji islands, and that he is led to infer that their occupation of the group had already extended over some time<sup>2</sup>. He thinks that Melanesian Fijians were probably there also at that time, though he admits that there is no actual information indicating this<sup>3</sup>. He also says, speaking from the study of the various traditions relating to this period, that apparently the people had prior to or about this time (A.D. 450) reached the Tonga group, and communicated with Samoa, possibly establishing colonies in the latter, though in no great numbers<sup>4</sup>. He seems to doubt whether the peopling of the Tongan group generally took place at about this time or earlier; but he thinks that this must have been about the time of the colonization of the island of Tongatabu<sup>5</sup>. Up to this period, however, there is no mention, in connection with the migrations, of any of the groups of eastern Polynesia, and it is only at this time that we meet with their names<sup>6</sup>.

I think that, in making these statements as to prior occupation and colonizing of parts of Tonga and Samoa, and the date of the peopling of Tonga, Smith is referring to occupation and peopling of these islands by the Rarotongans, and not to the occupation by those Samoans and Tongans, who, as has already been stated, he believes to have preceded the other Polynesian migrants, and were the first to enter the Pacific. He thinks the early migrants were already there. He is evidently referring to

<sup>1</sup> Smith, pp. 150 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 151.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 156.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 157.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 156 sq.

the Rarotongans when he says that the people with whom they came in contact in Samoa would be the *original migration of Samoans* [the italics are mine]—Polynesians, like themselves<sup>1</sup>. What I mean is that, as I understand it, the Rarotongans found the earlier Polynesians there. Also he is referring to the Rarotongans in Fiji and Tonga, when he speaks of them as the “so-called Tongans and Fijians,” who commenced to occupy the coasts of Savai’i and Upolu, and says that they, in “alliance with their Tonga relatives,” for a long time inhabited parts of Samoa<sup>2</sup>.

Tu-tarangi (in Fiji) engaged in war<sup>3</sup>, not, Smith thinks, with the Melanesians, if they were then in Fiji, but with the earlier Polynesian inhabitants<sup>4</sup>; and the story of this war gives a list of the islands in the neighbourhood which he conquered<sup>5</sup>. I am unable to identify some of these islands; but the names Tonga (Tonga-tabu?), Vavau, Uea (Wallis I.?) and Nuku lead me to assume that the fighting was in, or extended to, the Tongan group<sup>6</sup>; moreover the subsequent context seems to suggest this<sup>7</sup>. There are other records also, which show that there must have been at about this period (A.D. 450) an immense amount of fighting in Western Polynesia, not, apparently, between Polynesians and Melanesians, but between different groups of Polynesians; and it may well be that, if very considerable bodies of the migrant Polynesians, original and Rarotongan, had by this time reached these western isles, the struggle between themselves for existence would be severe. Smith tells us that, according to Rarotongan histories, in consequence of wars originated by Kuru, Taakura and Ari, the people spread out (from Fiji) to all the islands—to Avaiki runga (Eastern Polynesia), Iti-nui (Great Fiji), Iti-rai (Large Fiji), Iti-anaunau, Iti-takai-kere, Tonga-nui (Tonga-tabu) Tonga-ake (probably East Tonga) Tonga-piritia, Tonga-manga, Tonga-raro (Leeward Tonga, perhaps Eua Island), Tonga-anue, Avaiki-raro (Savai’i), Kuporu (Upolu), Manuka (Manu’a), Vavau, Niua-pou (Niua-fou), Niua-taputapu (Keppel’s Island), etc.<sup>8</sup> The date of these wars is not stated; but they apparently were in or about Tu-tarangi’s time, for Kuro and Ari were his contemporaries<sup>9</sup>. Possibly they are the same wars as those in which he was engaged, as previously stated; or were connected with them.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 156.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 163.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 155.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 156.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 155.

<sup>6</sup> But Vavau is also the name of an island north of Fiji (Smith, p. 117).

<sup>7</sup> Smith, pp. 156 sq.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 158 sq.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 156, 161.



Smith says that the people—the Tonga-Fijians of Samoan story—had evidently in about A.D. 575 spread over all the groups around Fiji, and had occupied Samoa, but, he believes, only the coasts of the latter. And he regards this epoch as the commencement of the long occupation by them of the coasts of Savai'i and Upolu, which continued afterwards for some 25 generations. He says that the Tongans are supposed to have occupied the south side of Savai'i, and the Fijians the north, and that it must have been the same as regards Upolu<sup>1</sup>. These "Fijians" and "Tongans," referred to collectively as "Tonga-Fijians," were, as I understand the matter, the Rarotongan migrants and their descendants, who had settled in Fiji, and spread out to Tonga, and the original Tongans, whom they had subdued, and with whom they were thus in "alliance," the defeated Tongans having joined forces with their conquerors. Smith evidently identifies what he calls the "so-called Tongans and Fijians," who occupied the coasts of Savai'i and Upolu, and for a long time inhabited parts of Samoa (*ante*), with the Rarotongans.

From this time onwards, during the period of the occupation of Samoa by the Rarotongans, the intercourse between them and the Samoans was close and frequent, and even after the former moved onwards to the east, voyages were constantly made backwards to Samoa. Smith also explains the frequent intercourse which took place between Samoa and Fiji by referring to the intermarriages between Samoans and Polynesians living in Fiji. Apparently he thinks there were not many Melanesians there at that time<sup>2</sup>. It was the descendants of these Rarotongans, or the Tonga-Fijians, who were driven out by the Samoans long afterwards, according to Smith's calculations in about A.D. 1250<sup>3</sup>.

It was probably, Smith thinks, at the time of this spreading of the people from Fiji to Samoa and Tonga, and when they were in alliance in their occupation of these groups, that they visited other islands to the west, including New Caledonia, and there conquered tracts of land<sup>4</sup>; but Smith leaves it an open question whether the Polynesian settlements, in and about the New Hebrides and the Santa Cruz groups, were established at this time or during the outward journey from Indonesia<sup>5</sup>.

In about A.D. 650, some 200 years after the period of Tu-Tarangi, an important development of Polynesian migrations

<sup>1</sup> Smith, pp. 162 sq.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 164.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 165.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 163.

eastward began; for then it was that Ui-te-Rangiora entered upon the scenes<sup>1</sup>. He and his followers were, according to Smith, Rarotongans<sup>2</sup>. At this period the headquarters of these people were Fiji, with colonies in the Tongan and Samoan groups; and probably they had branches also still living in Indonesia; and with them it was that the voyages of discovery emanating from Fiji first began, many islands being discovered and settled<sup>3</sup>. Ui-te-rangiora had two brothers, Tu-te-rangiataea and Whenua-haere, both of whom apparently, and certainly the former, shared in the discoveries, for which they set out in a fleet composed of one very large canoe and six others<sup>4</sup>. The great canoe was called "men's bones were the wood of that canoe" and its keel was called "Atea's bones"<sup>5</sup>. The following is a list of lands discovered or visited at this period:

Te Ravaki		Iti-nui	} Fiji group ?
Rangi-raro		Iti-rai	
Mata-te-ra		Iti-anaunau	
Nu-kare	} New Hebrides	Iti-takai-kere	
Nu-takoto		Pa-pua	
Nu-taara		Vaii	} Hawai'i group
Nu-mare		Tavai	
Nu-pango		Ngangai	
Nu-iti		Maro-ai	
Nu-amo			Iva-nui
Tonga-nui	} Tonga group	Iva-rai	
Tonga-ake		Iva-te-pukenga	
Tonga-pirita		Te-kirikiri	
Tonga-manga		Te-Rauao	
Tonga-raro			Te-Mae-a-tupa
Avaiki-raro		Rau-maika-nui	
Nu-taata		Rau-maika-iti	
Ma-reva		Ngana	
Pia (? Tikopia)		Te Paumotu ( <i>katoa-toa</i> =all)	
Uea (Wallis Island)		Akaau	} Society Islands
Raro-ata		Taiti	
Amama		Morea	
Tuna (Futuna)		Rangi-atea	
Rangi-arara		Uaine	
Rotuma		Taanga	
Vava'u		Porapora	
Niva-pou (Niuafou)		Rurutu	
Atu-aapai (Haapai)		Pa-pau	
Tangi-te-pu			
Rara			

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 166.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 167.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 167.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 170, 173, 182.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 169.

Avaiki	} Samoan group	Rima-tara	} Cook's group
Kuporu		Mauke	
Te Tuirā		Motia-aro	
Manuke		Atiu	
Tokerau	Auau		
Uru-pukapuka-nui		Rarotonga	
Uru-pukapuka-iti		Rapa-nui (Easter Island)	
Enua-kura		Rapa-iti (Opara Island)	
Papua		Teni-te-ia	
Au-taria-nui		Avaiki-tautau (New Zealand)	
Au-taria-iti		Vaerota	
Kateta-nui		Kuruponga	
Kateta-iti		Matietie	
Panipani-maata-one-okotai			

and we are told that this long list of islands winds up with the statement, "Others remain, the greater part is not written"<sup>1</sup>. Smith thinks that the voyages extended over very many years<sup>2</sup>, which, indeed, they well might.

The names given are old ones, and Smith has been unable to identify many of them<sup>3</sup>. The four Samoan Islands, are, I take it, Savai'i, Upolu, Tutuila and Manu'a.

I am in this chapter dealing only with migrations into the Pacific, and not with subsequent inter-island movements. I do not therefore propose to follow here Smith's continuance of the history of the matter. I may say, however, that in this history he gives accounts of the formation of colonies in Tahiti, Hawai'i, New Zealand, Rarotonga, the Marquesas, the Paumotu and elsewhere, all of which accounts seem to have been collected from the Rarotongan traditions, or associated with voyagers whose names appear in the Rarotongan genealogies; so that these wide Pacific movements become identified with the descendants of the people whom I have been calling the Rarotongans.

The foregoing account of migrations is merely a repetition in abridged form of some of that given by Smith, and in part by Fornander. A good deal of it, especially so far as details are concerned, is more or less speculative in character, and it must not be imagined that, in introducing it as I have done, I am assuming its accuracy. I am not now in a position to express an opinion one way or another, and very likely I never shall be so. The importance of the account lies in the fact that, whether it is right or wrong, it is based upon a study of actual Polynesian

<sup>1</sup> Smith, pp. 171 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 170.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 172.

traditions, and it is the only full or consecutive account of this character (other than previous articles in the *Polynesian Journal*, from which much of its matter is taken) that has been published.

Since the publication of *Hawaiki*, Smith was fortunate in obtaining access to a series of documents that had been dictated by one of the last of the old priests of the *Whare-Wananga*, or house of learning of the Maori, and had hitherto been withheld from the knowledge of Europeans. The portion of this fresh material with which we are now concerned refers to another migration from India, *via* Indonesia, into the Pacific, the original ocean journey of which was from Indonesia to the island of Ahu (Oahu) of the Hawai'ian group, followed by another voyage of the same group of people from there to Tahiti, and again another from Tahiti to New Zealand. It has been published, with copious notes and explanatory comments, by Smith in a series of articles in volume 22 of the *Journal of the Polynesian Society*; but I must content myself here with referring to the matter very briefly. Smith says that, so far as we can at present say, this migration into the Pacific was somewhat later than that of the Rarotongans, or at any rate it occupied a much longer time on the way. The tribes on the east coast of New Zealand from whom the traditions were derived are evidently regarded by him as having descended from this separate group of migrants.

Passing now to the story of the migration, I may say that Smith re-opens and further discusses the question of the original home of the various Polynesian migrants, including those now under consideration, still, however, assuming it was India. The story begins with what appears to have been internal tribal fighting in the original Indian home, at the conclusion of which the defeated party migrated in seven canoes and arrived at an island, which they called Tawhiti-roa (Long Tawhiti), which was, he suggests, Sumatra. There they settled down, and apparently dwelt for a long time (Smith suggests it extended over very many generations) until their numbers had greatly increased. Ultimately they became engaged in disastrous war with another group of people there—apparently, according to Smith, prior inhabitants of the island—in which they were defeated; so the survivors decided to abandon the country, and seek a fresh home, and they voyaged, again in seven canoes, to an island called by them Tawhiti-nui (Great Tawhiti), which Smith identifies with Borneo. They dwelt there for a long time,

and again became numerous; but ultimately some of them migrated in six canoes to Ahu. Smith discusses the identity of this island with Oahu, of the Hawai'ian group, and says, "it seems impossible to doubt the fact that the Hawai'ian group was reached." I am not clear as to the length of residence of the group in Ahu; but ultimately they, or some of them, voyaged to Hawaiki (Tahiti), and ultimately there was a final migration to New Zealand.

I mentioned a few pages back certain explanations and further information, which Mr Smith had been good enough to give me as to his views concerning the commencement of the occupation by the Polynesians of the islands of the Pacific, including Fiji. He referred to three well-marked migrations of Polynesians into the Pacific. The first was that of the original Tongans and Samoans, whom I will call the "pre-Rarotongans," and was considerably earlier than the second, though we have no means of arriving at its date; the people reached these islands by way of the Lau group of the Fiji Islands, which they occupied for a time. The second was that of what he calls in *Hawaiki* the "Rarotongans," "Maori Rarotongans," "Tonga Fijians" and other somewhat similar names, and I have called them the "Rarotongans." It was they who peopled the eastern Pacific. They also came *via* the Lau Islands, where they remained for some generations, and there they came in contact with pre-Rarotongan Polynesians (that is, of course, their descendants). They spread out to Tonga, subduing or obtaining the co-operation of its earlier Polynesian inhabitants. These people conquered parts of Samoa, being assisted by the pre-Rarotongan people whom they had found in the Lau Islands, and in Tonga. The Samoan islands thus attacked and conquered were, he thinks, Upolu and Savai'i; he doubts whether they included Tutuila, and whether Manu'a was conquered at all at that time, though he recognizes the subsequent close connection between the Rarotongans and the people of Manu'a. The pre-Rarotongan inhabitants were driven to the mountains, and remained there for many generations. He distinguishes between this attack and that made later direct from Tonga, which, he says, nowhere had given to it the same prominence as the other. He imagines the later attack to have been rather in the nature of raids, not ending in anything like permanent conquest, or extending over many generations, as the former had done. It was the expulsion of these later Tongan invaders that was called *mata-mata-me*.

I may say that this Tongan attack and expulsion will be referred to in a subsequent chapter. The third migration was that (already mentioned here) which first reached the Hawai'ian Islands, and thence went to Tahiti.

I have in the previous pages applied the name "Polynesians" to the people whose migrations are discussed in them; but it must be understood that in doing this I am not assuming that there had not been an earlier movement or movements into the Pacific of people, ethnically different perhaps from these so-called Polynesians, but who also were ancestors of what we call the Polynesians of the present day. Then, again, I have referred from time to time to the extensive way in which those great navigators, the Rarotongans as I have called them, spread over and colonized the islands of the Pacific. If I understand Smith rightly—I may be misinterpreting him in this—his belief is that the earlier Polynesians, the pre-Rarotongans as I have called them, though they reached Samoa and Tonga, did not spread eastwards to the other islands, at all events to any great extent. If this is his view, we must, I think, recognize that it may or may not be correct. There may have been, spread over the Pacific, an ethnic element which we shall be disposed to attribute to a much older ancestry there—say Rivers's sitting interment people—and also another later element which we shall be inclined to associate, not with the Rarotongans, but with the pre-Rarotongans. Possibly the pre-Rarotongans were not such skilled and daring navigators as were the Rarotongans, and did not possess such sea-worthy canoes; but, even if we were assured of this, it would not justify us in assuming that they had not also spread eastward, perhaps gradually, and by shorter voyages, possibly in some cases as castaways, groups of them having reached, say, some of the less easterly islands and settled there, whilst later on groups from those islands had moved further east, and so on. I do not think we can enter into the consideration of this matter (though I may refer to it incidentally and especially draw attention to what may have been distinguishable as Rarotongan elements) until all the available data from the various islands have been collected and compared; and even then, the presence in any island or group of islands of cultures which seem probably to be attributable to the pre-Rarotongans, would not prove that these people were descended from pre-Rarotongan migrants who had moved eastward in the Pacific before the arrival in the Pacific of the Rarotongans.

## CHAPTER II

### POLITICAL AREAS AND SYSTEMS

#### SAMOA

THE two larger islands of the Samoan group are Upolu and, to the west of it, Savai'i. The little islet of Manono is at the western extremity of Upolu. To the east of Upolu is Tutuila; and still further east, the Manu'a cluster, including Tau, by far the largest, Ofu and Olosega.

The maps in this book of Upolu and Savai'i are copied from those appearing (along with others of Tutuila and the Manu'a cluster) in Dr Krämer's *Die Samoa-Inseln*. I am indebted to Dr Krämer and to his publishers, E. Schweizerbart'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung (Erwin Nägele) of Stuttgart, for their kindness in allowing me to use these maps in this way.

The island of Upolu was divided into three main areas, which I shall call "divisions," these being Aana to the west, Tuamasanga in the middle and Atua to the east; and each of these three divisions was a self-governing area. Krämer divides the larger islands of Samoa and these three divisions of Upolu into what he calls *Unterdistrikte*; and I shall call these "districts." These were again subdivided into groups, called by him *Dorfschaften*, of villages, or hamlets, which he calls *Dorfteile*; I shall call these "village districts" and "villages" respectively. It may be said broadly (subject to exceptions) that each village, village district, and district in the Samoan Islands, was, like each of the three divisions of Upolu, a self-governing area having its own *fono* or parliament; though the *fono* of a village would presumably always, or nearly always, be of a small and more or less informal character<sup>1</sup>. The whole of Samoa, exclusive of the Manu'an Islands, was united under the control of the *fono* of all Samoa, held at Leulumoenga in Aana. Manu'a was in early times, and evidently for a long period, politically separate from the rest of the islands, whilst the latter were closely associated<sup>2</sup>.

As I shall have to quote from Turner and Stair, I must, to avoid confusion as to meaning, draw attention at the outset to

<sup>1</sup> As to the villages, see Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 229 on this point.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 18, 366; Churchward, p. 42; Von Bülow, *I.A.E.* vol. XIII, p. 60, n. 4.

what is, I think, a difference in their terminology. Both refer to the primary division into "districts"<sup>1</sup>; but, whilst Turner only refers to smaller places, called by him "villages," Stair divides districts into "settlements," and subdivides the latter into "villages"<sup>2</sup>. Is Turner's "village" the same as that of Stair? and if so, what is Stair's "settlement"? If, on the other hand, Turner's "village" is identical with Stair's "settlement," then what are we to understand by the latter's "village"? A perusal of chapter XVI of Turner's book indicates, I think, that his "village" is remarkably like Stair's "settlement"; I would specially refer to a paragraph upon page 173 of Turner's book. He says, "Their Government had...more of the patriarchal and democratic in it, than of the monarchical. Take a village, containing a population, say, of three to five hundred, and there will probably be found there from ten to twenty titled heads of families, and one of the higher rank called chiefs....What I now call a family is a combined group of sons, daughters, uncles, cousins, nephews, nieces, etc., and may number fifty individuals. They have one large house, as a common rendezvous, and for the reception of visitors, and four or five other houses, all near each other." Brown also describes what is evidently the same thing<sup>3</sup>. I suggest that this enlarged family circle, or consanguine family, described by Turner, is probably Stair's "village," and that Turner's "village" is Stair's "settlement"; and I propose, in the absence of any other explanation of the matter which seems to me to be more reasonably likely to be correct, to assume, for the purpose of this book, that it is so.

To co-ordinate these terminologies with those which I am adopting I will say that my term "district" is, I think, identical in meaning with that adopted by both Stair and Turner; that my "village district" is apparently the same as Stair's "settlement" and Turner's "village"; and that my "village" is apparently the same as Stair's "village," and may, I think, be identified with the group of about fifty people described by Turner. In quoting Stair and Turner I shall, at all events as regards matters where exactitude of terminology is important, use my own terminology, as above defined; though I may sometimes (and often in subsequent chapters) quote terms as used by these and other writers without co-ordinating them with my own.

<sup>1</sup> Turner, p. 180; Stair, p. 83.

<sup>2</sup> Stair, p. 83.

<sup>3</sup> Brown, pp. 24 sq.



The division of Aana in Upolu was divided into two districts. Itu Alofi to the north and Itu Tuafanua to the south<sup>1</sup>. Apparently, however, these were merely geographical, and not political areas, for I find no mention by Krämer of either of them having a seat of government, nor do his greetings (the formal welcomes given at *fono* or parliamentary gatherings) include greetings for *fono* of either of these two districts as a governmental area. Tuamasanga was not, apparently, divided into big districts of this character<sup>2</sup>. Atua was divided into three districts, Itu Anoama'a to the north, Itu Salefao to the south, and Aleipata at the eastern extremity. Each of these was a governmental area, with one of its village districts as a seat of government<sup>3</sup>. Savai'i had six districts, Itu Fa'asaleleanga and Itu Nganga'emaunga to the east, Itu Ngangaifaumaunga (= Taoo) to the north, Itu Fa'atoafe to the south, Itu Salenga (= Fongalele) to the west and Itu Asau at the north-western point; each of these was a governmental area, with one of its village districts as a seat of government<sup>4</sup>. Tutuila was divided into nine districts; Sua, Vaifanua and Saole to the east, Fangaloo, Ituau and Iturangi in the centre, and Nofoa, Leasina and Fofu to the west; each of these was apparently a governmental area with a seat of government<sup>5</sup>. Manu'a does not seem to have been divided into governmental areas such as I can call districts—indeed its largest island, Tau, was too small for such a division, and the others are mere islets.

Turner says that the number of districts in Samoa was only ten<sup>6</sup>; but, as he does not name them, I cannot compare his statement with the particulars given by Krämer. Some of the districts were much larger or more influential than others; in Tutuila, for instance, power was really concentrated in four of its nine districts—Sua and Vaifanua (taken together) and Fofu and Iturangi (taken together), all the other districts being only small<sup>7</sup>, and great differentiation in this respect existed in Upolu; so it may well be that Turner's ten districts only include the more powerful ones. Discrepancies of this sort may also well arise in comparison of the statements of writers whose terminologies are not identical.

Within each of these districts, whether it was itself a governmental area or not, were a number of self-governing village

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 148.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 270.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 313.


<sup>7</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 313.


<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 221.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 46.

<sup>5</sup> Turner, p. 183.

# UPOLU





# SAVAII I.

Faasaleleaga

Gagaemauga

Gagaifonua

itua Salega

itua Fatoafe

Gagaematae

ilu o Asau

Tufutafu'e

Asau

Vaisala

Popa

Satava

Fagalele

Faleabupo

Aopo

Amoa

Faga

Safotulafai

Sapapalii

Ioa

Salelologa

Cag. Paapaleiia

Palauli

Utiamoa

Satupaitea

Sili

Papa

Puleii

Gaitavai

Gataivai

Tufu

Nui

Taga

Saliva

itua itua

Sanata

Faiiiti

Vaiyua

Sagone

districts, each containing its constituent self-governing villages. Krämer gives the names of these village districts and villages and supplies some detailed information concerning them; and further information is contained in his notes upon the greetings at their respective *fono*. He gives these particulars for Aana<sup>1</sup>, Atua<sup>2</sup>, Tuamasanga<sup>3</sup>, Savai'i<sup>4</sup>, Tutuila<sup>5</sup> and Manu'a<sup>6</sup>.

Stair says that "the different districts...were represented by their *laumua* or leading settlements" (his settlements being what I call village districts); and he states that there were five of these<sup>7</sup>. Turner says that "the villages (my village districts), in numbers of eight or ten, united...and formed a district...and that some particular village was known as the capital of the district"<sup>8</sup>. These two statements, taken together, create a difficulty: for, as stated above, Turner says the number of districts was ten, and Krämer accounts for many more. How then comes it that there were only five leading village districts? The explanation may, perhaps, be partly due to the difference of the periods to which the writers refer; but I think it probable, however, that the confusion really arises from Stair's use of the term "the different districts." It is clear that very many, and indeed, most of the districts, whatever their number may have been, had leading village districts—capitals or seats of government, but that five only of these leading village districts were specially important in the general political structure of Upolu, Savai'i and Tutuila (Manu'a is not included in this matter), and had the special designations of *laumua*, or (see below) *tumua*.

The following are the leading village districts, so far as I have been able to ascertain them, of Krämer's districts.

				Leading village district
In Aana ...	...	...	...	Leulumoenga <sup>9</sup> (seat of government of all Aana, and of "All Samoa")
In Tuamasanga ...	...	...	...	Afenga <sup>10</sup> (seat of government of all Tuamasanga)
In Atua				
Itu Anoama'a...	...	...	...	Lufiluli <sup>11</sup> (seat of government of all Atua)
Itu Salefao ...	...	...	...	Lepa <sup>11</sup>
Aleipata ...	...	...	...	Salea'aumua <sup>11</sup>
In Savai'i				
Itu Fa'asaleleanga ...	...	...	...	Safotulafai <sup>12</sup>
Itu Nganga'emaunga	...	...	...	Saleaula <sup>12</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 152-65.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 47-82.

<sup>7</sup> Stair, p. 79.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* p. 223.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 272-90.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 314-31.

<sup>8</sup> Turner, p. 180.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* p. 270.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 223-37.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 366-72.

<sup>9</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 148.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* p. 46.

			Leading village district
In Savai'i ( <i>continued</i> )			
Itu Ngangaifaumaunga	...	...	Safotu <sup>1</sup>
Itu Fa'atoafe	...	...	Palauli <sup>1</sup>
Itu Salenga	...	...	Satupaitea <sup>1, 2</sup>
Itu Asau	...	...	Asau <sup>1</sup>
In Tutuila			
Sua and Vaifanua	...	...	Fangaitua (?) <sup>3</sup>
Fofo and Itulangi	...	...	Leone (?) <sup>4</sup>
In Manu'a			
Tau Island	...	...	Tau <sup>5</sup> (seat of government of all Manu'a) [but Fitiuta, as the eldest settlement in Manu'a, and the dwelling place of the Tangaroa family, when on earth, has always been a rival of Tau for supremacy <sup>6</sup> ]
Olosenga Island	...	...	Olosenga? <sup>7</sup>
Ofu Island	...	...	Ofu? <sup>8</sup>

Turning now to the five important *tumua* or *laumua*, I give Krämer's and Stair's names in parallel columns<sup>9</sup>.

	Krämer	Stair
In Aana	Leulumoenga	Leulumoenga
In Tuamasanga	Afenga	Sangana or Saauimatangi and Laumua
In Atua	Lufilufi	Lufilufi <sup>10</sup>
In Savai'i	Safotu <sup>11</sup>	Saleaula
	Palauli <sup>11</sup>	Safotulafai
In Tutuila	None	None

Krämer says that Leulumoenga was the political centre of Samoa<sup>12</sup>, which during the ascendancy of Aana would be natural enough; that Lufilufi was the central seat of government of Atua<sup>13</sup>; and Afenga was that of Tuamasanga<sup>14</sup>.

I cannot explain the differences between the two writers as regards Savai'i. Concerning the more important case of Tuamasanga, Afenga is clearly right; and Sangana includes Afenga, whilst Laumua is probably merely the descriptive name. Saauimatangi (or Sa Aumatangi) was another name for Malie, close to Afenga; I shall have to refer to it later.

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 46.

<sup>2</sup> It will be seen from the map that this village district appears to be outside its district. This matter will be referred to in a subsequent chapter.

<sup>3</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 326.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 368.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 370.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 372.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 371.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 148 sq., 222, 482; Stair, p. 79.

<sup>10</sup> Stair says it also represented "the islands to the eastward."

<sup>11</sup> As regards these two villages, the *tumua* title was only given by way of courtesy (Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, pp. 60, 482).

<sup>12</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 148.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* p. 270.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.* p. 223.

With reference to the terms *tumua* and *laumua*, whilst Stair applies the latter to all the five leading village districts, Krämer only applies it to the Tuamasanga village district, Afenga, and calls all the others *tumua*. He says that *laumua* signifies "the first," whilst *tumua* means "stand forward or first"<sup>1</sup>. They evidently mean practically the same thing; but, if, as I presume, we should associate the names with the distinction between them appearing in connection with the will of Ationgie, of which I shall speak later, *laumua* meant (theoretically) something less important than *tumua*. Other writers also refer to these *tumua* and *laumua* village districts<sup>2</sup>.

I have already given Turner's description of what I call a village. Brown says of it that each chief or head of a family generally contrived to have at least one *fale ulu* or principal residence, in addition to a number of smaller houses in which the members of the family lived; to one of these latter the chief or head himself and his family (that would mean his own family) retired when the principal house was occupied by visitors<sup>3</sup>. The head for the time being of one of these extended families, occupying a village, was doubtless a man with considerable power and authority over the others.

There was an official head chief or king of the Manu'an islands, another of Aana, another of Atua, and another of Tuamasanga; their titles were respectively the *tui manu'a*, the *tui aana*, the *tui atua* and the Malietoa. The *tui* forming the commencement of the first three of these meant "lord" or "king"; Malietoa was a family title, the origin of which will be explained hereafter. There was also an official head called *tafa'ifa*, of all Samoa, excluding Manu'a, which was independent, but including Savai'i and Tutuila. He, however, was, as we shall see, not a separate personage, but one who possessed the two titles of *tui aana* and *tui atua*, and two titles (not that of Malietoa) in Tuamasanga. So also there were official heads of districts, village districts and villages, ranging in rank from leading chiefs to minor chiefs and again downwards to *tulafale* or orators. The government of these several areas, great and small, was not, however, vested merely in the chiefs or other official heads; great power was, as we shall see, wielded by the *fono*, or council meetings—parliamentary gatherings attended

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 11, 222. Cf. Krämer, *Globus*, vol. LXXV, p. 188.

<sup>2</sup> Elloy, *A.P.F.* vol. XLIV, pp. 368 sq.; Ella, *A.A.A.S.* vol. IV, p. 629; von Bülow, *Globus*, vol. LXXI, p. 150.

<sup>3</sup> Brown, pp. 25 sq.

by chiefs and orators and heads of landowning families. Stair, in describing the government of Samoa, says, "Perhaps it may be best described as a combination of the monarchical and patriarchal forms"<sup>1</sup>; and Turner says that it had "more of the patriarchal and democratic in it than the monarchical"<sup>2</sup>. I think both these statements are more or less correct, for the organization was both monarchical and patriarchal, and, in a way, democratic. The *fono* and the powers of the chiefs will be made the subjects of subsequent chapters.

Each of the village districts considered itself, so far as its own internal affairs were concerned, quite independent of all the others<sup>3</sup>; and the same remark might have been repeated with equal truth as regarded villages, districts and divisions. The chief of a village district had no hereditary right to retain his position; the heads of families comprising the village district could at any time unite and take it from him, and give it to his brother or uncle, or some other member of the chief family, who would, they thought, act more in accordance with their wishes<sup>4</sup>. Here again the remark might have been repeated as regarded districts and divisions. This is a matter which is here touched only broadly, and will be dealt with more fully hereafter.

The land within the village district boundary belonged to individual owners and families, and, whatever uncertainty might arise as to these owners' boundaries, those of each village were well known, as also were the boundaries of each village district. Trespassing by one village or village district upon the preserves of another was apt to produce fighting, and the village or village district always zealously defended its rights against outsiders<sup>5</sup>.

When disturbances arose between village districts in a district, the combined chiefs and heads of the other village districts within the same district united in forbidding strife<sup>6</sup>. Official intercourse between the village districts was always conducted by means of specially appointed messengers, each village district having a different name for its messengers; and a similar system was adopted as regards official intercourse between one district and another<sup>7</sup>.

The boundaries between the districts were also well known, and the care of them was committed to the two nearest villages

<sup>1</sup> Stair, p. 76.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 180. Cf. Williams, p. 529.

<sup>4</sup> Turner, p. 177.

<sup>6</sup> Turner, pp. 180 *sq.*

<sup>2</sup> Turner, p. 173.

<sup>5</sup> Stair, pp. 83 *sq.*; Brown, p. 287.

<sup>7</sup> Stair, p. 89.

on either side, these being called *leoleo-tuaoi*, or boundary keepers. A feeling of irritation between these guardians of the borders constantly existed, and border feuds were frequent<sup>1</sup>.

A village district wishing to sever its political connection with one district, and to enter into an adjoining district, was able to do so. Some earth and stones were wrapped up in a piece of prepared bark of the paper mulberry, and taken to the rulers of the district into which they desired to enter, the ceremony being regarded as an expression of their wish, and a transfer of authority over the village district<sup>2</sup>.

Several other writers, besides Krämer, Stair and Turner, refer, some of them only very shortly, to the way in which Samoa was divided politically into larger and smaller areas in the way above described<sup>3</sup>.

Having endeavoured to give an outline of the political division and subdivision of Samoa, I propose before passing to matter of a more historical, or semi-historical character, to refer to some legends and narratives, because, fanciful and absurd though several of them may appear to be, I think we may perhaps be able to see in some of them side lights upon what may have been the very early history of the group. I will number these tales for the purpose of future references; they are not arranged in any special order.

1. There was a tale of creation beginning with *leai* (nothing); thence sprung *nanamu* (fragrance); then *efuefu* (dust); then *iloa* (perceivable); then *maua* (obtainable); then *eleele* (earth); then *papatu* (high rocks); then *maataanoa* (small stones); then *maunga* (mountains). *Maunga* married, and there were subsequent generations of births ending in *Mua* and *Talu* who originated the names of two districts on the island of *Upolu*<sup>4</sup>.

2. There was a cosmical genealogy, taking the form of married couples. It begins with the marriage of rocks which produced the earth; but after this it is all a matter of phenomena connected with the sky, including different sorts of clouds and winds, and such things as shadow, twilight, daylight, noonday, afternoon, sunset, and descriptive references to the heavens. Then we come to the marriage of cloudless heavens with spread

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 83.

<sup>2</sup> Brown, p. 287.

<sup>3</sup> Hood, p. 118. *Rovings*, vol. II, p. 158. D'Ewes, p. 167. Wilkes, vol. II, p. 153. Erskine, *J.R.G.S.* vol. XXI, pp. 225 sq. Brenchley, p. 45. Von Hübner, vol. II, pp. 358 sq. Foljambe, pp. 161 sq. Ella, *A.A.A.S.* vol. IV, p. 629; vol. VI, p. 598. Friedlander, *Z.f.E.* vol. XXXI, p. 21. Stuebel, p. 92. Von Bülow, *Globus*, vol. LXIX, pp. 192 sq.; vol. LXXXIII, p. 375.

<sup>4</sup> Turner, p. 3.



out heavens, which gave birth to Tangaroa, the originator of men. His son was Pili, who married Sina, the tropic bird, and had five children, Sanga, Ana, Tua, Tolufale and Munganitama<sup>1</sup>.

3. Cloudless heavens also married the eighth heavens, and had a son Tangaroa, the dweller in lands, who married cloudy heavens, and had a son Tangaroa, the explorer of lands, who married the queen of the earth and had a son Valevalenoa, or space. At another birth cloudy heavens brought forth a head, which fell from the skies to earth, and acquired a body. Space asked this man child to be a son to him and, in answer to the child's enquiry as to its parentage, said that its father was in the east, in the west, towards the sea, inland, above, and below. Afterwards the boy grew to manhood, and travelled north, south, east and west, married in each of these places and had children there, and finally went up to the heavens, and told his children to follow him there<sup>2</sup>.

4. The god Tangaroa made the heavens, and afterwards made the earth. Savai'i and Upolu were formed by two stones rolled down from the heavens, or, according to other versions, they were drawn up from under the ocean with a fish hook. Tangaroa then made Fe'e, the cuttle-fish, and told him to go down under the earth, and hence the lower regions of sea or land were called *Sa le fe'e*, or sacred to the cuttle-fish. The cuttle-fish brought forth all kinds of rocks, and hence the great one on which we live<sup>3</sup>.

5. The rocks married the earth, and the earth became pregnant. Salevao, the god of the rocks, observed motion in the *moa* or centre of the earth; so the child, when born, was named Moa, from the place where it was seen moving. Salevao said he would become loose stones, and everything that grew would be *sa ia Moa*, or sacred to Moa, till his hair was cut; after a time his hair was cut and the restriction taken off, and the rocks and earth were called *sa ia Moa*, which became abbreviated into Samoa<sup>4</sup>. I may say, as to this story, that Salevao was, according to beliefs, one of a group of Savai'ian gods, the brother of Savea Si'uleo, the Tongan Hikuleo, who was, in both Samoa and Tonga, a god of the dead.

6. A couple, called Head of day and Tail of day, lived away in the west in Puluotu (the Samoan paradise). They had four children, Ua (Rain), Fari (Long grass), Langi (Heavens) and

<sup>1</sup> Turner, pp. 3 *sqq.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 5 *sq.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 7.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 10 *sq.* Cf. Reinecke, *Globus*, vol. LXXVI, p. 8.

Tala (Story). These four travelled to Papatea in the east, which Turner appears to think may have been one of the Paumotu group, were attacked by the Papateans, and only Tala and Langi returned to Pulotu to tell of their ill-usage. Then Elo, the King of Pulotu, went and fought and conquered the Papateans, all who fled into the bush being killed, and only those who got to sea escaping. Two of the latter, a man called Tutu and his wife Ila, reached the island of Tutuila, and named it so; U and Polu reached Upolu, and so named it; Sa and Vaila reached Savai'i, and called it by a united contraction of their two names<sup>1</sup>. U and Polu had a son, whom they named the king of Upolu. He called his village the *marae*, or meeting place of Upolu, and all the gods of the Samoan group assembled there at times. It was here that they assembled to discuss the question of the duration of human life<sup>2</sup>. Krämer, in commenting on the latter part of this tale, says that it was naturally regarded by the Manu'an people as a presumption<sup>3</sup>.

7. Another legend attributed the origin of Samoa to two girls, who, being carried off from some unknown place by a great wave, drifted on to Manu'a. Tangaroa, in the eighth heaven sent his son Alu-ifo for them, and eventually Tangaroa married one of the girls, and his son the other, and they all came down to earth and lived in Manu'a. From these two unions two families of sons arose. By order of Tangaroa one of these sons was to live in Manu'a and to be called Tui-Manu'a. Two other sons, named Tutu and Ila, were sent to live in Tutuila; two others, U and Polu, were sent to Upolu, and two others Saa and Uii to Savai'i. Saa and Uii were scattered far and wide to all lands<sup>4</sup>. Smith points out that this last statement is a corroboration of the Rarotongan belief that it was from Savai'i that the people scattered over the eastern Pacific<sup>5</sup>.

8. The following are traditions associating the god Tangaroa with the earliest political history of Manu'a and the origin of the *tui manu'a*. The Tangaroa family came down from heaven, and bestowed the smaller *ao* title upon a newly-born Manu'an boy named Galeali, who thereupon became the first chief in all Manu'a; afterwards they came down again, dwelt in a house in

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 222 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 227.

<sup>3</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 147.

<sup>4</sup> Smith, pp. 193 sqq. For other legends of a somewhat similar character see Turner, pp. 227 sq., 230 sq., and cf. Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 147.

<sup>5</sup> Smith, pp. 193 sq.

Lefanga in the island of Tau (Manu'a group), which had been built by him under their directions, and, acting under the orders of Tangaroa, took from the chief his *ao* (minor) title, and bestowed upon his newly-born son the great, or *papa* title of *tuimanu'a*, or lord of Manu'a. The whole Tangaroa family gathered together, and spread their hands over the boy's head, called out the title, and laid it upon him; he thus became the first *tuimanu'a*<sup>1</sup>. The name given to the royal residence—*fale'ula*—which meant shining house, and, according to Krämer, signified the ninth heaven, was consistent with the legend as to its descent from heaven, an operation in which the great Pili appears to have taken an active part, and with its occupation for a period by the Tangaroa family<sup>2</sup>. The Tangaroa family also provided this first *tuimanu'a* with his band of kava chewers, brought down from heaven<sup>3</sup>.

Krämer tells a story of complaints made against the sun for not remaining longer in the sky between rising and setting. This angered the sun, who said he would be terrible, making his uprising felt, and would next morning begin to slay men. Then followed a discussion between a boy Lua and his sister Ui as to which of them should be the first to die, each wishing to make the sacrifice. The girl prevailed, and next morning she went to the spot where the sun rose, and sat facing him, with her legs apart. The sun told her that his name was Tangaroa, and said that, as a reward for her submission to him, and as she had become his wife, he would no longer kill and make meals of men, and would travel more slowly. He gave her instructions as to the treatment of her child, when born, directing, among other things, that she was to call it Tangaroa-a-Ui; which she did when the child was born<sup>4</sup>. There are other versions of this story which do not identify the sun with Tangaroa; but, according to one of them Ui swam to Tau [the main island of the Manu'an cluster], where her son was born, was adopted by Tangaroa, and was named Tangaroa-a-Ui, or the son of Tangaroa. The child grew up, and had six children, Ta'e-o-Tangaroa, O-le-Fanonga, O-lele, Asi-asi-o-langi, Moe'u-le-apai (a girl), and Tui-fiti (king of Fiji)<sup>5</sup>. There is another version, which does not identify the sun with Tangaroa, but according to which Ui was the daughter of the king of Manu'a,

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, pp. 382 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 382.

<sup>3</sup> Powell-Fraser, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. xxv, pp. 122-8.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 385.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 403 sqq.

and Manu'a is the scene of the events which it narrates<sup>1</sup>. Another story, partly similar, does not mention Ui, but is about the practices of Tangaroa, a sun-god, creator of all islands, and refers to his habit of devouring people<sup>2</sup>.

This Tangaroa-a-Ui was by birth a god, but he was also of human birth through his mother; as a god, he had a right to go up to the heavens, to attend the councils there, which he often did. All Tangaroa's children were gods, and all had the same power to ascend from earth to heaven, to pass over seas, and to go to the most distant regions. At that time no rule had been established among men, so there were no councils<sup>3</sup>. Tangaroa-a-Ui lived until reaching manhood at a place called Falenui, south of Saua on the eastern shore of Tau. There is a long account of his doings; but I must only refer to a small portion of it, picking it up at the place where he reached a spot where the beautiful princess Sina, the daughter of Sa'umani, was about to bathe, and by a stratagem succeeded in catching her, as she bathed, in a net, and married her. His first child by her was Le-Fanonga and the next was Ta'e-o-Tangaroa. When Ta'e-o-Tangaroa was old enough, his father used often to take the boy up with him to council meetings in heaven, but left Le-Fanonga at home, because he was very unruly. The boy, however, found his way up, but was sent down again to fetch the 'ava fe-ai, or fierce kava, a mission in which it was expected he would perish, but was in fact successful. The council then deliberated and it was resolved to send Tangaroa-a-Ui down with the *ao* (supreme power) and all kingly privileges, including the *fale-ula* (palace) and the *fono* (council building); and he in his turn gave the *ao*, or royal dignity and universal rule to Ta'e-o-Tangaroa, who was therefore the first on earth to hold the title, dignity and authority of *Tui-o-Manu'a ma Samoa atua* (the king of Manu'a and the whole of Samoa), Le Fanonga retained his portion of the 'ava fe-ai<sup>4</sup>. There are other references to this Ta'e-o-Tangaroa as being the child of Tangaroa-a-Ui and Sina-a-Sa'umani<sup>5</sup>, and to the fact that he was the first *tuimanu'a*<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Turner, pp. 201 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Fraser, *J.P.S.* vol. VI, p. 66.

<sup>4</sup> Fraser-Powell, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. XXV, pp. 104-7. Cf. Fraser, *J.P.S.* vol. VI, pp. 67 sq.

<sup>5</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, pp. 419 sq. Pratt, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. XXVI, p. 294.

<sup>6</sup> Powell, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. XXV, p. 138. Stair, *J.P.S.* vol. VI, p. 74. Cf. *J.P.S.* vol. VI, pp. 117 sq.

I now come to two legends, similar to each other, and probably only different versions of the same story.

According to one of these Ta'e-o-Tangaroa, the child of Tangaroa-a-Ui and Sina-a-Sa'umani, though he was the *tuimanu'a*, was regarded as a god, rather than a man. He had two wives, the one named Laulau-a-le-Folasa, the daughter of Le Folasa, and the other named Sina, the daughter of Tao-toai-se-Aua-luma, who both became pregnant at the same time, and each of them at the same time bore a son. Ta'e-o-Tangaroa was then living at Lefanga, as also was his first wife Laulau-a-le-Folasa, but not his second wife Sina. The family of Laulau shouted out that a *tuimanu'a* was born; but Ta'e-o-Tangaroa, displeased at this haste, went to his other wife Sina, and learnt of the birth of her son. She proposed to let the other wife's son retain the honour, but Ta'e-o-Tangaroa disapproved, and told Sina to bring her child, and let him be named Fa'a-ea-nu'u, (exalter of the people), and be proclaimed *tuimanu'a*, which was done. It is explained that in view of the divinity of Ta'e-o-Tangaroa, this son was the first *man* to hold the title; in fact Ta'e-o-Tangaroa explained his view that the sovereignty over men should be exercised by a man. The other child was to be named Ati-i-langi (addressing speeches to the heavens), and was to direct his addresses to heaven to Tangaroa and be associated with the gods<sup>1</sup>, which means in effect that he was to be his brother's chief priest. Both Powell and Stair in their genealogies give Ta'e-o-Tangaroa as the first *tuimanu'a* and Fa'a-ea-nu'u as the second, Powell giving to the name of the latter the meaning "lifter up of submerged (*i.e.* conquered) lands"<sup>2</sup>.

The other of the legends was, in part, very similar in its beginnings to that of Ta'e-o-Tangaroa and his two wives. The scene of it is the same Lefanga, which we are here told was in the district of Fiti-uta, in the island of Tau, but the *dramatis personae* are not the same. There was a prophet, who had been born there, called Le-Folasa, whose son of the same name married Sina, and had a son Le-lolonga. Then follows a description of the almost simultaneous births of two sons of Le-lolonga by two wives. The prophet had prophesied that whichever child was born first would have the kingdom; but under circumstances very similar to those related in the other legend the

<sup>1</sup> Pratt-Fraser, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. xxvi, pp. 293 sq. From the context it appears that Ati-i-langi was to be high priest to his brother. Cf. Fraser, *J.P.S.* vol. vi, p. 68.

<sup>2</sup> Powell, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. xxv, p. 138. Stair, *J.P.S.* vol. vi, p. 74.

title was given to Ali'a tama, the younger of two brothers, and not to Ali'a matua, the elder<sup>1</sup>. On referring to Powell's and Stair's lists of the earlier *tuimanu'a*, I find the name of Le-lolonga, appearing—next but two after Fa'a-ea-nu'u in Powell's list, and next but one in Stair's list—and in both lists the next names are, first Ali'a matua, and then Ali'a tama, the elder brother thus appearing first, according to the lists<sup>2</sup>.

According to another story, Tangaroa, having married a girl on earth called Masina-au-ele, and having raised up the land of Manu'a, established their son there and he was the first *tuimanu'a*<sup>3</sup>.

The belief as to the close connection between the Tangaroa family and the *tuimanu'a* can be demonstrated a little further. The village district of Tau, on the western shore of the island of Tau, was, as we have seen, the central seat of government of the Manu'an group and it was the residence of the *tuimanu'a*. Lefanga (mentioned above) was in the district of Fiti-uta, on the eastern coast<sup>4</sup> and was the oldest settlement in Manu'a, the traditional dwelling place of the Tangaroa family, and it had from earliest times disputed with Tau the superior lordship<sup>5</sup>. This Fiti-uta was closely associated in the legends with the Tangaroa. It was on the shore at Fiti-uta that Ui gave birth to Tangaroa-a-Ui<sup>6</sup>. The special house in Lefanga was the place where, according to the Tangaroa-Galeali legend, the Tangaroa family lived when on earth. From the tale of Ta'e-o-Tangaroa and his two wives Laulau-a-le Folasas and Sina it appears that Ta'e-o-Tangaroa, the divine *tuimanu'a*, was living at Lefanga, so that place (or perhaps the larger area of Fiti-uta) seems therefore to have been regarded as having been the original political centre of Manu'a. Again in the Le-lolonga tale the scene was placed at Lefanga. Also Falenui must have been in or close to the same district. I wish to make clear the apparent connection between the original divine Tangaroa sovereignty, under the title of *tuimanu'a*, over Manu'a, centred traditionally in Fiti-uta, and the subsequent rule of the *tuimanu'a* at Tau.

For this purpose it is necessary to return to the story of Ta'e-o-Tangaroa and his two wives, the Le-lolonga tale, and the Tangaroa-Galeali legend, picking up each of them at a

<sup>1</sup> Powell-Fraser, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. xxv, pp. 133 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 138. Stair, *J.P.S.* vol. vi, p. 74.

<sup>3</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. vi, p. 117.

<sup>4</sup> *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. xxv, p. 133. Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 370.

<sup>5</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 370.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

later point. We left the tale of Ta'e-o-Tangaroa and his two wives at the point where Sina's son Fa'a-ea-nu'u became the first human *tuimanu'a* and Laulau-a-le Folasas's son Ati-i-langi was to be his orator or chief priest. The legend speaks of Ati-i-langi as "that child at the east," and says that in accordance with this appointment the chief or priest of Fiti-uta used at *fono* to sit cross-legged, leaning on the handle of his fly-flapper, and thus offer prayer and make speeches<sup>1</sup>. It is clear that, according to the traditions, the position of the two sons was that Fa'a-ea-nu'u was the *tuimanu'a*, and Ati-i-langi was a *tulafale ali'i*, or orator chief, the priestly counsellor and spokesman of the *tuimanu'a*; it is also probable that the latter was associated with Fiti-uta; but up to this point we do not know where was then the official home of the newly appointed *tuimanu'a*. From the legend it is seen that Ta'e-o-Tangaroa was apprehensive of trouble between his two sons, and in this connection we find a reference to the possibility of Fiti-uta attacking Fale-tolu<sup>2</sup>. "Fiti-uta" here obviously refers to Ati-i-langi; and Fale-tolu means the "house of three," and refers to the three great families of orators or orator chiefs, who, as we shall see in a later chapter, in effect controlled the succession to the *tuimanu'a* title, and the *fono* of all Manu'a, held at Tau, just as houses of six or nine or other numbers of families controlled it in other parts of Samoa. We may therefore gather from this that the seat of government of Manu'a, and the official residence of the *tuimanu'a*, was in the legend conceived as having been transferred from Fiti-uta, on the eastern coast, to Tau, on the western coast. Consistently with this view, we find that Ta'e-o-Tangaroa, in addressing his two sons, and warning them against fighting between themselves, said that if Ati-i-langi crossed the battle ground [*i.e.* presumably the land between Fiti-uta and Tau] and came to its westerly side, his land would become desolate, whilst the same fate would fall to Fa'a-ea-nu'u, if he crossed the boundary to its eastern side<sup>3</sup>. I now pass over a considerable part of the legend, and pick up the tale at a point at which the elder of two brothers became *tuimanu'a* and the younger his attendant, that meaning, I assume, his orator chief. When the two brothers were walking together the younger guilefully persuaded the elder to disrobe, and take off his "crown," and climb a palm tree to gather coconuts; whereupon

<sup>1</sup> Pratt-Fraser, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. xxvi, p. 294.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 294 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 295.

the younger brother snatched up both crown and robe, and ran with them to *Fale-tolu*, shouting that he had got his crown and kingdom, which in fact he succeeded in maintaining<sup>1</sup>. It seems that the seat of government was, according to this legend, then located at *Tau*.

We left the *Le-lolonga* legend at the point at which the title of *tuimanu'a* was given to *Ali'a tama*, the younger of two brothers, instead of to *Ali'a matua*, the elder. Here we are told of an incident between these two young men similar to that narrated above. The *tuimanu'a* was persuaded by his elder brother to doff his white turban, the symbol of royalty, and climb a coconut tree, whereupon the other seized the turban, and ran off shouting that he had got his dignity, and in this case it is stated that it was to *Tau* that he ran. Finally the elder brother was confirmed in his position of king of *Manu'a*, whilst the other was to have an inferior position of chief of *Fiti-uta*<sup>2</sup>.

Passing now to the *Tangaloa-Galeali* legend, left at the point at which the son of *Galeali* was endowed at *Lefanga* by the *Tangaroa* family with the title of *tuimanu'a*, we come to the incident of a later *tuimanu'a* climbing a coconut tree, leaving his "title" below it, and of his son seizing it, and running off with it; but in this case he was persuaded to return it to his father. Then follows a tale, similar to that told in the earlier parts of the other two legends, of two wives of the holder of the title giving birth to sons simultaneously and of the competition between their maternal families for the succession; ultimately the *fale-tolu* [the term used in this case with reference to the three elective families in their capacity of controllers of the title] decided in favour of one of the boys. Then, says the legend, "they went thence, and brought the boy to *Tau*; and the boy at once became king, through the *fale-tolu*, for they also brought the *fale-ula* [*i.e.* king's house] thither. Then they protected and surrounded their king, the first king of the *fale-tolu*." Later follows an episode, similar to those appearing in the other legends, of the climbing of a coconut tree by the owner of the title and its theft by his companion<sup>3</sup>.

The combined effect of all these stories is, I think, that the people of *Manu'a* ascribed the origin of their political system to the god *Tangaroa* and his divine or semi-divine descendants;

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 297 *sqq.*

<sup>2</sup> Powell, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. xv, pp. 134 *sq.*

<sup>3</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, pp. 383 *sqq.*



that these descendants were the first *tuimanu'a*; that Fiti-uta, on the easterly shore of the island of Tau was supposed to have been the earthly home of those Tangaroa people; and that it probably had in fact been the original seat of government of Manu'a, though this had afterwards passed to Tau, on the west of the island.

9. There was a legend as to the origin of the name Manu'a, by which it is connected with the marriage of the rocks and the earth, from which a child was born, covered with wounds—"wounded" being the meaning of the name<sup>1</sup>.

10. Day and Night had two children, called respectively Samoa and Manu'a. The former was arrested in its birth just below the thorax at the part called the *moa*; hence it was named Satia-i-le-moa, *i.e.* arrested or torn at the *moa*, and this was contracted into Samoa, and again into Moa, which was the ancient hereditary name of the king of Manu'a. The other child was born with one of its sides much abraded; so it was called Manu'a-tele, or great wound. Powell, in telling this story, refers to, and accepts, a suggestion that the first syllable of the name Samoa must be taken with its meaning of "the family of," so that the whole name means "the family of Moa"; he suggests that it indicates an idea that the first party of the progenitors of the Samoans, who landed on the islands, was headed by a chief named Moa, and says it was stated in Manu'a that the name Samoa belonged to surrounding groups, since all were of the family of Moa, which, he says, is probably true to a certain extent<sup>2</sup>.

11. Tangaroa of the heavens had two children—a son called Moa and a daughter called Lu. She married a brother chief of Tangaroa, and had a son who was named Lu after herself. One night, when Tangaroa lay down to sleep, he heard his grandson singing "Moa Lu, Moa Lu," which he changed after a time to "Lu Moa, Lu Moa." Tangaroa was annoyed at the presumption of the boy, in putting his name before that of Moa, the firstborn. So he called Lu and beat him with his fly-flapper, after which the boy escaped, came down to earth, and named it Samoa<sup>3</sup>.

12. Once the land was flooded by the sea, and everything died except some fowls and pigeons. The latter flew away, but the *moa* or fowls, remained; so Lu made them sacred, and not

<sup>1</sup> Turner, p. 223.

<sup>2</sup> Powell, *J.V.I.* vol. xx, p. 152.

<sup>3</sup> Turner, p. 11.

to be killed; and from them was derived the term *sa-moa* or preserve [*i.e.* sacred or taboo] fowls of Lu<sup>1</sup>.

13. Tangaroa and his son Lu built a canoe up in the heavens, and this was placed on the earth, as there was no sea at that time. Lu married and had a son of the same name, to whom the canoe was given, and, his mother having given birth to the sea, he sailed on it in his canoe, taking with him two fowls which he had caught. Eventually his canoe was carried on to the top of a mountain in Atua (in Upolu) where he lived, keeping his *Sa-moa*, or preserve fowls, which were not to be killed. There are other variations of this legend<sup>2</sup>.

14. Two of the people of Tangaroa of the heavens came to fish, and as they were returning Lu's fowls pecked at the fish in the baskets; so they killed the fowls, and ran off with them to heaven. In the morning Lu discovered the theft, went up to the heavens where he found and beat the culprits; they fled, and Lu pursued them up to the tenth heaven, where Tangaroa lived. He forbade fighting there, but Lu told him what had occurred; so Tangaroa told Lu that he must abate his anger, and spare the men, and gave Lu his (Tangaroa's) daughter to be his wife. So the couple came down to earth and had a son, and both the earth and the son were named Samoa in remembrance of Lu's preserve fowls<sup>3</sup>. Krämer's version of this tale presents the episode in a much more serious light, as he says that, because of the stealing by the Tangaroa people of Lu's fowls, war raged, and the Tangaroa people were put to flight; but the ending was the same<sup>4</sup>.

15. According to another tale Lu had a son, and named him Moa, after his preserve fowls, and this Moa became king of Manu'a. So, out of respect for the king, fowls could no longer be called *moa* in Manu'a, and another name was found for them<sup>5</sup>.

16. Another legend was that Standing rock married Earth rock, and their son, Loose stone, married Mud, and had a son, Grown from nothing, who became the first man. He married the daughter of Tangaroa, and they had a son Lu, who married Langituavalu (eighth heaven), and by her had a son, who became king of Atua<sup>6</sup>.

I shall refer to these tales in later pages; and will now turn to some other stories, relating presumably to a later date, and subsequent history.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 25.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 11 sq.

<sup>5</sup> Turner, p. 224.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 12 sq.

<sup>6</sup> Brown, pp. 357 sq.

Pili was a Samoan god of great historical importance. I hope to refer to the somewhat confusing and inconsistent legends relating to him when, in a future book, I discuss the gods; but I may say here that the widely prevailing idea in Samoa, as shown by the traditions, was that he was descended from the god Tangaroa, being very commonly regarded as having been his son, and came from Manu'a, though Aana evidently made some claims to him, and even the Atuans appear to have tried to associate him with their division, though in doing so they recognized his original connection with Tangaroa and Manu'a. Pili was said to have come down from heaven to Manu'a and to have married Sina, the daughter of the *tuimanu'a*<sup>1</sup>; after which he visited Tutuila, Savai'i and Upolu, where he married the daughter, also named Sina, of the *tuiaana*<sup>2</sup>, by whom he had four sons. First were born two twins Tua and Ana, the former of whom was named from the back of a turtle, which Pili caught at the time, and the other from the cave in which it was taken. The next born was called Tuamasanga (after the twins). Then followed Tolufale (three houses), whose name was, according to Turner, derived from the three houses into which the mother was taken before the child was born; though Krämer associates the name with three places, the small island of Manono (near the western end of Upolu) and Safotulafai and Palauli (village districts on the east and south-east coasts of Savai'i) over which Tolufale gained power. Elsewhere Krämer associates the name with the charge given to him over his three brothers, as will be seen below<sup>3</sup>. A division of property between these brothers was effected by their dying father (according to Turner) or by mutual arrangement among themselves (according to Krämer). I propose to quote the narrative of the former, as being the fuller and more interesting one. Pili called his children together, and appointed them their places and employments. To Tua he gave the plantation dibble, representing the work of agriculture, and the division of Atua. To Aña he gave the spear, as an emblem of war, and the division of Aana. To Sanga (so called by Krämer, but Turner calls him Tuamasanga) he gave the orator's staff and fly-flapper, used in public speaking, and the division of Tuamasanga; and the name of a subdistrict or village on its northern coast—Sangana (sacred to oratory)—

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, pp. 26, 393. Stuebel, p. 69.

<sup>2</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, pp. 27, 168. Turner, p. 233. Stuebel, p. 70. Von Bülow, *I.A.E.* vol. XI, p. 109.

<sup>3</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 190. Cf. Turner, pp. 233 sq.

is associated with this gift. Tolufale got nothing, but was to live in Manono, and go about and take the oversight of all<sup>1</sup>. So the four brothers separated, Tua going to and founding Atua, Ana going to and founding Aana, Sanga remaining in and founding Tuamasanga, and Tolufale going to Manono, where he married, and afterwards to the island of Savai'i, which he founded<sup>2</sup>. At a later date there was fighting between the brothers, Ana and Atua against Tuamasanga and Tolufale<sup>3</sup>. This tradition may be compared, as regards Pili's marriage and children, to legend No. 2 given on a previous page.

According to another form of this tale Ana and Tua (sisters) and their brother Sangana sailed from Tonga to Samoa and landed on the west end of Upolu. Ana, the elder sister, went to the western end (Aana), where the spear and club are still cherished as appertained to it by her. Tua, the younger, went to the east (Atua), and this division still retains the *oso*, or planting stick, as the emblem she assigned to it. Sangana settled in the middle district, which still enjoys his name, Sangana, and claims the orator's *fue*, or fly-flap, as the distinction bequeathed by him<sup>4</sup>.

Von Bülow, after giving a version similar in substance, though not in detail, to that of Krämer, says that up to the present day the Atua people have busied themselves with the cultivation of the land, the Aana people have held the chief command in war, and the Tuamasanga people have opened councils and have had influence through their voice<sup>5</sup>. This is rather a wide and sweeping statement which must not, I think, be taken too literally.

It will be seen that according to Turner's and Krämer's versions of this tale the division of Upolu into three main political areas, each with its head chief, was effected by the Manu'an god Pili, and the island of Savai'i was founded by his son Tolufale; whilst, according to Pritchard's version, the division of Upolu was effected by a family from Tonga.

I now pass on to certain traditions as to the peopling of Savai'i by Lealali, or Alali, as he is sometimes called<sup>6</sup>, and his

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, pp. 9, 27. Turner, pp. 233 sq. Cf. Churchward, pp. 322 sq. Pratt, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. xxv, p. 257. Stair, *J.P.S.* vol. iv, p. 51. Von Bülow, *Globus*, vol. LXVIII, pp. 139 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, pp. 25, 190.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 25.

<sup>4</sup> Pritchard, pp. 390 sq.

<sup>5</sup> Von Bülow, *Globus*, vol. LXVIII, p. 140.

<sup>6</sup> I imagine it is really the same name. *Le* means "the," and is, I think, here only added as a prefix.

descendants. A question as to this matter, which I regard as of considerable interest and importance, is, who was Lealali? Was he, as has been stated, a Manu'an, or of Manu'an descent? I shall refer to the evidence which makes me think that he was so; but in doing this I shall have to mention claims to him made by Tuamasanga. These claims are connected with a Tuamasangan chief named Ationgie and his sons, to whom I shall refer in later pages; but I must here say very shortly in advance who and what these people were, as otherwise some of the evidence and contentions as to the ancestry of Lealali would be difficult to follow. Ationgie was, as we shall see, at the time when the island of Upolu was more or less under the domination of a body of invaders from Tonga, a chief of a village district of Tuamasanga. He had three sons, Savea, Tuna and Fata, who, or the latter two of whom, succeeded in driving the Tongans out of the island, an event with which legends associate the origin of the title Malietoa, first held by this son Savea, and afterwards by the head chiefs or kings of Tuamasanga; and it was after this that by arrangement between these sons themselves, or by the "will" of Ationgie, the constitution of Tuamasanga under the Malietoa was formed. The point at issue is the claim of Tuamasanga that Lealali was a son of Ationgie, and was therefore not a Manu'an, but a Tuamasangan chief, and its importance arises from the attribution to him and his descendants of the peopling of Savai'i.

I have already referred to the will of Pili by which he left the three great divisions of Upolu to his three sons Ana, Tua and Tuamasanga, whilst his fourth son Tolufale got nothing, but was to live in the little island of Manono, and go about and take the oversight of all; and to the tradition that Tolufale went to Manono, and afterwards to the island of Savai'i, which he founded. Krämer says that Lealali politically organized Savai'i<sup>1</sup>. There can, I think, be little doubt that Pili was a Manu'an; and it is noticeable that we have the two statements, one that Pili's son Tolufale founded Savai'i, and the other that Lealali organized it. I find no ground for suggesting that Tolufale and Lealali were the same person; but, according to one of Krämer's genealogies, Lealali was the grandson of a woman Pili-le-So'opili, who married a *tuimanu'a*<sup>2</sup>; so it is quite possible that Lealali was a member of the Pili family, of whom the god Pili was the ancestor, and he may have been descended from Tolufale. If

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 83.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 83.

he was a descendant of Pili, he also was of Manu'an origin. On the other hand, there are genealogies, given by Stuebel, von Bülow and Krämer, according to which Lealali was the son of Ationgie<sup>1</sup>. Krämer comments on this idea that Lealali was the son of Ationgie and the brother of Malietoa Savea, Tuna and Fata, saying that he lived at an earlier date. Krämer contends that the adherents of the Malietoa family had falsified pedigrees, and made out Ationgie (who was a chief of Faleata in Tuamasa-ga) as the original ancestor of all Savai'i and Upolu for their own glorification; and adds that it may probably be regarded as correct and certain that Lealali was a direct descendant of Pili of Manu'a<sup>2</sup>. I have looked into other genealogies, which seem to support Krämer's view as to dates; and as regards his charge against the Malietoa people, I may say that both von Bülow's and Krämer's genealogies are admittedly Malietoan, whilst that of Stuebel was obtained from a person who, though a Savai'ian, was of an *ainga* or branch family of the Malietoa. It may be noted that in another of von Bülow's genealogies, in which is introduced Lealali, along with Savea, Tuna, Fata and others as children of Ationgie, Ationgie himself is made the direct descendant of Pili, who was the son of Tangaroa, and father of Tua, Sanga, Sua and Tolufale, the last of these having been, according to him, not a man, but a woman<sup>3</sup>; so that, even according to him, Lealali was a descendant of Pili. Krämer, however, disputes the idea that Lealali was the son of Ationgie on other grounds. He refers to Lealali's will, by which he directed that Salevaonono and Sausi, his two sons by his first wife, should remain in Leulumoenga (the seat of government of Aana), that they might rule for the *tui'aana* as far as Falealupo (the village at the extreme western point of Savai'i); and that Tupa'imatuna, Tupa'ilelei and Tupa'isiva, his three sons by his second wife, were to go as chiefs to Savai'i; and Krämer's comment on this is that the intention was to put Savai'i under the influence of Aana<sup>4</sup>. It will be noticed that the reference to Falealupo places the whole of Savai'i under Lealali's two sons at Leulumoenga; and, as regards these two sons, I may point out that up to modern times the Sausi and Salevaonono were two of the nine families of Leulumoenga who granted the

<sup>1</sup> Stuebel, p. 61. Von Bülow, *I.A.E.* vol. XI, p. 105. Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 241.

<sup>2</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 83.

<sup>3</sup> Von Bülow, *I.A.E.* vol. XI, pp. 109 sq. Cf. Turner, pp. 3 sq.

<sup>4</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, pp. 83 sq.

*tuiaana* title<sup>1</sup>. We must remember also that apparently the Manu'an Pili had married the daughter of a *tuiaana*, and his children by her, and their descendants would be of the blood royal of Aana. I find one or two Pilis holding the title of *tuiaana* in the genealogies of the *tuiaana*<sup>2</sup>; and, according to one of Krämer's genealogies Lealali's maternal grandparents were a *tuimanu'a* and a woman Pili-le-So'opili, who, Krämer appears to suggest, was a member of a *tuiaana* family<sup>3</sup>. We thus find a close connection, which appears to have been continued to recent days, between the Pili family and the kings of Aana, and this connection seems to have extended to Lealali himself. Krämer points out that a connection of this sort might well enable Lealali to make a will affecting the rulership, under the *tuiaana*, of Aana; and adds that if he had merely been the son of Ationgie, who was only a chief of Faleata in Tuamasanga, he could never have done this<sup>4</sup>. I must say that I agree with this view; and I propose to assume that in all probability Lealali was a descendant of the great Pili of Manu'a.

I will now show how large a number of village districts in Savai'i were, according to Krämer, associated with the descendants of Lealali. Lealali's second wife, referred to above, was a Savai'i woman, and her three sons were, as we have seen, named Tupa'imatuna, Tupa'ilelei and Tupa'isiva. A woman, Laufa-faetonga, of Tongan origin, hearing of the beauty of Tupa'ilelei, desired him; but, when she came, and found that he was ugly, she lived with Tupa'imatuna. On becoming pregnant, she went, according to her father's commands, to Tonga to be delivered, and there she had a son Va'asiliifiti<sup>5</sup>, of whom I shall speak again directly. Turner gives another version of this tale, in which, among other things, he substitutes Tupa'ilelei for Tupa'imatuna<sup>6</sup>. I may here point out that the concluding portion of this woman's name itself suggests a Tongan origin, while that of her son suggests a Fijian connection.

Then followed a number of marriages, and births of people of whom it is said that they were certain villages, or that the villages were derived from them, and it is evident that the idea was that the villages were founded by them<sup>7</sup>. I shall introduce these births partly in tabulated form, so as to show, in separate columns, the names of the children, and those of the villages

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 152.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 83.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 83 sq.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Krämer, *S.I.*, vol. 1, pp. 58, 72, 79.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 175, 168

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 83.

<sup>5</sup> Turner, pp. 252 sq.

supposed to have been founded by them, and the localities in Savai'i of those villages.

Laufafaetonga, when in Tonga, was unfaithful to her husband, and lived with Lautala, a Fijian chief there, and had by him the following three sons and daughter:

Name of child	Village founded by him or her	Position in Savai'i of village
Ututauofiti	Matautu	Near eastern end of N. coast
Tauaofiti	Sataua	Near western end of N. coast
Lengaotuitonga	Salenga	In middle of S.W. coast (a district)
Fotuosamoa ♀	Safotu	Near eastern end of N. coast <sup>1</sup>

These villages were therefore, according to the tradition, founded by the children of a Fijian chief, living in Tonga, by a woman of Tongan origin. The Fijian or Tongan origin of the sons is illustrated by their names.

Va'asiliifiti (the son of Tupa'imatuna by Laufafaetonga) married a woman of Sangana, and another of Saleimoa (both in Tuamasanga), and he had a son Funefe'ai by the former, and a son Laifai by the latter<sup>2</sup>. These two sons take a prominent position in the traditions of Savai'i. Turner, after giving a tale as to the origin of their names, says it was arranged that Fune was to live in one district of the island and Laifai in another, whilst an aunt Fotu established herself between them to prevent them from quarrelling<sup>3</sup>. Fune was, as we shall see directly, the founder of the Tangaroa group whose title was, according to Krämer, one of the two most important original titles of Savai'i, that of Tonumaip'e'a, of which I shall speak presently, being the other<sup>4</sup>. Of Laifai Turner says that Fa'asaleleanga (an important district on the south-eastern coast of the island), and even the whole of the island of Savai'i, was often, in prose and poetry, called Sa Lafai, or sacred to Lafai, and that in the legends this chief had an early place<sup>5</sup>. Krämer refers to this also, and says that Laifai or Lafai was regarded as the original ancestor of Savai'i<sup>6</sup>.

According to the legend of the origin of the Tangaroa group, whose ancestor was Fune, this chief had a wife Sinaalaua, who was greatly desired by the god Tangaroa of the skies. So the god said to Fune that, if he would give him the girl, he [Tangaroa] would give Fune his name as a title. He would also

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 83.

<sup>3</sup> Turner, p. 253. The aunt would be Fotuosamoa mentioned above; but I shall refer to her parentage later.

<sup>4</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 46.

<sup>5</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 85, n. 1.

<sup>6</sup> Turner, p. 252.



give Fune eight men who should sit on each side of him [that meant they would be his *tafa'i*—the attendants who sat on each side of a titular chief], and would be called the *taulauniu-maile-langi*, or sheltering fans of the heavens. The following were the names of these people, the villages they represented, and the positions of those villages.

Names	Villages	Position
Sae and Fataloto	Vaiafai (Safune Vaiafai)	Near southern end of E. coast (part of Iva)
Tunganga and Tangaloataoa	Safunetaoa (the great Safune, called in Krämer's map "Safune")	Near eastern end of N. coast
Ngale and Tuiasau	Vaisala	Near western end of N. coast
Mata'afa and Taliva'a	Sili (Safune Sili)	Near middle of S. coast (part of Tufu Ngautavai)

Fune consented to the god's proposal, and hence each of the four places were thenceforth called Safune<sup>1</sup>.

Laifai married Mata'uia-tali of Falease'ela (in Aana) and had by her the following children:

Name of child	Village founded by him	Position in Savai'i of village
Fotulafai	Safotulafai	Towards the southern end of the E. coast
Talalafai	Iva	Near the southern end of the E. coast
Tupa'iloa	Falealupo	At the N.W. point
Loaloa	Safe'e	(?)
Tupa'ifa'aulu	Ne'iafu	Near the northern end of the W. coast
Tupa'ilifao	Asau	Near the western end of the N. coast
Mulianalafai	The Salemuliana group of people	A few villages scattered round the coast <sup>2</sup>

His son Fotulafai married Levaoita of Salelologa (near the southern end of the east coast), and had two children:

Letufunga	Letufunga	Part of village of Safotulafai towards the southern end of the E. coast
Leaula	Saleaula	Near to the eastern end of N. coast

Laifai was married again to Mata'iuafatu, the sister of his first wife, and had a son Va'asilitamaolepo who married two sisters from Saleimoa (in Tuamasanga) and had two children:

Lafailetaua	Palauli	Near the eastern end of the S. coast <sup>3</sup>
Lafaitupaitea	Satupaitea	" " " "

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.J.* vol. 1, pp. 89 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 85-7.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 85.

A comparison of the situations of all these villages shows how widely spread were those whose origins were attributed to Lealali's two great-grandsons Fune and Laifai; they were scattered more or less all round the coast of Savai'i.

Von Bülow's version of the matter starts with the will of Ationgie, who, it is said, divided the islands of Upolu and Savai'i between his two sons Lealali and Savea, to the latter of whom he gave the Atua and Tuamasanga divisions of Upolu; while to Lealali was given Savai'i and the Aana division of Upolu, and he thereupon went to Savai'i to organize its government by sub-chiefs<sup>1</sup>. It thus gives us material for discussing further the question of Lealali's parentage. The stories, which will be referred to later on, as to the arrangements made either under the will of Ationgie with reference to his sons, or by the sons themselves, after the driving out of the Tongans, contain no reference to Lealali, and it is the mention of him that makes it needful for me to introduce von Bülow's version here. I may, however, say in advance that in none of these other versions is there any suggestion that the arrangement, which appears to have related in the main to the foundation of the Tuamasangan title of Malietoa, in any way affected any part of Samoa other than Tuamasanga.

The idea that Lealali was a son of Ationgie, and von Bülow's story as to the giving by Ationgie to Lealali of Savai'i and Aana are not in accord with the other traditions. But I ask another question, similar to that raised by Krämer and with which I have expressed my agreement, concerning the will of Lealali. That question was, how could Lealali, if he was merely the son of Ationgie, a chief of Tuamasanga, provide by his will for the mode of government, under the *tuiaana*, of Aana? The present question is how, for the same reason, could Ationgie dispose of the government of Aana, Atua and Savai'i? The element of great improbability is the same in both cases; but there is in the present case, a possible reply to the criticism, which is absent as regards the other. Ationgie's sons having driven the Tongan invaders out of all Upolu, it is quite conceivable that the subsequent political arrangement of the whole island might be to a large extent at the discretion of themselves and their father, however local and relatively unimportant their previous position might have been<sup>2</sup>. I think, however, that there

<sup>1</sup> Von Bülow, *I.A.E.* vol. XIII, p. 59.

<sup>2</sup> It may have been important in Tuamasanga.

are two rejoinders to this reply. The first of these is the apparent inconsistency of the view that Lealali was the son of Ationgie and that Ationgie parcelled out the whole of Upolu and Savai'i between Savea and Lealali with the other traditions. The second, which seems almost unanswerable, is that if Ationgie had been able to do this, and had done it, we should see indications of the consequences, in the form of some subsequent control arising from it over Aana and Atua, a control to which the great hereditary chiefs or kings of these divisions, the *tuaana* and the *tuiatua*, would have been in some way subject; whereas in point of fact there is not in the traditions a shadow of suggestion of anything of the sort. I still hold that Lealali was of Manu'an origin.

Von Bülow tells us some details of the commencement of Lealali's arrangements in Savai'i<sup>1</sup>; I need not repeat these here, but I refer to his comment that it is evident from his particulars that the island of Savai'i was colonized from Fiji, and perhaps in a small degree from Tonga also<sup>2</sup>.

Von Bülow also gives another version of the tale of Laufaetonga, who, according to him, was the daughter of the *tuitonga*; but the only portion of this version to which I need refer is the reference in it to the girl's original desire for Tupa'ilelei, whom she believed to be handsome, her discovery that he was not so, her consequent marriage to his brother Tupa'imatuna, and the subsequent birth of her son Va'asiliifiti and of a daughter Samoa ua Fotu, whose name was attributed to an incident connected with Samoa<sup>3</sup>. The brothers are the same as the two brothers mentioned by Krämer; so we get a double origin of the same tale, though the two versions differ. Von Bülow also tells of the marriage of Laufaetonga, with Lautala, who, according to him, was a Tongan chief, and the birth of two sons Utu and Taua, and a daughter Lenga<sup>4</sup>, and of another son Lavalu<sup>5</sup>. It will be noticed that he and Krämer differ as to the paternity of the girl Fotu, and the sex of Lenga, and that only von Bülow mentions Lavalu. Von Bülow also tells the story of the double marriage of Va'asiliifiti, his version, though differing from that of Krämer, being similar to it, in that both the wives came from Tuamasanga, and the names of their two sons were Fune and Lafai<sup>6</sup>. He also refers to quarrels

<sup>1</sup> Von Bülow, *I.A.E.* vol. XIII, pp. 59 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 61.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* vol. XIII, p. 65.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 59.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* vol. XI, p. 105.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 62.

and fighting between the two brothers, and says that Va'asilli therefore decreed that Lafai was to live at Safotulafai at the eastern end of Savai'i and Fune at Safune in the west, and their aunt Fotu was to live at Safotu between them, and act as a mediator<sup>1</sup>, which accords with Turner's statement; I must point out, however, that only one of the villages (Vaisala) which Krämer associates with Safune was in the west. Von Bülow also gives an account, similar to that of Krämer, of the origin of the Tangaroa title of the Fune branch of the family<sup>2</sup>. He also introduces certain particulars as to the descendants of Lafai, which, so far as they go, are more or less similar to those of Krämer<sup>3</sup>.

We have in the accounts of these three writers, notwithstanding their differences, one feature substantially in common, so far as the point of view from which I am recording them is concerned. According to Krämer, the organization and colonization of Savai'i was effected by Lealali, the descendant of the great Pili of Manu'a, and by Lealali's great-grandsons, Lafai and Fune, and both Fiji and Tonga enter largely into the account. In Turner's very short reference to the matter we find that the names of Lafai and Fune (identified by him as the grandsons of Tupa'ilelei), referred to by both Krämer and von Bülow, were associated in legends with Savai'i, and he also brings in Tonga and Fiji<sup>4</sup>. Von Bülow's account is, so far as it goes, somewhat similar in certain matters to that of Krämer; and though he does not recognize the Manu'an origin of Lealali, he at all events connects the early peopling of the island with Tonga.

An obvious question arises as to how the children of the Tongan woman Laufafaetonga by the Fijian or Tongan chief Lautala came to establish themselves in Savai'i, and be the ancestors of Savai'ian families; but the following tradition, told by von Bülow, seems, if true, to be a sufficient explanation. Fotu married a Savai'ian husband<sup>5</sup>; and afterwards Tuifiti (King of Fiji) sent the brothers Utu and Taua and their sister Lenga to visit Fotu, who was their half sister, and her family in Savai'i; and all three evidently then settled in the island, as they were the founders of the three villages referred to in a previous page. Von Bülow says that even to the present time the brother and sister bond of relationship of *ilamutu* or *tamasa* persists between Utu and Taua and their posterity on the one hand, and the posterity of Lenga on the other, and all of

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 62 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 65.

<sup>4</sup> Turner, pp. 252 sq.

<sup>5</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, pp. 58, 86.

them, still at the present time, show to the posterity of Fotu—Safotu—the respect due to an elder sister<sup>1</sup>.

Von Bülow, in discussing the early settlements of Savai'i in the way above described, says it would be incorrect to assume that the island had been uninhabited at the time of the migration of the ancestors of the present population. He refers to what he calls original inhabitants, by which he evidently means people living in the island prior to the time when these settlements were made. He says that Maunga [mountain], who dwelt in Samaunga and his sister Pai, who peopled Satoalepai, were mentioned as original inhabitants, though, as regards them, he says that only their names were preserved. Then (speaking, I think, of both Savai'i and Upolu) he tells us that the people believed that Liavaa, who lived in Aopo, and Tuuleamaanga and Loa, who ruled over Fangalooa, and Tuiaana le Tava'etele, the head chief of Aana, belonged to the original population. He also refers, in connection with this matter, to the legend of Mausautele<sup>2</sup>. According to this legend there was a marriage between two mountains, and a mountain was born of the marriage; this last mountain married another mountain, and they had a mountain as a son; a similar marriage and evolution occurred a third time; finally the mountain child of the third marriage was married to another mountain. All these mountains, the names of which are given, were in the interior of Savai'i. The issue of the last marriage were Lauifa and Tangatapopoto; they were human, and were in fact the first men. Then came a couple from Fiji, called Futi and Sao, with their child Sinafetuna, a girl, whom they brought to be married to Tangatapopoto; but at his suggestion the girl was married to his brother Lauifa, instead of to him. They had a son Mausautele (called by the natives the "son of the land" or "original inhabitant"); and he married Sina Lalotava, the daughter of Soalo, of Samaunga, and had a son Taumatamu. He married Muaolepuso and had a son Samoanangalo, who married Fiti Maupolonga, a chief's daughter, and had two sons Sanaalala and Latuivai<sup>3</sup>.

The Tongan war, in which the Tongans were driven out of certain parts of Samoa, and the creation of the Tuamangan title of Malietoa seem to have occurred in what may perhaps be regarded as the commencement of the period at

<sup>1</sup> Von Bülow, *Globus*, vol. LXVIII, p. 140.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* I.A.E. vol. XIII, p. 59.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 66 sq.

which our knowledge of the internal affairs of Samoa begins to be more or less historical. In order to appreciate the possible significance of this war we must call to mind the history, as constructed by Percy Smith, and narrated in the previous chapter on origin and migrations, of the earlier events following the arrival into the islands of the western Pacific of those people whose journeyings thither have been recorded in the Rarotongan logs, and the exploits of whom, and of their descendants, in spreading over the Pacific, are the subject of Rarotongan and other traditions. In discussing the migrations, following Smith's terminology, I called these people the "Rarotongans." I now propose to abandon this somewhat misleading term, and to adopt, for reasons that will appear in later pages, the term "Tangaroans" for these people, or an important group of them and their descendants, and I shall continue to use the term "Tangaroans" with this meaning throughout the book. We have seen that, according to the accounts given, these Tangaroans first established themselves in Fiji, whence they spread more or less over the Tongan and Samoan islands, apparently subduing the earlier Tongans, or partly so, or securing their co-operation, though Smith thinks they only occupied the coasts of Samoa; and he refers to the period when this had been accomplished, to which he attributes the date of about A.D. 575, as the epoch that formed the commencement of the long occupation by the Tangaroans of the coasts of Savai'i and Upolu, during which there was, according to Samoan traditions, frequent intercourse between Fiji and Samoa and frequent intermarriages between their people, which continued afterwards for about twenty-five generations, until the Tangaroans were driven out in about A.D. 1250. As regards this date Krämer says that the Tongans, as he calls them, had power over Samoa in A.D. 1200<sup>1</sup> which is consistent with Smith's date of their expulsion. Von Bülow puts the date of expulsion at about A.D. 1600<sup>2</sup>.

As stated in the chapter on origin and migrations, I look upon all these dates with a good deal of suspicion, thinking that the various periods were probably not so long as has been suggested (except in the case of von Bülow, whose date I am unable to discuss), though probably the alleged sequence of events is more or less correct; but I can only take them as I find them. The Tangaroan occupation of parts of Samoa, which is

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Von Bülow, *Globus*, vol. LXXI, p. 149.

said to have terminated in about 1250, had, according to Smith, continued for about 700 years previously. We have, however, to compare this with statements by other writers. Lesson apparently thinks the "Tongan" occupation of Samoa only lasted for the period of the lifetime of one man<sup>1</sup>; Stuebel does not seem to think it lasted very long<sup>2</sup>; von Bülow thinks the "Tongans" were only in Samoa ten years<sup>3</sup>; Krämer thinks the "Tongan" supremacy only lasted for two generations<sup>4</sup>. As to this, I must point out that Smith distinguishes between this later Tongan domination, which he regards as having been of relatively short duration, and the original Tangaroan domination which had lasted for a long period. There is therefore nothing in the suggestions of these other writers inconsistent with Smith's views, unless it be some question as to the character and extent of the previous Tangaroan occupation and power. I may point out, however, that the original Tangaroans and their exploring descendants were undoubtedly an extremely strong, energetic, pushing people, and it seems improbable that, if they had established themselves in parts of Samoa, they would relinquish their hold there. Moreover there appears to be no record or tale that points to any expulsion of these people, prior to that which we are now going to consider. On the other hand, this later special "Tongan" occupation of Samoa, of which these other writers speak, seems to have been a purely Tongan affair, which occurred not very long before the time when they were driven out again. According to my views, however, which I shall discuss hereafter, these Tongans were a Tongan section of the descendants of the original Tangaroans; and if so, this occupation by them was a strengthening of the Tangaroan position in Samoa.

This brings us to the traditions as to the expulsion from Samoa of these Tongans, as they are called by the writers—Tongan Tangaroans, as I regard them. There are three distinct versions by Stuebel, one by von Bülow, and one by Graeffe; these vary considerably in detail, but there is a general similarity between them—especially between Stuebel's and von Bülow's versions. I propose to draw attention to some of the more important features of the episode disclosed by one or other of the versions. First, as regards the character of this Tongan

<sup>1</sup> Lesson, *Poly.* vol. II, pp. 431 *sqq.*

<sup>2</sup> Stuebel, pp. 86 *sqq.*; and *J.P.S.* vol. VIII, pp. 231 *sqq.*

<sup>3</sup> Von Bülow, *Globus*, vol. LXVIII, p. 365.

<sup>4</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 169.

dominion in Samoa at the time, as stated in these versions, we find it said that Samoa was subjugated by the Tongans, who ruled in Upolu and Savai'i; there were at that time no kings in Samoa (Stuebel, 1st version). At that time the Samoans were subjugated by Tuitonga, who also bore the name of Tala'aifei'i, the king of Tonga<sup>1</sup>; Samoa had kings, but no single king with sovereignty over Samoa (Stuebel, 3rd version). The Tongans had once come in their double war canoes, under their king Tala'aifei'i, landed in Samoa, beaten the Samoans and carried out a rigorous, but very beneficial, government in those islands (von Bülow). There had for a long time been war between the Samoans and Tongans, and the Tongans had driven the Samoans to Aleipata (at the eastern end of Upolu, in the division of Atua), and except for a small remnant, all the land of Samoa was in their hands (Graeffe). The occasion of the outbreak seems to have been a royal visit to Samoa of the *tuitonga*, who landed at Safotu, on the northern coast of Savai'i (Stuebel, 2nd and 3rd versions), where he set up his court and constructed a fortified camp (von Bülow). The persons who took the lead in attacking him were two brothers, named Tuna and Fata, sons of Ationgie of Sangana [on the north coast of Tuamasanga in Upolu] and their elder brother Savea, though the latter does not appear in all the accounts as an actual combatant. According to two accounts the brothers went to Safotu, where they stole the anchor pole of the *tuitonga's* war canoe (Stuebel, 2nd and 3rd versions); according to another they fought and defeated the *tuitonga* at Safotu, though this was not the end of the fighting (von Bülow). In this last account it is said that the defeated Tongans fled from Savai'i to Upolu; but the tale, as given in the other accounts, refers only to Upolu as the place where fighting occurred. According to one account the object of the *tuitonga's* visit to Samoa was to visit and travel round and inspect this kingdom of his, and we are told how he crossed from Savai'i to Upolu and landed in Aana (Stuebel, 3rd version); but in the account which gives the fighting in Safotu the crossing of the Tongans to Upolu was a flight (von Bülow). The commencement of the main episodes of the story was, according to three of the versions, at Aleipata (Stuebel, 2nd and 3rd versions; von Bülow). There was a dance, with singing there, and the Samoans sang a song, which

<sup>1</sup> His name appears in Krämer's list of the *tuitonga* (Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 468).



the Tongans apparently did not understand, but which referred to an intention to rout them; and this was followed by a sudden onslaught of the Samoans on the Tongans, and the defeat of the latter. I may point out that, according to the previous history, as given by Graeffe, this district of Aleipata was the place to which most of the Samoans had been driven previously by the Tongans, and would therefore be the spot where they would be the strongest. We cannot speculate much on the possible construction to be put upon details of this sort; but this point of consistency may be no mere accident. The Samoans then pursued the flying Tongans westward along the whole length of the two coasts of Upolu, one of the two brothers, Tuna and Fata, following them along the north shore, and the other along the south shore, until they met at the extreme western point, in Aana, of the island, where such of the Tongans as were left escaped, or were allowed to depart, in their canoes. The last act of the *tuitonga* before departing was to offer his praise to the Samoan brothers for their warlike bravery, addressing them as Malietoa<sup>1</sup>, and saying that the war should be buried, and the next time the Tongans came to Samoa they would do so as peaceful friends and not to fight. After this a question arose between Tuna and Fata as to which of them was to take this honoured title of Malietoa, and according to some versions there was fighting between them; but the ultimate arrangement was, according to all the versions, that their elder brother Savea should take the title. There are one or two points of similarity in the details of the stories. One is an order by *tuitonga* to Tuna and Fata to perform the apparently impossible task of removing a great stone, and their success in doing so with the help of eels, or according to one account, an octopus, and the courage and discomfiture which this success gave to the Samoans and Tongans respectively (Stuebel, 3rd version; von Bülow). Another was a trick played by the brothers in burying their clubs, made, according to two accounts, out of the stolen anchor pole of the *tuitonga's* canoe, in the ground where the dance was to take place, and the sudden and unexpected onslaught which this enabled them to make (Stuebel, all three versions; Graeffe). The third was the pleasure of *tuitonga* at finding that the brothers had respected the virtue of his wives, who had been so painted on parts of their bodies as to reveal any improper conduct (a belief which,

<sup>1</sup> According to Baker's *Tongan Dictionary*, *malie* =bravo, and *toa* =brave.

according to two accounts, was not justified by the facts), a pleasure which seems to have moved him to make his final complimentary speech to them (Stuebel, 1st and 2nd versions; Graeffe)<sup>1</sup>.

Krämer's account of the matter is somewhat different in construction so I refer to it separately. He says that at the period A.D. 1000-1200 the influence of the *tuimanu'a* in Upolu had long been extinct, and Aana and Atua had risen into prominence<sup>2</sup>; also, according to him, the intercourse between Samoa and the neighbouring group, which, apparently, had previously been considerable, had gradually become less active though intermarriages between Samoans and Tongans still occurred<sup>3</sup>. He refers to the period of about A.D. 1200, when, he says, the Samoan Islands, or at all events Tutuila, Upolu and Savai'i were under subjection to the Tongans<sup>4</sup>—foreign oppressors, who had seized the power, no *tuiaana* or *tuiaua* having been elected<sup>5</sup>. He says on another page that the Tongans had established themselves in Savai'i, Upolu and Tutuila, and only Manu'a seems to have escaped<sup>6</sup>. As regards the driving out of the Tongans by Tuna and Fata, he quotes Stuebel, Turner and Stair, and says the account of the matter given to him was similar in all essentials to that of Stuebel<sup>7</sup>. He refers to the transfer by Tuna and Fata to their elder brother Savea of the title of Malietoa<sup>8</sup>. Krämer gives an account of the driving out of the Tongans from Tutuila by a chief there called Fua'autoa<sup>9</sup>; but there is nothing in the tale that need be detailed here. Smith says this expulsion was at the period of Karika's voyage to Rarotonga<sup>10</sup>.

The "will" of Ationgie and the events connected with it are difficult to interpret, so I will content myself with adopting Krämer's own explanation. Ationgie's two sons, Tuna and Fata, had driven the invading Tongans out of Upolu; so the people naturally turned in gratitude to him and to them. His son, Savea, was the Malietoa, by transfer from Tuna and Fata, and to him Ationgie gave his home and other neighbouring villages in and near the village district of Faleata, including the village district of Afenga, which afterwards became the seat

<sup>1</sup> Stuebel, pp. 84 sq. (1st version); 85 sq. (2nd version); 86 sq. (3rd version). Von Bülow, *Globus*, vol. LXVIII, pp. 365 sq. Graeffe, *M.G.G.* Hamburg, 1887-8, pp. 65-8. Cf. Turner, pp. 253 sq.; Stair, p. 241.

<sup>2</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 11.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 10, 394.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 12.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 14.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 259.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 12.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 252 sq.

<sup>10</sup> Smith, p. 164.

of government. Fata and Maulolo, brothers of the Malietoa's wife, were set over Afenga, as orators in Council. Tuna and Fata, the brothers of the Malietoa, were directed to support him, the former establishing himself in Faleata and to the east of it (on the northern shore of Tuamasanga), and the latter in Safata (on the southern shore). It will be seen that, in view of what had occurred, Ationgie's family had earned a dominant position in Tuamasanga. I gather from the various historical accounts that there had not been previously a great chief of all Tuamasanga, as there had been in Aana and Atua. The prominent divisions of Upolu were Aana, the *tumua* or chief council place of which was Leulumoenga, and Atua, whose *tumua* was Lufilufi, although, owing apparently to the Tongan invasion, there had been a break in the election of the *tuiavana* and *tuiatua*. Ationgie, however, seems to have been anxious not to appear to be trying to encroach upon their privileges; so he contented himself with calling his own seat of government *laumua*. After this the Malietoa family retained the head chieftainship of Tuamasanga. Krämer also regards this episode as the commencement of a period, which he thinks lasted for some generations, during which the Malietoa family were more important and had greater power than the older families of *tuiavana* and *tuiatua*<sup>1</sup>.

The subsequent history of Upolu discloses a decrease in the power of the Malietoa family of Tuamasanga and an increase in that of the *tuiavana*, this position continuing, with short interruptions, until the beginning of the 19th century, when the Malietoa family again secured the ascendancy; but these are historical matters outside the scope of this book.

There was, however, one important feature of the Samoan political constitution, of relatively recent date, the character, and so far as possible, the origin of which must be explained. This was the establishment of the office of the *tafa'ifa*, or king of all Samoa, a royal personage recognized as being at the head of the whole Samoan group, except the Manu'an cluster, which had become separated politically from the others. I may say in advance that to qualify for this position it was necessary to possess both the titles of *tuiavana* and *tuiatua*, and, though the Malietoa title itself formed no part of the qualification, two other titles of Tuamasanga, namely those of Ngatoaitete and Tamasoali'i were also requisite. No person who had not these

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 260.

four titles concentrated in himself was qualified to be *tafa'ifa*. This office was not hereditary in the sense that the succession passed on the death of a *tafa'ifa* in the ordinary way, for no person who according to the ordinary rules would be a presumed or possible successor to a dead *tafa'ifa* could attain to the office of *tafa'ifa* unless he held the four requisite titles<sup>1</sup>. It was not, I may say, a continuous office; sometimes there was a *tafa'ifa*, and sometimes there was not.

Before entering into this matter, I must refer to the extremely important Savai'ian family or group of Tonumaipé'a, concerning whom it is interesting to note that it was, according to the traditions, descended from Lafai. A good deal of detailed evidence on this point could, I think, be elaborated; but I will content myself here with saying that the woman Leutongitupaitea, through whom the family title of Tomumaipé'a originated, was, according to the pedigrees, a daughter of Lafai's son Le Muliana<sup>2</sup>, and that the village districts of Sataua, Falealupo and Satupaitea, which were important Tonumaipé'a centres, were, according to the traditions, connected with sons of Lafai<sup>3</sup>. Another interesting matter concerning this family is that they claimed to be the descendants of the great Samoan god of the dead, Si'uleo, and his daughter, the great war goddess, Nafanua<sup>4</sup>, both of whom, I shall contend, were deities of the Tangaroans, with whose early history parts of Fiji, Tonga, Manu'a and Savai'i were, I believe, specially connected.

The history of the matter begins with the alleged origins of the Ngatoaitete and Tamasoali'i titles. The Malietoa La'auli had two daughters, Ngatoaitete and Ngasoloaiaoolangi<sup>5</sup>. The origin of the name Ngatoaitete is said to have been the bringing to Malietoa La'auli, whilst sitting with his daughter, of a *ngato* fish; whereupon he said "Let the name of my daughter be Ngatoaitete"<sup>6</sup>. Ngatoaitete married Sanalala of Safata (on the southern coast of Tuamasanga); but she was childless. Ngasoloaiaoolangi married a man who neglected her, after which she went to live with her sister and her husband<sup>7</sup>. This

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 18. Von Bülow, *I.A.E.* vol. XI, p. 117. Stuebel, p. 95. Schultz, *J.P.S.* vol. XX, p. 48. Mgr. Elloy, *A.P.F.* vol. XLIV, p. 369. Pratt, *A.A.A.S.* vol. II, pp. 662 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, pp. 87, 94 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 85, 95 sq. Von Bülow, *I.A.E.* vol. XI, pp. 105, 107.

<sup>4</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 96.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 243.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 253 sq.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 243.

marriage of Ngatoaitete with the Safata man was, it has been suggested, the event which introduced into the family the name of Tamasoali'i, which was a Safata name, having its origin in a story concerning the wooing of Ngatoaitete and her sister<sup>1</sup>. The husband of Ngatoaitete had by Ngasoloaiaoolelangi two daughters, Vaeatamasoa and Leatoungaungatuitonga<sup>2</sup>; Ngatoaitete adopted the former<sup>3</sup>; Vaeatamasoa married Selanginato, a chief of the *tuiiana* family, and had a son, who became *tuiiana* Tamalelangi<sup>4</sup>, and is regarded by Krämer as the person with whom the real historical *tuiiana* title began, all previous kings of Aana having been more or less legendary<sup>5</sup>. Leatoungaungatuitonga married the holder of the title of the Tonumaip'e'a family of Savai'i, and had by him a daughter So'oa'emalelangi and a son Tupa'i<sup>6</sup>. The *tuiiana* Tamalelangi was thus first cousin to the sister and brother So'oa'emalelangi and Tupa'i, their mothers having been sisters. So'oa'emalelangi married *tuiatua* Matautia<sup>7</sup> but did not have a child by him<sup>8</sup>.

The Malietoa La'auli, it is said, bestowed upon two orator chiefs of Afenga the right of granting the name of his daughter Ngatoaitete as a title, and at the same time the district of Safata received the right to grant as a title the name of his granddaughter Vaeatamasoa, this name becoming Tamasoa ali'i (chief Tamasoa), contracted into Tamasoali'i<sup>9</sup>. These two titles were, like those of *tuiiana* and *tuiatua*, *papa* or great titles, to distinguish them from the *ao* or minor titles; but they were themselves distinguished from the other *papa* titles by the designation *papa tamafefine*—the titles of the chief's daughter<sup>10</sup>. They were Tuamasanga titles, but were quite distinct from that of the Malietoa, which extended over all Tuamasanga. A Malietoa, wishing to qualify for the position of *tafa'ifa*, could not do so by securing, in addition to his own title of Malietoa, those of *tuiiana* and *tuiatua*; it was necessary for him to acquire the grants of the Ngatoaitete and Tamasoali'i titles<sup>11</sup>. Taken together, they were far reaching, for they were granted by Afenga and Safata<sup>12</sup>, of which the former, on the northern coast

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, pp. 233, 254.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 12.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 12, 19.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 243, 97.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 295.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 243.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 169.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 202 sq.

<sup>9</sup> Krämer, *Globus*, vol. LXXV, p. 186. As regards the contraction, cf. Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, pp. 12, 14.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* p. 186. Cf. Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 14. Von Bülow, *I.A.E.* vol. XI, p. 117.

<sup>11</sup> Von Bülow, *I.A.E.* vol. XI, p. 117. Cf. Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 18.

<sup>12</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 15.

of Tuamasanga, close to Malie, the ancient home and official centre of the Malietoa, was the seat of government of Tuamasanga; whilst the latter was the large and powerful village district of the southern coast, the place, where, according to the traditions referred to above, Fata, one of the sons of Ationgie, established himself, evidently for the purpose of governing the southern portion of the division on behalf of his brother Savea, the Malietoa, at Afenga. I think I may say that these two areas taken together, represented, so far as power and influence were concerned, practically the whole of Tuamasanga; and that the Malietoa would therefore have but little power, if opposed by the holders or holder of the Ngatoaitete and Tamasoali'i titles.

I see from Krämer's genealogies that the *tuiavana* Tamalelangi apparently belonged to the fifth generation after the driving out of the Tongans from Samoa<sup>1</sup>, and he allocates the *tuiatua* Matautia to the same period<sup>2</sup>; from these data we get an approximate idea of the period when the Ngatoaitete and Tamasoali'i titles were supposed to have been created. The holding of these titles, along with those of *tuiavana* and *tuiatua* evidently did not then involve any right to be king of all Samoa under the title of *tafa'ifa*, this having been a later development, in which the Tonumaip'e'a family of Savai'i took the leading part, as will now be seen. As regards this latter subject I may point out that the holder of the Tonumaip'e'a title, having married the woman Leatoungaungatuitonga (the daughter of Ngasoloaiaoolangi) had established a strong matrimonial connection with Tuamasanga; and as her sister Vaeatamasoa had married a member of the *tuiavana* family and was the mother of *tuiavana* Tamalelangi, there was also a connection with Aana. Then again, passing to the next generation, So'oa'emalelangi, the daughter of this Tonumaip'e'a marriage, had married the *tuiatua* Matautia, and she and her brother Tupa'i were first cousins to the *tuiavana* Tamalelangi. It will thus be seen that the Tonumaip'e'a family of Savai'i had become closely connected in more ways than one with the leading Upolu royal families of Tuamasanga, Aana and Atua, a circumstance which must be borne in mind, in following the subsequent history of the matter, in which we shall see how the Tonumaip'e'a people took advantage of internal quarrels in Upolu.

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, pp. 168 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 295.

*Tuiaana* Tamalelangi had a rival Sangaate, who, apparently, was trying to secure the title. He therefore sent his female cousin, So'oa'emalelangi, who was living at Leulumoenga, the seat of government of Aana, to Savai'i to beg the assistance of the war goddess Nafanua, the divine ancestress of the Tonumaip'e'a family, whose inspired high priest was So'oa'emalelangi's brother Tupa'i<sup>1</sup>; and here I may say that in this matter, and in other appeals to this goddess for help to which I shall have to refer directly, this Tupa'i was evidently the person before whom the appeals were placed, and it looks as if in all these matters it was largely through him that the Tonumaip'e'a family engaged in highly successful intrigues to secure power and influence in Samoa. Nafanua promised her help (apparently military, as well as divine) but made it a condition that, if Tamalelangi won, though he might establish his government (*i.e.* it was to remain at Leulumoenga), he should give his title to Nafanua. Then followed war between Tamalelangi and Sangaate, in which the former was victorious; but in pursuance of the arrangement, he only retained his sovereign power, his title having been taken away by Nafanua<sup>2</sup>.

An interesting point of detail is suggested by the statement that So'oa'emalelangi was living at Leulumoenga. As the respective mothers of herself and Tamalelangi were sisters, under systems of classificatory relationship and matrilineal descent (of which the former undoubtedly prevailed in Samoa, whilst the latter was by no means extinct, even in later days), she and he would be sister and brother; and this would explain the fact that her name was the *sa'oauaaluma* name of the *tuiiana* family—that is, as I shall explain hereafter, a designation applied to the daughters of successive chiefs holding the title, and generally derived from some previous famous woman of the family—usually, apparently, the sister of one of the previous chiefs. The interest of this point, so far as our present subject is concerned, is that it suggests another close connecting link between this daughter of the Tonumaip'e'a chief and the *tuiiana*.

This was followed by disturbances in Tuamasanga; and an appeal to Nafanua for troops was made by Ngatoaitete, "for war raged against Malie" (the residence of the Malietoia family on the northern coast, and original seat of the government of Tuamasanga). It was, according to Krämer, trouble between

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, pp. 97, 199.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 190 sq.

the Ngatoaitete people in Afenga and the Malietoa at their ancestral seat in Malie, caused apparently through the oppression of the former by the latter. She agreed to help; but made it a condition that the government should be transferred from Malie to the neighbouring village district of Afenga, and that she should be given the Ngatoaitete title. The war was successful, the Malietoa being defeated, and the conditions fulfilled<sup>1</sup>.

Next followed war between two contending *tuiatua*, one of whom, Fonganiutea, appealed to Nafanua. Here, as in the case of the *tuaana*, she gave her help, and he was successful; but, though he was allowed to retain his government at Lufilufi, the seat of government, she took the title<sup>2</sup>.

Finally there was a quarrel between two conflicting parties of Safata (on the southern coast of Tuamasanga) in which one of them appealed to Nafanua, and received her assistance, the price paid for which was the Tamasoali'i title<sup>3</sup>.

I must here draw attention to the apparent astuteness of Tupa'i, the Tonumaip'e an high priest of Nafanua, the ancestor goddess of the family. He secured for the family the great titles of *tuaana* and *tuiatua*; but he did not get that of the Malietoa, who had apparently been, since the driving out of the Tongans, the dominant chiefs of Tuamasanga. He only secured in that division two titles, derived from the Malietoa; and it was therefore necessary to assert some precedence and superiority over the latter. So he made it, as we have seen, a condition of help that the seat of government of Tuamasanga should be transferred from Malie (the ancient home and governmental centre of the Malietoa) to Afenga (the central home of the Ngatoaitete title, according to the arrangement that had been made by Malietoa La'auli). Then again, I may mention that, in accordance with the alleged orders of Nafanua, Tupa'i was, after the Ngatoaitete victory, to remain in Afenga "in order to answer Afenga in his speech" (which meant, I imagine, that he was to take the lead in the *fono* there), and was to remain at Lufilufi (the seat of government of Atua) "to make it a sacred seat for *tuiatua*" after the Atuan victory, and was to remain in Safata "to watch over the government and take charge of the good behaviour" of the people after the Safata victory; but no Tupa'i was to remain at Leulumoenga (the government seat of Aana)

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 200.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 200 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 201.



after the Aana victory, because, as Nafanua said to So'oa'emalelangi, "thou art the Queen (Herrin)"<sup>1</sup>. We may gather from this that the Tonumaipé'a people not only took the four titles as the price of their help, but took precautions for watching over matters in the seat of government of each of them, except Leulumoenga, where it was unnecessary, as Tupa'i's sister So'oa'emalelangi was already there. As the result of all these operations the Tonumaipé'a people had not only secured the titles of *tuiavana* and *tuiatua*, but they had, through their relationship with these Malietoa women, got the legal possession of two important titles which in effect covered the whole of Tuamasanga, and established a certain degree of superiority of power there of those titles over the Malietoa themselves.

The four titles were bestowed by Nafanua (as Krämer expresses it) upon So'oa'emalelangi<sup>2</sup>. She, having no children of her own, adopted Salamasina, the daughter of her cousin *tuiavana* Tamalelangi, and handed over to her all power and the four titles; and ever since then these titles have been requisite for regal power over all Samoa<sup>3</sup>. The time of this event was probably, according to Krämer, about A.D. 1500<sup>4</sup>.

The direct right or eligibility of Salamasina to the titles was fortified by the fact that she could claim kinship with each of the three families with which they were connected. As regards the *tuiavana* title, she was the daughter of the *tuiavana* Tamalelangi; as regards the *tuiatua* title, she was the adopted daughter of So'oa'emalelangi, the wife of the *tuiatua*; this would not, however, involve kinship with the *tuiatua* himself, unless, as is possible, he had joined with his wife in adopting her; as regards the Ngatoaitele title, she was the granddaughter of Vaeatamasoa, the niece and adopted daughter of Ngatoaitele herself; and as regards the Tamasoali'i title, she was the granddaughter of Vaeatamasoa. She was the first *tafa'ifa*, or monarch of all Samoa<sup>5</sup>, and subsequent *tafa'ifa* were those who were able to secure the concentration in themselves of all the four titles.

Several writers refer to the alternative title *o le tupu* (the grown) given to the *tafa'ifa*<sup>6</sup>; but there are statements that the

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, pp. 199 *sqq.* Even up to modern times the name of Tupa'i appears in the greetings of the *fono* of all Atua and of Lufilufi—both held at Lufilufi. (Krämer, *op. cit.* pp. 271, 274.)

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 14, 201 n.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 14.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 15.

<sup>6</sup> Stair, pp. 65, 81. Brown, p. 283. Ella, *A.A.A.S.* vol. VI, p. 597. Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 18. Von Bülow, *Globus*, vol. LXXXIII, p. 373.

use of this term to designate the king was introduced by the missionaries at a comparatively recent date<sup>1</sup>.

The actual granting of the titles rested with four groups of orator chiefs; these were the nine orator chiefs of Leulumoenga (who controlled the Aana title)<sup>2</sup>, the six orator chiefs of Lufilufi (who controlled the Atua title)<sup>3</sup>, two orator chiefs of Afenga (who controlled the Ngatoaitete title)<sup>4</sup>, and two orator chiefs of Safata (who controlled the Tamasoali'i title)<sup>5</sup>. The Tamasoali'i title was generally granted along with the Ngatoaitete title<sup>6</sup>. In granting the titles Aana acted first, and then Atua, and afterwards Afenga and Safata<sup>7</sup>.

I must mention the fact that Ella refers to a fifth title of Le Pule-o-Salafai, representing the whole of the island of Savai'i, as being requisite for the kingship of all Samoa<sup>8</sup>; and Stair says that five titles (not four only) were required<sup>9</sup>, but he does not specify them. I think, however, that they must be wrong, as the addition of a fifth title is against the general weight of the evidence and would be out of accord with the whole history of the matter. The number given by Brown is four<sup>10</sup>; and von Bülow, evidently referring to this matter, insists that the number was four, not five<sup>11</sup>. Stair evidently did not, when he wrote, know the history, though he attributes this concentration of titles to the conquest at some time over their owners, and suggests that the title of the king of all Samoa was not so old as the *tui* titles<sup>12</sup>, which was evidently the case.

I draw attention to the fact that the Tonumaie'a family, after all their successful diplomacy and fighting, seem to have got in the long run little or no direct and obvious benefit other than glory and influence, as a reward. Had So'oa'emalelangi, the daughter of the Tonumaie'a chief, had a child, it may be presumed that it would have been in this child, and not in the *tuaanan* princess Salamasina, that the four titles would have been concentrated, in which case a Tonumaie'a would have been *tafa'ifa* of all Samoa, a most notable achievement. According to Krämer's account of the story of the substitution of Salamasina for So'oa'emalelangi, Tupa'i seems to have been

<sup>1</sup> Von Bülow, *I.A.E.* vol. XI, p. 109 n. 1. Krämer, *Globus*, vol. LXXV, p. 186.

<sup>2</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 152.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 274.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 224.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 233, 254 n.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 233.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 15. Cf. Stair, p. 81.

<sup>8</sup> Ella, *A.A.A.S.* vol. VI, p. 597. It would not be exactly a title, the meaning being the controller or commander of Salafai.

<sup>9</sup> Stair, p. 76.

<sup>10</sup> Brown, p. 283.

<sup>11</sup> Von Bülow, *I.A.E.* vol. XI, p. 115. <sup>12</sup> Stair, pp. 65 sq.

very reluctant to consent to it<sup>1</sup>. As it was, however, not even Savai'i as a whole had any actual share in the matter, though the Tonumaip'e'a family must at first have had a large amount of influence with reference to it; nor had Tutuila, but this was never an important member of the Samoan group. The Tonumaip'e'a family, with its ancient and important Savai'ian ancestry and its matrimonial connections then and afterwards, with the great royal families of Upolu—especially the great *tuaiana*, became, however, recognized as one of the leading families of the Samoan chiefs. As regards the future history of the kingship of all Samoa, I will content myself with referring to the general statement by Stair that for a long series of years it remained in the Muangututia family<sup>2</sup>, a branch of the *tuaiana*<sup>3</sup>.

I have, up to this point, been dealing with the general structure of the political systems of Samoa, and certain traditions, and portions of its history, legendary and actual, which bear upon, and in part explain, the origin or supposed origin of its political structure. There are, however, one or two specific matters to which I must draw attention.

There were in Samoa certain great orator chiefs, called *alataua*, who were, it is said, regarded as semi-divine. They were the preservers of the traditions and genealogies, and were consulted as diviners with reference to all important decisions, their services being specially required in times of war. The interest of this subject here is its possible connection with a system of separation of sacred from secular duties, which we shall find illustrated in some of the Polynesian Islands, but not in Samoa, by a dual kingship, a subject which I shall have to discuss later on.

These *alataua* were connected with certain villages or village districts<sup>4</sup>, by which is meant there were certain villages or districts whose duties in time of war were religious, and which, as we shall gather from the evidence, did not as a rule take part in the fighting. The term *alataua* seems to be used by Krämer with reference to the *alataua* village districts as well as to the *alataua* diviners. The term *ituau* was applied to certain village districts which were strong in war, and were connected with the village districts where prayers were made to the gods<sup>5</sup>—that is, with the *alataua* districts. Krämer says

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, pp. 201 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 171.

<sup>2</sup> Stair, p. 77.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 476.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 477.

that Aana and Atua did not, like Savai'i and Tuamasanga, possess *alataua* districts; but their chief council places, Leulumoenga and Lufilufi took upon themselves this office to a certain extent<sup>1</sup>.

The matter is illustrated by the following examples. The village district of Sili, in the Manu'an island of Olosenga, is a clean cut case. It comprised two villages Silitai and Siliuta, of which the former went out to battle, and the latter remained behind, praying for success<sup>2</sup>. In Tuamasanga the combination seems to have covered, as it were, the whole division, because a number of villages of Safata, the great village district of the southern coast, constituted the *alataua* district, and Faleata, on the north coast, was the *ituau*<sup>3</sup>. In Tutuila two village districts, Fangaitua and Leone were *alataua* districts and Nu'uli and Fangasa were *ituau*<sup>4</sup>. There are a number of references to *alataua* districts, in which no mention is made of corresponding *ituau*; the explanation of these cases, or some of them, may well be that there would often be a group of villages or districts, connected with one another politically, on one of which lay the religious duties of the *alataua*, though there was no one village or district, that was specially responsible for the fighting, this being the duty of the group as a whole; I should imagine this would often be the case, and that, where a specific village or district is called the *ituau*, we must believe, either that it and the *alataua* were specially and alone associated in this way, or if not, that it was very strong in fighting, and so was specially regarded in that light *vis-à-vis* the *alataua*. In Savai'i four villages or village districts, Satupaitea, Falelima, Ne'iafu and Tufutafo'e were, according to Krämer, *alataua* districts<sup>5</sup>. These were all seats of the great Tonumaipé'a family, which had other seats also. Fraser says that in Falealupo, another village district of the Tonumaipé'a, their great goddess Nafanua was specially revered; it was a sort of city of refuge, its people never engaging in the wars of their neighbours<sup>6</sup>. Von Bülow refers to an occasion when Nafanua engaged in fighting, and says that since that time Falealupo had been regarded as unconquerable, and had not been attacked again, because Nafanua, the war goddess, protected it. On the other hand, if war broke out in Samoa, all parties sued the favour of Falealupo,

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 151.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 227, 233.

<sup>5</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 72.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 377, 388.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 324.

<sup>6</sup> Fraser, *J.P.S.* vol. v, p. 181 n. 7.

not that it should take part with them in the war, but that it might make intercession for them to Nafanua, it did go to battle, but did not take part in the fighting. Falealupo was therefore called the *tapuainga* of *tapuai*—i.e. "to pray or make intercession"<sup>1</sup>. This statement may be compared with the history of Nafanua's intervention in the fighting in Upolu, which led to the foundation of the title of *tafa'ifa*. Regarding the terms *tapuainga* and *tapuai* and the reference to a city of refuge, I may say that, according to Pratt's dictionary, *tapuainga* meant lands which did not engage in war, but served as a refuge to those who fled; whilst *tapuai* meant to abstain from work, and sit waiting for success or protection (as during war, or the progress of a dangerous disease, etc.) adopted to signify worship<sup>2</sup>. It is evident that the terms are based upon the *alataua* idea, and indeed perhaps express the same thing in another way. As to the use of one of these places as a city of refuge, if we bear in mind that it would be the spot where the great semi-divine *alataua* priests prayed to a powerful god, we can believe that it would be regarded as specially sacred by reason of its connection with that god, and so might well be a place of refuge where fighting was taboo; I will not attempt to discuss how far it would be a place of safety as against an enemy who did not worship, or was not specially afraid of that god. Krämer refers to a number of other *alataua* districts, in Savai'i and Tutuila, but gives no details concerning them to throw any further light on the matter.

Passing now to Aana and Atua, which, as I have said, Krämer differentiates from the rest of Samoa in saying that they did not possess *alataua* districts, their chief council places Leulumoenga (in Aana) and Lufilufi (in Atua) taking upon themselves this office to a certain extent, I will explain what, according to him, were the systems there. He says that in cases of war Leulumoenga and Lufilufi did not as a rule go to the battle; they remained at home, and prayed for victory. This may be regarded as the *fa'aalataua*, and was the same thing as what was *tapuainga* in Falealupo, and some places in Tutuila and Manu'a<sup>3</sup>. Concerning the case of Leulumoenga, Krämer says

<sup>1</sup> Von Bülow, *Globus*, vol. LXVIII, p. 158.

<sup>2</sup> If we divide the term *tapuainga* thus, we get the meaning of sacred related family.

<sup>3</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 151. Krämer says that *fa'aalataua* means "to bring the good news of war" (*S.I.* vol. I, p. 476). I think he introduces into this rendering rather more than the word actually involves; but if we take the words

that its inhabitants consisted in the main of the high council of the nine families, these people "the House of the Nine" as they were called, being, as I shall explain in a subsequent chapter, the hereditary electors of the *tuiavana*, and the people who took the lead in a *fono* of all Aana, held at Leulumoenga. According to Krämer, Leulumoenga formed a brother bond with the village districts of Tufulele (on the north coast—not very far off) and Samatau (on the opposite coast—a considerable distance away), known as the *mua'au o le tuiavana* or vanguard of the *tuiavana*<sup>1</sup>; but he speaks elsewhere of the famous warriors of Sangafili (on the north coast), and says that in a sense this village district was the *ituau*, Leulumoenga being the *alataua*<sup>2</sup>. In giving more particulars as to Lufilufi, Krämer qualifies his statement that it did not go to battle, but only prayed for victory, by adding that it doubtless concerned only one part of Lufilufi; and tells us that one orator chief represented both *ituau* and *alataua* in Lufilufi<sup>3</sup>, whatever that may mean. Turner is perhaps referring to this separation in time of war of the duties of praying and fighting when he says that a Samoan would persuade an aged chief, or a chief of high rank, not to go with them to the war, but to remain in the village and help them by his prayers<sup>4</sup>.

Another feature of the political systems of Samoa was the division of the country into two parties, the strong and the weak. An additional interest attaches itself to this system, because it has prevailed in other parts of Polynesia; so I shall quote several writers at length, though this involves some repetition. Hale (1839) says that the party which had the ascendancy was termed the *malo*, or strong; the other was the *vaiwai*, or weak—answering nearly to our "administration" and "opposition"; the general government of the country was, in fact, conducted entirely by the former, though the chiefs of the latter generally retained their power in their respective districts<sup>5</sup>. According to Wilkes (1839) the whole power lay in the high chiefs of the *malo*, or conquering party; they assembled in *fono* and determined the general laws and rules of action. At his time the head of this party was the Malietoa<sup>6</sup>.

*fa'a* (to make or cause), *ala* (a way, a cause or reason), and *taua* (war), we may perhaps think that he refers to the good news, announced by the *alataua*, that the gods were favourable to war, the receipt of which would induce the people to engage in it.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 157.

<sup>5</sup> Hale, p. 29.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 273.

<sup>6</sup> Wilkes, vol. II, p. 152.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 152.

<sup>4</sup> Turner, *Nineteen Years*, p. 351.

Erskine (1849) says that Atua, Tuamasanga and Aana with Manono formed a kind of loose confederation, governed by a council of the principal chiefs, who held large *fono*. Some one district, however, was always considered as the principal in the confederation, the *malo* or power...which had previously been acquired by war, resting with it. This *malo* it had ever been a point of honour to obtain, but it was generally employed merely in oppressing and plundering one of the other tribes, occupying their lands and seizing their provisions, until the sufferers were sufficiently exasperated, or felt themselves strong enough to seek redress by war<sup>1</sup>. Pritchard (1856-7) tells us that at the end of the then last war (in 1848, see page 50) the political supremacy was claimed by Manono, and Atua and Aana held the status of conquered districts, while Tuamasanga...was in close alliance with Manono, and shared with her the privilege of domineering over the other two districts. This political supremacy was called *le malo*, and the first privilege it conferred was the right to plunder and oppress the other districts. The *malo* was in fact the conquering party, who by right of conquest might occupy the lands and appropriate the chattels and plantations, and even the daughters of the conquered districts<sup>2</sup>. Hood (1862) says that the war beginning in 1848, which lasted nine years, arose from the insolent exactions of the *malo* (which word expressed the power of the conqueror), a sort of feudal right exercised by the dominant confederation of chiefs, whose head-quarters were at the small island of Manono. It resulted in the abolition of that power and the general independence of the several petty states or communities. Some of these were, when Hood wrote, under the government of a chief or king, a *tuiatua*, whilst others could not settle who was to be their ruler. Each of the communities had its own laws and customs, uniting in districts of six or more, for offensive or defensive purposes<sup>3</sup>. Ella says that Samoa had been for many generations divided into two parties, the *malo* or conquerors, and the *toilalo*, or conquered and enslaved. Hence the frequent wars in the inevitable struggle for supremacy<sup>4</sup>.

The picture which these statements convey to my mind is somewhat as follows. There were from time to time great wars, in which all Samoa or its more powerful elements were concerned. The collection of the conflicting dynasties and families

<sup>1</sup> Erskine, p. 63. Cf. Erskine, *J.R.G.S.* vol. XXI, p. 225.

<sup>2</sup> Pritchard, p. 52.      <sup>3</sup> Hood, p. 78.      <sup>4</sup> Ella, *J.P.S.* vol. VI, p. 154.

into one or other of two hostile groups would probably be the result of family and matrimonial connections and political opportunism and intrigue, much of which would be intended as a preparation for what was to come. At the end of any one of these wars the victors would exercise the right of pillage and oppression of the vanquished which were usual in Polynesia. The situation thus created might last for a long period, during which affairs would gradually settle down to a greater or less extent, and the independence and freedom of the vanquished party would again arise, at all events to a certain degree, but nevertheless the heel of the conquerors would still be more or less upon them; and so it would continue until the tide of fortune was turned by another war. At the commencement of the period of oppression by the victors the affairs of "all Samoa" would be practically under their control; but as time passed, and their dominance tended to weaken, the other party would begin an attempt to assert itself, and so would arise the situation of the "administration" and "opposition" referred to by Hale. I do not know what influence the *malo* domination would have upon the election of the *tafa'ifa* of Samoa, the securing of this office having been primarily a matter of concentration in one man of the four necessary titles, and this concentration being secured, I imagine, largely by marriages and intrigue; but the existence of a strong *malo* party at the time of an election would, we may assume, be a powerful factor in determining its result.



## CHAPTER III

### SOME HYPOTHESES AS TO THE EARLIEST HISTORY OF SAMOA

I PROPOSE to suggest a series of hypotheses as to the earliest history of the Polynesians in Samoa, but in doing so I shall not touch upon the question of a possible earlier race of inhabitants (as, for example, Rivers's sitting interment people), prior to the arrival of the groups of people referred to by Percy Smith, as quoted in the previous chapter on "Origin and Migrations," as Polynesians, and whom I shall call by that name. These hypotheses are as follows.

1. There had been in Samoa, as Smith suggests, a Polynesian population prior to the arrival in the Pacific of the migrants the beliefs as to whose journeyings thither, and as to the subsequent spreading out of whose descendants throughout parts of the Pacific, were recorded in the Rarotongan "logs" and in other legends; I propose, as already explained, in this and future chapters, to call these later migrants, or an important group of them, and their descendants, the "Tangaroans"; and shall use the term "pre-Tangaroans" for the earlier settlers.

2. After the arrival of the Tangaroans in Fiji they had established themselves more or less strongly in Tonga, which thus became associated with Fiji in subsequent movements and operations. This also is in accord with Smith's views. He thinks there were then pre-Tangaroans in Tonga also, and in parts of Fiji, which may well have been the case; but this is not an essential part of my hypotheses.

3. The Manu'an islands and Savai'i must specially be associated with the early history of the Tangaroans in Samoa. Probably they first occupied Manu'a, and spread afterwards into Savai'i; though there are a few traditions of direct migrations from Fiji or Tonga into Savai'i, not from Manu'a.

4. Tangaroa was not a god of the pre-Tangaroans, but was the great god of the Tangaroans. It is my belief as to this that induces me, for convenience, to use the terminology which I am adopting; and it must not be imagined that I do so with any assumption that my belief is correct.

5. The royal lines of the island of Upolu must be associated with the pre-Tangaroans.

6. Some of the legends and genealogies were competitive in character. They disclose efforts by the Tangaroans of Manu'a to prove their superiority over the pre-Tangaroans of Upolu, and attempts by the latter to resist this. The interest of this hypothesis in relation to my present purpose is that I so construe some of the legends, and thus introduce them as evidence in support of other hypotheses.

I have thought it convenient to commence this discussion with a tabulated statement of my hypotheses, in order that they may all be in mind when considering the evidence; the need for this arises from the way in which the evidence is mixed up, and the impossibility of dealing separately with the several hypotheses. My view of the evidence is not so much that it proves each hypothesis separately as that it is consistent with them, if taken together as an interdependent group.

The suggestion (hypothesis 4) that Tangaroa was the god of the Tangaroans is based largely, though not entirely, upon evidence that he was specially the god of the Manu'ans, and so is to some extent dependent upon the accuracy of my third hypothesis. I will first say something about this hypothesis.

The close association, according to traditions, of Tangaroa with the original constitution of Manu'a is indicated by the series of stories which I have collected together as number eight; but further indications of this connection may, I think, be seen in Samoan legends of creation by Tangaroa, and though I cannot deal with these fully in this book, I propose to refer, without quoting all authorities specifically, to certain features of them which bear upon our present subject.

I refer to four legends, or rather versions of the same legend, of which one was obtained by Krämer, and three by Powell<sup>1</sup>, though other writers also speak of them; they were all, I think, of Manu'an origin. It is stated or implied in all of them that Manu'a was created first, and the belief seems to have been that this island formed Tangaroa's headquarters on earth during his creative labours, the other islands, according to one or two of the versions, having been only visited by him as he created them. After Manu'a came Fiji, Tonga and Savai'i, the order of whose creation varies in the several versions; finally came Upolu and Tutuila, referred to in two versions in a somewhat contemptuous

<sup>1</sup> Powell, *J.P.S.* vol. I, pp. 175-80 (and see also pp. 164-70, 180-8, 273); *J.V.I.* vol. xx, pp. 148-55; *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. xxiv, pp. 207-11; Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I. pp. 395 sqq.

way as having been merely pebbles, or small bits of rock, their purpose being, that of resting places or stepping stones by which Tangaroa could travel from island to island. As regards the peopling of the Samoan islands, there are a number of references in legends to Tangaroa's method of doing this by means of creeping vines, from which, during their decay, evolved worms or maggots, which Tangaroa afterwards fashioned into men. In the accounts now under consideration, however, we find a differentiation as regards this matter between the several islands. Manu'a itself was the beginning of everything, and, as explained in the tales to which I have referred already, its constitution was founded by the Tangaroa family, who were the earliest *tuimanu'a*. Savai'i was peopled, according to two of the versions by the placing there by Tangaroa of two children of original heaven-born parents from Manu'a, and Fiji and Tonga were peopled by couples, said to have been children of Tangaroa, sent down from heaven. All the versions, however, refer to the peopling of Upolu and Tutuila by means of creeping plants, identified by writers as the *fue*<sup>1</sup>, the wild or creeping vine<sup>2</sup>, or *fue tangata*<sup>3</sup>, the peopling or man-producing vine<sup>4</sup>, and the worms or maggots, which came out of them in the way above referred to<sup>5</sup>. The general effect of these tales is therefore to extol Manu'a as the island first formed by Tangaroa and the home of the Tangaroa family; they all give Fiji, Tonga and Savai'i the honourable position of being created next, and a highly honourable origin is attributed to the populations of these islands; they speak contemptuously of Upolu and Tutuila and their inhabitants.

Another matter to which I call attention is that, if Tangaroa was the deity whose worship had been introduced into the Pacific by the Tangaroans, the question arises, to whom are we to attribute the origin of the worship of the other great Polynesian gods, such as Tane, Rongo, Ru, etc.? Were they gods of the pre-Tangaroans? In considering this question we must bear in mind that the Tangaroans were, so far as we know,

<sup>1</sup> Wilkes, vol. II, p. 132. Von Bülow, *Globus*, vol. LXVIII, p. 139. Stuebel, *K.M.V.* vol. IV, pp. 60 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Wilkes, vol. II, p. 132. Hale, vol. VI, p. 24. Pratt's dictionary.

<sup>3</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. I, pp. 169, 180. Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 396 and n. 12.

<sup>4</sup> *J.P.S.*, vol. I, pp. 169, 179 sq. *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. XXIV, p. 209. *J.V.I.* vol. XX, pp. 154 sq. Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 396 and n. 12. [Note, *tangata* means a man.]

<sup>5</sup> In discussing the political areas of Tonga I shall draw attention to legends which point, I think, to a similar contemptuous allegation by the Tangaroans that the pre-Tangaroans there were derived from maggots evolved from the *fue*.

the last group to enter the Pacific by way of Fiji, Tonga and Samoa. Fornander, after referring to the precedence accorded in most of the southern groups of Polynesia—by which he means, I suppose, the groups south of Hawai'i—to Tangaroa, as the great creator god, over Tane, Tu, Ru and others<sup>1</sup>, speaks of Tangaroa as having been the southern god *par excellence* of a later creed<sup>2</sup>. He perhaps touches the same matter when he says that the legends and traditions of the pre-Pacific life of the Polynesian race had been preserved in a fuller, better, and purer condition in the Marquesan and Hawai'ian groups than in Tahiti, Samoa or Tonga, where they were found distorted, or frittered away, if found at all, or entirely forgotten<sup>3</sup>. Smith suggests that Tane was probably at one time the principal god of the Polynesians, but was superseded, with some branches, at a later date, by Tangaroa<sup>4</sup>. I believe that a reference to the probable more recent character of the cult of Tangaroa has been made by some one else, but I cannot find my note of it. In looking through the material I have collected relating to the great Polynesian gods, other than Tangaroa, I find Samoan traditions as to Mau'i, whom I believe to have been a very ancient volcano god, as to Ti'i-ti'i (Tiki-tiki), who was, I think, a younger Mau'i, and as to Lu (Ru?) and Longo (Rongo?)<sup>5</sup>; but I find no evidence of any of these gods being actually worshipped in Samoa as active deities; and in Tonga the only great names, other than Tangaroa, that appear in traditions are apparently Mau'i and Tiki-tiki, and there is no sign of their worship. The name of Tane does not seem to appear even in the traditions of either Samoa or Tonga. I may say, as regards this god, that I shall have to draw attention to traditions of the Society and some other eastern islands, which seem to point to conflicts between an older cult of Tane and a later cult of Tangaroa, and a certain amount of supersession of the former cult by the latter. There is, I think, ground for suspecting that the great gods whose worship was spread over Polynesia, other than Tongaroa, were pre-Tongaroan deities<sup>6</sup>, which justifies me in considering the possible interpretations to be put upon some of the Samoan traditions on the supposition that they were so.

<sup>1</sup> Fornander, vol. I, p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* vol. I, p. 168.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* vol. II, p. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Smith, pp. 102 sq.

<sup>5</sup> In Samoa the Polynesian *R* is absent and *L* is substituted, and the *K* is wanting.

<sup>6</sup> Mau'i and Tiki-tiki may have been previous to the Polynesians, whom I am calling pre-Tangaroans; but I cannot discuss this question here.

It would be impossible, except as regards these preliminary comments on these two points, to arrange my material in any systematic way, and I shall not attempt to do so. I shall simply deal with the several matters bearing upon my hypotheses one after another, explaining in each case my view as to the construction that may be put upon the evidence, and shall begin with referring to what has already appeared in this book, and further material which will be introduced. I shall, however, insert in square brackets at the end of each paragraph the numbers of the hypotheses (other than 6) upon which I think it bears, and at the end of the chapter I shall draw attention to the main features of the evidence upon which I rely in respect of each of the hypotheses. Unfortunately, portions of the additional material will relate to matters that are outside the scope of this book, and I am placed in the difficulty, to which I have referred in the Preface, arising from the connection between different subject matters and the overlapping of evidence, and I shall have to adopt the method of confining myself to mere references to the general effect of evidence and to the conclusions to which it has led me.

I will first refer to a matter which may bear upon the suggestion that the royal lines of Upolu must be associated with the pre-Tangaroans. These lines are the *tuiaana*, of Aana, the *tuiaatua* of Atua and the Malietoa of Tuamasanga, or rather in the latter case the ancestors of these kings, because the line of the Malietoa, as we have seen, only commenced after the driving out of the Tongans. I am treating this matter on the assumption that the Tangaroans had occupied parts of Upolu, apparently the coasts only (but these would be infinitely the most important parts), ever since their original settlement there, though the Tongan invasion, the highest estimate given of the length of which is two generations, did not occur till much later, the date of their expulsion being, according to Smith, about A.D. 1250. Krämer's genealogy of the *tuiaana* family shows 15 generations prior to this expulsion<sup>1</sup>; his genealogy of the *tuiaatua* family shows 15 or 16 prior generations<sup>2</sup>; his genealogy of the ancestors of the Malietoa family shows 13 prior generations<sup>3</sup>; and though I do not regard these earlier generations as being matters upon which we can rely, it is clear that these people claimed ancestries going a long way back. We have seen

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, pp. 167-73.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 292-5.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 241-6.

that it was claimed that there were *tuiavana* in Pili's time for he was credited with having married the daughter of one of them. The persons who, according to tradition, drove the Tongans out were members of the Malietoa family, which thereupon took the Malietoa name. The people who were driven out were (as I contend) a Tongan section of the Tangaroans acting under the leadership of the *tuitonga* or king of Tonga. We do not know whether, and to what extent, Aana and Atua helped in the expulsion. Krämer thinks that the titles of *tuiavana* and *tuiatua* had ceased to be given during the period of the supremacy of these Tongans<sup>1</sup>. This means, as the Malietoa rule over all Tuamasanga only commenced after the driving out, that there had been during this period no great Upoluan kings of the island actively ruling; and Krämer's view of the situation is evidently that they and their people were in such subjection that election of kings was useless. All this shows that, according to traditions, the *tuiavana* and *tuiatua* were not only kings of Upolu, though their rules had been interrupted, during the period of the Tongan-Tangaroan domination, but had been so for long before that time, when the island was largely under the domination of the descendants of the original Tangaroans in Samoa; and we know that these kings were not expelled, as their continued reigns in Upolu form a part of the subsequent history of Samoa. If, then, we are to place any reliance upon the traditions, the possibility arises that all these Upolu kings were of pre-Tangaroan blood, no doubt with some Tangaroan admixture, and, as regards the traditions, however inaccurate they may have been in detail, it seems probable that in this broad respect they represent Samoan beliefs. I shall, however, draw attention later on to a weak spot in my argument as to this subject. [Hypotheses 1 and 5.]

Legends Nos. 1 and 2 (*ante*) may be taken together for the purpose of comparison. Both introduce rocks, but, whilst No. 2 goes on to sky matters, No. 1 only goes to mountains. In the latter we find a heavenly origin, attributed to Tangaroa, who was pre-eminently a sky god, and probably this was a Manu'an story. In the former, on the other hand, the scene of which, whatever its origin, was in Upolu, we find the names of districts in that island, originating in descendants of *Maunga* (mountains). I suggest that a legend of such an ancestry tends to point to a belief that the people so descended were autochthons, and

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 260. Cf. pp. 168 sq.

I may point out as to this that we have seen that a similar idea of descent from mountains prevailed as to certain people in Savai'i, and, I think, Upolu, regarded as having been original inhabitants. A belief of this sort is consistent with the idea that these people were supposed to have been pre-Tangaroans; and it may be noticed that among these "original" inhabitants was included *tuiaana* Tava'etele, who was the *tuiaana* whose daughter married Pili<sup>1</sup>. I must admit that I should attach little or no value, for my present purpose, to these legends, if they stood alone; but I draw attention to them because they perhaps add a little to the cumulative weight of the whole of the evidence which I am bringing forward. [Hypotheses 1, 4 and 5.]

In legend No. 3 we find the first Tangaroa, called the dweller in lands, born of the heavens, and his first son Tangaroa, the explorer of lands, whose mother was the heavens; this son had a son called Space, after which the first Tangaroa had another son, who was adopted by Space, and who afterwards travelled in all directions, marrying and having children everywhere, thus in effect peopling the places he visited. Let us picture in this a reference to the first Tangaroa, a confused idea that his descendants were connected with travelling and space, and finally a belief as to the wide voyaging and colonization by one of them. I suggest that this voyaging and colonization may well refer to the spreading by the Tangaroans over the Pacific, in which case we have a belief as to their descent from Tangaroa, which is consistent with the hypothesis that Tangaroa was their god. [Hypothesis 4.]

The earth created by Tangaroa, according to the Samoan legend No. 4 would presumably be Samoa, or part of it. The relatively ignominious origin attributed to Upolu and Savai'i and the insignificance of Tutuila in Samoan legends and history leaves us to assume that the earth in this case meant Manu'a. Then we are told of Tangaroa creating Fe'e, and sending him down to the lower regions. There was a legend concerning a journey by Tangaroa, starting presumably from Manu'a, among the other islands of the group. At the western extremity of Savai'i he met Fe'e, apparently for the first time, and persuaded the latter to return with him to the eastern islands—this probably meaning the Manu'an cluster<sup>2</sup>. Fe'e seems to

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, pp. 25, 168, 174. Von Bülow, *I.A.E.* vol. xi, p. 109.

<sup>2</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. vi, p. 111. Cf. Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 45.

have been primarily a Tuamasanga god, specially connected perhaps with the Malietoa, but I cannot go into this question here. The interest of this matter, for my present purpose, is that Fe'e was a Samoan god of the dead, the souls of whom plunged into the sea at the western extremity of Savai'i; that after his departure his place was, it was said, taken by Savea Si'uleo, another Samoan god of the dead; that this last mentioned god was the same as Hikuleo the Tongan god of the dead; that in Samoa he was primarily a Savai'i god, more especially connected with the Tonumaip'e'a family, whom I regard as having been of Manu'an (Tangaroan) origin, and who claimed him as their divine ancestor (the father of their ancestral war goddess Nafanua); and that, according to Samoan beliefs, Fe'e was specially connected with Sa le Fe'e, their hades below the earth, whereas *Pulotu*, their paradise, believed by some to be an island away to the west, was presided over by Si'uleo. I am inclined to think that Fe'e was one of the oldest gods of Samoa; and that he was probably a god of the dead of the pre-Tangaroans, having taken the place of Mau'i, a still older god of an ancient volcano cult<sup>1</sup>. On the basis of these data we may perhaps see in the legends under discussion attempts by the Manu'an Tangaroans to belittle the islands other than Manu'a, and to belittle the pre-Tangaroan god Fe'e, by claiming that he was made and ordered about by Tangaroa; and an indication that he was partly supplanted as the Samoan god of the dead by the Tongan (Tangaroan) god Hikuleo. Another point of interest arises also. There are, I think, reasons for believing that it was under the earlier volcano cult, that the souls of the dead were supposed to join their god in hades, beneath the earth, and under a later paradise cult, that they were supposed to go to a delightful place in the skies or above the earth. Tangaroa was *par excellence* a god of the skies; and it seems natural that, though Fe'e continued his connection with the dead in hades, Si'uleo of Tongan origin, whom I suggest would be a Tangaroan god, should preside over paradise<sup>2</sup>. [Hypotheses 1, 3 and 4.]

<sup>1</sup> Stair says of Fe'e that he was possibly connected with the records of an earlier, but long extinct, race (Stair, p. 218); and Krämer says of him that he was the ruler of the underworld until Savea Si'uleo took his place (Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 45); but I have other reasons for my views as to these two gods, and as to Mau'i.

<sup>2</sup> I do not wish to imply that the religion of the pre-Tangaroans was based on a volcano cult, though it may be that survivals or traces of this earlier cult, as I regard it, were found in that religion—perhaps as the result of interaction. But I cannot discuss this matter here.



In legend No. 5 we have Salevao, a Savai'ian god, supposed to be the brother of Si'uleo, associated with the word *moa*, which was the name of the *tuimanu'a*<sup>1</sup>, and is a word mixed up closely with Manu'an traditions. I confess, however, I do not think much of this as necessarily meaning anything. [Hypothesis 3.]

Legend No. 6 suggests an origin of the islands of Upolu, Savai'i and Tutuila, quite different from that of the Tangaroa legends of Manu'a, and makes a *marae* in Upolu the meeting place of the Samoan gods. This might well be a Upoluan counterblast to the claims of Manu'a to divine superiority; and this would be the explanation of Krämer's statement that the tale was regarded by the Manu'an people as a presumption. [Hypotheses 1, 3 and 4.]

Legend No. 7 was presumably a Manu'an tale. I have drawn attention to Smith's comment on the matter, in which he assumes that the scattering far and wide to all lands referred to the movements of the Tangaroans over the Pacific. [Hypotheses 1, 3 and 4.]

There are a few matters to which I must draw attention before discussing the tales about Lu, whom I am identifying with the well known Polynesian god Ru, the two names being, according to one of the rules for interchange of consonants, identical. I have already indicated that I think, not only that Tangaroa was a Tangaroan god, but that the other great Polynesian deities, Tane, Rongo, Ru, etc., were pre-Tangaroans, so far as the Pacific was concerned—that is, they were gods of the Polynesian people who arrived in the Pacific before the Tangaroans. There are certain Samoan traditions concerning the god Ru or Lu which I must mention here. According to Krämer's tree of Lu and Pili, Lu was the son of Tangata, also called Tupufua (the first man—derived from nothing), who was descended from early ancestors ("Light in the east" and "Light in the west" and their son "the dove") of the *tuiaana*, and Lu married the daughter of Tangaroa<sup>2</sup>. According to a tradition obtained by Powell in Manu'a, and recorded by Pratt<sup>3</sup>, Lu's father Tangata or Tupufua (man grown from nothing) married a daughter of Tangaroa; Lu was the son of this marriage, and he also married a daughter of Tangaroa. Pratt says that Lu was spoken of as the king of heaven, but that he was brought

<sup>1</sup> Brown, p. 360. Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 366.

<sup>2</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, pp. 24 sq. <sup>3</sup> Pratt, *A.A.A.S.* vol. II, p. 655.

down (I presume this means to earth), and that, on the birth of his son, his title "king of heaven" was dropped, and he was called king of Atua, a title to which his son succeeded<sup>1</sup>. According to this legend, Lu was the ancestor of the *tuiatua*; and Krämer quotes this as referring to the forerunners of the *tuiatua*<sup>2</sup>, and he himself speaks of Lu as the original ancestor of the *tuiatua*<sup>3</sup>. Schultz was told in Atua that Lu was regarded as the earliest king of Atua<sup>4</sup>. We thus have beliefs that Lu's father was the first man, derived from nothing, and that he had a supernatural ancestry identical with that of the *tuiavana*, and a belief, reported from both Manu'a and Atua, that Lu himself was the first *tuiatua*; and I suggest that these beliefs are consistent with a hypothesis that the Tangaroans found in Upolu a population which they perhaps regarded as autochthonous, with which the *tuiatua*, and perhaps the *tuiavana*, were associated, and with the Atuan branch of which the god Lu was directly connected. It is in the light of this suggestion that I shall consider the Lu legends. [Hypotheses 1, 3, 4 and 5.]

Legend No. 11 may well have been a cold douche administered by Manu'a to Upolu; it makes Moa the eldest son of Tangaroa, and this might be associated with the fact that Moa was the family name of the *tuiamanu'a*. The idea as to Lu would be that he with his Upoluan connections was a person inferior to Moa, and he was punished by Tangaroa for suggesting otherwise; this would be a direct snub to both Aana and Atua, especially the latter. [Hypotheses 1, 3, 4 and 5.]

Legends Nos. 13 and 16 may have been definite claims by Atua that Lu was specially associated with that division of Upolu. [Hypotheses 1, 3, 4 and 5.]

Legend No. 14 refers to fighting between Lu and the Tangaroa family, their defeat by him, and his subsequent appeasement by the god Tangaroa, whose daughter was given to him. Possibly the tale was based upon traditions of some conflict between the Tangaroans and pre-Tangaroans; and as, according to the tale, the latter won, we may believe that the tale would emanate from Upolu, and not from Manu'a. The alleged cause of the fight was the stealing by the Tangaroa people of Lu's fowls. I may say as to this that the general effect of the legends as to the origin in Samoa of kava is that it came from either Manu'a, Fiji or Tonga; and according to one of them it was

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 657.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 168. Cf. p. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 291.

<sup>4</sup> Schultz, *Globus*, vol. xcviII, p. 145.

obtained from heaven by Tangaroa in Manu'a. Two of these legends refer to its having been given in Samoa, in one case by someone in Manu'a and in the other by someone from Fiji, in exchange, in the former case for a brood hen, prolific in chickens, and in the latter for two laying hens. There are other legends as to the origin of kava, in which fowls are referred to without any definite statements that they were given in exchange for kava. There is another Manu'an legend which apparently contends for the superiority of kava, as compared with fowls. The unimportant island of Tutuila also had its claim of having introduced kava, perhaps in association with Manu'a, and it refers contemptuously to its much more important rival Savai'i as being an island without chiefs or people, and possessing only fowls. The broad combined effect of these tales is that there were contentions between the islands as to which of them had first produced the sacred kava, most of them being claims by Manu'a, and one of these attributing its origin to Tangaroa; also that brood hens or fowls were associated with the matter, certain statements being made that kava was given in exchange for them. I have assumed up to this point that the fowls in question were supposed to be only ordinary birds, used for food; but the same idea crops up in one of the *senga* stories—that is, the tales relating to the sacred *senga* bird, with its red feathers, about which there were various traditions. According to this story, Ta'e-o-Tangaroa, the member of the Tangaroa family who was claimed by Manu'a as the first divine *tuimanu'a*, made the acquaintance of Langafua, a chief of Tutuila, and the latter, wishing to secure Ta'e-o-Tangaroa's friendship, brought him a *senga* hen. Ta'e-o-Tangaroa, however, saw that the man was palming off upon him an unfruitful bird that would not have chickens; so, by way of retaliation, he gave him in exchange a piece of kava stem without tubers, which could not be used for propagation<sup>1</sup>. There is apparently some tradition behind all these tales; and the most probable character of it is that the people connected with Fiji, Tonga and Manu'a—that is, according to my suggestions, the Tangaroans, claimed to have introduced kava into Samoa, giving it in exchange for fowls of some sort, which pre-Tangaroans, and not they themselves, possessed. Such a construction would provide an explanation of the close association, according to traditions, between Lu and his fowls, including the story of the

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 431. Fraser, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. xxix, pp. 370 sq.

Tangaroa people stealing them, and being severely punished by Lu for having done so. As regards the *senga*, there were on the other hand Manu'an traditions to the effect that a lump of blood was born in heaven, taken under the protection of the Tangaroa family, and developed into the *senga*; after which it was secured by Tuifiti (king of Fiji), who afterwards gave it Ta'e-o-Tangaroa—the first divine *tuimanu'a*. Then follow efforts of the Upoluan chiefs to secure the bird; and a feature of these efforts was that the motive for them appears to have been to acquire the *mana* it possessed, spoken of as the *mana* of the *tuimanu'a*<sup>1</sup>. There is no suggestion that the fowls of Lu, or the fowls given in exchange for kava (except in the Tangaroa-Tutuila story) were more than ordinary fowls; and it may be that we may see in the Tutuila story of giving a *senga* hen and the Manu'an contentions as to the origin of the *senga*, an example of competition between Tangaroans and pre-Tangaroans for the glory of having first introduced this most sacred bird into Samoa. [Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.]

Legend 15, according to which the king of Manua was the son of Lu, may have been a counterblast by Upolu to Manua's claims of superiority. [Hypotheses 1, 3, 4 and 5.]

There is, among the Tangaroa stories, a legend as to an expedition to the heavens of a being called Losi, with some other gods who helped him, to attack the Tangaroa family, in which the latter were defeated; there were several versions of this tale<sup>2</sup>. The interest of it for my present purpose is the names of the gods who helped Losi, as to which the versions differ; but the names (along with others which I cannot identify), Mafui'e, Ti'i-ti'e, Fe'e, Moso, Pava, Le Sa, and Le Fanonga appear, some in one or two versions, some in several; and I make the following comments as to these names. Taking first Losi himself, I find no evidence that he was worshipped as a god, and indeed it is only in connection with these tales that his name appears. I notice, however, that Tregear in his dictionary refers to a Maori mythical being called Rohe, the Maori consonantal equivalent of Losi, who was the wife of Mau'i, and the goddess of the underworld hades or *po*; I also point out that, according to the great Mangaian creation myth

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, pp. 428 *sqq.* Cf. Stuebel, *K.M.V.* vol. iv, p. 145.

<sup>2</sup> See Turner, pp. 105 *sqq.*, 249 *sqq.* Churchward, pp. 116 *sq.* Powell-Fraser, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. xxvi, pp. 274-8. Pratt-Fraser, *ibid.* pp. 278-82, 283-93. Krämer, *S.I.* vol. II, pp. 136 *sqq.*

the root of all existence in the lowest depths of Avaiki, was called Te-aka-ia-Roê<sup>1</sup>, and that Roê is in Mangaia the consonantal equivalent of the Samoan Losi. It is possible that Losi, like these others, was a conception of a being in the underworld. The name of Mafu'i (another form of the name Mau'i) appears in one of the versions, and Ti'i-ti'i in each of two others; I have already referred to my belief that Ti'i-ti'i was a junior member of the family of the original Mau'i, whom I regard as having been the very ancient volcano god of the underworld. In one version Fe'e appears as one of the champions; he was, as we have seen, connected with the Samoan underworld, and I have referred to my view that he was a pre-Tangaroan god, primarily of Tuamasanga, and perhaps connected with the Malietoa. The name of the god Moso appears as one of Losi's colleagues in all the versions. Moso is spoken of by Pritchard as a Samoan national god<sup>2</sup>; Turner says he was one of the great *land* gods, in opposition to Tangaroa, the god of the heavens<sup>3</sup>; I think that he was specially connected with the *tuia*tua, but I cannot discuss this matter here. The name of Pava appears in two of the versions. He was supposed to have been the child of the creeping plant *fue*<sup>4</sup>, which at once suggests that he was believed to have been a Upoluan or Tutuilan, and, according to my views, a pre-Tangaroan. He was found by the Tangaroa-a-Ui (the son of the original Tangaroa of the skies) in Manu'a, and driven out by him to Upolu<sup>5</sup>. Stair apparently associates the tale with the driving out from Manu'a by a Tangaroa party of a Pava party whom they found living there<sup>6</sup>; and Krämer says that it was Pava who brought Fe'e, "the cuttle fish god," to the Apia district of Tuamasanga<sup>7</sup>. Another supporter of Losi mentioned in one of the versions was the god Le Sa, but though he seems to have been a well known Samoan god, I have found no information about him affecting our present subject. Again another god mentioned in one of the versions was Le Fanonga who, as we have seen, was the eldest son of Tangaroa-a-Ui, whom the council meeting of the Tangaroa in the heavens first tried to kill by sending him for the "fierce" kava, and then displaced in favour of his younger brother Ta'e-o-Tangaroa when selecting the first

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *Myths*, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Pritchard, p. 113.

<sup>3</sup> Turner, p. 36.

<sup>4</sup> Fraser, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. xxv, p. 119.

<sup>5</sup> Turner, pp. 42 sq. Other writers also refer to this story.

<sup>6</sup> Stair, *J.P.S.* vol. iv, p. 52.

<sup>7</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, pp. 405 sq. n. 9.

*tuimanua*; under these circumstances it is natural that he should join the Tangaroas' enemies. According to another belief, Le Fanonga was one of the children of Pava, who, with him, fled from Tangaroa in Manu'a to Upolu<sup>1</sup>. One of the accounts of the matter contains the curious statement that while the other warriors (that is, Losi's party) hastened to the heavens, "the sons of Pili remained quiet"<sup>2</sup>, the meaning of which is, I presume, that they remained neutral, not helping either party. [Hypotheses 1, 3, 4 and 5.]

I think that this Losi tale probably points to actual human fighting, the participators in which might have been either deified men or worshippers of the gods to whom their deeds were attributed; and as to this I may say that, according to Turner, the people who fought the Tangaroa were five Atua men and four men of Aana<sup>3</sup>. It is stated in one of the versions that Losi and his companions, after defeating the Tangaroas in the heavens, on their return to earth brought back, among other things, all the kava of the Tangaroas; so this legend again touches the point I have just been discussing. [Hypotheses 1, 3, 4 and 5.]

The explanation of the legend, which I suggest, is that it points to an attack upon the Tangaroans, represented in the accounts by their god Tangaroa, by the pre-Tangaroans of Upolu, represented by gods, all of whom were, in the Pacific, pre-Tangaroan gods<sup>4</sup>, except one, who may have been a Tangaroan god who had quarrelled with his own people, and so had joined forces with their enemies. Turner's reference to five Atua men and four men of Aana is consistent with this view; and as in those days Aana and Atua seem to have been the only divisions of Upolu that had great chiefs or kings, an attack by them would in effect be an attack by Upolu generally. As regards the abstention of the sons of Pili, I may point out that, though Pili seems to have been a Manu'an (that is, according to my construction a Tangaroan) god, he had, according to the traditions, married daughters of both the *tuimanu'a* and the *tuiaana* and had apportioned Upolu among his sons, factors which might well explain why his sons remained neutral, or lead those who narrated the legend to say that they had been neutral. [Hypotheses 1, 3, 4 and 5.]

<sup>1</sup> Stair, *J.P.S.* vol. IV, p. 49.

<sup>2</sup> Pratt-Fraser, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. xxvi, p. 288.

<sup>3</sup> Turner, p. 249.

<sup>4</sup> Mau'i and Ti'i-ti'i (Tiki-tiki), and perhaps Losi, may have been still older gods.

Referring to the inclusion among Losi's allies of Pava and Le Fanonga I may say that Stair gives a tradition of the driving out by Tangaroa of Pava and his children, of whom Fanonga was one, and their flight to Upolu, and tells of subsequent fighting between the Tangaroa people and Pava and his company in Upolu in which the former were victorious; but I cannot say whether the two accounts refer to the same struggle. The interest of this version arises from Stair's conclusions, based upon it and other matter, that Samoa was peopled from different sources, and in particular that the Manu'ans had an origin different from that of the rest of the group. He, I must add, thinks that Manu'a was settled first<sup>1</sup>, a conclusion not in accord with my suggestions, if the Manu'ans are to be identified in origin with the Tangaroans. [Hypotheses 1, 3 and 4.]

Lesson tells a story very similar to that given above, but in which Ti'i-ti'i is the chief hero. According to this tale, this being, who, as I have pointed out, was Tiki-tiki, regarded by me as one of the Mau'i family, used to go to heaven from time to time by its entrance at *fafa*, to which the souls of the dead went after plunging into the sea on their journey to *Pulotu* or *Sa-le-Fee*. He thus acquired a longing for the *taro* which they enjoyed in *Pulotu*, and requested Tangaroa to give him some; but the god refused. War was therefore declared; Ti'i-ti'i set out with his whole family for heaven, defeated Tangaroa and chased him from his *taro* field. Peace having been concluded, Ti'i-ti'i promised, in spite of his success, not to touch the *taro*, from which it is suggested that his victory can hardly have been decisive; but he managed to secure a piece of *taro* and conceal it in his urethra, and thus carried it back to earth, planted and grew it<sup>2</sup>. This is probably another version of the legend told above; indeed this is indicated by a comparison of the way in which Ti'i-ti'i carried away his piece of *taro* with what appears in two of the versions of the other tale<sup>3</sup>. [Hypotheses 1, 3 and 4.]

There are a number of statements as to what I regard as the original Tangaroan connection between Fiji, Tonga and Manu'a, and touching the question of Tangaroan domination over Samoa in the distant past—prior, that is, to the Tongan invasion and subsequent expulsion from Upolu. As regards the

<sup>1</sup> Stair, *J.P.S.* vol. iv, pp. 49, 52 *sqq.*

<sup>2</sup> Lesson, *Poly.* vol. ii, pp. 476 *sq.*

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Powell-Fraser, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. xxvi, p. 274. Krämer, *S.J.* vol. ii, p. 136.

former matter I may first refer to Stair's view that the people of Manu'a had an origin different from that of the inhabitants of the other islands of the group, and that their old people had formerly been eaten as a mode of burial. His view is that Manu'a was first peopled<sup>1</sup>. According to a tradition, there was originally only one king for the whole Samoan group, which included Samoa, Tonga, Fiji, Rarotonga, Tahiti and Wahu. The *tuimanu'a* received tribute of fish from Fiji, Tonga and eastern groups, and there was an instance of some Fijians once, owing to some difficulty as to the fish, bringing a pig instead, which was accepted as a substitute<sup>2</sup>. The inclusion among the people said to have paid this tribute of inhabitants of Rarotonga and Tahiti, or the Eastern islands (I cannot identify Wahu) may, I think, be regarded as pointing to the Tangaroans as the persons who received, and perhaps paid, this tribute in connection with their spread eastwards over the Pacific or were said to have done so, and if so, we have here a belief as to the past pointing to a Tangaroan connection between Fiji, Tonga and Manu'a. The tribute, as it is called, might be the tribal or clan or group tribute paid by chiefs and their subjects to an overlord; but it might be the enforced contribution levied by Tangaroan conquerors over conquered inhabitants of these eastern islands; but in this case the former seems, in the light of the other evidence we possess, to be the probable construction; that is, there had been—or so it was said—one great Tangaroan chief or king who received tribute from the others. The claim by Manu'a that their king was the overlord may have been merely an idle boast, persisted in after Tangaroan power in Fiji had waned or disappeared and the Tangaroans of Manu'a and Tonga had become politically separated. There is a statement by Martin that the *tuitonga* (the sacred king of Tonga) was the king of Manu'a<sup>3</sup>. [Hypotheses 2 and 3.]

Poulaho, the *tuitonga* of Cook's time, was also named, according to Thomson and Caillot, Pau or Bau<sup>4</sup>; and as Bau, or Mbau, on the eastern coast of the Fijian island of Viti Levu, was a district with a strong Polynesian element in it, it seems probable that the identity of names points to a Fijian association of the *tuitonga*, possibly a Fijian origin of one of his names. A Paumotuan chant, relating to the gods and the distant past,

<sup>1</sup> Stair, *J.P.S.* vol. iv, p. 54.

<sup>2</sup> Powell-Fraser, *J.P.S.* vol. vi, pp. 69 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. xx, pp. 165 sq.

<sup>4</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* pp. 321, 396. Caillot, *Mythes*, p. 306.



refers to Tangaroa as the king of Hiti-nui (Great Fiji), who proclaimed his laws, and uttered his priestly wisdom<sup>1</sup>; so we have a belief connecting the Tangaroans with Fiji. [Hypotheses 2 and 3.]

Von Bülow, after referring to Tangaroa a langi (Tangaroa of the skies) as the great creator god of Samoa, who watched over the destinies of the people, gives a list of his sons<sup>2</sup>. The following are the names of these sons, with my comments on them.

Tuifiti. King of Fiji.

Tuitonga. King of Tonga.

Tangaroa. Spoken of by von Bülow as a Samoan chief; possibly the idea was based upon the beliefs as to the original Tangaroa *tuimanua* named Ta'e-o-Tangaroa, who was the son of the divine Tangaroa-a-Ui, who was the son of Tangaroa of the skies, and it was he that was referred to.

Pe'a. Referred to by von Bülow also as the flying fox. According to Pratt's dictionary *pe'a* means the vampire bat, and was a Samoan title of nobility. According to a legend, the origin of the great Savai'ian title Tonumaip'e'a, which is said to mean "Salvation came through the *pe'a*, flying fox," was connected with flying foxes who saved the life of a woman who lived with one of the *tuitonga*<sup>3</sup>. Probably the title Pe'a was an abbreviation of that of Tonumaip'e'a. I think von Bülow commonly calls the family by the name Pe'a<sup>4</sup>. I have already referred to a belief, that this family was descended from Lafai, and I shall shortly tell a story of Nafanua (the great Tonumaip'e'an ancestral war goddess) which indicates that she, in Savai'i, regarded Manu'a as her country—the home of her parents.

Senga-ula. The red *senga* bird, so sacred in Samoa, and specially associated in legends with the Tangaroa people and Manu'a.

Tuli. The snipe, called by von Bülow Tuli a Tangaloa. The *tuli* bird was closely associated with Tangaroa in the creation legends.

Mavae. Also described by von Bülow as the sea eel or lamprey. Both Pili and Si'uleo were in Samoa conceived of as being eels; and I am connecting both these gods with the Tangaroans.

It looks as though this list was intended to collect together, and associate with Tangaroa, the islands of Fiji, Tonga, Manu'a and Savai'i; and it is noticeable that the names of *tuaiana* and *tuiatua* are omitted. [Hypotheses 2, 3 and 4.]

There are a number of Tongan tales, more or less alike, as to the fishing up by Mau'i of western islands; but I will here only refer to certain features of them. In an account obtained in the island of Eua, given by Reiter<sup>5</sup> we find the

<sup>1</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. XII, p. 236.

<sup>2</sup> Von Bülow, *Globus*, vol. LXVIII, pp. 366 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, pp. 94 sq.

<sup>4</sup> He does so in *Globus*, vol. LXXI, p. 149; but I am sure he does so in other places also.

<sup>5</sup> Reiter, *Anthropos*, vol. II, pp. 443-7.

work of creation conducted under the direction of the Tangaroa family in the skies, and a feature of the tale is the employment by them as a messenger of a bird *kiu*, which Reiter thinks was perhaps the snipe. The general character of the tale with the reference in it to this bird, is very similar to that of some of the Samoan tales of creation by Tangaroa assisted by the *tuli* bird (apparently a snipe or plover), and this suggests a connection between Tonga and Manu'a. Continuing with the story, we are told that the islands of Eua and Ata were created by Tangaroa. The tale then refers to the fishing up of islands by the dwarf member of the Mau'i family, who obtained the magical hook with which he did it from a person called Tonga of Manu'a; this again suggests a belief as to a connection between these islands. Mau'i and his party then fished up other islands, including Samoa (not Manu'a, which according to the tale was already there) and some of the Tongan islands, one of which, in pursuance of a request by Tonga of Manu'a, they called Tonga. In all this we may see the results of the interaction of, or competition between, two cults by which the creation of Manu'a is presumably, and that of certain Tongan islands actually, attributed to Tangaroa, whilst the fishing up of other Samoan and Tongan islands, though credited to Mau'i, was effected under the direction of Tangaroa. The version given by Caillot is very similar to the other; but the part of it to which I draw attention is a statement that Mau'i did not fish up certain of the Tongan islands, nor the Samoan island of Manu'a, nor the islands of Fiji, because these countries had been produced by Hikuleo, the king of Bulotu<sup>1</sup>. I have already suggested that Hikuleo of Tonga (Si'uleo of Samoa) was a Tangaroan god; and if I am correct in this, we have here a definite association with the Tangaroans of Fiji, parts of the Tongan group, and Manu'a. In a version obtained from the *tuitonga* of Tonga it was explained that the name Tonga was the personal name of a great chief, the *tuimanuka* (Manuka=Manu'a) of Samoa, a great fisherman who could fish up land with a famous hook, and it identifies this great chief as the person in Manu'a from whom Mau'i obtained his hook and who stipulated for the giving of his name to Tonga<sup>2</sup>. According to Fraser's version the Manu'an chief who provided the hook was the *tuimanu'a*<sup>3</sup>. In none of these accounts are the great

<sup>1</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, p. 258 n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Martin, *J.P.S.* vol. xx, p. 166.

<sup>3</sup> Fraser, *J.P.S.* vol. vi, pp. 70, 71.

chiefs of Upolu mentioned. I am not, of course, attaching detailed importance to these individual legends in themselves. Their value for my present purpose is, to my mind, that they disclose floating ideas in the minds of people of Tonga, as well as of Manu'a, as to an early special connection, associated with the god Tangaroa, between Fiji, Tonga and Manu'a. [Hypotheses 2, 3 and 4.]

On the question of Tangaroan domination over Samoa there is a variety of material. According to the Pili tale the original organization of Upolu in three separate divisions was effected by the Manu'an Pili, whilst according to Pritchard's story it was the work of people from Tonga. There is a statement that Manu'an people, speaking of olden days, said that there were then in the western islands only three great titles, *tuimanu'a*, *tuititi* and *tuitonga*, the title of *tuimanu'a* standing for all Samoa<sup>1</sup>. This claim implies that at the period in question there were in Upolu no *tuaana* and *tuiatua*, or if there were such, they were then only of inferior titular importance. In any case, if I am right in identifying the early kings of Manu'a with the Tangaroans, this claim of Manu'a is consistent with the view that the Upolu kings were being belittled by the descendants of the Tangaroans, and this again is consistent with the suggestion that they were pre-Tangaroans. There have evidently been disputes between Manu'a and Upolu on this matter. It was said that the first kings of Manu'a called themselves *tuimanu'a ma Samoa atoa*, in which the word *atoa* (whole) related to Samoa, Tonga, Fiji, and the eastern islands<sup>2</sup>, and that the royal race of Moa-atoa, from whom all the *tuimanu'a* had derived, were regarded as the oldest in Samoa<sup>3</sup>. We may assume that these were Manu'an contentions. On the other hand, the inclusion within the power of the early *tuimanu'a* of the western islands of Samoa was disputed by the *tuaana*, who considered themselves as old and as great as the *tuimanu'a*<sup>4</sup>. Krämer suggests that the *tuiatua* were probably the oldest important chiefs<sup>5</sup>, but he gives no very adequate reason for this belief. We are told of a curious Samoan custom which evidently survived up to modern times, though the power of Manu'a over the other islands had been lost, and indeed Manu'a had become separated off from them politically, long

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *Globus*, vol. LXXV, p. 185.

<sup>2</sup> Powell-Fraser, *J.P.S.* vol. VI, pp. 67 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, pp. 366, 18.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 9.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 291.

ago; this was for the people to carry the body of a dead chief about on a bier, calling out as they did so *tuimanu'a e lo'u ali'i*—"Oh my chief, king of Manua." According to Powell and Fraser this custom was observed in both Upolu and Savai'i; Stuebel is apparently referring to it in connection with Savai'i; Krämer connects it with Savai'i only; von Bülow attributes it to Samoa generally, but he lived in Savai'i<sup>1</sup>. I may point out that unless the custom prevailed in islands other than Savai'i, its significance as pointing to Tangaroan domination over Samoa generally is lost; but it might then be regarded as evidence of the connection with Manu'a of Savai'i. There are a few more statements bearing on the present question. Turner says that Fititaumua, or Fiji the foremost, was mixed up with Manu'a's history. He was said to have conquered in Fiji, and then subdued the leeward (by which is meant the western) islands of the Samoan group, reached Manu'a, and dwelt there. All Samoa took tribute to him, and hence the place was called Great Manu'a<sup>2</sup>. It will be noticed that this suggests the Fijian origin of the *tuimanu'a* who are said to have received tribute from the rest of Samoa. According to Graeffe, in former days the *tuimanu'a* had a great political significance in the whole Samoan group; tradition ascribed to Manu'a the origin of the whole Samoan population, and therefore its chiefs were the earliest in origin, and the oldest and noblest in rank. In political disputes which concerned the whole group, or the greater part of it, the *tuimanu'a* held the decision in his power<sup>3</sup>. Churchward says that, according to Samoan traditions, the Samoan royal family sprang from Manua, and, according to some natives, the whole Samoan race did so<sup>4</sup>. [Hypotheses 1, 2, 3 and 5.]

It will be noticed, concerning these disputed claims by Manu'a, that they involve two questions not necessarily identical, namely the relative antiquities of the Manu'an and Upoluan royal houses, and of the peoples of the islands, and the alleged domination of Manu'a over Upolu and other islands. As regards the latter question, the value of each separate statement probably depends upon the source from which it was obtained. Was it Manu'a or, say, Upolu? Assuming, however, for the

<sup>1</sup> Powell, *J.V.I.* vol. xx, p. 153. Fraser, *J.P.S.* vol. vi, p. 71. Stuebel, p. 92. Von Bülow, *Globus*, vol. LXXI, p. 149. Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Turner, p. 224. Cf. Fraser, *J.P.S.* vol. ix, pp. 129 sq. Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, pp. 434 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Graeffe, *J.M.G.* vol. 1, p. 30.

<sup>4</sup> Churchward, p. 27.

purpose of argument, that all the allegations as to Manu'an supremacy emanated from Manu'a, their very number and persistency, and the very feeble and limited response of Upolu, suggest their probable truth. Smith thinks "the so-called Tongans and Fijians" (the people whom I am calling Tangaroans) had "occupied" the coasts, not only of Savai'i, but of Upolu also, ever since their original movements there, up to the time of the expulsion of the Tongans by Tuna and Fata<sup>1</sup>. Then, again, we have Krämer's statement, in connection with the driving out of the Tongans, which is in effect that at the time of the Tongan invasion the influence of the *tuimanu'a* in Upolu had long been extinct, and Aana and Atua had risen into prominence<sup>2</sup>; from which it is clear that he believes there had in the past been some Manu'an control over Upolu, though it had passed away. Indeed he says that this loss of influence of the *tuimanu'a* seems to have ceased very soon after Pili had come from Manu'a, and married the daughter of the *tuaana*, and through his sons by her founded the political organization of Upolu<sup>3</sup>. As regards the question, quite distinct from the other, of the relative antiquity of the chiefs and people of Upolu and those of Manu'a, the claim of the *tuaana*, and Krämer's belief that the *tuiatua* were the oldest important chiefs, would be consistent with my hypothesis that the ancestors of these people had been the pre-Tangaroan inhabitants of Upolu. [Hypotheses 1, 2, 3 and 5.]

The close connection in the early days of Savai'i with Manu'a, and therefore, as I contend, with the Tangaroans, is asserted by Krämer, who says the island was regarded as having been settled by Manu'a in the earliest time<sup>4</sup>; it is also reflected in the Manu'an tales of creation by Tangaroa, and we have seen its development in the legends as to the peopling of Savai'i by the descendants of Lealali, whilst the Tangaroan connection is to be found in another form in the direct Tonga-Fijian elements that appear to have taken a part in this early process of peopling the island. The absence of any evidence that the Tongans were driven out of either Manu'a or Savai'i, to which I shall refer presently, may perhaps be associated with this connection, assuming, of course, that I am right in regarding these Tongans as descendants in the main of the original Tangaroans. Smith refers to the Rarotongan belief that it was

<sup>1</sup> Smith, pp. 163 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 9 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 11.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 45.

from Savai'i that the Polynesians scattered over the Eastern Pacific<sup>1</sup>, and the belief is undoubtedly in accord with the Rarotongan legends. If this was so, the fact discloses, according to my hypothesis, a marked connection of Savai'i with the Tangaroans. The connection of Savai'i with Manu'a may also be seen in a tale concerning the Savai'ian (Tonumaipe'an) war goddess Nafanua and Taema—here regarded as her sister. The two goddesses were together at Amoa in Savai'i, but were about to separate, Nafanua remaining in Savai'i and Taema going to Tutuila. Nafanua, in a parting injunction to her sister, prophesied that some day war would turn itself towards "our country" (which obviously, I think, meant Savai'i) and "our parents in Manu'a"; she told her sister that, when it arose, she was to turn her back to Manu'a, and her front to Upolu, in which case Savai'i would remain neutral; but warned her that if she turned the war on Manu'a, she would be overwhelmed with vines<sup>2</sup>. The meaning of this injunction in its reference to "our parents in Manu'a" and in differentiating between Manu'a and Upolu in the event of war seems obvious; the mention of the vines is a Samoan mode of expression referring to death<sup>3</sup>, corresponding, I think, to our phrase "grass growing over you." [Hypothesis 3.]

In connection with this peopling of Savai'i from Manu'a and Tonga-Fiji, I draw attention to von Bülow's reference to original inhabitants of that island, and, I think, of Upolu, believed, apparently, to have been there prior, as regards Savai'i, to this other process of peopling. One interesting feature of the matter is that these earlier people included a *tuiaana*. Another is found in the beliefs that one of the original inhabitants was called *Maunga* (mountain) and that one of the families had its origin in a series of marriages of mountains in the interior of Savai'i; this belief would be consistent with a native idea that the people were regarded as being autochthonous. According to this mountain tale the people who found these original inhabitants in Savai'i, and whose daughter married one of them, came from Fiji, and her son by him was called "Son of the land." We thus have beliefs which suggest that other earlier people may have been in the island prior to the arrival from Fiji of the Tangaroans. [Hypotheses 1, 2 and 3.]

One or two interesting questions arise on a consideration, in

<sup>1</sup> Smith, p. 195.

<sup>2</sup> Fraser, *J.P.S.* vol. v, p. 177.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 207.

the light of other traditions, of what we are told of the Tangaroan occupation of Samoa, and the ultimate expulsion of these Tangaroans, or at all events of the more recent invaders from Tonga. I will discuss this matter on the basis of an assumption that these Tangaroans had a dominant position in Fiji (it would, of course, only be certain portions of this group), in Tonga and, according to my interpretation of the traditions, in Manu'a, and had spread from these islands to Savai'i; but it is of course possible, and indeed I think probable, that at the later period of the Tongan invasion the political connection between these several islands had become less close, and may in some cases have disappeared; though their family or social relationship would still be recognized. I draw attention to Smith's reference to the long occupation, evidently from the distant past, by the Tangaroans of the coasts of Savai'i and Upolu; to Stuebel's statement that the Tongans, who had subjugated Samoa, ruled in Upolu, and Savai'i, a statement which apparently refers to the more recent domination of Samoa by them; to Krämer's statement that at the period A.D. 1000-1200 the influence of the *tuimanu'a* in Upolu had long been extinct, and Aana and Atua had risen into prominence; and to Krämer's statement that in about A.D. 1200 the Samoans, or at all events Tutuila, Upolu and Savai'i were under subjection to the Tongans, but that Manu'a seems to have escaped the invasion. Then, as regards the events when the Tongans were driven out, I draw attention to the fact that both Stuebel and von Bülow say that the *tuitonga* first landed in Savai'i, but that, except for a reference by von Bülow to a preliminary successful attack, though not final defeat, by the two Tuamasangan chiefs Tuna and Fata in Savai'i, the scene of the whole history of the expulsion, as given by both these writers, is Upolu. Now it is noticeable that not one of the accounts refers to any driving out of the Tangaroans from Manu'a, or contains any reference to Manu'a, a circumstance which is perhaps Krämer's reason for thinking Manu'a had escaped from the invasion. Another interesting feature of the matter is that, though we have several accounts of their expulsion from Upolu, and one of their expulsion from Tutuila, there is not a word of any expulsion from Savai'i. It is true that, according to one of the accounts, they suffered a defeat in Savai'i, but this was not, even according to that account, their final defeat and expulsion from Samoa, which took place

afterwards in Upolu; moreover that earlier defeat was suffered not at the hands of the people of Savai'i, but at those of the Tuamasangan chiefs Tuna and Fata, who had sailed over from Upolu. I also point out that it was, according to the accounts, in Savai'i that the Tangaroans had first landed, prior to the fighting. On the other hand, we know that according to Manu'an traditions the Tangaroa family, whom I identify with the Tangaroans, had made Manu'a their head-quarters, and had founded it, a Tangaroa having been the first *tuimanu'a*; and it is stated and suggested by the evidence that they had occupied Savai'i. What is the explanation of all this? I think the following possible explanation may be suggested, if my original hypotheses are correct. The original Tangaroans, travelling from Fiji, or Tonga, or both, had reached Manu'a at a very early period, and had taken possession of it, and had spread to Savai'i. There had also been, as suggested by Smith, for long after that a more or less dominating Tangaroan population in parts of Upolu and Tutuila, between whom and the pre-Tangaroan people of those islands there had perhaps been some quarrelling and fighting, such as is suggested by the legends of fighting above referred to; but the original dominance of the Tangaroans, operating from Manu'a, had, if Krämer is right, died out. In the meantime the power of Upolu had developed, this change finding expression in the importance acquired by the *tuiaana* and *tuiatua*. Then followed the Tangaroan invasion, carried out from Tonga, which may well at that period have become more or less separated politically from Manu'a, and the consequent loss of power and omissions to elect the *tuiaana* and *tuiatua*, and the subsequent expulsion of these Tongans, including perhaps the old Tangaroan residents in Upolu and Tutuila or some of them. I do not attach much importance to the extent of Tangaroan power in Upolu and Tutuila prior to this Tongan invasion, and my suggestions as to this are obviously extremely speculative. Under these circumstances there would perhaps be no question of driving the Tangaroans out of Manu'a and Savai'i; indeed it is possible that the pre-Tangaroans had never reached Manu'a at all, or had only occupied it in relatively small numbers, or had even in the early days been dominated there by the Tangaroans. Perhaps the *tuitonga's* reason for landing first in Savai'i was that it was a friendly and convenient base from which to launch the attack on Upolu. [Hypotheses 1, 2, 3 and 5.]



According to my view of the evidence, the power of the Tangaroans over Upolu and Tutuila had first been exercised largely from Manu'a, but its extent and duration in this form, and indeed its character, seems to be uncertain; then came the military subjection by Tonga and the subsequent expulsion. There seems to be no definite evidence of the period when Manu'a became politically separate from, not only Upolu and Tutuila, but also from Savai'i, and the latter three islands became more closely associated with one another. Krämer suggests that the detachment of Manu'a followed shortly after the founding of the more westerly islands by Pili<sup>1</sup>. He also refers to the way in which Upolu, the richest and finest of the islands, flourished, and to its constant subsequent intermarriages with Tonga and Fiji; in this way, he says, it eclipsed little Manu'a, which, however, in proud aloofness never attached itself to Upolu, and nowadays takes no part in the western kingship, though it still requires special demonstration of respect from every visitor from other islands, on which account it is naturally avoided as much as possible<sup>2</sup>. I may point out that these references to connections in later days of Upolu with Fiji and Tonga in no way militate against my hypotheses. Doubtless the descendants of the original Tangaroans and pre-Tangaroans had for a very long period, by intermarriages and in other ways, become largely mixed in the western islands of Samoa, and very likely in Tonga also, though the continuance up to modern days of the ancient line of the *tuitonga* suggests that the Tangaroan element may have remained strong there. As regards Manu'a, it is noticeable that, even up to modern times, the apparently competitive character of legends and tales points in the main to conflicting jealousies between that island and Upolu, and it is possible that the Tangaroan element in the Samoan peoples has remained specially strong in Manu'a. [Hypotheses 1, 2, 3 and 5.]

It is a notable fact that none of the great Polynesian gods seem to have been worshipped in Fiji—indeed I have not been able even to identify any Fijian god with one of the local gods of Tonga and Samoa. Williams says that the gods of *eastern* Polynesia (the italics are mine) seem to have been unknown to the Fijians; possibly he means by this Polynesia to the east, and does not confine his statement to the eastern islands of Polynesia. Thomson says that there is much truth in Water-

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, pp. 9 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Krämer, *Globus*, vol. LXXV, p. 185.

house's contention that the Fijian *kalou-vu*, or original gods, were of Polynesian origin, brought to Fiji by immigrants from the eastward, and imposed upon the conquered Melanesian tribes, in addition to their own pantheon of deified mortals<sup>1</sup>; but if this was so, and if he is speaking of specific gods, and not merely of a certain class of gods, I must say that the names of these imported gods must, so far as I can make out, have been changed. The *kalou-vu* of Fiji seem, however, to have been deified ancestors<sup>2</sup>, and it is possible that the suggestion that they were of Polynesian origin merely means that the Polynesians introduced into Fiji a cult of the dead; I have not, however, been able to look into this matter yet. As regards the great gods of Polynesia, other than Tangaroa, the lack of knowledge of them in Fiji is not surprising, as very little was known of them in Tonga and Samoa, where they appear to have been driven into oblivion by the overmastering cult of the Tangaroan Tangaroa. Moreover these other great gods were, according to my contentions, pre-Tangaroan deities, and we do not know whether the pre-Tangaroans occupied Fiji in their migrations to the Pacific, as is stated by Smith. The interest of this matter, so far as my present purpose is concerned, centres, however, on Tangaroa. According to my contentions, parts of Fiji and Tonga, Manu'a and Savai'i must be specially associated with the early history of the Tangaroans in western Polynesia, and Tangaroa was the god of these Tangaroans. I attribute his position as a great creator god in Manu'a to this; he was a very important god in Tonga; and we should naturally expect to find him occupying a prominent position in the Olympus of such portions of the Fijian group as had been occupied by the Tangaroans. His apparent absence from Fiji touches the whole scheme of my associated hypotheses. We have seen that, according to a Paumotuan chant, he was the king of Fiji, which suggests a possible connection, human or divine, or both, with that group; but this is not sufficient for my present purpose. I am testing these hypotheses by seeing how far they are capable of explaining or fit in with recorded legends and beliefs; and here I am confronted with a factor which is certainly difficult to explain at first sight on the basis of the

<sup>1</sup> Thomson, *Fijians*, p. 112. (He does not refer to the page in Waterhouse's book on which this contention is raised, and I have not been able to find it.)

<sup>2</sup> Fison, *J.A.I.* vol. x, p. 336. Hocart, article in *J.A.I.* vol. XLII, commencing on p. 437. Cf. Hocart, *Man*, vol. xiv, pp. 193 sq.; vol. xv, p. 73.

hypotheses. Perhaps, however, a sufficient explanation is to be found in certain data given by Hocart, and his contentions with reference to them; indeed, if his views are correct, he not only helps me out of my difficulty, concerning Tangaroa, but provides me with a little more affirmative evidence as to other hypotheses as well<sup>1</sup>. [Hypotheses 2 and 4.]

Hocart deals with eastern movements, beginning eight or nine generations ago within the Fijian group, and passing still further east into western Polynesia. It was, according to him, a dual movement, with people of a Polynesian or partly Polynesian type in front and Melanesians following them. So far as Fiji is concerned—Hocart thinks the impetus arose much further west—it commenced in the thickly populated island of Viti Levu, where the Melanesians moved eastward with the Polynesians, as I will call them, in front. Hocart draws attention to the more Polynesian physical characteristics of the people at the eastern parts of this island, as compared with the negroid type found in and about the mountainous regions to the west and north-west, a differentiation which he associates with this movement, and not with the Tongan invasion of Fiji a century and a half ago. The double movement then continued further eastward, across the Koro Sea, to the eastern end of the island of Vanua Levu, and the groups of islands, called the Lau Islands that form the eastern barrier of that sea, and where the Polynesian element in the physique of the people is even more marked than in eastern Viti Levu. Hocart comments on all this that we must conclude that the eastern Fijians must previously have been more like their Polynesian neighbours than they are now, which, on the basis of his contentions, they presumably would have been. He then follows the Polynesian part of the movement still further, from eastern Fiji to Rotuma, Tonga and Samoa; and in connection with all this he draws attention to some remarkable family details. He points out, as regards Tui'Fiti, whose name must, I think, be regarded as indicating that he had been a chief ruling over some part of Fiji, that Samoan legends are full of him and other Fijian chiefs that came to Samoa, and that he was worshipped there, all of which is undoubtedly true, though I may point out further that it was in the island of Savai'i that his worship prevailed<sup>2</sup>. Hocart refers also to the title of

<sup>1</sup> Hocart, *J.A.I.* vol. XLIX, pp. 42-51.

<sup>2</sup> Turner, p. 62. Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 58. Fraser, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. XXIV, pp. 199, 203. Stair, *J.P.S.* vol. V, p. 41. Von Bülow, *Globus*, vol. LXXXI, p. 85.

Tui Lakepa, the title, we may believe, at one time of the head chief of the Lau island of Lakemba (the two names admittedly refer to the same island); and he points out that, whilst there is now no such title in that island, it is the title of a Tongan nobleman, and is found also in Rotuma. Lakemba, I may add, was described to me by Dr Corney as the most Tongan centre of the entire Fiji group. Hocart also refers to a high Tongan title of Tui Vakano, the Fijian origin of which is well known in Tonga, and to a Tui Lau title in Samoa. [Hypotheses 2 and 4.]

The interest of all this, so far as my difficulty as to Tangaroa is concerned, is that it points to an expulsion or squeezing out by Melanesian pressure of the Polynesians from Fiji at a period prior, apparently, to that in which these islands came under the observation of white men<sup>1</sup>. It is obvious that in their migration from Fiji to Tonga and Samoa, they would take their gods with them; and though it would not have been surprising to find in the parts of Fiji where the Polynesian element is most marked, traces of the worship of Tangaroa, the absence of such traces can hardly be regarded as militating very strongly against my hypotheses concerning him. Apparently, if Tangaroa had been, as he presumably would have been according to my hypotheses, worshipped in parts of Fiji, he had been swamped by the great Fijian god Ndengei. It is, I suppose, possible that in Fiji Tangaroa was a living chief, who went to Tonga and Samoa, and died and was deified there; but in that case one would think that his worship would have spread to his old home in Fiji. [Hypotheses 2 and 4.]

If Manu'a and Savai'i, as distinguished from Upolu and Tutuila, had been specially connected with the Tangaroans, we should expect to find some sign of it in their beliefs as to the gods; and some evidence of this character is available. I have not found any reference to a single god specially connected with either Upolu or Tutuila who was worshipped in Tonga; or the mention in Tongan traditions of any god of Upolu or Tutuila, nor, I must confess, have I found such a god of Manu'a, the religion of which tiny group of islets seems, so far as we can gather, to have been centred on the Tangaroa family. I shall, however, refer presently to Alo-alo. Savai'i, however, provides several examples, but I must content myself

<sup>1</sup> Tasman, Cook, Bligh and others saw nothing of Fiji, and any knowledge we have of it has been collected not earlier than the latter part of the first half of the 19th century.

here with mere references to them, without giving particulars concerning them. [Hypotheses 1, 2 and 3.]

There was a very important group of Savai'ian gods, who were supposed to have been related. This group is headed by Savea Si'uleo, or Si'uleo, as he is often called, who was one of the Samoan gods of the dead. We next come to two goddesses, Taema and Tilafainga. These girls were, according to certain traditions, the daughters of Si'uleo's brother, and Tilafainga, or, according to another account, Taema, became the wife of Si'uleo. They were generally regarded as having been twins, physically attached to each other, though they were afterwards separated. There were various tales about these girls; but the story, of which there were several versions, to which I draw attention here is that of their swimming from Fiji to Samoa, to introduce there the Fijian practice of tattooing, in connection with which I may refer to their worship in Samoa as the goddesses of tattooers. According to a Manu'an version of the tale they were born in Manu'a. Nafanua was, according to most of the legends, the daughter of Si'uleo by one of these girls. She was the great Savai'ian war goddess, and we have seen how she was connected with the important Tonumaip'e'a family of Savai'i who claimed descent from Si'uleo and her, and was credited with having succeeded by fighting or diplomacy or both in securing the four titles, the possession of which was required to qualify for the position of *tafa'ifa*, or king of all Samoa. Turning now to Tonga, we find that Hikuleo, whose name is, according to the rule for the interchange of consonants, identical with the Samoan Si'uleo, was the god of the dead. There was a Samoan tale of two brothers, Savea and Si'uleo (these being the two names sometimes given to the same Savai'i god) children of Tangaroa of the skies, who landed in Tonga, and thence went to Puluotu (the Samoan and Tongan paradise), where they remained<sup>1</sup>; it is possible that we may see in this evidence of identity between the Samoan and Tongan gods of these names, if such be needed. It also shows a belief as to a direct connection of Si'uleo with the Tangaroa cult. Another side light on the identity of the two gods is found in a statement that the full name of the Tongan Hikuleo was Havea Hikuleo<sup>2</sup>, which is identical (again allowing for interchange of consonants) with the Samoan Savea Si'uleo. The Tongan traditions also introduce the two twin girls and Na-

<sup>1</sup> Stair, p. 293.

<sup>2</sup> Reiter, *Anthrop.* vol. II, p. 239.

fanua, though in a form different from those of Samoa. In the Tongan accounts the name of Hikuleo does not appear, and the names of the girls are Topukulu and Nafanua; and as to this I may say that Nafanua is one of the twins, and not a daughter of a twin, in one of the Samoan versions. These girls were Siamese twins, as in Samoa; they swam from Tonga to Samoa, and both of them had sexual intercourse with their mother's brother (who in this case was also their own father), just as one of the Samoan twins was supposed to have married her father's brother Si'uleo. There is no reference in the Tongan account to tattooing. The girls were both goddesses, worshipped, it is said, in Tonga and other islands. I may refer incidentally to two Samoan stories, dealing with other matters, according to one of which Savea Si'uleo apparently came from Fiji<sup>1</sup> and in another of which we are told that Nafanua and her humpbacked daughter came from Fiji<sup>2</sup>. In this reference to a humpbacked daughter we have the idea of deformity which may be compared with that found in the conception of the two girl twins. [Hypotheses 1, 2 and 3.]

A connecting link between Fiji, Tonga and Manu'a is found in the traditions concerning the god Alo-alo, as to which I must here only refer to certain matters. We cannot, perhaps, prove the actual worship of this god in Samoa; but he was well known in the mythology of Manu'a. He was there believed to be the son of Tangaroa of the skies, and his mother was apparently a Fijian woman. He lived with his mother in Fiji and there he married the daughter of the *tufiti*, or king of Fiji. In Tonga he was the supreme god of the island of Haapai, where worship and supplications were offered to him. The scenes, other than the open sea, of the tales about Alo-alo were Fiji, Manu'a and Savai'i. [Hypotheses 1, 2 and 3.]

I am sure that I could extend considerably the volume of evidence pointing to a close legendary connection between all or some of the groups and islands, Fiji, Tonga, Manu'a and Savai'i. It is illustrated by all sorts of stories dealing with all sorts of matters, in such a way that I may say that, in referring to a legend connecting, say, two of these names together, I always look to see if the other two, or one of them, enters into the story, and I frequently find that it does so. [Hypotheses 2 and 3.]

In looking through the material given above in support of my hypotheses and my comments on it and suggested explana-

<sup>1</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, p. 29. <sup>2</sup> Von Bülow, *J.A.E.* vol. XII, pp. 136, 141.

tions, I am concerned at the extent to which the various matters are mixed up in a confused and disconnected jumble, though, as I intimated beforehand, and as I hope will be recognized, this was more or less inevitable. An attempt now to marshal *all* the evidence and contentions under the heads of the respective hypotheses would involve an immense amount of repetition and is out of the question; but I propose to take my hypotheses *seriatim*—not following the order in which I originally placed them—and draw attention with reference to each of them to what seem to me to be some of the more important parts of the evidence that affect it, and in this there may sometimes be repetitions of previous explanations. I do not claim that any one of the pieces of evidence proves anything, if taken by itself, and some of them, if so taken, are ludicrously insufficient. They are to a large extent interdependent, and it is upon their combined and cumulative effect that I rely. My view of the matter is that the hypotheses seem to offer reasonable explanations of a number of traditions and stories which would otherwise be difficult to interpret, and that, if they do so, this is a *prima facie* ground for regarding them, for the moment, as being possibly correct, and accepting them as working hypotheses, unless and until it is found that there is evidence which points to their probable inaccuracy, or other hypotheses can be formulated which account for the traditions and stories to which I have referred better than, or as well as, they do.

I am met at the outset, in my proposal to tabulate, as it were, the main supporting features of the evidence, by a difficulty. As I said, after stating my hypotheses, the suggestion that Tangaroa was the god of the people whom I am calling Tangaroans—that is, the migrants, the beliefs as to whose journeyings to the Pacific, and as to the subsequent spreading out of whose descendants throughout parts of the Pacific were recorded in the Rarotongan “logs” and other legends, or an important group of them, and their descendants—[hypothesis 4], is based to some extent on evidence that he was specially the god of the people of Manu‘a; on the other hand, the value of much of the evidence that Manu‘a must specially be associated with the early history of the Tangaroans in Samoa [hypothesis 3] depends on the assumption that they were worshippers of Tangaroa. This is an example of the interdependence of both the hypotheses and the evidence; but it is a matter in which I might easily be led into a line of false and deceptive deductions.

I propose therefore to deal with these two hypotheses together in a way which will, I hope, get over the difficulty. In doing this I shall have to assume the truth of my other hypotheses, this being the principle of my whole contention, and the special danger to which I have referred only applying to these two—as affecting each other—I shall in this discussion, and afterwards in discussing other hypotheses refer to data as being “evidence” in favour of my contentions; but it must be understood as to this that I only claim them as evidence in the sense, to a considerable extent, that they are in accord with and can be explained by the hypotheses, and that I use the single word merely for the purpose of brevity.

I propose to tabulate the evidence as to these hypotheses 3 and 4 in the following way. *First*: I shall refer to evidence, in which Tangaroa is not mentioned, that Manu‘a was specially associated with the early history of the Tangaroans. *Second*: I shall draw attention to evidence, in which Manu‘a is not mentioned, that Tangaroa was an important god of the Tangaroans. The evidence up to this point will, whether or not sufficient in itself, be clean evidence on hypotheses 3 (so far as Manu‘a is concerned) and 4, free from the objection of which I have spoken. *Third*: I shall refer to evidence, in which the question of the Tangaroans does not arise, that Tangaroa was in Samoa more especially the god of Manu‘a. This will connect, and add weight to the first and second groups of evidence. *Fourth*: I shall deal with evidence connecting Tangaroa and Manu‘a jointly with the Tangaroans. This method may appear rather complicated and cumbersome; but it seems to be the best way of enabling us to weigh the evidence as a whole.

The first proposition is that Manu‘a was specially associated with the early history of the Tangaroans (evidence in which Tangaroa is not mentioned). The relevance of most of the evidence to be referred to under this heading is based on the assumption that the Tangaroans, after reaching Fiji, established themselves in Tonga, which became, as it were, another Tangaroan home, and another centre from which they conducted subsequent operations; the bearing of this evidence is the apparent close connection, in these early days, of Manu‘a with Fiji and Tonga. I refer, in particular, to the evidence pointing to the close connection between these islands as disclosed by the payment and receipt of tribute, including statements that Manu‘a itself at one time received tribute from



both Fiji and Tonga. If these statements are correct, the question that arises is obvious. If Manu'a was not then essentially Tangaroan, it must presumably have been in the possession of pre-Tangaroans; and under what conceivable circumstances can we picture these people as demanding and receiving tribute from the conquering Tangaroans of Fiji and Tonga? If Manu'a was Tangaroan the situation is intelligible. It is not necessary to assume that there was any general superiority of Manu'a over either Fiji or Tonga; it may have been that the head chief or king of the whole group had his head-quarters for the time being in Manu'a, in which case it would be to Manu'a that the tribute payable by his people would go. Then again we are told that Manu'a received tribute from Rarotonga and Tahiti. Why? It is hardly likely that this would be so if the dominating Manu'an people were pre-Tangaroans; but on the other assumption they might well be receiving it from branch sections of the Tangaroan group that had gone to those places, their movements thither having formed part of the great spread of the Tangaroans eastward over the Pacific, or the tribute might possibly have been paid by earlier inhabitants of Rarotonga and Tahiti whom the Tangaroans had conquered. Then we have the statement that in olden days there were in the western islands only three great titles, *tuimanu'a*, *tufiti* (which means lord of Fiji) and *tuitonga* (lord of Tonga); and here again it is reasonable to believe that these were the three great Tangaroan chiefs, each at the head of the island whose name he bore. As to this, it is noticeable that it is stated that the title *tuimanu'a* stood for all Samoa, and that no mention is made of the *tui-aana* and *tuiatua*, whom I associate with the pre-Tangaroans, and who claimed, at all events, to have had longer ancestries in Samoa than that of the *tuimanu'a*, in which case they would be in Upolu at the time. We may well believe that the great Tangaroan chiefs would attach but little importance to the chiefs of the pre-Tangaroans. There are also the statements that the *tuitonga* was king of Manu'a, and that Fitiaumua (Fiji the foremost), having conquered Fiji, had finally settled in Manu'a; one or other of these might be at the time the head chief, and if he was living in Manu'a, this would be in accord with my suggested explanation of Manu'a's receipt of tribute. We have seen that Lefanga, in the district of Fiti-uta (Fiti is Fiji) on the eastern shore of the Manu'an island of Tau, was the supposed scene of the earliest traditional

history connecting Tangaroa with Manu'a. Turner says that Fiti-uta means inland Fiji; and he tells a story of Ta'e-o-Tangaroa, whose sister married the king of Fiji and went to live there. Ta'e-o-Tangaroa, hearing that his sister was ill-used, went to Fiji, and found that it was true. He then turned the bush where she lived into a fruitful garden, after which the king of Fiji made up matters with his wife, and named the place Fiti-uta. Ta'e-o-Tangaroa then returned to Tau, and changed the name of this eastern district from Anga'e to Fiti-uta<sup>1</sup>. My point is that the name has a traditional connection with Fiji. The history of the driving out of the Tongan invaders of Samoa is consistent with the contention that the Tangaroans had been fully established in Manu'a. We know that they were driven out of Upolu and Tutuila, but there is no suggestion that they were driven out of Manu'a; and I think this fact may be explained just as well by saying that the Tangaroans were well established and dominated there as by the suggestion that the Tongan invaders had not attacked Manu'a. If these invaders were Tangaroans and the Manu'ans were Tangaroans, there would be no obvious reason why they should do so. The original entry of the Tongan Tangaroans into Upolu by way of Savai'i would also be consistent, if we recognize how closely Savai'i had apparently been connected in early days with Manu'a. These arguments based on the driving out of the Tongans are, however, extremely conjectural and speculative. I have referred to Stair's belief that the people of Manu'a had an origin different from that of the inhabitants of the other Samoan islands; such a belief would be well in accord with my present proposition, except perhaps partly as to Savai'i; and it might be that the ultimate political separation of Manu'a from, and attitude of "proud aloofness" in respect of the other islands of the Samoan group would be connected in some way with this difference in origin, and that the special demonstration of respect which it required from visitors from the other islands was based on its original supremacy or power, however great or otherwise this may have been, over them. I must say, however, that Stair only gives two of the reasons on which he bases his opinion, and these do not appear to me to be very convincing.

The second proposition is that Tangaroa was an important god of the Tangaroans (evidence in which Manu'a is

<sup>1</sup> Turner, pp. 224 sq. Other writers give versions of this story.

not mentioned). The Paumotuan chant calls him king of Fiji. Then there is the list, obtained by von Bülow, of the sons of Tangaroa of the skies—that is, the first and original Tangaroa. These sons included Tuifiti (king of Fiji), Tuitonga (king of Tonga), Tangaroa (spoken of by von Bülow as a Samoan chief). Pe'a (probably head chief of the great Tonumaipe'a family of Savai'i, of Manu'an origin, and claiming descent from Hikuleo, the Tongan and one of the Samoan gods of the dead, and from his daughter the war goddess Nafanua). Here we have what I regard as a truly Tangaroan brotherhood, of whom it was claimed that Tangaroa was their father; and here again we may note that the only great Samoan chiefs included in the list of sons seem to have been Manu'an and Savai'ian, and that the *tuiavana* and *tuiatua* are not mentioned. The gods who joined Losi in fighting the Tangaroa family were deities who were apparently either Upoluan gods, whom I regard as pre-Tangaroan, or, as regards one of them, a member of the Tangaroa group, who had been driven out, or, as regards two others, and perhaps Losi himself, gods of a cult which perhaps prevailed before that of the pre-Tangaroans; it may well be that this tale is based on traditions of conflicts between pre-Tangaroan inhabitants, and the incoming Tangaroans. I have already commented on the possible significance of the abstention from the conflict of the sons of Pili. We may compare with this Losi tale Stair's tradition of fighting of Pava and Fanonga against Tangaroa, and Lesson's story of the fight of Ti'i-ti'i with Tangaroa. I have referred to the traditions as to the god Lu, and his apparent close association with Upolu; and it is in the light of these traditions that I interpret the story of the conflict between him and the Tangaroa family. So also I have suggested the interpretation to be put on legend No. 3, associating it with the wide spreading of the Tangaroans over the Pacific, and have drawn attention to opinions expressed by writers that the worship of Tangaroa was a later Pacific cult than that of the other great Polynesian gods, an opinion which, if correct, would be consistent with his special connection with the Tangaroans.

The third proposition is that Tangaroa was in Samoa more especially the god of Manu'a (evidence on the general question of the Tangaroans not appearing). The main evidence of this is the legendary Samoan history of creation by Tangaroa and of the original formation of the political constitution of Manu'a

under the *tuimanu'a*, the first of whom was a member of the Tangaroa family; and I may say here that there are other traditions, or versions of traditions, pointing in the same direction. I think I am also correct in saying that I have found no legends pointing to any original association of Tangaroa with any of the other islands of Samoa.

The fourth group of statements, connecting Tangaroa and Manu'a jointly with the Tangaroans—I can not speak of this as a proposition—covers a number of matters. I will first refer to the four versions of the legend of creation by Tangaroa of the Samoan and other islands. In all of them it is either stated or implied that Manu'a was created first, and was apparently his head-quarters during the process of creation of the other islands; and this is consistent with the stories as to the forming by Tangaroa of the original constitution of this island, of which a member of the Tangaroa family was the original *tuimanu'a*. Fiji, Tonga, and Savai'i were next created by him, though the order of their creation varies in the several versions; none of the versions—I may say—tells us how these islands were created, the idea being that by acts of will he caused them to rise from the sea. Upolu and Tutuila, on the other hand, were apparently afterthoughts, being merely created for use by Tangaroa as resting places, or stepping stones in travelling backwards and forwards over the sea from island to island; and they are described as having been merely pebbles or small bits of rock. Then again, whilst Fiji and Tonga were peopled by couples—children of Tangaroa—sent down by him from heaven, and Savai'i was peopled by a Manu'an couple of divine descent, the populations of Upolu and Tutuila were merely derived from worms, evolved from rotting creeper plants. The first point to which I draw attention is the way in which Manu'a, Fiji, Tonga and Savai'i are grouped together with a more honourable origin than that of Upolu and Tutuila, as regards both the islands themselves and their original inhabitants. This is consistent with my view that Manu'a, and Savai'i were, along with Fiji and Tonga, specially associated in the creation traditions with the Tangaroans. But a further interest may be found in the parts of these tales relating to Samoa, if we consider them in the light of my hypothesis No. 3 that Manu'a and Savai'i must be specially associated with the early history in Samoa of the Tangaroans, who probably first occupied Manu'a, and spread afterwards to Savai'i, which latter they certainly seem to have

done. There is an element of consistency in these tales with all this. Manu'a was the original Samoan home of the Tangaroans, who had spread there from Fiji and Tonga, and from Manu'a they spread again to Savai'i, which also was thus closely associated historically with the Tangaroans. The differentiation in the legends between the origins of the people of Manu'a and Savai'i on the one hand and those of Upolu and Tutuila on the other speaks for itself. My construction of all these tales is that they reflected the beliefs or contentions of the descendants of the original Tangaroans as to their earliest history in the Pacific; and that the stories about worms or maggots were simply intended to throw contempt upon the pre-Tangaroans of Upolu and Tutuila.

Legend No. 7 clearly associates Tangaroa primarily with Manu'a; and I think that Smith is quite right in his suggestion that the statement that Saa and Ui scattered far and wide may be associated with the belief that it was (partly at all events) from Savai'i that the Tangaroans spread over the eastern Pacific. If so, this legend definitely connects Tangaroa, Manu'a, and Savai'i with the Tangaroans. Legend No. 11 is, if we regard Lu as specially connected with Upolu—say the divisions of Aana and Atua—consistent with an idea of a snub administered by Manu'a to Upolu. The Tongan story of the fishing up by Mau'i, under the direction of the Tangaroa family, with a hook obtained from a Manu'an called Tonga, of islands is suggestive of a connection between Tonga and Manu'a, and of Tangaroa with both of them; and when we come to the statement that Mau'i did not fish up certain Tongan islands, nor those of Manu'a and Fiji because they had already been produced by Hikuleo, (whom I regard as a Tangaroan god) we seem to be dealing with a tradition in which there is discrimination between islands specially associated with the Tangaroans and the other islands. I also draw attention to the statement by one of the *tuitonga* that the name Tonga had been the personal name of a *tuimanu'a*.

In this discussion of hypotheses 3 and 4 (jointly) I was dealing primarily, so far as number 3 was concerned, with Manu'a, and not with Savai'i. Some of the evidence I have discussed touches Savai'i also, and I draw attention to this, as pointing to beliefs concerning an original close association of Savai'i with Manu'a, and indeed with the Tangaroans generally. I also refer here to a few other matters upon which I have already

commented; namely, Krämer's statement that Savai'i was regarded as having been settled by Manu'a in the earliest time, and the evidence that this had been so, and that Tonga-Fiji elements were there also; the question as to Manu'a and Savai'i in connection with the driving out of the Tongans; Smith's belief, which, I may say, seems to be partially in accord with the legends, that it was from Savai'i that the Polynesians<sup>1</sup> scattered over the eastern Pacific; the story about Nafanua and her sister; and the identity of some Tongan and Savai'ian gods.

Hypothesis No. 1, that when the Tangaroans reached Samoa there was already there a pre-Tangaroan population, and hypothesis No. 5, that the royal lines of the island of Upolu must be associated with these pre-Tangaroans, are so closely connected that I shall take them together. I may say that the evidence as to hypothesis No. 1 applies mainly to Upolu, though some of it affects Tutuila also; as regards Savai'i, there is von Bülow's reference to an earlier population, prior to the Tangaroan peopling of the island, and the traditions that their ancestors were mountains. I do not find anything by which we can suspect that there was or was not a pre-Tangaroan population in Manu'a, which, according to my contentions, became practically a Tangaroan stronghold. Some of the evidence affecting these two hypotheses has already appeared in the discussion of hypotheses 3 and 4. I refer to the passages in which the persons mentioned as the great chiefs or kings in early days were the *tuitonga*, the *tuifiti* and the *tuimanu'a*, and the absence of any mention of the *tuiatua* and the *tuiavana*, notwithstanding the fact that these royal lines seem to have been then in existence—a circumstance which I attribute to Tangaroan disregard and contempt, or claim of contempt for them; to the exclusion of the *tuiavana* and *tuiatua* from the list of sons of Tangaroa; to the story of the fighting between Losi and his companions and the Tangaroa family, and to fights against Tangaroa of Pava and Fanonga, and of Ti'i-ti'i; to the fighting between Lu and the Tangaroa family; to the suggestions that the worship of Tangaroa was, in the Pacific, a later cult than that of the other great Polynesian gods; to the traditions, doubtless of Manu'an or Tangaroan origin, as to the original creation of the islands, and the degrading ancestry

<sup>1</sup> He means by this the Tangaroans. He apparently does not think the pre-Tangaroans had spread eastward.

credited to the people of Upolu and Tutuila; to my comments on legend No. 11; to my comments on the stories as to the fishing up of the islands by Mau'i, as to which I must point out that the islands whose origin was attributed to Hikuleo, whom I regard as a Tangaroan god, were practically Fiji, Tonga and Manu'a, leaving to the credit of Mau'i the other islands of Samoa, including presumably Savai'i (not an *original* Tangaroan stronghold); and to the fact that Mau'i was, according to my views, a pre-pre-Tangaroan god, the volcano cult with which I associate him having survived in the conception of the pre-Tangaroan god Fe'e, and afterwards been modified by the sky or "above the earth" cult with which Hikuleo was associated.

There is, however, other evidence which touches hypotheses 1 and 5. There is the history of the driving out from Upolu by the Tuamasanga warriors of the Tongan invaders. I have treated these invaders as having been Tangaroans, which most probably they were; in which case it was a driving out from Upolu of Tangaroans by pre-Tangaroans. There is here, however, a weak spot in my argument. We have no knowledge that the people driven out were any other than these Tongans, whose invasion had occurred not long before; and as it may be believed that prior to this invasion there had been in Upolu a number of the original Tangaroan occupiers, who may or may not have been included in this expulsion, and we know that there had been Upolu-Manu'a intermarriages, the event may not have quite the significance which I have attributed to it. This is the weak spot, to which I referred in a previous page, in my argument relating to the fact that the *tuiaana* and *tuiatua* had not been expelled when the Tongans were driven out. It is obvious that if we are uncertain whether or not the original Tangaroans in Upolu were expelled by the Tuamasanga chiefs, the fact that these Upoluan kings were not so treated is not evidence that they must have been pre-Tangaroans.

As regards hypotheses 1 and 5, I may also refer to my suggestion that legend No. 1 points perhaps to an indigenous population connected with the mountains in Upolu, as compared with a heaven-born Tangaroa-Manu'an people whose origin is told in legend No. 2. It is true that the descendants of the original Tangaroa referred to in the latter were mainly Upoluan; but it must be pointed out that, according to other Pili traditions, his second wife Sina was the daughter of a *tuiaana*, and it was among her children that he made a political

distribution of Upolu. We also have von Bülow's reference to the original inhabitants of Savai'i and his inclusion among the earlier people of Upolu of the *tuiavana* whose daughter married Pili. The possible interpretation of legend No. 4, in which Tangaroa is credited with having made Fe'e, a Samoan god of the dead, and sent him down to the lower regions, is that it was a boastful claim by Manu'a to superiority over Upolu, Fe'e having been, as I believe, specially connected with the Malietoa of Tuamasanga. Then there is the further story, to which I have referred, of Tangaroa meeting Fe'e, apparently for the first time, in Savai'i, and taking him back to Manu'a, and my discussion of both stories, and the fact that, whilst Fe'e continued to be associated with the Samoan hades, Si'uleo presided over paradise. Legend No. 6 may well have been a Upoluan counterblast to Manu'a's claims that Samoa had been created by their god Tangaroa; and I agree with Krämer that the claim of Upolu that the *marae* which formed the meeting place of the gods was in that island would be regarded by the Manu'ans as a presumption. As regards the possible significance of the stories about Lu, I have already referred to statements that he was believed to have been the son of Tangata or Tupufua (the first man, derived from nothing), who, according to one account, was descended from the mythical ancestors of the *tuiavana*; that Lu was the ancestor of the *tuiatua* and was perhaps the first of the *tuiatua*, and that he married the daughter of Tangaroa; and have suggested as an interpretation of this that he was associated in the legends with an earlier race of people in Upolu, discovered there by the Tangaroans when they arrived. We also have legend No. 13, according to which Lu, having come down from heaven, was carried in his canoe to the top of a mountain in Atua, where he afterwards lived. One or two of the stories introduce Lu as the son or grandson of Tangaroa; but these do not disturb me in the least. The worshippers of Tangaroa seem to have had a method in some of the Polynesian stories of trying to undermine the superior antiquity in the Pacific of others of the great Polynesian gods, by alleging that they were merely descendants of Tangaroa. Legend No. 15 may have been an Upoluan counterblast to this Tangaroan claim to paternity. It is on the assumption of Lu's Upoluan ancestry and connections that I have interpreted legend No. 14 as to the fighting between him and the Tangaroa family as being based on traditions of



conflicts between the Tangaroans and pre-Tangaroans. The possible historical interpretation to be put upon the stories, to which I have referred in discussing legend No. 14, as to the exchange by what seem to have been the Tangaroans of their newly introduced kava, for brood hens, or perhaps a sacred *senga* bird, cannot be discussed in this book; but they may prove interesting hereafter.

Some of this evidence under hypotheses 1 and 5 suggests that the people whom I am calling the pre-Tangaroans were in Upolu before the arrival of the Tangaroans; but some of it hardly goes further than to point to conflicts between these two groups of people. As regards this last mentioned evidence, the question may well be asked, why do I assume that the pre-Tangaroans were there before the Tangaroans, and not *vice versa*? As to this, I think I am justified to a certain extent in reading this evidence in the light of that which suggests that they were so. But, independently of this answer, I may reply to the question by asking who and what were these pre-Tangaroans if they were not the earlier inhabitants. We may, I think, assume, that they were not an important group of people who, after the arrival of the Tangaroans in the western Pacific, had migrated there from the islands of the east; for there is not a shadow of evidence of any great movement of this character, the suggestion of which would be out of accord with all we know of Polynesian history. On the other hand, they cannot have represented a post-Tangaroan migration from Indonesia, or elsewhere from the west to the Fiji, Tonga, Samoa area, as, had they been so, we should surely have had some information as to such an important historical event in the traditions. I think it may be assumed that, if these were two distinct groups of people, the Tangaroans were the later comers.

Hypothesis No. 2 is not, to my mind, in any way vital as a matter to be proved on its own account. I have introduced it rather because of its bearing upon the question of the association of Manu'a and Savai'i with Tangaroa and the Tangaroans. I refer in support of it to evidence connecting Manu'a and Savai'i with Fiji and Tonga. Taking first the data included in my first proposition concerning hypotheses 3 and 4, I refer to the following matters. The connection between Fiji, Tonga and Manu'a with reference to tribute; the tradition as to the three titles, *tuimanu'a*, *tuifiti* and *tuitonga*, and the absence of any reference to the *tuiaana* and the *tuiatua*; the statements that


the *tuitonga* was king of Manu'a, and that Fitiaumua conquered Fiji, and then settled in Manu'a; the alleged origin of the name of the district of Fiti-uta; the suggestion that there was no drawing out of the Tongans from either Manu'a or Savai'i; Stair's belief that the origin of the people of Manu'a was different from that of the inhabitants of the other Samoan islands; and the reference to the proud aloofness of the Manu'ans and the special respect which they claimed. I refer to the tradition, mentioned in connection with my recent proposition concerning hypotheses 3 and 4, as to the names of the sons of Tangaroa, and the absence from the list of the *tuiavana* and *tuiatua*. And I refer to the material, mentioned in my fourth group of statements concerning these hypotheses, as to the differentiation between Fiji, Tonga, Manu'a, and Savai'i, on the one hand, and Upolu and Tutuila on the other, both as to the mode of their creations, and the origin of their inhabitants; and to the tradition as to the fishing up of islands by Mau'i. I also refer to my further comments on this tradition appearing in the discussion of hypotheses 1 and 5; and to the evidence as to the use by a *tuitonga* of the name Bau, and the Paumotuan tradition identifying Tangaroa as the god of Fiji; also to my general statement as to other traditions connecting Fiji, Tonga, Manu'a and Savai'i.

Hypothesis No. 6 was rather a means to an end; that is, my construction of some of the evidence relating to other hypotheses was based on the belief that certain legends were competitive in character. The question whether or not this belief is justified may be a matter of opinion. I admit as to this that it is often the easiest thing in the world to introduce ingenious, though by no means obvious, speculative interpretations, pointing to hidden significance of ancient traditions, and that the practice may well be dangerous. Where, however, there are a number of legends, the origins of all of which are capable of being interpreted in the same way and such an interpretation enables us to explain a number of matters which would otherwise be difficult to understand, I think the method may well be allowed. I may say that I believe that many of the Polynesian traditions are of this character.

It must be understood that in this final summary and allocation to each hypothesis of what I regard as the main features of the evidence that supports it, I have only been dealing with the matter somewhat broadly. A re-perusal of the evidence

itself and of my earlier comments, after considering this general outline, would throw additional light on a number of matters, and disclose various details, which, though perhaps small in themselves, would, I think, tend to point in the same direction. I think, however, that my hypotheses have stood the test pretty well, and that they are probably correct; and as matters will occasionally arise for discussion in this book, on which the hypotheses, or one or other of them, appear to have a bearing or possible bearing, I shall sometimes discuss things on the assumption that they are correct. It must be understood, however, that in doing this for working purposes, I am not assuming their accuracy more strongly than I do here.

There is just one point to which I must draw attention before closing this discussion. I have referred once or twice to traditions which pointed to a scattering over the eastern Pacific, and have treated these as evidence that the people who were supposed to have done so were Tangaroans. Smith seems to think that the pre-Tangaroans had not done this, and if this view is correct my treatment of the evidence would obviously, I think, be justifiable. I have, however, already expressed my view that this is a question the answer to which cannot be assumed, one way or another, at the present stage of our investigations. I may point out, however, that this doubt as to the facts does not prevent me from taking note of the traditions. If the pre-Tangaroans had spread eastward, prior to the arrival of the Tangaroans, we know absolutely nothing of the movement or movements by which they did so, in which case I am, I think, justified in associating the traditions with the movements of the Tangaroans, some of which are well known, and which are the subjects of many legends and stories. There can be no doubt that the cult which I regard as pre-Tangaroan *was* spread widely in the Eastern Pacific. My point is that the spreading of this cult may or may not have taken place, wholly or in part, before the arrival of the Tangaroans in the western islands, but that the recorded traditions refer, not to the pre-Tangaroans, but to the Tangaroans.



THE FAITOKA DESCRIBED  
BY COOK, 2<sup>ND</sup> VOYAGE

Cook's and Tasman's  
Anchorages

Colony of Flying-foxes

**TONGATABU.**  
(SHOWING ANCIENT  
MONUMENTS.)

0 1 2 3 4 MILES

## CHAPTER IV

### POLITICAL AREAS AND SYSTEMS

#### TONGA

THE Tongan Islands are divided into three groups; to the south are Tonga or Tongatabu (Sacred Tonga), and Eua and the other adjacent islets; in the middle are the islands of the Haapai group; and to the north are Vavau and the other islands of the Vavau group.

The map in this book of Tongatabu is a reproduction of that by Mr (now Sir) Basil Thomson which appears in volume xxxii of the *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. I am indebted to Sir Basil Thomson and the Council of the Institute for their kindness in allowing me to use the map.

Tongatabu must from early days have been the most important island of the group. Its very name suggests this. It had always been considered the most noble of the Tongan Islands, and from time immemorial the greatest chiefs had been accustomed to make it their principal place of residence, and had been buried there in the tombs of their ancestors<sup>1</sup>. It was the centre of government of a large number of islands, most, if not all, of which were regularly visited by the sovereign or commander-in-chief<sup>2</sup>, and it bore an unrivalled sovereignty over the whole group<sup>3</sup>.

The history of the Tongan Islands discloses broadly the political system of Tongatabu and its relationship with the other islands in the latter part of the eighteenth century and afterwards. Tongatabu was, as we shall see, the home of the *tuitonga*, or sacred king of the whole Tongan group and of the *hau* or secular king, spoken of by writers as the *tuikanokubolu* or *tuihaatakalaua* of Tongatabu, originally at all events the most important chiefs of all the Tongan Islands. I am about to attempt a narration of portions of the history needed for illustration of the political system; but I may here anticipate this by summarizing shortly what that system seems to have been. The religious power of the *tuitonga* appears to have extended over all the islands of the group. The *tuikanokubolu*

<sup>1</sup> Mariner, vol. II, p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> Wilson, p. liv.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 269.

and *tuihaatakalaua* were, I think, chiefs of two great families ruling specific geographical districts of Tongatabu, of whom sometimes one, and sometimes the other held the dominant position of *hau*. The other islands of the group had their head chiefs; but sometimes apparently the *hau* of Tongatabu might secure military domination over them, and I imagine that this authority would arise especially when he was acting on behalf or with the concurrence of the *tuitonga*.

Tongatabu was, according to the *Duff* missionaries, divided into three large districts; Aheefo, at the north-west end, reigned over by the *tuikanokubolu* with absolute sway; Mua, the middle district, under the same subjection to Futtafaihe; and Ahoge, at the S.E. end, under the same subjection to Vaharlo<sup>1</sup>. Veeson says that the district of Aheefo, consisting of the western part of the island, was immediately under the control of Tukuaho as liege lord, whilst the two other districts into which the island was divided, Ardeo and Ahogge, were also subject to his control; and Futtafaihe, the chief of the former, and Vaharlo, the chief of the latter, acknowledged him as their superior<sup>2</sup>. D'Urville says that the name of the *tuihaatakalaua* was derived from the district of Hogui, formerly called Hata-kalawa, over which he presided, and which formed the east part of the island<sup>3</sup>; and that the name of the *tuikanokubolu* was derived from his association with Pangai in Kanokubolu, which was part of the district of Hifo; he was the direct chief of this district, and could only be "consecrated" (by which he evidently means inducted) at Pangai<sup>4</sup>. Monfat says that Mua, as its name indicates, was the capital of the island, and was the place where the *tuitonga* lived<sup>5</sup>. Mangeret says it was the place where the greatest chiefs lived<sup>6</sup> and other writers identify it as being the residence of the *tuitonga*<sup>7</sup>.

It will be seen from the map (reproduced from Thomson's map) that Mua was on the south-eastern shore of the great inlet of the sea near the eastern end of the northern shore of the island. This was evidently the district of the *tuitonga*; the name of Futtafaihe given by the *Duff* missionaries and Veeson was the ancestral family name of the *tuitonga*. I cannot trace Veeson's

<sup>1</sup> Wilson, p. 269.    <sup>2</sup> Veeson, p. 72.    <sup>3</sup> D'Urville, *Astro.* vol. iv, p. 93.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 94. Cf. Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 309.

<sup>5</sup> Monfat, *Tonga*, p. 257. (*Mua* means "first").

<sup>6</sup> Mangeret, vol. II, pp. 69, 70.

<sup>7</sup> Poupinel, *A.P.F.* vol. xxxii, p. 107. Mahony, *J.P.S.* vol. xxv, p. 68. Incidentally this appears in several books.

Ardeo from the maps; but I find, in an account of a kava party, a reference to a *tuiardeo* (king of Ardeo), of royal blood, who was called *Ve*a, and was a sub-chief of *Mua*<sup>1</sup>; so that Ardeo, ruled over by the *tuitonga*, would be a part of his domain of *Mua*. *Hihifo*, called by these writers *Ahefo* and *Hifo*, was at the western end of the island, and *Pangai* was, according to Thomson, on the shore of *Maria Bay*, in the same district<sup>2</sup>. This was evidently the district of the *tuikanokubolo*. *Ve*eson's name *Tukuaho* was that of the holder of the title in his time. *Hahake* was, according to the map, at the eastern end of the island, adjoining *Mua*, and I think that *Ahoge*, *Ahogge*, and perhaps *Hogui* are varied spellings of the same name; indeed in *Mariner's* map this district is called *Hahagi*, and in *Sarah Farmer's* map<sup>3</sup> it appears as *Ahake*. This was the residence of the *tuihaatakalaua*, and *Vaharlo* was probably the name of a holder of that title, but I cannot identify it. I do not think there is any doubt whatever of the general accuracy of this; we get indications of it by writers here and there, and it is consistent with what we know of the localities of the burial grounds of these three families of chiefs.

As regards the subdivision of these three districts there are various statements. The *Duff* missionaries say that the three districts were divided into many smaller ones, which had their respective chiefs<sup>4</sup>. *Cook* knew of thirty districts in *Tongatabu*, each having its particular chief<sup>5</sup>. *D'Urville* supplies a list of nineteen districts, and gives the names of the chief and first *matabule* (councillor) of each of them<sup>6</sup>. *Lawry* gives a list of eighteen towns<sup>7</sup>. It is evident that there is in these statements confusion both as to numbers and terminology. Some of *d'Urville's* districts can be identified with some of *Lawry's* towns; but each of these lists contains a number of names which are not in the other; *d'Urville's* list includes *Mua*, *Hihifo* and *Ahoge*. *Waldegrave* says the island was divided into thirteen portions, a chief being the proprietor of each, and the inferior chiefs, the *matabule*, or persons between the inferior chiefs and the peasants, and the peasants, residing on the land given to them by the chiefs<sup>8</sup>. The *Duff* missionaries say that each of the

<sup>1</sup> *D'Urville, Astro.* vol. iv, p. 73.

<sup>2</sup> Thomson, *J.A.I.* vol. xxxii, p. 86.

<sup>3</sup> *S. Farmer*, p. 151.

<sup>4</sup> *Wilson*, p. 269.

<sup>5</sup> *Cook*, vol. v, p. 424. Cf. p. 429.

<sup>6</sup> *D'Urville, Astro.* vol. iv, p. 393. Cf. pp. 73 sq.

<sup>7</sup> *Miss. Not.* vol. iv, p. 313.

<sup>8</sup> *Waldegrave, J.R.G.S.* vol. III, p. 185.

chiefs of minor districts held, within his own district, an authority similar to that of the superior chiefs, though the former were responsible to the latter<sup>1</sup>. According to Young, each clan had its chief, and that chief was the governor or lieutenant in the town or village where he lived; the king ruled the chiefs, and the chiefs ruled the people<sup>2</sup>. The French missionary Poupinel (1858) says that the government of the Tongan archipelago was formerly rather similar to our feudalism of the Middle Ages. A *tuitonga* reigned over all these islands, and each island and each village had its master, who held for the *tuitonga* by right of fief, and with dependence, his little local government. All these subordinate chiefs were frequently at war with each other, and he who was more active and ambitious often succeeded by force and cunning in subjecting his peers, and sometimes went so far as to subjugate the whole archipelago, leaving the supreme chief only the honours and a nominal dignity. Then he was supplanted by another, or perhaps the *tuitonga* succeeded in regaining authority over his turbulent vassals<sup>3</sup>. Pigeard, writing in 1843, says there was no longer, as formerly, in Tonga, a king concentrating the authority in himself; the island was divided into districts, of which each was commanded by a chief, who considered himself independent<sup>4</sup>. This statement is not, however, one to which we must attach great importance, as in Pigeard's time things in the Tongan islands were in a more or less disordered state, though I do not propose to enter into the lengthy detailed evidence required to demonstrate this.

Assuming the clear differentiation between the three main divisions of Tongatabu, the evidence as to the subdivision of the whole Tongan group into districts is not very clear, especially as we find in lists of districts names of divisions side by side with those of what must have been mere districts, and some of which may have been only sub-districts or villages (I am not here using the distinguishing terminology which I employed for Samoa). Nevertheless we seem to have a general idea of the political arrangement. I will assume for the moment that the *tuitonga* was the sacred king of the whole group and that the head of one or other of the two other great families was the secular king of, at all events, Tongatabu, whilst each of these three head chiefs had special local jurisdiction over his own

<sup>1</sup> Wilson, p. 269.

<sup>3</sup> *A.P.F.* vol. xxxii, p. 103.

<sup>2</sup> Young, *S.W.* p. 235.

<sup>4</sup> Pigeard, *N.A.V.* vol. 1, p. 183.



division of Tongatabu. We then have the further subdivision of each of these three divisions into a number of districts, each having its head chief. As regards the other islands, Vavau, about half the size of Tongatabu, may itself have been the subject of some political subdivision; but all the other numerous islets of the Haapai and Vavau groups, or such of them as were inhabited, could only be regarded as districts or villages. The form of government was probably feudal in character, the sacred king holding jurisdiction over the whole, each of the three divisions of Tongatabu and the other islands or groups of islands<sup>1</sup> being governed by its head chief, of whom one was the sacred king, subject in Tongatabu to a certain amount of control by the *hau* in matters concerning the whole island, and the smaller districts or villages throughout the group having minor chiefs or *matabule* (orators) as their official heads. An example of the system is provided by Mariner's reference to an underchief of Tongatabu, who wished to come over on a mission to Finau at Vavau, and had to obtain the permission of his superior chief before doing so<sup>2</sup>.

Passing now from these somewhat meagre particulars of the general political system of Tonga, I propose to refer to certain historical, and in part legendary, matters; I will commence with the alleged history of the origin of the kingship and of the development of the system of dual (sacred and secular) kingship, after which I shall discuss the question of the *tui-kano-kubolu* and *tuihaatakalaua*, and finally I shall refer to some history, which gives a general picture of the position of matters during the earlier periods of observation of the islands by white men, including especially the decay of the power of the *tuitonga*.

The history of the kingship or head chieftainship of the islands of the Tongan group, a history commencing with lists of kings, legends and the memories of the people, but based in its later stages upon the observations of travellers, discloses an original concentration of both religious and secular powers in one ruler; then comes a transfer, at first, perhaps, only partial, to another man of the secular authority of this ruler; and this is followed, by the entire, or almost entire, loss by the religious head of his secular power, and afterwards by the loss, or at all events the undermining, of his religious power.

Some lists help us in tracing the earlier history, actual or

<sup>1</sup> I shall consider the question of the connection of these other islands with Tongatabu later on.

<sup>2</sup> Mariner, vol. I, p. 202.

mythical, of this dual kingship. Bastian supplies us with a list of the *tuitonga*, or sacred kings of Tonga, the materials having, apparently, been obtained by him from the Rev. Mr Baker<sup>1</sup>. Thomson publishes a list, as given by Tregear on the authority of the Rev. J. E. Moulton, of the *tuitonga*<sup>2</sup>. Krämer combines these two lists, and adds to them notes, showing connections between the *tuitonga* families and those of the Samoan kings<sup>3</sup>. Caillot gives another list of the *tuitonga*<sup>4</sup>. He also gives a list of the *tuihaatakalaua*<sup>5</sup>, and two different lists of the *tuikanokubolu*<sup>6</sup>. West provides a list of the *tuikanokubolu*<sup>7</sup>.

Bastian's list is preceded by a short statement or myth, written in Tongan. I do not know the age of this myth, or its native source or authenticity; but the following is a translation of it, which Mr Sydney H. Ray has kindly made for me. "The size [? measure, space] (of) this land of Tonga, the air, and the measure (of) tree, the *liana*, and was divided-in-two (? or was two branches); and Tangaroa came down, and tore apart, and the root of the *liana* bled, and Manu grew up from it; and the grandparent came and cut, and two men grew up from it, and left by the grandparent of Manu; and Momo grew up from it; so that (?) there were three persons to the growth from Manu, and (this was) the origin of Momo."

I may say that the Tongan word which Ray has translated into *liana* is *fue*, which, according to Baker's Tongan dictionary, is the name of a shrub, and which is, as we have seen, the Samoan name for a creeping vine. In Samoa, Manu'an traditions attributed human origin in Upolu and Tutuila to worms or maggots evolving from the rotting remains of this *fue* plant. According to Baker's and Tregear's dictionaries the word *manu* was in Tonga a generic term for animals and birds, whilst according to Tregear's dictionary, in Polynesia generally, other than Tonga, the word was only used for birds, which may well have been its primary meaning in Tonga.

This myth is somewhat confused, but it suggests a division by Tangaroa of a creeping vine plant called *fue* into two parts, the birth or evolution of Manu (the bird) from the bleeding root, a subsequent fission of the plant or its root by the grandparent, by which, I think, was meant Tangaroa, and the consequent birth or evolution of two men, and the birth or evolution

<sup>1</sup> Bastian, *H.S.P.* pp. 296 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* pp. 395 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. 1, pp. 468 sq.

<sup>4</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, p. 306.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 306 sq.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 307.

<sup>7</sup> West, pp. 55-8.

of Momo; and it ends with the statement that there were three persons, one of whom was evidently Momo, derived, apparently, through the instrumentality of Tangaroa, from Manu (the bird).

This legend is followed in Bastian's list by the names of forty-four *tuitonga*. The first of these was Momo of *manu*; the second was apparently named Kohai; the third was spoken of as the man who was grown from a *fue*, as also, apparently was the fourth; the fifth was Kohai, and the sixth Koau; the seventh was Ahoeitu, which, according to Smith was the name of the second *tuitonga*; but, as he says there were two of this name<sup>1</sup>, the Ahoeitu of Bastian may well have been the first. Then follow a number of names of no interest for my present purpose until we come to number nineteen, whose name was Momo, this being the only *tuitonga*, other than the first, of this name in the whole list; and his name is followed by a sentence in parenthesis which is translated by Ray as follows: "Afterwards near to Momo so that three persons of *tuitonga* Uanga so that grew from Tua." *Uanga* in Tongan means a maggot, and *tua* means the back. I think this must refer to the original three persons—Momo and two others—said to have been derived from the bird, and it suggests the association of a maggot or maggots with their evolution.

Thomson's list begins with Kohai and his descendants, but it does not name or say how many generations there were of the latter. It then says that these were dispossessed, and there came to rule Ahoeitu, "descendant of Tangaroa." This was the first name of a series of thirty-two; and number ten was Momo, the only appearance of that name in the list. Caillot's list of thirty-five names begins with Ahoeitu, and the tenth name is Momo, which again is the only place in which this name appears in the list. Comparing these two lists with that of Bastian, we find that, whilst, according to Bastian, this later Momo was twelve generations after Ahoeitu, in the other lists he was nine generations later—an unimportant difference; and that the lists all agree in including only one Momo subsequent to Ahoeitu.

Now these details have no direct bearing upon the question of sacred and secular kingship; but I think they are of some interest in connection with the beginning of the history of the *tuitonga*, and with the subject of migrations and my hypotheses,

<sup>1</sup> Smith, p. 157. He spells it Alo-eitu, but I think it must be the same name.

developed in previous pages, as to the earliest history of Samoa. We have seen that, according to Smith, there were Polynesians in Fiji, Tonga and Samoa before the arrival in the Pacific of the group of migrants whom I am calling the "Tangaroans"; and that these Tangaroans occupied Tonga, conquering, or obtaining the co-operation of, the "pre-Tangaroans," as I have called them, there. According to my hypotheses, these Tangaroans were worshippers of Tangaroa, and in fact introduced his worship into the Pacific. They occupied Manu'a, and spread to Savai'i; but apparently, though they seem to have obtained some mastery over Upolu, there was there a considerable pre-Tangaroan population; and the legends point, as I have suggested, to conflicts between these two groups of people, and to verbal contentions in which the Tangaroans strove to belittle their pre-Tangaroan predecessors in the islands. One method of doing this appears, as I have already indicated, to have been to attribute to themselves (the Tangaroans) in Fiji, Tonga, and Manu'a direct descent from the Tangaroa family, whilst the people of Savai'i were descended from heaven born parents in Manu'a; but all the versions referred to the peopling of Upolu and Tutuila by means of *fue* plants which decayed, and from which were evolved maggots or worms, which Tangaroa fashioned, or which developed, into men. One feature of these Samoan tales, to which I did not refer before, is the prominent part in this act of creation taken by a *tuli* bird, apparently a species of snipe, acting as the messenger and agent on earth of Tangaroa. I shall show, when considering in a future book the legends of creation, that beliefs, similar to those of Samoa, prevailed in Tonga; in these Tangaroa-in-the-skies appeared as the great creator, and one of the Tangaroa family, carried by or immanent in, a bird *kiu*, believed to have been a snipe, acted as his messenger and agent. The messenger was given the seed of the creeper *fue*, which he planted and it germinated, and the tree climbed and spread. He broke the root of the creeper in two; what he tore off decayed; a large worm was found in it; and this he cut in two with his beak. The two parts formed themselves into men, who were called Kohai and Koau; and a little fragment hanging from the bird's beak became a third man called Momo<sup>1</sup>. Other versions of this story will be repeated. It may be described as being in the main the same as that of Samoa, with variations that

<sup>1</sup> Reiter, *Anthrop.* vol. II, pp. 443 sqq.

make it strikingly similar to what seems to be the explanation of Bastian's story.

The interest of these tales, as affecting my present subject, is this. In Samoan legends of creation we have Tangaroa as the great creator; a bird—apparently a snipe—acts as his intermediary; a *fue* plant is grown; and from its rotting remains are evolved maggots or worms, which turn into men; and these men are, according to my interpretation, identified by the Tangaroans of Manu'a, who claim for themselves descent from Tangaroa, with the ancestors of the pre-Tangaroan people of Upolu and Tutuila.

In Tonga the creation legend, as given by Reiter, is practically identical with that of Samoa, and the names of the men evolved from the worm are Kohai, Koau and Momo. Bastian's story, in which Tangaroa is the active god, tells of a *fue* plant, from the wounded part of which, through the instrumentality of, or in connection with, a bird, Momo and two other men are created, and these three persons are apparently associated with or derived from a maggot or maggots, or at least connected with them in some way. Then in his list of the *tuitonga* we get first Momo; then apparently Kohai; then two men referred to as derived from a *fue* plant; then Kohai (again), and then Koau. Thomson's list of the *tuitonga* begins with Kohai and his descendants. The combined effect of these Tongan stories is to point to Momo, and a few others (all presumably purely mythical) among whom are mentioned Kohai and Koau, as having been the very earliest supposed *tuitonga*, and to attribute their origin to worms or maggots, arising out of the decay of a *fue* plant, created by Tangaroa; and a bird—probably a species of snipe—comes into the stories. Now let us go a step further. According to Bastian, the first *tuitonga* after Kaou was Ahoeitu; Thomson says the descendants of Kohai were dispossessed, and there came to rule Ahoeitu, "descendant of Tangaroa"; in Caillot's list of the *tuitonga*, Ahoeitu's name is the first, and Smith apparently says the same. Then after an interval, which varies in the genealogies of the respective writers, Bastian, Thomson and Caillot give the name of a *tuitonga* Momo; and it is in connection with him that Bastian's story refers, not in very exact terms, to three persons who had been derived from, or were associated with maggots.

I will now construct a legendary account of these early days in Tonga, based on a possible interpretation to be put on the

stories. There was originally in Tonga a dynasty of *tuitonga*, comprising several successive kings, who were afterwards dispossessed by a *tuitonga* Ahoietu, the ancestor or predecessor of the subsequent *tuitonga*. The earlier dynasty, it was said, owed their origin to the god Tangaroa; but the method by which they were evolved was the rotting or wounding of a *fue* plant, from which worms or maggots grew, and out of which latter came men. Of Ahoietu, on the other hand, it was claimed that he was a descendant of Tangaroa. Following the line of construction adopted as regards Samoa, I suggest that the earlier Tongan dynasty was that of the pre-Tangaroans, and the latter that of the Tangaroans, the traditions in the two groups of islands being similar; and that the construction to be put on the Tongan legends, including that of the contemptuous belittling by the Tangaroans of the pre-Tangaroans, is practically the same as in Samoa. It may be noticed that both Bastian and Thomson include the members of the earlier dynasty in their lists of the *tuitonga*; but this in no way affects the matter, as this name simply means lord of Tonga, and would be applicable to members of the pre-Tangaroan dynasty, as well as to those of the Tangaroans. Caillot's and Smith's statements only start with what I am treating as the first Tangaroan *tuitonga*. The appearance later on, in the lists of what I am treating as the *tuitonga* dynasty<sup>1</sup> of the Tangaroan Tongans, of the name Momo is puzzling. Probably he was supposed to have been in some way connected with the earlier dynasty; and if so it was, perhaps, in order to draw attention to the humble character of his ancestry that it was in connection with him that the maggots were mentioned. I think that the similarity of these Tongan traditions to those of Samoa tends to support the interpretation which I have put on the latter. I point out, as to this, that in the case of Tonga the contemptuous references to maggots appear to be identified as applying to the earliest—say the pre-Tangaroan—kings, prior, I may add, to those of the lines referred to by Caillot and Smith, who perhaps were only the Tangaroan kings; whereas, as regards Samoa, the question of their application was a matter of conjectural hypothesis, except that it was confined to the people of Upolu and Tutuila. I suggest that if this identity in Tonga is recognized, this adds

<sup>1</sup> I am merely using the term "dynasty" to differentiate between pre-Tangaroan and Tangaroan kings. I do not imply that in either case there was necessarily only one dynasty, using the term in its strict sense.

probability to the correctness of the hypotheses concerning Samoa.

There was another legend, reported by Mariner, which may possibly touch these questions also, though I could hardly introduce it by itself as actual evidence. According to this legend, which Mariner describes as the story more universally believed, and probably the most ancient in Tonga, at a time when the islands of Tonga were already existing, but not yet peopled by intelligent beings, some of the minor gods of Bulotu [paradise] being desirous of seeing this new world [which Tangaroa had fished up], numbering about two hundred, male and female, sailed in a large canoe to Tonga, and, liking the novelty of the place, remained there. In a few days two or three of them died, and this frightened the others, who had thought they were immortal. One of them, being inspired by one of the superior gods, told the others that the chief gods had decreed, that as they had come to Tonga and breathed its air, and fed upon its produce, they should become mortal and subject to death; some of them then tried to get back to Bulotu, but failed, and had to return to Tonga<sup>1</sup>. Pritchard refers to this tale, but, according to his version the islands were supposed to have been fished up by the god Mau'i<sup>2</sup>. The present interest of the legend arises from a belief, reported by him, that the people were derived from worms, found among leaves of the *fue*, and scratched up by *kiu*, the snipe, and from the statement made to Pritchard by a Tongan chief, that it was the slaves that were derived from the worms, and the chiefs that were derived from the gods<sup>3</sup>.

It is, I think, possible that we have here beliefs that have originated in traditions of the descent of the conquering Tangaroans, coming from Fiji, upon the pre-Tangaroans in Tonga. The former, arriving from beyond the horizon, would probably be regarded as gods, and at all events their descendants would be likely to claim that they had been so, and, indeed, the old Polynesian chiefs of legendary history seem to have been often spoken of as gods, and Polynesian chiefs were commonly deified after death; and if they turned the conquered pre-Tangaroans into slaves, this would be in accord with Polynesian practices in war. I do not for a moment suggest that, hundreds of years afterwards, the two original groups of people would remain as two distinct classes—chiefs and slaves;

<sup>1</sup> Mariner, vol. II, pp. 115 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Pritchard, pp. 397 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

no doubt they would become intermingled by marriages, and we know there was a middle class population between the chiefs and lower working classes. The statement of the Tongan chief may have been based on a distinction between the great chiefs, descended, or supposed to be descended, from the earlier Tangaroan *tuitonga*, and their related minor chiefs, and perhaps the middle classes, on the one hand, and the poor unimportant labouring classes on the other. The belief that the islands, to which these gods came, had been fished up by Mau'i would, according to my ideas, be consistent, because I believe that Mau'i, to whom the feat was attributed in most parts of Polynesia, including Tonga, was the volcano god of the earliest inhabitants; and the substitution, in one version of the story, of Tangaroa would not, to my mind, militate against this, because I think there is ground for suggesting that in several islands of Polynesia, including Tonga, the worshippers of other Pacific gods, later than Mau'i, had tried to transfer the glory of the deed to their own deities. These, however, are not matters which I can discuss here.

Passing now to a later period, I begin by referring to a legend according to which in days of old the *tuitonga* was lord of all Tonga—lord of the soil, of the men and of the first fruits; and to him alone was tribute paid. He received tribute from Haapai, from Haafulu Hao [Vavau], from Niuaafouu, from Niuatobutabu, from Uvea [Wallis I.] from Fotuna, and even from Samoa and the far islands to the north. No man knew whence the *tuitonga* derived his power, unless indeed he was a descendant of the gods themselves, of Tangaroa, of Hikuleo and of Mau'i; but that, said the legend, was hidden in the clouds of the ages<sup>1</sup>.

Smith, by counting his generations on a 25-year basis, gives about A.D. 1050 as the period of the second *tuitonga* Ahoaitu<sup>2</sup>. The lists of the *tuitonga* subsequent to Ahoaitu differ somewhat, both as regards the names and the order in which they were supposed to have come; but this is what we should expect. It is, I think, with the periods of the earlier of these *tuitonga* that we must associate more especially Krämer's statement that it has long been known that in the earliest days the Tongan kings, and those of Fiji came to Samoa to get wives for themselves<sup>3</sup>. The numerous Samoan legends and genealogies, or

<sup>1</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* pp. 293 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 468.

<sup>2</sup> Smith, p. 157.



lists, and those of Tonga, point to this; and indeed it would be in accord with the customs of the people for a conquering tribe to strengthen and make more permanent their position among the tribes they had subjugated, or partly subjugated, in order to establish *ainga*, or *kainga* (family) relationships with them. I do not propose to compare the lists in detail, but will content myself with referring to a few names which appear in them. *Tuitonga* Talakaifaiki is the twenty-first name (the numbering beginning with Ahoeitu) in Bastian's list, and the fifteenth in those of Thomson and Caillot. He was, according to Krämer, the *tuitonga* who was driven out of Upolu by Tuna and Fata<sup>1</sup>. The name of *tuitonga* Takalaua is the fourteenth after that of Talakaifaiki in Bastian's list, the fourth in Thomson's and the fifth in Caillot's; the great difference between the one and the other two illustrates the uncertainties which comparison of lists involves, and the difficulties that attend their use in establishing dates.

It was said that Takalaua was a harsh man; and there was a tale of a fisherman, who was about to be slain in punishment for not having been able to provide Takalaua with fish, but who secured pardon by bringing to him a beautiful girl, whose somewhat miraculous origin was explained in the story, and whom the fisherman had found on Ata, an island near the island of Euaiki [little Eua]. Then followed an account of the cruelties of Takalaua, which culminated in his assassination, and the consequent miraculous turning of the sea into blood, and the pursuit by Takalaua's people, led by his eldest son Kau-ulu-fonua, of the murderers from island to island, until they were caught and slain in the island of Fotuna<sup>2</sup>.

The story next related how Kau-ulu-fonua, whose name follows that of his father in all the lists, being now the *tuitonga*, and realizing the danger to which even he was subject, in spite of his high religious position, decided to appoint a chief to conduct the secular government of the people, he himself retaining the supreme lordship of the soil and of the offerings [that is the annual offerings to the gods]. To this secular office he appointed his younger brother Mouna-motua, who thus became lord over the people, and to whom was given the title *tuihaatakalaua*. Since then, says the story, though there have been wars in Tonga, and chief has fought against chief, yet the *tuitonga* has passed unharmed through them all, for he was

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 468.

<sup>2</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* pp. 294-304.

lord of the soil only, and of the offerings<sup>1</sup>. This appointment is mentioned by West and Erskine also<sup>2</sup>, and the name of Mounga-motua is the first in Caillot's list of the *tuihaatakalaua*<sup>3</sup>.

Thus, according to the story, was the dual kingship, the sacred and the secular, originally established. The tale then refers to a subsequent *tuihaatakalaua*, or secular king, named Mounga-Tonga, whose name also appears in Caillot's list, being the ninth after that of Mounga-motua. This king noticed that the people honoured only the *tuitonga*, to whom they gave offerings, and not himself, the *tuihaatakalaua*, to whose orders they were subject; so he effected a change, almost identical with that already described; he made his son, Ngata, lord over the people, giving him the title of *tuikanokubolu*, and he contented himself with receiving the offerings only<sup>4</sup>. The story does not say who at that time was the *tuitonga*, or explain how it came about that the civil lord, *tuihaatakalaua*, was able when handing over certain power to a son, to claim for himself the right to the offerings, which at a subsequent period were still made to the *tuitonga*. Probably the offerings referred to were not those made to the *tuitonga*; they may have been merely those made to the *tuihaatakalaua* as head of his own district, he retaining the sacred rights and duties which devolved upon him as such, and which would be quite distinct from those of the *tuitonga* as sacred king of all Tonga. The name Ngata appears at the head of West's list of the *tuikanokubolu*, and of both Caillot's lists<sup>5</sup>. West says that Ngata was the grandson of Mounga-motua, and that *tuikanokubolu* was the name that had distinguished the sovereign (by which he evidently means secular king) ever since<sup>6</sup>. Thomson says that Ngata was the *tuikanokubolu* in 1616, when Lemaire and Schouten landed<sup>7</sup>; and the story says that it was from this Ngata that all the subsequent *tuikanokubolu* "even to Tubu the king" had sprung<sup>8</sup>.

We might well believe from this evidence that the secular kings had all been called *tuihaatakalaua* up to a certain date, and afterwards had all been called *tuikanokubolu*; but there is evidence which shows that the older title continued to be recognized during the later period. There are a number of

<sup>1</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* pp. 304 sq.

<sup>2</sup> West, pp. 55 sq. Erskine, p. 126.

<sup>3</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, p. 306.

<sup>4</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 305.

<sup>5</sup> This story is combined by Erskine (p. 126) with the previous one; but he does not say anything about retention of the offerings.

<sup>6</sup> West, p. 56.

<sup>7</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 310.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 305.

detailed statements as to the relationship, pointing, apparently, to some confusion, between these two offices; but the statements are of a scrappy, and sometimes contradictory, character. I may, before considering this evidence, say that these two names do not appear to have been official terms, intended to designate secular kingship, the term used for which was *hau*. They were, as I understand the matter, the family titles of the head chiefs of two great families, of whom one lived at the eastern and the other at the western end of Tongatabu; and, if so, one question is whether, after a certain date, the secular kingship remained continuously in the possession of the *tui-kanokubolu* family.

In Caillot's list of the *tuihaatakalaua* the sixth name after Mounga-tonga is Maealiuaki, and the same name appears in all the lists of the *tui-kanokubolu*, being the sixth after Ngata in West's list and one of Caillot's lists, and seventh in Caillot's other list. The *tui-kanokubolu* whose name appears in West's list immediately before that of Maealiuaki was, West says, the *tui-kanokubolu* at the time of Cook's first visit<sup>1</sup>, and Thomson says that Maealiuaki was *tui-kanokubolu* at the time, apparently, of Cook's later visit<sup>2</sup>. It seems clear that he was the person whom Cook calls Mareewagee; but proof of this identity would involve a good deal of wearisome detail. The point to which I draw attention is that in a historical period, some time after that of Mounga-tonga and Ngata, there seems to have been a chief who held the offices of both *tuihaatakalaua* and *tui-kanokubolu*, or concerning whom there was a doubt as to which of them he held. The name of Tubu-lahi appears in all the lists of the *tui-kanokubolu*, being the next name before that of Maealiuaki in Caillot's lists<sup>3</sup>, whilst another name intervenes between them in that of West. D'Urville says, that at the time of Cook's third voyage Mariwagui (writers spell this name differently) held the office of *tui-kanokubolu*, which he had inherited from his elder brother Tubu-lahi; but on the same page he says that, Mariwagui having been raised to the rank of *tuihaatakalaua*, Tubu-lahi's son Finau was made *tui-kanokubolu*<sup>4</sup>. This Finau was not the chief of that name of Mariner's later date. D'Urville says that below the *tuitonga* came the great offices of state, the *tuihaatakalaua*, the *tui-kanokubolu* and the

<sup>1</sup> West, p. 56.      <sup>2</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 316.      <sup>3</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, p. 307.

<sup>4</sup> D'Urville, *Astro.* vol. iv, p. 94. I think his meaning is that Mariwagui was first *tui-kanokubolu*, and afterwards became *tuihaatakalaua*.

*hata*, of which the first two offices were civil and the third was military<sup>1</sup>. The *hata* was the commander-in-chief of the warriors; and in d'Urville's time (1827) the office was held by Hafoka, the chief of Hifo, who was more often called by the title of his office than by his own name<sup>2</sup>. This man must have been a local chief only, as the *hau* or *tuikanokubolu* of that time was Josiah Tubu. D'Urville says that the Tubu family furnished candidates for the offices of *tuihaatakalaua* and *tuikanokubolu*<sup>3</sup>; that both were charged with all civil and military affairs and the policing of the state<sup>4</sup>; that the *tuihaatakalaua* was at the head of temporal and military affairs<sup>5</sup>; and that the *tuikanokubolu*, in concert with the *tuihaatakalaua*, and alone, if the latter was too old, or not elected, held the reins of government, and was the actual king or *hau* of Tonga<sup>6</sup>. He explains that the two offices appear to have been often confounded with each other, that of *tuikanokubolu* alone being filled, perhaps, and the other office being left vacant; adding that there is some confusion as to this, but that in any case it is agreed that the office of *tuihaatakalaua* was the first office of the kingdom for the powers it conferred<sup>7</sup>. As to this I may say that a comparison of the records of various writers discloses several examples of great chiefs who were called *tuihaatakalaua* by one and *tuikanokubolu* by another.

Referring to d'Urville's statement that the Tubu family furnished candidates for the offices of *tuihaatakalaua* and *tuikanokubolu*, I think that it may have been an ancestral name common to both these related families. Whilst the name Tubu does not appear in Caillot's list of the former, which ends with Maelialuaki, all the lists of the latter include a chief whose name began with Tubu prior to Maelialuaki and several others after him. The name of one chief called Mumui appears in all these lists, being the fifth after Maelialuaki in West's list and the fourth in one, and second in the other, of Caillot's lists. D'Urville identifies this Mumui with the Tubu referred to by d'Entrecasteaux (whose visit was in 1793), and with the chief who received the *Duff* missionaries (1797). He succeeded to the office of *tuikanokubolu*; but was afterwards raised to the rank of *tuihaatakalaua*, and his son Tukuaho became *tuikanokubolu*<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> D'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. II, p. 48.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* *Astro.* vol. IV, p. 96.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* *Voy. pitt.* vol. II, p. 48.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* *Astro.* vol. IV, pp. 93 sq.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 93.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 94.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 93.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 94. Both Veelson (p. 71) and Thomson (*D.P.M.* p. 322) refer to him as *tuikanokubolu*.

I may mention that the *Duff* missionaries always refer to this Mumui as the *tuikanokubolu*; so does Veeson (1797). D'Urville is apparently referring to his own time (1827) in a statement as to the relative places of dignity of the chiefs in a kava circle. D'Urville says that the *tuitonga* remained outside the circle and apart, no one being allowed to sit near him, and that the first man of the kava assembly was the *tuikanokubolu*; he does not mention the *tuihaatakalaua*<sup>1</sup>. Young (1853) says that the *tuikanokubolu* had been the crowned kings of the land for nearly 200 years; but the *tuihaatakalaua* had formerly been above him, though that office was then (1853) extinct<sup>2</sup>.

According to West's list of the *tuikanokubolu* Mumui was succeeded by his son Tukuaho, who was succeeded by his eldest son Tubu-malohi, who was succeeded in about 1812 by his brother Tubu-toa, who reigned for eight years. According to d'Urville and Sarah Farmer, however, Tubu-malohi was brother to Tukuaho<sup>3</sup> and Thomson says Tubu-toa was brother of Tubu-malohi<sup>4</sup>. From 1820 to 1826 there was no *tuikanokubolu*, each chief ruling his own district or fortress. In 1826 Josiah Tubu succeeded to the title, and he again was succeeded in 1845 by George Tubu<sup>5</sup>. There are detailed differences in the accounts of these successions given by other writers, possibly due in part to the confused condition of affairs in Tonga during much of this period and lack of general recognition of the right to the title of *tuikanokubolu* of certain persons whose names appear in the lists; but the final succession as *tuikanokubolu*, first of Josiah Tubu, and then of George Tubu is well known. This brings me to a statement by Baessler that after the death of the *tuitonga* a chief called Tungi could claim by right the highest rank in the kingdom; having the title of *tuihaatakalaua*, he stood above the king [George Tubu], who as *tuikanokubolu*, only came in the second rank after *tuitonga*<sup>6</sup>. Thomson refers to Tungi as having been the *tuihaatakalaua*<sup>7</sup>; and to an order given by Josiah Tubu to the representative of the *tuihaatakalaua*, "the principal heathen" chief, to regard George Tubu as his successor in Tongatabu<sup>8</sup>.

Thomson suggests that the *tuikanokubolu* probably was at first the mouthpiece or messenger of the higher chiefs, their

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 72 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> Young, *S.W.* pp. 235 sq.

<sup>3</sup> D'Urville, *Astro.* vol. iv, p. 95. Farmer, p. 123.

<sup>4</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 341.

<sup>5</sup> See West, pp. 56-8.

<sup>6</sup> Baessler, *S.B.* p. 319.

<sup>7</sup> Thomson, *J.A.I.* vol. xxxii, p. 86.

<sup>8</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 355.

chancellor and perpetual prime minister; but that his power grew until it overshadowed the dignity of the heaven descended *tuitonga* himself<sup>1</sup>. He says that the *tuikanokubolu* was not strictly an hereditary office like that of the *tuitonga*. None but a member of the reigning family could succeed, and a custom "seems to have grown up" of choosing the successor alternately from the families of the *tuihaatakalaua* and *tuikanokubolu*; but it was always open to the principal chiefs, who formed the electoral college, to reject any aspirant to office who was physically, mentally, or morally unfit to reign<sup>2</sup>. I think that in this last statement Thomson, in comparing the case of the *tuikanokobolu* with that of the *tuitonga*, is using the former term merely with the meaning of secular king, as compared with the sacred king—that is, it would include the case of a *tuihaatakalaua*—but the idea of alternation between the two great families in selection of a successor bears a striking resemblance to a curious succession custom which seems to have prevailed in parts of Polynesia including, perhaps, Tonga, and to which I shall refer later.

Lawry (1850), in speaking of the images of gods handed over to him by converted chiefs, refers to two gods. One of these was Fakatoamafi, an incarnation of the mighty chief Halaingaluafi, daughter of a *tuihaatakalaua*; this god was represented by a whale's tooth necklace, and human sacrifice was offered to her. The other was Finau-tau-iku, also an incarnation of a daughter of the *tuihaatakalaua*; she was represented by cloth and red feathers; she was the god who looked after chiefs, and was "their shade at their right hand" and "a city of refuge from the power of the *tuikanokubolu*." Her priest was inspired, and if he said the god's anger was kindled against a man, or a family, or a city, the club was his instant avenger, and death devoured whom he denounced<sup>3</sup>. The latter of these statements suggests a belief that the spirit of a departed daughter of a *tuihaatakalaua* acted, among other things, as a controlling power, protecting chiefs, and perhaps others also, from misuse of power by a *tuikanokubolu*. Possibly this term is intended to include any reigning secular king, belonging to either of the two great families.

I have introduced the evidence relating to the connection between the *tuihaatakalaua* and the *tuikanokubolu* in what may

<sup>1</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 310.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 307.

<sup>3</sup> Lawry, *F.F.I.* (2), pp. 36 sq.

seem to be needless detail, because, in view of its contradictory character, this is necessary for any attempt to arrive at a conclusion as to the probable interpretation to be put upon it. It is clear that both the titles continued to be recognized, and I still maintain, notwithstanding statements pointing to these titles being designations of office, that, fundamentally at all events, they were simply the titles of the head chiefs of the two great families who occupied the eastern and western ends of the island of Tongatabu; but I shall refer to this point again. It may well be that these were branches of an original family of Haatakalaua, which was itself a branch of the *tuitonga* family, the senior branch being that which retained the name, and the junior branch being that which had in days long ago separated off, and taken the name of Kanokubolu. Indications of this may, I think, be seen in the stories of the appointment by *tuitonga* Kau-ulu-fonua of his younger brother Mounga-Motua to the secular government, under the title of *tuihaatakalaua* and of the subsequent appointment by the *tuihaatakalaua* Mounga-Tonga of his son Ngata, to some lordship over the people, under the title of *tuikanokubolu*; also in Young's reference to the past precedence two hundred years ago of the *tuihaatakalaua* over the *tuikanokubolu* and in Baessler's statement that a *tuihaatakalaua* was higher in rank than the *tuikanokubolu* George Tubu, even though the latter was secular king of Tonga. Perhaps the belief as to the goddess Finau-tau-iki had a similar origin. My suggestion would also, perhaps, account for West's statement—evidently inaccurate—that since Ngata's time the secular king had always borne the title of *tuikanokubolu*. What he should have said may have been that before that time they had never borne this title, whilst afterwards they often did so. It is quite possible that the first *tuikanokubolu* was a relative (say a son, as stated in the story), appointed by the then reigning *tuihaatakalaua*, to a ruling position under him, so that then the respective titles had in fact designated two separate governmental offices. However this may have been for a period, it may well be that after a lapse of time the younger branch of the family expanded and grew more powerful, and so became able to compete with the older branch in the claim for the secular kingship. I am encouraged in suggesting this explanation of the matter by the fact, to which I shall refer in a subsequent page, that in Tahiti there was a great clan, or social group (the Teva) divided into sub-groups, each of which had its head chief, whilst the head

chief of one of them ruled over them all; and that, though the head chief of all had originally been the chief of the oldest branch of the group, his rule passed to the chief of one of the younger branches, who thus obtained the superior temporal authority, whilst the superior social rank of family lineage of the head of the oldest branch continued to be recognized. If my last suggestion is correct, we only have to conceive of a continuing or intermittent competition, in part perhaps military, in part perhaps diplomatic, and in part perhaps matrimonial, as the result of which sometimes the head of one of the two families, and sometimes the head of the other, would secure the secular kingship; and there may have been some system, not apparently always adopted, under which the kingship was given to the heads of the two respective families alternately. As regards the military question, I find that in Baker's dictionary the word *hau*, which, as we have seen, was the official title of the secular king, as such, had two meanings, of which one was "a reigning prince" and the other "a conqueror." Very likely, when the head of one of the families was the secular king, the head of the other would often be consulted by him, and thus, sometimes, perhaps, in effect held a definite official position in the government; in this way the idea that these two titles were titles of officers working contemporaneously, and not merely of families, would readily arise, and much of the confusion in the evidence would be explained. This point also will arise later. The occasional holding by one man of both the titles would be natural enough; for the two families would doubtless be constantly intermarrying into each other, so that the holder of one title might at any time become the successor to the other.

The office of commander-in-chief, referred to by d'Urville, and called by him *hata*, seems to have been departmental, and would possibly often be entrusted by the *hau* to a member of his own family. The Finau Ulukalala of Cook's time was, as we shall see presently, the generalissimo and head of police, and he was the son of the reigning *hau*. Possibly the *hau* sometimes acted as his own commander-in-chief. Thus we shall find that at a later date Finau-Tukuaho succeeded, on the death of his father Mumui, to the position of *tuikanokubolu*, and again subsequently after the assassination of Finau-Tukuaho, Finau Ulukalala the second succeeded in securing, not the elected title of *tuikanokubolu*, but the *de facto* domination of the Haapai and



Vavau groups, where he was found by Mariner, claiming to be *hau* or king, of the Tongan islands. In neither case is there any evidence of any definite official appointment of commander-in-chief similar to that of the first Finau Ulukalala. I do not think *hata* was a departmental appellation of a commander-in-chief. It seems to have been merely the titular name of a Hifo chief family, the holder of which in d'Urville's time was a head chief, Hata (or Ata), whose personal name was Hafoka, and who then held the office of commander-in-chief<sup>1</sup>. Baker in his dictionary says that *Ata* was the official name of the chief of one part of Tonga, which rather supports my view, as it is unlikely that one family would always provide the commander-in-chief.

I now leave the subject of the history of the secular rule by the heads of these two great families, and will refer to certain historical particulars concerning the relationship between the sacred and secular kingship, and the decline of the power of the sacred king.

I will begin with a general statement by Monfat as to the position of the *tuitonga* in the earlier period. Though of comparatively recent date, it is taken from unpublished historical accounts by missionaries kept in the archives of the Société de Marie at Lyons, material which I regret to say I have not been able to see, as I could not undertake a special journey to Lyons for the purpose. According to this account, in their palmy days—for they have degenerated greatly, and have now disappeared—the *tuitonga* partake of the nature of the divinity, and are also his priests, the representatives and living temples, the image and incarnation. In them the civil and political power is exalted and sanctified by the divine power; wherefore their authority is boundless. They dispose of the goods, the bodies, and the consciences of their subjects, without ceremony and without rendering account to anyone. *Tuitonga* appears, and all prostrate themselves and kiss his feet. He speaks, and all are silent, listening with the most respectful attention; and when he has finished, all cry *Koe! Koe!* (It is true). The Tongans refuse him nothing, exceeding his desires. If he wishes to satisfy his anger or some cruel fancy, he sends a messenger to his victim who, far from fleeing, goes to meet death. You will see fathers tie the rope round the necks of their children, whose death is demanded to prolong the life of this divinity;

<sup>1</sup> *Vide et cf.* d'Urville, *Astro.* vol. IV, pp. 96, 393. Rowe, p. 98. Wilkes, vol. III, pp. 17 sq.

more than once you will see the child smile as it is being killed<sup>1</sup>. The apparent confusion in tense in this statement will be noticed; but it is obvious that the reference to the degeneration and disappearance of the *tuitonga* refers to the period when the account was written, and the description of the *tuitonga*, though written dramatically in the present tense, refers to the past. This knowledge of the past presumably relates to a period prior to that of these missionaries, and is based upon traditions acquired by them from the people. The most important part of the statement for my present purpose is that which touches the secular and political power.

I now turn to some detailed historical evidence; but I must say in advance that it presents many difficulties and uncertainties, especially as regards identification of names and relationships, and it must not be assumed that the interpretations I put on these matters are always correct. The importance of these names is that sometimes it is only by identifying the people referred to that we can follow the bearing of the evidence upon the question of sacred and secular rule. When Cook visited Tongatabu in 1777 the *tuitonga* was Paulaho or, according to Thomson, Bau<sup>2</sup>; the name of his family, sometimes applied to himself, was Futtafaihe<sup>3</sup>. The *tuikanokubolu*, and perhaps *tuihaatakalaua*, was Mariwagui (Maealiuaki)<sup>4</sup>; he was father-in-law to the *tuitonga*<sup>5</sup>. There were also two other very important personages, Tubu and Finau-Ulukulala. Tubu was the brother of Mariwagui<sup>6</sup>. Finau has been referred to as the son of Mariwagui<sup>7</sup> and as the son of Tubu, adopted by Mumui<sup>8</sup>, who was a younger brother of Mariwagui and Tubu<sup>9</sup>. Possibly these discrepancies are due in part to lack of knowledge of the classificatory system of relationship<sup>10</sup>. Cook refers to the supreme position of dignity of Paulaho and his son, as com-

<sup>1</sup> Monfat, *Tonga*, pp. 13 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* pp. 321, 396. They are the same person. Cf. Caillot, *Mythes*, p. 306.

<sup>3</sup> Cook, vol. v, p. 425. It is clear from many sources that this was the family name of the *tuitonga*.

<sup>4</sup> D'Urville, *Astro.* vol. iv, p. 93. Cf. Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 316. Cook, vol. v, p. 314. See West, p. 56.

<sup>5</sup> Cook, vol. v, p. 320.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 317.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 424. Ellis (Cook), vol. i, p. 176.

<sup>8</sup> D'Urville, *Astro.* vol. iv, pp. 94 sq.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 184. I am not sure that references to Mumui all apply to the same person.

<sup>10</sup> Other writers touch this question of the relationship between these people; but the evidence is confused and contradictory.

pared with the other principal chiefs, and says he saw both Mariwagui and Tubu offer obeisance to Paulaho's son, who was, it may be noted, Mariwagui's grandson<sup>1</sup>. Ellis, one of Cook's company, speaks of Paulaho's authority as absolute in almost every respect, though in some measure curbed by Finau and Tubu<sup>2</sup>. Turning now to the civil ruler, Mariwagui, Cook says he was of the first consequence in the place, superior in a way to Paulaho; but he was old—he appeared to be above 60—and lived very much in retirement<sup>3</sup>. Ellis puts his age at 70<sup>4</sup>. Tubu controlled the food supply. He presided over the food *tabu*; that is, he and his deputies inspected all the produce of the island of Tonga-tabu, taking care that every man should plant and cultivate his quota, ordering what should, and should not, be eaten, and so securing the provision of the requisite quantity of food and preventing waste<sup>5</sup>. He would order a supply of yams from one place, and of fish from another, and so on; and his orders were instantly obeyed, as though he were absolute master of people's property<sup>6</sup>. If he saw a probability of one species of provisions falling short, he would put a *tabu* upon its consumption till the following season<sup>7</sup>; his restraining power was specially enforced when there was a lack of food, arising from lavish consumption—as, for example, in entertaining visitors<sup>8</sup>, from war<sup>9</sup>, or after a great festival, such as the *inaji*<sup>10</sup>. Mariwagui, Tubu and Finau each acted like a petty sovereign, and frequently thwarted the measures of the *tuitonga* Paulaho—a matter of which he often complained; and the courts of Mariwagui and Tubu were equal in splendour to that of Paulaho<sup>11</sup>. Finau Ulukalala was the hereditary chief of the island of Vavau<sup>12</sup>. He was the generalissimo, and commanded the warriors, when called out for service. He was also head of the police, punishing all offenders, whether against the state or individuals; and Paulaho told Cook that if he (Paulaho) became a bad man, Finau would kill him; by which Cook understood him to mean that, if he did not govern according to law or custom, Finau would be ordered by the other great men, or by the people at large, to put him to death<sup>13</sup>. Finau was often

<sup>1</sup> Cook, vol. v, p. 320.

<sup>3</sup> Cook, vol. v, pp. 314, 317.

<sup>5</sup> Cook, vol. v, p. 428.

<sup>7</sup> Ellis (Cook), vol. i, p. 114.

<sup>9</sup> Cook, vol. vi, p. 140.

<sup>11</sup> Cook, vol. v, p. 424.

<sup>13</sup> Cook, vol. v, p. 429. Cf. Ellis (Cook), vol. i, p. 114.

<sup>2</sup> Ellis (Cook), vol. i, p. 114.

<sup>4</sup> Ellis (Cook), vol. i, p. 77.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 352.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 114 sq.

<sup>10</sup> Mariner, vol. ii, p. 187.

<sup>12</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 313.

sent from Tongatabu to the other islands on warlike expeditions or to decide differences<sup>1</sup>. He appeared to Cook to be highest in authority after Mariwagui and Tubu<sup>2</sup>. Thomson suggests that Finau had in fact raised himself to a position of greater power than that of his father the *tuikanokubolu* himself<sup>3</sup>. Indeed the nobles of Vavau appear to have held a somewhat independent position; and the Finau family in particular were men of strong personal character and individuality, and seem to have acknowledged the *tuikanokubolu* as their suzerain from inclination rather than from necessity<sup>4</sup>. Finau, when he first met Cook, actually assumed the title of king; and it was not until Paulaho appeared that he admitted that the latter was his superior<sup>5</sup>.

Maurelle visited the Tongan islands in 1781. The *tuitonga* of that time was apparently the Paulaho of Cook's time<sup>6</sup>. He was treated by the people with the utmost deference and humility; but no indication is given of his temporal power<sup>7</sup>. Another great chief is referred to as being sovereign over forty-eight islands; but he did not seem to command the regard or respect which was accorded to the *tuitonga*<sup>8</sup>. I do not know who was the *tuikanokubolu* or *tuihaatakalaua*. Finau Ulukalala would be still living, if Thomson is right in identifying him with the Finau who is said to have died in 1790<sup>9</sup>.

In about 1784 the *tuitonga* Paulaho died, leaving a son, to whom the rank of *tuitonga* passed by inheritance. He would presumably be *tuitonga* Mau-lu-beko-tofa<sup>10</sup>. This son, however, who was only eleven years old in Cook's time (1777), was at his father's death still young; so his affairs came under the control of his mother<sup>11</sup>. I cannot say who was the *tuikanokubolu* or *tuihaatakalaua* at that time, though we are told that between Mariwagui (of Cook's time) and Mumui (of the Duff time) there was a *tuikanokubolu* called Mulikihaamea<sup>12</sup>, and West's list shows one of that name and three others<sup>13</sup>. The Finau

<sup>1</sup> Cook, vol. v, p. 300.

<sup>3</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 313.

<sup>5</sup> Cook, vol. v, pp. 300 sq., 308.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* vol. i, pp. 304 sq.

<sup>9</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 321.

<sup>10</sup> See Thomson, *op. cit.* p. 396. Caillot, *Mythes*, p. 306.

<sup>11</sup> Veesson, p. 77. Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 321. Cf. d'Urville, *Astro.* vol. iv, pp. 113 sq. [but see d'Entrecasteaux, vol. i, pp. 303 sq.].

<sup>12</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 322.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Caillot's two lists, *Mythes*, p. 307, in one of which Mulikihaamea appears before Mumui and Tukuaho, whilst in the other he comes after them.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 424.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 169.

<sup>6</sup> La Pérouse, vol. III, p. 295.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 323 sq.

would presumably be Cook's Finau Ulukalala, who is said to have died in 1790, and to have been succeeded by his brother under the same title<sup>1</sup>—that is, Finau Ulukalala<sup>2</sup>.

At this point in the history Finau Tukuaho appears upon the stage. He was evidently one of the Finau family; indeed we are told that he was the nephew of Finau Ulukalala of Cook's time<sup>3</sup>; but apparently he was Mumui's own son<sup>4</sup>; he was the ruling chief of the island of Eua<sup>5</sup>, and became, as we shall see, the rival of the second Finau Ulukalala<sup>6</sup>. A conflict took place between him and the widow of the *tuitonga* Paulaho. We are told that she was a tyrannical, ambitious woman, who tried to extend her power (that is, I take it, the power of her young son) beyond that previously held by the *tuitonga*, and in particular that she dismissed Tukuaho from his office, and nominated a successor; and that, though other chiefs submitted, Tukuaho resisted. According to another account, the quarrel arose through Tukuaho's having seized, and refused to give up, land of the deceased Paulaho, which she claimed for her son. Whatever was the cause, a conflict took place between him and her, in which she was defeated; and apparently he retained the land which he had seized, and she "lost the sovereignty," which he wrested from her<sup>7</sup>. Her son, the young *tuitonga*, was apparently still regarded as the chief of all the islands<sup>8</sup>, to whom the chiefs offered homage<sup>9</sup>, but his mother's defeat could hardly fail to diminish his temporal power, and apparently it did so<sup>10</sup>; indeed Thomson speaks of this event as a sign of the waning power of the *tuitonga*<sup>11</sup>.

At some time about this period the *tuikanokubolu* Mulikihaamea is said to have died; but whether this was before or after the event last recorded I cannot say. Tukuaho, who seems to have been a most ambitious man, then managed by scheming to secure the election of his own father, Mumui, to the position of *tuikanokubolu*<sup>12</sup>; and as the latter was then a very old man, this placed considerable power into the hands of Tukuaho himself<sup>13</sup>—a power which would be accentuated by the contemporaneous

<sup>1</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 331.

<sup>2</sup> Thomson's note, p. 77, in Edwards.

<sup>3</sup> Wilson, p. 269.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 235. Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 323. West, p. 56.

<sup>5</sup> Wilson, p. 269.

<sup>6</sup> Wilson, pp. 103, 248-69, 270. Veeson, p. 77. Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 321.

<sup>7</sup> Edwards, pp. 52 sq.

<sup>8</sup> Wilson, pp. liii, 269.

<sup>9</sup> Hamilton, pp. 88 sq.

<sup>10</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 321.

<sup>11</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 321.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* p. 322. See West's list, p. 56.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* p. 322.

loss of prestige of the *tuitonga*. According to Veeson, Tukuaho invested his father with the power wrested from the *tuitonga*<sup>1</sup>.

When d'Entrecasteaux visited Tonga in 1793 there was a *tuitonga* whom he called by the family name of Futtafaihe<sup>2</sup>. Labillardière (1793) says he was one of the sons of Paulaho<sup>3</sup>. Probably he was the Mau-lu-beko-tofa above mentioned: for the latter was a son of Paulaho<sup>4</sup>, and Thomson's list shows no other *tuitonga* between Bau and Fuanu Nuiava, who succeeded to the throne just before Mariner arrived at the Tongan islands in 1806. The aged Mumui was still the *tuikanokubolu*. He is spoken of by d'Entrecasteaux and Labillardière as Tubu<sup>5</sup>; but the two names apparently belonged to the same man<sup>6</sup>; Tubu seems to have been a sort of family name. The *tuitonga* still held the regal honours; but the *tuikanokubolu* family enjoyed the material advantages<sup>7</sup>. We are told of an episode referring to Finau. A sentinel of d'Entrecasteaux' party was wounded by a Tongan; and the great chief of the island came with his followers on board the French ship, bringing with them the culprit, whom they proposed to punish with death; and one of the party, "the warrior Finau, not disdaining to perform the office," was to carry out the sentence, and, indeed, raised his club over the victim's head with the intention of doing so<sup>8</sup>. This episode seems to suggest that the Finau of this date was, like his namesake of Cook's time, the bearer of the offices of general of the army, head of police and lord high executioner; and, indeed Labillardière speaks of him as "a chief of the warriors"<sup>9</sup>. It is noticeable also that he, like his predecessor, had as his superior, the *tuikanokubolu*, only an old and feeble man.

Labillardière says that he was told that Tubu was superior to Finau, and that the latter admitted it<sup>10</sup>. This Finau might be either Tukuaho or Ulukalala the second; the presumption is that he was the latter.

The missionary party of the *Duff* reached the islands in 1797. At that time the *tuitonga* was the son of Paulaho (spoken of by Thomson under his individual name of Mau-lu-beko-tofa<sup>11</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> Veeson, p. 77.

<sup>2</sup> D'Entrecasteaux, vol. 1, p. 306. Labillardière, vol. II, p. 98.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* <sup>4</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 321.

<sup>5</sup> D'Entrecasteaux, vol. 1, pp. 284 sq. Labillardière, vol. II, p. 177.

<sup>6</sup> D'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. II, p. 53. This increases the doubt as to his identity

<sup>7</sup> D'Entrecasteaux, vol. 1, pp. 306 sq. Cf. Labillardière, vol. II, p. 177.

<sup>8</sup> Labillardière, vol. II, p. 116. Cf. d'Entrecasteaux, vol. 1, pp. 282 sqq.

<sup>9</sup> Labillardière, vol. II, p. 94. <sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* p. 114.

<sup>11</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 321; see his list on p. 396.

by Wilson under his family name of Futtafaihe<sup>1</sup>); the *tuikanokubolu* was the aged Mumui, but he died in that same year, and his son Finau Tukuaho succeeded him<sup>2</sup>.

There are numerous references to the respective powers of these people at this time; and the following is, I think, a fair summary of them. The *tuitonga* (Mau-lu-beko-tofa) had apparently lost none of his nominal and religious superiority over the *tuikanokubolu*. His rank and divinity were still recognized<sup>3</sup>; all paid homage to him<sup>4</sup>, this exceeding the homage paid to the *tuikanokubolu*<sup>5</sup>; he was, after the *tuikanokubolu*, the most powerful chief in the island of Tonga<sup>6</sup>. He also, apparently, had temporal power over the district of Mua, which as we have seen, was his own family district; but he could not punish a wrongdoer outside that district<sup>7</sup>. This last statement would not amount to much in the case of a powerful secular king, who might be more or less unable to interfere with the internal affairs of a district within the dominions of one of his great chiefs; but, if we compare it with Monfat's information as to the original power of the *tuitonga*, the difference is obvious. According to Wilson, the government had apparently been formerly more in the hands of the *tuitonga* family than it was then<sup>8</sup>; and he suggests that the *tuitonga* had lost temporal power through his voluptuous habits<sup>9</sup>. Nevertheless, though the *tuikanokubolu*, inferior in dignity, was superior to him in command, he had great authority in the whole Tongan group<sup>10</sup>.

The *tuikanokubolu* (Tukuaho) was then the commander-in-chief<sup>11</sup>, the real power and authority was vested in him, and the government was chiefly conducted by him. His father Mumui had been generally esteemed as king of the whole island of Tongatabu<sup>12</sup>, and he himself apparently became so on his father's death<sup>13</sup>. But he had extended his powers further; he was the greatest warrior, a terror, not only to the chiefs of Tongatabu, but to those of the adjacent islands; and he had brought the latter also under subjection, and had further strengthened his power with the chiefs by making them his

<sup>1</sup> Wilson, p. 384.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 235. Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 323. See West, p. 56

<sup>3</sup> Wilson, p. 109.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 384.

<sup>5</sup> Veeson, p. 159.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 77.

<sup>7</sup> Wilson, pp. 96, 109, 269.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 269.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. liii.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* p. 384.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* pp. liii, 384.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 96 sq. Veeson, p. 71.

<sup>13</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 323.

companions and friends<sup>1</sup>. Presumably he was the chief of whom La Pérouse says that he did not seem to command the regard or respect which was accorded to the *tuitonga*, but was the ruler of 48 islands<sup>2</sup>, by which would be meant the islands and islets of the Tongan group. Finau Ulukalala the second was living then, but the statement that the *tuikanokubolu* was commander-in-chief suggests that this Finau did not occupy the official position which his brother had held. Indeed this is unlikely, for he and the *tuikanokubolu* were rivals.

I have already referred to the despotic rights in their own districts exercised by the *tuitonga*, the *tuihaatakalaua* and the *tuikanokubolu*. It is said, however, that the districts of the *tuitonga* and of Vaharlo (who I have suggested was probably the *tuihaatakalaua*) were also subject to the control of the *tuikanokubolu*, and they acknowledged him as their superior<sup>3</sup>. I presume the position was that, while each of the three was a despot in his own district, a certain amount of control over the whole island was vested in the reigning *hau* for the time being; and of course the sacred authority, and presumably the still remaining secular power of the *tuitonga* would be equally extensive in area.

Finau Ulukalala the second was then a rival of the *tuikanokubolu* Tukuaho; but apparently he was, when the latter was developing his increasing powers in Tongatabu, occupied with affairs at Haapai<sup>4</sup>.

Veeson, who was one of the *Duff* party, says that the *tuitonga* was at that period performing the functions of high priest, and that he not only personated the god who gave them their crops, but conversed and interceded with him, acting as their mediator, to insure them plenty<sup>5</sup>.

The *tuikanokubolu* (Tukuaho) was a man of savage cruelty, and hated by his people; instances of his brutality are given<sup>6</sup>. A plot for his assassination was planned by Finau Ulukalala the second, at that time tributary chief of Haapai, and his brother Tubu Nuha, then a tributary chief of Vavau<sup>7</sup>. The circumstances of this murder touch the position at that time of the *tuitonga*, for according to Monfat, who, though a com-

<sup>1</sup> Wilson, p. 103. Veeson, pp. 79 sq. Cf. Mariner, vol. 1, p. 88.

<sup>2</sup> La Pérouse, vol. 1, pp. 323 sq. <sup>3</sup> Veeson, p. 72.

<sup>4</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* pp. 321 sq. Cf. Wilson, p. 269.

<sup>5</sup> Veeson, pp. 152, 158 sq.

<sup>6</sup> Wilson, p. 248. Mariner, vol. 1, p. 80.

<sup>7</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 324; cf. Veeson, p. 160; Mariner, vol. 1, pp. 80 sq.



paratively modern writer, obtained his information from MS. notes by the Catholic missionaries, the conspirators, before carrying out the murder, secured the assurance of *tuitonga's* consent, which he actually gave, and after the murder Tubu Nuha (one of the assailants) went to Tongatabu "to try to secure the good graces of the *tuitonga*, or perhaps to obtain the succession from him," though he did not succeed<sup>1</sup>. The murder seems to have been carried out at the time of the annual *inaji* ceremony in the year 1799, Tubu Nuha being the actual murderer<sup>2</sup>. Thomson thinks that on the death of Tukuahaho the hopes of his party were centred on Mulikihaamea, then "the most important executive chief in the island"; but that to their dismay he went over to Finau's party<sup>3</sup>. He thinks, however, that Finau had probably been assured of Mulikihaamea's support before he ventured to fight<sup>4</sup>. According to Veelson, the intention of the Finau party seems to have been that Mulikihaamea should be made *tuikanokubolu*<sup>5</sup>. This person can hardly have been the suggested predecessor of Mumui; according to Thomson and West and one of Caillot's lists, he came before Mumui and Tukuahao, whilst in Caillot's other list, he followed next after Tukuahao<sup>6</sup>.

Fighting then took place in Tongatabu between Finau's party and that of the murdered *tuikanokubolu*, in which the former swept the country, driving the enemy before them, and, though Mulikihaamea was killed, Finau afterwards routed the enemy; after which he returned to his own islands of Haapai, of which, after further fighting, he was declared "king"; and he afterwards attacked Vavau, which, after a desultory war, submitted to him<sup>7</sup>; and he was declared king of this island also, and appointed Tubu Nuha his tributary chief of it<sup>8</sup>. D'Urville says the *tuitonga* sided with Finau in the matter of the murder. In doing so he refers to him as being named Fuanu-Nuiava<sup>9</sup>.

The late *tuikanokubolu*, Tukuahao, had, according to Mariner, left neither son nor brother to succeed him; but he left several relations, each of whom put in claims to the succession; and

<sup>1</sup> Monfat, *Tonga*, pp. 21 sq.

<sup>2</sup> L.M.S., *Trans.* vol. 1, p. 281. Veelson, pp. 160 sq., 163. Mariner, vol. 1, pp. 80 sq. Thomson, *D.P.M.* pp. 324-6. Monfat, *Tonga*, p. 21.

<sup>3</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 325.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 326.

<sup>5</sup> Veelson, p. 160.

<sup>6</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 322. West, p. 56. Caillot, *Mythes*, p. 307.

<sup>7</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* pp. 325-8, 330 sq. Mariner, vol. 1, pp. 82-7.

<sup>8</sup> Mariner, vol. 1, pp. 86 sq.

<sup>9</sup> D'Urville, *Astro.* vol. IV, p. 91.

contention ensued in which the island of Tongatabu was soon divided into several petty states<sup>1</sup>. Thomson, however, says that Tukuaho was nominally succeeded by one Maafulimulou (his relationship is not stated)<sup>2</sup>, and that, upon his death a few months later, Tukuaho's "eldest surviving son," Tubu-malohi<sup>3</sup>, was proclaimed *tuikanokubolu*, though he was a "king without subjects"<sup>4</sup>. Sarah Farmer refers to the succession of Tubu-malohi, but says he was the brother, and not the son, of Tukuaho<sup>5</sup>. Whatever the facts may have been, as to all this, we know that the island of Tongatabu was plunged into civil war<sup>6</sup>; that Tubu-malohi was quite unable to establish his ascendancy there<sup>7</sup> and that Finau, with his Haapai people, supported by Tubu Nuha and the Vavau people, made repeated attacks upon some or others of the chiefs of Tongatabu, though without success<sup>8</sup>. We are also told that the *tuikanokubolu*, Tubu-malohi, after a flight from his Tongan subjects, and an absence of nearly five years in Fiji, returned to Tongatabu, and built himself a fortress on the hill at Nukualofa<sup>9</sup>, a place shown in all the maps on the northern coast of the island, in or near his family district of Hifo.

The *Port-au-Prince* arrived at the Haapai islands and was seized and destroyed by the natives in 1806, and here commence the adventures of Mariner. At that time Finau Ulukalala the second ruled over the Haapai and Vavau islands. Mariner calls him the *hau*, which indeed he was, *de facto*, as regarded the islands under his control; but Tongatabu, the old seat of the sacred and secular kings of the Tongan Islands, and centre of government of the group, though in a state of turmoil within itself, was in no way under the control of Finau; and the actual *hau* or *tuikanokubolu*, though bereft of his power, was alive and established in his fortress at Nukualofa. The *tuitonga* was Futtafehi Fuanu-Nui-ava<sup>10</sup>; but Futtafehi was, as already stated, only a family name<sup>11</sup>. He was living, not in the much disturbed

<sup>1</sup> Mariner, vol. 1, p. 87.

<sup>2</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 333. His name does not appear in West's list (p. 56), but it does in both of Caillot's lists (*Mythes*, p. 307).

<sup>3</sup> This name appears in all the lists. In West's list it is next after that of Tukuaho. In Caillot's lists the name of Mulikihaamea comes between them.

<sup>4</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 333.

<sup>5</sup> S. Farmer, p. 123.

<sup>6</sup> Mariner, vol. 1, p. 87.

<sup>7</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 333.

<sup>8</sup> Mariner, vol. 1, p. 87. See also Thomson, *D.P.M.* pp. 331, 333.

<sup>9</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 333.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 30, 340. See Thomson's list, p. 396, and Caillot's list, *Mythes*, p. 306.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Mariner, vol. II, p. 83. Edwards, p. 52 n. 1 (by Thomson).

island of Tongatabu, but in one of the Haapai islands<sup>1</sup>. His predecessor, Mau-lu-beko-tofa, had only recently died.

Finau had from time to time been making descents on Tongatabu, and one of the first events after the arrival of Mariner, was an expedition by Finau against the fort of Nukualofa, which he destroyed; but he did not follow up this advantage and returned to Haapai<sup>2</sup>.

Mariner was aware that Finau had obtained his power by usurpation in some way of the then reigning family of *hau*; but he discusses the descent of Finau in connection with his possible right to the throne, not from the point of view of his relationship to a previous *tuikanokubolu* and election to office, but largely from his kinship with previous *tuitonga*<sup>3</sup> which was not the correct basis. As a matter of fact, Finau's power did not extend to Tongatabu, but was confined to the northern islands; he had not been elected *tuikanokubolu*, though he tried to secure ascendancy in Tongatabu; but he was not, from the point of view of succession, an outsider, as he is said to have been the son of the earlier *tuikanokubolu*, Maaliuaki, and was at all events a member of the *tuikanokubolu* family; and he fortified his position by complying with a custom of marrying his daughter to the *tuitonga*<sup>4</sup>.

Turning now to the position of the *tuitonga* at this time, Mariner tells us that Finau had done away entirely with all the ceremonies formerly considered due to his divine character<sup>5</sup>. He was still, however, acknowledged as having been descended from the chief gods who had formerly visited the islands of Tonga, but his high rank in society and the respect shown to him were wholly of a religious character. Even Finau, if he met him, had to show his respect by sitting down on the ground until he had passed<sup>6</sup>; but he had, comparatively, very little absolute power, which extended in a direct and positive manner only over his own family and attendants<sup>7</sup>. I may say as to this that I do not find in Mariner's record a single example of the exercise by the *tuitonga* of any temporal power whatever. Indeed we are told that, when *tuitonga* ventured to advise Finau as to some warlike proceedings, Finau replied "My Lord *tuitonga* may return to his own part of the island, and content himself in peace and security; matters of war are my concern,

<sup>1</sup> Mariner, vol. 1, p. 117.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* vol. II, pp. 88 sq.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* vol. II, p. 83.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 96-9. Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 333.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* vol. 1, pp. 121 sqq.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 84.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 86.

in which he has no right to interfere"<sup>1</sup>; and *tuitonga* submitted to the snub. It is, I think, clear that at this stage of the history any temporal power which the *tuitonga* might have possessed in the past must have sunk to a very low ebb; it is stated that Finau even regarded the institution of a *tuitonga* as useless, and was seriously proposing to abolish the *inaji*, the great annual presentation of food to the gods, in the person of *tuitonga*, as the sacred god-descended chief<sup>2</sup>. Mariner says that the *tuitonga* did not even appear ever to be inspired<sup>3</sup>. I may also point out that he was living in one of the Haapai islands, instead of his sacred residence at Mua in Tongatabu, a circumstance which must have been against him. His connivance with Finau and Tubu Nuha in the murder of the *tuikanokubolu* Tukuaho might well prevent his return to Tongatabu. All this would militate against his position, both in Tongatabu and in the Vavau and Haapai islands; but intrigues against the power of the *tuitonga* by Finau would, mainly at all events, affect it in the latter islands, as Finau had no power in Tongatabu.

Finau Ulukalala the second died and was succeeded by his son Finau Moengangono. This monarch actually carried out the plan which his father had proposed, and put an end [so far, this would be, as the Vavau and Haapai islands were concerned] to the ceremony of *inaji*, thus depriving the *tuitonga* of the very valuable offerings which were given to him at the ceremony<sup>4</sup>. Finau's name, like that of his father, does not appear in any of the lists of the *tuikanokubolu*, no doubt because they were not legitimate successors, and in fact in no way ruled in Tongatabu. It is, perhaps, surprising that it should have been possible for Finau to make a sudden change of this sort, which must have struck, more or less, at the very heart of the religious beliefs of the people. Specious arguments were not wanting, however; the *inaji* offerings were a great expense, and indeed they must have been a severe tax in times of insufficient food supply; the island of Tongatabu had, owing to political troubles, been deprived for years of the presence and influence of a *tuitonga*, without apparently suffering in consequence; and, if so, why was he so important to the other islands? By such contentions as these Finau succeeded in convincing his chiefs and *matabule* and the older members of society; and ultimately the people came round also<sup>5</sup>. One is

<sup>1</sup> Mariner, vol. II, pp. 125 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Mariner, vol. II, p. 125.

<sup>2</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 338.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 27.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 27 sq.

tempted to think that at this period the religious beliefs of the more influential people cannot have been very deep rooted; and indeed this idea is supported by their submission to Finau Ulukalala the second, who was, and was known, at all events by his intimates, to be a great unbeliever<sup>1</sup>.

It is obvious that this must have been a most severe blow to the prestige of the *tuitonga*, as regards, not merely his temporal power, but also, in a way, the sanctity of his rank and office; indeed his official position must, one would think, have been practically at an end, more especially as he (that is, *tuitonga* Nui-ava of Mariner's time) did not officiate as a priest. And the fact that no terrible visitation by the gods seems to have fallen upon the people in punishment for this terrible crime may well have removed the fears even of the most timorous.

I do not propose, in considering subsequent events, to trouble with names; but will content myself with quoting writers' comments on the subject of the *tuitonga*. D'Urville (1827) says that the *tuitonga* of his day [Lau-fili, the son of Nui-ava] lived in Vavau. Not having been consecrated at Mua, as the custom of the country required, his divine character as *tuitonga* was contested; many important chiefs were opposed to his return [to Tongatabu], and he lost much in public opinion because his father had sided with Finau against Tongatabu<sup>2</sup>. The executive power and command of the troops belonged to the *tuikanokubolu*, and the *tuitonga* could not interfere<sup>3</sup>. All this would refer to loss of position in Tongatabu itself. Bays (1829) says that the *tuitonga's* [Lau-fili's] local residence was in either the Haapai or Vavau islands; his office was merely nominal, and most of his time was spent in going from island to island and place to place, wholly indifferent to any national concerns whatever. Nevertheless his title was higher than that of the acting king, who had all the power<sup>4</sup>. Waldegrave (1830) refers to the two kings. He says the *tuitonga* was regarded as being superior, as he was believed to have been descended from a spirit; he was a state king, living at Mua, and it was the duty of the people to respect him, and to provide him with food, houses, wives and concubines; but his power was only nominal, as he was not permitted to fight or command in war or to give counsel. Next to him came the other king, superior

<sup>1</sup> See Mariner, vol. 1, pp. 292 sq., 338 sq.

<sup>2</sup> D'Urville, *Astro.* vol. IV, p. 92.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 81.

<sup>4</sup> Bays, p. 111.

in war and in council, who led the armies, made treaties and made peace<sup>1</sup>. This also refers to *tuitonga* Lau-fili, who did, after d'Urville's time, return to Tongatabu. Monfat, speaking of the period of about 1842, says that, though the ancient office was greatly discredited, it still had prestige. The *tuitonga* [Lau-fili] was always visited by the chiefs of the islands, and his precedence at feasts was never contested<sup>2</sup>. The missionary Wilson (1843) says the *tuitonga* [Lau-fili] was the greatest person in all Tonga; he lived retired, and adored by all the people, and the king might be regarded as his acting man, having the power to rule<sup>3</sup>. Pigéard (1843) says the primitive religion was in great part abandoned. The high priest, whose title had become insignificant, was called *tuitonga* [still Lau-fili]. He had been formerly the supreme chief of the archipelago, and was said to be of the blood of the gods; but his authority had become annulled on the seizing of power by the successor of Finau, and it was then (1843) limited to a right of veto, which was almost illusory, and a great veneration inspired in all<sup>4</sup>. Home (1849) was told by the *tuitonga* that he did not meddle in matters of state<sup>5</sup>. Erskine (1849) says that, though the *tui-kanokubolu* had the right to rule in Tonga, the *tuitonga* [Lau-fili] was higher; he was regarded as a kind of sacred personage, above the cares of government<sup>6</sup>. He refers to the refusal of the "heathen party" in Tonga to acquiesce in the abrogation of the *tuitonga's* office, which was still held by a descendant of the family, though his inauguration had never been fully completed. Some efforts had been made by that party to set him up in opposition to George as a temporal sovereign<sup>7</sup>. The George here mentioned would be George Tubu, who succeeded Josiah Tubu. It looks as if there had been some further efforts at this time to get rid of the *tuitonga*. Poupinel (1858) speaks of *tuitonga* [Lau-fili?] as having formerly had all the temporal and spiritual authority, and says he was regarded as a demi-god and was the object of a kind of cult<sup>8</sup>. Elloy (1877) says all the authority of the *tuitonga*, who had become Roman Catholic, had passed into the hands of King George; and if they still enjoyed the respect of their former subjects, they no longer exercised any influence in the administration<sup>9</sup>. Finally I come

<sup>1</sup> Waldegrave, *J.R.G.S.* vol. III, p. 185.

<sup>2</sup> Monfat, *Tonga*, p. 258.

<sup>3</sup> Pigéard, *N.A.V.* vol. I, p. 183.

<sup>4</sup> Erskine, *J.R.G.S.* vol. XXI, p. 228.

<sup>5</sup> Poupinel, *A.P.F.* vol. XXXII, p. 108.

<sup>6</sup> *Miss. Notices*, N.S. vol. II, p. 628.

<sup>7</sup> Home, p. 587.

<sup>8</sup> Erskine, p. 129.

<sup>9</sup> Elloy, *A.P.F.* vol. L, p. 453.

to Thomson, who says that, even so late as 1890, Futtafaihe, as a chief of spiritual line, enjoyed the highest consideration... after the king, and to him alone, besides the king, was a special language used<sup>1</sup>; and to Baessler (1895) who says that even in King George's day he, as *tuikanokubolu* had to show marks of respect to *tuitonga*; and "even nowadays" Lavinia, the daughter of the last *tuitonga*, and her descendants took a higher rank than the king; at various ceremonies at the grave of King George precedence was due to her, and not to the new ruler<sup>2</sup>.

The subject of the separation of the sacred and secular rule will be discussed after we have seen the evidence as to the custom in other islands. I am for the moment only considering the decline of the power of the *tuitonga*. The evidence seems to indicate that, though in early days he may have applied himself more especially to the duties of his sacred office he had also great over-riding power or influence in controlling affairs. We have the general statement by Monfat with which I opened the discussion of this matter. We have Ellis' statement that in Cook's time his authority, though in some measure curbed by Finau and Tubu, was absolute in almost every respect. His position must have been somewhat undermined by his mother's unsuccessful conflict with Finau Tukuaho and its consequences. But we have Wilson's statement that at the time of the *Duff* missionaries, in spite of a loss of past temporal power, he had great authority in the whole Tongan group, and Veeson's statement that he was then performing the functions of high priest. Then there is the evidence that shortly afterwards the conspirators plotting the assassination of the *tuikanokubolu* Tukuaho first secured his approval, and that after the assassination one of them sought his subsequent support. The evidence of the obtaining of his approval of an act which would be sure, as in fact it did, to lead to war between the *tuikanokubolu* family and Finau is rendered the more interesting by the fact, to which I shall refer hereafter, that in Mangaia any party proposing to commence internal warfare had first to obtain the consent of the sacred king of Mangaia, in his capacity of high priest of the great god Rongo. Passing to Mariner's time, it must be noted that in Tongatabu the *tuitonga*, who had sanctioned the murder, by the usurping Finau Ulukalala the second, of Haapai and Tubu Nuha of Vavau, of the reigning *tuikanokubolu*, who was

<sup>1</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* pp. 45 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Baessler, *S.B.* p. 301.

not living in his sacred dwelling place at Mua, or even in Tongatabu, and was concerting, or at least consorting, with Finau Ulukalala the second in his attacks on Tongatabu, was hardly likely to be regarded with favour; and as Finau himself, who had secured control of both the Haapai and Vavau islands, and does not appear to have been an orthodox believer of the old Tongan faith<sup>1</sup>, seems to have done his best to undermine the power and influence of the *tuitonga*, and his efforts were further developed by his son and successor, the position of the *tuitonga* must have been greatly weakened in these islands also. Then later on we have d'Urville's reference to *tuitonga* Lau-fili who had not been consecrated at Mua—a grave blot in his title—and who was living in Vavau, instead of at Mua. Finally we have the conversion of the *tuitonga* to Christianity, which must have been a deadly blow to the position of the king whose power was based upon beliefs as to his descent from the Tongan gods, and upon the great sanctity attributed to him and his ancestors. On this point Monfat, speaking of the year 1847, refers to the efforts of the French missionaries to convert the *tuitonga*, who was "at the same time the priest and the god," and says that with their success in this the old cult died<sup>2</sup>.

The evidence shows a decline, more or less gradual, in the power and influence of the *tuitonga*, commencing apparently about the beginning of last century, and culminating with his conversion to Christianity in the middle of it. During the second half of last century he still received a considerable amount of deferential respect, and any apparent inconsistencies in statements by writers as to the extent of this respect may be due largely to the way in which writers have been struck by the situation as they saw it. I may point out that not only would old beliefs as to his special sanctity take some time to die out, but, even when they had done so, there would remain beliefs as to the ancient lineage of his family, older than that of any other family in Tonga, and these by themselves would, in accordance with what appears to have been a wide spread Polynesian practice, suffice to secure for him a continuation of great deferential respect and priority to all others on ceremonial occasions.

We have, up to this point, been considering the subject of the political system of Tonga primarily and mainly with

<sup>1</sup> The very fact of his daring to treat the *tuitonga* as he did suggests that this must have been so.

<sup>2</sup> Monfat, *Tonga*, pp. 258, 307.



reference to the island of Tongatabu; but I will now say something about the other islands, the main question being the extent to which they were connected with Tongatabu and its rulers. For this purpose I shall have to draw attention again to certain matters to which I have referred already. I commence the matter by referring to the legends as to the origin of the *tuitonga*, and the subsequent creation of the names, first of *tuihaatakalaua* and then of *tuikanokubolu*, and to the specific association of the three great families of whom these were the chiefs with districts of Tongatabu, the island where, as Mariner has told us, the greatest Tongan chiefs had from time immemorial been accustomed to make their principal place of residence and had been buried in the tombs of their ancestors. We may well believe that in the distant past Tongatabu, always considered, as Mariner says, the most noble of the Tongan islands, had been the great central Tongan home and scene of action of the Tangaroans, as I have called them, and the centre of control at all events, of the other islands of the Tongan group. The power of their god-descended, divine king, the *tuitonga*, would extend over all these islands, and must have done so ever afterwards so long as he retained it; indeed we have seen the legend, according to which in the very distant past his jurisdiction had not only included all the Tongan group, but extended to Samoa, Fotuna and Wallis Island. Probably this refers to the days when the Tangaroans had spread out from their Fijian and Tongan centres to these other islands. D'Urville says that his influence extended throughout the whole of the Tongan group<sup>1</sup>; and the whole history of Tonga shows that it did so. In particular it is clear that all the islands shared in presenting the enormous offerings to him, as representing the god, at the great annual *inaji* festival. Up to this point there cannot, I think, be the slightest doubt; but when we come to the question of government or control by secular kings or chiefs, the matter is not quite so simple.

It seems reasonable, I may almost say, to assume, that in the earlier days of these secular kings and for a considerable period, before the old Tongan populations had increased greatly and become split up into numerous groups and subgroups, any local chiefs of these other islands would be more or less close relations of the great chiefs of Tongatabu, and their families would be branches of the families of the latter, in which case,

<sup>1</sup> D'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. II, p. 47. Cf. Edwards, pp. 52 sq.

whatever local power these minor chiefs might have, they would, as junior branches, be under some control by the superior chiefs of the main trunk families in Tongatabu. When, however, we reach the period at which true history commences, the populations of these other islands must have increased considerably; leading chiefs of those islands, supported by their sub-chiefs—probably relations—and their subjects, would become more powerful, and tend to become more independent. The close connection for governmental purposes between Tongatabu and the other islands, other than that involved by the powers of the *tuitonga*, might well have become somewhat loosened. Some of the evidence already quoted touches the matter, as, for instance, Thomson's statement that the nobles of Vavau seemed to have held a somewhat independent position. We have seen that Finau Tukuaho, when *tuikanokubolu*, had brought the other islands of the Tongan group under his subjection, which implies some previous independence, and it may well be believed that he himself, as a conquering military king, would then engage in acts of secular control over them; probably he is the person to whom the *Duff* missionaries, whose visit was at about this period, refer as "commander-in-chief" in saying that Tongatabu was the centre of government of a large number of islands, most, if not all, of which were regularly visited by the sovereign (by which, I take it, was meant the *tuitonga*) or commander-in-chief, and that it bore an unrivalled sovereignty over the whole group. We also have Poupinel's statement with reference to the Tongan archipelago, as he calls it, that, though there were under the *tuitonga*, who reigned over all the islands, a number of subordinate chiefs ruling their own respective areas, often one of these succeeded in subjecting his peers, sometimes going so far as to subjugate the whole archipelago, leaving the supreme chief (that is the *tuitonga*) only the honours and a nominal dignity. The implication which this involves is that secular rule by one chief over all the islands occurred, but was not usual; and, setting aside what may be regarded as modern times affected by white influence, Finau Tukuaho is the only *hau* of Tongatabu whom I have been able to identify as having secured this in historical times. Assuming for the purpose of discussion that the chiefs of these other islands were not generally under the rule of the secular *hau* of Tongatabu, the question arises who were these chiefs. Our information as to this is very scrappy, and only touches a

comparatively short period of history. We have seen that Finau Tukuaho, who ultimately schemed himself into the position of *tuikanokubolu*, had been the ruling chief of Eua, an island near to Tongatabu, and, that Finau Ulukalala the second and his brother Tubu Nuha, who arranged and carried out the assassination of Tukuaho, were the tributary chiefs of Haapai and Vavau respectively; so we have information as to chieftainship at one period of the whole of the Tongan group. Who were these men? The history has disclosed some uncertainty as to Finau Ulukalala the first; but the only doubt arising from discrepancy of statements seems to be whether he was the son of the *tuikanokubolu* Mariwagui or of Tubu, the brother of Mariwagui. We can at least assume that he was an important member of the Kanokubolu family, and Finau Ulukalala the second is said to have been brother of Finau Ulukalala the first; Finau Tukuaho is said to have been the son of Mumui; and Tubu Nuha is spoken of as the brother of Finau Ulukalala the second. We must not assume the exactitude of all these relationships, especially in view of the probable lack of knowledge by the recording writers of classificatory systems of relationship, and, indeed, we have seen discrepancies; but I think we are on fairly safe ground if we assume that these Finaus were members of a branch or branches of the Kanokubolu family. If this be so, we find that the chiefs of these outlying islands were the heads of families which were branches of the old original families of Tongatabu, a position similar to that of Samoa. Thomson refers to these chiefs of Haapai and Vavau as "tributary chiefs." I am not sure what he means by this; all the people of Tonga would be tributary to the *tuitonga* in the sense that they had to keep him in luxury and provide for all his wants, and would have to contribute to the offerings presented to him at the *inaji* ceremony; but these chiefs, being heads of branches of the Kanokubolu family of Tongatabu, and not merely conquered outsiders, would not as a rule be subject to obligations to the *tuikanokubolu* other than those of a branch to a parent stock. Of course, when the *hau* of Tongatabu had succeeded in securing a military dominion over these other islands, he might levy tribute of another character.

## CHAPTER V

### POLITICAL AREAS AND SYSTEMS

#### SOCIETY ISLANDS

THE Society Islands used to be divided in literature and maps into two groups. To the south-east was the Georgia group (sometimes called by Ellis the Windward Islands), comprising Tahiti, Eimeo (Moorea), Sir Charles Sanders Island (Tapamanu Island) and others; to the north-west was the Society Group (sometimes called by Ellis the Leeward Islands) comprising Ra'iatea (Ulietea), Huahine, Borabora, Tahaa, Marua and others<sup>1</sup>. Smith says that the entire Society group was anciently called Te Tahuhu, and that the name of the group, excluding Tahiti, was Te Aotea<sup>2</sup>. It is difficult to understand why this somewhat peculiar distinction should be made. Miss Henry says that the Windward Islands, including Tahiti, were named Hiti-i-ni'a (Upper border), whilst the Leeward islands, of which Ra'iatea is the centre, were called Hiti-i-raro (Lower border)<sup>3</sup>. Somewhat similar to this is a statement, derived from the Paumotuan island of Anaa, that the name for Tahiti was Hawaiki-tei-runga (which means the upper part), whilst that of Ra'iatea was Hawaiki-tei-raro (the under side)<sup>4</sup>. Again we find in a map, giving native names of islands, as learnt in Rarotonga, that Avaiki-runga covered the Society and Paumotuan groups, and Avaiki-raro was applied to the Fijian, Tongan and Samoan groups<sup>5</sup>.

#### TAHITI

The map of Tahiti in this book has been prepared by me after a comparison of some existing maps. One of these is that which appears in *The Voyage of the "Duff"*; another is by Garnier in *Océanie*; another is that (reduced from the French Admiralty Chart of 1876) appearing in Corney's *Quest and Occupation of Tahiti*, vol. III; another is contained in Baessler's *Neue Südsee-Bilder*. These maps differ somewhat, and it is evident that districts have had more than one name, or perhaps

<sup>1</sup> Ellis, vol. 1, p. 7.


<sup>2</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. xxvi, p. 115.

<sup>3</sup> T. Henry, *J.P.S.* vol. xx, pp. 4 sq.

<sup>4</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. xii, p. 239.

<sup>5</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. xx, p. 116.

# TAHITI



names have changed; I have, therefore, in one or two cases helped myself by reference to explanations of the positions of districts given in books. Under these circumstances my map can hardly be absolutely correct and it is not complete and detailed (I have not filled in names of villages, to which it is not necessary for me to refer); but I think it is sufficiently so for the purposes of this book.

Tahiti, by far the largest island of the group, is in shape something like an hour glass, being formed of two peninsulas, connected by a narrow isthmus. The larger peninsula, to the north-west, is almost circular, and the smaller one, to the south-east, is pear shaped. The larger peninsula has been called "Tahite Nui" or great Tahiti<sup>1</sup>. Cook called it "Obereano," in honour of the so called "Queen Oberea"<sup>2</sup> [Purea]. The smaller peninsula has been called "Tahiti iti" or little Tahiti<sup>3</sup>; but its native name is Tairapu.

The political division of the island in early days is explained by Ari'i Taimai (Mrs Salmon), in her account of its history. In those days no single chief ever had dominion over the whole island; and if any one chief tried to assert supreme authority and threatened the power of the others, the latter united to overthrow him. This state of affairs continued until about 1815, when Pomare II, having practically exterminated the chieftain class, might be regarded as king of Tahiti<sup>4</sup>. De Bovis, after asserting that no chief could claim to have subjugated the others, adds that chiefs sometimes obtained a superiority over their neighbours which resembled conquest, but a death or a war caused the districts to revert to their former limits<sup>5</sup>.

There were then what Ari'i Taimai calls "clans," and I propose for convenience to use this expression in quoting her, without considering for the present the suitability of the term. She says the Teva were the dominant clan<sup>6</sup>; indeed she looks upon their clanship as their distinguishing feature, they alone regarding themselves as a clan, and having a sort of union, weak at all times, but still real enough to make them unpopular outside their own limits<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Parkinson (1), p. 34.

<sup>2</sup> Cook, vol. I, p. 226; vol. III, p. 322, and other places.

<sup>3</sup> Parkinson (1), p. 34.

<sup>4</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 6 sq. Cf. Gaussin, pp. 122 sq.; Ribourt, p. 304; Turnbull, p. 327; Baessler, *N.S.B.* pp. 180 sq. I think I have seen references elsewhere also to the absence of any kingship of all Tahiti.

<sup>5</sup> De Bovis, p. 295.

<sup>6</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 2.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 8.

There was a legend as to the origin of this Teva clan, the scene of it being Vaiari (which we shall see was a Teva district) and Punaauia (which, though not a district of the Teva, was, as will appear, within the limits of their influence). The legend starts with the assumptions that before the first Teva existed, Vaiari and Punaauia already had their own chiefs and *marae* [temples] and that the Vaiari was the oldest family, and that Punaauia was later in seniority and rank, and it is in accord with a Teva claim, which Ari'i Taimai says was traditional, that the Teva were descended from "the shark god." It does not explain the meaning of the name Teva; and Ari'i Taimai, in commenting on this, says that the name was more or less known in many different places and languages, and adds that Fiji had a small tribe or clan of Teva, which was said not to be Polynesian at all. According to the legend, many generations ago a chief of Punaauia, named Te Manutunuu, married a chieftainess of Vaiari, named Hototu, and had by her a son Teri'i te Moanarau. On the birth of the child the father set out for the Paumotuan islands to obtain red feathers to make the royal *maro-ura* [the sacred red girdle] for the young prince. It is stated that it was for him that the *marae* of Punaauia was built, that in it he might wear the royal insignia. During Te Manutunuu's absence a visitor appeared at Vaiari, and had to be entertained by the chieftainess Hototu. This visitor was in form half human, and (as Ari'i Taimai puts it) the other half was "fish, or shark-god." He had swum from the ocean, in through the reef and introduced himself as Vari-mataauhoe. He lived with Hototu for a time, but afterwards left her because of his belief that she had misconducted herself with her dog; so he turned into a fish again and swam away. Before going, he told Hototu that she would bear him a child, and said that, if it was a girl it would belong to her and take her name; but, if a boy, she was to call him Teva; rain and wind would accompany his birth, and to whatever spot he went, rain and wind would always foretell his coming. He was of the race of *ari'i rahi* [great chiefs], and she was to build him a *marae*, which she was to call Mataoa (the two eyes of Tahiti), and there he was to wear the *maro-tea* [yellow girdle], and he must be known as the child of Ahurei (the wind that blows from Tairapu). A boy was born, and, as foretold, in wind and rain. The name Teva was given to him, a *marae* was built, and called Mataoa, and there he wore the *maro-tea*. Ari'i Taimai says that the Teva

name came from this boy; but when or how it was really given to the clan is unknown, except that it must have been given by the *ari'i* of Vaiari or Papara; and adds that to this day the Teva seldom travel without rain and wind so that they use the term *Teva rarirari* ('Teva, wet always and everywhere). She says that apart from the "facts" above as to the boy's father and mother little is known about him; but he must have been a very distinguished person, if the Vaiari people are to be believed, for they still point to the place where he lived as a child, his first bathing place, and the different waters in which he fished, as he came on his way towards Papara, and would feel insulted if anyone expressed a doubt as to his having been a Vaiarian. She tells us that her own family (the Papara family) all admit, not only that Teva was a branch of the Vaiari family, but that he wore the *maro-tea* by right of that descent, and set up his *marae* at Mataoa by transferring his stone seat or throne from the *marae* at Farepua<sup>1</sup>. The *marae* at Farepua was, as we shall see, in the district of Vaiari, and that at Mataoa was in Papara.

The Teva had a common cry, or signal call—"Teva the rain, Teva the wind, Teva the roe, the roe dear to Ahurei"; Ari'i Taimai interprets this to mean that Teva was strong and swift like rain and wind, and numerous like the roe of fish<sup>2</sup>. Stevenson refers to this also, and says it was the mustering word of the Teva clan<sup>3</sup>.

I may say with reference to this shark god tale, that there was a Tahitian legend that the island had been a shark, originally from Ra'iatea<sup>4</sup>; and it was stated by a native pundit of the Paumotuian island of Anaa that according to their native legends the island of Tahiti was a shark fished up by the god Maui, and was called by them *te paru no Maui*, or Maui's fish<sup>5</sup>.

The Teva were divided into eight groups, each of which had its own district. In stating the positions of these districts I have to bear in mind that references by Ari'i Taimai to the "west" coast and other incidental statements make it clear that she has regarded the island of Tahiti as extending more from north to south than is really the case, according to the maps; for instance, what she calls "west" includes what I shall call "south," or sometimes "west."

Four of the districts, called *Teva iuta* (Inner Teva), were on

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 12-15.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> *Ballads*, p. 58 n. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Ellis, vol. I, p. 167.

<sup>5</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. XII, p. 239 n.



the south coast of the larger peninsula, stretching from the isthmus to the south-western extremity. The following are their names and positions, the enumeration being started at the isthmus and the names being taken in order as we pass westward. The first district, just beyond the isthmus, was that of the Vaiari group<sup>1</sup>. The name appears as "Wyere" in the *Duff* map, as "Papeari" in Corney's map, and as "Vaiari (Papeari)" in Baessler's map. Tati Salmon (a Tahitian, the son of Ari'i Taimai) refers to Papeari as the modern name for Vaiari<sup>2</sup>. The Vaiari people had two very old and famous *marae*; one of these, called Farepua, had the distinction of being the only *marae* whose decorations were of *ura* (red) feathers; the other one was called Tahiti<sup>3</sup>. The next district was Mataiea (see Garnier's, Baessler's and Corney's maps). Then came Atimaono (see all the maps)<sup>4</sup>. The last was Papara (see all the maps). The original *marae* of this last mentioned district was in the sub-district of Amo; but Ari'i Taimai refers to two others, of which one was the *marae* of Mataoa mentioned above; and it was here that Pura and Amo built for their son Teri'irere the great stone pyramid which attracted the special attention of Cook and his friends<sup>5</sup>. Ari'i Taimai thinks that the Vaiari group was the oldest of the four, and that the Papara group was probably a younger branch of the Vaiari<sup>6</sup>. We may perhaps connect with this relationship the reference in the legend told above to Teva's journey westward to Papara.

The other four Teva districts, called *Teva itai* (Outer Teva) were all in the smaller peninsula (Tairapu); and the Teva clan and their connections held a sort of loose sway over the whole of the coast of that peninsula; and the whole of that peninsula was called by that name<sup>7</sup>. The maps of this part of Tahiti differ considerably, and are somewhat confusing. Ari'i Taimai enumerates the four districts as follows: Tautira was a large and powerful chiefdom on the east side of the peninsula (that would be in my map rather north-east, and even north) Pueu and Afaahiti were districts over which the chief of Tautira had authority. Teahupoo was a large chiefdom at the southern end, balancing Tautira<sup>8</sup>. Referring to the northern part of my map,

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 15 sq.

<sup>2</sup> T. Salmon, *J.P.S.* vol. XIX, p. 40.

<sup>3</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 15 sq.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 1-6.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 16.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 18.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 1 sq.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 23. I do not think that the *original* Teva districts included the northern part of the peninsula, though the evidence as to this is not clear. Cf. (on a later page) the use of the word "connections" with reference to the extension of their holding in the larger peninsula beyond their four districts.

I may say that the positions which I have allocated to Tautira, Pueu and Afaahiti are those in which they appear in Corney's and Baessler's maps; in Corney's map appears what seems to be a sub-district or village of Hui in the western part of Tautira. The *Duff* map gives seven names ranging along that coast, and among them I find Owaheite substantially in the position of my Afaahiti; Touterra at the extreme east end of my Tautira; Ahooe rather west, but also in my Tautira area, and Ahnooe a little further west. Garnier's map shows Afaahiti as I have got it; but my Pueu district is called Anuhi (cf. the *Duff* Ahnooe), and my Tautira district is divided into two—Hui to the west and Tairapu (quite distinct from the name of the whole peninsula, which he also shows) to the east; with a tiny Tautira, apparently only a village, on the northern coast at the division line between the two. Turning to the southern part of my map, the position of Teahupoo is that given to it in Corney's and Baessler's maps. In the *Duff* map we have in the same area, instead of this name, three others—Wivouea to the west, Ohotaboo in the middle, and Tahappea (perhaps intended for Teahupoo) to the east. In Garnier's map also we have, instead of Teahupoo, three names—Tairapu to the west, Hui in the middle, and Iroroa to the east. As regards Tairapu and Hui, I may say that Corney speaks of these as two districts united under the name of Teahupoo<sup>1</sup>; and as regards Iroroa, it is shown, apparently as a subdistrict or village of Teahupoo, in Corney's map, and in the same position as in the other map. My district of Vairao, with its subdivisions of Toahotu, Vairao, and Mataoae, are taken from Corney's map, and the three subdivisions, but not the name of the whole district, appear in the *Duff* map, and in those of Garnier and Baessler.

Some of the differences between these maps of the smaller peninsula are not vital for the purposes of this book; but as I have taken upon myself to construct a map, it is desirable that I should make it as correct as possible, and try to explain points of doubt. My inclination is to attribute the inconsistencies in part to confusion in the other maps between districts and sub-districts, and in part to changes which have taken place from time to time in the political division of the peninsula and the naming of its areas and sub-areas. My main trouble in the matter arises from Ari'i Taimai's division of the peninsula into

<sup>1</sup> Corney, *Tahiti*, vol. II, p. xxvii.

four districts, Tautira, Pueu, Afaahiti and Teahupoo, and the fact that in my map this excludes the considerable area of my district of Vairao. I think the probable explanation of the matter is that in days gone by the Teahupoo chiefs had some authority over the Vairao area, just as the Tautira chiefs had authority over the areas of Afaahiti and Pueu.

Ribourt (1847-8) gives names of divisions of Tairapu, and districts into which they were divided "before the establishment of the protectorate." The divisions were four in number (thus to this extent confirming Ari'i Taimai)—namely Tairapu proper, Mataoe, Taahiti [? Faahiti] and Vairao, under two great chiefs called Teri'i na Vahaorao and Tetuanui-naamarurai. I need not repeat the names of his subdistricts, which I cannot co-ordinate with what has appeared above. He says that "at the present day"—presumably the middle of last century—the peninsula was divided into seven districts, namely Faahiti, Anuhi, Tautira, Teahupoo, Mataoe, Vairao and Toahotu, which, it will be noticed, coincides with my names, following them round the coast<sup>1</sup>. I may say as to this that my map was made entirely from a comparison of the other maps, before I had seen Ribourt's list. He also says that the names of some of the districts were repeated many times, and affected by parties separated from each other by districts or portions of neighbouring districts. This was the result of conquests made by the chiefs of these different districts, who had given the names of them to the parts conquered<sup>2</sup>. This statement, which I imagine applies to Tahiti generally, may perhaps point to the origin of the appearance of the district names Hui and Tairapu both above and below the central division line between the north and south sides of the island.

The interest of these details lies in what has apparently been the general distribution of power in the smaller peninsula. According to my interpretation of the positions of the districts, the chief of Tautira controlled the northern, and north-eastern coasts, whilst the chief of Teahupoo (who, Ari'i Taimai tells us, was Vehiatua)<sup>3</sup> controlled the southern and south-eastern, and perhaps the south-western coasts. This would explain Ari'i Taimai's statement that Teahupoo balanced Tautira; and we shall see the apparent rivalry of these two chiefs, and the

<sup>1</sup> Ribourt, pp. 306 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 307.

<sup>3</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 28. Cf. Corney, *Tahiti*, vol. II, p. xxvii; Garnier, *Océanie*, p. 359.

important part which Vehiatua took in certain historical events in Tahiti<sup>1</sup>.

The important position of the Teva is obvious. They had spread over the whole of the smaller peninsula, and along the southern coast of the larger peninsula. Ari'i Taimai says that they and their connections even held the coast (*i.e.* the south and west coasts) of the larger peninsula from the isthmus nearly to the modern town of Papeete<sup>2</sup>, which involves an extension of their influence beyond the limits of their actual area to the whole of the western coast of the larger peninsula. Ari'i Taimai sums up the situation by saying that fully 80 miles of the richest coast were more or less controlled by the Teva, while all the other tribes in the island, taken together, occupied hardly 40<sup>3</sup>; and says that the family connections of Papara extended almost round the island<sup>4</sup>.

I will now refer to the districts, other than those of the Teva, in the larger peninsula; these will include districts on the western front, which were not Teva districts, even though under Teva influence, as stated above. I shall begin with that next to Papara (the most westerly of the Teva districts) and travel northward up the western coast, and then eastwards and finally southwards to the isthmus. The first district was Attahuru, or Teoropaa, the latter being apparently the name of the "clan" that occupied it; it was divided into two sub-districts, Paea (to the south) and Punaauia (further north)<sup>5</sup>. All these names are found in one or other of the maps, from which it will be seen that the district practically covered the whole western coast. The family influence of Papara extended more decisively over this district than over the Teva of the smaller peninsula, although in strictness it was not a Teva district<sup>6</sup>. The Papara head chief, when he called his dependent districts to war, or feast or council, included in the summons the chiefs of Paea and Punaauia, as well as those of the eight Teva districts<sup>7</sup>. Next came Faa or Tefana i Ahurai (see Garnier's, Baessler's and Corney's maps) at the north-western corner. This was a very narrow district only containing a few miles of coastline.

<sup>1</sup> This was the original and earlier situation. At a subsequent date the Vehiatua chiefs extinguished those of Tautira, and boundaries changed (Ari'i Taimai, p. 17; Corney, *Tahiti*, vol. 11, p. xxviii). What I imagine to have been the occasion of this will be explained shortly.

<sup>2</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 10.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* and see p. 74.

<sup>6</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 10 The chief of Papara was the head of the Teva group.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 11.

Though commonly allied with Papara, it was independent and very important. It stood between the great Teva alliance on the south, the Purionuu and Aharua to the east, and the large island of Eimeo to the west; and the friendship or otherwise of Tefana was a matter of considerable importance to the chiefs of Papara<sup>1</sup>. Beyond Tefana was the Purionuu, including two sub-districts Pare to the west (in which is the modern Papeete) and Arue further east. This district and its sub-districts appear in Garnier's and Baessler's maps; the sub-districts alone are given in Corney's map, "Oparre" is shown in the same place in the *Duff* map. It had its chief and was independent of Papara<sup>2</sup>; it was Pomare's district. Next came Aharua, a wide region, stretching down the whole east coast (north and east in my map). There were no great chiefs on this side of the larger peninsula, and the influence there of Papara was weak, if not hostile. It happened, however, to be the side where the English and French ships appeared<sup>3</sup>. This region of Aharua is indicated in Garnier's and Baessler's maps; but in all the maps it is shown to be divided into districts or areas, though the maps do not agree as to the names of these. I have shown these in my map, and introduced the names given to them in the several maps, adding to each name, in parenthesis, the initial of the person in whose map it appears. The *Duff* map gives some other names, ranging along the coast; but several of these names cannot be allocated clearly to any particular areas shown in the map, and I have only introduced such of them as can be so. As, however, some of these names may be useful for subsequent reference, I give them all here in the order in which they appear, travelling eastward, and then southward. They are as follows: Matavai, Whapiano, Wharoomy, Hewow, Hababoonea, Hoonowhia, Nanoonanoo, Otyare, Whaaheina and Hedeah.

Ari'i Taimai, speaking generally, says the Teva and their connections held a sort of loose sway along the whole of the coasts of the smaller peninsula, and across the isthmus, and thence along the south and west coasts of the larger peninsula up to Tefana i Ahurai<sup>4</sup>. As regards the chiefs of the various districts, she says that Vehiatua (in Taiarapu) was a great chief<sup>5</sup>; so were the heads of Vaiari and Papara; so were those

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 10, 41.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 10 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 11.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 1.

<sup>5</sup> He was the chief of Teahupoo (Ari'i Taimai, p. 28).

of Punaauia and Tefana i Ahurai; whilst the chief of Pare Arue [comprising the district of Purionuu] "might be called important." The Teva were not only strong in themselves and their connections, but also in the weakness of their rivals<sup>1</sup>.

I have used Ari'i Taimai's book as a basis in discussing the question of districts, because it is the work best suited for the purpose, and in particular is best adapted for comparison with the maps. The subject is, however, dealt with by other writers. Cook says that each of the two peninsulas of Tahiti was divided into districts, of which there were about 100 in the whole island; and the chiefs were lords, each of one or more of these districts<sup>2</sup>. The *Duff* missionaries give lists of the districts of Tahiti in 1797, with the names of their chiefs; these lists show 20 districts in the larger peninsula and 21 in the smaller<sup>3</sup>. The missionaries say that some chiefs were supreme in several districts, and that "if there were more chiefs than one, the district was divided into different *padtdoos*, or parishes"<sup>4</sup>.

The *Quarterly Chronicle* of the London Missionary Society, in enumerating the Christian churches of Tahiti in 1816, mentions by name 18 districts in the larger peninsula and 16 in the smaller<sup>5</sup>. The *London Missionary Society Report* for 1819 refers to certain districts of the larger peninsula by name; these include Matavai, said to be the northernmost, and Hapaiano, said to be the next district eastward of Matavai<sup>6</sup>. Ellis, speaking of the Society Islands generally, says that each island was divided into a number of large portions or districts called *maataina*, a term which applied also to the inhabitants of the district, and that each of these *maataina* had a distinct name, and was under the government of a chief of rank or dignity<sup>7</sup>. Lesson, in 1823, enumerates 22 districts in the whole island of Tahiti, and says that each was governed by a chief called a *tavana*. He says there were many villages, all situate on the coast, and gives the names of about 75 of these<sup>8</sup>.

According to Ribour, whose information, though published in 1863<sup>9</sup>, was, I understand, collected in 1847-8, there were six large divisions in Tahiti, of which "Tahiti proper" em-

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Wilson, pp. 215, 262.

<sup>5</sup> L.M.S. *Q.C.* vol. 1, p. 363.

<sup>7</sup> Ellis, vol. III, p. 119.

<sup>8</sup> Lesson, *Voy.* vol. 1, pp. 257 sq. *Tavana* seems to have been simply a native version of the English word "governor." (See Scherzer, vol. III, p. 247; Ribour, p. 204; Davies' *Dict.*)

<sup>9</sup> Reprinted from the *Revue Coloniale* of 1850.

<sup>2</sup> Cook, vol. 1, p. 225.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 322 sq.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid. Rep.* p. 106.

braced five and Taiarapu embraced one. The following are the names of these divisions, as given by him, though I have altered the order in which he puts them, for convenience of reference to my map. Te-aharoa, Porionuu, Te fana ia hurai, Te Oropaa, Tevaiuta and Tevaitai; it was Tevaitai that was in, or rather was, Taiarapu<sup>1</sup>. If we compare these names with the map, and remember that Tevaiuta was the collective name for the four districts of the Inner Teva, and Tevaitai was that for the four districts of the Outer Teva, we shall see that this list and the map tally exactly, bearing in mind that the Teva and their connections held the whole coast of the Taiarapu peninsula. It is interesting to note that he treats each of these two Teva groups of districts as a connected division.

Ribourt gives us particulars of the names of the districts in each of these divisions and some information as to their government; and I think it desirable to introduce this material for comparison with my map. Teaharoa had the following six districts: (1) Mahina (Haapape) formerly had two chiefs, whose names were Paitia and Tutoia. Then [here and in subsequent places "then" of course means the time when the information was collected, or the book written] there was only one chief named Paitia; (2) Haururu (Papenoo) formerly had two chiefs named Vanaa and Atitioroi. Then Vanaa no longer existed and there was only one chief named Ori; I am not sure from the context whether Ribourt means that Ori was the same as Atitioroi; (3) Te-ne and (4) Te-Mehiti (Tiarei) were two districts which had from all time been united under the command of two chiefs named Manua and Haru. Manua was the only one that then remained; (5) Ahuare (Mahaena) formerly recognized four chiefs, named Outu, Roura, Punua and Moahio. There was then only one, named Roura; (6) Taero (Hitiaa) formerly had two chiefs named Tumoehanua and Tarii tua. Then only the latter remained<sup>2</sup>. Porionuu was divided into two districts, Pare and Arue; they obeyed a single chief of the name of Ari'i Paea<sup>3</sup>. Tefana ia Hurai comprised only one district. It had a chief<sup>4</sup>. Te Oropaa was composed of two districts, Paea, with its chief, and Punaauia with its chief<sup>5</sup>. Tevaiuta was divided into four districts, Hoo Matavana (Pape-ari), Mataiea, Atimaono and Papara, each with its chief<sup>6</sup>. I have

<sup>1</sup> Ribourt, pp. 304 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 305 sq. (for comment on connection between these Aharoa districts see Baessler, *Globus*, vol. LXXIII, pp. 390 sq.).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 305.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 310.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 309.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 308 sq.

already referred to Ribourt's division into districts of Tevaitai (that is, Tairapu, the minor peninsula).

This distribution of districts or sub-districts (as distinguished from what Ribourt calls divisions) in the greater peninsula is very much the same as that appearing in my map; there are a few differences in detail, but the account helps to confirm the identity of several districts which in the map are credited with several different names. I may point out that the identity of some names is perhaps somewhat concealed on a hasty glance by the custom of prefixing a name with *Te*, which is sometimes done and sometimes not so. For instance *Te-Oropaa* and *Oropaa* are clearly the same. *Te* is simply the singular definite article. An interesting feature of some of the districts is found in statements that formerly they had two chiefs, *A* and *B*, whilst later one of these had disappeared, and only the other remained; that probably means that one of two chiefs, who had ruled side by side in two adjoining areas, had succeeded in securing the dominion of both areas. It might be that the head of one of the two chief families had, as the result of inter-marriage, succeeded to both the chieftainships, and that writers refer to him by the name of one of them only. Of course, I do not mean that the surviving chief, as I may call him, was necessarily the same person as the earlier chief bearing the same name; I fancy from the use of the word "formerly" that in most of the cases he would be a successor, who retained the ancestral name. Ribourt gives names of chiefs of other districts, but I have only introduced the names here in cases where these changes have occurred.

The districts were doubtless all governed by chiefs; these would be the great chiefs—probably what Moerenhout calls the principal chiefs<sup>1</sup>; Ellis refers to them as chiefs of rank or dignity belonging to the reigning family<sup>2</sup>. The sub-districts, and no doubt, at all events, the larger villages, were governed by minor chiefs or *ra'atira* (middle classes)<sup>3</sup>. Walpole (1844-8) says there were ten principal chiefs in Tahiti; and two hundred of inferior rank<sup>4</sup>. Each of the eight Teva districts had a chief at its head, and one of these was the head chief of all the Teva<sup>5</sup>.

An interesting feature appears in the division into districts. Ellis, speaking of the Society Islands generally, says that in this

<sup>1</sup> Moerenhout, vol. II, p. 10. See also Corney, *Tahiti*, vol. I, p. 337; de Bovis, p. 295.

<sup>2</sup> Ellis, vol. III, p. 119.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 120 sqq. Lesson, *Voy.* vol. I, pp. 257, 407.

<sup>4</sup> Walpole, vol. II, p. 85 n.

<sup>5</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 8 sq.



division the people seemed to have a remarkable predilection for the number eight. Almost every island, whatever its size, was divided into eight districts, and the inhabitants into an equal number of *maataina*, or divisions<sup>1</sup>. In partial confirmation of the latter statement, in principle at all events, I would point out that the domain of the Teva clan was divided into eight districts. Ari'i Taimai says there were eight districts of the Purionuu<sup>2</sup>. Don Domingo Boenechea said (in 1772) that the whole island of Tahiti was then divided into eight districts, and governed by as many *ari'i*<sup>3</sup>. The island of Ra'iatea was divided into eight districts<sup>4</sup>. So, evidently, was the island of Huahine; for it is stated that at the yearly ceremony, when the red feathers in the images of the gods were renewed, the image of Tane was laid in the middle of his bed in the *marae*, and the gods of four districts were placed on the right hand of the image, and those of four districts on its left<sup>5</sup>. There were eight districts in the island of Moorea or Eimeo<sup>6</sup>; and a song relating to the feast of Toorai speaks of "Eimeo, the eight branched"<sup>7</sup>. It is said that Borabora was divided into only seven districts<sup>8</sup>.

This practice of dividing into eight is reflected in some of the words used in Tahiti. The word for eight is *varu*; and I find in Davies's dictionary the following words: "*Raravaru*: the old native *papi* or canoe with many sails, called eight *rara* or branches, answering to the eight divisions of Moorea, Ra'iatea &c." "*Tavaru*: a fleet of canoes bringing food for the king or principal chief; the name is from *varu*, eight; a meeting of eight divisions or *mataeinaa*." "*Vaa*: the native canoe." "*Vaahiva*: all the people within the prescribed limits of the island or district." "*Hiva*: a clan, the company in a canoe." "*Vaamataeina*: a division of landowners." "*Tavaru*: a meeting of different districts for business and feasting." "*Tauvaru*: eight joined together, as subdivisions of canoes or of districts." The implication, as regards the canoes, almost seems to be that there would presumably be eight groups of people, each having its own canoe, or its own part of a common canoe; or the numerical conception may have been symbolic in some way. In neither case have we an explanation of the selection of the number eight, or any specific number, with reference either to the canoes or to the grouping of the people.

<sup>1</sup> Ellis, vol. III, p. 120.

<sup>2</sup> Corney, *Tahiti*, vol. 1, p. 337.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 267.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 58.

<sup>5</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 82.

<sup>6</sup> Tyerman, vol. 1, p. 519.

<sup>7</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 81.

<sup>8</sup> Tyerman, vol. II, p. 3.

There must be some explanation of this selection of the number eight for the purpose of geographical divisions, and there is a legend associating it, perhaps, with the eight arms of the cuttle-fish. Ari'i Taimai relates a tale of one Niuhi, one of the early chiefs of Pare, in Purionuu, prior to the arrival there of the Teu (Pomare) family. This chief killed two sons of a man named Tetohu of the adjacent district of Tefana, and laid their bodies in the *marae* of Raianaunau<sup>1</sup>. When Tetohu heard of this, he called his daughter Terero, and told her he was going to mourn for his sons at Raianaunau, and that, if he did not return in three days, she would know that he too had been killed. In that case she was to go to Hitiaa where she would find Teri'imana, *ari'i* of Moorea (Eimeo), who was feasting with Teri'itua at Hitiaa, and was to say to him that "I, Tehotu, beg him to revenge the death of my sons. The *fe'e* (cuttle-fish) has eight tentacles, Temahue, the mount of Pare, has eight peaks. There are eight districts in Moorea. There still remain the head and two eyes of the *Fe'e*. Give the head to Tefana i Ahurai, one eye to Teruru of Pereaitu (of Paea), and the other eye to Vavahiiteraa (of Mahaena)." Tehotu told his daughter to beg of Teri'imana that he would leave instantly for Moorea, start the war canoes, and give battle to the Ari'i Niuhi. The legend explains that the head and two eyes of the cuttle-fish were Niuhi and his two sons, and that the eight tentacles were the eight districts of the Purionuu<sup>2</sup>. It is difficult to interpret this tale; but I gather that Niuhi, when vanquished, was to be handed over for sacrifice at the *marae* of Tefana; and that his sons were to be sent for the same purpose, one to the district of Paea in Attahuru, and the other to the district of Mahaena. The tale looks as though it might have some interesting historical significance, which I have not been able to detect; but I repeat it here only with reference to the question of the cuttlefish. Ari'i Taimai says that the people of Tahiti used to call their island a fish; the extreme south-eastern point of the smaller peninsula (Tairapu) was the head, and the north-western end of the larger peninsula was the tail<sup>3</sup>. I cannot help thinking that by "fish" she may have meant cuttle-fish; I can see no resemblance between the shape of the island and that of a fish; but its resemblance in form to the body

<sup>1</sup> This would presumably be the name of the *marae* or of the village in which it was; but I cannot identify it.

<sup>2</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 81 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. . Cf. T. Henry, *J.P.S.* vol. iv, p. 291, and note 116, p. 294.

and head of a cuttle-fish, without its tentacles is obvious. Another curious circumstance is that among all the tales of the forcing and propping up of the sky, so widely distributed in Polynesia, the island of Ra'iatea is, so far as I have been able to discover, the only one whose myth introduces the cuttle-fish. According to this myth, the sky, lying flat on the face of the earth and sea, was held down by the "legs" of a huge cuttle-fish; and it was only by diving into the sea and dismembering the cuttle-fish that Mau'i was able to release the sky, and enable it to rise<sup>1</sup>. I think these tales, though they prove nothing, lend some colour to the suggestion of a possible connection between the method of division into eight and the cuttle-fish.

From the legend as to the origin of the name Teva, told in a previous page, it appears that the Vaiari group was supposed to be an older family than that of the Papara group. Apparently the Vaiari family had at one time held the head chieftainship of the whole Teva clan; but it had been taken from them by the Papara family at a period which Ari'i Taimai places at about twenty generations before the beginning of the present century. The following is the story of this change as told by the people. Hurimaavehi was the head chief over the Vaiari district and the adjoining district of Mataiea and of the Teva clan. The head chief of Papara was Oro, not the god of that name, but the chief of the small sub-district of Amo with its old *marae*. Tiaau, Oro's father, had a great friend Panee, who had a daughter famous for her beauty. Hurimaavehi kidnapped the girl, and carried her off to his home in Vaiari. Panee, on learning that the girl was being maltreated by her captor, invaded Mataiea, attacked all he met, killed some of Hurimaavehi's people, and sent to the Vaiari chief an insulting message, which could only be atoned by death. He then hurried back home, and warned Tiaau and Oro of the approach of Hurimaavehi and his warriors, whereupon they prepared to resist him. A battle took place, apparently in Papara, and Hurimaavehi was defeated. Oro then pursued him right through his own country, and drove him out of it into Hitiaa, which, as we have seen, was not a Teva district. This brought Oro into collision with the chief of Hitiaa, and a dispute arose between them as to the position of the Vaiari-Hitiaa boundary. Ultimately the boundary was fixed at a point running inland from the northern side of the isthmus. Two results followed from this war; one was that

<sup>1</sup> Tyerman, vol. 1, p. 526.

from that day the chiefs of Papara issued their summons to all the Teva, and took the political headship of the clan; the other was that the Teva secured entire control of the isthmus, which was the only means of communication by land between their districts in the two peninsulas<sup>1</sup>.

I must point out that, though this victory of Papara over Vaiari resulted in the transfer from the chief of the latter to the chief of the former of the political headship of the Teva group, it in no way affected the superiority of the social family rank of the head chief of the Vaiari. The *marae* of Farepua, in Vaiari, was older and superior to those of Papara and the other Teva districts, and would remain so "as long as society should last." The Vaiari and Punaauia families were always considered to be of higher rank than the Papara family, they having these older *marae*, and each of them having the right to wear a *maroura*<sup>2</sup>, the sacred belt of red feathers, which only the highest chiefs might wear, and to which the Papara chief was not entitled.

In about A.D. 1650 Tuiteraï, the head chief of the Papara district, was the recognized head of the whole Teva clan. Tavi was head chief of Tautira, the large and powerful district comprising the north-eastern corner of the smaller peninsula. Tavi had a wife, Taurua, the most beautiful woman of her time, and a son, Tavihauroa. Tuiteraï sent a message to Tavi asking for the loan of his wife and promising that she should be returned in seven days. Tavi had to comply reluctantly with the request, and sent his wife to Papara; but Tuiteraï fell madly in love with her, and at the end of the seven days broke his pledge, and refused to return her to Tavi—a great outrage to a man who, notwithstanding Tuiteraï's position as the recognized head of the Teva, was equal to him in rank. Tavi therefore sent to Papara an armed expedition, which defeated Tuiteraï, who was taken prisoner, and brought back, bound, to Tavi. Tavi had told his warriors to kill Tuiteraï; but he had by ingenious arguments induced them not to do so; so, as, when brought to Tavi, he had, by the etiquette of the people become a guest, Tavi had to spare his life; and even gave him the wife who had been the subject of the quarrel. By this war Tavi of Tautira became the most powerful chief in Tahiti. His direct and full authority extended only over his own chief-

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 18-21. The boundary reached the coast, according to Garnier's map, at the northern shore of the isthmus, and I have so placed it in my map. According to Corney's map it terminated at about the middle of the isthmus.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 18.

dom of Tautira; but by rank or courtesy, through his family connections or his influence, it extended over the whole clan, and even the whole island<sup>1</sup>.

Tavi, having overthrown the head chief of Papara, and become the dominant chief of Tahiti, asserted his power by imposing a *rahui* for the benefit of his young son Tavihauroa. A *rahui* was a food taboo. It might last a year or more; and during its continuance everything produced was preserved for the young prince; not a pig should be killed, and no cloth made, except for the child, and at the end of the *rahui* all was to belong to him; infringement of a *rahui* would cause war. Tavi, however, had a powerful rival in the person of his neighbour Vehiatua, head chief of Teahupoo, whose daughter Tetuaehuri had married the head chief of Purionuu (the Pomare district). This daughter, being about to give birth to a child, and acting on the advice of the women attending her, ate pig's flesh every day, and thus broke the *rahui*. This infringement was an insult which could only be wiped out with blood; so Tavi made war on Vehiatua, but was defeated by him. Vehiatua seized Tavi's land and drove him and his family out of the island<sup>2</sup>—he himself going, it was said, to the Paumotuan Islands. The son returned; but was afterwards killed in punishment for an act of sacrilege in a *marae*. Vehiatua's power was then so great that it was likely that he would supersede the Papara chief, and become the political head of the Teva, and most powerful chief in the island<sup>3</sup>; but this danger to the Papara chief was avoided by a marriage between the two families, the chief thus managing to retain his supremacy<sup>4</sup>.

Taurua, the wife of Tavi of Tautira, afterwards given by him to his defeated foe Tuiteraï of Papara, had by the latter a son, who married, and the son had two daughters and two sons, the daughters being the elder. The elder daughter married in Ra'iatea and left Tahiti; and the younger married into the Vehiatua family. The elder son, Aromaiteraï, claimed the head chieftainship of Papara; but the younger, Tuiteraï, disputed the claim, contending that the primogeniture rights vested only in the eldest child, male or female, and had been lost by

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 23-8.

<sup>2</sup> This is what I believe to have been the event by which the original division of the eastern end of the smaller peninsula became modified.

<sup>3</sup> I gather from this that, though the Papara chief had been defeated by Tavi and so lost his actual power, he had not lost his nominal political headship of the Teva.

<sup>4</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 27-30.

their elder sister by her departure to Ra'iatea, and that all the other children had, as between themselves, equal rights, thus making it a matter for election. Apparently the matter did come before the *hiva*, the official judges in questions of this sort, and it ended in their banishing Aromaiterai. This probably happened in about A.D. 1730. The other son, Tuiteraï (who thus became head chief of Papara) married, and had, among other children, a son Tevahitua (also called Amo), who seems to have obtained recognition as head chief both of Papara and of the Teva; so the position still remained in the Papara family. Amo, as I shall now call him, married Porea (called by Cook "Oberea"); she was very highly connected, her father being chief of Tefana, an extremely important district, and her mother a member of the ancient and aristocratic Vaiari branch of the Teva clan; and she had an unbroken descent from chiefs "as far back as society existed." The importance of the connection is illustrated by the statement that Amo and Porea could, between them, control a hundred thousand people<sup>1</sup>. The Papara head chief, however, was never chief over the whole island. His jurisdiction included Oropaa, but not Tefana, Purionuu or Te Aharoa<sup>2</sup>.

Amo and Porea had a son Teri'irere, who, I may here mention, would, in accordance with the custom of the island, immediately on his birth succeed to his father's title, the father losing it and its social pre-eminence, but retaining for a time the actual control of affairs. This son (born in about 1762) became at once the most important person in the world in the eyes of Tahiti. It was on the birth of Teri'irere that his father, acting in accordance with a common custom, abandoned his old name of Tevahitua, and adopted the name of Amo, this meaning "the winker," and referring to the child's habit of winking. Amo and Porea, for the purpose of asserting the supremacy of Teri'irere, imposed a general *rahui* for his benefit and commenced the erection for him of the great Papara *marae* described by Cook, so well known to students of Polynesia. This was more than Porea's female relations could bear, and it set society into a ferment; for though Amo and Porea were admittedly superior politically, socially they were no better than their cousins<sup>3</sup>.

Custom required that if during a *rahui* any relation or guest of equal rank should come to visit the chief who imposed it,

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 31-41.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 11.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 42.

the *rahui* was broken, and the guest received by courtesy all that the *rahui* had produced. No chief under direct control of Papara would attempt to break the *rahui*, but Tefana was independent. Ari'i Taimai thinks that the first person who undertook to do this, was Purea's sister-in-law, the wife or widow of Purea's brother, who did it on behalf of her (the sister-in-law's) son; they set out from Tefana in a double canoe, of a form which only head chiefs could use, and on reaching the Papara coast, turned in at an opening in the reef, through which only sacred chiefs were allowed to go. Purea hailed the canoe, challenged the right to enter by this opening, asked how many more royal heads there could be, adding that she knew of none but her son, and ultimately compelled the offending chieftainess and her son to return discomfited, without having effected the visit which would have broken the *rahui*. A renewed attempt was then made by this sister-in-law's daughter, who afterwards married Pomare I, and was the Iddeah of the *Duff* missionaries; she, acting on behalf of the same man (her brother) also came in a state canoe to Papara, and in spite of Purea's opposition, came ashore; she then sat on the beach, and cut her head with a shark's tooth, letting the blood flow in a hole which she had dug in the ground. This was a form of protest; an appeal to blood, and unless the shed blood were wiped away, it had to be atoned by blood. The situation was thus very grave; but the high priest, Amo's younger brother, interposed, remonstrated with his sister-in-law Purea, and on her refusing to listen to his exhortations and admit any rivalry to her son, dried the blood with a cloth, thus wiping away the feud, so far as he was concerned<sup>1</sup>. Shortly afterwards the great feast was held, at which Teri'irere wore for the first time the *maro-ura*, the sacred red girdle, only worn by certain great chiefs at certain great feasts; but the contest which Purea had challenged ended in disaster to the Papara dominion<sup>2</sup>. I must point out that, though the Papara chief was entitled<sup>3</sup> to wear the *maro-tea*, or yellow feather belt already referred to in connection with the shark tradition, he had not hitherto been one of that very select number of chiefs (*e.g.* the king of Ra'iatea, and the head chiefs of Vaiari and Punaauia) of the Society Islands that might wear the *maro-ura*; so in doing this he was claiming a new dignity and challenging hostility.

I will, before proceeding with the narrative, sum up very

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 42-6.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 57.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 7.

shortly the previous history as given above. The Teva group had occupied their eight districts, covering the whole of the smaller peninsula and the southern shore of the larger; but the western, northern and eastern sides of the larger peninsula were occupied by other groups. The headship of the Teva had originally been with the Vaiari family, who by tradition and by the admission of their rivals of Papara were the oldest branch, or, as it might perhaps be more correctly put, the main trunk, of the whole Teva group; but it had long ago passed to Papara, the highest rank of blood and that of official headship having thus become separated. Afterwards by the vicissitudes of war within the group Papara had lost its dominance for a time, though not apparently its nominal position as head of the group; but its power had been regained, and had been extended beyond the districts of the group, so as to include the western shore of the larger peninsula, leaving only its northern and eastern shores—that was Tefana, Purionuu (the district afterwards of the Pomare family) and Aharoa—still independent. The final episode of the history has been the effort of Amo, the head chief of Papara and of the Teva, and his powerful wife Porea to establish the high position of their son Teri'irere. I must point out as to this that the extension of the power of Amo of Papara—or rather of his son Teri'irere—beyond the limits of the Teva area, along the western shore of the larger peninsula, must have been greatly strengthened by Amo's marriage with Porea, the daughter of the chief of Tefana (at the north-western extremity); and that the opposition seems to have been organized by Porea's own paternal relatives in Tefana who, it may be believed, were in fear of the absorption of or domination over their own district.

We have now reached a period at which the evidence of white explorers is available; and it is desirable that I should refer to two points of possible confusion, before continuing the narrative. We shall find that the names of three families or persons of the larger peninsula figure prominently in the history. One of these families is that of Amo and Porea of Papara, with their son Teri'irere. Another is that of Teu, sometimes called by his other name of Whappai<sup>1</sup>, of Purionuu, and his son Tu (Otu)—afterwards Pomare I; Whappai is

<sup>1</sup> Ellis calls him Teu (vol. II, p. 68); so does Quatrefages (p. 197). The *Duff* missionaries call him "Otey" (p. 318). There is no doubt about the identity; and it is confirmed by Ari'i Taimai, p. 67.



sometimes spoken of as chief of Tepirreonu. This appears in the *Duff* map as (apparently) a regional name, embracing the whole northern area, including Purionuu; but I think we may assume that it means Te Purionu (*i.e.* Purionuu). The third name is that of Tutaha, the head chief of the district of Attahuru. It will be noticed that these three families, who took such a prominent part in the events to be narrated, represented, roughly, the southern, north-western and western coasts of the larger peninsula<sup>1</sup>. Amo, and by patrilineal succession, his son Teri'irere, belonged to the Teva clan of the south coast; but the other two did not. Tutaha would represent the west coast and Teu the district on the north-western coast, beyond Tefana; which shows how the resistance to the ambitions of Amo and Purea on behalf of their son was spreading along the coast of the larger peninsula. We must also remember that there seem to have been no powerful chiefdoms in the region of Aharoa.

When Bougainville visited Tahiti in 1768, the larger peninsula was, according to the *Duff* missionaries, divided into "three principal governments," these being, apparently, Tedevaruta to the south, Attahooroo to the west, and Tepirreono to the north<sup>2</sup>. The first of these names is, I think, Te Teva iuta, the district of the four Teva groups of the larger peninsula, and the area with which Amo and Teri'irere (and Purea as the ambitious mother of the latter) were connected; the second is Attahuru, of which Tutaha was head chief; the third is (as I have suggested above) evidently Purionuu, the home of the Pomare family. Lesson refers to a triple division of the larger peninsula into provinces; and these are, roughly speaking, in accord with those of the *Duff* missionaries<sup>3</sup>. I do not think this reference to "three principal governments" must be taken as in any way affecting the system of political division of the larger peninsula already explained; it is simply a broad statement, and a pretty accurate one, of the actual distribution of great power at the time.

The other point of possible confusion is more serious. The *Duff* missionaries say that Amo, Teu and Tutaha were brothers<sup>4</sup>, and I think other writers have said so also. As a matter of fact they were nothing of the sort in our sense of the term. According to Ari'i Taimai's genealogical tables, Teu was Amo's sister's

<sup>1</sup> The Aharoa portion of the northern coast was not of great political importance.

<sup>2</sup> See and compare Wilson, pp. xii sq., and pp. 58, 318, and map facing p. 182.

<sup>3</sup> Lesson, *Voy.* vol. 1, pp. 256 sq.

<sup>4</sup> Wilson, pp. 318 sq.

daughter's husband's father (the husband being half brother to Pomare I); and Tutaha was Purea's brother's wife's brother. It will be noted that they were all of the same generation. This is an excellent example of the difficulty, referred to in my preface, arising perhaps from travellers' ignorance of the classificatory systems of relationship<sup>1</sup>, a difficulty which may, I fear, be responsible for many inaccuracies throughout this book.

Returning now to the narrative, when Wallis visited the island in 1767 the Papara family still held the authority or power over the whole of Tahiti, except certain districts<sup>2</sup>; the excepted districts would be Tefana, Purionuu and the areas eastward of the latter and down the east coast. Moerenhout says that the Papara family had been in this position ever since the days of Amo's great-great-grandfather Tavi eau ru, the then reigning king of 120 or 150 years ago, a man of much renown, and the subject of songs sung at fêtes, even after the arrival of the Europeans<sup>3</sup>. I think this Tavi eau ru must refer to the Tavi who conquered the Papara chief of that time; if so, he was not an ancestor of Amo. The statement that Amo's family had been in power for 120 years seems to be correct, subject to the interruption for a period of their actual, as distinguished from nominal power. Ari'i Taimai says that when Wallis and Cook arrived the chief of the Papara family was the head chief—*ari'i rahi*—of the Teva connection<sup>4</sup>. She thinks Wallis's visit occurred just before the holding of the big feast already referred to<sup>5</sup>. Moerenhout says that Amo was the reigning chief<sup>6</sup>; but the *Duff* missionaries say that this was Cook's "Tirridiri" (whom they confuse with his half-brother and successor Temari'i) and that Purea was acting as regent<sup>7</sup>. D'Urville (also confusing the half-brothers) says that Temari'i was the chief, and Amo was regent<sup>8</sup>. I think we may assume that, in accord with the well known Tahitian system, the actual title had passed from Amo to Teri'irere, though he had not then gone through the ceremony of investiture. As regards the regency (Teri'irere would then only be quite a young child), the natural person to hold office would, I imagine, be Amo; but it is possible that the very able and ambitious woman

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ari'i Taimai, p. 67.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 38. Cf. Moerenhout, vol. II, pp. 387 sq.; Ari'i Taimai, p. 18.

<sup>3</sup> Moerenhout, vol. II, pp. 387 sq.

<sup>4</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 6.

<sup>5</sup> Moerenhout, vol. II, p. 387.

<sup>6</sup> D'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. I, p. 544.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 46.

<sup>8</sup> Wilson, p. 318.

Purea was regent, or at least controlled matters to a large extent. It is said that she at that time had separated from Amo<sup>1</sup>, and was cohabiting with the chief priest<sup>2</sup>, and that quarrels had arisen between Amo and her as to the child, Amo wishing to destroy it, either because of his doubt as to its paternity, or because he himself did not wish to abdicate in its favour; and the quarrel had ended in Amo retiring to a private station in his own district of Papara, leaving his wife to govern for her son<sup>3</sup>. Amo seems, however, to have been acting for his son in the following year.

After Bougainville's departure in 1768 the smaller peninsula (Taiarapu) to the south-east, Purionuu (the Pomare district) to the north-west, and Attahuru to the west, combined in attacking Papara from both sides, and succeeded in crushing it<sup>4</sup>. It is said that Tutaha of Attahuru wanted the title of *ari'i rahi*, or king, of all Tahiti<sup>5</sup> to be taken from the son of Amo and Purea, and given to Tu (afterwards Pomare I) the son of Teu (of Purionuu), and to be himself appointed regent<sup>6</sup>. The smaller peninsula was represented in the matter by Vehiatua, the great chief there referred to in previous pages (his district was Teahupoo), who proposed to secure the independence of his peninsula from the sway of Papara<sup>7</sup>. It will be noted that the inclusion of Vehiatua in this attack still further increased Amo and Purea's difficulties, as he was, as we have seen, a great Teva chief, apparently controlling all the smaller peninsula, and was taking part with outsiders against the official head of the Teva.

The arrangements for the great ceremony of inaugurating the young Teri'irere by investing him with the *maro-ura*<sup>8</sup>, or sacred red girdle, and its accompanying feast, having been

<sup>1</sup> Cook, vol. 1, p. 145. Cf. Ari'i Taimai, p. 110.

<sup>2</sup> Wilson, p. x. D'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. 1, p. 544. Cf. Parkinson (2), p. 69.

<sup>3</sup> Wilson, p. 318. Cf. Parkinson (2), p. 69.

<sup>4</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 74.

<sup>5</sup> The title was applied to a great head chief or king; but did not imply rule over all Tahiti, which, as we have seen, did not prevail till Pomare II in effect secured it. The old writers all seem to have been misled as to this. Cf. Ari'i Taimai, p. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Wilson, p. xiii. D'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. 1, p. 544. Moerenhout, vol. 11, p. 409. Cf. Parkinson (2), pp. 69, 64, where it is apparently suggested that Tutaha's proposal was that he should be regent on behalf of Teri'irere. This is probably another error arising perhaps from want of knowledge of the classificatory system of relationship. (See Ari'i Taimai, p. 110.)

<sup>7</sup> Wilson, p. xiii.

<sup>8</sup> He was entitled to wear the *maro-tea* or yellow girdle referred to above; but I gather that the head chief of Papara had never before worn the *maro-ura*.

completed, Amo, in accordance with the usual custom, sent round to all the chiefs and aristocracy the "flags of chiefs," by which they were summoned to attend the ceremony. Vehiatua tore up the flag, when the messengers reached him, this being a recognized method of declaring defiance and rebellion<sup>1</sup>. I do not know whether any of the other chiefs did this.

The ceremony was, however, performed. I cannot describe these inauguration ceremonies in this book; but I must mention, in connection with this one, two matters referred to in a song, preserved by the Teva of Papara, commemorating the downfall of Teri'irere, of which Ari'i Taimai supplies a translation, and upon which she offers comments<sup>2</sup>. The number of great chiefs mentioned as being summoned to "the feast of flags," as it is called in the song, shows the extent of Teri'irere's influence; they included, not only head chiefs of Tahiti, such as those of Punaauia, and Purionuu, but chiefs from Eimeo, Borabora and even Ra'iatea. The song refers to two men who "broke up the feast of the *ari'i*"; and Ari'i Taimai says that the troubles of Papara began by a disturbance which broke up this ceremony<sup>3</sup>.

The initiative in bringing about the disaster, which then fell upon the Amo-Purea-Teri'irere family, seems to have rested with a woman named Purahi, the daughter of Amo's sister<sup>4</sup>; and the song reproaches her bitterly for having sinned against her own head chief. Purahi was supported by Vehiatua, who came with an army which defeated Amo's forces, devastated Papara and massacred the people<sup>5</sup>. This army was led by Teieu (cousin of Vehiatua) and Tetumanua<sup>6</sup>, who would appear from the song to have been the people who broke up the feast. At the same time Tutaha attacked Amo's home in Papara, seized from the great *marae* there<sup>7</sup> the *maro-ura* (the royal sacred girdle) and the vehicle in which the sacred emblem of the *atua*, or god, was borne, and carried them off to the *marae* at Paea in Attahuru, which thenceforth for many years was the place where great solemnities and human sacrifices were celebrated<sup>8</sup>. It will be noticed that this *marae* was in the district

<sup>1</sup> Moerenhout, vol. II, p. 408.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 57.

<sup>5</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 59, 74. Cf. Banks, p. 104; Wilson, p. xiii; Moerenhout, vol. II, p. 408.

<sup>2</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 57-61.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 59.

<sup>6</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 60.

<sup>7</sup> This was the new *marae* which Amo and Purea had built for their son.

<sup>8</sup> Wilson, pp. xiii, 319. D'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. I, p. 544. Ari'i Taimai, p. 74.

of which Tutaha himself was chief, and not that of Teu and the proposed new king Tu, a fact which would presumably tend to enhance considerably Tutaha's prestige in the island.

I have tried to find a clue to a possible strong motive inducing the woman Purahi—also called Moeatua (see Ari'i Taimai's genealogy quoted below)—to join Vehiatua and Tutaha in this struggle against her mother's people, and I think I have found one in two genealogies provided by Ari'i Taimai and Corney respectively<sup>1</sup>. Her father was Aromaiterai, the son of the Aromaiterai who had, as we have seen, disputed the succession with his younger brother Tuiteraï, and the latter was her maternal grandfather; so there may have been a continuance of an old rivalry within the Papara royal family. But there was another apparent reason for what she did. She had, according to Corney's genealogy, married a head chief of the Vehiatua family (who died in 1771), and had had by him two sons (born in 1755 and 1767 respectively) each of whom had succeeded—the younger apparently following after the elder—to the title. It follows that the Vehiatua whom she was supporting would be either her husband or one of her sons. She would therefore have a definite motive in resisting on behalf of her sons the proud pretensions, and perhaps claims to increased domination, of Amo and Pura on behalf of their son Teri'irere (her cousin). Then again, returning to the question of rivalry within the Papara family, she, as Ari'i Taimai points out<sup>2</sup>, belonged, through her father by descent, to the senior (Aromaiterai) branch of the family, whilst Teri'irere only belonged to the junior (Tuiteraï) branch; and Ari'i Taimai says she supposes that, according to island law, the woman had a perfect right to take the power from him if she could.

Pura, Amo and the boy Teri'irere escaped to Hapape whose chief was Amo's cousin or uncle<sup>3</sup>. Amo and Pura had to make what terms they could with Tutaha, and to recognize Tu (Pomare I) as having a right to the dignity of the *maro-ura* at the *marae* Maraetaata at Paea, to which it had been carried. The district of Papara had lost its political supremacy, which had passed to the coalition of the areas of Attahuru and Purionuu with Tairapu (the smaller peninsula); but Teri'irere remained chief of the Teva districts, retained his social position and the

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, Table I, p. 4. Corney, *Tahiti*, Preface II, p. xxxviii.

<sup>2</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 59.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 61.

*maro-tea*<sup>1</sup>, and was still the most powerful *single* chief in the island. The quarrel which brought about the war seems to have been with the ambitious Purea rather than with Amo or Teri'irere; and no attempt was made to drive them out of the island<sup>2</sup>. Tu (Pomare I) who was then aged about 25 or 26<sup>3</sup>, got little or no benefit, except the right to wear the *maro-ura* at Paea and was unknown outside his own personal territory; and Tutaha was apparently the person who reaped the greatest benefit from the war<sup>4</sup>. Among other things, he was, it is stated, appointed regent over Tu<sup>5</sup>.

In view of the dominant position in Tahiti which the Pomare family afterwards acquired, something should be said about their origin, and this is a convenient place for doing so. Many chiefs had ruled over Pare, the larger of the two main districts of Purionuu, before the Pomare dynasty was known there<sup>6</sup>. The ancestors of the Pomares were chiefs of Fakarava, one of the north-western Paumotuan islands; and the Pomares were always ashamed of their Paumotu descent, the Tahitians regarding the Paumotuans as savage and socially inferior. For this reason the Pomares tried religiously to hide the connection, and few Tahitians would have dared to allude to it in their presence. The record says that Tu of Fakarava, whose period was some generations (the number is not known) before that of Teu, the father of Pomare I, landed in Pare, became the guest of Mauaihiti, apparently the chief of Pare, and made himself so agreeable that Mauaihiti adopted him as a *hoa*, or brother, and ultimately, on Mauaihiti's death, Tu became his heir and successor. He then gave up all idea of returning to the Paumotu, and devoted his attention to extending his connections in Tahiti. He married into the Arue family—Arue being the other of the sub-districts of Purionuu—and thus his son had a claim to the chieftdom of both sub-districts—that was the whole of Purionuu. Subsequently Ta'aroa Manahune, his grandson, or a member of some later generation, married the daughter of Vehiatua, the powerful chief of Tairapu (the smaller peninsula), whose name has already appeared in the history of the Teva clan and whose successor took such a prominent part in

<sup>1</sup> This was the yellow belt referred to in the account of the origin of the Teva clan. It appears to have been inferior to the *maro-uru*, and to have been connected only with Papara.

<sup>2</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 74 sq. Cf. Forster, *Voy.* vol. II, p. 93.

<sup>3</sup> He was born about 1742 (Ari'i Taimai, p. 88).

<sup>4</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 88. <sup>5</sup> Forster, *Voy.* vol. II, p. 93. <sup>6</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 78.

the attack on Papara<sup>1</sup>. Teu (father of Pomare I) was a descendant of this marriage, three or more generations later; he was born about A.D. 1720, and married first to Tetupaia i Hauiri, a princess of the family of the head chiefs of Ra'iatea. This marriage was another important step in the social scale; for Ra'iatea was a most ancient and valuable social connection, and from Tetupaia her descendants inherited the right to wear the *maro-ura* of Ra'iatea<sup>2</sup>.

When Cook paid his first visit to the island of Tahiti in 1769 the position was that created by the events which I have narrated<sup>3</sup>; both Tu (Pomare I) and Tutaha were then living in Pare, the hereditary home of Tu<sup>4</sup>. Cook saw Tutaha at Matavai in Hapape<sup>5</sup>; but he did not see Tu<sup>6</sup>; he learnt that in an area of twenty miles the people could not sell pigs etc. without the permission of Tutaha<sup>7</sup>. On the other hand Amo, Porea and Teri'irere, who, as we have seen, had family connections in Hapape, and had escaped there, came to visit him, although only three or four months had elapsed since their defeat<sup>8</sup>. Ari'i Taimai explains that Teri'irere, whose father's mother was the daughter of the chief of Hapape, had a seat in the Hapape *marae*, and so was treated there with the respect due to an *ari'i rahi*, or head chief; whereas Tu, having no seat and no rights there, dare not enter the district<sup>9</sup>. The district chiefs stripped themselves on Teri'irere's approach; but this was because of the connection between the families<sup>10</sup>.

Tutaha, having attained to his high position as regent of Tu through the help of Vehiatua of Taiarapu, now turned his attention to the latter, and persuaded other chiefs to join in an attack upon him, so as to destroy the independence which had been given to his district of Taiarapu. There was a bloody battle in which Vehiatua was conqueror; Tutaha was killed, and Tu (Pomare I) fled to the mountains. Vehiatua, however, after laying waste the country, sent proposals of peace to Tu and his father, and these were accepted; Tu retained his chieftainship, and assumed the actual work of administration<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 84 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 86.

<sup>3</sup> See Wilson, p. xiii.

<sup>4</sup> Wilson, p. xiii. D'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. 1, p. 544.

<sup>5</sup> See map. It may be that Matavai was only a sub-district of Hapape; Ari'i Taimai, p. 7, says that Matavai was in Hapape.

<sup>6</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 89. Cf. d'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. 1, p. 544.

<sup>7</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 89.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 89 sq.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* p. 7.

<sup>11</sup> Wilson, p. xv. D'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. 1, p. 545. Cf. Ari'i Taimai, p. 90.

Vehiatua died shortly afterwards<sup>1</sup>. The following chiefs then ranked as equals: Vehiatua of Taiarapu (son of the chief last mentioned, having succeeded his father at the age of 17 or 18), Teri'irere of Papara, Teri'i Vaetua of Tefana, and Tu (Pomare I) of Pare. Of these Tu was (according to Ari'i Taimai) the least powerful; though the death of Tutaha had apparently brought the district of Hapape more or less under his influence<sup>2</sup>.

The Spaniards, who visited the island in 1772, saw Amo in Papara; but were told that Tu was the principal chief of the island, holding dominion over all the other chiefs<sup>3</sup>. Each of these, however, seemed to rule over his own district, and did not appear to render much obedience to Tu<sup>4</sup>. So also the Spanish visitors of 1774-5, whilst they recognized Vehiatua as the head chief of his own district, regarded Tu as the overlord, though the evidence of his supremacy seems to have been confined to acts of ceremonial respect paid to him and matters of taboo<sup>5</sup>.

At the time of Cook's second visit in 1773 Tu (Pomare I) was enjoying chief's honours<sup>6</sup>; but he was not apparently really recognized as the most important ruler of the island<sup>7</sup>. His district had not recovered from the ravages of war; provisions were scarce; and Tu himself was timid, and did not even wait to receive the English, though he was ultimately persuaded by Cook to go on board his ship<sup>8</sup>. Ari'i Taimai (quoting Cook) says Tu did not seem to enjoy much consideration, and complained that the chiefs of Tefana and Attahuru were not his friends, one reason for this being that Tu, being engaged, or about to be engaged, along with these two chiefs, in a war with the island of Eimeo, did not in fact take any part in it<sup>9</sup>. This war was caused apparently by the revolt of Eimeo, which was tributary to "Tahiti"<sup>10</sup>. The object of the Tefana and Attahuru chiefs was to support Teri'itapunui (Tu's wife's brother), who I imagine must have been in charge of the island, against

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 91.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Corney, *Tahiti*, vol. I, pp. 315, 323; vol. II, p. 79.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* vol. II, p. 58.

<sup>5</sup> Corney, *Tahiti*, vol. II, pp. 124, 242, 265.

<sup>6</sup> D'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. I, p. 545.

<sup>7</sup> Moerenhout, vol. II, pp. 410, 440.

<sup>8</sup> Wilson, p. xvii.

<sup>9</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 91.

<sup>10</sup> Ellis (Cook), vol. I, p. 139. The use here of the name "Tahiti" must be attributed to the mistaken view of the Cook party as to the political situation in that island. Chiefs in Eimeo were probably tributary to certain Tahitian chiefs; but Eimeo could not have been tributary to Tahiti, as the latter was not a political entity.



Mahine (Teri'itapunui's uncle), who led the revolt. The two chiefs wanted the help of Tu, who was, they thought, as much interested in the result of the war as they were; but Tu could not be induced to help them<sup>1</sup>.

It seems, however, that Cook and his party and (I may add) other Europeans were led to believe that Tu was a much more important ruler, with much wider dominions and power in Tahiti, than was really the case; and as Matavai, in Hapape, was Cook's most convenient harbour, and had become more or less under the sway of Tu, he became the provider of fresh meat to Cook's party. He really seems to have been regarded by them as the king of Tahiti. It was he, therefore, who received most of the axes and other gifts from the English; and the fury of the people of Tefana and Attahuru, who had never before been treated as the inferiors of a Purionuu chief, was so violent that Tu had to flee for safety from his own district of Purionuu to Matavai<sup>2</sup>.

Papara also had apparently lost influence completely<sup>3</sup>. Pickersgill, who visited Papara in 1773, thought that Porea was then entirely deprived of the greatness which had once rendered her conspicuous; and though she visited Cook's ship at Matavai with the usual presents, and both she and Amo retained the social position which they had always held, the glamour of royalty was gone. Porea, still, however, retained control of her own district, and Teri'irere was still *ari'i rahi* there<sup>4</sup>.

I would here draw attention to the confusion and errors which have probably found their way into some of the observations of travellers in Tahiti, and doubtless many other Polynesian islands, concerning the relative rank and power of chiefs. Superiority was of more kinds than one; it might be that of family rank, of nobility, or of recognized official headship of a district or number of districts, or of actual dominating influence, secured by personal strength of character, or military prowess. These are clearly distinctions which might easily be misunderstood and confused. One chief might, for example, be regarded by a traveller as dominant over all the others, because he, above all, received all the usual ceremonial marks of deferential respect; and yet it might be that this was offered

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 94.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 94.

<sup>3</sup> Moerenhout, vol. 1, pp. 410, 440.

<sup>4</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 92 *sq.* (quoting Cook and Forster).

to him merely in recognition of his superior family rank, whilst another chief, standing by his side, and not treated with such excessive ceremony, was, so far as official authority or actual dominating power or influence was concerned, his superior. Then again error in the impression of an observer as to the relative importance of two chiefs might have arisen from the chance of the particular district in which they were met. Possibly the mistake of Cook's party in regarding Tu as king of all Tahiti was mainly of this character. Ari'i Taimai doubts whether any head chief in Tahiti preserved his sacred character throughout the entire island, believing that each chief was sacred only among his own people or connections by marriage<sup>1</sup>; this factor also is obviously a ground for possible misunderstanding, for a chief, seen in his own district, might be regarded by a European as more important than a chief, who happened to be visiting there, of another district, though the latter was the greater of the two.

The next stage at which the history may be picked up is in 1777, when Cook paid his third visit to Tahiti. Purea had then died<sup>2</sup>; but Amo, who had married again, was still living, as also was Teri'irere, the latter being apparently still the head chief of Papara<sup>3</sup>. The Eimeo war was still proceeding, or, perhaps I should say, had broken out afresh; but the evidence as to this Eimeo business is somewhat confused, and as its importance for my present purpose is not sufficient to justify me in engaging in a long and critical investigation of details, I do not propose to do so. I may say that one result appears to have been to cause serious quarrels between Tu and Towha, the head chief of Tefana, but that Cook intervened, and a reconciliation between Towha and Tu was effected<sup>4</sup>.

In about 1782 Tu (Pomare I) had a son Tu<sup>5</sup>; and in accordance with the custom of the country he immediately abdicated in the son's favour, though continuing to act as his regent<sup>6</sup>. Tu then took the name of Tineh<sup>7</sup>. It was probably some time about the end of this year that the Eimeo people and Attahuruans combined in making a descent on Tu, and ultimately they defeated him; he fled into the mountains<sup>8</sup>, and his own lands were laid waste<sup>9</sup>. This was apparently a prolonged warfare.

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 7.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Wilson, p. xxii.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 97.

<sup>2</sup> Forster, *Obs.* p. 124. Ari'i Taimai, p. 96.

<sup>4</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 96.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 87.

<sup>7</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 99.

<sup>9</sup> Vancouver, vol. 1, p. 137.

It was probably some time in about 1788 that Tu changed his name to Pomare, and I shall in future refer to him as Pomare I and to his son as Pomare II though the latter did not assume the name of Pomare till his father died<sup>1</sup>. This change of name is explained by both Quatrefages and Ellis, and is an illustration of the readiness with which Tahitian chiefs altered their names. He had caught a cold, which developed into a cough, and caused him a sleepless night; this was spoken of as *po-mare* (night of cough), and he was so pleased with the sound of the word that he adopted it as his name<sup>2</sup>.

When Bligh arrived in the *Bounty* in 1788 the Pomares were almost at their last gasp. Purionuu had been thoroughly ravaged and apparently all the neighbours of Pomare I had united to impoverish him<sup>3</sup>. He was living in light portable sheds, and only had three large canoes<sup>4</sup>. He was afraid of being attacked when Bligh left the island, and wanted Bligh to take him and his wife to England<sup>5</sup>. The dignity of high chieftainship in the person of Pomare II was, however, not abandoned; for Bligh was only allowed to see him across a river at a distance of 50 yards<sup>6</sup>. The arrival of the *Bounty*, and the support which Pomare I received from the English, completely changed the situation<sup>7</sup>. In the further fighting which ensued Pomare I (acting as regent for his son) had as his foes Towha of Tefana, Potatow of Paea, and Mahine of Eimeo, who had come over for the purpose; but he was supported, not only by the English, but by the chief of Papara also<sup>8</sup>. Pomare succeeded in defeating his enemies in the latter part of 1790. Mahine of Eimeo was killed and Towha and Potatow had to flee into the hills and ultimately surrendered<sup>9</sup>. Pomare does not, however, seem to have then had any authority in Papara<sup>10</sup>.

In describing the defeat, after Bougainville's departure in 1768, of Amo and Puraea and Teri'irere, I have referred to the carrying off by Tutaha from the *marae* at Papara to his own *marae* at Paea, of the *maro-ura* of Papara which had been worn by Teri'irere at his inauguration. The Papara chief, though politically at the head of the Teva, had, as I have said before, not previously been regarded as being entitled (as was the Vaiari chief) to wear the *maro-ura*. This Papara belt, which is

<sup>1</sup> Ellis, vol. II, p. 70.

<sup>3</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 99.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 122, 137.

<sup>7</sup> Wilson, pp. xxv, 319.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 115.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* Quatrefages, p. 197 n. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Bligh, p. 72.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 74, 136.

<sup>8</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 102 sq.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

spoken of by Ari'i Taimai as "a curious form of the *maro-ura*" which Purea had made a symbol of supreme authority, was not, like the other *maro-ura*, an ancestral belt. It had been made under Purea's directions out of the British pennant left by Wallis at Matavai, and which Purea had taken to Papara<sup>1</sup>. This belt remained at the Paea *marae* from 1768 till 1790; but as the result of the fighting last described, the victorious Pomare had secured the belt, and carried it off to his *marae* in Pare<sup>2</sup>.

It was at this period that Pomare I left his son Pomare II in Pare with supreme authority [this would be only as a conqueror] over Tahiti and all the neighbouring islands, whilst he retired to the defeated Eimeo; and shortly afterwards he became regent of the island on behalf of a niece, to whom the chieftainship of the island had passed<sup>3</sup>, subject to the over-ruling authority of Pomare II, who, it will be noticed, was then only a boy. In this way Pomare fortified his son's authority over this island. Vehiatua, the great chief of Tairapu (the smaller peninsula), having died, leaving only a very distant relation to assume his name and government, Pomare and his adherents compelled this person to relinquish his rights, and, with the people of Tairapu, to acknowledge Pomare's younger son (the brother of Pomare II) as their chief, under the authority of Pomare II, and this young man assumed the name of Vehiatua as a necessary appendage to his government<sup>4</sup>; and another relative of Pomare took up his residence on the borders of Tairapu to watch the people in their allegiance to the new Vehiatua, so that measures could be taken in case of any sign of disaffection or revolt<sup>5</sup>. Thus was the authority of Pomare II over Tairapu fortified.

Speaking broadly, I may describe the situation by saying that the Pomare family had, by defeating their great rivals, established their authority over almost the whole of Tahiti and Eimeo; though, as Ari'i Taimai says, in commenting on Vancouver's account of the matter (which includes other particulars besides those I have quoted), nothing is said (*i.e.* by Vancouver) as to Pomare's most serious rival, the chief of

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 109. Other writers refer to the use of Wallis' flag for the making of this belt.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 106.

<sup>4</sup> I have referred, in speaking of the history of the ancestors of the Pomare family, to the marriage of Ta'aroa Manahune with the daughter of the Vehiatua; and Corney supplies a genealogy showing how the two families—the Vehiatua and the Pomares—thus had a common ancestry (Corney, *Tahiti*, Preface II, p. xxxix). I do not know by what process the brother of Pomare II secured the Vehiatua title; but the possibility of doing so may have arisen from this common ancestry.

<sup>5</sup> Vancouver, vol. I, p. 140.

Papara<sup>1</sup>. A few writers, notably the *Duff* missionaries, d'Urville and Moerenhout, of whom the last two, at all events, were, as regards this matter, only collectors of past history, tell us something of the events and schemes which led up to this situation; but I do not think I need lengthen this chapter by referring to their statements, especially as there seems to be some confusion in them as regards both names and relationships.

There seems to be confusion as to the identity of the chief of Papara who had helped Pomare in obtaining his victories; but I shall adopt Ari'i Taimai's explanation. Teri'irere had died in or before 1788, leaving a younger half-brother Temari'i Ari'ifaataia, then aged 15 or 16<sup>2</sup>. The head chieftainship of Papara had passed to this young man, and Ari'ipaea, the husband of Amo's niece, had been appointed his guardian<sup>3</sup>. This person was half-brother to Pomare, but was supposed not to be on good terms with him; he was, however, a weak man, allowed himself to be influenced by Pomare, remained inactive during the early period of his campaign, but ultimately came to his assistance<sup>4</sup>. He appears to have been hardly true to his guardianship trust in allowing the *maro-ura* of Papara, when taken from Attahuru, to be carried away to Pare; indeed we are told that the Papara people regarded him as having betrayed his trust, and resented his action profoundly, not having had any share in it, and not recognizing it as binding upon them<sup>5</sup>.

The *Pandora*, in pursuit of the mutinous crew of the *Bounty*, reached Tahiti in 1791. It would seem that at that time Temari'i Ari'ifaataia (also spoken of as Ari'ifaataia or Temarre) had "come of age," and taken up the responsibilities of his position<sup>6</sup>. Captain Edwards, in charge of the *Pandora*, found that some of the mutineers were with Temari'i, who was regarded as a great chief in Papara, and the proper "king of Tahiti," the Pomare family being regarded as usurpers<sup>7</sup>. Pomare himself seemed to have very little authority or influence in Papara, and though he claimed the sovereignty of the eastern part of the island (Tairapu), this was disputed by Temari'i<sup>8</sup>. As on the occasion of Bligh's visit, Pomare wanted the English to take him and his wife to England<sup>9</sup>. Ari'i Taimai

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 108.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 111.

<sup>7</sup> Hamilton, p. 25.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 110 sq.

<sup>8</sup> Edwards, p. 32.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 111, and Table VII.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 115.

<sup>9</sup> Hamilton, p. 58.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

says it would appear that Temari'i, as chief of Papara, was as powerful and independent, and as hostile to the ambition of Pomare, as any of his predecessors had been<sup>1</sup>. It will be noted that Tairapu, which was included in the area of Pomare's power, was the land of the outer Teva; and, as Ari'i Taimai points out, the control of this area was in itself a matter of concern to the inner Teva<sup>2</sup>, of whom, along with the outer Teva, Temari'i was the head chief.

Vancouver visited the island in 1792. Pomare I was then in Eimeo, and Pomare II (the then reigning Pomare) in Tahiti<sup>3</sup>. Vancouver refers to the restrictions which prevented the young reigning chief from entering the white men's tents and ships, and to the freedom with which the other did so, without causing the inconvenience which would have arisen if his son had done it<sup>4</sup>.

Ari'i Taimai, in commenting upon the events in Tahiti above narrated, says that in old times, whenever a single chief became intolerably arrogant, or threatened to destroy the rest, the other chiefs united to overthrow him. All the wars remembered in the traditions of the island were caused by the overweening pride, violence or ambition of great chiefs or districts, and ended in restoring the balance. Pura had been punished in this way, and the *maro-ura*, or symbol of sovereignty, she had assumed for her son passed for safe keeping to the *marae* of Tutaha at Paea, in Attahuru. Then, when Tutaha tried to assert supreme authority, he was defeated and killed. Ultimately Tu (Pomare) I attempted domination, and he was temporarily overthrown, and would have been so altogether, but for the help which he received from the English<sup>5</sup>. Pomare could win supremacy only by destroying, one after the other, the whole of the old chieftain class; for so long as one of them survived, he was sure to champion the great body of the islanders, who detested the tyranny of a single ruler, and knew what it meant for them. Against a despotism of this character their tribal system was their only protection; they clung to this, and Pomare had to destroy it or succumb<sup>6</sup>.

The history of Tahiti for some years after Vancouver's visit is sparse, and somewhat confusing, and it does not seem to include any events to which it is necessary for me to refer;

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 105.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 106.

<sup>4</sup> Vancouver, vol. 1, p. 146. The reason of this would be that the sanctity or taboo associated with the family title had passed, with the title, to Pomare II.

<sup>5</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 138.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 138 sq.

I will pick up the narrative, however, in 1798, in which year, with some subsequent years, we have the diary records contained in the *Transactions of the London Missionary Society*. In this year Temari'i Ari'ifaataia (whom I shall call Temari'i) died<sup>1</sup>. By this event the line of Amo became extinct, and the succession to the head chieftainship of Papara passed to Amo's younger brother, Manea. Manea died (probably in the same year), and his grandson, Taura atua i Patea, afterwards known as Tati, succeeded to the chieftainship; Ari'i Taimai says that he was probably friendly with Pomare II<sup>2</sup>.

According to these missionary records there had been at this time some hostility between Pomare II and his father (Pomare I) and mother; and it appears to have been connected with Temari'i, or he was connected with it. It is said that Temari'i was "closely allied" with Pomare II against his parents; and reference is made to the anger shown by Pomare II towards the missionaries when Temari'i died, the idea apparently having been that in their efforts to cure him they had really cursed the medicine and so purposely caused his death. The parents seem to have stood in dread of the close union subsisting between their son and Temari'i, and the missionaries believed that they would rejoice at the death of the latter. It is said that so deep rooted was the jealousy between them and him that the missionaries were every day expecting an open rupture<sup>3</sup>. We find a reference, a couple of months after the death, to reports that Pomare II was going to make war, evidently against his parents' party<sup>4</sup> and to the fact that his younger brother, then chief of Taiarapu, had previously threatened to make war upon him, being, the missionaries thought, in league with his parents<sup>5</sup>. It is impossible to say what this was all about; but a conceivable explanation is that Pomare II, who was then officially the head chief of Purionuu, was chafing under some continued interference by his father with his affairs, and wanted to secure his independence. I have not found any mention of a situation of this character anywhere else in Polynesia; but, if my suggested explanation is correct, it could hardly arise, except with a system, like that of the Society Islands, under which the son succeeded to his father's rank and official position in the life-

<sup>1</sup> L.M.S. *Trans.* vol. 1, pp. 76 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 147 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> L.M.S. *Trans.* vol. 1, pp. 78 sq.

<sup>4</sup> Pomare I was then in the Paumotu. See *Trans.* vol. 1, p. 84, and cf. Ari'i Taimai, p. 129.

<sup>5</sup> L.M.S. *Trans.* vol. 1, pp. 83 sq.

time of the father, but the latter might continue to exercise for a time the control of the chiefdom.

On the following day (we are still in 1798) the missionaries were told that Pomare II and Mannemanne had usurped the power over all the larger peninsula, and turned Pomare I out from exercising authority in any part of it, a statement which points to active interference by him in his son's affairs. The districts of Pare, Tataha [which appears in the *Duff* map in the position of Tefana, and was perhaps another name for it], Attahuru, Papara, etc. [all the lands to the westward, and running round to the south], had declared for Pomare II. The land of "this district" [Matavai, where the missionaries were; see Wilson, p. 202, Ellis, vol. II, p. 7, and Ari'i Taimai, p. 130] to the eastern boundary had been given by Pomare II to Mannemanne, he reserving the westernmost part for himself. The arrangement seems to have been that, if the districts on "this side of the island" to the isthmus [Aharoa—cf. Ari'i Taimai, p. 130] should refuse to acknowledge the sovereignty of Pomare II, Mannemanne would compel them to do so by force of arms. The missionaries comment on this that the absence of Pomare I had been a favourable opportunity<sup>1</sup>.

This person Mannemanne was a native of "Oryatea" [Ra'iatea] of which island he had once been chief, but his subjects had revolted and expelled him from the island. He had then sought shelter in Tahiti and obtained it, and had there exercised the office of chief priest for many years. In this capacity he had been guilty of much slaughter, shedding torrents of human blood in sacrifice. He was esteemed by all ranks as a man of great knowledge, so that it was thought he had not his equal on the island. He was related to Pomare I, who was afraid of him, believing that whom he blessed was blessed, and whom he cursed was cursed<sup>2</sup>. The missionaries seem to have regarded him as chief priest of the whole island, which he could not have been. Ari'i Taimai says he was the high priest of Ra'iatea and of Maraetaata<sup>3</sup> and refers to him as the high priest of Attahuru<sup>4</sup>; and the missionaries, living at Matavai, might well imagine that he was high priest of all Tahiti. I see from the *Duff* list of districts and their chiefs in 1797 that Mannemanne was chief of Hewow, which, according

<sup>1</sup> L.M.S. *Trans.* vol. I, p. 85.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 92.

<sup>3</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 123 (Maraetaata was the great *marae* of Oro in Paea).

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 131.



to their map, was in the position of my Tiarie, and of Attah-roah and Owahie, which, according to their map, were in my Tautira<sup>1</sup>.

I pass over a number of relatively unimportant entries in the diary appearing in the records, with war and rumours of war, the death of Mannemanne, and in March 1799, the ratification of peace between Pomare II and his father<sup>2</sup>, and pick up the thread again with the war conducted by Pomare I and Pomare II against Attahuru with reference to the image of the god Oro in his great *marae* (Maraetaata) in Attahuru. This war, I may say, is referred to by several writers, but probably some, at all events, of their information has been obtained from missionary sources. From the missionary records it appears that war of some sort was in progress in 1799, and the reason for it, as the missionaries then understood it, was the resentment by the Attahuru people of the high-handed, tyrannical and oppressive conduct of the chiefs; but even at this stage the image of Oro comes in; for the missionaries were told that the Attahuru people had removed it to the mountains lest it should fall into the hands of their enemies<sup>3</sup>. The diary entries during the latter part of 1799 and the years 1800 and 1801 contain references to war, or rather rumours of war. They speak of commotions among the lower classes of natives against Pomare on account of his tyrannical conduct and frequent plundering of the people; and of their desire to restore to the island its ancient form of government; under which every district was subject to its own chief, without the acknowledgment of a superior over him<sup>4</sup>. It is not stated that this discontent and agitation was merely in Attahuru; and we find that in the autumn of 1800 Pomare I did not seem to know who were his friends, or who his foes, but acknowledged as the probable cause of the discontent the arbitrary proceedings of Pomare II, and the general desire of the people for the suppression of a monarchical form of government and the re-establishment of the independence of each district<sup>5</sup>. I mention these preliminary details, because other writers on this war seem to associate it solely with the wish of the Pomares to carry off the image of Oro from his *marae* at Attahuru, whereas from these records, taken at the time, and other records, it appears that the political

<sup>1</sup> Wilson, pp. 215, 202.

<sup>2</sup> L.M.S. *Trans.* vol. I, pp. 87-116.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 176.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 143 sq.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 202 sq.

question also entered into it, in some way, which I cannot define; and the way in which these records are written points to the previous independence of one another, and freedom from controlling rule, of the chiefs of different parts of Tahiti, to which attention has already been drawn. I fancy that, behind all these suggested reasons, was the desire of the Pomares to secure a dominating power over the independent chiefs of Attahuru.

The scene of the drama now passes to Attahuru where the Pomares had gone with their fleet to attend a conference which had been arranged. The missionaries, who went there, passed the great *marae* of Oro, where they saw the pigs' bodies on the altars, and the bodies of men who had been sacrificed hanging on the trees; and they tell us of the great image of the god, laid on a stool on the beach, covered with cloth, and of the prayers and chants offered by "the king" [this meant Pomare II] and priests, and of the subsequent movement of the fleet to a spot close to the shore opposite to the *marae*, the king and priests still praying in the *marae*<sup>1</sup>.

Then came the great council meeting of Pomare I, Pomare II and all the principal *ra'atira* in the *marae*, the Pomare party sitting on one side of the ring and the Attahuru party on the other. The subject of discussion was the demand of Pomare II that the image of Oro should be handed over to him, which the Attahuruans were unwilling to do. When they finally refused to do this, Pomare II broke up the meeting, and immediately his people seized and carried off the image. They with their fleet were all prepared to fight, but this was avoided by the retreat into the valley of the people of Attahuru. Pomare II fearing that the god would be angry at the treatment of his images had one of his own servants killed and offered as a sacrifice<sup>2</sup>. Moerenhout, in referring to the event, attributes the desire of the Pomares to have the image to their belief that their triumph over their enemies would not be complete until the image had been snatched from the most dangerous of them<sup>3</sup>.

The Pomares did not take the stolen image of the god to their own district of Purionuu; they took it to a *marae* of Oro in the district of Tautira in the smaller peninsula where it was to be deposited. I shall refer to this in a subsequent page. The fleet

<sup>1</sup> L.M.S. *Trans.* vol. II, pp. 63, 64.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 64 sq. Cf. Ellis, vol. II, pp. 51 sq.; d'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. I, pp. 552 sq.; Turnbull, pp. 151 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Moerenhout, vol. II, p. 430.

accompanied it, sailing southwards and then eastwards right round the south side of the island<sup>1</sup>. Tautira was reached and further ceremonies, with human sacrifice, took place there; but in the meantime the Attahuru people renewed the conflict, and made an attack on Purionuu, where they were met by, but defeated, troops from Tefana, Pare, Matavai and Eimeo. Then they were joined by the districts of Papara, Puppe, Ooreede and Pappere, marched to Tautira, fought and defeated Pomare, and recaptured the image of the god<sup>2</sup>. I cannot identify Puppe and Ooreede; but Pappere is evidently my Papeari (Vaiari); Ellis says that the "rebels" secured the support of "the whole of the south-west side of the larger peninsula" in this last attack<sup>3</sup>. Taking the two statements together, we may believe that the Attahuruans were supported by the Teva districts; so here again we find an example of general opposition to a would-be conqueror of the island. Further fighting occurred; but in 1803 peace was declared and the Attahuru people delivered over to Pomare II the image of the god<sup>4</sup>. Shortly afterwards, in the same year, Pomare I died<sup>5</sup>.

I do not know where Pomare II kept the image temporarily after he had received it; but it is clear that it was necessary for it to be deposited solemnly in the *marae* of Tautira. Considerable preparations were made for this in both Tahiti and Eimeo and in 1806 the image was taken and deposited in Tautira with offerings, human and other, to the gods. It was accompanied by the images of five other gods, one of which, Ohero [? Hiro] was placed with that of Oro in his house in his own sacred canoe, and the other four, Tane, Temeharo, Ruahadu and Huae-maa [of which Temeharo was the tutelary god of the Pomare family<sup>6</sup> and the last two were shark gods] each had its own canoe. These other five gods, having accompanied the great Oro to his destination, returned home again<sup>7</sup>.

I do not propose to continue the history of Tahiti any further. It is a story of victories and defeats, plots and counterplots. For some time the Pomare party was in retreat in the island

<sup>1</sup> L.M.S. *Trans.* vol. II, pp. 65, 110. Cf. d'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. I, p. 552; Ellis, vol. II, p. 52; Moerenhout, vol. II, pp. 430 sq.

<sup>2</sup> L.M.S. *Trans.* vol. II, pp. 110-14. Cf. Ellis, vol. II, pp. 52-5; Turnbull, pp. 152 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Ellis, vol. II, p. 55.

<sup>4</sup> L.M.S. *Trans.* vol. II, p. 289. Cf. Turnbull, p. 318.

<sup>5</sup> L.M.S. *Trans.* vol. II, pp. 147, 292, and other writers.

<sup>6</sup> Lesson, *Voy.* vol. I, p. 400. Cf. L.M.S. *Trans.* vol. IV, p. 432.

<sup>7</sup> L.M.S. *Trans.* vol. III, pp. 169-71.

of Eimeo, occasionally returning to Tahiti to renew their efforts to recover their power. The policy of the Pomares appears to have been to exterminate all possible rival chiefs. Ultimately in 1815 they were again successful, and were established in the government of Tahiti and its dependencies. A striking feature of the whole history, so far as the Pomare family is concerned, of which indications have appeared in past pages, but which I could have brought out conspicuously, is the steady help and support which they seem to have had from the English, including the missionaries, without which they could never have attained the position they secured. As regards this, I must point out that these people seem to have imagined that the Pomare family were in truth the rightful kings of all Tahiti and its dependencies.

#### OTHER SOCIETY ISLANDS

The island of Eimeo, close to Tahiti, was, as I have said above, divided into eight districts, and Ribourt (1855) tells us something about them. He first distinguishes between two main divisions of the island, viz. Eha te io iraro at the north and a little to the east, and Eha te io inia in the south and a little to the west, which formerly obeyed two great *ari'i* or chiefs<sup>1</sup>. Raro means, according to Tregear's dictionary, "below" or "underneath." Each of these divisions should, as indicated by its name<sup>2</sup>, comprise four sub-divisions, and Ribourt gives the following information on the subject. The sub-divisions of Eha te io iraro were Paiuma, Teaharoa, Varari and Faatoai or Papetoai. Paiuma comprised three districts—Moruu, Haapiti and Teavaro. Teaharoa comprised two districts—Teaharoa and Atimaha. The chief of Varari formerly had under his orders two chiefs of lesser importance, but their names had ceased to exist. The sub-divisions of Eha te io inia were Maatea, Haumi and Afareaitu. Maatea formerly had two chiefs; but Pomare instituted a sole chief in their place. Afareaitu formerly comprised two distinct parts, and these, with Maatea and Haumi, formed the four sub-divisions of Eha te io inia; but Pomare had substituted one chief of the whole in place of the two chiefs of the parts<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Ribourt, p. 311. Cf. Davies, *Dict.* p. 119; de Bovis, p. 251.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Tregear, *aeha*, four; and Turner, p. 374, *ha*, four.

<sup>3</sup> Ribourt, pp. 311 sq.

My main reason for giving these details is that they show how uncertain are detailed statements by observers as to the political division and sub-division of islands, not only in the Society group, where we have seen something of the same sort in the lesser peninsula of Tahiti, but, I think, in Polynesia generally; and how easy it is for the accounts of different persons given at different periods to disagree with one another. In referring to the Society Island practice of dividing into eight districts, I mentioned the fact that in Borabora there were only seven; but very likely the original number had been eight. There are other references to changes of a similar character in Eimeo<sup>1</sup>; and Agostini (1895) divides the island into four districts of Papetoai, Haapiti, Afareitu and Teavaro<sup>2</sup>. The island has been referred to in connection with Tahiti; but I do not propose to trace out its internal history, which does not help us in understanding the political systems of the Society Islands. In Wallis' time (1767) the whole island seems to have been under the dominion of the Papara family of Tahiti, and Cook mentions a "king" of Eimeo<sup>3</sup> which suggests a ruling chief, acting, perhaps, under some suzerainty of Papara; but ultimately it passed into the rule of the Pomares.

Of the north-western islands, Ra'iatea seems to have been by far the most important. It had had an ancient name of Havai'i<sup>4</sup>; it is also sometimes spoken of under the name of Ulietea. If we adopt Percy Smith's views as to the widely spread character of the use of the name Hawaiki (in its various forms) in the islands of the Pacific, the fact that it was the name of Ra'iatea may have some significance, pointing to the island as a halting ground of some body of migrants, from which they had afterwards moved on still further in their migrations<sup>5</sup>; and from this might arise traditions, which may or may not have been correct, that later island homes had been derived from the alleged earlier Hawaiki. There were traditions of this character with reference to Ra'iatea. Miss T. Henry gives an ancient chant, obtained by her grandfather from Ra'iatean scholars in 1817, in which we found Havai'i (Ra'iatea) spoken

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 162 167-71.

<sup>2</sup> Agostini, p. 100.

<sup>3</sup> Cook, vol. I, p. 132; vol. VI, pp. 27 sq. Cf. Ellis (Cook), vol. I, p. 139.

<sup>4</sup> Smith, p. 56; *J.P.S.* vol. II, p. 33; vol. XXVI, p. 115. Corney, *Tahiti*, vol. II, p. 164. Leverd, *J.P.S.* vol. XIX, p. 176. T. Henry, *ibid.* vol. III, p. 136; vol. XXI, p. 77. Gaussin, p. 276.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Smith, pp. 49, 57, 259. Savai'i (Samoa) is, like Havai'i, the same word; and there can be little doubt that this island was a great starting point for expeditions eastward.

of as the birthplace of lands. Its first-born was the island of Borabora; then followed Maupiti (Marua), Mopeha, Scilly (Fenuaura), Motuiti (Bellinghousen), Huahine and Maiao (Tubai?), all of them being islands in or near the north-western section, of which Ra'iatea is the principal island, of the Society group. After this follow islands of the Paumotuan and Marquesan groups and others. I find no reference to Tahiti or the other south-eastern Society Islands<sup>1</sup>. Gaussin, writing in 1853, says that it was to Hawai'i, as Ra'iatea was originally called, and in particular to the *marae* of Hawai'i, constructed by Oro, the first king of the island, that the natives of the Society group carried back their traditions<sup>2</sup>. Miss Henry also says that it was formerly asserted, and by many Tahitians of the present time (1911) is still believed, that Tahiti and Mo'orea (Eimeo) were once one land, and formed part of Ra'iatea, uniting it with Tahaa, now separated from it by a strait. She tells a legend that during a time of great sacredness throughout Ra'iatea, whilst the priests communed with the gods at the great *marae* of Opoa [in Ra'iatea], a young girl committed the sacrilege of bathing in the river. Owing to the displeasure of the gods, she was swallowed whole by a great eel, which arose from a sudden opening of the ground in the bed of the river, and which, becoming possessed by the spirit of the girl, burrowed through the ground, and broke away the eastern side of the land, which thus became detached, and quickened, and swam away as a fish to its (Tahiti's) present position in the east, Mo'orea falling off by the way. The fish was guided by the god Tu (stability) standing on its head<sup>3</sup>. She refers also to a Paumotuan belief which appears to be a variation of the above<sup>4</sup>. Ellis, after speaking of the Society Island traditions of creation by Tangaroa, says that another extensive and popular tradition referred the origin of the people to Opoa, in the island of Ra'iatea, where the *ti'i*, or spirits, formerly resided, these assuming to themselves, or receiving from the gods, human bodies, and becoming the progenitors of mankind. The name of one was Ti'i Maaraauta—the *ti'i* branching or extending towards the land or the interior; the name of another was Ti'i Maaraatai—the *ti'i* branching or spreading towards the sea. These, however, were supposed to be but other names for Tangaroa. It was thought that previously the islands had been resorted to only by gods

<sup>1</sup> T. Henry, *J.P.S.* vol. III, pp. 136 *sqq.*

<sup>3</sup> T. Henry, *J.P.S.* vol. XX, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Gaussin, p. 276.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 5.

or spiritual beings, but that these two, endowed with powers of procreation, had produced the human species. They first resided at Opoa, whence they peopled the island of Ra'iatea; but subsequently they spread themselves over the whole cluster<sup>1</sup>. There are a number of other references to beliefs as to the peopling of Tahiti or parts of it, from Ra'iatea, to which I shall refer later.

Ra'iatea was divided into eight districts<sup>2</sup>, each of which would presumably have a chief at its head. It also had, as we shall see directly, its head chiefs or kings ruling over the whole island.

Cook was told that Ra'iatea was formerly the most eminent "of this cluster of islands" (by which he may mean only the north-western cluster of the Society group, or the entire group), and probably the first seat of government<sup>3</sup>. It is said that, prior to Wallis' visit in 1767 to Tahiti, Ra'iatea was the most eminent of "the group" (by which, I think, is meant the whole Society group)<sup>4</sup>. Another statement is that for ages unknown the king of Ra'iatea was regarded as being to a great extent supreme in all the islands around, these being tributary to him, and their kings, with all their civil officers, receiving their authority from him, and from time to time sending him tribute<sup>5</sup>. According to de Bovis, each island had its independent chiefs, and the supremacy of Ra'iatea was altogether religious; it was like Rome to the Catholics, Mecca to Musulmen and Jerusalem to Jews<sup>6</sup>. The island was the cradle of royalty and religion; and it was there that on certain solemn occasions, the noblest and most ancient *marae* of Mo'orea (Eimeo) were obliged to send human victims<sup>7</sup>. For isolated and still barbarous populations, it was only a step from the prestige surrounding the island kings to the idea that they were also gods. The petty sovereigns rendered homage to the spirit of Opoa; even those of Tahiti bringing him their presents, and calling him their lord<sup>8</sup>.

Quatrefages gives a translation of a list of the kings of Ra'iatea; it is apparently an authentic document, closely checked, he says, when used by the Pomare family to prove to the French officials the family's rights in the islands<sup>9</sup>; but Quatrefages thinks the list is incomplete in the sense that it

<sup>1</sup> Ellis, vol. 1, p. 111.

<sup>3</sup> Cook, vol. VI, p. 114.

<sup>5</sup> L.M.S. Q.C. vol. II, p. 426.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 223.

<sup>9</sup> Quatrefages, pp. 195 *sqq.*

<sup>2</sup> Tyerman, vol. 1, p. 519.

<sup>4</sup> Wilson, p. xxxix.

<sup>6</sup> De Bovis, p. 294.

<sup>8</sup> Arbousset, p. 260. Cf. Baessler, *N.S.B.* p. 123.

does not go far enough back, and that the earliest names would probably be those of gods<sup>1</sup>. A revised and annotated copy of this list, made from materials collected in the early part of last century, has been prepared by Miss T. Henry<sup>2</sup>. The first name in the list is thirty generations prior to the Ra'iatean princess Tetupaia, who married Teu, and was the mother of Pomare I—probably in about the middle of the eighteenth century. Calculating on Percy Smith's basis of 25 years for a generation (which we must do, whether it is right or wrong, for the purpose of comparison with his dates), this list takes us back to A.D. 1000, which is about the time when, according to Smith, there was living in Tahiti Tui-nui, the great-great-grandson of Apakura<sup>3</sup>, a woman who fills a large space in Maori and Moriori traditions, and was known in those of Rarotonga and Samoa<sup>4</sup>. The name of the first king in the list was Uru, and that of his wife was Hina. Uru is a being of whom I have no knowledge; but Miss Henry says that the name is well known, both to Hawai'ians and the Maoris, both people tracing descent from a person of that name<sup>5</sup>. The mythical Hina was believed to have been specially associated with Tangaroa in his works of creation; but she, or other women of the same name, were supposed to have married other gods, and mythical (?) human beings.

The special interest, for our present purpose, of this genealogy is the appearance (the fifteenth from the beginning) of the name Hiro, presumably the great deified navigator of that name so well known in Polynesian traditions including those of Tahiti; for this leads me to refer to a Ra'iatean tradition. I shall have to refer presently to beliefs that the great Society Island god Oro was the son of Tangaroa, and that Hiro was either Oro's brother or his descendant; also that it was Hiro who first consecrated to Horo (whom I identify with Oro) the great *marae* at Opoa in Ra'iatea. The story to which I draw attention here is that Hiro, the king of Ra'iatea had two sons, of whom one succeeded his father in Ra'iatea, and there wore the *maro-ura* (red girdle) of royalty, whilst the other went to Borabora, founded there a *marae* called Vaiotaa, and, in order to show that he was king in Borabora, and independent of the dynasty of his brother in Ra'iatea, instituted there a white *maro*, to be a sign of royalty to his posterity<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Quatrefages, pp. 171 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Smith, p. 222.

<sup>5</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. II, p. 27.

<sup>2</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. II, pp. 25-42.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 202.

<sup>6</sup> De Bovis, pp. 236 sq.



The ancient name for the island of Borabora had been Vavau<sup>1</sup>. This name, appearing in one form or another, is one of the names which Smith associates with the traditional fatherland of the Polynesians, drawing attention, in connection with this subject, to its appearance in the Tongan group and to its having been the original name of Borabora<sup>2</sup>. Parkinson says that, prior to the time of the conquering Opuna (Puni), of whom I shall speak presently, the government of the island had been "feudal"<sup>3</sup>. Edwards (1791) mentions a king of Borabora, named Tahatoo<sup>4</sup>. Orsmond (the missionary) says (1823) that Mai and Tefaora were then the kings of Borabora<sup>5</sup>. Tyerman and Bennet refer to these two kings<sup>6</sup>. De Bovis (1855) says that the island had two independent chiefs, named Mai and Tefaaroa, whose laws were recognized in turn; and that Mai's heir was taken by Cook to England<sup>7</sup>. He also says that Mai and Tefaaroa were the titles implying sovereignty in the island<sup>8</sup>. Ari'i Taimai says the island had a head chief<sup>9</sup>. This evidence suggests two great chief families, whose ancestral titles were Mai and Tefaaroa, of whom sometimes one and sometimes the other held the sovereignty of the whole island, a system which may be compared with that of the *tuihaatakalaua* and *tuikanokubolu* of Tongatabu, as interpreted by me. I have referred to the beliefs as to the founding of a royal dynasty in Borabora by a son of Hiro, the king of Ra'iatea, and it is quite possible that these two families of Mai and Tefaaroa, were related families, both descended from this ancestor, each occupying its own area, and of whom sometimes one and sometimes the other, provided the king of the whole island.

Huahine was, as we have seen, divided into eight districts, each of which apparently had its own god; presumably each district would have its own head chief. Close to the great *marae* of Tane, with its platform for the god in the centre, the images of the eight attendant gods being to the right and left of it, were eight isolated stones, set up at some distance from one another, indicating the parts of the *marae* belonging to the respective districts, and round which the inhabitants con-

<sup>1</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. II, p. 34; vol. III, p. 136; vol. XIX, p. 176; vol. XXI, p. 77; vol. XXVI, p. 115.

<sup>2</sup> Smith, pp. 66 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> Parkinson (2), p. 62.

<sup>4</sup> Edwards, p. 39.

<sup>5</sup> Lesson, *Voy.* vol. I, p. 407 n.

<sup>6</sup> Tyerman, vol. II, p. 3.

<sup>7</sup> De Bovis, p. 294. Cf. Caillot, *L.P.O.* p. 98.

De Bovis, p. 295.

<sup>9</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 86

gregated in tribes on public occasions<sup>1</sup>. It is probable that these stones were seats or pillars on which the eight chiefs sat, or against which they leaned. The sovereignty of the whole island passed in turn to one or the other of two rival families, who contested the power, which would be secured in accord with the relative capacities or popularity of the two respective chiefs<sup>2</sup>; and here again I suggest that the two families probably had a common ancestry. The beliefs as to this may perhaps be seen in a tradition of the origin of the god and royal family of Huahine. It was said that a couple having an only daughter, for whom no husband could be found in her own land, sent her to sea in a drum under the care of the god Tane. They landed on Huahine, of which Tane became the tutelar god, and the young lady, whose name was Hotuhiva, married a chief Teaonuimarua, and had two sons, Tina and Hena, who were considered to be the ancestors of the "present chiefs"<sup>3</sup>.

These north-western islands of the Society group seem to have been closely associated. It may, I should imagine, be almost assumed that Ra'iatea would in early days be the predominating island of the cluster. There is a statement that a few years before Wallis' time (1767) it was in strict alliance with Huahine and Tahaa<sup>4</sup>; but its influence may have extended to other islands. Cook was told that the rocky and barren island of Borabora had originally been uninhabited; but the kings of Tahiti and the neighbouring islands had begun to send their exiled criminals there, and their numbers were increased by others who fled thither to escape punishment. The people on the island thus became so numerous that its resources were insufficient for their subsistence, and they became pirates, seizing every canoe that fell into their power. One of these people, a man named Puni, became their head chief. Under his leadership they attacked and conquered Tahaa, and landed in Ra'iatea, where, after three years' fighting, the head chief of that island was killed, and apparently almost the whole island fell into the hands of the invaders. This head chief left an infant son, who was immediately invested with the *maro-ura*. Then followed a final and decisive victory for Puni, which put him in possession of the whole island; and the young king fled with his followers to Tahiti. Puni afterwards conquered several other neighbouring islands, which he annexed as dependencies

<sup>1</sup> Tyerman, vol. 1, p. 282.

<sup>2</sup> Davies, *Dict.* p. iv.

<sup>3</sup> De Bovis, p. 295.

<sup>4</sup> Wilson, p. xxxix.

to his dominion of Borabora<sup>1</sup>. The situation at the time of Cook's first visit (1769), seems to have been that Ra'iatea was under the administration of a man called Oree, as representative of Puni; and mention is made of Ooroo, the real king of Ra'iatea, who retained his title and rank<sup>2</sup>; Puni was then nearly 90 years of age<sup>3</sup>. The Spanish visitors say that in 1775 Puni was the chief of Ra'iatea, and many of the adjacent islands were tributary to him; that he was the chief of Ra'iatea and Tahaa; that Tahuaoha, who was the chief of Huahine, was tributary to Puni, who ruled in Ra'iatea; and that Borabora and Marua belonged to the chief of Ra'iatea<sup>4</sup>.

Some time—I do not know how long—after this, Puni died; and at his death both Ra'iatea and Tahaa fell, according to the *Duff* missionaries, into the possession of a person called Manne Manne<sup>5</sup>, also known by the name of Moure<sup>6</sup>. There is some confusion as to the identity of this person; but he was clearly a Ra'iatean chief, and presumably a member of the royal family of Ra'iatea. He is spoken of by Vancouver as the real king of Ra'iatea and Tahaa<sup>7</sup>. The matter is not of sufficient importance for the introduction here of a detailed discussion of it; so I will content myself with saying that there seems to be no doubt that he was the Mannemanne whose name has already appeared in the sketch of the history of Tahiti.

Pomare II either had, or thought or pretended that he had, some expectant claim to Ra'iatea. Vancouver says that he would in right of his paternal grandmother (meaning thereby Tetupaia i Ra'iatea), on the death of Moure, claim the sovereignty of Ra'iatea and Tahaa; and adds that Moure seemed fond of Pomare II, and proud that he should be his heir<sup>8</sup>. The *Duff* missionaries say that Mannemanne meant to leave the two islands to Pomare II. What happened, and how Pomare did, in a way, secure control of them is not explained. I may say, however, that he had other Ra'iatean ancestry, besides that of his grandmother Tetupaia i Ra'iatea. According to Ari'i Taimai's tables his mother Iddeah and her mother were both Ra'iatean chieftainesses<sup>9</sup>; they were, perhaps, it may be

<sup>1</sup> Parkinson (2), pp. 61 sqq. Cf. Parkinson (1), p. 73; Turnbull, p. 190; Wilson, p. xxxix.

<sup>2</sup> Cook, vol. I, p. 246; vol. III, p. 347; vol. VI, p. 114. Forster, *Voy.* vol. II, p. 156.

<sup>3</sup> Parkinson (2), p. 63.

<sup>4</sup> Corney, *Tahiti*, vol. II, pp. 166, 192 sq.

<sup>5</sup> Wilson, p. xl.

<sup>7</sup> Vancouver, vol. I, p. 141.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. xxxiii.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> Table III, p. 43.

mentioned, the two women who—first the mother and then the daughter—tried to break the *rahui* instituted by Purae<sup>1</sup>.

To what extent Pomare II secured some form of power over Ra'iatea and others of the north-western islands, appears to be doubtful, though his supremacy over Ra'iatea and Borabora seems to have been acknowledged in 1806<sup>2</sup>; but he apparently did not acquire the title of the Ra'iatean royal family. In 1822, at all events, a Tamatoa<sup>3</sup> was head chief of Ra'iatea; and the missionaries were told that in his youth he had also been sovereign of Borabora, Huahine and Tahaa, possessing not only the lands, but the absolute government; but that he had since then given Huahine to the sister of the widow of Pomare II, and had resigned the nominal sway over Borabora and Tahaa to their respective chiefs<sup>4</sup>. I could possibly unravel a good deal of the history of all this by a more minute investigation of the evidence I have collected than I have devoted to it; but there does not appear to be anything in this material that throws additional light on the political system, so the effort would only lengthen the present chapter considerably, without any sufficient compensating advantage.

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 44 sq. and Table III.

<sup>2</sup> Moerenhout, vol. II, p. 444.

<sup>3</sup> The family name of the Ra'iatean kings.

<sup>4</sup> Tyerman, vol. I, p. 519.

## CHAPTER VI

### SOME POSSIBLE EARLY HISTORY OF THE SOCIETY ISLANDS

WE have seen that the Teva people of Tahiti, occupying the southern part of the larger, and, in effect, the whole of the smaller peninsula, seem to have been from ancient times a socially united group, with chiefs of their several districts, of whom one was chief of the whole group. Of the early history of the rest of Tahiti we know practically nothing prior to the commencement of the Pomare dynasty, except that it is fairly evident that it was split up into a number of separate chiefdoms. There is no material from which to trace the origin of the bulk of these chiefdoms and their original relationships to one another; but I am venturing to embark on a somewhat speculative enquiry as to whether it is not possible that some of these people were, along with those of Ra'iatea, in origin, the people whom I am calling Tangaroans, that is, the migrants whose movements and doings are recorded in the Rarotongan and other logs and legends, or an important section of them, and their descendants, who were, according to my contentions, worshippers of Tangaroa; and this will lead me to some further speculation. I can offer no clear cut line of argument in support of this possibility. My evidence is mainly deductive and more or less disconnected, so my discussion of the matter is necessarily much the same; and it must be understood that I am, as before, merely suggesting a possibility in using the term "Tangaroans" to designate these migrants and their descendants, who were, I suggest, worshippers of Tangaroa.

I will begin by considering the island of Ra'iatea. I have referred in the chapter on "Origin and Migrations" to the great Tangaroan voyagers Ui-te-rangiora and his two brothers Tu-te-rangiatea and Whenua-haere. Smith says that according to the tradition, it was Tu-te-rangiatea who first reached Hawaiki, which was, as we have seen, an old name for Ra'iatea, but which Smith here identifies with Tahiti<sup>1</sup>. This Tu-te-rangiatea built on the island of Ra'iatea a great house for the gods and priests, and

<sup>1</sup> Smith, p. 169. Apparently the use of the name was somewhat varied; but it seems to have been applied primarily to Ra'iatea.

gave to it the name of Rangi-atea, which afterwards became the name of the island. Smith says that in all probability this house was the *marae* at Opoa, celebrated all over Eastern Polynesia as the sacred meeting place of all the tribes of these parts<sup>1</sup>, which perhaps it was; but the identity is not essential to my purpose. The *marae* at Opoa belonged in historical times to the great Society Island war god Oro, and seems to have been the centre of his worship. According to Tyerman and Bennet it was the metropolis of idolatry, not only in Ra'iatea, but throughout all the South Pacific Islands, within a compass of 500 miles; human victims from every shore were sent there for the altar of Oro, whose principal image was worshipped there; and it was the residence of the kings, who enjoyed divine honours, being deified at the time of their accession to political supremacy<sup>2</sup>. The reference to its being the residence of kings probably only refers to the kings of Ra'iatea itself, who would live in the neighbourhood of the *marae*.

The name of Ra'iatea appears in the traditions concerning the origin of the well-known *areoi* society (or societies) of the Society Islands. According to the story, the name Taramanini was taken by Mahi, the traditional Ra'iatean founder of the Society, to whom the god Oro gave his instructions for its formation at the temple of Opoa, and by the head chief of Ra'iatea—the two acting together in the matter; and it is stated that it was the custom for the head or grand master of all the lodges of the Society to live in Ra'iatea, and that the name of Taramanini was always given to him<sup>3</sup>.

I will now refer to indications that Tangaroa was specially connected with the island of Ra'iatea. There is evidence that points to Tangaroa, and not Oro, as having originally been the god to whom the Opoa *marae* belonged. Miss Henry, after telling us that Ra'iatea, at first called Havai'i, was believed to have been the centre of creation, all other lands afterwards developing around it, says that Opoa became the seat of the gods, where the great *marae* was built by the first royal family, who sprang from the gods, and that this *marae* was dedicated to the supreme god Tangaroa; it was after the demise of the last of the first eight kings that there was born the warrior god Oro-taui, said to have been the son of Tangaroa and Hina, a demi-goddess, and to him Tangaroa gave, as his dominion, the air

<sup>1</sup> Smith, pp. 169 sq. I may point out that, as the Polynesian *ng* is wanting in the Society Islands, their Ra'iatea is identical with Rangiataea.

<sup>2</sup> Tyerman, vol. I, pp. 529 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Moerenhout, vol. I, p. 488; vol. II, p. 402.

and the earth, and the great *marae* as his home; and soon Oro became a powerful and cruel god, who delighted in human sacrifices and in decorating his *marae* with the skulls of his slain foes<sup>1</sup>. In the Society Island legends of creation by Tangaroa it appears that Hina, regarded as his daughter or wife or both, was closely associated with him in the work, and that Oro was believed to have been his son. Ellis speaks of the Tangaroa-Hina legend of creation as a tradition of the Leeward [north-western] Islands<sup>2</sup>; so probably its home would be the island of Ra'iatea. I have already referred to the belief, recorded by Ellis, that attributed the origin of the people of the Society Islands to Opoa, where the *ti'i* or spirits had formerly lived, of whom two, the Ti'i Maaraauta and Ti'i Maaraatai, supposed to have been the parents of the human race, were believed to have been Tangaroa himself under other names<sup>3</sup>. Then again there is the legend, also referred to in a previous page, that it was an eel from Ra'iatea that had created Tahiti and Eimeo; and I may say as to this that there is ground for suspecting that there was a connection between eels, snakes and lizards with the god Tangaroa and some other important gods whom I associate with the Tangaroans. Then, as regards Oro, there are indications, which I cannot discuss here, that, though he was such an immensely powerful and important god in Tahiti, his worship there commenced at a relatively recent period, and that his place of origin, from which he came there, was supposed to be Borabora. I may say also that he is spoken of as a Ra'iatean god by both Cook and Forster<sup>4</sup>, whilst in Davies' dictionary he is said to have been introduced into Tahiti from Ra'iatea. It is possible, in view of the close ancient association between these two islands, that both statements are correct. De Bovis refers to a belief that the Opoa *marae* was founded by Hiro, "the first king and demi-god," who consecrated it to the god Horo [Oro?] from whom he was descended<sup>5</sup>; and Hiro, one of the celebrated Tangaroan navigators, was, according to some beliefs, like Oro, a son of Tangaroa<sup>6</sup>. This claim to descent would be shared by subsequent members of the

<sup>1</sup> T. Henry, *J.P.S.* vol. XXI, p. 77.

<sup>2</sup> Ellis, vol. I, pp. 325 sq.

<sup>3</sup> The *ti'i* of the Society Islands were spirits, apparently of human origin, of whom there were many; but this tradition refers apparently to two supposed *ti'i* of the distant past.

<sup>4</sup> Cook, vol. VI, p. 160. Forster, *Voy.* vol. II, p. 151.

<sup>5</sup> De Bovis, p. 236.

<sup>6</sup> Confusion in the beliefs as to the relationships between the gods are common in Polynesia.

royal family of Ra'iatea. De Bovis says that "the royal race of the Opoa *marae* was directly descended from Hiro and the gods"<sup>1</sup>; and Tyerman and Bennet say that they were the hereditary high priests of Oro<sup>2</sup>. They also tell us that Tamatoa, the king in their time of Ra'iatea, traced his genealogy to Tangaroa<sup>3</sup>, whom he (Tamatoa) spoke of as a god, not made by anyone, as the rest of the Ra'iatean gods had been, and above them all, but of whom the people had only an indistinct notion<sup>4</sup>. The central position of Ra'iatea in the worship of Oro is perhaps illustrated by the statement that when the king of that island rejected Oro, on his conversion to Christianity, he commanded all his dominions and dependencies to do so also<sup>5</sup>. The connection between Tangaroa and Ra'iatea may also perhaps be seen in a story of Ta'aroanui Maiturai who came to Vaiari to court the lady Tetuanui and gave her as a marriage present the famous canoe Manu'atere, which, it was said, had been built from a tree that grew in Ra'iatea<sup>6</sup>. It is not stated where this person came from; but the source whence his canoe came suggests that it was Ra'iatea. His name Ta'aroa-nui (great Tangaroa) indicates that he was believed to have been the god Tangaroa, or possibly a chief who worshipped that god and adopted his name. The name of the canoe may perhaps have been derived from the Samoan island of Manu'a<sup>7</sup>, which I associate specially with the cult of the god Tangaroa; and the statement that it found its ultimate resting place in Rarotonga<sup>8</sup> suggests that its owner was a Rarotongian, and would probably be what I am calling a Tangaroan. Its Tangaroa connection is further indicated by a tale as to its subsequent use by the high priest of Tangaroa<sup>9</sup>.

The combined effect of all this evidence is, I think, that it points to traditions connecting Ra'iatea and its *marae* of Opoa with the worship of both Tangaroa and Oro, and to beliefs that it had originally been the centre of a Tangaroa cult, but that afterwards Oro, supposed to have been his son, had, to a certain extent at all events, taken his place. The importance

<sup>1</sup> De Bovis, p. 292.

<sup>2</sup> Tyerman, vol. I, p. 530.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 526. Tamatoa was the royal name of all these kings (de Bovis, p. 294).

<sup>4</sup> Tyerman, vol. I, p. 523.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 553.

<sup>6</sup> T. Salmon, *J.P.S.* vol. XIX, p. 45.

<sup>7</sup> *Manu'a-tere* is in Samoan *Manu'a-tele* (great Manu'a), which is a name commonly given in Samoan legends to the island of Manu'a. (Cf. Powell, *J.V.I.* vol. XX, p. 152; Krämer, *S.I.* vol. I, p. 395, and other writers.) *Tele* means great.

<sup>8</sup> T. Salmon, *J.P.S.* vol. XIX, p. 45 n.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 45.



for my present purpose, of this connection between Tangaroa, whom I shall regard as having been originally the great god of Ra'iatea, and Oro, arises from the fact that Tangaroa is the god whom I specially associate with the Tangaroans, but his son Oro is the god to whom I shall have to refer mainly hereafter in this discussion. It is important therefore to recognize that, whatever may have been the actual origin of Oro, his cult was in the minds of the people associated with that of Tangaroa, who, I may say, was, it is said, still regarded in parts of the Society Islands as the great original creator god, though he was said to be too great and too distant to trouble himself with the affairs of men<sup>1</sup>.

I now pass to the worship of Tangaroa or Oro in the island of Tahiti, and the object of my argument as to this will be to show that apparently Tangaroa and Oro had not, originally, been gods of the Teva group, but that they, or one of them, had been deities of other Tahitian people (I do not necessarily include in this all the rest of the population of Tahiti); who may therefore, according to my hypotheses, have been Tangaroans. My line of discussion will be as follows. I shall first refer to evidence which seems to point to the great *marae* of Oro at Attahuru as having been, originally at all events, the main centre of his worship in Tahiti, his other great *marae* having been that of Tautira. I shall then suggest reasons for thinking that Oro had not any *important marae* in the Teva districts, other than that of Tautira, such as we should expect if his worship was dominant there; though we know of two *marae* in Papara and Vaiari respectively of which one was, and the other may have been dedicated to him, and that therefore Tangaroa and he were probably not originally Teva gods. I shall next consider, in connection with this question, the Tautira *marae* of Oro, and suggest grounds for thinking that the presence of this *marae* in a Teva district is not inconsistent with my contentions. Then finally I shall say something about the traditions as to the two *marae* in Papara and Vaiari.

I will, however, before entering into this discussion, refer to one or two matters reported by Ellis, whose information was, it must be remembered, collected mainly in the northern, and perhaps north-western parts of Tahiti, and not in the Teva districts to the south, and especially was obtained from the

<sup>1</sup> This has been said of more than one of the great Polynesian gods who were, in fact, approached on important occasions; and this was the case with Tangaroa.

Pomare people. His description of the ceremony on the inauguration of a "king<sup>1</sup>," by which he no doubt refers to the head chiefs of Purionuu, discloses the fact that it took place in the *marae* of Oro, that the image of Oro was the object that took a prominent part in the proceedings, and that it was the priest of Oro who conducted the religious part of the ceremony. Nevertheless we find<sup>2</sup> that the final act, after which the king was invested with the *maro-ura*, included an invocation, by the priest of Oro, of the god Tangaroa. So also, Ellis tells us<sup>3</sup> that in the offering of human sacrifice during war [to secure divine support] it was the priest of Oro who offered prayers to "the god" [that would be Oro, unless it was Tangaroa]; but that sometimes the victim's head was carried to the *marae*, and buried before [the image of] Tangaroa. The interest of this evidence, as affecting my present subject, is that it illustrates the close association in this part of Tahiti, in important matters, of the worship of the old god Tangaroa with that of Oro; and even suggests that, if Tangaroa had to be approached, it was the priest of Oro who did so.

Turning now to the first of my four points of discussion, there can, I think, be little doubt that the well-known Attahuru *marae*, Maraetaata, was the old and chief Tahitian *marae* of Oro. Davies says that the great original *marae* of Oro in Tahiti was in Attahuru, and that this seems to have been the Maraetaata *marae*<sup>4</sup>. I have already referred to Ari'i Taimai's statement that Mannemanne was the high priest of Ra'iatea and of Maraetaata, and her mention of him as the high priest of Attahuru; and I suggest that the connection, to which this points, between the Maraetaata and the *marae* of Opoa in Ra'iatea and the fact that the man was high priest of Attahuru are significant. The Attahuru *marae* seems to have been the resting place of the great image of the god, until the Pomares succeeded in securing it and removing it to Tautira. It was one of those very sacred *marae* that ultimately received the bodies of the human beings who had been killed and offered in sacrifice in other *marae*<sup>5</sup>; though apparently this distinction was transferred by Pomare to the Tautira *marae* after the image of the god had been taken there. The Duff missionaries say that on all great solemnities in Tahiti all the chiefs of other

<sup>1</sup> Ellis, vol. III, pp. 107-113.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 110.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* vol. I, p. 289.

<sup>4</sup> Davies, *Dict.* p. 172.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. L.M.S. *Trans.* vol. III, pp. 280, 284. Baessler, *N.S.B.* p. 124.

districts taking part in them had to go to Attahuru for the purpose<sup>1</sup>; and Cook provides an example of this in telling of a very great ceremony there in anticipation of war, in which Pomare I had to take part, he going out of his own district of Purionuu to Attahuru expressly for the purpose<sup>2</sup>. The importance of the Tautira *marae* is perhaps indicated by the fact that it was there that the image of Oro taken from Attahuru was deposited; but evidence of beliefs as to its age and place of origin, which bears on its probable importance, will be referred to when I consider the question of this *marae* presently. I may say that, so far as I have been able to ascertain, these two are the only *marae* in Tahiti, other than the *marae* in Papara to be referred to presently, that are mentioned as having been devoted to the worship of Oro.

I am met at the outset, in considering the question of the absence of an important Tangaroa or Oro *marae* in the Teva districts, by the difficulty that, except as regards the Tautira *marae* and the Papara *marae*, we do not seem to have any information as to the god to whom any one of the Teva *marae* was, or originally had been, dedicated. It can hardly be doubted that the worship of Oro must have spread more or less to the Teva districts, even if he was not originally a Teva god, partly, perhaps, because of his great position as a powerful war god, and partly as the result of inter-marriages between spouses of the Teva and non-Teva groups, the descendants of whom might adopt the gods of either or both of these spouses; and if this had been so, we may reasonably believe that there would be Oro *marae* in the Teva districts. The presence of this worship, so arising, and its accompanying *marae* would not affect my contentions, which apply to the early history of Tahiti. I think that what we have to consider is the question of important, and especially ancient, *marae* of Oro (or Tangaroa) or traditions as to them; and the absence of any reference to either the *marae* or the traditions in connection with this very powerful and leading war god of the Society Islands seems to me to suggest that his

<sup>1</sup> Wilson, p. 319, cf. p. xiii. D'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. I, p. 544. So far as chiefs of Teva districts were concerned this would, I think, only be for ceremonies connected with Oro, whose worship in Tahiti, whatever may have been its origin, had probably spread, more or less, over the island.

<sup>2</sup> Cook, vol. VI, pp. 28 *sq.* This was not Pomare's *marae* and his right even of entry there was based on relationship with the Attahuru chiefs. It is clear that it was the great Oro *marae* at which the ceremony took place, and it was to him that the sacrifices were offered (VI, p. 35). The Pomare association with Oro might be strong, seeing that the mother of Pomare I was a Ra'iatean princess.

worship in the Teva districts, assuming that it prevailed there, was not comparable with what it was or had been, at all events in Attahuru, and that in the early days he had not been a Teva god. I may also refer again to the statement by the *Duff* missionaries, quoted above, that on all great solemnities in Tahiti, all the chiefs of other districts had to go to Attahuru, and suggest that this could hardly have applied to the Teva chiefs, if there had been a great Oro *marae* within their own districts.

Miss T. Henry tells a story which perhaps throws a little side light upon this matter. She says the last great *marae* built in Tahiti was Tuarai, erected near Mahaiatea, after Pomare I had subjugated all Tahiti and Eimeo. When the *marae* was completed and the time for its consecration arrived, it was discovered that no god had been found for it. A Ra'iatean chief and his people proposed to have Oro there, but the "Tahitians" wished to retain the prestige of one of their own gods for it; there arose among them a dispute, which became so heated that both parties turned away in anger and dispersed to their own respective homes<sup>1</sup>. Now this *marae* was in the Tevan district of Papara. One of the most important *marae* in this district was Taputuarai, this having been the old original *marae* of the district; and the *marae* of Tuarai was founded with a stone taken from Taputuarai<sup>2</sup>. It will be noticed that the names of the parent *marae* and of the *marae* founded from it were the same, except that the prefix *tapu* (sacred) in the one was not given to the other also.

The interest of the tale for my present purpose, is that it shows a conflict between the Oro cult of the Ra'iatean chief and his people and the local cult of the "Tahitians," which I interpret as meaning in this case Papara people, interested, as regarded the new *marae*, in the selection of a god to whom the *marae* was to be dedicated. The two groups of people must have been related, as otherwise they could not have been associated together in the building of the *marae*; each group would have its own god or gods and there might be a god or gods common to both; but the Papara group were opposed to the selection of the Ra'iatean Oro. This may be an illustration of the possibility, to which I have referred, of the introduction of the worship of Oro into a Teva district, and consequent dedication to him of a *marae* there. It may be that the peoples concerned had two lines of ancestry, one Tevan and the other Ra'iatean; and that

<sup>1</sup> T. Henry, *J.P.S.* vol. XXII, p. 27.

<sup>2</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 16.

the Ra'iatean influence was pressing for a dedication to Oro, whilst the other was contending for a Tevan god. Then there is another possible deduction arising out of the story. If the new *marae* Tuarai was an off-shoot of the old *marae* Taputuarai, founded with a stone taken from the latter, then I imagine that the presumable and usual course would be for the new *marae* to be dedicated primarily to the great god of the old one—its parent—even if some other god was also associated with it; or at all events for the old god to be recognized as being there in the background. If we interpret the story on this basis we are led to the proposition that this old and important *marae* of Taputuarai, the original *marae* of the Tevan district of Papara, was dedicated to some god other than Oro. This would be the "one of their own gods" whose prestige the "Tahitians" wished to retain for it; indeed the use of the word "retain" suggests that Miss Henry understood that this god was presumably connected in some way with the new *marae*, which would, I think, be the case in the sense I have explained.

I now come to the question of the *marae* of Oro in Tautira, which was a Tevan district, so that the presence there of this *marae* which was, according to tradition, an old one, requires explanation, in order to remove what might seem to be an inconsistency in the evidence. One of the names of Oro's *marae* at Opoa in Ra'iatea was Vai'otaha<sup>1</sup>. De Bovis follows up his statement, quoted above, that this *marae* was founded by Hiro, with a further statement that Hiro was succeeded by one son in Ra'iatea, but that his second son went to Borabora and there founded a *marae* of Vaiotaa<sup>2</sup>. It was an Oro *marae*. This would probably be done by the usual method of taking from the old *marae* a stone with which to found the new one; and the giving to the new *marae* of the name of the old one would be in accord with a Society Island practice. Now Corney speaks of the *marae*, also called Vaiotaha, at Tautira (evidently the *marae* which we are considering), and says that it was founded twenty generations before 1774 with a sacred stone from Borabora<sup>3</sup>. The identity of names of the three *marae* is consistent with a belief that they were closely connected, and the situation here seems to have been that the Tautira *marae* was the daughter—as I may call it—of that of Borabora, and the grand-daughter of the great original *marae* of Opoa in

<sup>1</sup> T. Henry, *J.P.S.* vol. XXI, p. 77.

<sup>2</sup> De Bovis, p. 237; cf. p. 263.

<sup>3</sup> Corney, *Tahiti*, vol. II, p. 127 n. 1.

Ra'iatea. It was a great *marae*<sup>1</sup>, and was probably of great age; and its relationship to the other two *marae* points to its having been an old Oro, or perhaps Tangaroa, *marae*.

The question is, how was it that this ancient *marae*, apparently an offshoot of the Tangaroa or Oro *marae* at Opoa in Ra'iatea, was in what was, at all events in relatively recent times, a Teva district? Ari'i Taimai, in describing the areas over which the Teva clan "and their connections" held a "sort of loose sway," includes the whole coast of the smaller peninsula (Tairapu), and the whole of the south and west coasts of the larger peninsula<sup>2</sup>, and says that thus all this area was "more or less controlled" by the Tevas<sup>3</sup>. The west coast of the larger peninsula was admittedly beyond the boundary of the actual Teva districts, and it may be that some of the coast of the smaller peninsula was or had been so also; then again, we have seen that there is some confusion in the evidence as to what constituted the Teva districts in the smaller peninsula even in relatively modern times. Under these circumstances we cannot say what may have been definitely Teva territory in the smaller peninsula at a period twenty generations before 1774, to which the founding of the Oro *marae* in Tautira is attributed by Corney. It may well be that the Teva people did not then control that part of the island; perhaps their own territory only extended, as it afterwards did in the larger peninsula, over its southern coast. If this was so, no explanation is needed of the erection in Tautira of a *marae* emanating from the Tangaroa or Oro *marae* in Ra'iatea, even if we hold that the old cult of the Teva people was not a Tangaroa cult. I may say as to this matter that, according to one of the stories as to the building of the *marae* in Vaiari, to which I shall refer presently, and which, according to one story at all events, was an offshoot of the *marae* of Opoa in Ra'iatea, the people who built it landed in Tautira, and found no inhabitants there, and so, apparently, thought that they were the first people to land in the smaller peninsula. It may be that this story is connected with traditions of an original population, derived from Ra'iatea, and not Teva people, in Tautira. Then again, it is possible that a *marae*, derived from Borabora—that is, according to tradition, from Ra'iatea—might have been erected in Tautira, even if it was then a Teva district, under circumstances such as those that will appear in one of the stories as to the Vaiari *marae*. I think

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 17.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 2.

that, up to this point, the presence of this old *marae* in what seems to have been, in relatively recent times at all events, Teva territory does not necessarily place any obstacle in the way of my suggestions.

I am still, however, met by the fact that this *marae* was, in the historical period with which we have been dealing, a *marae* of the god Oro. A possible explanation of this would be that there was still in Tautira a group of people, descendants of those who had built the *marae*, who retained an old Tangaroa religion in the modified form of substituting Oro to a certain extent, perhaps with Tangaroa in the background, in the way suggested by the inauguration ceremony to which I have already referred. Also it is possible that immigrants of Tangaroa or Oro worshippers from other parts of Tahiti—say, for example, Attahuru—or from one of the other islands, had at some time or times settled in or visited a part of Tautira and married, and left descendants there, and thus perhaps continued or revived an old Tangaroa-Oro cult; indeed we have seen that the ancestor of Ta'aroa Manahune (whose very name suggests that he was a worshipper of Tangaroa), who was the ancestor of the Pomare family, had so settled in Pare, and that a younger son of Pomare I had secured the title of Vehiatua, and Corney says that the Tautira *marae* belonged to the Vehiatua<sup>1</sup>. Possibly it was the power of the Pomares over Tautira, and the absence of any sufficiently important Oro *marae* in their own district, that caused them to take the Attahuru image of Oro to Tautira.

I have in this discussion only suggested possibilities; but it is, I think, permissible, when an isolated fact seems at first sight to stand in the way of a constructive proposition, to suggest a possible explanation which, if correct, removes the apparent obstacle.

The *marae*, though in the hands of Vehiatua, a Tevan chief, seems to have retained its association with Ra'iatea; for we are told of the illness of a Vehiatua, in Vaiari, during which two Tautira priests came to pray for him, and one of these, it is said, had come from Ra'iatea<sup>2</sup>.

I now turn to the two *marae* in Papara and Vaiari respectively, and the following are beliefs as to these. As to the Papara *marae* we only have a statement by Beechey that a chief of

<sup>1</sup> Corney, *Tahiti*, vol. III, p. 196 n. 4. He was *primarily* the head chief of Teahupoo.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* vol III, p. 119.

Papara, having through his newly acquired god Oro achieved important victories, built a *marae*, which he dedicated to Oro<sup>1</sup>. There is no other information about this *marae*, which may or may not have been an important one; but we see that Oro had not been the chief's original god, so it fits in with my contention.

The Vaiari *marae* to which I referred is the *marae* called Tahiti, in the Vaiari district, which I may point out, was the district of the oldest and most aristocratic branch of the Teva people. The Vaiari chiefs had two very old and famous *marae* in their district. One of these was called Farepua; it was older than and superior to all the other Teva *marae*; it alone, of all the rest, enjoyed the distinction of having decorations of *ura*, or red feathers; and it was, as we have seen, associated with early Teva tradition. The other—the one which we are now considering—was called Tahiti<sup>2</sup>. Both *marae* belonged to the head chief of the Vaiari group of people, but there was this difference between them, that whilst his title Maheanu belonged to him in connection with the Farepua *marae*, his title of Teri'inui was connected with the Tahiti *marae*<sup>3</sup>. It was as holder of the Maheanu title that he had the right to wear the *maro-ura*<sup>4</sup>. A message to him summoning him to a *fono* of all the Teva groups was delivered to him as Maheanu of Farepua, and not as Teri'inui of Tahiti<sup>5</sup>. The practice of summoning the Vaiari chief would obviously only apply to the periods subsequent to the time when the headship of all the Teva passed from Vaiari to Papara, prior to which he himself would be the summoner. The interest of the matter, as affecting my present subject, arises from the special Teva identification, for the purpose of a *fono* of all the Teva, of the Vaiari chief with the Farepua *marae*, together with its reputed age and superiority, which stamp it, I think, as having probably been a very old *marae* of Teva origin, belonging specially to, and perhaps the chief centre of worship of, the Teva people.

What then was the origin of the *marae* named Tahiti, which was evidently much less important—probably incomparably so? Ari'i Taimai refers to the uncertainty as to the origin of the name of this *marae*—whether the *marae* was named after the island, or the island after the *marae*, and in either case what the name meant, which she says no one knows, though she

<sup>1</sup> Beechey, vol. I, p. 302.

<sup>2</sup> Ari'i Taimai, pp. 15 sq., 18.

<sup>4</sup> Baessler, *N.S.B.* p. 169.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 15 sq.

<sup>5</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 9.



thinks Tahiti must have been an original Vaiari name of the *marae*<sup>1</sup>. This uncertainty leads me to some legends as to the origin of the *marae* Tahiti. Baessler tells us of a tradition that it was of Ra'iatean origin, a stone having been taken from the *marae* Taputapuatea there [that is one of the names of the big *marae* of Oro at Opoa] for the purpose of founding the new *marae* in Vaiari<sup>2</sup>. He also tells of another tradition, which I have already mentioned, according to which Tahiti-iti (the smaller peninsula) was the first part of the island to be inhabited, ancestors of the present population having landed in Tautira in the canoe called Manu'a-tere (the moving land) and called the peninsula Manu'a-tere after the boat, but named the big island Tahiti after the first *marae* which they built in Vaiari with the sacred stone Hiti, brought by them as a foundation stone<sup>3</sup>. Salmon also associates the name Tahiti with the Hiti foundation stone of a *marae* in Vaiari. He says that the god creator Tangaroa decided that Nuutea Tepurotu, "fairest of the fair," chieftainness of Vaiari, was to be the first possessor of the first temple. The god selected the place for the building of the temple, which was to be called Farepua, and when it was finished Nuutea Tepurotu was ordained its first head chief, and the name Te-ri'i-nui-o Tahiti was given to her, and has since been held by her descendants<sup>4</sup>. I must point out that this title of Teri'inui was, as we have seen, according to Ari'i Taimai (who is, I think, much more to be relied upon than her son Tati Salmon) and according to Baessler<sup>5</sup>, connected with the *marae* Tahiti of Vaiari, and not with the *marae* Farepua; and I shall assume that the latter has been in error (probably it has only been a careless slip), and that the story relates to the *marae* Tahiti, which was, according to Baessler (above), the *marae* connected with the Hiti stone.

Let us compare the following stories, which were, I suspect, variations of the same tradition, or had a common origin. (1) The story, told in the discussion of the connection of Tangaroa with the island of Ra'iatea, of Ta'aroa-nui (great Tangaroa) coming to Vaiari to court the lady Tetuanui, and giving her as a marriage present the canoe Manuatere, said to have been built from a tree that grew in Ra'iatea. (2) Baessler's first story, just told. (3) Baessler's second story, just told. (4) Sal-

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 16.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 113.

<sup>3</sup> Baessler, *N.S.B.* p. 169.

<sup>4</sup> Baessler, *N.S.B.* p. 137.

<sup>5</sup> T. Salmon, *J.P.S.* vol. XIX, p. 40.

mon's story just told. I shall refer to the points that arise, not in what I regard as their order in importance, but in the order that seems best adapted to bring out their possible points of significance in convenient sequence.

The central leading personage of the story was, according to legends (1) and (4), Tangaroa, who may have been regarded as the god, and is stated so to have been in legend (4), but may well have been a chief of the group of people whom I have called, and am calling, the Tangaroans.

The canoe called Manu'atere is referred to in legends (1) and (3). This word is translated by Baessler as meaning "the moving land"; but, as I have pointed out in a footnote relating to legend (1) (in the discussion of the connection of Tangaroa with the island of Ra'iatea) this word is the same as Manu'atele (great Manu'a) which is a name commonly given in Samoan legends to the island of Manu'a. It is possible that this name has some reference to this island, which I have contended was specially associated with the Tangaroans in the earliest history of Samoa.

There are references to Ra'iatea. In legend (1) it is said that the canoe in which Tangaroa came to Vaiari was built from a tree that grew in Ra'iatea, which suggests that he had come from there. According to legend (2) the *marae* Tahiti was founded with a stone taken from the great *marae* at Opoa in Ra'iatea, and this would be in accord with a Society Island custom when a new *marae* was built as an offshoot, as it were, of an older parent *marae*. If this is in accord with the actual tradition, we may well believe that the sacred Hiti stone referred to in legends (3) and (4) was the stone brought from the *marae* Opoa.

If the various legends are to be associated together, as I have suggested, the immigrant party may have first landed, as stated in legend (3), in Tautira, in which case there may be some undisclosed connection between them, or descendants of theirs in Tautira, and the *marae* in Tautira, which I have already discussed, and which seems to have been, according to tradition, connected directly or indirectly with the *marae* at Opoa in Ra'iatea.

I have already drawn attention to the statement in legend (3) that the immigrants found Tautira uninhabited, suggesting that perhaps the Teva people were not there at that time; and it is possible that it was they who built the Tautira *marae*, and dedicated it to Tangaroa; but they evidently, according to legends (1) and (4), found Vaiari inhabited, and its inhabitants

may well have been the Teva people, of whom the Vaiari group seem to have represented the original trunk family. According to legend (1) the object of the visitors was the courting and marriage by their leader with a Vaiari lady; and if this is in accord with the actual tradition, we may assume that legend (4) points to the same purpose.

There must, I think, have been some well-known tradition behind these stories; and I draw attention to the introduction into them of the names Tangaroa, perhaps Manu'a, Ra'iatea, and its *marae* at Opoa. It may well be that the tradition has had its origin in the arrival at Vaiari, then occupied by the Teva people, of a party of travellers, coming from Ra'iatea, and perhaps with memories of Manu'a; and if this was so, these people would probably, according to my views, be what I am calling Tangaroans—in this case descendants of the original Tangaroans of Manu'a.

We are not told to what worship the Tahiti *marae* in Vaiari was dedicated, or had been dedicated originally. If my construction of the matter is correct, the original god would probably be Tangaroa, and it may be that it was with the worship of Tangaroa or Oro, or both, that the *marae* was still associated in relatively recent times. No inconsistency with this would arise from the fact that the *marae* Tahiti belonged, like the *marae* Farepua, to the head chief of the Teva district of Vaiari, who had formerly been at the head of all the Teva groups; we have only to assume that there had been a marriage between the Tangaroan visitor and a Vaiari woman, and that the Vaiari chiefs had been descended from it, to explain the fact that the *marae* Tahiti belonged to them, they having, as it were, absorbed the migrants and the descendants of the marriage having added the god of those migrants to those whom they had worshipped before. Here also we should find a clue to the fact that it was the Farepua *marae* and not the Tahiti *marae* that was associated with the Tevan relationship and political connection of the Vaiari head chiefs.

I have been discussing my suggestion that the people of Ra'iatea, and some of those of Tahiti (not the Teva people) were in origin what I am calling Tangaroans, that is, the migrants whose movements and doings are recorded in the Rarotongan and other logs and legends, or an important section of them and their descendants, and whom I believe to have been worshippers of Tangaroa. The bulk of the evidence concerning

Tahiti already adduced has related to what seems to have been the distribution, and especially the centralization in Attahuru, of the worship of Tangaroa and Oro, as disclosed by the *marae*, and to statements bearing upon that aspect of the question. I now propose to refer to evidence which seems to connect the people of Ra'iatea and Attahuru, and to the north of Attahuru, with the Tangaroans themselves, and not merely with what I believe to have been their worship of Tangaroa.

So far as Ra'iatea is concerned, I have referred to the traditions relating to Ui-te-rangiora and his two brothers, and to Hiro, all of whom were undoubtedly what I am calling Tangaroans; and I may say that, in the various stories of movements and adventures of the Tangaroans in the Pacific, Ra'iatea so often takes a prominent place that we must recognize the close association of that island with their ancient history; and indeed its name of Hawai'i suggests this<sup>1</sup>.

Passing now to Tahiti, we have seen that Attahuru seems to have been the great centre of the worship of Oro, and perhaps previously of Tangaroa, in Tahiti, and the question arises, what was the reason of this? Lesson gives an answer to this question which offers an explanation we might well expect. According to the traditions of the people of Oropaa [the name given to the people of Attahuru], who, he says, were the most fanatic worshippers of Oro, they had been migrants from Ra'iatea, and he thinks the name Opoa was probably the longer name in elided form. This may have been so, but I think another possible explanation, which may or may not be correct, is that Oropaa or Oropoa (it is spelt both ways) was a contraction of Oro-Opoa. In either case we get a definite connection with the *marae* at Opoa in Ra'iatea, and so with the old inhabitants of that island. He speaks of their famous *marae*; says that the Oropaa people had arrived in Tahiti as conquerors; and tells us that the Tahitians had always recognized their superiority, and regarded them as the bravest warriors. They thought themselves of higher origin than the other tribes of the island; and some of them told Lesson that their ancestors came from Ra'iatea, and were the most powerful conquerors of Tahiti<sup>2</sup>. The general superiority claimed by the Attahuruans would, I think, be consistent with Tangaroan descent; and their high opinion of themselves, in comparison with the other people of Tahiti, including their claim to higher origin, may be com-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Smith, pp. 54-62.

<sup>2</sup> Lesson, *Poly.* vol. II, pp. 327 sq.

pared with similar ideas which seem to have prevailed in Samoa and Tonga. Whether or not they had been so superior is another question; and we must remember that Lesson did not get his information from Tevan sources.

There were also traditions that point to a connection with the Tangaroans of the district of Tefana i Ahurai, immediately to the north of Attahuru. These traditions refer to the great voyager Tangiia-nui, one of the Tangaroans, whose ancestors came from Samoa, and had settled in the Society Islands. There were various versions of the stories, but the general effect of them was that Tangiia-nui had a quarrel with his brother Tutapu, who pursued him across the Pacific to Rarotonga, where he and the equally celebrated voyager Karika, also a Tangaroan, fought and killed Tutapu; and afterwards Tangiia-nui and Karika established the early political organization of Rarotonga. In the legend of Honoura, collected by Williams, and since translated into English by Miss T. Henry, and which the editors of the *Journal of the Polynesian Society* say was a Ra'iatean legend<sup>1</sup>, the persons whose names appear in the story include Tutapu, Tai'ihea, and Tai-te-arii, of whom Tutapu was said to have been the chief of Hiva<sup>2</sup>. The editors of the *Journal* also say that these three persons were known to Rarotongan historians as Tutapu, Tangiia and Tai-te-ariki, and say of the last mentioned that there can be little doubt that he was a son of Iro [the Hiro of Tahiti whose name has appeared in recent pages], adopted by Tangiia "one of the founders of the present tribes of Rarotonga"<sup>3</sup>. Then again they speak of Tutapu having been chief of Hiva at the date of Karika's migration to Rarotonga<sup>4</sup>. If these editorial statements are correct, we have in two of the *dramatis personae* of the legend of Honoura, the Tangiia-nui, who took part in the original founding of the constitution of Rarotonga, and his brother Tutapu. And here comes the interest of this matter for my present purpose. Tangiia was a chief of the district of Faaa [Tefana i Ahurai]<sup>5</sup>, which is the small, but important, district to the north of Attahuru, and so would probably be connected with the worshippers there of Tangaroa. It is stated that both he and Tutapu lived at Faaa<sup>6</sup>, which the latter may have done at one time, even if he was chief of Hiva. So we have some information connecting this part

<sup>1</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. iv, p. 255.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* vol. v, p. 127.

<sup>5</sup> Williams, p. 192.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 196. Cf. *J.P.S.* vol. i, p. 25; vol. ii, p. 276; vol. vi, p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 275.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* vol. vi, p. 9.

of Tahiti with two of the best known of the traditional Tangaroan voyagers of the Pacific. But Ra'iatea was connected also; for Hiva, of which Tutapu was head chief, was, apparently, in Ra'iatea<sup>1</sup>. Indeed, in one part of the legend of Honoura, mentioned above, there is an address to Hiva, which speaks of its wrestling, and the wrestling of its reef, of agitation and uprising, of the disturbance of ten fathoms upon ten fathoms, and sprays flying across the sea, and of land which, when it got severed outwards, was Tahiti<sup>2</sup>; and the editors in a note to this say that Hiva was the place from which Tahiti was said to have broken away as a fish<sup>3</sup>; the version of this tale, introducing the sacrilegious girl who was swallowed by an eel, has already been told by me.

Some traditions or history of Rarotonga, whose principal god, I may say, was, or appears to have been, Tangaroa, also point in the same direction. A Rarotongan teacher said that the first inhabitants of that island were from Hiva of the Marquesan group, and their chief was, according to a Rarotongan myth, named Tutapu of Tahiti. Then came Tangiia from Tahiti, and Karika from Manu'a (in Samoa) and they defeated Tutapu<sup>4</sup>. The editors in a note say there is strong reason to believe that the Hiva from which the people were supposed to have come was in Ra'iatea<sup>5</sup>, and I think it must have been so. I may say that there seems to be confusion in this version, based probably on the fact that Tangiia and Karika did defeat Tutapu in Rarotonga, whither he had pursued Tangiia; but I doubt whether according to accepted versions, he was regarded as having been a ruling chief of Rarotonga. Tutapu was apparently, as we have seen, chief of Hiva. According to another belief the ancestor of Tangiia, called Uenga, lived in the district of Punaauia in Tahiti<sup>6</sup>; this, it will be noticed, is the northern district of Attahuru. It is said that a Rarotongan chief established in Atiu (another of the islands of the Hervey group) a *marae* which he called Taputapuatea after the greatest *marae* in Ra'iatea<sup>7</sup>. Taputapuatea was one of the names of Oro's great *marae* at Opoa<sup>8</sup>. The fact that the chief was supposed to have named this new *marae* after the old Opoa *marae* suggests strongly that he regarded Ra'iatea as the home of his ancestors, and that

<sup>1</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. v, p. 126; vol. vi, pp. 9, 73 n.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* vol. iv, p. 285.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* vol. vi, p. 72.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* vol. xx, p. 141.

<sup>8</sup> Baessler, *N.S.B.* p. 124.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 293 n. 99.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 73.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* vol. xxii, pp. 69 sq.

he was a Tangaroan. In a genealogy of the ancestry of Tangiianui, going back to a period prior to that of the Tangaroan Tutarangi (well known in Rarotongan traditions) we find among his ancestors Te Arutanga-nuku<sup>1</sup>; and in an account of the magical construction of this person's canoe it is stated that it was called Te Pori-o-nou, after his grandmother<sup>2</sup>. This name is clearly the same as my Purionuu (the Pomare district), to the north-east of Attahuru; so here again we get an indication of a possible connection of Tangiia with this region of Tahiti. Finally, I refer to a tradition of the making by the people of Rarotonga of a large drum, which they sent by the hands of two priests as a present to Oro, the god of war, at the great *marae* at Opoa in Ra'iatea<sup>3</sup>.

Fragmentary though this Society Island and Rarotongan evidence is, its cumulative effect seems to point to a close connection with the Tangaroans both of the island of Ra'iatea and of Attahuru, and perhaps of Tefana i Ahurai and Purionuu.

The evidence in support of my contention that Tangaroa and Oro were not originally Tevan gods has, up to this point, been purely negative. An obvious question is, who then was their great god? though an answer to this question is not absolutely essential to the primary purpose of my contention. If we had any knowledge as to a specially Tevan worship, or even as to the gods to whom the Tevan *marae* were dedicated, and more so still if we also had this knowledge as to the old Farepua *marae* of Vaiari, and again still more so, if there were traditions identifying the worship at that *marae* in the distant past with any specific god or gods, we should have some data upon which to formulate an answer to the question; but, in the absence of any information as to all this, no confident answer is possible. Nevertheless I am going to suggest that perhaps the Tevan god was, or had been, the great Polynesian deity Tane, though a consideration of the evidence to which I shall refer will show that my suggestion is of a speculative character, and cannot be regarded as in any way proved.

Miss Henry, after telling the story of the girl being swallowed by an eel, and of the subsequent making by that eel of the island of Tahiti, says that afterwards the chiefs divided the land among themselves, and erected *marae* to prove their titles to their respective possessions, and that their tutelar gods were

<sup>1</sup> J.P.S. vol. XXI, pp. 40 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 54.

<sup>3</sup> Williams, p. 55.

Tangaroa, Tu and Tane<sup>1</sup>. Apparently she knew nothing of any possible differentiation, as between the different parts of the islands, as to the origins and specific cults of the peoples who occupied them, and regarded them all as a single homogeneous people, originating, I suppose, in Ra'iatea. The point to which I draw attention is an apparent belief, gathered, I presume, from native informants, that the original great gods of Tahiti were Tangaroa, Tane and Tu (of which last mentioned god I shall have something to say presently), a belief which would probably be associated with a recognition of the great dominating importance of these gods in the traditions and perhaps, subject to the modifying effect of the more recent cult of Oro, in comparatively modern times. Ellis refers to Oro and Tane as the two principal national idols<sup>2</sup>; and again speaks of "Tangaroa, Oro and Tane, with other deities of the highest order"<sup>3</sup>, from which I imagine that he puts these three at the head of the list. I think, however, that in both cases he is speaking of the Society Islands generally, and not only of Tahiti. The *Duff* missionaries put Tane at the head of the Tahitian Olympus<sup>4</sup>. The interest, for my present purpose, of these statements arises from the mention of Tane as one of the two or three principal gods and in one case as the leading deity. Miss Henry and the *Duff* missionaries are speaking of Tahiti only; but Ellis apparently includes all the islands, and Tane was, as we shall see, the chief god of Huahine, which *might* be his reason for including this god's name. I do not for a moment, however, think that this is so, as I cannot believe that he would do this merely because of Tane's connection with the relatively unimportant island of Huahine; so, as Ra'iatea and Borabora were centres of the Oro cult, and Eimeo was politically unimportant, I am convinced that he must be including Tahiti as a place where Tane was one of these leading gods, and I shall assume that it is so.

This brings me to the first point in the discussion. If Tane was not the god of the Teva people, how did he come to be one of the leading Tahitian gods? (The same question might, of course, be asked concerning Tu, also included in Miss Henry's list; but I shall refer to this point later on.) There is no indication that he shared the honour with Oro in Attahuru; nor is this likely. It is clear that the Pomares of Purionuu regarded Oro as their most important god, and in all the history of the

<sup>1</sup> T. Henry, *J.P.S.* vol. xx, p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 322.

<sup>3</sup> Ellis, vol. 1, p. 271.

<sup>4</sup> Wilson, p. 333.



Pomare family I find no reference pointing to the worship of Tane, though he was one of the gods whose images joined in the voyage of Oro to Tautira—a matter to which I shall refer directly. The region of Aharoa was unimportant. These districts and Tefana include the whole of Tahiti other than the portion of it belonging to the Teva people; so there is a preliminary ground for suspecting a special Teva connection, their area being apparently the only place left for his principal home.

Another reason for suggesting that Tane may have been the great god of the Teva people is connected with the shark. We have seen that according to the tradition the whole Teva clan, as Ari'i Taimai calls it, was descended from the son of a chieftainness of Vaiari by a fish or shark god. This deified ancestor would probably be specially sacred to the whole clan; and if he was thought to have been a shark, it is probable that in the beliefs of the people he would continue to be seen in the shark. Then we have the definite statement of Ari'i Taimai, a Tevan lady of very high rank, that "Our Tevas claim by tradition a descent from the shark god"<sup>1</sup>. If their great god ancestor was a shark, and if we can associate Tane with the shark, then there is ground for suspecting the worship (past or present or both) of Tane, though our knowledge of this Teva group tells us nothing of a Tane supremacy among them, nor of a special shark cult. As regards the former point, I may, however, say that, according to both Banks and Cook, the high priest of Purea (Oberea) and Amo of Papara often prayed to Tane for a wind, when sailing with Cook on the *Endeavour*<sup>2</sup>.

We have indications of what looks like a connection between this great Polynesian god, of widespread worship, and the shark in the island of Huahine. Tane was the tutelary god of this island<sup>3</sup>. He had eight sons, who were all classed with the most powerful gods, and received the highest honours<sup>4</sup>. His *marae* in Huahine was called Mata'i-rea<sup>5</sup>. It was said that this *marae* was built and dedicated to Tane by Rua-Hatu-Tinirau, "the Tahitian Neptune," who opened two passages in the reef, of which he called one "Aperture of the parrot fish," and the other "prayer for fishing"<sup>6</sup>. The god Tinirau, who appears

<sup>1</sup> Ari'i Taimai, p. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Banks, p. 111. Cook, vol. 1, p. 231.

<sup>3</sup> Cook, vol. vi, p. 160. G. Forster, *Voy.* vol. II, p. 151. J. R. Forster, *Obs.* p. 541. Ellis, vol. 1, p. 325.

<sup>4</sup> Ellis, vol. 1, p. 325.

<sup>5</sup> De Bovis, p. 273.

<sup>6</sup> T. Henry, *J.P.S.* vol. XXII, p. 25.

to be referred to by Society Island writers as Rua-Hatu or Rua-hatu-Tinirau, was well known in various parts of Polynesia, being specially connected with the sea and fishes. It is reasonable to think that the people might imagine that the god of fishes would select a shark god as the great god to whom he was to dedicate his *marae*. This *marae* had in the centre a huge stone pile called the bed of Tane, upon which the image of the god was placed on special occasions; and the gods of the eight districts into which the island was divided were placed four on each side of this pile<sup>1</sup>. We may, I think, assume that these eight gods were the eight sons of Tane mentioned above; in which case there was a central cult of Tane affecting the whole island, with branch Tane cults in the respective districts; the cult would be both general and local. Now it appears to be the fact that the worship of the shark was specially prevalent in Huahine. According to Tyerman and Bennet sharks were worshipped on the island, and large oblations were offered to them by the priests; in one bay numbers of them were so tame that they came regularly to the beach to be fed with fish and pork, which were provided for them in large quantities; also, whenever the people met a shark when in their canoes on the sea they tried to propitiate it by throwing out some of the fish they had caught<sup>2</sup>. Speaking of another district Tyerman and Bennet say that some of the sharks were specially known and named, the name given being always connected in some way with the shark itself, as it would be offended by a paltry name; and that almost every family had its particular shark<sup>3</sup>. They also refer to another place which they visited; and there again sharks were tutelary deities<sup>4</sup>. They refer too to tales of miraculous doings by sharks, and mention two *marae*, which they saw, dedicated to sharks<sup>5</sup>.

There is another matter, of a totally different character, which suggests a possible connection between Tane and the shark. Miss Henry, in an article on Tahitian astronomy, refers to a belief (apparently of Borabora) as to the Vai-ora-a-Tane—the living water of Tane—which she says was the Milky Way. The handsome shark Fa'aravi-i-te-ra'i (sky shade) was there in his pool, as also was a bird; there were also star fishes, and two trigger fishes, that dwelt in holes, vacant spots in the Milky Way, and ate mist<sup>6</sup>. This may be compared with Moerenhout's

<sup>1</sup> Tyerman, vol. 1, pp. 266 sq.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* <sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 245 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 246.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 247.

<sup>6</sup> T. Henry, *J.P.S.* vol. XVI, p. 102.

statement that there were one or two points in the Milky Way, which they called *mao* and *ari*, the names of sharks which were believed to eat certain stars when they disappeared from the horizon<sup>1</sup>.

There was, in the island of Mangaia (Hervey group) a group of Tane or Aitu people, who came from Tahiti, and were worshippers of Tane<sup>2</sup>; but unfortunately we do not know from which part of the island they came. There is, however, a record of a priest called Ue (evidently a priest of Tane), whose home was on the east side of the smaller peninsula of Tahiti, who went to Mangaia. It was said of this [either the peninsula or its eastern side—I am not sure which] that it was a place where Tane was once worshipped, but was expelled on account of his man-devouring propensities. The priest hid the sinnet shrine of the god in an empty coconut shell, plugged up the aperture, and threw the shell into the sea, adjuring the god to seek a new home. Afterwards the priest himself set out to seek him; and ultimately reaching Mangaia he found the shell containing the god, and built a *marae* in his honour<sup>3</sup>. This apparently took place between A.D. 1620 and 1660<sup>4</sup>. The present interest of this tale is the statement as to the previous worship of Tane in the smaller peninsula of Tahiti, the east side of which included Teahupoo, admittedly an old Teva district, and Tautira which, whatever it had been originally, was, or had become, a Teva district at a later period. The complaint as to the god's devouring propensities would be consistent with his identification with a shark, and may be compared with what was said of the sharks of the Milky Way.

I admit, as regards the question of the Teva people and the god Tane, that my data are meagre in quantity and disconnected in character; but if we may accept the Huahine evidence and the Milky Way beliefs as suggesting a close Society Island connection between the Tane cult and sharks, and if we consider in the light of that connection the belief that the Teva people were descended from a shark, and bear in mind the statements as to the important position held by Tane in Tahiti, and the apparent absence of any great Tane cult in any part of the island other than the Teva districts, we seem to have ground for suspecting that Tane was, or had been, the great Teva god. I may also draw attention to the statement about the

<sup>1</sup> Moerenhout, vol. II, p. 181.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 33, 38.

<sup>2</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* p. 30 n. 4.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* cf. pp. 28, 30, 38.

high priest of Amo and Purea, and point out that Amo was the head chief or king of the whole Teva group.

Miss Henry's inclusion of Tu as one of the three great tutelary gods of Tahiti calls for comment, because my suggestion that Tane must have been a Teva god might apply to Tu also; though I may point out that she is the only writer who exalts him as a Tahitian god in this way. Tu was one of the old deities whose worship was spread widely over the Pacific and prevailed in Tahiti; but I have found no evidence of his holding the specially prominent position there with which Miss Henry credits him. I think a possible explanation of the matter may be that Tu was a special god of the Pomare dynasty, and this might perhaps be the reason why Miss Henry classes him in Tahiti with Tangaroa and Tane, for she seems always to have regarded the Pomares as the highest chiefs in all Tahiti. Indeed, the great success of the Pomares, with the help of the English, in establishing their dominion over Tahiti might enhance immensely the prestige of their family god. I have no definite evidence that Tu was the god of the Pomares, though there is a statement, emanating from Rarotonga, to the effect, apparently, that the Pomares were descended from Tu-te-rangi-marama [in the bright skies]<sup>1</sup>; and the main ground for suggesting it is the apparent identity of family name—rather a perilous basis. I have already referred to the fact that Teu, the father of Pomare I, was of Paumotuan descent, from an ancestor in the island of Fakarava. The god Tu was certainly known in the Paumotuan islands. He was apparently a leading deity of Mangareva (Gambier Island); but unfortunately, as this island was at the south-easterly and Fakarava at the north-westerly end of the group, there is no reason for assuming that the ascendancy of Tu had extended to the latter. If it had done so, we should have a good basis from which to approach the evidence as to name; and I may say as to this that Pomare I succeeded in establishing his supremacy over the entire Paumotuan archipelago, and getting it recognized voluntarily by the high chiefs<sup>2</sup>. The name of this Paumotuan ancestor some generations, the number of which is unknown, before Pomare I, was, as we have seen, Tu. Pomare's father was named both Teu and Whappai; but according to Wilson his previous name

<sup>1</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. II, p. 273.

<sup>2</sup> T. Henry, *J.P.S.* vol. xx, p. 7. The Paumotuans seem to have connected their god Tu with Tahiti, even crediting him with the origin of the island. See *J.P.S.* vol. xx, pp. 4 sq.

had been Tu<sup>1</sup>. Pomare I and Pomare II were both named, successively, Tu, though Pomare I adopted the fancy name of Pomare, which was later taken by Pomare II, and seems afterwards to have been the name by which their successors were known. It seems clear, however, that Tu was the ancestral name of the family, and indeed the sister of Pomare I said that it had been their family name<sup>2</sup>. The name Pomare was purely fanciful; but the adoption by Pomare I, on the birth of his son (afterwards Pomare II), of the name of Tineh must be associated with the passing to the latter, on his birth, of the official name of Tu<sup>3</sup>. Miss Henry says that the regal names of the high chiefs of Pare (that is the Pomares) were Tu-nui-e-a'-a-i-te-atua (Great-stability-who-settles-the-gods) and Tu-nui-a'-e-i-te-atua (Great-stability-greater than the gods)<sup>4</sup>. Now the Polynesian word *tu* means "to stand," and perhaps the name of the god Tu was, as writers assume, associated with the idea of stability; indeed this is perhaps seen in the well-known Maori legend of creation, according to which Tu was the only one of the children of Rangi (sky) and Papa (earth) who succeeded in resisting the onslaught of their brother Ta-whiri-ma-tea, the father of winds. Miss Henry apparently regards the Tu, which formed the commencement of the names of these head chiefs of Pare, as being purely descriptive of their regal stability; but I doubt if it was so, for in that case the chiefs were claiming to "settle the gods" and be "greater than the gods," and I do not think even a Polynesian head chief dare have carried his pretensions quite so high as that. I think a much more probable interpretation of the matter is that the Tu, to whom the descriptive matter was applied, was the god himself, and that the names were adopted by the chiefs as the human representatives, the earthly embodiments, of the god, this being well in accord with Polynesian ideas concerning their great chiefs. If my view is correct, we have here a very definite connection between the god and the head chief for the time being of the Pomare family of Pare. I may say as to this that I shall contend in a subsequent chapter that the chief or other head of a social group, great or small, was commonly regarded as the chief priest of the god of the group, who entered into him, and through him communicated the divine wishes, or instructions to the people.

<sup>1</sup> Wilson, p. 71.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 178.

<sup>3</sup> See Wilson, pp. 71, 178 sq. Bligh, p. 65. Vancouver, vol. 1, p. 98.

<sup>4</sup> T. Henry, *J.P.S.* vol. xx, p. 8.

Pomare I perhaps inherited the Tu cult from his father, and the Oro cult from his mother (a Ra'iatean); but the latter might be due in part to the great ascendancy of this god in the Society Islands.

I have discussed this question of Tu and the Pomares at what may seem needless length in order to account for Miss Henry's putting him, apparently, in the same category as Tangaroa and Tane; and I think there is at all events sufficient probability in my suggested explanation to justify us in believing that the two great original cults were those of Tane and Tangaroa, Oro being included in, or associated with, the latter.

There are one or two matters to which I will refer, and try to explain on the assumption that my speculations are in the main correct, thus putting the speculations themselves to a little further detailed test. We have seen that when the Pomares, with their fleet, carried the image of Oro to the *marae* in Tautira, Oro's image was accompanied by that of Hiro, which went in Oro's canoe, and those of Tane, Temeharo, and two shark gods, which were carried in separate canoes. The privileged position given to Hiro would be consistent with the belief that he was Oro's brother, or descendant. Tane's position in the procession as merely an attendant god would be consistent with the fact that he was, so far as the Oro-worshipping Pomares were concerned, only a minor god as compared with Oro; perhaps because he was a Teva god. Temeharo, being only a family god, would not travel with Oro. The two shark gods would probably, according to my ideas, be Teva gods. Ellis is apparently speaking of the Society Islands generally when he says that marriage ceremonies were generally performed in the family *marae*, except when the parties were connected with the reigning family, which rendered it necessary that it should be solemnized in the temple of Oro or of Tane, the two principal national idols<sup>1</sup>. It is, I think, clear that the reigning family to which he refers is the Pomare family; and my interpretation of the matter is that there were two great gods, of whom Oro was (subject to the priority of the distant Tangaroa) the principal god worshipped by the Pomares. A marriage of a member of their family would take place in a *marae* dedicated to Oro, unless the other spouse belonged to a group with whom Tane was the principal god; in which case the ceremony would be in an Oro *marae* or a

<sup>1</sup> Ellis, vol. 1, p. 271.

Tane *marae*, according to circumstances. It may be noted that, though Ari'i Taimai recognizes the rank and sanctity of the head chiefs of Ra'iatea, and the fact that the Pomare line rose to rank through relationship with them, she, though specially Tevan in ancestry, never once describes the Teva as having come from Ra'iatea, nor does she claim rank for the Teva through relationship with the Ra'iatean head chiefs.

I have in this discussion been dealing in the main with what I regard as having perhaps been two main great cults of Tahiti, namely that of Tangaroa, including Oro, and that of Tane; though there were, of course, plenty of other gods, great and small worshipped in Tahiti. I have introduced into the discussion other islands of the Society group, besides Tahiti; but I now propose to introduce some more evidence which enlarges the geographical scope of the discussion so as to include practically the whole Society group.

Tane and Tangaroa were, I imagine, the two original gods with whom we are concerned in this matter, the worship of Oro having commenced at a later date, though I cannot say how long before what I may call historical times. I cannot elaborate here the beliefs and traditions as to Oro; but I may say that, so far, at all events, as the Society Islands are concerned, his worship seems to have originated in the north-western islands, and the wide spreading of his worship through the Society Islands is attributed by some writers to the successful conquering by his people under Puni of the north-western islands of the group, and the consequent desire of people in Tahiti and islands to the south-east to secure his military support<sup>1</sup>.

The fresh evidence which I propose to introduce deals with the Society Island importance of Tane, in speaking of whom I have hitherto confined myself mainly to Tahiti, and, for the purpose of my argument, Huahine. Most of the Society Island myths of creation that are known to us attribute it to Tangaroa; but the *Duff* missionaries give one in which Tane appeared as the creator of water, the wind, the sky, and the sun, and there were subsequent evolutions, including the months, Tangaroa apparently being his wife, through whom he begat them<sup>2</sup>. I think Ellis is referring to the Society Islands generally when

<sup>1</sup> This could probably only be done by the establishment, through inter-marriages, of social (what I may call "clan") relationship with his worshippers; but this point is not material here.

<sup>2</sup> Wilson, pp. 333 sq.

he describes the ideas of the people concerning the heavens; he says there were ten celestial strata, each the abode of gods or spirits, whose elevation was regulated by their ranks or powers, the tenth being the abode of the first class only. Apparently there were supposed to be more gods than one in this highest heaven; but the name of it was *te rai haamama no tane*, the opening or unfolding to the *po* or darkness<sup>1</sup>; and from this it seems that it was specially associated with the god Tane. So also Moerenhout speaks of *terai ama ma tane* (evidently almost the same collective term differently divided), which he calls the mouth of Tane, the opening or door of the extremity, through which the light entered<sup>2</sup>. Then again, I find in Davies's *Tahitian Dictionary* the following, "*Aroa*, the firmament or heaven; called also *moana roa*, and said to be the residence of the god Tane." I think it probable that the apparent predominance of Tangaroa over Tane disclosed by the creation legends is greatly exaggerated, and that this exaggeration may well be attributed to the sources from which the traditions were collected. Cook, J. R. Forster, Banks and Ellis probably obtained most of their material from the Pomare area and its neighbourhood, and Moerenhout says that he obtained all his traditions as to creation and cosmogony from an old priest of Ra'iatea<sup>3</sup>. I suspect that traditions collected in the Tevan districts of the south coast of Tahiti, would have given more prominence to Tane, and that we have here an example of boastful claims by the worshippers of Tangaroa comparable with those of the Samoan island of Manu'a.

Ellis, after referring to the mode of warfare in the Society Islands since the commencement of the reign of Oro, says that before this time, during the celestial supremacy of Tane and Ra, these gods were accustomed in action to advance before those bands of warriors whom they were disposed to aid, and to spread dismay through the ranks of their enemies by waving their tails, which the natives regarded as resembling the tails of comets, or falling or shooting stars<sup>4</sup>. So also de Bovis says that Tane and Oro used to be at war with each other, and suggests that their cults had formerly been under two enemy flags<sup>5</sup>. All this might refer either to physical fighting between the worshippers of the two respective gods, or to a contention

<sup>1</sup> Ellis, vol. III, p. 169.

<sup>2</sup> Moerenhout, vol. I, p. 443.

<sup>4</sup> Ellis, vol. I, p. 285.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 383, 394.

<sup>5</sup> De Bovis, pp. 271 sq.



by those worshippers for religious domination and supremacy of their gods, or both. It might be only a dramatic picture of a natural spread of one cult to the detriment of the other. Whichever it was, Tane seems, as we shall see, to have been the original holder of the position, and Oro the god who afterwards attacked him, and throughout a considerable portion of the Society group succeeded in ousting him, or at all events superseding him, though in some places where he was superseded he may have remained as a distant great god of the past, and probably did so. Thus Tyerman and Bennet were told of the way in which people used "formerly" to address the gods when they desired anything, in the island of Borabora, credited, along with Ra'iatea, in traditions as having been the original home of Oro; and in giving an example of this they give as the name of the god addressed "Tani<sup>1</sup>," which we must, I think, identify with Tane. So also in the same island the rainbow was worshipped under the name of *Toomeitee no Tane*<sup>2</sup>, which suggests a belief connecting him with the skies. The worship of the rainbow under the name of *Toomeitee no Tane* prevailed also in Ra'iatea and Tahaa<sup>3</sup>. The god of the last named island is stated by Anderson to have been Tanne<sup>4</sup>, and by Forster to have been Orra<sup>5</sup>, which suggests a diversity of belief in Cook's time; and de Bovis in his list gives Tane as the original god of the *marae* Auroa in Tahaa, but says that later the *marae* was consecrated to Oro<sup>6</sup>. Passing now to the south-easterly islands, there is an indication in de Bovis' list of Oro superseding Tane in Eimeo (Mo'orea)<sup>7</sup>. In this island the missionaries saw a god house of Oro. They were told that it formerly belonged to Tane, but that he had given it up to Oro; and in one end of the house they saw Oro [that is his image] deposited in a box<sup>8</sup>. The evidence from Tahiti loses much of the value it might otherwise have because we are not told in most cases to which part of the island it refers. Gill was told by the Rev. C. Barff that the worship of Tane, the tutelary god of Huahine, once prevailed over Tahiti<sup>9</sup>. Smith says the same thing<sup>10</sup>; indeed he says elsewhere that Tane had been the ancient god of the Society and Tahitian groups, but Oro subsequently became their god, to the exclusion of Tane<sup>11</sup>. De Bovis says that there

<sup>1</sup> Tyerman, vol. I, p. 318.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Forster, *Voy.* vol. II, p. 151.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> Gill, *D.L.P.* p. 64.

<sup>2</sup> Parkinson (1), p. 70.

<sup>4</sup> Cook, vol. VI, p. 160.

<sup>6</sup> De Bovis, p. 273.

<sup>8</sup> L.M.S. *Trans.* vol. II, p. 135.

<sup>10</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. IV, p. 292 n. 44.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* p. 32.

was in Tahiti, near the *marae* of the first order, consecrated to Oro, a little secondary *marae*, consecrated to Tane, to which the human victim was brought after it had been offered to Oro; and he is even inclined to believe that the charnels of all these *marae* were consecrated to Tane, who was regarded as delighting in corpses<sup>1</sup>. I am not sure whether, in the first part of this statement, he is speaking of a specific *marae* or of *marae* generally; but, if the latter, it must be taken subject to a qualification, because the great Oro *marae* at Attahuru was a final resting place for the bodies of victims, unless we may believe that that *marae* had a charnel consecrated to Tane<sup>2</sup>. As regards the reference to Tane's delight in corpses, I think the true explanation is perhaps found in de Bovis's statement that all the *marae* had not the right to maintain the corpse, they usually having to pass it on to a *marae* which was of higher rank or more sacred, where alone the corpse could be disposed of. He again says here, as regards the *marae* of Oro, that the corpses offered there were thrown into a special charnel, sometimes forming a distinct *marae*, though neighbouring the first, and consecrated to Tane<sup>3</sup>. The interest of these statements for my present purpose is that, according to them, it was the higher ranked, or more sacred *marae* that finally received the body, and these were dedicated to Tane. Banks says that in Tahiti Tane was more generally invoked than Tangaroa, as he was supposed to be the more active deity<sup>4</sup>. I do not think we can deduce much from this; both Tangaroa and Tane seem to have been regarded as more or less remote, but this would probably seem to be more so in the case of Tangaroa than of Tane, because the worshippers of the former would commonly address themselves to his more active son Oro. In conclusion I quote de Bovis's statement that the *marae* of Oro covered almost all the archipelago, and those of Tane, more thinly sown, and reduced to second rank, only preserved their pre-eminence in Huahine<sup>5</sup>. This statement might seem somewhat antagonistic to my suggestion connecting Tane with the Teva people, but I do not think it really is so. De Bovis wrote in 1855, long after the establishment in Tahiti of the Pomare dynasty, and it may well be that by this time the ascendancy and greater importance of

<sup>1</sup> De Bovis, p. 272.

<sup>2</sup> It must not be assumed that this would include victims from Tevan *marae*; and presumably it would not do so if my suggestions as to Tane and Tangaroa are correct.

<sup>3</sup> De Bovis, p. 287.

<sup>4</sup> Banks, p. 173.

<sup>5</sup> De Bovis, p. 272.

Oro over Tane had further developed, and had to a certain extent spread to the Teva districts.

My suggestions as to the possible conclusions to which the evidence bearing upon this question of the early history of the Society Islands may lead us are obviously and admittedly of a speculative character. Nevertheless I think that, if we take the evidence as a whole, it seems to point broadly to one or two things as probably being substantially correct. It does look as though there had been in the distant past a strong Tane cult spread widely over, apparently, the whole Society group, and as though, perhaps at some later period, a Tangaroa cult had reached the islands of the group, Ra'iatea probably having been its first or principal home there, and had afterwards in certain places, as a Tangaroa, or Tangaroa-Oro or Oro cult, displaced, or thrust into the background, the dominant position of Tane. We cannot say when this period was, or how long it lasted; nor can we say to what extent the subsequent change was rapid or gradual. If I am right in my belief that the commencement of the worship of Oro was relatively recent, then we are, I think, justified in suspecting that Tangaroa was the original intruder; and the fact that Tangaroa was one of the great gods whose worship was spread, or at least who was known, practically throughout Polynesia, whilst Oro was only a local god of the Society group, or at all events was only prominent there, adds considerable support to this view. The great age, sanctity and importance of Oro's *marae* in Opoa in Ra'iatea and the belief that it had originally been dedicated to Tangaroa, points to Ra'iatea as having perhaps been the original centre of the Tangaroa cult, or at all events its centre at the earliest period of native traditions. There is no sufficient material from which to trace the spread to other islands of the worship of Tangaroa himself, independently of his reputed son Oro. If the traditions as to the spread of the worship of Oro are to be taken as a guide, it would seem probable that it extended first to certain north-western islands, and afterwards to Tahiti and Eimeo. As both Tangaroa and Tane were ancient, and were regarded as distant gods, who did not concern themselves with the less important affairs of mankind, it is possible that the more intimate worship of the more active and accessible Oro spread to areas whose chief god was Tangaroa as well as those of the worshippers of Tane, both gods being, as it were, in some places thrust into the background as great original gods,

rather than as deities more readily accessible to humanity. The extent of the change would vary in different areas; for example the Oro cult appears to have become dominant in the north-western islands, other than Huahine, where Tane remained the tutelary god of the island. It is clear that Oro became, subject to the shadowy presence in the background of Tangaroa, and, in some places, apparently, of Tane, the most important god of Attahuru and of parts, at all events, of north-western Tahiti and perhaps Tautira. The question of the Teva districts of Tahiti depends to a considerable extent upon the accuracy or otherwise of my speculations as to the special connection of Tane with these districts. The dominant cult of any island or district, as between these respective gods, would presumably not necessarily be the sole cult, as inter-marriages might introduce into one area the cult of another, the resulting issue of the marriages belonging to the groups of both or either of the spouses, and becoming worshippers of both or either of their gods.

The main point of interest for my present purpose is the presence in the Society Islands of two totally distinct, and apparently competitive cults—namely that of Tane, and that of Tangaroa, or of Oro, the son of Tangaroa, or both. I imagine that the worshippers of Tangaroa and Oro would be in the main descendants of the people whom I am calling the Tangaroans, and whom I have discussed in connection with Samoa—assuming, of course, that my Samoan hypotheses are sound, which may or may not be the case. Who in that case were the worshippers of Tane? They may have been some of the people whom I have called pre-Tangaroans, and I may say as to this that Tane seems to have been a god of very great antiquity. This, however, is a question which we cannot even attempt to discuss, except as part of an investigation, as regards this and cognate matters, of the whole of Polynesia, when all our available data, religious, social and otherwise, are at our disposal.

## CHAPTER VII

### POLITICAL AREAS AND SYSTEMS

#### HERVEY ISLANDS

THE Hervey or Cook group comprises the following islands, the names inserted in parentheses being the ancient names<sup>1</sup>. To the south are the two larger islands Mangaia (Auau) to the east, and Rarotonga (Tumute Varovaro) to the west. Northward of these is Atiu (Eua Manu), and near it are the little clusters of islets, Mitiaro (Nakuroa), Mauiki or Mauke (Akataka Manava) and Takutea (Areuna). North-west of these is the Manuae (Manu-eua) cluster; and, still further to the north-west, is the island of Aitutaki (Araura).

Each island was supposed to be the body or outward form, to which a spirit, bearing a distinct name, located in Avaiki (the nether world) belonged. The meanings of the names of the islands and of their spirits are given by Gill as follows:

Body	Spirit
1. Rarotonga=Western Tonga	Tumutevarovaro=echo
2. Auau=terraced or Mangaia=peace	Akatautica=well-poised
3. Aitutaki=god-led	Araura=fragrant wreaths for dancing
4. Atiu=eldest born (the first settler)	Eua-manu=land of birds
5. Mauki=land of Uki (the first inhabitant)	Akatoka=stony (or Teraeotepeu=the lip of the drum)
6. Mitiaro=face of the ocean	Nukuroa=vast boat
7. Manuae=home of birds	Eua-kura=land of red parrot feathers <sup>2</sup>

I may point out that in all cases, except Mangaia, the names given by Gill to the spirits are identical with, or somewhat similar to, the ancient names of the islands, as given by Large, which seems natural enough, the islands themselves being regarded as symbolic—the visible forms—of the spirits, or rather, as I think we should call them, spirit places, in Avaiki.

The following observations, though perhaps referring only to Mangaia, further illustrate the ideas of the people concerning

<sup>1</sup> These are taken from Large, *J.P.S.* vol. xxii, p. 69, and vol. xv, pp. 214 sq., 217; and some of them are confirmed in other publications.

<sup>2</sup> Gill, *Myths*, pp. 16 sq. Cf. Large, *J.P.S.* vol. xv, pp. 214-7; vol. xxii, p. 69. It will be noticed that Takutea is not mentioned.

the association between the outer and spirit worlds. The state was conceived of as a long dwelling, standing east and west; the chiefs of the southern (right) side of the island represented one side of that dwelling, and those of the northern (left) side the other. The under chiefs everywhere symbolized the lesser rafters, and the other people the separate leaves of the thatch covering. By a subtle process of thought, the state itself, with its great and lesser chiefs and numerous members, was the visible expression of a spirit-dwelling in the under-world, in which the major and minor divinities lived, and which they actually constituted, the major gods being the pillars and main rafters, the minor gods the lesser rafters—and so on. The safety of the state consisted in this—that in the spirit temple in the nether-world there should be no schism or rent; for if this occurred, divisions would immediately arise in the visible world, that is in the councils of the great chiefs; and from this would flow war and bloodshed<sup>1</sup>.

#### MANGAIA

I wish to state, before passing to the actual political systems of Mangaia, that I have tried in all likely quarters to obtain an adequate map of the island, which would have been very useful, but I have not been able to find one which would be of any use whatever for the purposes of this book.

There is in Mangaia a central hill, half a mile long, and 250 ft. high, extending from east to west, which is, or was, called Rangimotia, or centre of the heavens; and from this lesser hills branch out on all sides; in particular there were two ridges stretching outwards in north-easterly and south-easterly directions, and two others stretching to the north-west and south-west. The island was thus divided by this central backbone and these four ridges into four natural sections to the north, south, east, and west. The central hill was considered very sacred and it was there that the sacred chiefs used to adjust the sacred girdle upon warriors before they embarked, in the name of the great god Rongo, upon warlike expeditions, the condition of wearing the girdle being that the man must succeed or die. The belief as to this hill was that under it a god, Temanovaroa (the Long Lived) lay buried, face downwards; under the central ridge lay his back; at the eastern

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *S.P.N.G.* p. 17.

extremity, towards the rising sun, was his head, and a depression near this extremity showed the position of his neck; his arms were covered by the ridges running north-east and south-east, and his legs by those passing north-west and south-west. In allusion to this belief the eastern section of the island was always called the *pauru*, or head, the southern section the right side, and the northern section the left side<sup>1</sup>.

The legendary history of Mangaia begins with the birth in Avaiki of the three grandsons<sup>2</sup> of the great god Rongo—Rangi, Mokoiro and Akatauirā. Rongo gave to Rangi the “drum of peace,” to Mokoiro the direction over food of all kinds, and to Akatauirā (his youngest and “pet” grandson) the *karakia*, or prayers, and sway over his brethren. These three brothers were always described as joint kings, or *nga ariki*; and their descendants were all called by this name, which was contracted to *ngariki*<sup>3</sup>. Mangaia was at that time in Avaiki, but Rangi, with the help of his brothers, dragged the island up to the light of day; and there they took up their abode, being the first inhabitants of the island and the ancestors of the original “tribes” by which it was peopled. Three small rocks, united at the base, close to the *marae* of Rongo and the altar for human sacrifice, were pointed out as symbolizing the threefold lords of the soil<sup>4</sup>. Mangaia thus became the centre of the universe, occupied by living men and women, whilst the inhabitants of other outlying islands were only *taurangi* or evil spirits in the guise of humanity<sup>5</sup>.

We find that, consistently perhaps, with the tale of the gifts by Rongo to his three grandsons, there were three great offices in Mangaia; namely, the secular head chiefs, the “rulers of food” and the sacred or praying chiefs, this last-named office being subdivided into two.

The secular head chiefs were the warrior rulers of the whole island; their succession was a matter of success in warfare. Upon a decisive victory being gained, the leading victorious warrior was proclaimed the secular chief of Mangaia<sup>6</sup>; that is, if the ruler was defeated, the rule passed to his conqueror; whilst a victorious ruler remained in power. Gill gives a tabulated statement of the battles fought in Mangaia, this

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *Myths*, pp. 128 sq.

<sup>2</sup> They were his illegitimate sons by his daughter Tavake (Gill, *Myths*, pp. 15 sq.).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 18 sq.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 17.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 16.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 293.

statement showing, as regards each battle, where it was fought, who was the victor, who were the defeated people, and who thereupon became recognized as what he calls "Lord of Mangaia"—a term which he applies to the secular ruler of the island. In each case the rulership passed to the victorious party, though the name of the person who became ruler was not always that of the actual victor; in such cases it was presumably one of his people<sup>1</sup>. The first ruler whose name appears in this list is Rangi; the next is Teakataura; the last is Numangatini, who was the ruler in Gill's time<sup>2</sup>. The word which signified "peace" also meant "rule" or "reign"; and the rule of the secular king lasted only so long as no blood was spilt<sup>3</sup>—that was during the period of peace. It would almost appear from Gill's statement that war necessarily terminated the reign of the then ruler, even if he was victorious, and continued to reign—that is, it was a new reign, and not a continuation of the old one; and this would be in accord with the fundamental idea. An important and essential feature of the ceremony inaugurating the close of hostilities, the return of peace and the commencement of the new reign following it, was human sacrifice followed by the beating of the drum of peace<sup>4</sup>; and this is probably the explanation of the gift by Rongo to Rangi of the "drum of peace," the term being symbolic of secular rulership. Perhaps we must associate with it the meaning of the name Mangaia, as stated by Gill.

Gill also supplies a list of the "rulers of food" beginning with the original Mokoiro, born in Avaiki, who was succeeded by another of the same name, and ending with the holder of the office in 1829. He unfortunately tells us nothing about them generally; but he says that the family of Namu, a name which appears twice in the list, were priests of Mokoiro; and that it was their hereditary office to fasten on to the bow of each canoe in the fishing season (from September to December) the little leaf god emblematic of Mokoiro, a sacred office which no other hand but theirs could perform, and it was they who had to give the word for the entire fleet of canoes to start off. The emblem acted as a protector, supposed to be all powerful with regard to wind and waves; and no man would venture over the reef without it<sup>5</sup>. Speaking elsewhere of this leaf emblem, Gill describes it as the extremity of a great coconut leaf, comprising ten or twelve lesser leaves, cut off, and neatly

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* pp. 224 sq.

<sup>4</sup> Gill, *Myths*, p. 295.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 224.

<sup>5</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* pp. 104 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 301-2.



bound with a bit of yellow sinnet, and says it was the fisherman's god and was made by "the priest of all food"<sup>1</sup>. He also, in describing the ceremony of inauguration of a new secular king, refers to a man who had the management of all great feasts, and "was supposed to make the food grow"<sup>2</sup>. Both these two statements are taken from a book in which he tells us nothing about the rulers of food other than the origin of the office given above; it is, I think, clear that "the priest of all food" was this ruler, and we may, I think, believe that the man who "was supposed to make the food grow" was so also. If so, the "ruler of food" had duties of both a religious and secular character; he may also have had some secular duties of regulating food supply, and proclaiming a *tabu*, when necessary; but no mention is made of this. As regards the use by Gill of the term "hereditary office" in speaking of the Namu family, I should say that he tells us, as to his list of the "rulers of food," that the connection in each case was that of father and son<sup>3</sup>.

The special duties of the sacred chiefs were to ward off, by means of rhythmical prayers of great antiquity to the god Rongo, the evil-minded spirits which might injure the island. The office was a dual one. The principal sacred chief, specially designated *te arika karakia* (the praying chief), generally referred to by Gill as the king, lived in the interior, in the midst of abundance, in the sacred district of Keia. His prayers were supposed to keep away bad spirits coming from the east. The secondary sacred chief, *te arika pa tai*, lived at O-Rongo, on the barren sea shore, and his prayers were directed against the bad spirits coming from the west<sup>4</sup>. Gill supplies lists, dating from the beginning, of these sacred chiefs<sup>5</sup>. The list of the principal sacred chiefs begins with the name Rangi, the next name being Teakataura and the last but one being the modern Numangatini (mentioned above), who was followed by his son and grandson, ruling conjointly. The list of the secondary chiefs begins with the name Tui, and ends with Numangatini.

A comparison of the list of the principal sacred chiefs with that of secular chiefs is interesting. It will be noticed that the two first names in each list are identical—Rangi and Akataura<sup>6</sup>. To be consistent with the tale of Rongo's gifts to his

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *Myths*, p. 79.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 297 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* p. 229 n. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Gill, *D.L.P.* p. 315.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 315 sq.

<sup>6</sup> The *Te-* prefix added to the name of Akataura is merely the definite article.

three grandsons, the list of sacred chiefs should exclude the name of Rangi, and begin with that of Akataura. Again, if the lists may be regarded as representing correctly the ideas of the people as to the past history of the two offices, we are led to the conclusion that they believed that originally the sacred and secular offices were united in the same holder.

All these sacred chiefs were *ex officio* priests of Rongo, the tutelar god of Mangaia<sup>1</sup>; but the principal sacred chief was, as will appear directly, a person of special importance and power. There was a legend that Tui, the first of the secondary sacred chiefs, was appointed by Rangi, the first of the principal sacred chiefs "to guard by his prayers the sea-side from evil minded spirits coming from the sun-setting," whilst Rangi kept a sharp look-out against bad spirits from the east<sup>2</sup>. It may be that we have here an indication that at one time there was only one sacred chief. Gill says that, when the "sea-side king"—by which term he evidently means the secondary sacred chief—was installed in office, and took up his abode near the *marae* of Rongo, the most sacred spot in the island, a large basket was hung up in the neighbourhood, so that all who passed to and from the sea might deposit an offering to the goddess Ruatamaine, the revealer of secrets. In going, the gift might be only a bit of cooked *taro*; but on coming back it had to be an entire fish. If nothing whatever had been caught, a white coral pebble had to be put into the basket instead. Ruatamaine was a very exacting divinity; and if the accustomed offering was omitted, no success in fishing could be expected<sup>3</sup>. This statement perhaps suggests some possible confusion or overlapping in connection with the offices of "ruler of food" and sacred chief of the shore; though the very meagre information at our disposal only actually refers to protection against dangers of the sea as being within the scope of duty of the former towards fishermen. Perhaps the gifts were in the nature of first-fruits to a fisherman's god.

Gill says "the kingly office" was hereditary; but the installation rested with the "lord of Mangaia for the time being"<sup>4</sup>. It is clear that by the former expression he means the office of the principal sacred chief, of whom he always speaks as the king, and the lord of Mangaia is the term which he always uses for

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *Myths*, p. 293; *L.S.I.* p. 120; *D.L.P.* p. 315.

<sup>2</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* pp. 1 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Gill, *L.S.I.* p. 122.

<sup>4</sup> Gill, *D.L.P.* p. 315; cf. *Myths*, p. 293.

the secular chief; indeed, in one place he makes the distinction clear<sup>1</sup>. As regards this installation he says that a father *might* be set aside in favour of his eldest son, or one brother in favour of another; still the person appointed had to be of the blood divine, as they believed it to be. The sacred chief of the shore was not infrequently a natural son of the sacred chief of the interior<sup>2</sup>.

Turning now to the status and powers of these sacred chiefs, it is said that the chief of the shore, although second to the chief of the interior, was, when once formally installed, so sacred that even the great secular chief, after the offerings had been made by that chief's attendants, approached the sacred chief, crawling on all fours. But the moment the charm of peace had been destroyed by the shedding of human blood, this sacredness disappeared, and the chief returned to his ancestral lines in the interior<sup>3</sup>. This last statement is remarkable; for it seems to imply that war terminated the official position, not only of the secular chief, but of the lower class of sacred chief.

The importance and power of the great sacred chief of the interior seem to have been immense. I find no suggestion that he ever engaged in secular executive functions; his power seems to have rested entirely upon his religious position. The great secular chief had to obey him, just as the other people had to do so, through fear of Rongo's anger<sup>4</sup>. War could not be commenced without previous human sacrifice<sup>5</sup>; and it was he who had to offer up the victim to Rongo<sup>6</sup>. Blood could not be spilt without his consent, given in the name of Rongo<sup>7</sup>. Similarly his co-operation was required for the termination of the war by the beating of the drum of peace, for this ceremony had to be preceded by human sacrifice to Rongo<sup>8</sup>. Again he had to repeat the prayers at the inauguration of a new secular king<sup>9</sup>. Gill puts the matter generally by saying, the kings (by which he means the principal sacred chiefs) were the mouthpieces or priests of Rongo. As Rongo was the tutelary divinity, and source of all authority, they were invested with tremendous power, the temporal lord having to obey, like the multitude. Peace could not be proclaimed, or blood spilt lawfully without the consent of the king, speaking in the name of the god Rongo. So sacred was his person that no part of his body might be tattooed; he could not take part in dances or in actual warfare. It

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *Myths*, p. 293.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 317.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 18 sq., 288.

<sup>7</sup> Gill, *Myths*, p. 293.

<sup>2</sup> Gill, *D.L.P.* p. 315.

<sup>4</sup> Gill, *Myths*, p. 293.

<sup>6</sup> Gill, *L.S.I.* p. 328.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 295.

sometimes happened that the temporal lord was at enmity with the king of his day. In that case the king would refuse to complete the ceremonies for his formal investiture; life would remain unsafe; the soil could not be cultivated, and famine soon followed. This state of misery might endure for years, until the obnoxious chief had in his turn been despatched, and a more agreeable successor fixed upon<sup>1</sup>. These observations, I should explain, appear under the heading of "The Drum of Peace"; the picture of general insecurity and desolation is based on the fact that if, when a war was over, and the drum of peace was proposed to be beaten on the installation of the conqueror, the religious chief refused to go through the requisite ceremonies, the country remained in a state of war, and shedding of blood and killing could continue. After the beating of the drum of peace, on the other hand, it was unlawful for any one even to carry a weapon, or even to cut down ironwood, which might be used for making weapons, instead of spades; though aged men might have their staffs<sup>2</sup>. The autocratic power of these sacred chiefs is well illustrated by two examples. On one occasion the sacred chief would only consent to beat the drum of peace on condition that his two maternal uncles, the two leading victorious warrior chiefs, should be slain, and laid on the altar of the god as the price of peace; and this, apparently, was done, though the sacred chief ultimately lost his rank for this undue enforcement of his powers<sup>3</sup>. Another example is afforded by the following episode which occurred apparently in about the middle of the eighteenth century. A man had killed the grandfather of Mautara, the high priest of the great national Mangaian god Motoro, and a very powerful personage. The daughter of this man, a woman of a fugitive tribe, was cousin of the wife of the sacred king, and the latter had taken her under his protection as a slave. Mautara wished to avenge his grandfather's death by killing and eating this woman; but though armed men were sent three times "by order of the god Motoro" to fetch her, the king refused to allow her to be taken, and Mautara had to submit<sup>4</sup>. I would point out that the "sway over his brethren," given by Rongo to his youngest grandson Akataura, seems to have been maintained by his successors.

As the connection between the "rulers of food," given in Gill's list of them, was that of father and son<sup>5</sup>, it follows, subject

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *Myths*, p. 293.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 301.

<sup>3</sup> Gill, *S.P.N.G.* p. 11.

<sup>4</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* pp. 134 sq.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 229 n. 1.

to any question as to matrilineal descent, that these officials must be regarded as having been members of the family of Mokoiro, from whom, according to the list, they were descended. Similarly, as the office of the higher branch of the sacred chiefs was hereditary, in the sense that it had to be held by one of the blood divine<sup>1</sup>, which meant of the family of which Akataura was the ancestor, we must, I suppose, look upon them as belonging to his family. As regards the lower branch of sacred chiefs, it is stated that Tui, the original holder of that office, came from Rarotonga<sup>2</sup>; so the ancestry of these lower sacred chiefs is uncertain at the outset, and we have seen the frequent relationship between them and the higher branch<sup>3</sup>. The rule under which the last conqueror presumably became the secular chief applied to the whole island, including, not only the Ngariki, but other, and quite distinct people. This is evident from a glance at Gill's list of battles, etc.<sup>4</sup>.

Gill says that there were in Mangaia separate "clans," each of which had its separate gods, customs, traditions and songs, and constituted but one great family, with a single head, and pledged to defend each other to the death<sup>5</sup>. As already stated, the descendants of the three grandsons of Rongo were called Ngariki; these three groups of descendants were apparently the original peoples of Mangaia, and were separate and distinct groups. They regarded all others as interlopers, to be slain and sacrificed if possible<sup>6</sup>; Gill (writing in 1878) concludes that these first inhabitants occupied the island some five or six centuries back, his opinion being based upon a comparison of his lists of the rulers of food with those of the priests<sup>7</sup>.

Gill gives the names of a few divisions of the Ngariki people as existing at a subsequent period; but there is no ground disclosed for identifying any of them, except perhaps the Akataura (see below), with any one of the three grandsons of Rongo—indeed one of them is stated to be a subsequent creation. We are not shown, as regards the Ngariki people and their subdivisions, which (if any) specific portions of the island were regarded as their recognized homes.

The Mautara people seems to have been a branch of the Ngariki, and were perhaps what Gill calls a "tribe" of people, holding two districts, the only districts in the island that had

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *D.L.P.* p. 315. Cf. *Myths*, p. 293.

<sup>2</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* p. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* p. 224.

<sup>6</sup> Gill, *Myths*, pp. 16 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Gill, *D.L.P.* p. 315.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 136.

<sup>7</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* p. 229.

never changed hands; and they were in fact the priests of Matoro, the tutelar god of the Ngariki. These people, who were called the Amama, or open mouthed tribe, had ruled the island from the time of Rangi downwards, first as priests of Matoro, and latterly by right of conquest<sup>1</sup>. The Mautara people claimed descent from Pappaunuku, a vassal in the train of Rangi from Avaiki. They were "founded" by Ngangati, who was then the priest of Matoro, and was nicknamed Mautara after a notorious cannibal, and took to eating human flesh at the time when the real Mautara was slain. They almost exterminated, and literally devoured, the other descendants of Rangi and his brothers, and ruled the island of Mangaia for about a century<sup>2</sup>. Gill tells us elsewhere that the Mautara, or priestly tribe, as he calls them, gave up their ancient deity Tane in favour of a new god Tiaio, the legends concerning whom are referred to by Gill, and who, he says, was "generally associated with" Matoro. The greatness of Tiaio marked the supremacy of this warlike "clan" which was of recent origin<sup>3</sup>. According to Gill he was the warrior chief who repulsed the Atiuan invaders, and so became secular king of the island, being the third sovereign after Rangi<sup>4</sup>. Gill says this was 340 years ago<sup>5</sup>.

Other branches of the Ngariki were the Vaeruarangi people<sup>6</sup>, and the Akatauirā<sup>7</sup>, the latter of whom may have been descendants of Rongo's grandson of that name.

There was also in Mangaia a colony of Tongan immigrants, whose history goes back to the days of Rangi. The legend says that they arrived in a fleet of canoes in command of Te-ao-roa, the first high priest of the god Turanga, and the battle between Rangi and his people and these Tongans is the first of the recorded pitched battles of Mangaia. The Tongans were beaten and fled in disorder, the remnants of them escaping and taking shelter in the cave of Tautua. Peace was then made, and Rangi allowed the Tongans to occupy the place in the south of the island where they had landed. Gill says that this tale of the origin of the Tongan element in Mangaia is an historical fact<sup>8</sup>; and he (writing in 1878) apparently thinks it was only something over 450 years ago<sup>9</sup>. The Ngariki treated the Tongan immigrants

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *Myths*, p. 36.

<sup>2</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* pp. 70, 214.

<sup>3</sup> Gill, *Myths*, p. 30.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 29; *S.L.P.* pp. 21, 224.

<sup>5</sup> *S.L.P.* p. 21 (the date of this book is 1878).

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 89.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 99.

<sup>8</sup> Gill, *Myths*, pp. 287 sq.

<sup>9</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* list of battles, p. 224. See also Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 293 n.

as a people devoted to sacrifice<sup>1</sup>. There were two branches of these Tongan people, one called Teaaki<sup>2</sup>, and the other Teipe<sup>3</sup>. The period of their predominance will be seen in the list of battles. Gill says that at a later date they became almost extinct<sup>4</sup>.

There were also in Mangaia two immigrant peoples from Tahiti—the Tane or Aitu people, whose “founder” was Terangai, and the Tekama people, who came from Vairia (in Tahiti), and who, after landing at, and being expelled from, the island of Atiu, reached Mangaia, and settled in a north-eastern district there<sup>5</sup>, but were afterwards repulsed<sup>6</sup>. All this was subsequent to the Tongan immigration<sup>7</sup>. The Aitu people, worshippers of Tane, built a *marae*, the centre of which was filled up with human heads, instead of stones, the heads being procured by raids on the older settlers. They were therefore the subjects of two attacks by the Ngariki (Battles 7 and 10 in the list below) in about 1620 and 1660, in both of which they were defeated, and their warriors thrown into a huge oven and burnt to death; in this way they were nearly exterminated<sup>8</sup>. The Tekama people were, according to Gill (writing in 1878) practically exterminated about 300 years ago<sup>9</sup>.

Gill, in his book *Savage Life in Polynesia*, supplies a list of the battles fought in Mangaia<sup>10</sup>. It is little more than a list, and, though it states in most cases who were the opposing people in the several battles, and who were the victors and the vanquished, it does not in many cases identify these groups with exactitude. He adds a few remarks, however, and further clues can in many cases be obtained by searching through the stories in the body of the book. It is impossible, even with all this material, to construct anything like a history of these wars; but the following abstract of the earlier part of the list will give some idea of the character of the relations of peace and war which prevailed among all these groups of people. The “observations” are mine, as also are, in some cases, the identifications of the combatants; and where I refer in them to pages, these are the pages, other than those of the list, in the above-mentioned book from which I get my information. I may add that in each case he states who was or became the secular king of

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *Myths*, pp. 289 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* p. 92 n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Gill, *Myths*, p. 290.

<sup>4</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* pp. 53 sq., 57.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 30 n. 4, 23. The name of the Aitu people is distinct from that of the island of Atiu.

<sup>6</sup> Gill, *Myths*, p. 29. Cf. *S.L.P.* p. 224.

<sup>7</sup> Gill *Myths* p. 290.

<sup>8</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* pp. 27-30.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 25.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* p. 224.

of war	Victors	Vanquished	Observations
1	Rangi	Tongan Colony	
2	"	Aitu (Tahiti) people	
3	Ngariki	Rarotongs	Gill thinks this occurred in about A.D. 1425 (p. 4) { In these cases only the names of the victorious chiefs are given; but it is, I think, clear that they were Ngariki chiefs. Estimated dates of Nos. 3 and 5 about 1500 and 1540 (pp. 17 and 21, <i>Myths and Songs</i> , p. 288)
4	"	Aitutaki Island people	
5	"	Atiu Island people	
6	"	Tekama (Tahiti) people	
7	"	Aitu (Tahiti) people	
8, 9	"	Tekama (Tahiti) people	Probable date about 1620 (p. 28) Probable date of 8 about 1570 Probable date about 1600
10	"	Aitu (Tahiti) people	
11	"	Tongan people	
12	Tongan people	Ngariki	
13	"	Vaeruarangi (Ngariki) people	Other names appear also as included among the defeated people, but I have not identified them
14	"	Tekama (Tahiti) people	
15	"	" "	
16, 17	"	?	
18	"	Teipe (Tongan) people	
19	"	Ngariki	
20	"	?	
21	"	Ngariki	
22	"	Teipe (Tongan) people	
23	"	"The flower of the Tongan clan"	
24	"?	?	Probable date about 1666 Probable date about 1670
25	"	Vaeruarangi (Ngariki) people	
26	"	Tongans?	
27	"	"	
28	"	Tongans	
29	"	Vaeruarangi (Ngariki) people	
30	"	Akataura (Ngariki) people*	
31	"	Mautara (Ngariki) people	
32	"	"	
33	"	"	
34	"	"	
35	"	"	
36	"	Tongan people	
37	"	Ngariki	
38	"?	"	At period when Captain Cook touched at the island in 1777 Probable date about 1787

\* See p. 164



Mangaia, and it is clear that the secular kingship was dependent upon the fortunes of war.

When I use the term "Ngariki" in this list I intend to imply members of this group other perhaps than one of its offsets whose names I have mentioned previously; and when I speak of the "Tongan people," I do not know whether one only or both of the branches of the Tongans were engaged. It may well be that in cases the people fighting on one side or the other did not include all the people to whom the name given would apply; and I think it probable that my abstract contains inaccuracies of identification. Looking at the list broadly, however, it will be seen that the Ngariki people were dominant until a period probably somewhere in the seventeenth century; that the Tongans then supplanted them until about the beginning of the last quarter of that century; and that then the Ngariki people, or some of them, regained their domination, subject to one period of interruption, to the end. It will also be noticed that the fighting was sometimes between people of the same group.

There was thus in Mangaia a mixed population, the oldest inhabitants being apparently the Ngariki, whatever their origin may have been, the next Tongan, and the next Tahitian. As regards the internal organization of these peoples, I have found no definite information as to any division of the island into self-governing districts, sub-districts and villages, or whether the Tongans continued to occupy the southern area which had been allotted to them. I think, however, we may assume that some such system of division probably existed.

There seem to have been in Gill's time six chiefs, each of them subject to the head chiefs, and each of these six chiefs evidently had his own district, for Gill tells us that, if any large fish became stranded on the shores, it was offered to these six chiefs in definite portions. The head was given to the two chiefs at the *pauru*, head or sun-rising section of the island (to the east); the middle part was divided along the back-bone into two equal portions, and given to the two chiefs in the central part (perhaps one of them would be in the northern, and the other in the southern section); and the tail was divided between the two remaining chiefs at the sun-setting (western) section; and all these portions were again sub-divided "until each individual had a minute share"<sup>1</sup>. Moreover in all great feasts, the etiquette was first to call out the name of the head

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *Myths*, p. 129.

sacred chief, and then to announce in a prescribed order the names of the six chiefs of Mangaia beginning with one of the chiefs on the east, and then going round in regular order until the second chief on the east had been called out, and the circuit of the island completed<sup>1</sup>. I have also found a reference to sub-chiefs<sup>2</sup>, and to the summoning by the head sacred chief of the chiefs and leading men to council<sup>3</sup>. From these materials it would seem that the political system in Mangaia was one of division into districts under chiefs, and sub-districts under sub-chiefs, or perhaps other leading men; but I cannot connect this system or the six chiefs with the known groups of the population. Gill says that the population of Mangaia was in his time gathered into three villages, the principal one being to the west, the second in size and importance to the south, and the third to the north-east<sup>4</sup>. Baessler, however, referring to three villages, which I imagine must be the same, says that the people only settled in them at the request of the missionaries, they having previously been scattered over the whole island<sup>5</sup>, which is obviously possible. As the whole island was only about twenty miles in circumference there may well be some confusion as to the use of the terms district, sub-district and village. There is no indication as to the connection between the six chiefs and the three "villages." Gill is apparently referring to these chiefs when he says that priesthood and chieftainship of a clan went together<sup>6</sup>.

#### RAROTONGA

The island of Rarotonga is, roughly speaking, oval in shape, its ends pointing east and west. I have inspected three maps, appearing in the Admiralty charts, of the island, but they differ from one another, and give very few names. The late Mr S. Percy Smith, however, sent me from New Zealand a much better, and apparently more recent map, which shows what seem to be some villages round the coast, and what are stated to be "native settlements," and appear to be districts. These latter are *Avarua*, in the middle of the north coast; *Matavera* at the northern end of the east coast, *Ngatangia* in the centre and *Muri* at its southern end; *Titikaveka* towards the eastern end of the south coast; and *Arorangi* in the middle of the west coast. The only names among these to which I shall have

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *Myths*, pp. 129 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 291.

<sup>3</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* p. 201.

<sup>4</sup> Gill, *L.S.I.* p. 8.

<sup>5</sup> Baessler, *N.S.B.* p. 273.

<sup>6</sup> Gill, *L.S.I.* p. 328.

to refer are those printed in italics. Ngatangia is, I may say, a contraction of Ngati-Tangia.

The real history of the island begins with the doings of Tangia-nui and Karika; but there are recorded traditions as to what are stated to have been earlier settlers. I will refer to a few of these traditions, though I may say that they and others, taken together, are confusing; it is impossible to coordinate them, and I have grave doubts as to the substantial accuracy of the dates to which some of the events recorded are attributed. Also I cannot associate the people named in the traditions with any feature of the social and political distribution and organization in Rarotonga in later days. I therefore only refer to the stories in order to draw attention to the fact that beliefs as to earlier settlers, prior to Tangia-nui and Karika are reported. According to Smith the first habitation of the island of which we seem to have definite information took place at a period, which he fixes at about 875, when Apopo-te-akatinatina and Apopo-te-ivi-roa, of Savai'i, after defeat in battle, got away to sea with a few of their people, and made their way to Rarotonga<sup>1</sup>. It is said, however, that these were not actually the first settlers, for just before the Apopos and their people reached the island, another party from the Marquesas had settled there. At first the Marquesans were defeated; but their chief by stratagem captured one of the Apopos, scooped out his eyes and swallowed them. The Marquesans stayed in the island some time, after which they returned to their own group. The descendants of the Apopo people were, however, found in Rarotonga some 375 years later by Tangia<sup>2</sup>. These Apopo people were descendants of the Tangaroans of Samoa. According to Gill Karika found in Rarotonga a few "Maori" or brown people from Iva, originally from Avaiki. Their chief was named Ata. They were nearly all killed by Karika<sup>3</sup>. There are other references relating apparently to these same people<sup>4</sup>. Gill identifies this Iva with the Nukuhiva of the Marquesas group<sup>5</sup>; but Smith thinks it was probably Hiva, in Ra'iatea<sup>6</sup>, to which I have referred in considering the Society Islands. Savage mentions two men named Toi and Te Marau as having

<sup>1</sup> Smith, pp. 210 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 231 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Gill, *A.A.A.S.* vol. II, pp. 629 sq. I may mention that Atea was a great god of Marquesan traditions, as also was Vatea in Mangaia, and Atea's name seems to have been sometimes spelt Ata.

<sup>4</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. II, pp. 273, 277 sq.; vol. VI, pp. 2, 9, 72.

<sup>5</sup> Gill, *A.A.A.S.* vol. II, p. 629.

<sup>6</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. VI, p. 9, editor's note.

also been earlier immigrants, and refers to certain roads and pavements they were supposed to have constructed<sup>1</sup>. W. Gill says Tangiia and Karika found an aboriginal race on the south side of the island, physically and mentally much inferior to themselves, and few in number; they were soon subdued and absorbed<sup>2</sup>. Brown also refers to earlier settlers<sup>3</sup>. It is said also that Rata, in one of his voyages, had visited Rarotonga, living on the western side of the island near a place called Vaiakura, and that some of his descendants held possession of this land up to the period when Tangiia-nui arrived; they joined him, but were always independent chiefs and people<sup>4</sup>. Again it is stated that Tangiia's great-great-grandfather Kaukura, had arrived with Iro at Rarotonga before Tangiia came there; and that when he did so, the Kaukura tribe, being related to him, joined him, and the ancestral Kaukura was deified<sup>5</sup>. It is said that Kaukura's home was Tongareva (Penrhyn Is.)<sup>6</sup>.

I propose, in view of the traditional close association of the early political structure of Rarotonga with Karika and Tangiia, to say a few words as to the beliefs concerning the ancestry and history of these two men—I call them men, as I think they must have been human beings. They were important members of the great voyagers into the eastern Pacific whom I am calling the Tangaroans.

Nicholas gives an account, obtained from the Karika people, of the ancestry of Karika. It begins with references to the earth growing, becoming beautiful, budding, becoming mature, having duration, and becoming a parent; after which, evidently referring to the child of this parentage, it speaks of his trumpet (conch shell), his drum, and a kava leaf in token of his royal office and a great shouting. It then says that Makea-Vaerorangi [who was, I suppose, this child] married Ina [this is the same as Sina or Hina, the name so widely spread in Polynesian mythology], the daughter of the god Rongo, who had a son Makea-Tavake, after which it gives a succession of lineal descents, of which the fifteenth was Karika<sup>7</sup>. Gill supplies a mythical account of the name Makea, the regal title of the Rarotongan kings, of whom Karika was the first. According

<sup>1</sup> Savage, *J.P.S.* vol. xxv, pp. 141 sq. Cf. Nicholas, *J.P.S.* vol. 1, p. 73 n. 15; Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. xii, pp. 218 sq.

<sup>2</sup> W. Gill, *Gems*, vol. II, p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Brown, *J.P.S.* vol. vi, pp. 1 sq., 9.

<sup>4</sup> Savage, *J.P.S.* vol. xix, p. 153.

<sup>5</sup> Gill, *J.P.S.* vol. xx, p. 204; cf. p. 142.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 142.

<sup>7</sup> Nicholas, *J.P.S.* vol. 1, p. 70.

to this Atea<sup>1</sup> married Papa<sup>2</sup>, and had as children Rongo, Tane, Tu, Tangaroa and other gods, and here again there is a reference to the kava bowl as the sign of royalty, and the shouts that follow the king. It does not say from what marriage the first Makea was born, but attributes the selection of his name to Rongo and Tane<sup>3</sup>. Gill also refers to a list of purely mythological names, given as the ancestors of Karika<sup>4</sup>; and he gives another tradition, according to which these ancestors once dwelt in Uea (Wallis Island)<sup>5</sup>. Nicholas gives some particulars of beliefs as to the early life and subsequent doings of Karika, prior to his meeting with Tangiia. The tale begins with Karika as a boy, but gives no information as to where he was supposed to be living; he engaged in an expedition to Avaiki, which the editor of the *Polynesian Journal* assumes to have been Savai'i of the Samoan group. Then it tells of a voyage to Rarotonga, said to have been his first visit to that island, where he landed at Avarua, building a *marae* there and another at Araitetonga<sup>6</sup>. He made a circuit of the island, and then returned to Avaiki, where he stayed for some time. Then follows an account of travelling adventures to other islands (not named), fights with chiefs, and carrying off of trophies to his home in Avarua and Araitetonga, and returnings home to Avaiki; his landings at Rarotonga were at various places, including Avarua, Rutaki, Vavaroa, Tokerau (where he built a *marae* Puatiki, also called Tokerau), but unfortunately we do not know where these places, other than Avarua, were. Ultimately he went with his wife, his serfs, his children and his people to Rarotonga, and left Avaiki finally<sup>7</sup>. The editors of the *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, in which this account appears, say that it was from Manu'a (of the Samoan group) that Karika sailed when he discovered Rarotonga<sup>8</sup> and when he migrated there<sup>9</sup>. Gill refers to the alleged Manu'an origin of the Karika family, and says that the family *marae* of the Makea (Karika) tribe was therefore named "Rangi Manuka" (Manuka in the skies)<sup>10</sup>. He also says that Karika sailed from Tonga, Rotuma, Avaiki

<sup>1</sup> Atea or Vatea is the name of a Polynesian god, associated in traditions with light, noonday—perhaps the sun.

<sup>2</sup> The earth.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 634.

<sup>6</sup> Avarua is in the middle of the northern coast, and Arai-te-tonga is, according to Smith, about two miles east of Avarua (*J.P.S.* vol. XII, p. 218).

<sup>7</sup> Nicholas, *J.P.S.* vol. I, pp. 70, 71.

<sup>8</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. I, p. 75 n.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 74 n. 2.

<sup>10</sup> Gill, *Myths*, p. 25. Manuka is Manu'a.

<sup>3</sup> Gill, *A.A.A.S.* vol. II, p. 629.

<sup>5</sup> Gill, *J.P.S.* vol. XX, pp. 219 sq.

(Savai'i) and Manu'a, and that his final voyage started from Tau<sup>1</sup>; which, as we have seen, was the seat of government of the Manu'an kings. He also refers to a *marae* of Sali'a (Karika) in the island of Tau, which, he says, may still be seen. Karika has also been identified with Ali'amatua<sup>2</sup>, whose name appears in Powell's list of the *tuimanua*<sup>3</sup>. There is no doubt that Karika was one of the Tangaroans, as I am calling them.

Tangiia-nui must not be confused with the Hervey Island god Tangiia, who, it is said, was a different person. Tangiia-nui, or Tangiia as I shall call him for shortness, was undoubtedly a descendant of the Tangaroans of Fiji, Tonga and parts of Samoa, as is shown by the genealogical trees of his ancestors. There are several of these, but I will content myself with referring to that given by Smith in *Hawaiki*<sup>4</sup>. The history of Tangiia and his ancestors, including their voyages and adventures, occupies a considerable space in Polynesian traditions, which, as might be expected, vary considerably; but I pass these over, and commence the story, to which I shall refer only in the briefest outline, with Tahiti, taking my material from *Hawaiki*, and not troubling to refer to other versions. The immediate ancestors of Tangiia seem all to have lived in Tahiti<sup>5</sup>, and, as we have already seen in considering my suggestions as to the early history of the Society Islands, Tangiia himself was said to have been a chief of Faaa, close to Attahuru, where was the great *marae* of Oro, these being districts which were apparently occupied by the Tangaroan worshippers of Tangaroa. I have already also referred to his brother Tutapu, who was a chief of Hiva in Ra'iatea (also occupied, it would seem, by these Tangaroans) and who was said to have lived, at one time at all events, in Faaa. Smith speaks of Tutapu as having been the cousin of Tangiia; but he says that both of them were "adopted" by the same man<sup>6</sup> in which case they would also be regarded as brothers. I need not go into the particulars of the disputes that arose between the members of this family, but will confine myself to referring to those between Tangiia and Tutapu (here also contenting myself with the version given in *Hawaiki*), between two of which Tangiia took voyages to various places,

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *A.A.A.S.* vol. II, p. 634.

<sup>2</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. I, p. 75.

<sup>3</sup> Powell, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. XXV, p. 138.

<sup>4</sup> Smith, *Rarotonga genealogies*.

<sup>5</sup> Smith, p. 233. Cf. Gill, *Myths*, p. 23. There is other evidence as to this, and since I wrote this a long account of the life and adventures of Tangiia, before his meeting with Karika and afterwards, has been published (*J.P.S.* vol. XXVIII, pp. 183-97).

<sup>6</sup> Smith, pp. 233-4.

including Savai'i and the island of Mauke of the Hervey group. After this followed a dispute between the two brothers, which ended in Tutapu coming with his fleet from Hiva to make demands against Tangiia, which the latter refused. War followed, in which Tangiia was defeated and driven out to sea; but as he stole and carried off Tutapu's god Rongo-ma-Uenga, the latter commenced his long pursuit of his brother, which earned for him the name of "the relentless pursuer"<sup>1</sup>. Then followed the wanderings at sea of Tangiia, in the course of which he was advised to go to Rarotonga, and there end his days, until eventually, as he drew near to Mauke, in his search of Rarotonga, he met Karika in his canoe<sup>2</sup>.

This brings us to what I may call the joint history of Karika and Tangiia. There are several different versions of what took place on the meeting of these two chiefs, and I will refer to them all, only detailing such matters as are important for our present purpose. There is an account, given by Nicholas, derived from people of the Karika group<sup>3</sup>. According to this version they met at sea, near the island of Mauke, or on the island. Karika was seized with anger against Tangiia, and wanted to kill him, and Tangiia wished to appease Karika. So Tangiia said to Karika "I give the regal authority to you," thus offering his submission; afterwards, being still afraid for his safety, he repeated the offer, and added "Yours is the pile of food, the slaves, the short lip (or hog), the whale, the long-hog (man), to eat; yours is the canoe (this expression meaning Tangiia's canoe, and its occupants and all it contained); and what remains is the sister's portion." After this they separated, Karika going to Rarotonga. Some time afterwards Tangiia's canoe approached the island, this being his first arrival there, and again Karika was hostile, and again Tangiia submitted himself to him saying, "Thine is the word, thine the *putunga* [pile of food?], thine the *tuikaa* [royal kava??], thine the *ngutu*, thine the *rara-tea*, thine the *rara roa*; here is thy canoe, I give it to thee." And thereupon they became friends<sup>4</sup>. The account given to Nicholas in connection with the genealogy of Pa, the head chief (female) of the head branch of the Tangiia group, shows Tangiia in a much more dignified attitude. According to this narrative the two men made friends at their first meeting, Tangiia marrying

<sup>1</sup> Smith, pp. 236-40.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 240-6.

<sup>3</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. 1, p. 65 (editor's note).

<sup>4</sup> Nicholas, *J.P.S.* vol. 1, pp. 71 sq.

Karika's daughter, and there is no reference to any submission by Tangiia; and in Tangiia's subsequent landing at Rarotonga he was received by Karika as a friend<sup>1</sup>. According to Williams, Tangiia made his submission to Karika at the outset, presenting him with the emblems of supremacy, both civil and religious, and saying "Yours is the long legged" (or man belongs to you); "Yours is the short legged" (or the turtle belongs to you), this having been what Williams calls the most sacred fish, and regarded as an emblem of supremacy in religious affairs; "Yours is the source of every treasure"; but Tangiia reserved to himself the food with which the people of his own district might supply him. Karika, satisfied with this, made covenant with Tangiia, and married one of his daughters<sup>2</sup>. Stair's version of the tale makes Karika the one who made his submission; but Tangiia accepted Karika's daughter as a wife, offered him his own insignia of rank and "adopted" him; and so the friendship was sealed<sup>3</sup>. Percy Smith's account is somewhat similar to that of Stair; but ends in the two chiefs making peace with each other, Tangiia marrying Karika's daughter<sup>4</sup>.

I need not repeat the differing accounts of the subsequent fighting in Rarotonga of Karika and Tangiia, acting together, against strangers who came to the island, including Tutapu, who was killed<sup>5</sup>; but there are interesting statements as to the doings of these two people to which I must refer. According to the tale told by the Karika people, when Tangiia landed on the island, and again offered his submission to Karika, and made friends with him, Karika led Tangiia to Araitetonga, where they feasted together; and after this Karika "divided the land to Makea, to Tangiia and to the *mataiapo*"<sup>6</sup>. Makea, I may say, was Karika's son<sup>7</sup>, and the *mataiapo* and *komono* were minor chiefs, ranking beneath the *ariki*, and holding their lands independently<sup>8</sup>. Then (I am still quoting the Karika version) after, apparently, an interval of peace, the wars to which I have referred commenced, Karika and Tangiia defeating the invaders. At one stage of one of these battles, Karika and Tangiia being together, Karika said to Tangiia "You go by the inland path, I will go by the beach path," and

<sup>1</sup> Nicholas, *J.P.S.* vol. 1, p. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Williams, p. 194.

<sup>3</sup> Stair, pp. 282 *sqq.*

<sup>4</sup> Smith, pp. 246 *sq.*

<sup>5</sup> Nicholas, *J.P.S.* vol. 1, pp. 72 *sqq.*, 26. Williams, pp. 194 *sq.* Smith, p. 250.

<sup>6</sup> Nicholas, *J.P.S.* vol. 1, pp. 70 *sqq.* Cf. Smith, p. 250.

<sup>7</sup> Nicholas, *J.P.S.* vol. 1, p. 74.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 29 (editor's note).



in this way they separated, Karika afterwards killing various enemies; met again; joined in killing more enemies; again separated, Karika again going by the shore and Tangiia travelling inland; again met each other; again separated, Karika going by the shore and Tangiia inland; and finally met again, and conquered the rest of their enemies. Afterwards there was a further period of peace, followed by more successful fighting. At the end of all this Karika and Tangiia remained peacefully together for a long time, after which Karika said to Tangiia "Remain thou in our land with our child Makea-putaki-te-tai (Karika's son). I am going to the east, and shall die there far away." And Karika went on his way, whilst Tangiia remained with Makea-putaki-te-tai<sup>1</sup>. The Pa (Tangiia) genealogy tells of the defeat of Tutapu, and says that Tangiia and Karika then dwelt quietly together with their people for some time. Then, after they had all made a circuit of the island, and after the completion of Tangiia's house, Tangiia said to Karika "Let us select from the people, some to be *ariki* (chiefs), some to be *taunga* (priests), some to be *mataiapo* and *komono* (minor chiefs)." Then the Ngati-Karika and the Ngati-Tangiia gathered together for the selection; and Tangiia said to Karika, "You go with your people by the inland road," which they did; and then he said to the Ngati-Tangiia "Let us go by the sea shore," and they did so. Then Tangiia set up his adopted son, Te-ariki-upokutini, as chief over all the Ngati-Tangiia, and Karika was chief over Te-au-o-tonga. This being done, Tangiia noticed that things were not right, as he had five priests, whilst Karika had only one; so he sent Potiki-taua to the inland or Karika's side, leaving his own, the seaward side, with only four. They then set up the *mataiapo*, eighty in number, and subsequently the *komono*, also eighty in number; and Tangiia explained to them their relative positions, the *mataiapo* to rank beneath the *ariki*, and the *komono* below the *mataiapo*. When these arrangements had been completed, Tangiia announced that "To-morrow we will divide our lands." When morning came they proceeded with the division, completing the circuit of the island. Then each man settled on his own land; and they became *tangata enua*, or natives of the land<sup>2</sup>. Smith (working presumably on his basis of twenty-five years for a generation) thinks the colonization of Rarotonga by Karika and Tangiia was in about the

<sup>1</sup> Nicholas, *J.P.S.* vol. 1, pp. 72 *sqq.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 26 *sq.*

middle of the thirteenth century<sup>1</sup>. Gill places it at about the beginning of that century<sup>2</sup>.

A comparison of the two accounts, one from a Karika source and the other from a Tangiia source, obtained by Nicholas, is interesting. According to the Karika version, Tangiia, in order to appease Karika when he met him at sea, seems to have submitted to him absolutely, and he did so again on landing at Rarotonga; the subsequent division of the land was the act of Karika, and it was Karika who ultimately, on leaving Rarotonga, told Tangiia to remain there with his (Karika's) son. According to the Tangiia version there was no submission by Tangiia to Karika, and it was Tangiia who ultimately took the lead in organizing a political system and in the division of the land. I think we may see in this evidence of subsequent rivalry between the two groups of people, each claiming to be superior historically to the other, and developing ancient traditions to suit its contentions. I do not know from which groups Williams', Stair's and Smith's versions were obtained, but the first would, according to my suggestion, be a Karika story and the other two Tangiia tales. A curious feature of the two versions is that in the Karika account it is said that in the course of the fighting Karika directed Tangiia to go by the inland path, whilst he himself went by the beach; and according to the Tangiia account, at the time of the ultimate arrangement of matters, Tangiia directed Karika to go by the inland road, whilst he himself went by the sea-shore. Here again we find each group claiming for its own founder the direction of their respective movements, and in each case the person who did so selected the shore and sent the other to the interior. The difference as to the alleged occasion for this supports the idea that one account is not merely taken from another, and that each was based upon a common tradition. There is, however, nothing to show upon what any such tradition was based. Was the sea-shore with its marine advantages considered more suited to be the portion of the superior chief, and so regarded as having been selected by him? I can think of no other explanation. In Mangaia, as we have seen, the great sacred king performed his offices in the interior, and the subordinate sacred chief did so on the coast, so the former locality would probably be regarded as the more sacred; but if we attributed some question of relative sanctity to the Rarotongan tradition,

<sup>1</sup> Smith, p. 295.

<sup>2</sup> Gill, *A.A.A.S.* vol. II, pp. 629 sq.

we should have to recognize a reversal, as compared with Mangaia, of the sanctity of the coast and the interior<sup>1</sup>.

Another point to which I draw attention is the statement that there were eighty *mataiapo* and eighty *komono*. Why eighty in each case? One is tempted to speculate whether this points to a tradition of an original division of the island into eight districts, each with its group of chiefs and under-chiefs, thus extending to Rarotonga the curious system of which we have evidence in the Society Islands.

An investigation of the subsequent political division of Rarotonga starts with the dual division between the Karika and Tangiia people; and it is convenient, before commencing this investigation, to refer to the origins and histories of two great families or groups—namely those of Pa and the Tinomana.

Nicholas gives a translation of a genealogy, obtained in the Tangiia district of Rarotonga, of the Pa family. It refers to an origin in Atea (the god) and Papa (the earth), and then gives a list of forty-eight names, including a number of gods, which brings us to Tu-tarangi, the great Tangaroan warrior whose name has appeared in the previous chapter on migrations. Then follow twenty-two more names, the last of which is the god Iro (Hiro). After this follow forty-four names, bringing the list up to the latter part of last century<sup>2</sup>. It is clear that this family claimed a long and distinguished ancestry. Iro had a son Tai-te-ariki, who appears in the list as his successor. This son was adopted by Tangiia, became the ruler of his people, and it was with him that the family title of Pa commenced. These facts are referred to by different writers in different ways, and I will quote the several statements to secure their cumulative effect. Nicholas says that Tangiia met Iro at Mauke, and asked the latter to give him his son Tai-te-ariki as a chief for him and a head for the whole of his people. Iro granted the request, and gave Tangiia this son, with his gods Tangaroa, Tutavake and Taakura, and possessions, and Tangiia then named the son Te-ariki-upoku-tini<sup>3</sup>. Smith refers to Pa as the adopted child of Tangiia, his real father being Iro<sup>4</sup>. Brown says that Pa-Ariki of Takatumu was adopted by Tangiia<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> There is a Samoan story of the goddess Nafanua rescuing her people from oppression, and in arranging for the battle she said that she would advance by the shore path, and they were to do so by the inland path (Steubel, pp. 152 sq.). I think I have seen another example of the same thing, but cannot remember where it was.

<sup>2</sup> Nicholas, *J.P.S.* vol. I, pp. 25 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 25 sq.

<sup>4</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. II, p. 277.

<sup>5</sup> Brown, *J.P.S.* vol. VI, p. 6.

According to Gill, Tangiia elected an *ariki*, or high chief, over his people, named Pa, or Tai-te-ariki, the son of Iro<sup>1</sup>. Savage refers to the adoption by Tangiia of Iro's son Tai-te-ariki, and to his calling that son Pa-te-ariki-upoku-tini<sup>2</sup>; and in connection with this matter he says that though he has secured several genealogies of the Pa line claiming direct descent from Tai-te-ariki, he has never heard of any branch of the Karika family doing so<sup>3</sup>. There is no doubt that the Pa family were, and continued up to modern times to be, the royal family of the Tangiia group of people of Rarotonga; and as to this the editors of the *Journal of the Polynesian Society* refer to the Pa family as one of the three governing families of Rarotonga, and point to Pa, the son of Iro, adopted by Tangiia, as the ancestor from whom the family acquired its name<sup>4</sup>. I must point out, in connection with this matter, that there were several sub-groups or families of the Makea (Karika) and Tangiia groups, respectively, each of which doubtless had its head chief, but that the position of the Pa family was that of the reigning family of the Tangiia group<sup>5</sup>.

The special interest of the Tinomana group, whose district was Arorangi on the west coast, arises, not from any historical events of importance with which they were specially associated, but from the fact that in historical times, and apparently long before then, the original dual grouping (Karika or Makea and Tangiia) of the people had changed into a triple grouping of the Karika, Tangiia and Tinomana families. The question is who were the Tinomana? Were they a branch of either the Karika or Tangiia, or descendants of an independent body of settlers in Rarotonga? Some accounts attribute their origin to the Karika and others to the Tangiia people. I do not propose to investigate the evidence minutely; but will, for the benefit of those who wish to do this, draw attention to it in outline.

Commencing with the Karika evidence, Gill provides us with a list, obtained from the "wise men" of Makea and Tinomana, of the Karika or Makea kings from the original Karika to the present day, and the ninth name on this list is Makea-te-raturira, this being followed by Makea Rongo-oe also named Te-ariki-ape-tini. Prior to the reign of the latter of these two there

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *J.P.S.* vol. xx, p. 202.

<sup>2</sup> Savage, *J.P.S.* vol. xx, p. 209; cf. vol. xxvi, p. 55.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* vol. xxv, p. 140.

<sup>4</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. xviii, p. 217.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *J.P.S.* vol. i, p. 26. For lists of the sub-groups of the Makea, Tangiia, and Tinomana groups see Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. ii, p. 271.

had been only one king in Rarotonga, but in consequence of this king's arrogance and cruelty his uncle Takaia split up the island into two hostile groups, Makea Rongo-oe's younger brother Makea Teina was "by the fiat of the gods" appointed king of the tribe at Avarua (the original central home, it will be remembered, of the Karika) and Rongo-oe himself remained king only over the smaller or doomed portion which took the name of Puaikura at Arorangi (on the west coast). Makea Teina's portion of Avarua, which included the *marae* Araite-tonga, was called Te-au-o-Tonga—the Tongan kingdom<sup>1</sup>. The following names in the list, subsequent to that of Makea Teina, are evidently those of the kings of the main royal (Karika) branch at Avarua<sup>2</sup>. Another list, obtained by Gill elsewhere, introduces the name of Rongo-oe as the eighth king<sup>3</sup>. He also, however, gives a list, commencing with Rongo-oe and carried to the present day, of the kings of the "Puaikura" tribe, and the last four names on this list are Tinomana, the last but one being called Tinomana Rongo-oe II<sup>4</sup>. Nicholas's list of the Karika agrees fairly well, subject to differences here and there, with that of Gill (that is following what I have called the main branch after Rongo-oe), and in particular it shows Makea-Teina following Rongo-oe<sup>5</sup>. Savage's list is difficult to compare with that of Gill, though some of the names are the same; it does not include the names of Rongo-oe (or Te-ariki-ape-tini) or Teina<sup>6</sup>. There is another reference to this Rongo-oe matter in a translation of a story told by a Rarotongan chief or priest named Te-aiā. The first part of the tale deals with Tangiā. It then goes on to say that after this time there grew up a wicked *ariki*, from out of the ruling family, whose name was Rongoe, his mother being the wife of Makea-te-ratu. Five months of this child were of Makea, and five of the paramour Tinomana Runanga. The boy fell into evil ways, throwing stones at children and beating them with sticks; and eventually he was adopted by the priest Takaia, who taught him all kinds of evil things, so that he became a trouble to the great tribe of Tangiā. It was he who commenced the killing and eating of men; and then began evils and troubles in the land<sup>7</sup>.

I now turn to the Tangiā evidence. In the story last quoted Te-aiā refers to Tinomana, Te-rei and Pa as the children of

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *A.A.A.S.* vol. II, pp. 628, 631.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 631 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 633.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 632.

<sup>5</sup> Nicholas, *J.P.S.* vol. I, p. 74.

<sup>6</sup> Savage, *J.P.S.* vol. XXVI, pp. 62 sq.

<sup>7</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. II, pp. 277 sq.

Tangiia, the latter being really the child of Iro, adopted by Tangiia<sup>1</sup>; Savage tells of a belief that Mоторo, the son of Tangiia by his wife Puatara, was the first person to receive the name of Tinomana, from the fact that he was not injured by the fire which Tutapu had kindled in Tahiti. The name means "absolute power," and may also be translated "body vested with power"<sup>2</sup>. This alleged derivation is probably based on the conception of *mana*. I may say as to this that according to Mangaian beliefs Mоторo, a most important god of the island, was the son of the ancestral Rangi, and had been given by him to Tangiia as a god<sup>3</sup>. A story found among Gill's papers after his death concerning Tangiia and his son Mоторo tells how Tangiia travelled from Mangaia, where he and Mоторo had been, to Rarotonga, leaving his son in Mangaia; afterwards Tangiia, grieving for his son, sent two messengers to fetch him, of which one was a butterfly and the other apparently either an insect or a bird, and the name Tinomana was given on account of the *mana*, or superhuman power, of these two messengers in carrying Mоторo to Rarotonga<sup>4</sup>. It is not stated in this tale that Mоторo himself received the name of Tinomana, but the origin of the name is associated with him. A long genealogy, given by Gill, of Tangiia's ancestors and descendants, includes among the latter two chiefs called Tinomana. The name of Rongo-oe appears in this list among the descendants of Tangiia, with a note that it was in his time that the great division of the tribes and war commenced in Rarotonga<sup>5</sup>. Savage gives a genealogy of what he calls the senior line of the Tinomana, beginning with Tangiia; in this Mоторo, the son of Tangiia, is called Tinomana-Mоторo-Tamaau, and all the rest with one exception have Tinomana (evidently a titular name) in front of their other names, until near the end of the list, where we find five names prefixed by Tangiiau, instead of Tinomana, followed by a Tamaau, after which is a Tamatoa, whose date is 1915. The name of Rongo-oe does not appear in this list<sup>6</sup>. He gives another Tinomana genealogy, beginning with Tangiia, followed by Mоторo-Tinomana; three generations after the latter the line passes through a younger son Ruatapu (well known in Polynesian mythology) and is carried on to the same period as the other. The name Tamatoa

<sup>1</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. II. p. 277.

<sup>3</sup> Gill, *Myths*, p. 25.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* vol. XXI, pp. 40 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Savage, *J.P.S.* vol. XVIII, p. 217.

<sup>4</sup> Gill, *J.P.S.* vol. XX, p. 143.

<sup>6</sup> Savage, *J.P.S.* vol. XXVI, pp. 64 sq.

appears a few times also in this list<sup>1</sup>, which I imagine to be that of a junior line. The name of Rongo-oe appears in this list, but not in the direct line of descent. William Gill says that the ngati-Tinomana (*ngati* as a prefix means a group of people descended from) were descendants of the ngati-Tangiia<sup>2</sup>; he tells us that the Tangiia and Karika tribes kept themselves distinct and independent of each other, more or less on terms of amity, until, about 150 years ago (prior, that is, to 1855), there arose a most tyrannical chief over the Tangiia people who oppressed his people heavily, until at last they could endure it no longer, and some petty chiefs united in revolt, drove the despot and his family to the west and south-west parts of the island—"Hence the third party in the island"<sup>3</sup>. Brown (1897) says that Tinomana, the then present *ariki* of Arorangi, was a descendant of the Tangiia<sup>4</sup>.

I could quote other references dealing with this matter; but I think that what I have given is sufficient for our purpose. It seems clear that these Tinomana people of Arorangi on the west coast were descendants of either the Karika or the Tangiia group or both, and were not a separate group of immigrants, which is the main point I wished to ascertain; but I think we may carry our speculations as to the probable effect of the evidence a little further. The Tangiia evidence, as I have called it, points to the Tangiia people as the group from which the Tinomana had *originally* sprung, though probably, owing to past intermarriages, they had ancestors among both the Tangiia and the Karika people; but we have to bear in mind the evidence as to Rongo-oe. Gill introduces him as a king of the Makea (Karika) line, and he appears as such in the genealogy of Nicholas. Te-aia identifies him with the "ruling family," which means in effect the Karika; and indeed Te-aia says his mother was the wife of a Makea. W. Gill is evidently referring to him when speaking of the "tyrannical chief," in which case he identifies him with the Tangiia family, and his name appears in two Tangiia genealogies. It may be that a hint as to a possible explanation of this discrepancy is provided by Te-aia's reference to the fact that his mother, the wife of the reigning Makea, had a paramour Tinomana, and to the idea that five months of the child were of Makea, and five months of Tino-

<sup>1</sup> Savage, *J.P.S.* vol. xxvi, p. 61.

<sup>2</sup> Wm Gill, *Gems*, vol. II, p. 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* The chief referred to must, I think, be Rongo-oe.

<sup>4</sup> Brown, *J.P.S.* vol. vi, p. 6.

mana. The son of the wife of the Makea chief, if recognized by him, might well succeed to the title, but the reference to the two periods of five months each, which apparently refers, not perhaps with scientific exactitude, to the time of pregnancy, suggests a doubt as to whether he was the son of Makea or of Tinomana. Under these circumstances, if he was driven away from the Makea head-quarters of Avarua, a natural place of refuge would be that of the Tinomana people at Arorangi. It is also not at all surprising that his name should appear afterwards in both Karika and Tangiia lists of kings. If this suggested explanation about Rongo-oe is correct, then he is not an obstacle in the way of the evidence connecting the Tinomana people more especially with the Tangiia group.

The eleventh Makea (Karika) king after Rongo-oe in Gill's list was named Makea-te-Patua-kino, and the list shows that after that there were always, up to the present day (end of last century), two Makea kings<sup>1</sup>. Gill's explanation is that the origin of this dual kingship within the Makea family was merely the desire to make a suitable provision for the eldest sons of the two wives of Makea-te-Patua-kino; and he says that the custom was always followed in the Tongan kingdom (by which he evidently refers to the Karika rulership<sup>2</sup>) for both kings to enjoy regal honours, whilst only one of them wielded authority, which, however, he did in the names of both of them<sup>3</sup>. This explanation is woefully insufficient, more especially in its application to the continuance of the system of dual kingships in subsequent generations; and I find no explanation elsewhere. Gill says that the descent (by which he evidently means what I call succession to office) of the Makea kings was, except in the case of Makea Teina, who, as we have seen, followed his brother Makea Rongo-oe, from father to son<sup>4</sup>; by which I suppose he means that the two sons of Makea-te-Patua-kino were the founders of two separate joint or concurrent dynasties, subsequent kings of one dynasty having been descended from one of them, and those of the other dynasty from the other, and each dynasty having its own successions from father to son, or however otherwise the succession passed. This view is in accord with a few actual records given by Gill, and for the purpose of explaining these records, some of which also touch the question

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *A.A.A.S.* vol. II, p. 632.

<sup>2</sup> See references above to Te-au-o-Tonga (the Tongan kingdom).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 628.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*



of succession, I propose to give the names of the kings, as they appear in his list, beginning with the two children of Makeate-Patua-Kino.

22.	Makea	Pini	and	Makea	Keu
23.	"	Tinirau	and	"	Tekao
24.	"	Pori	and	"	Karika II
25.	"	Davida	and	"	Pa
26.	"	Tevairua	and	"	Tuaivi
27.	"	Daniela	and	"	Tavake
28.	"	Abela	and	"	" (the same person)*
29.	"	Takau	and	"	" *

\* "Both now living"<sup>1</sup>.

Gill says that Tinirau and Tekao had in their life-time voluntarily devolved the regal authority and title upon their sons Pori and Karika II<sup>2</sup>; so here we have devolutions from the two fathers to the two sons respectively. Then again he says that Davida and Tevairua were brother and sister, and that Daniela and Abela were their younger brothers; also that Takau (a woman) was the only child of Davida<sup>3</sup>. This gives us a string of successions in one of the dynasties, all by members of the same family; it also indicates that Gill's statement as to succession being from father to son requires some qualification. We may, I think, almost assume that this dual kingship of relatively modern origin<sup>4</sup> was not a case of separation of sacred and secular rule. It was, I think, a matter of secular kingship (bearing with it, of course, the sanctity which even the secular kings enjoyed); but the question arises how was it regulated. Was the king who actually wielded authority always a member of one only of the two ruling families, or did the right to rule pass backwards and forwards, as between those families? Unfortunately we are not informed as to this.

I will now pass on to statements by writers as to the actual leading political groups or chiefs of the island and the areas occupied by them. Williams (writing in 1837) says that the people were to that present day divided into two distinct bodies, Ngati Karika, or descendants of Karika, and Ngati Tangiia, the descendants of Tangiia, the former still occupying the north side of the island and the latter the east. The superior chieftainship was still vested in the Karika family; for, though they had been beaten many times, indeed generally, by the descendants of Tangiia, yet the conquerors agreed in allowing

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *A.A.A.S.* vol. II, p. 632.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 630.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 628.

<sup>4</sup> Gill knew Tevairua and Williams knew Davida (*Gill, A.A.A.S.* vol. II, p. 628).

the others the supremacy which they had possessed from time immemorial<sup>1</sup>. Elsewhere he says that there were three grand divisions of the island, governed by four principal chiefs, Pa, Kamaka, Tinomana and Makea, the last of whom enjoyed limited superiority over the whole<sup>2</sup>. William Gill also speaks of a triple division between (a) the Ngati-Karika, who occupied the northern districts, and were governed by the Makea family, (b) Ngati-Tangiia, being a confederate body of independent landowners, who retained the south-east and south portions of the island, and who had vested magisterial power in the elder branches of the families of Pa and Kainuka, two mighty warriors of ancient renown, and (c) Ngati-Tinomana, who were the descendants of Ngati-Tangiia, and retained equal rank with the Makea family, and who inhabited the west and south-west of the island<sup>3</sup>. Moss says that when the Rarotongan mission began in 1823 the island was "as now" divided among three tribes, each with an independent *ariki* at its head<sup>4</sup>; but he does not give their names. According to Large there were three tribes, the Makea, Tinomana and Tangiia<sup>5</sup>. Savage refers to three high chiefs, Pa, Tinomana and Makea<sup>6</sup>. Baessler (1900) says that the government of Rarotonga had been under the government of three people, Makea in the north, Pa in the east and Tinomana in the south-west<sup>7</sup>. Wragge (before 1906) speaks of Makea, the queen of Rarotonga, who he says had the most power, owned the land, and presided over the native court, over which ruled, beside the queen, three *ariki*, Kinuku, Tinomana and Pa<sup>8</sup>. Gill, writing in 1885, speaks of five chiefs of Rarotonga, and mentions Tinomana as one of them<sup>9</sup>.

The greater part of the evidence points, I think, clearly to a triple division between three main groups, the Karika or Makea group at Avarua to the north, the Tangiia or Pa group to the east, the district of which is called in the map Ngati-Tangiia, and the Tinomana group at Arorangi to the west; and I propose to discuss some details on the assumption that this is so. In the first place I may say that the identity of the Karika and Makea people is undoubted; all the literature, including genealogical trees, points to Makea, the name borne by the son of the original Karika, as the royal name of the Karika group;

<sup>1</sup> Williams, pp. 196 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Wm Gill, *Gems*, vol. II, p. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Large, *ibid.* vol. II, p. 271.

<sup>4</sup> Baessler, *N.S.B.* p. 255.

<sup>5</sup> Gill, *Jottings*, p. 88.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 214.

<sup>4</sup> Moss, *J.P.S.* vol. III, p. 20.

<sup>6</sup> Savage, *ibid.* vol. XVIII, p. 217.

<sup>8</sup> Wragge, p. 132.

hence it is sometimes called by its group name of Karika, and sometimes by the Makea name of its royal family. Similarly the eastern group is sometimes called by its group name of Tangiia, and sometimes by the name, Pa, of its royal family.

Passing now to the separate groups, I draw attention, as regards the Karika group, to Gill's reference to the use of the term the "Tongan kingdom" for the area occupied by the Karika group; elsewhere he uses the same term for the whole island<sup>1</sup>, but probably the two ideas are connected, as Karika was the superior king of the island. It must be remembered that Karika travelled to Rarotonga from the western islands, apparently from the Samoan Manu'a, which, I have contended, was closely connected politically and socially with Fiji and Tonga, all of them having been strongholds of the Tangaroans, as I call them, whereas Tangiia, though also a Tangaroan, came from Tahiti. It may be that this difference between the two original chiefs is the origin of the use of the term Tongan kingdom in Rarotonga.

As regards the Tangiia group, we have seen that, according to Williams, there were three grand divisions of the island, governed by four principal chiefs, Pa, *Kamaka* (the italics are mine), Tinomana and Makea, whilst W. Gill says that the power in the Tangiia district was vested in the older branches of the families of Pa and *Kainuka* (my italics), and Wragge says that there were, under the queen Makea of the whole island, three chiefs *Kinuku* (my italics), Tinomana and Pa. In connection with this I may say that the Rarotongan chief Te-aia includes the *Kainuku* (my italics) among the *hapu* or sub-groups of the Tangiia group<sup>2</sup>. Gill says he was a chief of the Tangiia district, and it must have been a very ancient line, because his name appears in a tradition, to which Gill refers, of the period of Tangiia-nui and Iro<sup>3</sup>, and in another of the same period reported by Savage<sup>4</sup>, which is in accord with W. Gill's inclusion of the *Kainuka* branch with that of Pa as being the two older branches of the Tangiia group. There are slight differences in the spelling by writers of the names to which I have referred; but if, as is quite possible, Williams' *Kamaka* is a MS. or printer's slip for *Kainaka*, the names before us are *Kainaka*, *Kainuka*, and *Kainuku*, which we may well believe were the same names. I will refer again to the statements quoted above on this assumption.

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *J.A.I.* vol. vi, p. 7.

<sup>3</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* p. 93.

<sup>2</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. II, p. 271.

<sup>4</sup> Savage, *J.P.S.* vol. xxvi, p. 18 n.

Concerning the Tinomana group, there are Gill's references to the name Puaikura, which he apparently regards as having had its origin at the time of the expulsion from Avarua of Rongo-oe. Their district was that, or was in that, of the Tinomana, but whether they were a branch of the Tinomana, or whether these are two names of the same group I cannot tell; I may say that a search for clues as to this makes me think that the latter explanation is correct, but a demonstration of this would occupy a good deal of space. W. Gill's statement that the Tinomana people retained equal rank with the Makea people may be based on some idea associated with this Rongo-oe, whose name appears in lists of Tinomana head chiefs; but who, according to the story, did for a time hold the position of the head Karika chief.

I now put the proposition that the three great ruling groups were Karika (Makea), Tangiia and Tinomana to the test, in the light of the possible causes of apparent inconsistency in the evidence; in considering the matter we must bear in mind that observers are often, in giving the names of principal chiefs, guided largely by what they saw of these chiefs' powers and importance at the time, and that we must not assume that they always represented grades of rank based on social divisions and subdivisions of the people. Polynesian literature gives numerous examples to the contrary. On this basis Williams' reference to four principal chiefs, Pa, Kamaka, Tinomana and Makea, the last having superiority over the whole, may well have been correct, Pa and Kamaka having been the two great Tangiian chiefs. Wragge's reference to the three chiefs Kinuku, Tinomana and Pa who ruled under Makea amounts to exactly the same thing. These are the only apparent divergencies from the evidence of a triple division, except Gill's reference to five chiefs, which, as he only mentions one of them, I am unable to discuss; so I think we must accept this triple division as the basis of the Rarotongan political system, bearing in mind, of course, that the Tinomana were a derivative, and not an original group.

Each of the three main groups or *ngati* was divided into a number of sub-groups or *hapu*, some of which are mentioned from time to time by writers. Lists of the *hapu* of each of these groups are given by Smith, quoting Te-aia<sup>1</sup>; but I do not propose to enumerate them, as in the absence of any informa-

<sup>1</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. II, p. 271.

tion as to the areas which all of them, with one or two exceptions, occupied, the particulars would be practically useless. No doubt each *hapu*, whether occupying what we might conveniently call a sub-district or a village, would have a chief or leading man of some sort, at its head; but I have not found any particulars as to this.

#### AITUTAKI

According to traditions of the island of Aitutaki, it had an original history of its own, and was not a mere offset of either Rarotonga or Mangaia. Nicholas tells the story of Ru, said to have been the first man, who came to the island from Avaiki<sup>1</sup>. I may point out that Ru is the name of one of the great Polynesian gods, and that he was known in the Hervey Islands; but we must not assume that the Ru of the story was the god. The name Avaiki may have been used to signify the unknown remote Polynesian home, or it may have referred to a Pacific place of origin—say the Samoan island of Savai'i or Ra'aitea. The tale says that Ru and his people came in a large double canoe, seeking for lands, landed in Aitutaki, and erected *marae* at the place of landing and in the interior of the island, and gives the names of the elders whom he appointed lords of the island, and tells us that they and the rest of the party—numbering, as Nicholas construes it, over 200—settled down on the land and increased largely in numbers. It gives a genealogy of the Ru family, subsequent to the landing, the succession passing in each case from father to son; the number of names appearing in this is only eleven, but it is stated that there were many others. These formed the tribe of Ati-Ru "which is also" Ngati-Ru, and the family branched off, and populated the island<sup>2</sup>.

The next arrivals in the island were, according to the traditions, Te-erui and his people. They also came in a canoe from Avaiki<sup>3</sup>; the names of some of Te-erui's ancestors are given. He erected *marae* in the island, and he and his people took possession of and settled down in a district. War ensued between the newcomers and the Ru people, in which the latter were defeated and exterminated, only the women being spared, and Te-erui was left lord of the island. He divided a quantity of the land between these women—a list is given of the names

<sup>1</sup> Nicholas, *J.P.S.* vol. iv, p. 65.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 65 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Here the Polynesian term used is *i raro*.

of the women and of the districts allotted to each—and it is said that they became the legitimate owners of these districts, “as their descendants are to the present day.” Te-erui reserved to himself two districts, of which the names are given and they became the regal districts. The land was then settled and quiet. Te-erui had two sons, Take-take and Onga, and the names are given of their descendants in successive generations, the last of these being Taruia (six generations after Te-erui) who was the first of the *ariki* on the land, and the names of five of his successors are also given<sup>1</sup>.

The next arrival, according to the same tradition, was that of Ruatapu. The account of his doings is long and detailed, and I must to a large extent confine myself to certain portions of it. His canoe came from *raro mai* (westward) he being in search of his two sons Tamaiva and Moenau, who had voyaged to Avarua in Rarotonga, there to live as chiefs. Ruatapu found his elder son Tamaiva there, but was told that the other had gone to the island of Mauke. On arriving at Mauke he found his son had been killed but had left a son. Ruatapu then sailed with this grandson, first to Atiu, then to Manuae, and finally to Aitutaki. The story then tells of his marriage there, the birth of a son Kirikava, his building of two *marae* on the attainment of this son to maturity, and other matters, and then narrates how he came in contact with Taruia (mentioned above) who was apparently the principal chief of the island. Next follows an account of the friendship that arose between Taruia and Ruatapu, of the jealousy which the latter afterwards felt of the former, and of the schemes employed to supplant him, Taruia being persuaded to go off with Ruatapu in search of a beautiful wife, and Ruatapu by a trick giving him the slip, letting him sail away to Rarotonga, whilst Ruatapu returned to Aitutaki, and there assumed the title of *ariki* in his place. Taruia was overtaken by storms and drifted to Penrhyn Island, where he was made a chief, and afterwards became sole ruler of the island. He married and had descendants. One of these, named Urirau, returned to Aitutaki and claimed to be its ruler by inheritance. He was put to the test, being taken to the *marae* of Rongo to recite his incantations; and upon his praying, the living sacrifices did in fact die, whereas they had failed previously to fall dead on the prayers of Ruatapu, a circumstance which the people attributed to the fact that the latter

<sup>1</sup> Nicholas, *J.P.S.* vol. iv, pp. 66 sq.

was not the real *ariki*. Therefore his claim was recognized, and he was installed as the Divider of food, Priest, and Protector of Avarua, "as his descendants are to this day. They claim also to be arikis from their ancestor Te-erui, but it has not been conceded to them"<sup>1</sup>. Avarua was the name of the political centre of the Kariki people in Rarotonga, and the Rarotongan Avarua is, as we have seen, referred to in this tradition; but apparently the place of residence of Taruia, the descendant of Te-erui, in Aitutaki was also called Avarua<sup>2</sup>.

The tradition proceeds with a reference to an Aitu clan of warriors, who had arrived in the island and whose destruction was desired. These Aitu people have already been referred to as having reached the island of Mangaia, and must not be confused with the people of the island of Atiu. The tradition says that Maeva-rangi, the grandson of Ruatapu's son Kirikava, who was living in Aitutaki, sent a message for the children in Rarotonga of a female descendant there of Ruatapu, named Maine-Marae-rua, to come to Aitutaki and help him to slay the intruders. It then tells how these Rarotongan relatives sailed from island to island in the group, fighting and defeating the inhabitants for the purpose of securing additions to their forces, and finally reached Aitutaki, and fought and routed the Aitu people; but, having done so, their leader Maro-una claimed to be "lord over all," divided out his warriors, whose names are not given, procured wives for them from the Ru women who owned the lands given to them, and was installed as *ariki*. It concludes by saying that the descendants of Maro-una "are the *ariki* of Aitutaki to this day" and that the principal landowners of the island are also the descendants of his warriors, who had married these Ru women<sup>3</sup>.

Gudgeon gives an account of the earliest migrations from Hawaiki to Aitutaki. He says that, so far as could be ascertained, the first arrival was a canoe containing a party under a chief named Te-Muna-korero; the second contained a party under a chief Kaki, and at the same time came the canoe of Uitario; the next was the double canoe of Te-Erui-o-te-Rangi; the last was the canoe of Ruatapu<sup>4</sup>. These alleged arrivals coincide with those of Nicholas except for the substitution of the arrivals of Te-Muna-korero, Kaki and Uitario for that of Ru.

<sup>1</sup> Nicholas, *J.P.S.* vol. IV, pp. 67 *sqq.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 69 *sq.*

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *ibid.* p. 68.

<sup>4</sup> Gudgeon, *J.P.S.* vol. XIV, pp. 217 *sq.*

Williams was told by priests that, though Aitutaki existed before Te-erui came, it was he who made it, and gave it its present form, moulding it with his hands. He was the son of Tetareva, who had climbed up to earth from Avaiki (whence his name was derived) and was the first man<sup>1</sup>. The name Tetareva does not appear in Nicholas' list, either as Te-erui's father or other ancestor<sup>2</sup>. Gill gives an Aitutakian legend of Te-erui, said to be the son of Te-tareva (the expanse) who lived in Avaiki and came to the land of light in a canoe. This account only refers to the difficulties and adventures of Te-erui before he reached Aitutaki and in this it is somewhat similar to the account of Nicholas. It says that Te-erui and his brother Matareka called their new found home Aitutaki (god-led). Gill here identifies Avaiki with Savai'i<sup>3</sup>. In another account by Gill we find an element of similarity to that of Nicholas (I did not refer to this) in that the names of Rongo and Tangaroa occupied a prominent place as, apparently, gods helping the migrants, though the two accounts differ in detail as to this and are in other respects quite distinct<sup>4</sup>. There is also a posthumous reference to a MS. of Gill's which said that Ruatapu was a man of Tonga, who had voyaged to Rarotonga and, not being allowed to stay there, had gone to Mauke Island, where his dead son Moenau had lived, and settled there<sup>5</sup>. It will be noticed that in the reference to Rarotonga and Mauke the account is broadly consistent with that of Nicholas.

Large gives a full legendary account of the doings of Ruatapu, according to which he was a descendant of Iro (Hiro) and the grandson of Mоторо, the son of Tangiia. He sailed from a place, which the editor of the *Polynesian Journal* identifies as having probably been in Ra'iatea, and reached Rarotonga, where he married and had a son Tamaiva, whom he left there to be an *ariki*. Afterwards he went to Tonga, where he married and had a son Moenau. He sent this son to join Tamaiva at Avarua in Rarotonga, but the latter having sent his brother away, he (Moenau) went to Mauke, and married and settled there, but was afterwards killed by the Mauke people. Then follows an account of Ruatapu's journeyings from Tonga to Avarua, thence to Mauke, afterwards to Atiu, thence to Manuae, and finally to Aitutaki, which is very similar to that of Nicholas. After this comes the birth of his son Kiri-kava, and the story

<sup>1</sup> Williams, p. 66.

<sup>2</sup> Nicholas, *J.P.S.* vol. iv, p. 66.

<sup>3</sup> Gill, *Myths*, pp. 139-42.

<sup>4</sup> Gill, *J.P.S.* vol. xx, pp. 149 sqq.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 165.



very similar to that of Nicholas, of the way in which Ruatapu came in contact with Taruia, with whom he afterwards dwelt, and the trick by which he lured the latter to sail off in a canoe, whilst he himself returned and usurped Taruia's position as *ariki* in Aitutaki. At this point the two versions show a material difference. In that which I am now giving there is no mention of a descendant of Taruia returning to Aitutaki and recovering his ancestral chiefdom, the story being that Taruia himself returned and failed to do so, upon which he sailed to Penrhyn Island and Ruatapu "remained at Aitutaki as *ariki* of the island" [this apparently referring to the whole island]. After this there is a reference to the death of Ruatapu, and the succession of his son Kiri-kava. The story of the arrival of the Aitu people, the request of Maeva-rangi of Aitutaki to the family of Mainemarae-rua in Rarotonga to come to his help, of their voyages to islands collecting recruits, and their victory, under their leader Maro-una, over the Aitu people, is practically the same as in the other version. The tale then goes on to say that after this victory Maro-una divided Aitutaki, among his warriors Tane, Tara-apai, Ue and Titia and the "ship's company," into districts by divisional boundaries "which remain to this day." Then, in substitution for Nicholas' version that Maro-una provided wives for his warriors from the Ru women, it says that Maro-una himself married one of these women named Va-nuku-kaitai, had a son named Te-Au-kura, who married another of them named Te-Aka-ariki-o-te-rangi, and had a son Tupu-o-Rongo, from whom branched the three lines of ancestors of the Vaerua-Rangi, Tamatoa, and Te-uru-kura *ariki* families of Aitutaki, descended from his three respective wives Uirei-ariki, Ka-tapu-ki-te-marae and Pure-upoko<sup>1</sup>.

Large provides a long and comprehensive Aitutakian genealogy obtained by him from the native from whom he obtained the legend<sup>2</sup>. This genealogy begins with the eastern god Atea [commonly regarded as representing "light"] and his wife Papa [the earth]. It attributes to them three sons, and beneath the name of each of these is a long column of names evidently representing successive generations of children or successors. I will deal with each of these columns in turn. The first column consists of a series of Ru, of whom that of the 30th generation is identified by Large with the Ru who came to Aitutaki, whilst six of the later names in the list,

<sup>1</sup> Large, *J.P.S.* vol. xv, pp. 213-19.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* vol. XII, facing p. 144.

coming before him, are the same as six of the eleven names given by Nicholas as his descendants. The 44th name is a woman Te-Uirei-ariki (shown to have married Tupu-o-Rongo). The second column, which splits into two branches at the 34th generation, contains the names of Tangiia (gen. 40), Mоторо (gen. 41), Ruatapu (gen. 43), identified by Large as the immigrant of that name, and Kirikava (gen. 44)—all these being of the senior branch, and Maro-una (gen. 49), descended from both branches; it then shows the marriages of Maro-una and his son Te-Aukura, as stated in the legend, and gives the name—Tupu-o-Rongo—of the son (gen. 51) of the latter (Tupu-o-Rongo being shown to have married a woman Ka-Tapu-ki-te-marae). In the third column the name of Te-Erui-o-te-Rangi—identified by Large with the immigrant Te-erui [the rest of the name only means “of the skies”]—is No. 11 in the list. There are, after Te-erui, thirteen names in succession not mentioned by Nicholas; but the subsequent names are very much the same as those of Nicholas. First comes Take-take-Maonga, which may be compared with Nicholas’ two names Take-take and Onga<sup>1</sup>. Then follow six names, of which four are identical with the names (prior to Taruia) given by Nicholas, and appear in the same order. Then appears the name Taruia, followed by seven names, each being Taruia with an additional name added, and five of these additional names are identical with the names, as given by Nicholas, of the successors of Taruia, though the order in which they appear is different. That is to say, we only have to eliminate from Large’s list the long series of thirteen earlier names to bring his genealogy very much into line with that of Nicholas. I may say, however, that in Large’s list of the eight successive chiefs, all named Taruia, the last of these chiefs is identified as being he who was *ariki* when Ruatapu came to Aitutaki, whereas according to Nicholas it was the first. Six generations after this last Taruia is the name of a woman Pure-Upoko (shown to have married Tupu-o-Rongo)<sup>2</sup>.

I will now consider the later part of this genealogy in the light of Large’s reference to the Vaerua-Rangi, Tamatoa, and Te-uru-kura *ariki* families of Aitutaki. The genealogy shows

<sup>1</sup> *Ma* means “and”; so the two versions are identical, except that in one case we have two names, and in the other they are treated as being only one.

<sup>2</sup> A comparison of the generations of the persons identified by Large as the Ru, Te-erui, and the Ruatapu of the stories shows that the genealogy and stories cannot be co-ordinated. Te-erui, in particular, would have to be placed at a much later date in the genealogy.

that Te-Tupu-o-Rongo, of the Ruatapu column, married three wives, and I will deal with each of these marriages and their issue separately. His first wife was Te-Uirei-ariki, who was, as we have seen, a descendant of the Ru group. Twelve generations following this marriage are given, the last name of these being Vaerua-rangi (the "present *ariki*"), whose original ancestry was therefore of the Ru group through his female ancestor and the Ruatapu group through his male ancestor. The second wife of Tupu-o-Rongo was Ka-tapu-ki-te-marae, who is not identified as belonging to either of the other two groups, nor is her ancestry shown. Thirteen generations following this marriage are given, the last name being Tamatoa (the "present *ariki*"), whose original ancestry is therefore unknown to us as regards his female ancestor, and who was of the Ruatapu group through his male ancestor. The third wife was Pure-upoko, who was, as we have seen, a descendant of the Te-erui group. Fourteen generations following this marriage are given, the last name being Te-urukura (the "present *ariki*"), whose original ancestry was therefore of the Te-erui group through his female ancestor and the Ruatapu group through his male ancestor.

I refer, as regards the distant ancestry of Ruatapu to portions of certain information obtained by Martin, in the island of Tongatabu, from the *tuitonga*. He said that the name Ruatapu was familiar in Tongan traditions, and that he was the person who was, in Tonga, said to have carried the name of Tonga in a Tongan canoe to Lalo-tonga<sup>1</sup>, or under-Tonga, and added, in effect that the *tuitonga* had been the *tuimanuka* or kings of Manuka [*i.e.* Manu'a, of the Samoan group]<sup>2</sup>.

These traditions do not present any clear cut history of the earliest ancestry of the Aitutakians; but I think they supply materials which justify us in speculating as to probabilities. I will commence the consideration of the matter by referring again to the three families Vaerua-rangi, Tamatoa and Te-uru-kura, whom Large seems to regard as having been leading families of the island. The earlier parts of his genealogy are, like those of other very long Polynesian genealogies, not to be relied upon, except as traditions, and even when we reach Ru and Taruia, named in the traditions, there may be differences of opinion as to which of the chiefs of each of these lines was he

<sup>1</sup> The Polynesian "r" is "l" in Samoan and Tonga.

<sup>2</sup> Martin, *J.P.S.* vol. xx, pp. 165 sq.

whose name appears in the stories. I shall, however, treat the subject on the assumption that Tupu-o-Rongo was, or was believed to have been, a descendant of Ruatapu, that his first wife was a chieftainess (she is called in the genealogy *Te-uirei-ariki*, which suggests her importance) of the Ru family, and that his third wife was a descendant of Taruia, the descendant, according to tradition, of *Te-erui*. On this assumption we find that these three families had a common ancestor of the Ruatapu group, and that the separation between them arose from their ancestresses, of whom the first belonged to the Ru group and the third to the *Te-erui* group. If, as is quite possible, the ancestress of the second family was a Ruatapu woman, then the separation between the three families had had its origin in what may have been some recognition of matrilineal descent a number of generations back.

The Ru family is introduced by Large as one of the three families claiming descent from Atea and Papa; and though it was a common custom for great Polynesian chiefs to claim ancient or divine descent in this way, such a genealogy would hardly have been preserved if the family had not been recognized as representing one of the oldest groups of the Aitutakian people. They may have been, as Nicholas states, regarded as the descendants of the first inhabitants, and as to this it may be noticed that Large treats the original Ru as having been the eldest son of Atea and Papa. Apparently also there was a belief that there was a population in the island prior to the arrival of *Te-erui*—witness Gudgeon's statement. An interesting feature of the traditions is that relating to the Ru women and the dividing up of the land into districts. According to Nicholas's version *Te-erui* divided most of the land between these women, and they became the legitimate owners of their respective districts, "as their descendants are to the present day." Nothing is said as to his giving the women in marriage to his own people; but if, as it is said, the Ru men were exterminated, this would probably be the way in which they had these descendants. Moreover, it seems to have been a common Polynesian practice for a conqueror to form a matrimonial connection with the conquered, so that his son by the marriage would be related, through his mother, to them, and so be qualified to succeed to a title or family name and the ownership of the land. Then again, Nicholas says that *Maro-una* (a descendant of Ruatapu) procured for his warriors wives from the Ru women

who owned the lands given to them and that the principal land-owners were the descendants of these warriors who had married the Ru women; and, according to Large, Maro-una himself married one of the Ru women, his son afterwards marrying another of them; and thus originated the three great families to which he refers, and Maro-una divided the island among his warriors in districts by divisional boundaries "which remain to this day." The differences between these accounts do not detract from, but rather add to, the probability of their being based on traditional history. I think that these traditions help to support the belief that the Ru people were the earliest known inhabitants of the island, and suggests that the local division of the islands into districts had perhaps in some way had its origin in these people, and had continued with but little alteration to historical times. The effect of the dominion over the island, after that of the Ru people, first, according to tradition, by Te-erui, and afterwards by Ruatapu, would, especially if the Ru men had all been killed, tend, with patrilineal succession, to destroy the recognition of the Ru people as a whole, as a separate and defined social group, they becoming absorbed by the subsequent immigrants, even if a family of them afterwards became, through marriage, specially associated with the ancestry of one of the leading families of the island.

It seems from the traditions that Te-erui's arrival in Aitutaki was some time before that of Ruatapu, who came to the island during the reign of Te-erui's descendant Taruia. According to Nicholas, Taruia was, as we have seen, six generations later than Te-erui. In Large's genealogy the first of the chiefs named Taruia was twenty-one generations after Te-erui, and the last, whom he identifies with Taruia of the legends, was seven generations later still. The difference between the two writers arises in the main from the introduction by Large of the first thirteen alleged successive descendants of Te-erui. In the absence of other evidence we cannot express any opinion as to the authenticity or otherwise of these names, and so cannot say how long it was after Te-erui that Ruatapu appeared on the scene; but it is obvious that these early names were very likely more or less mythical and incorrect.

I think we must believe that Te-erui and his descendants, down to Taruia, were, according to tradition, head chiefs of the whole island from the time of his arrival up to the time of the arrival of and usurpation by Ruatapu. This is suggested by

Nicholas's statement that the two districts which he reserved for himself became the regal districts, and other parts of the island would probably be allotted to the leading members of his party, who perhaps married the Ru women. Then we have Nicholas's statement that his descendant Taruia was the first of the *ariki* on the land. According to the accounts of both Nicholas and Large, Ruatapu got Taruia out of the island and usurped whatever power he possessed; but they differ as to the next important event. Nicholas says that a descendant of Taruia returned and recovered and was installed in his chiefdom of Avarua<sup>1</sup> "as his descendants are to this day," and that these descendants claimed to be *ariki* from their ancestor Te-erui, but that this was not conceded to them. Large says that Taruia himself returned, but failed in his attempt, and Ruatapu remained at Aitutaki as *ariki* of the island. I do not think the question is of vital importance; but I may point out that according to both accounts, it was Maeva-rangi, said to have been the great-grandson of Ruatapu, who sent to his relatives in Rarotonga to help him to drive out the Aitu people, and as this must have been an island, and not a mere district matter (the circumference of the whole island is only about 20 miles), it is difficult to understand why it should be he that did this if Taruia or his descendant was head chief of the island. Very likely the two accounts were competitive in character, each family trying to establish the past glory of its ancestors; and this may be the explanation of Nicholas's statement that the claim of Taruia's descendants to be *ariki* from their ancestor Te-erui was not conceded to them. However this may have been, both accounts agree that Maro-una of Rarotonga was a descendant of Ruatapu, and that it was he who drove out the Aitu people, and became head chief of the island; and Nicholas says that Maro-una's descendants are the *ariki* of Aitutaki to this day, whilst Large shows him to have been the common ancestor of the three great families. There is an apparent inconsistency in Nicholas's statements, first that the descendants of a descendant of Taruia were rulers to this day, and then that the descendants of Maro-una were so; but it is very likely that subsequent head chiefs were, through the marriage of Tupu-o-Rongo (of the Maro-una line) with Pure-upoko

<sup>1</sup> It is clear from the details of the story that he claimed to be *ariki* in succession to Taruia, and the terms "divider of food," "priest" and "protector" would be consistent with this.

(of the Taruia line), descended from both families; it is possible that it might have been from this dual ancestry that competitive traditions, if they were such, arose, each of the two families claiming that their distant ancestors constituted the ancient royal line. There may also have been more intermarriages.

There is no material from which to arrive at any conclusions as to the political division of the island. Nicholas supplies a list of sixteen districts said to have been divided by Te-erui among the Ru women, and of the names of all the women; but I find no map of the island that enables me to identify and locate these districts. If, as he says, the descendants of the women are the legitimate owners of these districts to the present day, it seems to follow that, notwithstanding the family confusion that must have arisen through subsequent intermarriages, etc., during a very long period, the people of each district had a separate and distinct distant ancestry which they regarded as being specially their own, the original female ancestors having been the Ru women, and the male ancestors (probably) originally members of Te-erui's party, with perhaps a subsequent intermixture of Maro-una's people.

Large says nothing of the districts occupied by the three families, Vaerua-Rangi, Tamatoa and Te-uru-kura, to which he refers. They may each have occupied one or more of Nicholas's sixteen districts and each succeeded in securing some wider domination. It is possible that the apparent inconsistency in Nicholas's statements as to the subsequent head-chieftainships of the descendants of both Taruia and Maro-una may be attributed, not merely to matrimonial intermixtures between these families, as suggested above, but to competitions between the two families, sometimes one and sometimes the other, securing the supremacy; but we have no information as to all this. Whatever may have been the relative positions as between these three families, the evidence seems to suggest that of the three original families whose genealogies are given by Large, and whom I may call the Ru, Ruatapu and Te-erui families, the dominating position had probably been secured by the Ruatapu family. According to Large the returning representative of the Te-erui family failed to recover his ancestral rights from the Ruatapu family. According to Nicholas he did so; but against this there is the fact that, according to both of them, it was a Ruatapu man who afterwards sent to Rarotonga for help in driving out the Aitu people, and on the

top of all this we have the fact that it was a Ruatapu man (Maro-una) who accomplished this, and then became the head chief of the island. Subsequently we have the marriages of the Ruatapu man Te-tupu-o Rongo with women in the direct main lines of descent of both the Ru and Te-erui groups, which would immensely enhance the subsequent power of his descendants, adding, as it would, to any military or purely political power they might otherwise possess, rights involved by descent from all the three original ancestors, alleged descendants of Atea and Papa.

This apparent probable continuance of the head chieftainship of the island in the Ruatapu people leads me to draw attention to one other matter. We have seen that, according to Gill, Ruatapu was a Tongan; whilst Large refers to his alleged descent from Tangiia and Iro, and tells us of his sailing apparently from Ra'iatea to Rarotonga, and afterwards going to Tonga, where he married, afterwards again voyaging to Rarotonga; Martin also perhaps connects him with Tonga. I again refer to my past suggestions as to the great voyagers, whose original Pacific home seems to have been first Fiji and Tonga, whence they spread to parts of Samoa, whose doings are recorded in the Rarotongan legends and logs, and whom, with their descendants, I have called the Tangaroans. From the narratives concerning Ruatapu we may well suspect that he was a Tangaroan, bearing in mind, among other things, the evidence, given in previous pages, that Ra'iatea appears to have been an eastern home of some of these Tangaroans. I have contended that Tangaroa was the great god of these Tangaroans; and it is to be noticed in connection with this that Tangaroa appears to have been the chief god, both of Rarotonga<sup>1</sup> and of Aitutaki<sup>2</sup>.

#### ATIU

There were a few traditions as to the origin of the people of the island at Atiu. According to one of these a pigeon, the pet bird of Tangaroa, went from the spirit land to Atiu, and there rested in a grotto which was still known as the pigeon's fountain. It saw a female shadow in the fountain, and embraced it, and then returned to spirit land. The child born of this union was called Atiu ("first-fruit" or "eldest born") and from him the island derived its name<sup>3</sup>. It was on this account that they called

<sup>1</sup> W. Gill, *Gems*, vol. II, p. 14. Cf. Gill, *Myths*, p. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Williams, p. 108. Cf. Gill, *Myths*, p. 14. <sup>3</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* pp. 188 sq.



their island a land of gods<sup>1</sup>. Somewhat similar to this was the statement that Nuku-kere-o-manu was the first *ariki* of Atiu; he was sixth in descent from Te Tumu, the great original first cause (god ancestor) of the island. The inhabitants were birds in those days, and that was why the ancient name of the island was Te Enea Manu (bird land), which was its spirit name. Tangaroa, the god, took Nuku-kere's aunt to wife, and their first born son was Atiumua, and his name was subsequently adopted as the worldly name of the island. The meaning of that name was *a tiutiu*, signifying the flight of Tangaroa to heaven. When Nuku-kere died, Mariri, also descended from Tangaroa, but who belonged to a senior branch, was made *ariki*, taking precedence over Atiumua<sup>2</sup>. The name of Te Tumu, mentioned in the tradition last quoted, appears in one of Gill's posthumous papers. This contains a genealogy, beginning with Atea and his wife Paparua-i-te-itinga. I may point out again that Atea is the deified conception of light; the name of his wife is rendered by the editors of the *Polynesian Journal* as meaning "Paparua of the sunrise"; but I may mention that *papa* means a rock, or the earth, and *roa* means long, so the genealogy obviously begins in the mythical period. They had a son called Te Tumu, who married Paparua-i-te-opunga (Paparua at the sunset). The name of Nuku-kere-o-manu does not appear in this genealogy; but four generations after Te Tumu comes Uke-umu of the "evil pit" (? hades), who came to this world, became a man and married. They had a daughter who married, and it was she and her husband Tura who spread the populations of Atiu and Mauke. After Tura the genealogy continues for twenty-five more generations<sup>3</sup>. There was a belief that the people of Atiu had come from the Samoan island of Manu'a<sup>4</sup>. Gill says that Mana, the old chief and "wise man" of Atiu said he was sprung from the Makea-Karika family; but being of a younger branch, the law of primogeniture induced the first chief of Atiu to seek a home elsewhere; so he called his vassals together and departed to the comparatively barren island, still in the possession of his descendants<sup>5</sup>. I gather that this means that he left Rarotonga and came to Atiu, of which he was the first chief.

Large says that though the Atiuans knew the names, sequence and leading events of the careers of their remote ancestors they

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* p. 189. Cf. Cook, vol. v, p. 247

<sup>2</sup> Large, *J.P.S.* vol. xxii, p. 74.

<sup>3</sup> Gill, *J.P.S.* vol. xx, pp. 135 sq.

<sup>4</sup> Gudgeon, *J.P.S.* vol. xiii, p. 210.

<sup>5</sup> Gill, *J.A.I.* vol. vi, p. 7.

had lost the names of ancestral canoes and said that their forefathers either originated in Atiu, begotten by the gods, or, like Utatakienna, swam across the ocean<sup>1</sup>.

Some historical material, obtained by Large from an Atiuan source, commences with Utatakienna, said to have been the great-great-grandson of Te-Erui, who was a descendant of the god Tangaroa of Avaiki<sup>2</sup>. This may have been the same person as Uta-taki-enua, whose name appears as a descendant of Te Erui in Large's Aitutakian genealogy, to which I have already referred, though there, owing to the introduction, to which I have drawn attention, of a long line of previous successors of Te Erui, his name appears a long way down the list<sup>3</sup>. According to the story, Utatakienna and his friend Tara came "from across the sea" (it does not say from what island) to Atiu, the ruler of which at that time was Tutuaiva. There is no mention of fighting, but Tutuaiva fled to Rarotonga, and Utatakienna established his rule in the island by killing its ancient people. He lived at and reigned from Mokoero, hence his rule was called *te au o Mokoero*, and this rule, carried on and extended by the *ariki* (chiefs) descended from him, continued until the annexation of the island by the British Government. The tenth *ariki* in descent from Utatakienna, named Tukuata, married a woman descended from Mariri (I presume this is the person of that name mentioned above) here said to have been a very ancient ancestor of the Atiu people—like Te Erui supposed to have been of divine origin; and their son Ruaautu "thus united in his person rival lines of ancestry hitherto in deadly enmity." An account is given of expeditions by Ruaautu's grandson Rongomatane Ngaakaara against the islands of Mauke and Mitiaro, both of which were defeated, and it is stated that from that time onward the so-called *ariki* of these islands held their positions as feudatories at the pleasure of the *ariki* of Atiu<sup>4</sup>. There are references to the subsequent frequent intercommunication of all these islands with Rarotonga, Tahiti, etc., and to the visits paid to them by Tangiia-nui of Rarotonga and how he left his mark upon all of them<sup>5</sup>.

I have referred to the statement that the rule of Utatakienna and his descendants—the Mokoero people—continued up to modern times, and to the cementing of the power of Ruaautu by reason of his ancestry. His father was a descendant of Utatakienna and his mother a descendant of Mariri. There

<sup>1</sup> Large, *J.P.S.* vol. XXII, p. 67.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* vol. XII, p. 144.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* vol. XXII, pp. 67 sq.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 69 sq.

appear, however, to have been struggles for power during this period. We are told of "a tribe of the ancient people of Atiu," named Ngaatua, who were defeated by the Mokoero people, fled, and were lost. At the time of their disappearance "another kindred tribe," called Ngatitinorau, and their chief Tane Kakerangi, were ambushed and destroyed by the Mokoero clan Ngatitamatou<sup>1</sup>, under Te Maua, but later on Tane's son Ngurau killed Te Maua; and his party—the ancient people—gaining the ascendancy, he became in turn the ruling chief of the island. It was not until Ruaautu *ariki*, some generations afterwards, defeated Te Ranginui that Atiu was finally united under Te-au-o-Mokoero<sup>2</sup>.

There is a further record of fighting, in which Te Arai and Toanui, "two ancient warriors of Atiu," determined to kill the Ngatiuru, the dominant tribe at that time. They fought the Ngatiuru, and beat them, thus becoming the rulers of the land, and "their words have become powerful in Atiu amongst their descendants"<sup>3</sup>. The Ngatiuru people may have been a branch, ruling for the time being, of the Mokoero group; and as we do not know whether the ancient character of their conquerors was that of the men themselves or of their ancestries, we cannot say whether this matter has any bearing upon the general history. Also the curious way in which the ultimate consequences of their success is expressed does not necessarily involve any continued dominion by their descendants over the island.

Passing now to a more recent period, the island of Atiu is said to have had in 1867 three chiefs ruling over it, and to have had under its jurisdiction the little islet groups of Mauke and Mitiaro, to which periodical visits were made for securing food and women<sup>4</sup>. Gill says that these three chiefs were of equal authority<sup>5</sup>; but I do not know whether he refers to joint control over the whole island, or control of each chief over a separate portion only. So also Baessler says the island had three *ariki* and five villages, and of these villages he gives the names of three, Arutunga on the west coast, Waipi in the east and Tautu in the south-east, Arutunga being the largest of them<sup>6</sup>. Apparently then there were in relatively recent days three principal chiefs, and possibly the three villages mentioned by

<sup>1</sup> I do not know whether this is another name for the whole group, or on of a section of it.

<sup>2</sup> Large, *J.P.S.* vol. XXII, p. 70.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 75.

<sup>4</sup> Lamont, p. 75. Cf. Gill, *L.S.I.* p. 7.

<sup>5</sup> Gill, *Jottings*, p. 40.

<sup>6</sup> Baessler, *N.S.B.* pp. 270 sq.

Baessler were their respective head-quarters. Each of these three chiefs would rule over his own district; and if it is true that the Mokoero group obtained, and afterwards maintained, rule over the whole island, the probability is that one, or perhaps all, of these three families of chiefs belonged to this group, and either that one of them had secured the dominion of the island, or that it passed sometimes to one and sometimes to another, according to the fortunes of intrigue or war or both.

There are features in these traditions which may perhaps be considered in the light of my Tangaroan hypotheses. Referring first to the legend of Nuku-kere, I point to the statement that he was said to have been descended from Te-Tumu, the great original first cause or ancestor. The word *tumu* has a general Polynesian meaning of the trunk or root, the beginning or origin of things; and a number of traditions as to the origin of islands, or their inhabitants, commence with Tumu, regarded as an original ancestor. This was probably an ancient conception; and the reference to the idea that in (or before?) Nuku-kere's time the inhabitants were birds is consistent with it. The belief that Te-Tumu was the child of Atea (associated with the idea of light) and Papa (the earth, or a rock) is also consistent with the conception. To Te-Tumu was attributed the origin of the people of Atiu and Mauke, and his descendant Nuku-kere was supposed to have been the first *ariki* or chief of Atiu.

Tangaroa's appearance in the drama seems to come at a period later than that of Te-Tumu. He married Nuku-kere's aunt, who would probably be supposed to be another descendant of Te-Tumu, and they had a son Atiumua. Mariri was said to be descended from Tangaroa, but it is not stated whether he was a descendant of the marriage with the aunt. As, however, it was said that Mariri succeeded Nuku-kere as *ariki*, in preference to Atiumua, because he was of the senior branch, it is clear that both of them were believed to have belonged to Nuku-kere's family, and so presumably would be descendants of Te-Tumu, Mariri having also his Tangaroan ancestry. I think these traditions may point to an older group of people, with its chief, and the intermarriage into that group of Tangaroa, to whose descendant the chiefdom passed; and we may associate with the Tangaroan ascendancy which this would involve the story of Tangaroa's pet bird, which may be compared with the Samoan traditions.

This brings us to the story of Utatakienna, who also was

credited with descent from Tangaroa<sup>1</sup>. Utatakienna came "from across the sea," seized the chieftainship from the reigning chief Tutuaiva, who fled to Rarotonga, and was probably therefore supposed to have been a Tangaroan. Utatakienna's descendants retained the chieftainship up to modern times. This points perhaps to the arrival of a party of Tangaroans, who conquered the existing partly Tangaroan group, which had originated in the marriage of Tangaroa with the woman of Te-Tumuan descent.

Tutuaiva had not been killed, and resistance to the new rule might well have been offered afterwards by the dynasty that had been superseded; and this might be the reason why the later chief Tukuata, descended from Utatakienna, married the descendant of Mariri, who was said to have been a very ancient ancestor of the Atiu people, and was presumably the person of that name already referred to; and so the three lines became united in their son Ruaautu. This would form a double Tangaroan element in the chieftainship; and the statement as to the later conquering expeditions against Mauke and Mitiaro, and references to frequent communication with Rarotonga and Tahiti, and visits paid by Tangiia-nui are all consistent with the idea that these Atiuan chiefs were what I am calling Tangaroans, irrespective of their worship of Tangaroa. So also is the belief that the people of Atiu came from Manu'a<sup>2</sup>.

The fighting between a tribe of the ancient people of Atiu and a kindred tribe with the Mokoero people may have been a recrudescence of the old hostility, and it is noticeable that the chief of the kindred tribe was called Tane.

Deductions reached in this way by comparison of traditions must, of course, be speculative and unreliable; but admitting this, I suggest, as a possibility, that perhaps these Atiuan traditions had their origin in the presence in the past of an original pre-Tangaroan population, to which was afterwards added a later Tangaroan group, which was, still later, followed by another Tangaroan group, which secured the ascendancy. Tangaroa is said to have been the principal god of the island<sup>3</sup>.

#### MAUKE

I find but little original tradition of the island of Mauke, but perhaps we may regard as such a pedigree of Tararo,

<sup>1</sup> That was through his alleged ancestor Te-Erui, who may have been the Te-Erui of Aitutakian traditions, in which nothing is said about Tangaroa.

<sup>2</sup> The people to whom this referred would be the dominant Tangaroans, who would disregard the original inhabitants.

<sup>3</sup> Large, *J.P.S.* vol. xxii, p. 70.

apparently a head chief of the island, with four predecessors of the same name, who claimed direct succession from the well known Polynesian personage Rata, twenty-eight generations back<sup>1</sup>. According to another statement he was a descendant of Ruatapu<sup>2</sup>; and there is other evidence touching the question of his descent, but it is uncertain in character and I do not think it worth while to investigate the subject. It is said that when Rongamatane (to whom I have already referred in connection with the island of Atiu) defeated the people of Mauke, he left one of his party, Tararo, the ancestor of the present Mauke chief of that name, in charge of the island<sup>3</sup>. According to Gill the name of the island meant the land of Uki, the first inhabitant<sup>4</sup>; and this idea must perhaps be associated with the tradition referred to above as to Uke-umu, who came to this world and became a man, and whose daughter spread the populations of Atiu and Mauke.

In recent times there were in the island three villages under three *ariki*; but the inhabitants were divided into two hostile groups. The extent of this hostility is illustrated by the mission church and the services held there. The church consisted of two parts, completely different from each other in construction and decoration, each part also having its own special path of stones and a special path to the schoolhouse. The chancel stood in the middle between the two halves, and the preacher had to give out the word of God exactly from its centre. The hostile parties never sang together; whilst one sang the other was silent and only began when the former stopped. Each party also only used its own special path, and when after the service they were assembled in the schoolhouse to chat, they still kept separate<sup>5</sup>. I have met with accounts from other islands of missionaries' difficulties in collecting together, for religious and other purposes, separate groups of islanders, but in none of these has the hostility between the groups been so strongly brought into evidence. It is possible that we have here an indication of very hostile competing groups, similar to the *malo* and *vavai* parties of Samoa; if so there would presumably be an island dominion held by the *malo* party for the time being. If, however, the whole island was, as has been stated, under the dominion of Atiu, the power of the *malo* party could hardly have been very great.

<sup>1</sup> Large, *J.P.S.* vol. XIX, p. 156. Cf. Savage, *J.P.S.* vol. XX, pp. 156 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* vol. XV, p. 219.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* vol. XXII, p. 68.

<sup>4</sup> Gill, *Myths*, p. 17.

<sup>5</sup> Baessler, *N.S.B.* p. 268.

## CHAPTER VIII

### POLITICAL AREAS AND SYSTEMS

#### MARQUESAS

THE Marquesan Islands cover an area stretching from the north-west to the south-east. The following are their names, as given in Brigham's *Index to the Islands of the Pacific*, the name given first being in each case that appearing in his map, and those inserted in parentheses being other names of the same islands given in his text. For reasons which will appear directly I divide them into two groups.

The north-westerly group comprises Hatutu (Chanal, Nexsen, Hancock, Langdon), Eiao (Masse, Knox, Hiaou), Motuiti (Franklin), Nukuhiva (Marchand), Huapu (Adams), and Huahuna. The south-easterly group comprises Fatuhuku (Hood), Hivaoa (Dominica, Oniva Hoa), Tahuata (Santa Cristina), Motane (San Pedro, O-nateaya), and Fatuhiva (Magdalena)<sup>1</sup>.

I propose to commence the consideration of the group by referring to two matters. The first of these is information given us by writers which points to a possible presence in some of the Marquesas of a "Melanesian" element. Quiros says of the natives of Santa Cristina (*i.e.* Tahuata) that they did not appear to be as white as those of Magdalena (*i.e.* Fatuhiva)<sup>2</sup>. He also tells us that, when the Santa Cristina natives saw a negro in one of the Spanish ships, they pointed to the south, and made signs that in that direction there were people of the same kind, who fought with arrows, and with whom they were sometimes at war<sup>3</sup>. Lesson is apparently referring to this last statement when he speaks of the same matter, and suggests that the country to the south to which these natives referred was perhaps Fiji<sup>4</sup>. Von den Steinen refers to certain Melanesian qualities which von Luschan had found in a number of Marquesan skulls<sup>5</sup>; but he does not say how many of these

<sup>1</sup> Cf. list of islands shown in map prepared by Banks from information obtained in Tahiti (Lesson, *Poly.* vol. II, pp. 209 sq.).

<sup>2</sup> Quiros, vol. I, p. 27.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 152.

<sup>4</sup> Lesson, *Poly.* vol. II, pp. 207 sq.

<sup>5</sup> Von den Steinen, *V.G.E.* vol. xxv, p. 509.

skulls von Luschan saw, or anything about them. They may merely have been skulls of people from other islands—perhaps castaways—and I do not think that we must attach any weight to the statement concerning them.

Quiros suggests a relative darkness of skin of the people of Tahuata as compared with those of Fatuhiva, and I gather from his reference to the people further south that they must have been definitely dark skinned. As regards Lesson's suggested identification of these people with the Fijians, I point out that, though Fiji is somewhat further south than the Marquesas, its relative position is substantially to the west; also I find it difficult to picture the people of the tiny island of Tahuata engaged in occasional warfare with the negroid people of Fiji, if for no other reason, because of the enormous distance of the Fijian islands away to the west. It seems much more likely that these unidentified enemies would be Paumotuans; they might conceivably be Easter islanders, but they also were a long way off, and were about due south-east of the Marquesas. I have not found a reference by any other writer to this suggested physical difference of the Marquesans from other Polynesians.

This evidence of a Melanesian element<sup>1</sup> in certain Marquesan islands, taken by itself, is only very fragmentary in character and quite insufficient in quantity; but I am in no way inclined therefore to give it a curt dismissal. I may point out that there appears to be definite ground, both physical and cultural, for suspecting that there was a Melanesian element in the people of Easter Island<sup>2</sup>; and if so we should not be surprised at finding evidence of it in other parts of the eastern Pacific. Fr. Eugène says the Marquesans chiefly resembled the Easter Islanders in physique<sup>3</sup>. I have, however, other reasons for finding some interest in the suggestion as regards the Marquesas; but in order to explain these I have to refer to matters the discussion of which cannot be introduced into this book. One of these relates to Maui and Tiki. Maui is sometimes spoken of by writers as a demi-god, and rightly so, because, though his name figures largely and widely in myths and legends, I do not think he was actually worshipped in the greater part of Polynesia. I think, however, there is substantial ground for suspecting that the original

<sup>1</sup> I am using this term for shortness to designate characteristics associated with what we call the Melanesians as distinguished from those called Polynesians.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Balfour, *Man*, vol. xx, pp. 47 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *A.P.F.* vol. xxxviii, p. 56.



Maui was the embodiment of a very archaic volcano cult, which had perhaps prevailed in the Pacific before the arrival there of the well-known Polynesian gods, Tane, Rongo, Ru, Tu and the still later Pacific god, as I believe him to have been, Tangaroa. Then, again, I believe that Tiki, believed in some islands to have been the first man, must be identified with a later Maui (descended from the original god), who was so widely credited with the fishing up of islands, lifting the skies from the earth, and discovering fire in the subterranean regions below. The interest of all this for my present purpose is the apparently important position occupied by Maui and Tiki in the Marquesan religion, as compared with that of other islands. As regards Maui, this appears in the seasonal feasts whose purpose was, according to Moerenhout, to obtain from the gods fertility and abundance in backward seasons and seasons of dearth<sup>1</sup>. The winter feast was the occasion of saying goodbye to the gods at the end of the season of fertility—the closing of the year<sup>2</sup>, after which the *areoi* went into mourning, lamenting the absence or death of their god<sup>3</sup>; and the identity of this god is disclosed by the statement that the spring feast was held in honour of Maui<sup>4</sup>, to celebrate his return<sup>5</sup>. Tiki is said to have been regarded in the Marquesas as a creator god<sup>6</sup>, the father of the gods<sup>7</sup>, and the high priest of Tahuata said he was the principal god, being all powerful, the deity who made the trees flower and bear fruit, and created the fish<sup>8</sup>.

The possible bearing of all this upon the question of a Melanesian element in the Marquesas will be seen by referring to some statements by Rivers in connection with his hypotheses. He says "It becomes probable that the belief in an underground hades, reached through volcanoes or volcanic vents, is to be associated with the earlier strata of the population of Melanesia. ...If, as seems probable, the underground hades of Polynesia is associated with volcanic activity, we have confirmation of the view that this belief is to be ascribed to the earlier stratum of the population of Polynesia, while it was the kava people who believed in a future home on earth or in the sky"<sup>9</sup>. Now it is to this belief as to an underground destination of the souls of the dead that I referred when I spoke of a volcano cult. I suspect that beliefs as to such a destination formed the

<sup>1</sup> Moerenhout, vol. I, p. 523.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 561 note.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 58.

<sup>9</sup> Rivers, *H.M.S.* vol. II, p. 479.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 517 sq.


<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 516.

<sup>8</sup> *A.P.F.* vol. XIX, p. 23.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 503.

<sup>6</sup> Mathias, p. 6.

# NUKUHIVA (MARQUESAS)



\* Whitney, J. A. I., vol. 1, p. 267.

original basis of the Polynesian religion of the dead, and I hope to draw attention at a future date to the alternative destination (according to what I shall suggest was a later cult) to a future home on or above the earth, or in the sky, and to be able to suggest an association of this latter belief more especially with the important hereditary chiefs, who, as we have seen in the chapter on "Origin and Migrations," are, according to Rivers, to be connected with the kava people, and perhaps to point to evidence of confusion of ideas arising from interaction between the two cults. If this is correct, and if I am right in associating Maui and Tiki with the volcano cult, and if these two beings, but little worshipped (if at all) in the more western islands, were, as they appear to have been, approached as gods in the Marquesas, we should expect to find the pre-kava element—that is, so far as Rivers's hypotheses concern Polynesia, his sitting interment people—more prominently shown in the Marquesas than in those other islands; and suggestions by writers as to a "Melanesian" element in the Marquesas would be consistent with this. There was perhaps a relative lack, as compared with the other islands, in the importance of the Marquesan chiefs, and this would point in the same direction. There may be other features of culture which touch this matter also, but these can only be considered when my investigation of Polynesia has been completed.

The other general matter, referred to above, to which I wish to draw attention is the evidence as to certain linguistic differences between the peoples of the north-western and south-eastern islands of the Marquesan group. Whitmee says that the Marquesans had at least two different dialects, and associates this fact with the presence of a Melanesian element<sup>1</sup>; but the difference seems to have been only dialectic. According to Tautain, the *ng*, "probably the archaic form," had disappeared almost entirely from the Marquesas, except in certain words of the dialect of the Taipii (one of the Nukuhivan groups of people). It was, he says, replaced by either *k* or *n* according to dialects, and he gives the following comparative examples, among others

*Koika* (feast) in the north-west, and *koina* in the south-east, instead of the archaic *koinga*.

*Haka* and *hana* (creek or harbour)—I presume he still means in the north-west and south-east respectively—instead of *hanga*; though the latter term was still used by the Taipii people, whose harbour was called Hanga-haa.

<sup>1</sup> Whitmee, *J.A.I.* vol. VIII, p. 267.

*Tohuka* (learned, clever) in the north-west, and *tohuna* in the south-east, instead of the New Zealand *tohunga*<sup>1</sup>.

Christian draws attention to the same thing, and illustrates it by the alteration of the word *tonga* into *toka* in the north and *tona* in the south<sup>2</sup>. Then, as regards Nukahivan local variations, he tells us that the Teii-nui-a-Haku group, comprising the inhabitants of Tai-o-Hae, Hakau and Taioa, Haapa, Aakapa and Hakaehu, used the *k*, whilst the Taipii-nui-a-Vaku group, comprising the inhabitants of Taipii-Vai, Houmi, Haatuatua, Anahu, and Hatiehu, used *ng*<sup>3</sup>. Jardin says that the dialect of the northern group was less harmonious and flowing than that of the southern islands<sup>4</sup>. Des Vergnes refers to the use of the *k* in the north-western islands, and the *n* in the south-east, and gives another example. He also says that where the letter *h* was used in the north-western islands it was often changed to *f* in the south-east, where alone the *f* was used. He is apparently speaking of the whole group when he says there were only five or six words that contained the letter *r*. In commenting on the matter he says that there seemed to him to be a striking community of origin between Hawai'ian and Marquesan, and that, though he knew Marquesan fairly well, he was never able to understand a word of Tahitian; and that, whilst the Marquesan native rapidly learned Tahitian, the Tahitians experienced many difficulties in speaking Marquesan<sup>5</sup>.

Though I am introducing into this discussion of political areas and systems a certain amount of material touching the question of the origins of the groups of people in the various islands and groups of islands, and am indulging in speculations as to possible origins of descent from the Tangaroans, as I am calling them, no serious attempt at investigating inter-island migrations and consequent relationship can be made till I have completed the collection and arrangement of the materials relating to all the subjects. Therefore, although I have thought it desirable to introduce this linguistic material, I only do so for the purpose of future use, and shall not now attempt to suggest any deductions that may be derived from it.

I may, in connection with this linguistic differentiation between north and south, refer to one or two statements made

<sup>1</sup> Tautain, *L'Anthrop.* vol. VII, p. 448 note.

<sup>2</sup> Christian, *J.P.S.* vol. IV, p. 195.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 199 sq.; cf. p. 197.

<sup>4</sup> Jardin, p. 209.

<sup>5</sup> Des Vergnes, *R.M.C.* vol. LIII, pp. 82 sq.

by Clavel as to tattooing. He says that the Nukuhivans are less given to tattooing than the inhabitants of Hivaoa and Fatuhiva; but he apparently associates this difference with the more extensive contact of the former with Europeans<sup>1</sup>, and if this is the explanation, the matter is unimportant. He also, however, after referring to the great varieties of design adopted by different persons, speaks of the uniformity of design still applied to facial tattooing, and says that of this there are two principal forms—the *tiapou* and the *pahêké*. The latter is only seen on the chiefs of Nukuhiva and Oua-Pou [by which he evidently means my Huapu]; but the former is much more widespread, and is alone held in honour by the natives of the south-east group<sup>2</sup>.

Assuming that there were dialectical differences between the people of the north-western islands and those of the south-east, we may believe that these point to differences of origin from—say—the more western islands of the Pacific, even though we do not at the present stage attempt to trace those differences. This would probably involve hostility between the two groups, and there are one or two legends which appear to indicate hostility in the distant past. Von den Steinen was told that the rocky cliffs and lofty [? *zerlüfteten*] islands at the eastern end of Hiwaoa [no doubt my Hivaoa—one of the south-eastern islands], called Matafenua, formerly stood up as the most powerful mountain giant of the archipelago. Matafenua in single combat conquered the tallest rivals on the northern islands, which all closed in upon him. But in the end he was brought down his whole length by Poumaka, the highest point of Uapou [no doubt my Huapu—one of the north-western islands], while the others had marched up along the north coast of Hiwaoa to his aid, and his head was cut off, and still lies there as Matafenua (face of the land)<sup>3</sup>. This story was one of a number, intended to explain local features in the islands. It is very possible that the story of the bringing down and decapitation of this mountain was a native explanation of the physical consequences of some volcanic explosion or earthquake in the past; but the introduction of the story of fighting between this mountain and those of the northern islands probably, I think, has a further significance. I am inclined (I do not know whether this view will be

<sup>1</sup> Clavel, *Rev. d'Eth.* vol. III, p. 134.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 40 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Von den Steinen, *V.G.E.* vol. xxv, p. 500.

accepted) to suspect that legends attributing human action to mountains may sometimes have their origin in beliefs as to human events in the distant past, the actors in which were perhaps in some cases believed to have been autochthonous<sup>1</sup>; especially as mountains or rocks often appear in Polynesian myths as distant ancestors. Another story is told by des Vergnes, in order, he says, to explain the antipathy which was formerly pushed to hatred, between the natives of the south-east group and those of the north-west group. The sacred eel of Nuhiva lived in the river of Taipii Vai, in Comptroller Bay [in Nukuhiva]; that of Hiva-oa lived in a river [evidently in the south-eastern island of Hiva-oa]. One day the eel of the south-east group, in order to satisfy the natives of its island, went to Nuhiva to look for the other, and engaged the latter to come and see it, promising it the muddiest waters, and the finest grottos. So the Nuhiva eel made the voyage, but on arriving at Hiva-oa it was killed and eaten by the people there<sup>2</sup>.

The south-eastern island of Fatuhuku is only a small one, but there was a tradition, according to which it had once been large. The story tells of Tanaoa and his wife Ometo leaving their district of Atuona, and settling in Fatuhuku. Their young son let out into the sea the fish which they kept in a tank, including many of the *humu* or leather-jacket kind, and the latter worried and nibbled at the head of the *mano-aiata* (tiger shark), the guardian spirit of the island, and so provoked him that with one lash of his tail he broke the pillar of rock which held up the island, at the same time withdrawing his own supporting bulk. The land was overturned and sank down into the depths, and the people perished in the sea; no one was left alive, and only a little piece of land was left<sup>3</sup>. Another story, beginning with the pressure of Papa-Uka, the world above, upon Papa-Ao, the world below, the birth from this union of the well-known gods Tane, and Atea, and a number of minor—apparently local—gods, and the breaking out of these children into the regions of light, tells of the subsequent scatterings and settling of the children in various places, including [the names in parentheses are added by me] the Marquesan islands of Eiao, Moho-tani (? Motane), Hivaoa, Uauka (? Huahuna)<sup>4</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> I have referred to this matter twice in discussing my hypotheses as to the earliest history of Samoa.

<sup>2</sup> Des Vergnes, *R.M.C.* vol. LII, pp. 725 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Christian, *J.P.S.* vol. IV, p. 199.

<sup>4</sup> Substituting the southern *n* for the northern *k*.

Nukuhiva, Tahuata, Uapou (evidently Huapu), Fatuhiva and Fatauku (evidently Fatuhuku). Atea took possession of Papa-nui, Tane took Akikemo and another son took Havaiki, the land of fire. I have not been able to identify Papa-nui [Big papa] and Akikemo with islands. Of this island of Fatauku it is said that, having been taken by one of the sons, it afterwards became the land of Tanaoa and Meta, who wrought sore evil and brought destruction upon many. When, as the king, with reckless javelin wounded the guardian monster, the *mano-aiata*, which upheld the island on his back as by a mighty pillar, the mighty guardian shadow was wroth and withdrew his supporting bulk, and the land sank into the depths, and all the people perished save a few, and small is the proportion now left<sup>1</sup>.

I suggest that these two tales, as to which the first and the latter part of the second seem to be variations of the same story, are capable of a construction which is of interest with reference to my hypotheses as to the Tangaroans, as I have called them. The legend with which the second tale begins is substantially similar to legends found in other parts of Polynesia, and accounts for the origin of the Marquesan god Atea (corresponding with the Mangaian god Vatea), the great Polynesian god Tane and a number of minor gods, and tells how most of them spread about over the Marquesan group, of the several islands of which they would be regarded as having been the original inhabitants. At a later date Tangaroa<sup>2</sup> came to the island of Fatuhuku, of which apparently he took possession, and either he or his son so acted that the old guardian shark god of the island withdrew his support, and almost the whole of the island, with all or most of its inhabitants, went to the bottom of the sea. This part of the story may be based on a belief that there had been in the Marquesas an earlier race of people, worshippers of Atea, Tane and the other gods mentioned, and that at a subsequent period the Tangaroans landed and took possession of the island of Fatuhuku. The statement that the guardian and supporter of the island, who let the bulk of it sink in consequence of the misbehaviour of the newcomer, Tangaroa or his son, was a shark may perhaps be read in the light of my suggestion as to a possible connection

<sup>1</sup> Christian, *J.P.S.* vol. iv, pp. 187 sq.

<sup>2</sup> If we alter this name by substituting *n* for *ng* to bring it into accord with the southern Marquesan dialect, and eliminate the *r*, which is wanting in the Marquesas, we get the name Tanaoa.

of the shark with Tane, and perhaps with the Teva people, in Tahiti<sup>1</sup>.

I will now try to give some particulars of the groups of people who inhabited the island of Nukuhiva and of the districts which they occupied. Unfortunately some of the evidence is confused, insufficient, and even contradictory; and, though I think the greater part of my suggestions concerning it are correct, or substantially so, there are others as to which I am far from confident. The map of the island in this book has been prepared by me from French Admiralty charts of 1838 and 1844, and I have spelt the names as they are spelt in the charts; two names (marked in parentheses V.D.) have been taken from a map in Vincendon-Dumoulin's *Iles Marquises*. Unfortunately the meagre particulars given are not very clear, and a gross inconsistency will be seen in the placing by Vincendon-Dumoulin of Point Akani or Tchitchagoff in one position, whilst, according to the Admiralty charts, these are two separate headlands further to the west. The charts show that the interior of the island is mountainous, with a main peak or ridge, running broadly east and west, in the centre, and side ridges and spurs stretching outwards to the sea in all directions, the latter often branching. Thus are formed a series of river valleys, all rising in the interior, then uniting as larger valleys, and finally dropping and widening as they approach the sea. No doubt a general formation of this character is common to many of the Polynesian islands, but it is necessary to draw attention to it here for the purpose of considering the distribution of the Nukuhivan people.

The Taipii group (also called by writers Taipi and Typee, but I shall generally refer to them as Taipii) was evidently very powerful. They refused to do homage to Porter, and he found it very difficult to fight them in their almost impregnable valley and strong stone fort; he says the public square in their chief village was far superior to any other he had seen<sup>2</sup>. Shillibeer also says that the most spacious and elegant assembly place

<sup>1</sup> In these stories Tanaoa (Tangaroa) appears as a being who wrought evil. A Marquesan creation myth introduces Tanaoa, representing darkness, and Atea, representing light or the Sun, and tells how Atea fought and defeated Tanaoa, and drove him away to distant regions of darkness. Atea was an important god in the Marquesas, or in some islands of the group; but Tangaroa does not appear to have been worshipped there. Perhaps we may associate these stories with a lack of success on the part of the Tangaroans in trying to establish themselves strongly in the Marquesas.

<sup>2</sup> Porter, vol. II, pp. 69 sq., 86-103.



was in their district, being large enough to hold 1200 people and well built<sup>1</sup>. Porter divides the Taipii group into twelve sections, and gives their names<sup>2</sup>; and Vincendon-Dumoulin gives the same twelve names<sup>3</sup>.

The following is Vincendon-Dumoulin's list, the observations being taken from his book, except where otherwise stated:

1. Pohigouha	}	Each of these had a separate chief. They often fought amongst themselves, but united against strangers. Porter says their district was the north part of Comptroller Bay <sup>4</sup> .
2. Nahegouha		
3. Attayaias		
4. Cahoumaka	}	They were under one principal chief. Their district was the "Shoeme (Houmi)" valley [that is, I presume, the main valley at the head of Hooumi inlet]. D'Urville refers to Taipii living near this inlet <sup>5</sup> . Though Porter includes them on p. 80 in the list of twelve sections of the Taipii, he speaks of them on p. 31 merely as allies of the Taipii, who generally joined with them in peace and war.
5. Tomaa-Waina		
6. Tike-Mahou		
Hate Kaa, comprising	}	Had a chief over them all
7. Mouaika		
8. Attihou		
9. Atteta-Waina	}	Their district was the valley of "Hanna Hoo" [which is perhaps the main valley of the Hanga-Haa inlet]. Porter says these people all lived in the valley of "Hannahow," which he locates on the east side of the island (p. 31).
Wooha, comprising		
10. Attehawes		
11. Attetomakoi	}	
12. Attekakanouii		

Vincendon-Dumoulin says elsewhere that the bay of the Taipii had three recesses (*enfancements*), the most easterly being Houmi, the middle one Hakahaka [cf. Hanga-Haa on map], which divided the neutral land between the Taipii and the Happa groups, and the most westerly Hakahappe [cf. Haka-Paa on map] which bounded the shores of the Happa<sup>6</sup>. According to Belcher, Comptroller Bay was an extensive arm, containing three distinct bays, that to the eastward, inhabited by a distinct race of Taipii, being completely divided by a peninsular tongue<sup>7</sup>. Des Vergnes, in his story of the two sacred eels, referred to on a previous page, says that one of them lived in the river of Taipai Vai in Comptroller Bay [cf. Taipi-Vaii in map]<sup>8</sup>. Christian divides the Taipi-nui-a-Vaku, as he calls them, into eighteen tribes. Only two, or perhaps three, of the names given appear to be the same as

<sup>1</sup> Shillibeer, pp. 42, 65.

<sup>2</sup> *I.M.* pp. 184, 186.

<sup>3</sup> D'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. I, p. 478.

<sup>7</sup> Belcher, vol. I, p. 358.

<sup>2</sup> Porter, vol. II, p. 80.

<sup>4</sup> Porter, vol. II, p. 31.

<sup>5</sup> *I.M.* p. 167.

<sup>8</sup> Des Vergnes, *R.M.C.* vol. LII, pp. 725 sq.

those appearing above, so I will not tabulate them; but the valleys or districts in which he says they lived were Taipi-Vai, Houmi, Haatuatua, Anahu and the "wide valley" of Hatiehu. At the period of which he speaks the numbers of the populations of these areas had evidently dwindled down to very minute proportions<sup>1</sup>.

The Happa group was divided, according to Porter, into six sections, viz.: Nicekee, Tattievow, Pacha, Kickah, Tekaah and Muttaaoha. Only five chiefs' names are given; but it is not said that one of the sections had no chief<sup>2</sup>. Porter says they lived in a valley "which makes up from the north-west part of Comptroller Bay"<sup>3</sup>. D'Urville, after referring to Hoomi inlet as the residence of Taipii, says "further off" is the valley of the Happa<sup>4</sup>. Both these statements would be consistent with the belief that their district was that of the double inlet of Haka Paa and Haka Puuae; and this is where they are located in the Admiralty chart. Christian gives six names which are evidently the same as those given above, and adds a seventh—the Te-whi-tua<sup>5</sup>.

Passing now further westward on the southern side of the island, I refer to several names, which, though differently spelt, refer, I think, to the same people. These names are (eliminating the plural *s*, which writers often add to them), Taii, Tai, Teii and Taeeh. In quoting each writer I shall adopt his spelling (minus the final *s*, when it appears), so that my belief as to identity can be checked. Porter says that in the valley of Tieuhoy there were six tribes called Taeeh, whose names were Hoatta, Maouh, Houheeah, Pakeuh, Hekuah and Havvouh<sup>6</sup>. There was an acknowledged chief of four of these tribes, who, however, had much influence with the other two, of which one had also its own chief, whilst the other was "a perfect democracy without a chief," though it had a priest who had great influence, decided all cases of controversy, and the time of going to war. He gives the names of the chiefs and of the tribes over which they ruled. The term Taeeh meant friend<sup>7</sup>. According to Vincendon-Dumoulin there were in the valley of Taio-Hae six tribes called collectively Tai; he gives

<sup>1</sup> Christian, *J.P.S.* vol. iv, p. 200.

<sup>2</sup> Porter, vol. II, p. 31. Cf. Vincendon-Dumoulin, *I.M.* p. 184; Porter, vol. II, p. 79.

<sup>4</sup> D'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. I, p. 478.

<sup>5</sup> Christian, *J.P.S.* vol. IV, p. 200.

<sup>3</sup> Porter, vol. II, p. 31.

<sup>6</sup> Porter, vol. II, p. 79.

<sup>7</sup> Porter, vol. II, p. 29.

their names, which are obviously the same as those given by Porter though not spelt quite the same way<sup>1</sup>. Elsewhere Vincendon-Dumoulin enumerates the districts of Taio-Hae bay as follows: Akapehi, Ikohei, Havaou, Pakiou, Onia, Oto-meaho, Peka, Paatea (Oata) and Haotoupa (Meaho), and he gives the names of their chiefs<sup>2</sup>. If we compare the names of the "tribes," as given by Porter and Vincendon-Dumoulin, with the names of the districts given by the latter, we find that in three cases the names are the same or very similar; and if we then compare these names of districts with those of the valleys or districts shown in the map as being on the shores of Anna Maria Bay, we find that among the former are included all the latter. Again two names on the map—Oata and Pakiu are apparently the same, though differently spelt, as those of two of the tribes. The result of these comparisons is to lead us to think that the Teii group occupied the shores of this bay, Porter's name Tieuhoy probably referring to the general coastal opening into which the bay extended, and being consistent with Vincendon-Dumoulin's reference to Taio-Hae bay and his giving that name (see map) to the eastern point of its mouth. Mathias refers to the Teii as having lived at Taio-Hae<sup>3</sup>. Fanning says the Taeeh tribe were the neighbouring tribe to the west of the Happah<sup>4</sup>. According to d'Urville the Taii were a people near the bay of Taio-Hae<sup>5</sup>; and Stewart says so also<sup>6</sup>. Belcher says he sent a boat to Taioa Bay, to try to dissuade the Taioans from war<sup>7</sup>. Shillibeer identifies the bay of Tuhuouy with Anna Maria Bay<sup>8</sup>. These statements support the suggestion made above. Probably the Havvoh section of the Teii people were the most important in rank of blood and antiquity, whatever they may have been in other respects, for it is said that a *marae* in Haavao was the only *marae* of the Teii tribe in which human sacrifices might be offered<sup>9</sup>.

The Huchaheucha group included, according to Porter, three sections, Maamatuaha, Tiohah and Cahhaahe, and he says they had two chiefs. They were in a bay "to the leeward," and they were the allies of the Taeeh, joining them in all wars with people to the east of the Taio-Hae valley, although they were sometimes at war among themselves<sup>10</sup>. Elsewhere he

<sup>1</sup> *I.M.* p. 184.

<sup>3</sup> Mathias, p. 14.

<sup>5</sup> D'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. I, p. 479.

<sup>7</sup> Belcher, vol. I, p. 357.

<sup>9</sup> Tautain, *L'Anthro.* vol. VIII, p. 670.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 193 sq.

<sup>4</sup> Fanning, p. 211.

<sup>6</sup> Stewart, vol. I, p. 279.

<sup>8</sup> Shillibeer, p. 38.

<sup>10</sup> Porter, vol. II, p. 31.

speaks of a group called Maamatwuah, divided into three sections called Maamatwuah, Tioah, and Cahaha<sup>1</sup>. Vincendon-Dumoulin says that a district near Akani Bay was occupied by Taioa<sup>2</sup>; and again that on Akani Bay were three tribes, allies of Taioahae, called Maamatouah, Taiahah and Cahhahes, and having two chiefs<sup>3</sup>. Fanning speaks of a group called Tiohah to the west of the Taeeh group<sup>4</sup>. It is, I think, pretty evident that these are all the same, though whether they were referred to collectively by one or both of the names given by Porter, or by that of Taioa cannot be shown. As regards their habitat, Point Akani was, according to Vincendon-Dumoulin's map, at the mouth of the fair sized, more or less enclosed, bay immediately west of Anna Maria Bay, whilst, according to the Admiralty map, which identifies it as the home of the Taihoa, it was still further west, where there does not seem to have been a bay of this character, though this map indicates such a bay in the position shown by Vincendon-Dumoulin. I should think Vincendon-Dumoulin is more likely to be right, mainly because we seem otherwise to have no evidence of any population on his Akani bay—an improbable absence from such a convenient spot—and partly because the alliance between these people and the Anna Maria Bay group would be more effective if they were pretty near one another.

Porter speaks of a small group called Tiakah, whose home was the Tahtuatuah valley<sup>5</sup>. Vincendon-Dumoulin, in referring to them, gives the same name to their valley, but adds another name Ouatouatoua<sup>6</sup>, and this perhaps enables us, on comparison with one of the Admiralty charts (see Aa-toua-toua in my map) to locate them on the east coast of the island, evidently close to, but eastward or north-eastward of, some of the Taipii people.

Porter also mentions a group called Attatoka (divided into Attatoka, Takeiah and Paheutah) and another group called Nicekee<sup>7</sup>; but he says nothing about them or their whereabouts.

Jardin says that among the Naiki, tribes in the interior of the island, a stone was shown on which a woman called Hakamoetupua was supposed to have divided the sky into several parts, which she distributed among the different tribes

<sup>1</sup> Porter, vol. II, p. 79.

<sup>2</sup> *I.M.* p. 181.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 184.

<sup>4</sup> Fanning, p. 211.

<sup>5</sup> Porter, vol. II, p. 31.

<sup>6</sup> *I.M.* p. 186.

<sup>7</sup> Porter, vol. II, pp. 79 sq.

of the island. In repeating this I will alter the order of enumeration of these tribes. The Taipi-Moana, in Comptroller Bay in the east, had a grey and dappled sky; the Taipi-Vai, in the same bay, saw the blue sky at rare intervals from a general thick cloud; the Happa had a sky covered with heavy rain in abundance; the Tei, in the bay of Taio-Hae, were allotted a calm windless sky; the inhabitants of Taioa, a bay to the west of Taio-Hae, were condemned to a sky that was always rainy; in the north the Pua and the Atitoka only had clouds; in the centre, the Naiki had continually foggy sky<sup>1</sup>. I will not here discuss the origin of this story, or how the idea arose that this allocation of skies to the various groups was attributed to a woman of a tribe of the interior; though I may say that it is stated that the Nukuhivans thought that the different groups had different skies, which were named according to their characters<sup>2</sup>.

The interest of the story, so far as my present purpose is concerned, arises from its reference to the various groups of people. The geographical placing of the groups of the southern part of the island is consistent with my construction of the information supplied by other writers<sup>3</sup>; but I draw attention to the reference to the Pua and Atitoka people, both in the north, and to the Naiki people in the centre. The name Pua is somewhat similar to that of Pour Bay, shown in the map, and perhaps this was the district of these people. The name Atitoka is similar to that of Attetoko appearing in the map, and the latter may indicate the home of this group; we may also, I think, assume that this Atitoka group is the same as the Attatoka group referred to by Porter, though he does not tell us where they were. As regards Jardin's Naiki people in the centre, I draw attention to the name Nicekee given by Porter and Vincendon-Dumoulin to one of the sections of the Happa group, and the same name given by Porter to a group of whom he tells us nothing<sup>4</sup>. One is inclined to suspect that all these names refer to the same people, who may have been a separate group, but who may also have become absorbed by, or may have come into close political or social connection with the Happa people—perhaps those of them living farthest inland to the north.

<sup>1</sup> Jardin, p. 185.

<sup>2</sup> Mathias, pp. 208 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Except perhaps as regards the Happa, who are not located by her

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Christian, *J.P.S.* vol. IV, p. 200.

If my location of all these people is approximately correct, the relative positions of the groups may be stated broadly as follows. The Taipii occupied the south-eastern corner of the island, the Tiakah community on the eastern coast being close to their north-eastern boundary; they (the Taipii) spread along the north-eastern side of Comptroller Bay, and occupied the valleys of its most northerly long stretching inlet. At the western side of this bay, more or less to the south of these more northerly Taipii, were the Happa. To the west of these, further along the southern coast, were the Teii or Taeeh of Anna Maria Bay. Still further west, on Akani Bay, were the Taioa, Huchaheucha, or Maamatwuah group. To these then must probably be added the Pua and Atitoka people on the north coast, and the mysterious Naiki, alleged to have been in the centre, whatever this may mean. This still leaves the whole of the west coast and a considerable part of the north coast unaccounted for, a fact which suggests either that the people of the west and north were relatively unimportant (we seem to know little or nothing of the two apparent northern groups), or that they did not come much under the notice of white men, who perhaps confined their attentions to the deeply indented southern coast. Perhaps an explanation might be found in the physical structure of the island, but I have no knowledge as to this. Vincendon-Dumoulin says the territories occupied by the Tai, Happa, Taipi, and Taioa [his spelling] took up almost one-third of the island<sup>1</sup>.

I draw attention to the frequent recurrence of the number three (sometimes six, which may have been subdivided into threes) in the named subdivisions of the groups of people. It almost appears that they had as great a predilection for this number as the Society Islanders had for eight.

Christian gives a myth, told to him by a Taipii chieftainess, as to the origin of the Nukuhivan people. The bulk of this consists of a number of generations of marriages and births, the names given being "space," "surface," "opening up," "rising up" and a number of others of a similar character, including a few gods; but the interest of the story for our present purpose begins with the birth of two twin sons Haku and Vaku, from whom were born "the two tribes or ethnic divisions" of Nukuhiva. One of these divisions was called Te-ii-nui-a-Haku, and occupied the Haapa district, Tai-o-Hae

<sup>1</sup> *I.M.* p. 183.

valley, Hakani (evidently my Akani) and Aakapa (which I cannot identify); they thus, it will be seen, included all the groups to the west of Comptroller Bay; it was they who used the *k*. The other division was called Taipi-nui-a-Vaku, and occupied the valleys of Taipi, Houmi, Ahahu, Haatuatua, and Hatiheu; they thus included the Taipii groups and, apparently, the people of Aa-Toua-Toua on the east coast; it was they who used the *ng*<sup>1</sup>. He gives the genealogy of a chieftainess of the Houmi valley [who would be a Taipii woman] in which her ancestry is traced back to (ten generations earlier) Vaku<sup>2</sup>. We cannot attribute to the Taipii chieftainess Christian's use of the terms tribes or ethnic divisions, but the myth discloses a belief that all these people had a common origin, and that there had been an ancestral separation between the descendants of two brothers, which separation coincided with the modern geographical distribution of the districts occupied by the groups, and with the areas of linguistic differentiation. The spelling of the names on the map is, so far as it goes, consistent with this differentiation, except as regards the name Tikapo. The spelling of the names of groups and sub-groups, appearing in previous pages, is also consistent as regards the people to the west, but not so as regards the Taipii and Tiakah groups.

There are scattered fragments of information about the other Marquesan islands; in repeating it I do not propose to give names of districts or of their inhabitants. Christian says the island of Eiao, though now uninhabited, was formerly held by a single clan<sup>3</sup>. He refers to six valleys or districts in Huapu and gives the names of the groups that occupied them<sup>4</sup>. Vincendon-Dumoulin refers to a chief of the whole of this island, and gives the names of eleven villages<sup>5</sup>. Mathias says that "Vapu" (which is, I suppose, the same island) was under a single king<sup>6</sup>. Christian supplies the names of five valleys or districts in Huahuna, and of the groups who occupied them<sup>7</sup>; and of twelve valleys or districts with their occupying groups in Hivaoa<sup>8</sup>. This is a long shaped island, the two ends pointing east and west, and von den Steinen says there were two lines (genealogies) one for the west, and one for the east half of the island, which ran together in connection with a pair of

<sup>1</sup> Christian, *J.P.S.* vol. IV, pp. 196 sq. Cf. pp. 199 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 196

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 200 sq.

<sup>5</sup> *I.M.* p. 193.

<sup>7</sup> Christian, *J.P.S.* vol. IV, p. 200.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 201.

<sup>6</sup> Mathias, p. 374.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 201.

brothers<sup>1</sup>. Christian supplies the names of six valleys or districts with their occupying groups in Tahuata<sup>2</sup>. Vincendon-Dumoulin gives the names of twenty-three villages<sup>3</sup>. There are references by writers to the names of chiefs of specific districts in this island<sup>4</sup>. There is a reference to one district, the name of which can be identified with one of those given by Christian, in which there were four chiefs, of whom one was superior to the others<sup>5</sup>. A few writers give the names of chiefs who were, they said, kings of the whole island<sup>6</sup>. Christian gives the names of the clan which formerly held the island of Motane (now uninhabited)<sup>7</sup>; and supplies the names of five valleys or districts of the island of Fatuhiva with the names of the groups occupying them<sup>8</sup>. D'Urville gives the name of a king of this island<sup>9</sup>.

I now pass to the more general question of the internal organization of the various groups, and their conduct and political relationship as between group and group. The bulk of the information on these matters comes, I think, from Nukuhiva, and it is difficult to say if, and to what extent it is intended to apply to other islands also. The evidence as to the political systems which prevailed is neither exact nor identical; so I shall have to quote several somewhat similar statements for the purpose of comparison, copying the writers' own terminology. Porter, speaking of the Tieuhoy Bay groups, says that their valley was subdivided by the hills into other valleys, and each small valley was inhabited by a distinct tribe, governed by its own laws, and having its own chiefs and priests<sup>10</sup>. He says, speaking of the Nukuhivan people generally, that they cannot be said to have lived under any form of government other than a patriarchal one. The oldest man of a tribe, if he possessed the most land, and was the owner of the most bread-fruit and coconut trees, was the most influential among them. Wealth attached respect and gave power. They also had rank which was hereditary, and took much pride in tracing ancestry<sup>11</sup>. He refers to women, whose

<sup>1</sup> *V.G.E.* vol. xxv, p. 504.

<sup>2</sup> Christian, *J.P.S.* vol. iv, p. 201.

<sup>3</sup> *I.M.* p. 192.

<sup>4</sup> Bennett, vol. i, pp. 320 sq. Vincendon-Dumoulin, *I.M.* p. 192.

<sup>5</sup> Bennett, vol. i, p. 321

<sup>6</sup> Du Petit-Thouars, vol. ii, p. 338. D'Urville, *V.P.S.* vol. ii, i, 227. *A.P.F.* vol. xix, p. 27.

<sup>7</sup> Christian, *J.P.S.* vol. iv, p. 201.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> D'Urville, *V.P.S.* vol. ii, i, p. 227.

<sup>10</sup> Porter, vol. ii, p. 29.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* p. 30.



parents were considered wealthy, but who dared not walk or sit on a mat, because they were not of royal blood, this prerogative having apparently been confined to those who were so<sup>1</sup>. Mathias says each district had its chief, who was independent enough in his own domain, and was not obliged to have any relations with the chiefs of the other districts, except in regard to national feasts, and in cases of war. In the great assemblies of all these district chiefs, if there was one who was superior to others through the extent or richness of his land, or the number of his vassals or farmers, or through his warlike qualities, or some religious dignity, then he became, so to speak, the suzerain prince, and might properly be called king. The rest, during war or in the assemblies, were only small vassal princes who lent him support<sup>2</sup>. He also says that in war time and in assemblies for the great councils of the tribe, the power of the chief was more or less preponderant according to the titles he possessed<sup>3</sup>; also that each tribe was very careful to make its king or chief derive from a long chain of ancestors, most of whom had been deified<sup>4</sup>. Bennett says each valley was under the dominion of an *ariki* or chief, who maintained a feudal independence, though there were also several chiefs of minor rank who were equally absolute in their own districts<sup>5</sup>. Lisiansky says Nukuhiva and the other islands of the group were all governed by a number of chiefs, each of whom was independent of the rest, having a separate district and different subjects; and these chiefs and kings were always at war with each other<sup>6</sup>. Shillibeer says the island of Nukuhiva was divided into several districts or valleys, each having from 1500 to 2000 people, with a hereditary king attached to each. These tribes were frequently at war<sup>7</sup>. He further says, as regards the Tuhouou valley, that it was surrounded by a ridge of mountains of almost inaccessible height, forming the boundary of the kingdom, which was divided and subdivided into villages or districts, each having a chief tributary to the king, who was at all times ready to lead his warriors to battle at the sound of the conch; and that every kingdom had a chief priest and each of the divisions a sub-priest, who were much respected and ever held in the greatest veneration<sup>8</sup>. Du Petit Thouars says the natives of the Marquesas knew no form of

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 65.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 6.

<sup>6</sup> Lisiansky, pp. 79 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Mathias, p. 101.

<sup>7</sup> Shillibeer, p. 37.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 104.

<sup>5</sup> Bennett, vol. I, p. 319.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 39.

government. Tribes lived independently of each other, and followed the law of might. The only title of distinction was that of *ariki*, usually translated into chief or king, but which only seemed to designate a person possessing lands or inheriting them. But amongst these were some who through personal qualities, success in war, or through the greater number of their adherents (partisans) living on their domains, obtained a real superiority over their compatriots; and these persons were called *ariki noui*, or great chief. Sometimes there were several of them in one valley<sup>1</sup>. Langsdorff says that when there was a scarcity it was generally the chiefs who had the greatest store of provisions<sup>2</sup>. We are told that Porter tried to establish in Nukuhiva a single king for the whole island, in place of all the tribal chiefs who were always at war and killing and devouring one another; but his plan was not a success<sup>3</sup>.

Radiguet says that on the various islands of the group the tribes were composed of some hundreds of men, and were reckoned by valleys, each governed by a chief, generally hereditary. Independent among themselves, these tribes became enemies on the least pretext. They were then reinforced by ally-tribes, hostilities commenced, and when they were tired they made peace. He distinguishes from the others the island of Tahuata, the political system of which he describes as exceptional, there being a chief who had succeeded in establishing his ascendancy over the whole island, all the other chiefs recognizing his dominant power and living in peace under it<sup>4</sup>. Melville says the shores of Nukuhiva had several inlets inhabited by distinct tribes, who, though having the same religion and laws, had from time immemorial waged war against one another. The intervening mountains, generally 2000 or 3000 ft. above sea level, geographically defined the territories of these hostile tribes, who never crossed them, save on some expedition of war or plunder<sup>5</sup>. Owing to the mutual hostilities of the tribes, the mountainous tracts which separated their respective territories remained altogether uninhabited. The natives always dwelt in the depths of the valleys to secure themselves from predatory excursions of their enemies, who often lurked along their borders ready to cut

<sup>1</sup> Du Petit Thouars, vol. II, p. 355.

<sup>2</sup> Langsdorff, vol. I, p. 162.

<sup>3</sup> Mathias, pp. 14 sq. Cf. Stewart, vol. I, p. 279. D'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. I, pp. 485, 500.

<sup>4</sup> Radiguet, vol. XXII, p. 433.

<sup>5</sup> Melville, p. 25.

off any straggler or make descent on inmates of some sequestered habitation<sup>1</sup>. According to Baessler the valleys were once thickly populated; each was inhabited by a special clan, having a chief at its head, and at constant feud with its neighbours on the right and left<sup>2</sup>. Von Schleinitz says that not only were the islands independent among themselves, but the individual groups (*Stämme*) on the different islands were independent<sup>3</sup>. Jardin says that in Nukuhiva and the other islands each bay, each valley, each group of inhabitants, so to speak, had its chief, more nominal than real, whose influence and authority was only felt in times of war<sup>4</sup>. Stewart tells us that there were wars, which were strictly civil, in which different parties in the same tribe constituted the only combatants, as in cases in which different members of the same family entitled hereditarily to the chieftainship attempted to secure it to themselves, and accordingly enlisted separate bodies of adherents. A war sometimes took place between two tribes usually in alliance against a common enemy; and Stewart illustrates this by referring to a war between the Teii and Hapa, in which the valley of the latter was devastated, notwithstanding that these two tribes were allies in all wars against the Taipii. At times several tribes combined in the utter extermination of a single weaker, though independent body. At others all the tribes became nearly equally divided in a general contest. And again all were sometimes united in a war against another island or islands<sup>5</sup>. Des Vergnes, who was in the Marquesas in 1868-74 and wrote in 1877, says that the natives of the Marquesas were governed by chiefs who, in the same tribe, succeeded each other from father to son, or sometimes in the collateral line. These chiefs were numerous; each district or bay had one, two, three, and even as many as seven or eight chiefs, according as this district was inhabited by one or several tribes, each possessing its chief, of which some tribes were quite small and others of considerable size. At Atiheu, in the north of Nukuhiva [it is not shown in my map] one chief had four tribes under his domination; of ten inhabited bays of Nukuhiva seven tribes had each two or three chiefs. At the Harbour of Traitors [in the island of Hivaoa] which contained two inhabited bays,

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 28.

<sup>3</sup> Von Schleinitz, *V.G.E.* vol. vi, p. 341.

<sup>5</sup> Stewart, vol. 1, pp. 277 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Baessler, *N.S.B.* p. 193.

<sup>4</sup> Jardin, pp. 180 sq.

there were eleven chiefs. With such a large number of chiefs, each commanding a small personnel, a superior authority was necessary, either in each district or in each island. The natives felt this, because they often had, in each bay containing several chiefs, one amongst them who had pre-eminence over the others, as for example in the bay of Akani, where there were four chiefs, one of whom had the greatest authority, and at Atiheu, where there were originally five chiefs, of whom one was the superior. Finally, above all these chiefs of middling and petty rank, came the great chief or king, called *papa-akaiki* who had them all under his sovereignty. Des Vergnes says "we now know" no more than three great chiefs in the archipelago, at Nukuhiva, Upo and Tauata. He then goes on to explain how the chiefs acted as a bond of union between the French Resident and the natives, they being taken into consultation with reference to his proposed orders, and being the intermediaries through whom those orders were communicated to the people<sup>1</sup>.

It is not easy to form from these general statements a clear and clean cut conception of the matters to which they refer; and my reason for quoting the various authorities at what may appear to be needless length, has been to enable readers of this book to draw their own conclusions. If we consider the matter in the light of what we know of more westerly islands, we should expect to find divisions into groups, sub-groups, and so on, each group and sub-group having its own entity and official head, whilst there would generally or often be a head chief of a group possessing some degree of authority over the sub-groups into which it was divided. The difficulty is increased by the loose way in which writers speak of "bays," "valleys," "districts," etc., and of "tribes" and "clans." It is reasonable to imagine that there would be internal bonds of common interest and co-operation between the sub-groups of each of the great groups, such as the Taipii, the Happa, the Teii and the Taioa, and the presence of internal bonds of this character is suggested by Stewart's reference to wars between the Happa and Teii. The same system is, I think, disclosed in Mathias's reference to chiefs of districts who, though generally independent of one another, had to co-operate on occasions of national feasts and in war.

The question arises, however, whether the larger groups

<sup>1</sup> Des Vergnes, *R.M.C.* vol. LII, p. 185.

possessed head chiefs, the jurisdiction of each of whom spread over the sub-groups of his entire group, as distinguished from that of the chiefs of the sub-groups into which it was divided? Were there chiefs who can be compared, though their jurisdictions were smaller, with the *tuiaana* and *tuatua* of Upolu and the head of all the eight Teva districts of Tahiti? There is an indication of this in Shillibeer's reference to what he calls the kingdom in the Tuhuouy valley, subdivided into villages or districts, each having a chief, tributary to the king, who could at any time lead his warriors to battle; for if my construction of the evidence as to grouping is correct, this statement would refer to the whole Teii group, occupying the shores of Anna Maria Bay. There are a number of references to persons who were regarded as being head chiefs or kings of this group<sup>1</sup>, and, indeed, it was the head chief of the Teii whom Porter tried to establish as king of Nukuhiva<sup>2</sup>. I have, however, found no reference to an actual example of a head chief of any of the other large groups, so we must consider the general evidence as to the probability or otherwise of there having been such.

The consideration of the general evidence as to the political systems of the tribes or clans, as writers call them, which formed the sections of these larger groups is rendered difficult by the way in which writers refer to bays and valleys. I shall assume, however, that statements such as that every bay had its tribe, or its chief, refer to, or include, not only the outer bays, such as Comptroller Bay, Anna Maria Bay and Akani Bay, but the smaller inlets which formed parts of them. It could hardly, in the case of Comptroller Bay, refer to the whole inlet, if one shore was dominated by the Taipii, and another shore, or part of it, by the Happa. As regards this matter I draw attention to Bennett's statement that each valley was under the dominion of an *ariki* or chief, who maintained a feudal independence, though there were also several chiefs of minor rank who were equally absolute in their own districts. This points, I think, to a system similar to that which we have found in the more westerly islands of Polynesia, of subdivision of districts into sub-districts, each of which had its own sub-chief, whilst there was a chief over the whole. The alleged independence of the sub-chiefs in their respective sub-districts

<sup>1</sup> Fanning, pp. 168, 211; Porter, vol. II, p. 20; Stewart, vol. I, p. 279; d'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. I, p. 479; Coulter, p. 243; Belcher, vol. I, p. 354; Radiguet, vol. XXII, p. 460.

<sup>2</sup> Mathias, pp. 14 sq. Cf. Stewart, vol. I, p. 279.

is also in accord with the systems, as I understand them, in some, at all events, of those other islands, and possibly in all of them, the chief of the whole district not as a rule interfering with the internal affairs of the sub-districts, except in so far as they affected those of the district. I also refer again to Mathias's evidence. After saying that each chief was independent enough in his own domain (I will call this his "sub-district"), he refers to that chief's relations with chiefs of other districts (sub-districts) in regard to national feasts and in cases of war. Now these two matters would, we should expect, be the subject of council meetings between all the chiefs jointly concerned; this meeting would probably be held at the principal meeting place of the whole district, which would probably be in the sub-district of the head chief of the district, and it, again probably, would be presided over by the chief of the sub-district in his capacity of chief of the district. Indeed this man would be the person of whom Mathias says he was, so to speak, a suzerain prince, and might be called a king, to whom the others—the vassal princes—lent support, not only during war, but at the assemblies. It is true that the origin of the superiority of this "king" might, according to Mathias, be wealth, warlike qualities, or religious dignity; but the attainment of the head chieftainship of a group in other islands was sometimes secured by one or other of these influences. Possibly the *ariki noui*, referred to by du Petit Thouars, were head chiefs of districts, the sub-districts of which had their under-chiefs; *ariki-nui* simply means "great chief." I do not know where to place des Vergne's *papa-akaiki*, a term which may, I think, be translated "head chief." His indication that at the time of which he speaks all other chiefs were under their sovereignty and that there was only one of these head chiefs in Nukuhiva, whilst the only other two chiefs of this rank were in Upo (Huapu) and Tauata (Tahuata), rather suggests that they were head chiefs of their whole islands; but his statement that the natives, in view of their customs as to pre-eminent chiefs, "felt" the necessity for a superior authority, coupled with his explanation of the use of the chiefs as intermediaries between the French Resident and the people, makes me suspect that, though *papa-akaiki* may have been an old native term, his explanation of its use may have been associated with European Government. I may, however, draw attention to what he regards as an older, evidently native, custom for one among several chiefs in each

bay to have pre-eminence over the others. There are references to mutual independence of chiefs and districts; but the writers do not give precise explanations of their meanings or supply facts in detail. I may point out again, however, that in Samoa, and probably in other islands, the chief of a sub-area seems to have been largely independent of the chief of the whole area, except as to matters affecting the latter. I think we are justified in believing that a system of districts divided into connected sub-districts prevailed, and that there were head chiefs of the former having jurisdiction over the chiefs of the latter. It is quite possible that writers may have been misled by the *internal* independence of sub-areas and their chiefs.

As regards the references to single chiefs having dominion over whole islands, I do not believe for a moment, whatever may have followed European control, that there had been a really Marquesan system of this sort in Nukuhiva. As to other islands, Vincendon-Dumoulin and Mathias both report a chieftainship of this sort in Huapu; several writers report it in Tahuata; d'Urville does so as regards Fatuhiva. I must point out, however, that each of these islands is smaller than Nukuhiva, a factor which must be borne in mind in considering the possible bearing of such statements upon the question of Polynesian political systems. D'Urville says Tahuata was the only island in which such a system prevailed.

There are a few references to cases in which the numbers of the districts were greater than those of the chiefs; but this might be explained in one or two ways. For instance, relationship through intermarriage between the families of the two chiefs of two districts might be followed by the succession by one person, a descendant of the marriage, to both the titles; so also the chief of one district might conquer another district, and thus secure the rule of it, perhaps strengthening his position there by intermarriage of, say him or his son, with, say, a daughter of the defeated chief, so that a child or other descendant of that marriage might become qualified to succeed.

I draw attention to the statements as to the requisite alternative qualifications for chieftainship. Porter says the oldest man of the tribe was the most influential, if he possessed the most land and fruit trees, but that they also had hereditary rank of long ancestry; and refers to women, whose parents were wealthy, but who dared not sit on mats because they were not of royal blood. Mathias says the title of king would be applic-

able to him who had the most land or vassals or farmers, or the highest warlike qualities, or some religious dignity; but again he says that in war time and at assemblies preponderating power depended more or less on the titles he possessed, and refers to the importance attached to a long line of ancestors, mostly deified. Du Petit Thouars thought the title of *ariki* seemed to designate merely a person possessing or inheriting lands; but adds that a real superiority was gained by one of these through personal qualities, success in war, or the greater number of their adherents living on their domains. Radiguet says governing chiefs were generally hereditary. Stewart refers to the heredity of chieftainships. Des Vergnes states, apparently, that succession was always hereditary either in the lineal or collateral line.

In the more westerly islands of Polynesia succession to chieftainship seems almost always to have been hereditary in the sense that it passed to a descendant or collateral relation (including in these terms adopted people) of the late chief; but one is struck, as regards the Marquesas, by the references to property and military and a few other qualifications. We shall see in a later chapter that succession appears to have been hereditary in the Marquesas, and the question arises as to the meaning of those references. We must, I think, bear in mind, in considering the matter, a possible confusion on the part of writers between cause and effect. The class of chiefs was in Polynesia the wealthy class, even though a chief of high rank and great possessions might sometimes, owing to misfortunes, become quite poor. Perhaps writers on the Marquesas have imagined that men could become chiefs because they were rich, whereas really they were rich because they were chiefs. Rank of blood—of ancient ancestry—could not be affected by the degree of either wealth or prowess in war or anything else; but each and all of these factors might have a very considerable influence upon the amount of political power which a chief was able to secure including, for instance, the power arising from the obtaining by the chief of a sub-group of the head chieftainship of the whole group—a matter which would not, I fancy, be necessarily dependent upon superiority in rank of blood, and might well depend largely upon prowess in war, strong personality, wealth, or other matters. It is, I think, possible that we must interpret these references by writers in the light of my suggestions as to the explanation of them.



## CHAPTER IX

### POLITICAL AREAS AND SYSTEMS

#### PAUMOTU

THE Paumotuan or Low Archipelago is a collection of an enormous number of islands and islets, covering a large area, stretching from the north-west to the south-east; those to the north-west are to the east of, and adjoin closely, the Society Islands, and are sometimes spoken of by writers as the western islands, and those to the south-east are spoken of as the eastern islands. The author of *Rovings in the Pacific* (1842) says that the inhabitants of nearly all the islands wandered from island to island in their large double canoes, so that at times an island would appear to be thickly peopled, and at others scarcely an individual was to be found<sup>1</sup>; and there is a modern statement that the people of Vahitahi, Akiaki, and Amanu [shown in Brigham's Index as being in the central area of the archipelago] generally lived a nomadic life, going to fish turtle in other islands, and only coming back after several weeks, whilst the people of Hao [also in this area] rarely inhabited their village, as they were ceaselessly cruising about, and were widely diffused<sup>2</sup>. I do not think we can treat these statements as pointing to true nomadism; they seem to suggest what in the fourth edition of *Notes and Queries* (p. 162) is called "seasonal nomadism"; there can hardly be any question of true nomadism in tiny islands with long lists of successive reigning kings of those islands, as had one or two of the Paumotuan and perhaps others.

The island from which the greater part of our information has been obtained is Mangareva, or Gambier Island, at the extreme south-eastern end of the archipelago. This, like many of the others, is really a cluster of islets, surrounded, or partly so, by a reef. What appears to be a good map of it is provided by Cuzent<sup>3</sup>. The names of the islets are given by him and others<sup>4</sup> with different spellings, but I shall adopt the spellings given by Brigham, describing the relative positions of the

<sup>1</sup> *Rovings*, vol. 1, p. 258.

<sup>3</sup> Cuzent, *V.I.G.* facing p. 32.

<sup>2</sup> Caillot, *L.P.O.* p. 48.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* and *A.P.F.* vol. ix, p. 15.

islands as shown in Cuzent's map, and I shall adopt these spellings in subsequent pages. To the north is the main island of Mangareva; to the south-west of, and very near to, this island is Taravai, with the small islet of Angakanitai close to it; to the south-east of Mangareva are Aukena and Akamaru; and south of all these are some little islets whose names I need not give.

Caillot gives two lists, marked 1 and 2, of the successive kings of Mangareva<sup>1</sup>; these agree with each other as regards the last ten names, but in the earlier parts they are quite different; each of them contains altogether about thirty-five names. Smith provides a list which is almost identical with Caillot's list No. 1<sup>2</sup>. In some of the more recent successions Smith states that they have been from father to son; but, as he says, in most cases he does not know if this was so. The first four names in Caillot's list No. 1 are Atumotua, Atumoana, Tangaroa and Tangaroa-hurupapa; but Caillot says that it was not so much to the first three, but rather to the fourth, that the people prayed, he being regarded as *par excellence* the true king of Mangareva<sup>3</sup>. The first name in list No. 2 is Atea, the well known Eastern Polynesian god, and there is no mention of Tangaroa.

Our knowledge of the political system of the Mangarevan cluster is but scanty, and it is best explained by first referring to certain traditions, though I shall only do this very shortly. One of these stories begins with a chief, called Anua Motua, of Avaiki, and I must point out the uncertainty as to the place with which this name might be identified. It might be the original home, say in India or the Indonesian archipelago; it might be—say Savai'i (Samoa), or Ra'iatea (Society Islands). It is said, however, that in the Paumotu the island of Fakarava used to be called Havaiki<sup>4</sup>; and as this island was near the extreme north-west of the Paumotuan archipelago, very near to the Society Islands, it might well be that a migration from the west had reached it first, and moved from there south-east, ultimately reaching Mangareva, and that it is to Fakarava that the term Avaiki, used in the legend, must be attributed. The term was widely used in Polynesia to represent that unknown place, the home of the gods, and the destination of the souls of the dead.

<sup>1</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, p. 236.

<sup>2</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. XXVII, pp. 130 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, p. 153.

<sup>4</sup> Young, *J.P.S.* vol. VII, p. 109. Caillot, *Mythes*, p. 11, note 1.

According to the story it was in the reign of the Mangarevan king Taratahi [whose name does not appear in Caillot's No. 1 (Tangaroa) list, but is the seventh from the top in his No. 2 (Atea) list] that a chief of Avaiki, called Anua Motua, came from that country with his family and warriors, and settled in the Mangarevan group, touching first at the island of Taravai, where they stayed some time, and then went to the island of Mangareva. His son Matangiakaparo, by his favourite wife, spoken of in the story as the first prince, did not live long, but he left a son Rikitea, who was brought up by his grandfather Anua Motua, whose family was so considerable that, together with his warriors, it assumed the proportions of a tribe, and was still further developed by alliances with other chiefs of the archipelago [meaning, I think, the Mangarevan cluster]. This so frightened King Taratahi that he with his people fled from the island, and Anua Motua proclaimed himself king. His power was augmented by the important submission of the head of the warriors of Taku [shown in the map to be on the north-western coast of the island], and from that time Anua Motua, freed from all his rivals, reigned peacefully over the whole Mangarevan archipelago. After about fifteen years, he started on a great voyage, first proclaiming his grandson Rikitea king of Mangareva, and placed his (Anua Motua's) son Hoi as ruler at Taku. The name of the capital of Mangareva had been Angauru; but Rikitea substituted for it his own name, and this name appears in the map on the south-eastern coast of the island [In the No. 2 (Atea) list of kings the names Anua Motua, Matangiakaparo and Rikitea appear in succession, immediately after that of Taratahi.] Then follows a long account of the expedition of Anua Motua and his party. They reached Pitcairn Island, and, wishing to populate it, Anua Motua left there a daughter and her husband to rule over it, and warriors and women to be their subjects. A similar plan was adopted, according to one version, at Elizabeth Island [shown in Stanford's Pacific map as being near Pitcairn Island], then, passing Ducie Island [see same map], they made for Easter Island, said to have been the principal object of the voyage, but which they did not find, and got further south, where they were cold and shivering. They then turned back and finally reached Easter Island, apparently uninhabited, where they landed and settled down, and where Anua Motua lived and ruled for some years. Then Anua Motua arranged for the division to be made of his

kingdom. He gave Mangareva to his grandson Rikitea and Taku to his son Hoi. [These bequests were consistent with the arrangement he had made when he left the island. Taku, under Hoi, would presumably be subject to the over-rule of Rikitea as king of the whole island.] Then he made a distribution among his other sons and daughters; one of them got the island of Taravai; another the island of Aukena; another the island of Akamaru; to the others he gave places, some of which appear as villages in the map of the island of Mangareva, though I cannot identify the rest. The remainder of the story has no bearing upon the constitution of Mangareva<sup>1</sup>. This tradition is obviously based on the idea that the dominions of Anua Motua included all the islands of the Mangarevan group, and the gifts of the islands other than Mangareva may well have been subject, as I imagine it must have been with Taku, to the over-rule of Rikitea.

The name Tamakeu is the twenty-second from the beginning in the No. 1 (Tangaroa) list of the kings of Mangareva, and three places below it we find the name Apeiti; neither of them appears in the No. 2 (Atea) list. According to another story Tautairiki, then the ruler of the island of Taravai had among his relatives a lady called Taoteetuateorea. She was the granddaughter of king Tamakeu of Mangareva, and was the wife of Apeiti, the king of Angauru [the original name of the south-eastern capital of the island, afterwards altered, as above mentioned, to Rikitea]. She was very beautiful, and Turia, one of the warriors of Taku [the village put in charge of Hoi] tried to seduce her, but failing in this, he succeeded in getting possession of her and kept her for several nights. Afterwards he treated her very badly and finally killed her and her child [this could not have been his child; but it is not stated that it was that of Apeiti] and their bodies were cooked and eaten by him and his people. This raised a cry for vengeance on the part of Angauru and Taravai. The story of what then happened may be summarized by saying that the people of Taku were invited by Apeiti to come and feast with those of Angauru and Taravai, assembled at Angauru (Rikitea), and on their arrival, were treacherously attacked by their hosts, and all of them killed<sup>2</sup>. Then again, according to another story, Apeiti engaged in subsequent warfare with the Taku people, in order to destroy them, and become and remain sole master of the whole of the

<sup>1</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, pp. 194-212.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 177-83.

island of Mangareva, and defeated them utterly. Most of those who were not killed were allowed to leave the island, and those who remained became, so to speak, the slaves of Apeiti<sup>1</sup>. Smith refers to Apeiti as the conqueror of Taku, and says that under him were carried out the great migrations by which other islands of the Paumotu were peopled<sup>2</sup>.

The next story relates to a relatively recent period—say the beginning of last century, or the latter part of the century before. It says that king Temangi-Tutavake, whose name appears as Mangitutavake in both the lists, went fishing with his people, and on his return found his throne occupied by Teitiatua, a person whom I have not been able to identify. So he fled from the island with his wife and two sons, called the white king and the black king, and his other people, and landed on the island of Taravai, where he left his two sons, and then sailed away, and the queen of Taravai took the boys to her house, and brought them up. Later, when they were older, the queen told them to return and take possession of their throne at Mangareva. There is a long account of their subsequent doings, which I may summarize by saying that on arrival in Mangareva they were found by an old man, who turned out to be an ancestor, under whose direction they went to Angauru [the capital, Rikitea], where they were received with joy by another ancestor—their grandfather—named Akaema, who bathed the young men with water from a stream, and anointed their bodies with coconut oil. Then they, by Akaema's instructions, stole some fish and *popoi* [prepared food], which had been brought home and laid in the king's house by Teitiatua and his people (who had been away on a fishing expedition, from which they had just come back), and returned with them to Akaema's house, whereupon he told them that the throne was won. How this success was accomplished is not explained, for there is no mention of any fighting; but it was said that from this moment the royal power was taken from Teitiatua, who thereupon went to Taku. Finally Akaema made his two grandsons sit on the seats of the king, and then the royal power belonged to them. The whole population received the two men as kings of Mangareva; but Teakarikitea, the white king, was little more than king by name, and it was his younger brother, Akarikipangu, the black king, who exercised the authority; I notice, however, as to this that it is the former name that appears in

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 184-93

<sup>2</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. xxvii, p. 130.

both lists as succeeding Mangitutavake, and the latter name does not appear in either list. These two kings died, the white king leaving a son Teoa, and the black king a son Temahuru, and the throne was then occupied by these two sons, but here again only the name Teoa appears in the two lists<sup>1</sup>. In the case of this story Teitiatuao was probably a usurper, and as, on the appearance of the white and black kings, he went to Taku, we may believe that he was a chief of that place. The royal sanctity would probably, according to certain Polynesian beliefs, which I cannot discuss here, be thought to pass to these two kings by virtue of the process of bathing in water and anointing with oil, and this would perhaps account for the retirement of the usurper without a fight; and the seizure of the food would be an act of assertion of their royal rights.

Caillot narrates further traditions of an effort to dethrone Teoa made by a man Mataira, of whom we are told nothing, but who may possibly have been another chief of Taku striving for the kingship, and of subsequent fighting by Mateoa, son and successor of Teoa<sup>2</sup>; but there is nothing in these tales which throws any further light on the question of the political system of Mangareva.

The French missionaries were told the names of about fifty kings of Mangareva, and it was said there were others whose names had been forgotten<sup>3</sup>. Hale speaks of a genealogy of the chiefs of Mangareva. It contained the names of twenty-seven kings, the first of whom, Teatumoana, or Lord of the Sea, was supposed to have been the original ancestor, from whom "all the inhabitants of the land" were descended. There was after him an "unbroken" line—by which I gather he means a line of family succession—until the ninth king, who was succeeded by his son-in-law. The latter was not, it would appear, acknowledged by many of the chiefs, civil war broke out, and the son-in-law was killed. His son and afterwards his grandson appear to have succeeded him; but it was thought their reigns were short and perhaps merely nominal; and then again civil war broke out which placed one of the chief combatants in possession of supreme power. His name was No. 13 in the list. Mention is made of subsequent disturbances, and we are then told that the reigning chief in Hale's time (1838-42), named Maputeoa [it is the last name in both of Caillot's lists] was the

<sup>1</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, pp. 213-25.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 226-32.

<sup>3</sup> *A.P.F.* vol. xiv, pp. 331 sq.

fourteenth in a direct line from No. 13<sup>1</sup>. D'Urville says that this Maputeoa had absolute authority over all the inhabitants of the island, excepting his four uncles, who shared the land with him and whose dependence on him was only formal<sup>2</sup>. It is stated that one of these uncles was the high priest<sup>3</sup>.

A little more traditional material is supplied by the French missionaries<sup>4</sup>; but this also does not give us any further insight into the matter. There are also a few references by writers which help us in identifying the names of some of the kings<sup>5</sup>.

In discussing the traditions summarized in the previous pages I shall disregard Hale's slight and somewhat indefinite information, and confine myself to the contents of the more detailed accounts. I may point out, however, that the Teatumoana, mentioned by Hale, is the same as Atumoana appearing in Caillot's list No. 1.

The traditions, if considered broadly, disclose an earlier population of the island of Mangareva, with a chief Taratahi, whose residence was apparently at Angauru (afterwards named Rikitea) on the south-eastern coast, and another chief at Taku, on the north-western coast; but we do not know whether each of these chiefs was independent of the other, or one of them (the chief of Taku?) was a sub-chief. Then came from Avaiki the chief Anua Motua with his people; Taratahi and his people fled from the island; the Taku chief submitted; Anua Motua reigned without dispute over the entire island, and, it is said, the other islands of the Mangarevan cluster; and there is no indication of the return of the previous chiefs or their descendants to power. Anua Motua appears as a bold adventurer of the seas, sailing from island to island in the region of the south-eastern Paumotuan islands, getting even to Easter Island, and establishing populations in some of them; and we have a statement that a subsequent king of Mangareva (Apeiti) carried out great migrations by which others of the Paumotuan islands were populated. All this would be well in accord with the idea that these people were a group of the migrants whom I have discussed in previous chapters, calling them for shortness the Tangaroans. Then there is the tradition of Anua Motua's "will," by which he parcelled out the island of Mangareva and other islands of the cluster among his children, a tradition

<sup>1</sup> Hale, pp. 139 sq.

<sup>2</sup> D'Urville, *V.P.S.* vol. II, i, p. 433.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 152.

<sup>4</sup> *A.P.F.* vol. XIV, pp. 222-5.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* vol. IX, pp. 174, 176; d'Urville, *V.P.S.* vol. I, p. 166, vol. II, i, pp. 141-152, 165 sq., 358; Cuzent, *V.I.G.* p. 117; Smith *J.P.S.* vol. XXVII, p. 129.

which at once calls to mind that of the will of the Tangaroan Pili of Samoa.

Let us assume for the moment that these newcomers were Tangaroans, and look at Caillot's two lists of kings in the light of this supposition, bearing in mind my contention that Tangaroa was the great god of the Tangaroans, and that some of the Samoan traditions and genealogies were of a competitive character—the Tangaroans and the pre-Tangaroans each trying to assert their superiority. It will be noticed that Caillot's list No. 1 of kings begins with Atumotua, after whom comes Atumoana, then Tangaroa, and then Tangaroa-hurupapa, and the name of Anua Motua does not appear in it; his list No. 2, on the other hand, begins with Atea (the well known eastern Polynesian deity), who, according to my views would be a pre-Tangaroan god, whilst six names below this name is Taratahi, who, according to the tradition, was driven out by Anua Motua, and whose name is followed by that of Anua Motua, and then by those of Matangiakaparo and Rikitea, said in the tradition to have been his son and grandson. Now *atua* means a god—a supernatural being; *motua* or *matua* means a parent or old person; *moana* means the sea; and Tregear, in his dictionary gives the word *anu* as being (in New Zealand) a mythological term for "space," and as an illustration says that many deities are included in *te-tini-o-te-anu*, "the multitude of space." It is perhaps possible that the word *anu*, meaning cold or coldness, is to be associated with the idea of the coldness of the great space of *po* or *avaiki*.

If we apply these meanings to the two lists, we may arrive at the following interpretations. The No. 1 list of kings begins with Atumotua, the original divine parent, followed by Atumoana, a god associated with the sea (the conception of whom might well be connected with the sea-voyages of the Tangaroans) who is again followed by Tangaroa. The No. 2 list begins with the pre-Tangaroan god Atea, followed by a number of other kings, the last of whom, Taratahi, was driven out of the island by the stranger Anua Motua, spoken of as the old man or ancestor, who had appeared out of space, a descriptive name well in accord with the statement in the tradition that he had been a chief of *Avaiki*. I suggest that Atumotua (the god Motua) of the list No. 1 and Anua Motua (Motua who came from space) of the list No. 2 may have represented the same traditional being. If this was so, we have material for comparing



the two lists. I suggest that perhaps the list No. 1 was of Tangaroan origin, and so disregarded Atea and the alleged pre-Tangaroan kings, and began with what may be regarded as an original Tangaroan dynasty; whereas the list No. 2 was of pre-Tangaroan origin, started with their god Atea, gave a list of pre-Tangaroan kings, and then recorded the reign of the Tangaroan Anua Motua said to have come from *Avaiki*, and so was in accord with the tradition of his seizure of and succession to the throne, followed by his son and grandson.

In connection with this matter I may also point out that if, as appears probable, the Tangaroans remained more or less dominant in the island of Mangareva, the ancient royal seat of Angauru would probably be occupied by their kings, and the traditions indicate that this was so; and as to this I may say that the place to which the white king and black king were taken by their grandfather Akaema to be enthroned, and where they then sat on the royal seats, is stated in the legend to have been Marautangaroa, at Angauru (Rikitea)<sup>1</sup>. It seems clear from this name, the latter part of which is Tangaroa, that at the period referred to, or later, this place was associated specially with the god Tangaroa, and from this we may, I think, assume that the kings of the period in question regarded Tangaroa as the great god of their people, or of their royal family; but we cannot, from this isolated item, assume anything as to the time when that worship had commenced, and in particular that it had not prevailed before, say, the period of Anua Motua<sup>2</sup>.

Even assuming that my suggestions as to pre-Tangaroans and Tangaroans in Mangareva are correct, it is probable that both these groups would continue to form part of the population of the island, though the power in Rikitea had passed to the Tangaroans and extended, as I imagine, more or less over the whole of Mangareva. The central seat of government remained at Rikitea, but the power exercised elsewhere in the island seems to have been somewhat limited, and Taku in particular was a centre of competitive opposition which, in the later days, may have been, not by pre-Tangaroan peoples, but by Tangaroan sub-chiefs. Caillot describes the situation during the reign of Mapurure (Mateoa), whose name appears next after that of Teoa in both his lists, and whose reign was, according to him,

<sup>1</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, p. 221.

<sup>2</sup> The enthronement would properly take place at a *marae* or temple, where the seats would be; and its name may have been *marae* Tangaroa.

in the beginning of the nineteenth century<sup>1</sup>, whilst d'Urville says he was chief of Mangareva when Beechey visited the island<sup>2</sup>—that is, A.D. 1825–8. Caillot says, as regards both Mangareva and the other islands of the Mangarevan cluster, that at this time there were, on the islands of Taravai, Akamaru and Aukena, kings who were vassals to the king of Rikitea in Mangareva; but their vassalship was rather nominal than actual, and from time to time they did not stand on ceremony in making war on their suzerain. Absolute unity in the Mangarevan archipelago was very rarely achieved, and did not endure beyond the time of him who established it, the kings and chiefs being ambitious, and there being much jealousy among the different groups. No security existed in the islands, and the people of an island could not even go to the district of a state other than their own, without running the risk of being killed and eaten; thus the inhabitants of Rikitea and Taku respectively could not do this<sup>3</sup>. Then, as regards the competition between Rikitea and Taku, he says that for ages past these two districts had formed independent states, and at the time of the struggle between Apeiti of Rikitea and the Taku chief, all the islands of the group were under the domination of one or the other. Each sought to establish his superiority over the whole island; and their jealous rivalry revealed itself on all occasions by hostile acts, private quarrels giving birth to public quarrels and wars. Even after a victory the victor never succeeded in establishing his superiority over the other in a definite way<sup>4</sup>. Moerenhout and others refer to a great chief or king, who ruled over the whole group<sup>5</sup>; but this must probably be read in the sense described above.

The island of Taravai, however, appears to have had more close relationship with the Rikitea kings. Caillot says that the kings of Taravai were relations, and almost always allies of the kings of Rikitea; and that through this relationship they might have inherited from the latter, and so acquired the throne of Mangareva<sup>6</sup>. We have seen what is perhaps an indication of the beginning of this in the tradition of Anua Motua, in which case the relationship must have been of long standing; and we find signs of its continuance in the relationship disclosed by, and the co-operation in war narrated in the account of the fighting

<sup>1</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, p. 234.

<sup>2</sup> D'Urville, *V.P.S.* vol. II, i, p. 165.

<sup>3</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, pp. 234 sq.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 177 sq.

<sup>5</sup> Moerenhout, vol. I, p. 110. *A.P.F.* vol. IX, pp. 147, 174, 176.

<sup>6</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, p. 237; cf. p. 234 note 1. *A.P.F.* vol. IX, pp. 174, 176.

by Apeiti (of Rikitea) and the Taravai people against Taku, and in the commencement of the story of the white and black kings. Also the little islet of Angakanitai was a dependency of Taravai<sup>1</sup>; and there are statements that this island was a place of sepulture for the Mangarevan kings<sup>2</sup> and that some of the kings of Rikitea and all the kings of Taravai were buried there<sup>3</sup>; and that it was at a *marae* there that the hair of a king of Rikitea and Taravai was cut<sup>4</sup>. These statements are, I think, highly suggestive of a close relationship, both social and political, between the two ruling families, of which that of Rikitea would be the head.

The two sons of king Temangi-Tutavake, who succeeded him to the throne, were called the white king and the black king. This may imply something or nothing; but I draw attention to the indications, referred to in a previous page, of a "Melanesian" strain in some of the Marquesan islands, and to the south of them, which latter might well have been somewhere in the Paumotu. It is just possible that we have here something touching the same matter; perhaps the two brothers were sons of the king by different mothers, and the mother of the black king had in her "Melanesian" blood which her son inherited.

Cuzent gives a list of the villages of the island of Mangareva; they include "the principal village" Mangareva or Rikitea, and others less important, of which Taku is one, and their positions are shown in his map<sup>5</sup>.

I now leave the Mangareva cluster and pass to some of the islands of the central and northern and north-western areas of the Paumotu archipelago, and begin with a tradition. This relates to Moeava, spoken of as the greatest hero of the Paumotu group, renowned in all the islands of the archipelago, born twenty generations ago in the island of Takaroa (Takapua), his father being a man of Hao island and his mother of Takaroa<sup>6</sup>; I will only give the story in very brief outline. Moeava, whose home was evidently in Takaroa, had an elder brother Tangaroa, and the latter had four sons, Tangihia-ariki, Parepare, Rongotama and Reipu, and a daughter Tu-tapu-hoa-atua, but they were left orphans in early life, and were adopted by Moeava.

<sup>1</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, p. 213 note 1.

<sup>2</sup> Cuzent, *V.I.G.* p. 32.

<sup>3</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, p. 125 note 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 175 note 2. (This would probably be to secure the cut hair from hostile use in sorcery.)

<sup>5</sup> Cuzent, *V.I.G.* p. 33.

<sup>6</sup> Takaroa and Napuka (which will be mentioned) are two of the most northerly islands. Hao or Hau (Bow Island) is one of the central islands of the group.

He (Moeava) was a great voyager, and visited all the surrounding archipelagoes [evidently meaning clusters of islets], among which was Napuka, where he married, and had a son Kehauri. He then returned to Takaroa with his wife and son Kehauri; but disputes arose between Kehauri and the children of Tangaroa, who were proud of their seniority and despised the cousin born in Napuka. This culminated in a quarrel arising from the giving by Moeava of the head of a turtle to Tangihia, as the eldest of the family, the *ariki* or king of Takaroa and owner of the *marae* there. Kehauri had demanded the head of the turtle, but he was met by the reply that if he claimed this honour, he must go to his own *marae* at Napuka, where he was at home and master. In consequence of this trouble Moeava and his wife and son returned to Napuka; and in his absence a descent was made on the island of Takaroa by a league of his enemies, composed of all the peoples of the north-western and central islands of the Paumotu and including apparently some from the Marquesas. They ravaged the island and Tangaroa's three eldest sons were killed, cooked and eaten; but Reipu and the daughter Tu-tapu-hoa-atua escaped and hid. The tribe of Tautu, however, refused to take part in the massacre or to partake of the cannibal feast. Passing over details, in which birds come in as messengers, the legend says that all the invaders left the island, except Tautu (evidently the head of the tribe of that name) and his daughter Rangahua. Reipu and Rangahua married, and she became pregnant. Then by the advice of Reipu, who feared for the life of Rangahua and her father Tautu if they remained at Takaroa, and to avoid the vengeance of Moeava they returned to Hikueru [an island close to Hao], from which I presume that this was their home. Then Moeava returned, sought out everywhere and found his enemies, defeated and massacred them; after which all their islands, without exception, were brought under his powerful domination, and for the rest of his days he lived quietly at Takaroa<sup>1</sup>.

According to the tradition given above, the father of Tangaroa and Moeava was a Hao man; and this island had a tradition as to one Munanui, who was regarded as being very sacred. It was said that he was a big man with a strong body, and he could hold four men's heads in his hands; and that he possessed *mana*, derived from an evil spirit, and knew what passed everywhere. There were other great men in the island,

<sup>1</sup> Audran, *J.P.S.* vol. xxvii, pp. 26-35.

but Munanui, owing to the power coming to him from the evil spirits, his strength of body, and the large number of people under his dominion, dominated also over these other strong men. His name spread to other Paumotuan islands, and in consequence Kaki, a chief from another island, came with his war canoes, and Munanui assembled his men to meet the other in battle. In the fighting Munanui took men of the enemy, four at a time, and tore them to pieces; and Kaki was defeated, and fled with the few men left to him. It is said that Munanui was venerated in Hao and some of the other Paumotuan islands<sup>1</sup>. In a very long genealogical list of the kings of Hao, going back to mythical times, and beginning with Tiki and Hina, the name Munanui appears, and seven generations later (the successions appear in the list as having passed from parents to children) comes the name Moeava<sup>2</sup> who may have been the voyager mentioned above, or a member of the same family.

Belcher (1840) says that the Bow [Hao] islanders did not appear to have any chief among them, but by common consent submitted, probably to the best and oldest present<sup>3</sup>; this statement may point to a lack of signs of visible domination during his visit, but the reference to the "best and oldest present" seems to have been merely a surmise of his own.

The island of Anaa, commonly called Chain Island, is one of the north-western group, and it is one of the islands of that group nearest to Tahiti. Hale (1838-42) says that the people acknowledged no king; but had several chiefs who owed their influence to birth, valour, etc.<sup>4</sup>. The people of Anaa had in relatively modern times acquired by conquest sway over a great part, or the whole, of the north-western group, excluding Hao and islands south-east of it; they had begun to acquire this at the beginning of the nineteenth century, attacking one island after another, destroying most of the inhabitants, and carrying the remainder to their own island as slaves<sup>5</sup>. For some time, however, the Anaa people were under some control of the Pomares of Tahiti. This was the position in 1802-3 when, according to Turnbull the island was governed by a deputy sent by Pomare; and Turnbull saw the large double canoe which

<sup>1</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, pp. 31-40.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 7-16.

<sup>3</sup> Belcher, vol. I, p. 375.

<sup>4</sup> Hale, p. 35.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* Cf. Moerenhout, vol. II, pp. 370 sq. *Rovings*, vol. I, p. 260. Corney, *Tahiti*, vol. II, p. 117. *A.P.F.* vol. X, p. 208. Fitzroy, vol. II, p. 518. Young, *J.P.S.* vol. VII, p. 268. De Bovis, pp. 222, 251. Caillot, *Ann. hydro.* vol. XXI, pp. 180 sq.

had been sent from Tahiti to collect tribute<sup>1</sup>. Hale suggests, however, that the subjection was (1838-42) merely nominal, the Tahitians being in some awe of these fierce and warlike neighbours<sup>2</sup>. It will be remembered that the Pomare family were of partly Paumotuan blood; and this may have been a factor which helped to secure some form of supremacy. Smith gives a list of four districts into which Anaa was divided<sup>3</sup>.

I have explained my reasons for suggesting that in the Mangarevan cluster, at the south-eastern extremity of the Paumotuan archipelago, the people of a prior cult of the pre-Tangaroan god, as I regard him, *Atea* had been conquered and dominated by an invading body of Tangaroans. A tradition from the northern extremity has told us of two brothers Tangaroa and Moeava, living in the island of Takaroa (which is the same as Tangaroa), of whom Moeava was a great voyager and hero of wide-spread repute in the Paumotu, who defeated a combination of enemies from all the north-western and central islands, and secured domination over these islands, a tradition which is in no way touched by the statement as to the power obtained by Anaa in modern times. Then we have seen that the island of Hao, stated to have been the home of the father of Tangaroa and Moeava, had its great fighting traditions, and there is ground for suspecting that the great fighting chief Munanui of Hao, and the family of Tangaroa and Moeava of Takaroa were related. It may then be that we may see in these Paumotuan islands indications of a powerful conquering body of Tangaroans, though we have no indication, as regards them, of the worship of the people whom they conquered.

All this leads me to draw attention to a few references to the cults in this part of the Pacific of *Atea* (or *Vatea*), *Tane* and *Tangaroa*, all of whom were well known Polynesian gods, though the worship of *Atea* was apparently a cult of the eastern islands of the Pacific. A creation myth known in some of the islands, especially apparently *Takoto*, one of the central Paumotuan islands, and *Fangatau*, which I cannot identify, told by *Montiton*, begins with the close embrace of the sky and earth, and of internal fighting among some of their children, and then refers to the escape of *Oatea* [*Atea*], and his subsequent attempts to kill his brother *Tane*, who escaped by an

<sup>1</sup> Turnbull, p. 262. Cf. Moerenhout, vol. II, p. 372; d'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. I, p. 520.

<sup>2</sup> Hale, p. 35.

<sup>3</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. XII, p. 240.

ill guarded hole of the sun and went to hide above the sky. After some time he decided to come down and fight Oatea, and enlisted the help of his people to make a passage through the covering cloak or stratum (*capote*) over the sky, one of these helpers being Tangaroa; and finally Tane smashed a hole in it with large stones, through which he descended, and with the noise of thunder hurled himself on earth in search of his antagonist. He then raised the firmament to a certain height to give himself more fighting space, and finally caught and killed Oatea, the powerful spirits of the sky having meanwhile hidden themselves in terror. Tane was then sole master in heaven and on earth. He had the skies lifted to their ultimate position and propped up by these spirits, working under his directions, after which he mounted to their highest part, and trampled them with a noise which wakened and rejoiced all his ancestors, and finally established his throne on eternal bases and reigned alone as sovereign master of all things<sup>1</sup>. According to another account by Caillot, obtained in Hao island, it was Vatea who made the earth and sky, and all that was in them, including the first man, Tiki, the earth being flat and the sky joined to it, Tane who raised it up, and Tangaroa who kept it up<sup>2</sup>; and a somewhat similar belief seems to have prevailed in Makemo, one of the more northerly of the central islands<sup>3</sup>. A belief is reported from Mangareva that Tea, that is, I imagine, Atea, had created the water, the wind, and the sun<sup>4</sup>. According to another Mangarevan belief the three first gods of the people Atu-Motua, Atu-Moana, and Atea-Tangaroa, to whom I have referred in a previous page, had created the universe and all it includes<sup>5</sup>. Moerenhout says Tangaroa was one of the principal gods of Mangareva<sup>6</sup> and speaks of dim ideas in that island attributing creation to Tangaroa<sup>7</sup>.

These legends seem to disclose conflicting cults of Atea, Tane and Tangaroa, each of them having been regarded by some people as the head of their Olympus<sup>8</sup>. We then have statements from both Hao and Makemo that they had three gods, Atea, Tane and Tangaroa<sup>9</sup>, by which I imagine was meant that these were their principal deities, as there were a

<sup>1</sup> Montiton, vol. VI, pp. 342 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, pp. 7 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 22.

<sup>4</sup> *A.P.F.* vol. XXIV, p. 332.

<sup>5</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, p. 154.

<sup>6</sup> Moerenhout, vol. I, p. 110.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 557.

<sup>8</sup> Notice that, in the account of the fighting between Tane and Atea, Tangaroa appears as merely an assistant, working under the orders of Tane.

<sup>9</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, pp. 7, 22.

number of others. Tane seems to have held, so far as actual worship was concerned, as distinguished from mere traditions, the most prominent position among them, at all events in some of the islands. It has been said—apparently Anaa was the island from which the information was obtained—that it was Tane who caused vegetation to grow and disclosed the sources of history<sup>1</sup>. Montiton, who seems to have collected his material mainly in Takoto and Fangatau, says that, on a child being born, the high priest would pray to Tane, king of heaven and master of life, to preserve it; that at the incision ceremony the high priest prayed to Tane to make the boy a strong and robust man; and that at a wedding ceremony he addressed prayers to Tane, master of life<sup>2</sup>. On the other hand, it seems, according to a legend, that, at one time at all events, on the birth of a child in Mangareva, they prayed to Tangaroa<sup>3</sup>. Montiton speaks of Tane as having been apparently the Oceanic Jupiter<sup>4</sup>. Percy Smith, in an introductory note to some Paumotuian chants, sung at the birth of a high chief, draws attention to the fact that the first god mentioned is Tane, whilst Tangaroa has no important place, and associates the difference to the latter having been a more modern god, at all events to many branches of the race<sup>5</sup>, by which I suppose he means the Polynesians. My ideas on this subject, as affecting Mangareva, have been seen in the discussion of the traditions and lists of kings of that island; I think the relative priority or prominence given to one god or another would often depend on the cult of the people who recognized the tradition. I must also point out that an apparent priority of another god to Tangaroa in one of the eastern island groups does not necessarily point to priority in the Pacific.

These traditions and references disclose three cults of Atea and Tane, who, according to my ideas, would be pre-Tangaroan gods, and Tangaroa whom I associate with the Tangaroans. Our knowledge of the worship of Atea in the Paumotu is not sufficient to enable us to say much about him; but in the cases of Tane and Tangaroa we are able to view the evidence in the light of information we have obtained from the Society Islands, closely adjacent to the north-westerly islands of the Paumotu archipelago. It seems pretty clear that Tane, Atea and Tan-

<sup>1</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. XII, p. 239.

<sup>3</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, p. 149.

<sup>5</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. XII, p. 221.

<sup>2</sup> Montiton, vol. VI, p. 491.

<sup>4</sup> Montiton, vol. VI, p. 366.



garoa were old traditional gods of the Paumotu. The Mangarevan traditions suggest, according to my interpretation of them, an old Atea cult, afterwards more or less overwhelmed by a Tangaroa cult of a body of new comers whose characteristics would be in accord with a belief that they were Tangaroans. In the northern island of Takaroa, which is the same word as Tangaroa, we have the tradition of Moeava, the younger brother of Tangaroa, who was evidently the head chief of this island; and this Moeava, who also seems to have had the exploring and fighting characteristics of the Tangaroans, fought against and defeated a combination of enemies coming apparently from all the central and northern or north-western islands, and even from the Marquesas, and secured domination over the islands. The father of Tangaroa and Moeava was said to have come from Hao Island, and on referring to the traditions of this island we again find a story of powerful fighting men, who, apparently, may have been related to Moeava, attacked from elsewhere, and defeating and destroying their enemies. In some islands—notably apparently Takoto and Fangatau—we find traditions of hostility between Atea and Tane, in which the latter was victorious. I may also point out that the people whom I am calling Tangaroans are those whose exploits were told in the Rarotongan logs, and their descendants, and that Tane and Atea or their worshippers were, as we have seen, apparently the leaders of the migrations recorded in the Marquesan logs.

I have ventured upon some rather speculative developments, in connection with the Society Islands and the Marquesas, of my hypotheses concerning the people whom I am calling the Tangaroans; and I propose to do so again here. I suggest that Atea and Tane were two old pre-Tangaroan gods of the Paumotu Islands, though we cannot say how their respective worships were distributed, except that Atea had perhaps been originally the leading god of Mangareva. I suggest that the islands were afterwards the objects of an incursion or a series of incursions by the Tangaroans, who succeeded to a considerable extent in dominating some of the older inhabitants. The later date to which I assign this Tangaroan development is indicated as regards Mangareva, according to my interpretation, by the traditions. There is no evidence as to this from the north-western islands; but we have seen the indications that in the Society Islands the cult of Tane had probably preceded that

of Tangaroa, in which case it is also probable that this had been so in the adjoining Paumotu. It seems to me that the Paumotuan evidence, like that of the Society Islands and the Marquesas, tends to support, or at least is consistent with, the hypothesis, originally developed in connection with Samoa and Tonga, that it was the Tangaroans who introduced the worship of Tangaroa into the Pacific.

I must, before closing this discussion, refer to the god Tu. I have, in considering Tahiti, drawn attention to the worship of Tu there, and have spoken of his prominence in Mangareva, which may seem inconsistent with the present discussion. I may say, however, that whilst what I have said about Tu is based upon evidence which appears to be reliable, his worship in Mangareva and perhaps the Paumotu group generally seems to have been of later origin, and its prominence has not necessarily any bearing on a discussion, dealing with the conflicting cults of Atea, Tane and Tangaroa.

## CHAPTER X

### POLITICAL AREAS AND SYSTEMS

#### FIJI

AS stated in the preface, I am not treating Fiji as coming within the scope of this book, and am only referring to it in connection with matters concerning which it seems desirable to do so; though it will be difficult throughout the book to determine to what extent this desirability arises. As regards the present subject of political areas and systems, I do not propose to attempt to map out the political areas of the Fijian group, many of which are mainly or purely Melanesian, as I have done those of some of the other islands, and shall content myself with dealing quite shortly with one or two general points.

Lorimer Fison calls attention to the wide differences between the customs of the different parts of the group; but as regards the constitution of a community he selects for explanation Bau, on the eastern coast of the island of Viti Levu, and its immediate dependencies. In the community, as I will call it (adopting Fison's terminology), of Bau there were a number of *koro* or villages, of which the *koro turanga*, or chief village, was the village of Bau. Each *koro* was divided into "quarters," the number of which might be more or fewer than four. In connection with this matter, he says in a note that in some parts of Fiji the *koro* was divided into two sections, separated by a ditch, and subdivided into "quarters," and the head chief of the *koro* was chosen from each section in turn; but unfortunately he does not tell us in which part of Fiji this system prevailed. Returning to a *koro* of the community of Bau, he says that each of its constituent "quarters" belonged to a section of the people of the *koro*, called a *mataqali*, which term, he says, meant in effect a number of men who were twisted together, the inter-twisting being in this case that involved by a common descent. A *mataqali* was composed of the descendants of a *mataveitathini*, or band of brothers, from each of whom was descended a minor division called a *yavusa*, and each *yavusa* might be again subdivided into a number of *vuvale*, consisting of brothers with their families, who inhabited either the same

house, or adjoining houses. That is to say, a number of *vuvale* made up a *yavusa*, a number of *yavusa* made up a *mataqali*, and a number of *mataqali* made up a *koro*. The people of a *koro* were theoretically of common descent, though they were not always actually so<sup>1</sup>.

Young's account of the matter was obtained from a missionary at Lakamba, one of the eastern islands. He apparently uses the term "tribe" with the meaning with which Fison uses the term community. Young begins with the smaller unit of a family or *mataqali* (I shall use the word "family" in quoting him), into which he says every village was divided. The number of families in a village varied from two to ten, and each of them had its chief or head, and other functionaries, so as to make the family constitution complete in itself; each of these chiefs ruled in his own family. Going a step higher, there was a head chief of the village, and the families and their chiefs were subject to him. The next rise above this was the tribe, which would consist of one or several villages. One of these villages was called *koro-turanga*, or chief village, and it was here that the *turanga-levu* or great chief, the head chief of the tribe lived, and he and his family ruled over the rest. The population of the *koro-turanga* was, like the others, divided into families, of which that of the *turanga-levu* was the first, consisting of the several branches of his own family and their dependents. Thus the ruling family not only bore sway in the village of which it was a branch, but also extended its influence among all the subjects of the *turanga-levu*<sup>2</sup>.

It will be seen that, assuming that we can treat Bau, which Fison calls a community, as the equivalent of what Young calls a tribe, the account of the latter is, so far as it goes, in accord with that of the former, and expands it by telling us of the grades of governmental chiefs or heads of groups. The *koro-turanga*, to which both writers refer, may be compared with the *tumua* or *laumua* village districts of Samoa.

Each writer has up to this point, as I understand him, been dealing with a self-contained political organization with a definite connecting entity and unity of mutual interest of its own; but they both also explain what each of them calls a *matanitu* or kingdom. Fison, speaking of Bau, says that there might be, in addition to the *koro* forming the community, one or more *koro* belonging to it, but not of it; they were places

<sup>1</sup> Fison, *J.A.I.* vol. x, pp. 333 *sqq.*

<sup>2</sup> Young, *S.W.* p. 288.

that had been conquered by Bau, or had given themselves up to it. They owed a sort of allegiance to it, but the debt was binding upon them only so long as Bau was strong enough to enforce it. They rendered military service, and made offerings of food and property in time of peace. The latter was in fact tribute, and the people could refuse to pay it whenever they chose to run the risk of doing so, as for instance when political disturbances gave them the chance<sup>1</sup>. Young says that several "tribes" were united to constitute a kingdom; these had no general political bond between each other, except that they served the same master; but often the larger tribes had smaller ones paying tribute to them, as to superiors, and indeed this was very generally the case<sup>2</sup>. Both writers seem to be speaking, partly at all events, of the same thing; but Fison's explanation is the more explicit of the two. Young's kingdom also may have included tribes or communities connected otherwise than by conquest.

Bau, the district discussed by Fison, is, I think, generally recognized as having been in many respects Polynesian in character. Young says that the principal larger kingdoms (by which he evidently refers to his tribal areas with their dependencies) were Bau, Rewa, Thakaundrovi or Somosomo Lakemba, and Mathuata<sup>3</sup>. Of these Rewa was probably very similar ethnically to Bau, of which it was a close neighbour; Somosomo, in the island of Taviuni (to the south-east of Vanua Levu) is in an area which, according to Dr Corney, had a considerable Tongan admixture; Mathuata, on the northern coast of Vanua Levu, is within an area which he describes as a Tongan and Futunan mixture with Melanesian; and Lakemba, one of the eastern islands, is, according to him, the most Tongan centre of the whole Fijian group. We may believe therefore that the political systems we have been considering must be regarded as having had a substantial Polynesian element in the basis of their structure.

There is evidence of the separation of sacred and secular rule in Fiji. Waterhouse says that in Bau the king's town was occupied by chiefs in very large numbers. The sacred king was called *Roko Tui Bau* (the revered king of Bau), and seems to have been connected by office with the gods. He was bound to uphold religion, and to maintain the custom of

<sup>1</sup> Fison, *J.A.I.* vol. x, p. 341.

<sup>2</sup> Young, *S.W.* pp. 288 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 289.

cannibalism. His person was peculiarly sacred. He never personally engaged in war. He alone could wear a turban during the drinking of kava. It was taboo to strangle his widow, though some of the widows of other men were always thus destroyed. It was taboo to cry or make lamentation on the occasion of his death. At his death alone was the conch-shell blown, this being a repetition of the ceremony annually practised on the supposed departure from earth of the Fijian Ceres. Next in rank was the more powerful, though somewhat less sacred king, called *ha-Vu-ni-Valu*—the root of war. He was the commander in times of war, the great state executive officer in seasons of commotion, and the prime minister of all political departments. The *Roko Tui Bau* had to be of the Vusaratu clan, and the Vunivalu of the Tui Kaba clan<sup>1</sup>. Thomson tells us the same thing. His description of the *Roko Tui Bau* is almost word for word as that of Waterhouse; except that he does not refer to connection by office with the gods, and the duty of upholding religion and maintaining cannibalism, but tells us that he was the special patron of the priests. Thomson, however, tells us something more about the *Vu-ni-valu*, who, he says, was at once commander-in-chief and executive sovereign. He never consulted the *Roko Tui Bau* in temporal affairs, and he enjoyed taboo privileges little inferior to those paid to his spiritual suzerain. Thomson also tells us of the clan distinction between the two kings<sup>2</sup>. Additional value is given to Thomson's statement by his discussion, in connection with it, of the dual system in Tonga, a group which he knew well, from which we may infer that he regarded the systems of the two groups as similar. Also he gives comparative information on the subject of the separation of the religious and secular power in other parts of Fiji. He says the process of scission was found in Fiji in every stage of evolution. Among the Melanesian tribes of the interior it had not begun; in Rewa the spiritual *Roko Tui* still wielded the temporal power; in Bau and Thakaundrove he was beginning to lose even the veneration due to his rank<sup>3</sup>. Hocart distinguishes between the sacred title *tui* and the secular title *sau*<sup>4</sup>. From what Thomson tells us above, the former title was that of the sacred king, and we have seen that in Tonga the general name for the secular king was *hau*, which is the equivalent of *sau*.

<sup>1</sup> Waterhouse, pp. 14 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 60 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Thomson, *Fijians*, p. 61.

<sup>4</sup> Hocart, *J.A.I.* vol. XLIX, p. 47.

## NIUE

The island of Niue, or Savage Island, as it is commonly called, lies close to, and a little to the east of the Tongan group. It is roughly oval in shape, its longer sides being the west and east coasts. Like many other Polynesian islands, it has, or has had, more names than one. Smith says that the earliest name was apparently Nuku-tu-taha; another old name was Motu-te-fua, and other names, met with in songs, were Fakahoa-motu and Nuku-tuluea; its proper modern name, used on formal occasions and in songs, is Niue-fekai. Suggestions are given as to the meanings of these names<sup>1</sup>. All the old names were supposed to have been given to the island by Huanaki<sup>2</sup>, to whom I shall refer presently. There is a Government Survey map of the island; but another map, taken from an Admiralty chart, reproduced by Smith<sup>3</sup>, though perhaps not so accurate in outline, is more useful, as it gives more names of villages.

Smith says the people were divided into two main groups. The Tafiti and the Motu, of whom the former occupied the south end of the island, from and including the southern part of the village of Alofi to the village of Liku, and the latter occupied the rest of the island<sup>4</sup>. Alofi is shown on both maps as being about half way up on the western coast, and Liku about half way up near the eastern coast; so it may be said that, roughly, the island was divided by a line running east and west across its centre into two halves, of which the northern part was occupied by the Motu people and the southern part by the Tafiti people. He tells us that these two groups had been constant enemies from time immemorial down to the introduction of Christianity, conflicts being very frequent, though they were not always in a state of war. The people could not tell the origin of the two names, but said the two groups had been so called from very ancient times. Smith remarks that the frequent state of warfare between the groups seems to emphasize the fact of the population having been drawn from two sources. He thinks that the name Motu probably referred to the original migration, or people of the island (*motu*) who came there in very early times, and that the Tafiti people were a later migration coming from the Fiji group, where the Polynesians stayed so long. [That means perhaps a section of the

<sup>1</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. XI, pp. 81 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* vol. XI, p. 80.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* vol. XII, p. 24.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 167 sq.

people whom I have called the Tangaroans.] In process of time these two migrations have become so mixed that they cannot be distinguished from each other, though the distinctive names are still current<sup>1</sup>. "Fiti" is, of course, "Fiji," and Tafiti was a name given to Fiji by the Samoans<sup>2</sup>.

Smith gives us the following translation of an ancient song, sung to a tug-of-war game:

Twist thy muscles to retain  
The meeting place at Paluki.  
Pulls the Motu; pulls the Tafiti;  
Where will they pull it to?

He says that in this there is a reference to the constant struggles between the Motu and Tafiti people<sup>3</sup>. Concerning the mention of Paluki, I may say that though Alofi is now the capital in the sense that the Government Resident's office and the Missionary Station are there, and though the present *patu-iki*, or so-called king, resides at Tuapa, which is shown on the maps as being in the northern part of the island, this last named place has not always, according to Smith, been the "capital" of the island; Paluki near the centre [it is shown on Smith's map as being practically in the centre of the island, on the dividing line from Alofi to Liku] seems to have been the great place in former days, though no one lives there permanently now<sup>4</sup>. I have found a few references which point to the truth of this. There are statements concerning two of the kings of Niue—Ngalianga and Foki-mata—that they were "bathed" at Paluki<sup>5</sup>, these referring to the ceremonies on their installations. I do not know when these kings reigned; but I fancy from the uncertain data that it was probably in about the latter part of the eighteenth century. The following is a translation of a statement by a recent king of the island; "Paluki is our origin, centre; Paluki and Liua-langi are the names of the sacred isle (? wood) of Niue; it was the gathering place of all the island, where they made the *kava-atua*, and prayed for peace in the island"<sup>6</sup>. The words "sacred isle," the translation of which is questioned by Smith, are *motu-tapu*, of which *motu* has a general Polynesian meaning of something cut or broken off and is applied to an island; but Smith points out that with the Maori the word also means a clump of trees, gives reason for thinking that this use of the word was

<sup>1</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. XI, p. 168.

<sup>2</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. XI, p. 217.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 172 sq.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* cf. Turner, p. 12.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 85, 174.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 175.



known in Niue, and suggests that this is the sense in which the word *motu* should here be understood; he says there *was* a clump of tall trees called *motu-tapu* near Paluki<sup>1</sup>. I think he is probably right, and that *motu-tapu* might be translated as "sacred grove" and not "sacred isle"—indeed the context suggests that it was only a place in the island to which it referred. The reference to the divine kava (*kava atua*) and prayer for peace, suggests a *marae* (temple), and the *motu-tapu* would probably be the sacred grove in or near which the *marae* stood; applying this interpretation, the sacred and political importance of Paluki becomes obvious. In another recent chant by a king of Niue and his chiefs, we find a series of addresses to Tangaroa, extolling his glory, and among other things describing him as "the head and leader of the *fono*, making laws precious and sacred as the inner heaven," and special reference is made in this to Paluki, as the spot to which Maui came from dwelling in the sky far away<sup>2</sup>. Here then we have Paluki associated with the god Tangaroa in connection with the *fono* (council) meetings, which at once suggests its great importance; and the idea that Maui had descended to it is highly suggestive of a belief as to its great antiquity—that would probably be the antiquity of its *marae*.

I propose now to turn to some traditions of the island; but as a preliminary to this I will mention some lists of its kings, as I shall have to refer to them. I have before me five of these lists, of which the first three are given by Smith, and the latter two by Thomson. I will distinguish them by letters, thus: *A*<sup>3</sup>, *B*<sup>4</sup>, *C*<sup>5</sup>, *D*<sup>6</sup>, *E*<sup>7</sup>. The names of the kings in lists *A* and *C* are the same; but the information given about them is not so; except as to this the names in the five lists, though more or less the same, are not absolutely so, and do not always appear in the same order.

The recorded tradition which seems to take us furthest back is given by Thomson. Huanaki and Fao, two men, swam from Tonga to Niue. They found the island a mere reef, awash at high water. They stamped upon it, and it rose, flinging the water from its sides. They stamped again, and up sprang the trees and grass; and from a *ti* plant they made a man and a woman, and from these sprang the race of men<sup>8</sup>. There is

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 175 note.

<sup>2</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. XI, pp. 171 *sqq.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 116 *sqq.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* S.I. p. 36.

<sup>2</sup> Tregear, *J.P.S.* vol. IX, pp. 234 *sq.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* vol. XII, pp. 106, 110.

<sup>6</sup> Thomson, *J.A.I.* vol. XXXI, p. 139.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 86.

another version by Smith, more detailed, the *dramatis personae* of which were five gods (*tupua*), including Fao and Huanaki, but it is of the work of these two mainly that the story tells; there are a few features of this version which I must mention. The landing was effected at Motu, which is shown in Smith's map on the eastern shore of the northern section of the island; the origins of the names of the villages of Liku, on the boundary line between the northern and southern sections, and Lakepa, in the northern section, are, like the old names of the island, attributed to these two gods; a likeness of Huanaki is said to have been made of stone at Vai-hoko, on the coast at Mutalau, appearing in Smith's map at the north-eastern corner of the island; the village of Vai-hoko was often called the *kaupu* of Huanaki; at the large rocks a house of stone was built by Huanaki to shelter the people; the likeness and the house (a cave) are recognized up to the present day<sup>1</sup>. The story of these two men, or gods, is also referred to by Turner<sup>2</sup> and by Hood<sup>3</sup>. A noticeable feature of this tradition is that the scenes of it were all in the northern part of the island, the landing having been effected on the eastern coast of that part, and the final dwelling place having been at the extreme north-east corner. According to Tregear's dictionary, *kau* was a Polynesian word for "a troop of persons," and *pu* had a meaning of a company or party of persons; so the term *kaupu* may well have in this case meant the people of Huanaki.

The first name in list *B* of the kings is Tihamau, and he is there stated to have been the first king of Niue; but this name does not appear in any of the other lists. Smith tells us elsewhere about him that he built his house at a spot, the position of which is explained by Smith by reference to a number of names of villages or districts not shown in his map, but which, it is stated, was at the north end of the island. He was the lord of the *male* (plaza) of Fana-kava-tala and Tia-tele and of the stone house built by Huanaki at Vai-hoko<sup>4</sup>. This *male* was, I presume, a *malae* or open space where meetings, etc., were held, as in Samoa and Tonga, but I cannot identify the names associated with it; it is quite possible that the "stone house," which, as we have seen, is said to have been a cave, evidently capable of holding a number of people, and the *male* were near one another, and were regarded as having been associated, and

<sup>1</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. XII, pp. 22-7.

<sup>3</sup> Hood, p. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Turner, p. 304.

<sup>4</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. XII, p. 6.

that the belief was that they had been the central home and seat of governmental control by Huanaki over his people. There is no statement that Tihamau claimed descent from Huanaki; but it seems likely that he was regarded as having been his successor, though not necessarily his immediate successor.

It was during the reign of Tihamau that, according to tradition, Mutalau arrived at the islands. He succeeded in killing Tihamau's lieutenant, and then met Tihamau himself, in the northern part of the island. There was a dispute between them because of Mutalau's coming to the island, but the story does not say what happened next, except that Mutalau went to live at Ulu-lauta at the north end of the island, all we are told being that at a later date the sons of the slain lieutenant made preparations for war against Mutalau and killed him<sup>1</sup>. This Mutalau was said to have been born in Tonga, and to have been the son of a Tongan chief by a Niue woman, who had been swallowed by a whale and carried from Niue to Tonga in its belly<sup>2</sup>. The interest in this story arises from the facts that, though I can find in Smith's map no village of Ulu-lauta, there is in the extreme north-eastern corner, close to Vai-hoko, where the stone house was, the village of Mutalau (already mentioned), and that Mutalau was apparently, as we shall see, the founder of an important group of people. I may also point out that, if he was recognized as being the son of a Niue woman, the fact that it was to this north-eastern corner of the island that he went, suggests perhaps that it was his maternal home, and that he was a relative of Tihamau<sup>3</sup>, in which case any mention hereafter of the "Mutalau people" may refer to a group founded by a relative of Tihamau, and so connect the latter as the first king, with the Mutalau people in later days of the northern section of the island.

As I have said on a previous page, in list *B* the first name is Tihamau, said to have been the first king, and living apparently in the north-eastern corner of the island; but this name does not appear in any of the other lists. Each list gives the names of the other kings, the lists being very similar, and though we are told hardly anything about these kings, Smith tells us where some of them were bathed or anointed—he sometimes uses one term and sometimes the other—and Thomson tells us where they lived, which would probably be the place of bathing

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 6 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 100-2.

<sup>3</sup> This would perhaps account for his being allowed to remain in the island.

or anointment on installation in the sovereignty. We do not know where Tihamau was installed, but we know that he was a northern king. According, however, to Smith's lists *A* and *C* (*B* is silent on the subject), Puni-mata, whose name heads all five lists (subject to the previous introduction in list *B* of Tihamau), and who in Smith's list *A* is described as the first *patu-iki* (king) of the island, was bathed at a place near Hakupu, which is shown in the maps in the extreme south-eastern corner of the island, whilst, according to Thomson, he lived at Hala-fualangi, which, according to Smith's map, was close to Hakupu. I refer again to Smith's statement that the people of Niue were divided into two main groups, the Motu occupying the northern part of the island and the Tafiti the southern part, and his belief that the Motu represented an earlier and the Tafiti a later migration to the island, and point out that what we are told about Tihamau and Puni-mata seems, according to my interpretation of it, to be well in accord with this. One of the lists begins with a king who had lived in the north-eastern corner of the island, and the next king in this list, and the first in all the others, was a king who had lived in the south-eastern corner. It may be that we have here traditions as to the origins of the two groups; and it is possible that list *B*, giving this earlier north-eastern king, was of northern origin, whilst the others had their origin in the south, and so ignored the earlier northern king, the lists having perhaps been, to this extent, as I have suggested in other cases of other islands, more or less competitive in character.

Passing now to the next three of these kings, I have been able to identify from the map the villages where two of them were said to have been installed, or in which they lived, these two being Ngalianga and Foki-mata. List *B* says nothing about this; but each of the other four lists gives Paluki as the place of each of these two kings. We have only to bear in mind Smith's reference to the frequent fighting between the northern and southern groups, and picture a struggle for island domination between two original northern and southern dynasties, in which sometimes one and sometimes the other secured it, in order to realise the possibility that, whichever side was in the ascendancy, this village of Paluki, which was on the border line between the two divisions of the island, would be a convenient place from which the head chief of the victorious party could maintain his control over the other. Lists *A* and *B* both refer

to two candidates for the office of king, their names being bracketed together in the lists, of whom it is said that, as neither of them was approved and accepted by the whole island, neither of them was anointed, and list *A* refers to a period of interregnum, the length of which is not known, but the cause of which would perhaps be inability of the northern and southern halves of the island to agree upon a king.

We find in all the lists, following these earlier kings, the name of Pakieto, who, according to lists *A* and *C*, reigned less than a year, and, according to lists *D* and *E*, was starved to death. After this there was, according to lists *A* and *B*, a period of fighting on the question of the succession, whilst lists *D* and *E* mention an interregnum of 80 years—which probably refers to the same thing. Then, apparently, came king Tuitonga, anointed in 1875, and a couple of subsequent kings. Some information is given to us in list *B* as to the incidents which attended this fighting; but the only point to which I need refer is the introduction into the account of the name Mutalau, which has appeared on a previous page in connection with the early history of the northern part of the island, and is the name of a village in its north-eastern corner. We are told that the people of Mutalau hoped to be able to set up a king for the whole island, and whilst engaged in 1846 in choosing one, they were preparing for war. Then trouble broke out apparently among the Mutalau people themselves. There is a reference to the belief of the missionaries that the Mutalau people would conquer, as they had often conquered in former times, and a list of sixty-one warriors who took part in consulting as to who should be their leader, all of which suggests their importance. Smith says that at this period they were in the ascendant in the island<sup>1</sup>. Subsequently matters seem to have settled down under the rule of Tuitonga, at which period Christianity had been established; but the point to which I draw attention is that the people of Mutalau, who, I have suggested, were perhaps related to the alleged first northern king Tihamau, seem at this later period to have been prominent and important, and to have taken the lead on behalf of the north in its struggles for domination with the south.

The particulars given above seem to disclose a division of the people of the island into two groups, perhaps of definitely different origins, each occupying, or having originally occupied,

<sup>1</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. XII, p. 17.

its own area—one north, and the other south—though they had become mixed, contesting with each other for power; and I will quote a few general references to the matter. Smith says that the rank of *patu-iki*—"chief of chiefs," supreme chief or king—was not hereditary, nor had there, so far as could be ascertained, been a continuous line of kings from ancient times. He thinks the first institution of such a king was due to some outside influence, probably from Tonga or Samoa, and that previously there were only chiefs of families, etc. When the occasion which originated a *patu-iki* arose, one was chosen by the whole of the people from one of the leading families, and subsequently the villages which were the conquerors chose the king, but his election, to be valid, had to be agreed to by all<sup>1</sup>. The kings were not descendants of kings, but were of the families of the conquerors in each generation, and often the island was without kings whilst they were fighting about it<sup>2</sup>. He refers to the chiefs' languages used in Samoa and Tonga, in addressing or speaking of a king, and draws attention to the use of chiefs' words in Niue, which he associates with a Samoan and Tongan origin, and to the paucity of these words in Niue, which he attributes to a relatively recent introduction<sup>3</sup>. Thomson says that the institutions of Niue seem always to have been republican. In ancient times the ruling power was held by the *toa*, or fighting men, and the party that happened to be in the ascendant elected a king to be their mouthpiece. It was a dignity that cost its holder dearly, for the object of the opposition party was invariably to kill the king, and a violent death had come to be so often an appanage of royalty that for 80 years before the introduction of Christianity, and the consequent cessation of warfare, no one could be found willing to undertake the office<sup>4</sup>. Turner says there was no king of Niue when he was there in 1845; he refers to the practice of killing the king, and consequent unwillingness to take office, but he attributes this, not to party rivalries, but to beliefs that the kings caused the fruit to grow, and consequent killing of them in anger in times of scarcity<sup>5</sup>. Brenchley (1865) says the form of government had formerly been aristocratic or feudal; but in a revolt at a comparatively recent period the chiefs were all slain, and so then it had become in some sort patriarchal, the

<sup>1</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. xi, pp. 170 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* vol. xi, pp. 176 sq.

<sup>5</sup> Turner, pp. 304 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* vol. xii, p. 106.

<sup>4</sup> Thomson, *J.A.I.* vol. xxxi, p. 138.

head of each family managing his own affairs as he pleased and coming to an understanding with others, under the missionary's direction, in matters of common interest and in the control and punishment of delinquents<sup>1</sup>. Thomson says that since the missionaries have controlled the island there have been three kings, elected by chiefs of villages, who had themselves been elected by the people<sup>2</sup>. Turner refers to a threefold division of the island<sup>3</sup>. Mrs R. L. Stevenson says the island was governed by a king with the assistance of four chiefs and four sub-chiefs<sup>4</sup>. Goodenough (1873) was taken into consultation as to whether they should or should not have a king<sup>5</sup>.

## ROTUMA

Rotuma is a small island to the north of the Fiji group, and west of Samoa. The main part of the island is roughly oval in shape, extending east and west, but at its western end is a narrow neck, beyond which (further west) the land expands again, forming a sort of head. It was, according to Gardiner, formerly divided into five districts, namely Noatau to the east, Fanguta (afterwards subdivided into two districts, Pepji and Juju) to the south, Ituteu to the west, and Malaha and Oinafa to the north<sup>6</sup>. Gardiner gives a map of the island in vol. 54 of *The Quarterly Geological Journal*; but it does not show this division into districts. Dillon gives the number of districts as six<sup>7</sup>, which, including the two subdivisions of Fanguta as two, agrees with Gardiner. Allen says the people were divided into seven tribes or sections, namely Noatau, Oinafa, Malaha, Ituteu, Itumutu, Fanguta and Pepsei<sup>8</sup>. This list, therefore, agrees with that of Gardiner, except that it treats Pepsei or Pepji as being separate from Fanguta, omits Juju, which perhaps is regarded as part of Fanguta, and adds Itumutu; and when we refer to Allen's map<sup>9</sup>, which shows the positions of the districts enumerated by him, those of Noatau, Malaha, and Oinafa being as stated by Gardiner, we find that Fanguta and Pepsii are side by side on the southern coast; and he shows Juju as a village or sub-district of his Fanguta whilst Ituteu is at the western end of the main island, to the east of the neck, and

<sup>1</sup> Brenchley, pp. 28 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Turner, *19 years*, p. 469.

<sup>3</sup> Goodenough, p. 190. Cf. Moss, p. 12.

<sup>4</sup> Gardiner, *J.A.I.* vol. xxvii, p. 428.

<sup>5</sup> Allen, *A.A.A.S.* vol. vi, p. 571.

<sup>6</sup> Thomson, *J.A.I.*, vol. xxxi, p. 138.

<sup>7</sup> Mrs R. L. Stevenson, p. 16.

<sup>8</sup> Dillon, vol. II, p. 95.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 578.

Itumutu is the head to the west of it. The two lists are therefore practically identical, except that Allen adds this district of Itumutu, which Gardiner perhaps regarded as part of Itoteu.

Gardiner says that the first division made of the island was, according to legendary accounts, between Itoteu and the rest of the island, this having been done to put an end to the disputes of two kings, each of whom claimed dominion over the whole. His explanation of what was supposed to have occurred is not clear; but he refers in it to the subsequent separation of Itomotu (evidently Allen's Itumutu) from Itoteu in a way that suggests that the former still belonged to the latter, and this would be in accord with his inclusion of the one in the other in enumerating the districts<sup>1</sup>.

Goodenough (1875) also divides the island into the same seven districts as does Allen, and gives the names of the chiefs of some of them. He says these divisions came down from old times, and that they had always been independent. No one was higher than another; but the people spoke of the chief of Noatau as being the highest, whilst he himself thought the chief of Itoteu had really the most influence. He was told that they occasionally had a meeting of chiefs, which they called *fou*, and another name, and that before attending this meeting each of the chiefs spoke to his own people, and ascertained their wants. One law prevailed, and an offender was punished by a chief<sup>2</sup>. The reference to the meetings of chiefs, and perhaps that relating to the identity of law, indicate that the districts, even though independent of one another, co-operated in some matters.

Lesson and Hale both thought the number of districts was twenty-four<sup>3</sup>; and the names *ngangatsha* and *hinhangatcha*, which they give to the head chiefs of those districts are evidently the same as the term *ngangaja* applied by Gardiner to the chief of a district. Gardiner insists that Hale was incorrect<sup>4</sup>; and I think the latter must have been referring to what may be regarded as villages. Gardiner's map<sup>5</sup> of the island contains

<sup>1</sup> Gardiner, *J.A.I.* vol. xxvii, p. 428.

<sup>2</sup> Goodenough, p. 315. Cf. *Ann. hydro.* vol. xxxv, p. 544. As regards the statement that no one chief was higher than another, I shall have to refer directly to the sacred chief or *sou*; but we shall see that his office was abolished in about 1870.

<sup>3</sup> Lesson, *Voy.* vol. II, p. 432. Hale, p. 105.

<sup>4</sup> Gardiner, *J.A.I.* vol. xxvii, p. 402.

<sup>5</sup> Gardiner, *Quarterly Geological Journal*, vol. LIV.



thirty-three names; Allen's map<sup>1</sup> gives thirty-one; and an Admiralty chart gives twenty-nine. I think we must regard the names on these maps as referring to the same class of area; and Allen's map shows them as names of places within his districts—which means in effect villages. Names of some of Gardiner's districts appear among the others in all the maps; but it is not uncommon in Polynesia for districts to have within their boundaries villages whose names are identical with those of the districts. There is a statement that the number of districts was twelve, each having a chief<sup>2</sup>; but I cannot co-ordinate this with any of the others.

Each district was subdivided into a number of *hoang*, a term applied to all the houses of a family, placed together, and forming, if the family was a large one, a small village, and also applying to the family itself; and each *hoang* had a name<sup>3</sup>. It is clear that these *hoang* were consanguine families, some of which, perhaps, had increased to such a size as to attain to the dignity of villages. Each of the *hoang* had its *pure*, or head<sup>4</sup>, elected in a way which will be explained hereafter. Each district had its *ngangaja*, or chief, this office always, in any one district, remaining in the same family<sup>5</sup>. The district was ruled by its chief<sup>6</sup>; but its affairs were conducted by a council consisting of the chief and the *pure* of the families within it<sup>7</sup>. The government of the whole island was in the hands of a council of the chiefs of the several districts, "when they were not at war with one another"<sup>8</sup>. The president of this council of the whole island was the chief of whichever of the two districts, Noatau and Fanguta, had conquered the other in the last war. He was called the *fakpure*<sup>9</sup>. Hale gives the names of the different grades of rank (other than the spiritual king) as first the *mamthua* or *mathua* (councillors or elders) and second the *tha-muri* (lower classes)<sup>10</sup>; I cannot identify these ranks with anks given by Gardiner.

I now come to the question of the two offices of temporal chief of the whole island and its spiritual king. The *fakpure*

<sup>1</sup> Allen, *A.A.A.S.* vol. vi, p. 578.

<sup>2</sup> Waitz-Gerland, vol. v, p. 192.

<sup>3</sup> Gardiner, *J.A.I.* vol. xxvii, p. 429.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 428. Cf. Allen *A.A.A.S.* vol. vi, pp. 571, 577.

<sup>6</sup> Dillon, vol. ii, p. 95.

<sup>7</sup> Gardiner, *J.A.I.* vol. xxvii, p. 430.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 428.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* But see statements by Hale (p. 105) and Lesson (*Voy.* vol. ii, p. 432) that the *sou* presided. It may be that he did so nominally, whilst the *fakpure* did the talking.

<sup>10</sup> Hale, p. 105. *Mathua* is evidently the Polynesian *matua* (an old person).

was in effect, so far as his powers as president of the council of chiefs went, the island chief; and the similarity of his position to that of the temporal chief of Mangaia, so far, at all events, as the mode by which he obtained that position is concerned, will be noticed. The system under which he was the chief of one or other of two districts may be compared with that, as interpreted by me, of Tonga.

The spiritual king was, according to Gardiner, called the *sou*<sup>1</sup>. His rank did not, as in each of the cases of Tonga and Mangaia, remain in one family; it was a matter of election, each district appointing in turn, and his period of office lasting for six months though this could be extended<sup>2</sup>, or twenty months according to Lesson and Hale<sup>3</sup>. He had but little to do with the government<sup>4</sup>, and, though he reigned, he had no authority, his chief duty being to get fat<sup>5</sup>. He had to live wherever he was placed by the *fakpure* and other chiefs<sup>6</sup>; and though he was left alone during the three months of the year when there were no great feasts, he was not allowed to relax in any part of his state or go anywhere by himself<sup>7</sup>; but failure to pay proper marks of respect to him would be a cause of war<sup>8</sup>. Allen, describing the *sou*, says he was a sacred king over all Rotuma. He was regarded as a kind of god, and received presents and homage from people all over the island. He was not allowed to do any physical work, and chiefly confined himself in his house, where he was waited on hand and foot and feasted to his heart's content. He was generally elected for short periods of six or twelve months, and the five principal tribes took it in turn to select the *sou*. They would go to a neighbouring tribe, and select their king, and bring him to their own tribe to live with them; but he was *sou* for the whole of Rotuma, and all would willingly pay tribute to him during his term<sup>9</sup>. Comparing this statement with those previously quoted, we may, I think, believe that the period for which a *sou* was normally or nominally elected was six months, and was subject to extension, but I shall have to refer to this matter again; we have seen that Gardiner says nothing about the custom for the electing group to choose a *sou* from some other group; and it is so difficult to see any reason for this

<sup>1</sup> Gardiner, *J.A.I.* vol. xxvii, p. 460.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 461. Cf. Dillon, vol. II, p. 95.

<sup>3</sup> Lesson, *Voy.* vol. II, p. 432. Hale, p. 105.

<sup>4</sup> Gardiner, *J.A.I.* vol. xxvii, p. 460.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 460.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 465.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 401.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 470.

<sup>9</sup> Allen, *A.A.A.S.* vol. VI, p. 577.

custom that I regard Allen's statement about it with doubt. After a war in 1869-70 the office of *sou* was abolished<sup>1</sup>. Gardiner gives a list of the last sixty *sou*<sup>2</sup>.

It is said, in the legend of Rahu, the supposed creator of the island of Rotuma, and founder of its constitution and laws, that he appointed Souiftunga to be its king<sup>3</sup>; and it is suggested that he was probably the first *sou*<sup>4</sup>. Then in the legend of the coming of kava we are told that a Tongan warrior, named Kai-kaiponi, having helped his wife's three brothers to defeat their enemies, they wanted, as a reward, to make him *sou* of Rotuma, re-creating the office, which, it is said, had been vacant since the time of Souiftunga. But, as there was much opposition to this, they compromised the matter by making his wife *sou-honi* (apparently a female *sou*). Soon afterwards Kaikaiponi and his wife went to Tonga, and never returned; and her brother Muriak, and, after his death, another brother Afiak, became *sou*<sup>5</sup>.

Gardiner thinks the religious office of *sou* was once blended with that of the temporal chief, this opinion being based partly upon the above legend<sup>6</sup>, and partly upon some of the privileges of the *sou*, and upon his officers, and their duty towards him<sup>7</sup>. I am not sure what Gardiner means by the latter reason, unless he refers to the facts that the *sou* had definitely constituted officers of court, and that he used to go to war, and had certain attendants who were specially responsible for his safety.

Allen says that there was little intercourse between the people of the several districts of Rotuma; they were often at war with one another<sup>8</sup>, and the boundaries of their respective areas altered again and again as the result of war<sup>9</sup>. I connect with these statements that of Gardiner (above) that the *fakpure*, or president of the council of the whole island was the chief of whichever of the two districts, Noatau and Fanguta, had conquered the other in the last war, and a note by the French missionaries that, when they arrived in the island in about 1847, it was divided into two parties, that of the conquerors and the conquered, and that the great chief of Fao was at the head of the conquered<sup>10</sup>.

Gardiner provides a little historical material, which illustrates this system of dual division, and throws some light upon the

<sup>1</sup> Gardiner, *J.A.I.* vol. xxvii, p. 518.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 518.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 504.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 515.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 515 sq.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 516.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 460.

<sup>8</sup> Allen, *A.A.A.S.* vol. vi, p. 571.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 575.

<sup>10</sup> *A.P.F.* vol. xx, p. 352. I cannot identify Fao. It may have been the royal village of one of the districts—say Noatau or Fanguta.

position and election of the *sou* and other matters. The narrative begins in about the year 1800, the period of the earliest war remembered, when two brothers and their sister of the district of Malaha entertained the *sou* at a feast. The *sou* wanted to make the girl his wife, which Gardiner says he had a perfect right to do, though it was a right not generally insisted on. Her brothers apparently wanted her to submit to his wishes; but it afterwards transpired that he had not first sent his old wife away or sent his messenger and other officers to the girl, who was of a chief family, to escort her to him; and this was regarded as a great insult. Incensed at this, the two brothers made a chief of Malaha to be *sou* and established him in Malaha. Thereupon a man called Riemkou [he was the chief of the district of Fanguta. See Gardiner, *J.A.I.* vol. xxvii, p. 470] went to the district of Itoteu and conferred the office of *sou* upon a chief there and established him in the district of Fanguta. This was followed by the intervention of a man named Marafu [he was the chief of the district of Noatau. See Gardiner, same page]. Then a great war broke out between the districts of Fanguta, Itoteu and Itomotu (supporting Riemkou) and those of Noatau, Oinafa and Malaha (supporting Marafu). A big fight took place between the two opposing parties. This was followed by a period of quiescence; but the enmity between Marafu and Riemkou still continued, and in about 1837 war between them broke out afresh. The immediate cause seems to have been disrespect paid by a chief in passing the *sou*, who was in Fanguta, without lowering sail. Riemkou, as the *sou*'s protector when in his district, was furious; but Marafu aggravated the cause of offence by passing himself in front of the *sou*'s house in Fanguta without either loosening his hair or lowering his sail. A fierce battle between the two opposing parties took place, in which Riemkou won and Marafu was slain. The permanence of this dual antagonism is illustrated by the fact that so recently as 1878 further fighting took place, in which, though it is said antagonism between the Roman Catholic and Wesleyan missionaries was in part the cause, the old enmity between Riemkou and Marafu was utilized<sup>1</sup>. As to this matter, Gardiner says that in this continued antagonism Oinafa and Malaha usually sided with Noatau, and Itoteu and Itomotu with Fanguta<sup>2</sup>. The main interest of this narrative rests, I think, on the disclosure of a connection between the antagonism of the two great

<sup>1</sup> Gardiner, *J.A.I.* vol. xxvii, pp. 473-6.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 470.

opposing parties of Rotuma and the selection and dismissal of a *sou*; the account does not enter into detail sufficiently to enable us to co-ordinate what took place as regarded the *sou* with the information as to his periodical appointment referred to above. It does, however, illustrate the statement as to the dominating positions of Noatau and Fanguta, and the antagonism between them, each apparently striving for the *malo* or power.

The French missionaries tell a tale of difficulties that arose on their landing in Rotuma in about 1847. They came in contact with "the king," who was, they found, much embarrassed, and then visited a man spoken of as the "chief of the conquerors," who complained bitterly that the French had anchored near the districts of "the conquered," which was, in his eyes, a capital crime. Much discussion arose as to whether the missionaries should be allowed to remain in the island, the king being embarrassed by the matter, and the conqueror chief threatening the conquered chief with immediate war if he did not make the French leave his bay<sup>1</sup>.

I must, before leaving Rotuma, mention Gardiner's reference to the hill people of the island, between whom and those of the coast, there was, he says, a marked line of distinction. These hill people, who lived in villages along the inner slopes of the hills and cultivated exclusively the great central valley, were of greater stature than those of the coast; and in legends all giants and strong men were represented as coming from the hills. As a rule they had no land or rights outside the great central valley, and they had no claim in respect of the main channel between the shore and the reef; and the coast people, to whose rule they were subject to some extent, only allowed them to come down to the coast at certain times. The outer reef, however, was considered as joint property of the coast and hill people; though the latter had to make a yearly (that is six monthly) payment of taro or yams for the privilege of rowing across the channel to the reef. No wars were waged between the two groups of people; nor do the hill people seem to have taken much part in the wars between the coastal districts. The hill people appear to have become, when Gardiner wrote, practically extinct. They had left traces of themselves in their ruined villages and numerous legends. Gardiner is inclined to believe that most of them were tenants of the coast people; and says that first-fruits were rigidly exacted by the chiefs of

<sup>1</sup> *A.P.F.* vol. xx, pp. 352-9.

their districts, and that the coast people seemed to have had rights of planting on any of their land, not occupied, without any recognition of their ownership. He suggests that they were perhaps the original inhabitants of the island, conquered by some subsequent migration, and recruited from the overcrowded *hoang* of their conquerors<sup>1</sup>.

#### FOTUNA

The island of Fotuna or Futuna, with its adjoining island of Alofi, commonly called the Horne Islands, are situate due west of the Samoan group. Fotuna must not be confused with Futuna, one of the islands between the New Hebrides and Loyalties, of which I shall have to speak in later pages. Fotuna is roughly oval in shape, its longer sides being those to the north-east and south-west. A map of the two islands, provided by Mangeret<sup>2</sup>, shows Fotuna to be divided into four districts, Tua (on the north-eastern side), Asoa (at the south-eastern end), Alo (on the south-western side), and Singave (at the north-western end); it also gives the names and positions of a number of villages scattered round the coast. In his book Mangeret states in two places the positions of the districts of Tua, Alo and Singave (Asoa not being mentioned)<sup>3</sup>; but as these statements are inconsistent with each other, and neither of them agrees with what is shown in the map, I think we may adopt the latter. He says that the people of Fotuna were divided into three "tribes," the Tua, Alo and Singave. At the head of each tribe was a chief who commanded the chiefs of its dependent villages. War was the element of the lives of the people, and not a year passed without its being declared on some slight pretext. Two tribes were generally fighting against the third; but the allies were not always the same. In this way the Alo tribe was annihilated, or, as he puts it on another page, in which he refers to 1837 as the date, it was absorbed, and no longer counted as a tribe<sup>4</sup>. The two remaining tribes continued always ready to come to blows<sup>5</sup>. The island was divided into the conquering or *malo* party, and the conquered, or *lava*; and the island of Alofi was a trophy of victory. Mangeret is apparently speaking of the chief of the conquering party, when

<sup>1</sup> Gardiner, *J.A.I.* vol. xxvii, pp. 481 *sqq.*

<sup>2</sup> Mangeret, vol. i.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 237 *sq.*, 248.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 237, 247 *sq.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 238.

he says he was not an absolute master, but had to consult a council composed of the other chiefs of the tribe, and had to take into consideration the prevailing opinion, the country having been a republic rather than a monarchy, and the chief being liable to have his authority taken from him in certain cases of recognized unworthiness<sup>1</sup>. Bourdin is speaking of the two surviving groups only, the Tua and Singave, when he says they lived in distant regions separated by deep valleys, the Tua in the east and the Singave in the west. He tells us that a single king governed the whole island. He says this royalty was essentially theocratic; the chief in whom it was vested was regarded as the tabernacle of the great god of the island (Fakaveli-kele), and as having divine wisdom in dealing with affairs, and so was surrounded with respect and obeyed without limit. This office of supreme chief belonged, except in cases of absolute unworthiness, to one particular family, and on the death of the holder the members of the great council had to choose his successor from this family. The political institutions were feudal in character, the island being divided into districts, governed by chiefs, under the suzerain head chief; and the latter only intervened in matters in which the common weal was concerned<sup>2</sup>. The king, in his character of *toe-matua* (priest) alone had the right to order religious feasts and human sacrifice, and he determined the quantity of food that each was to bring him to these solemnities<sup>3</sup>. There are other references to the division of the island into *malo* and *lava* parties<sup>4</sup>.

Caillot gives a list of kings of the island (p. 364), putting them in two parallel columns as follows (omitting a part relating to the beginning of the present century).

Volitoki or Veliteki, king of Tua, about 1800.	Folitua, king of Singave (?)
Niuliki (relation of Volitoki); king of Tua (of the victorious party or <i>malo</i> ) in 1838; died in 1841.	Vanae, king of Singave (of the conquered or <i>lava</i> ) in 1838; died in 1839.
Musumusu (relation of the preceding, and his heir presumptive according to the customs of the island); succeeded him, and reigned over one party, but only for a few months; died in 1846.	Petelo Keletaone (Sam); an upstart; king of Singave (of the conquered); first reigned over one party for some months, then all alone, from 1842 to 1851, when he was deposed.

<sup>1</sup> Mangeret, vol. I, p. 248. Cf. *A.P.F.* vol. xxxii, p. 98.

<sup>2</sup> Bourdin, pp. 452 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 443.

<sup>4</sup> *A.P.F.* vol. xiii, p. 379; vol. xv, p. 37; vol. xvi, p. 363. It will also be seen in subsequent pages.

Filipo Meitala, son of Niuliki; born in 1826; king of Tua (of the conquering party) in 1844; died in 1862; had a brother called Sevelo, who, according to the laws of heredity ought to succeed him; but, finding him too young to govern his estates, as also his other brothers, he appointed as successor

Ali Sengi, his nearest relation, after his brothers<sup>1</sup>.

It would almost appear from this list, setting aside the period of Volitoki, of whom the list itself tells us nothing, that the Tua group had always been the *malo* party, in which case the distinction between *malo* and *lava* would lose much of its interest; but a little more information is available. Caillot says that Volitoki conquered the island of Alofi, and afterwards conquered the kingdom of Alo in Fotuna; but in a war by him with the tribe of the kingdom of Singave he was conquered, and taken by the chiefs of that tribe, who put him to death. These various events took place between 1800 and 1815<sup>2</sup>. It may almost be assumed that after this the Singave people would be the *malo* party, and it is possible that this was during the reign of Folitua, who would thus be the conquering sovereign. Mangeret says Volitoki was succeeded by Niuliki<sup>3</sup>; and if the Tua people had lost the ascendancy, they must, according to Caillot's list, have recovered it again; I gather from Mangeret and Bourdin, that in 1837 Tua was the *malo* party and Singave the *lava* party<sup>4</sup> which is consistent with this. The French missionaries say that it was so in 1840, though the *lava* people obeyed another chief<sup>5</sup>, which of course means their own chief. Shortly after the arrival of the missionaries in about 1840 the Singave (*lava*) party killed one of the other; this amounted to a declaration of war, and the two armies, on their guard, kept watch on each other, but there was no fighting<sup>6</sup>. The Singave people in the meantime made an attempt to purloin the god of the Tua folk. A number of Singave young men proceeded to the settlement of Niuliki, the Tua chief, when he and his people were away at their plantations. These young men deposited nine roast hogs in the *marae* or court before Niuliki's

<sup>1</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, pp. 312 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 312 note 1. Cf. Mangeret, vol. 1, pp. 242 sq.; Monfat, *Tonga*, p. 139.

<sup>3</sup> Mangeret, vol. 1, p. 248.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* Bourdin, p. 453.

<sup>5</sup> *A.P.F.* vol. XIII, p. 379.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 380.



house, made a rough litter, on which they placed a small piece of white *tapa*, and then, after several war cries, and with much shouting, carried the litter home under the belief that they had taken away Niuliki's god. Niuliki and his people, enraged at this, immediately made preparations for war. There was a *fono* in which he and his priests (representing the gods) addressed the people; kava was offered to the gods that had been stolen, and roast pig was distributed<sup>1</sup>. The Singave abductors were pursued and overtaken; but were forgiven by Niuliki<sup>2</sup>. The nine pigs taken by the Singave men had, it seems, been offered to Niuliki's god in the persons of two sacred men—oracles of the gods—and these two men actually "as had been expected," went over to the Singave people. War was declared; Niuliki was crowned afresh and received the oath of fealty from all his subjects. The Singave, on the other hand, felt secure of victory because of the arrival in their camp of the gods and the two sacred men. There was a battle in which the Tua people were victorious, and so retained their supremacy<sup>3</sup>. It is clear that the Singave king who was opposed to Niuliki in this matter was Vanae, for Mangeret mentions him as the chief who was defeated in the conflict, and refers separately to a young man Keletaoa (also called Sam), who also belonged to the Singave group and had acted with great courage in the fighting, and who was afterwards to succeed to the kingship of the island<sup>4</sup>. Smith also refers to Vanae in connection with the matter, and says that he supplemented the efforts to entice away the god by hanging in his (Vanae's) *marae* a piece of *tapa*, and above it three coconut leaves [a most sacred emblem] by way of invitation, the god being identified by him as the great Faka-veli-kele<sup>5</sup>.

There are a few statements as to what occurred after the death of Niuliki; they overlap somewhat, so I will quote them separately. Mangeret says that Musumus, who was a relation of and had been minister to Niuliki, was the person to whom the crown went, according to the custom of the country, but he had killed one of the missionaries, and Meitala was very young; so the missionaries proposed "Sam" as king, and the people acquiesced in this through fear of the French, though they

<sup>1</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. I, p. 42. Cf. *A.P.F.* vol. XIII, p. 383.

<sup>2</sup> *A.P.F.* vol. XIII, p. 383.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 383 *sqq.* According to the account given in this book, the Singave people kidnapped several gods, not only one.

<sup>4</sup> Mangeret, vol. I, p. 302.

<sup>5</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. I, p. 45.

never fully acknowledged the authority of this king<sup>1</sup>. According to an account of one of the missionaries, after the death of Niuliki half the island recognized Sam-Keletaone as king, but another part of the population remained under the command of Musumusu; though the natives formed two parties they were friendly, and they left the selection of the king to the Catholic bishop, and by his advice elected Sam-Keletaone<sup>2</sup>. Another missionary account says that the old men of both parties elected Sam-Keletaone as king; but as he belonged to the conquered Singave party, the conquerors soon wished to have nothing to do with him and even talked of making war. The account tells how the missionaries got over the difficulty by using their influence with their religious neophytes of the Tua party, and thus secured Sam's position<sup>3</sup>. Another missionary refers to the fact that Petelo Keletaone was elected king by both parties, but was some years afterwards dethroned and expelled for bad behaviour<sup>4</sup>. It is easy to see what probably happened. On the death of Niuliki a successor to the chieftainship of Tua had to be elected; apparently Musumusu was recognized as chief, but only ruled for a few months, and the statement that he reigned "over *one party*" means that he did not become king of the whole island; he was succeeded by Filipino Meitala. At the date of Niuliki's death, Petelo Keletaone was chief of the Singave, and "first reigned over *one party* for some months." The successions to the respective rules of these two districts were evidently, nominally at all events, independent of each other. Then arose the question of the kingship of the whole island; the king would in ordinary course have been one of the Tua party, they being the *malo* group, but owing, mainly apparently to missionary influence, Petelo Keletaone of the Singave *lava* group was elected instead, though there was some Tua dissatisfaction at the selection. We are thus told that after his rule over one party, he ruled "then all alone," which refers, I think, to the fact that he was king over the whole island.

There is one feature of the system to which I may draw attention. We have seen that, according to Bourdin, the office of supreme chief belonged to one particular family, by which he apparently means one family of the whole island; whereas the evidence indicates that the king might be of either of the two competing groups, according to the fortunes of war, as the

<sup>1</sup> Mangeret, vol. I, p. 382.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* vol. XVI, pp. 370 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *A.P.F.* vol. xv, pp. 427 sq.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* vol. XXXII, p. 98.

great object of the competition seems to have been to secure the island kingship and domination. Perhaps Bourdin (he wrote in 1867) had in mind the political system as it then was, the old military competitive system having been done away with on the introduction of Christianity, in which case there would very likely be one royal family for the whole island. Apparently Sam Keletaone was elected, in some way or other by people of both parties, which may have been in accordance with native custom, or a changed custom brought about by missionary influence; there seems to be no reason for assuming that the latter view is correct, and the former would be in accord with what, as we have seen, is said to have been the custom in Niue, where the consent of everybody seems to have been necessary to render the election valid. The possibility occurred to me that all this historical matter referred only to a secular kingship, and that there was also a sacred king; but I think that, if there had been such a separate king, someone would probably have mentioned him, or referred to some great high priest with whom we might identify him; and no one has done so.

Grézel, in his dictionary, gives the names of the chiefs of the Fiua valley, the district of Pouma, the Olu district and the Tufuone district<sup>1</sup>. None of the names mentioned are those of any of the kings whom we have been considering, and three of the districts named by him appear in the map as villages, or other minor areas. I gather from this that in Fotuna there was a system of local self-government within these minor areas.

A few writers draw attention to physical, cultural and linguistic elements in the Fotunans which they attribute to Fijian admixture. Graeffe, after saying that they belonged by descent to the Samoan race, and that their language and the construction of their houses were like those of Samoa, says that through immigration of Fijians they had mixed greatly with the latter. The natives were in general somewhat darker than the Samoans, probably through intermixture with Fijian Papuans, and for the same reason their hair was sometimes curly and sometimes long and smooth<sup>2</sup>. According to Boisse the island of Fotuna, 40 leagues from Wallis Island, was inhabited by natives with very different manners, doubtless owing to their frequent relations with the Fijians. As examples of this he refers to the absence of the ceremonious politeness of the Samoans; the relatively rough and more mettlesome character

<sup>1</sup> Grézel, pp. 189, 233, 235.

<sup>2</sup> Graeffe, *Ausland*, vol. XL, pp. 1142 sq.

of the people; their independence, and unwillingness to tolerate any authority but that of the old people. Even the kings were hardly such except in title, and were spoken of as "men," like any one else, instead of being designated, as in Samoa, by terms different from those of the ordinary language. Each Fotunan head of a family was in reality perfectly independent though they submitted as a rule to the decisions of the old people<sup>1</sup>. Lemaire and Schouten are apparently speaking of the island of Fotuna when the former calls its king *latou*<sup>2</sup> and the latter calls him *herico*<sup>3</sup>; it is possible that the former of these terms is the same as the Fijian *ratu* and the latter is the Polynesian *ariki*. Bourdin, after quoting a belief of one of the French missionaries that the Fotuna people were descended from a Fijian migration, refers to his (the missionary's) long knowledge of the people and his conviction that they had striking features, both physical and moral, of resemblance to the Fijians. Bourdin refers to similarities in language, customs and cannibalism, and says that the Fotuna people got on very well with the Fijians, whilst the natives of Wallis Island had a predilection for the Tongans. He tells us that this missionary was in Fiji when the Fotunan king Petelo was paying a visit to a Fijian king. Petelo asked the latter, as a friend, for one of his lands, and was offered "the island of Tikopia, which your ancestors abandoned"<sup>4</sup>.

The material given to us is quite inadequate, both in quantity and quality, for the formation of any assumption as to the extent of this alleged Fijian element in Fotuna, as distinguished from that of, say, Samoa, and I am not prepared to assume the accuracy of all the statements as to the character of Fotunan cultures; but the evidence shows that people who have been there have been struck by its apparent presence. Fotuna is very near Fiji—much nearer than is either Samoa or Tonga—so intercommunication is probable enough; but the Fijian element may have been of comparatively recent origin, in which case it is not a subject of special interest. On the other hand, it is just possible that this evidence may have some bearing upon the question of migrations into the Pacific. The Fijian characteristics to which the writers have referred might for instance be Melanesian, but not originating in Fiji, and as to this we have the remarkable reference of the Fijian chief to the Fotunan

<sup>1</sup> Boisse, vol. x, p. 437.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 42 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Dalrymple, vol. II, p. 56.

<sup>4</sup> Bourdin, pp. 439 sq.

ancestors in Tikopia and their abandonment of the island. If the connection was direct, with Melanesia proper, it is interesting, even if comparatively recent; and if it has been *via* Tikopia, it may have a bearing upon the Tikopian data provided by Rivers, and his views upon them.

## UVEA

Uvea, or Wallis Island—the latter term including the small islets around the main island—is very near the Fotuna or Horne Islands. It must be distinguished from Uvea or Uea which forms one of the Loyalty group. Uvea is, roughly speaking, oval in shape, its ends pointing north and south. It was divided into three principal districts, Mua in the extreme south, Hahake in the south, and Hihifo in the north<sup>1</sup>; and in a map provided by Mangeret we find the district of Mua extending along the southern coast, with the district of Hahake to the north of, but closely adjoining it, and the district of Hihifo extending along the northern coast, separated from the other two by the mountains of the interior, a number of villages or minor districts being shown scattered round the coast of the island<sup>2</sup>. It is a noticeable fact that the names of these districts are, as we have seen, the names of the three main districts of the island of Tongatabu, Mua having been the home of the *tuitonga*, Hahake that of the *tuihaatakalaua*, and Hihifo that of the *tuikanokubolu*. Another feature of similarity is that in Tongatabu, as in Uvea, Mua and Hahake were close together at one end of the island, whilst Hihifo was, widely separated from them, at the other end. Now in Tonga *Mua* means “first,” or “in front of,” and *Hahake* and *Hihifo* mean east and west respectively; in Tonga the first name would fittingly be applied to the residence of the divine *tuitonga*, and the other two were in accord with the geographical positions of the districts. So also in Uvea the name *Mua* might merely have been that of the most important district in the island; but the descriptive character in Tonga of the other two names is inapplicable, because one of the districts was at the southern, and the other at the northern extremity of the island. This fact, and the curious similarity in the separation in both islands of the district of Hihifo from the other two districts, which were close together, suggests the possibility that the appearance in

<sup>1</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. I, p. 107.

<sup>2</sup> Mangeret, vol. II.

Uvea of these names may have had some historical or traditional origin, associated with the three great families of Tongatabu, for there is evidence which points to a close connection between Uvea and Tonga; though I cannot demonstrate that here. I draw attention to the matter, however, with a view to its possible interest hereafter; we shall see directly that there was perhaps a pretty close similarity in the systems of political relationship between the leading families of the two islands.

A record of the French missionaries, made in 1838, says that the power was concentrated in three principal families, those of the king and of the two great chiefs or ministers, whose authority was military<sup>1</sup>. Bourdin, writing in 1867, after referring to the separation of the people into two classes of nobles and commoners, says that the nobles were divided into two parties, often at war, one being called *malo* (victors) and the other *to-ki-lalo* (fallen down). The king belonged to the first family of the *malo*, and the *kivalu*, or first minister, to the second<sup>2</sup>. The *kivalu* never received royal honours, because he belonged to the second class of society; and yet he was the minister who did almost everything, especially if he was capable and an intriguer<sup>3</sup>. Graeffe (1867) says that one of the families had the highest or royal title, but their power was very limited, more nominal than real, and the king could decide nothing without consulting the assembly of the people. At that time the widow of the late king bore the title of queen of Uvea<sup>4</sup>. According to Saffre (1876-9) the whole population of the island was divided into four villages all on the edge of the sea; Mua at the south, Matautu at the east, the dwelling-place of the queen and the bishop; Lano at the north; and Hihifo, the least important, in the north-west<sup>5</sup>. Mangeret's map shows all these villages, except Hihifo, Mua being in the district of that name, Matautu about half way up the eastern coast, and Lano at the north-eastern corner. Mangeret, whose information was, I imagine, obtained from the records of Bataillon, whose experience went back at all events to 1838, says that in Wallis Island they had a monarchy where a king reigned, and a first minister governed under the name of *kivalu*. Two great families shared the government of the island, the reigning royal family and the governing family of the *kivalu*. The king had right

<sup>1</sup> *A.P.F.* vol. XIII, p. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Bourdin, p. 497 note 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 499.

<sup>4</sup> Graeffe, *Ausland*, vol. XLI, p. 530. (I do not know what is the Polynesian word that is represented by "queen"; but the reference to Uvea suggests dominion over the whole island.)

<sup>5</sup> Saffre, vol. XLI, pp. 443 sq.

of life and death over his subjects, and the right to take their property. He could lay a taboo on all the population, impose certain labours on them, and make peace and war; and he presided at public assemblies, at kava and at solemn feasts. The *kivalu* was the second person in the island, and when he was an intriguer or intelligent, he succeeded in exercising a veritable domination, although in the second place. The island thus possessed a *maire du palais*, with a king who did nothing. The *kivalu* alone had the right to make observations, and even to oppose the king's veto<sup>1</sup>.

I do not think this evidence enables us to determine with any degree of confidence what was the political structure of Uvea; but the following seems to me to be the most probable explanation of it. There were in the island three great families, each having its own head chief. The most important of these families occupied the district of Mua, the name of which suggests its priority over the others, and their chief was the king and may perhaps be compared with the *tuitonga* of Tongatabu; the other two families occupied the districts of Hahake and Hihifo respectively, and their chiefs, whose duties are said to have been military, may perhaps be compared with the *tui-haatakalaua* and *tuikanokubolu*. In that case these two families might be the competitors for secular power, one being the *malo* party, and the other the *to-ki-lalo* party, according to the varying fortunes of war. According to my view of the matter, the two great families, to which Mangeret refers, of which one was the reigning, and the other the governing family, would be the royal family of Mua and whichever of the other two families happened to be in the ascendancy at the time. Bourdin's statement that the king belonged to the first family of the *malo* party, and the *kivalu* to the second, would be inconsistent with my view if we are to interpret it as meaning that these were the first and second branches of the family, of either Hahake or Hihifo, which formed the *malo* party for the time being; but I do not think this is necessarily his meaning. He may be referring merely to the fact that at any one time there would be two rulers, of whom the king belonged to the first, or royal family, and the *kivalu* to the other family which was in power at the time. Even if Bourdin's idea is that the king and the *kivalu* belonged to the same great family, it is possible that this was a misconception; if at the time the

<sup>1</sup> Mangeret, vol. 1, pp. 104 sq.

Hahake family happened to be in power, it might well be that an observer might regard it and the closely adjoining Mua family, as distinguished from the Hihifo people at the other end of the island, as being the same family or group. All three families were probably closely connected by intermarriages. We may note Saffre's statement that the "Queen" was living, not at Mua, but at Matautu; but as this was in about 1876, and Matautu was the place of residence of the missionary bishop, I attach no importance to the matter. The references by Bourdin and Mangeret to the ability of the *kivalu* to do almost everything, and to exercise a veritable domination, if he was capable and an intriguer, reminds us of what we know as to the sacred and secular rule of Tonga.

It will be noticed that, if my suggested construction of the evidence is correct, the political system of Uvea was very similar to that of Tonga, and that we only require evidence of a special sanctity attributed to the king to make it practically identical; it seems to me very likely that it was so.

An old man was able to give the French missionaries the names of fourteen kings he had known, of whom almost all had died a violent death<sup>1</sup>. Caillot, however, obtained in 1913 a list of no less than thirty-eight kings, arranged in a series of consecutive *faahinga*, with approximate dates<sup>2</sup>. The term *faahinga* means, according to Baker's dictionary, "tribe," and may here perhaps be used with the meaning of families or dynasties. The following is a summary of his list:

1.	Kings of Kehekehe dynasty.—	Number of kings	7.—	Date	1450-1600
2.	" Takumasiva "	" "	" 6	" "	1600-1660
3.	" Vehi ika "	" "	" 8	" "	1660-1780
4.	" Takumasiva "	" "	" 2	" "	1780-1810
5.	" Kulitea "	" "	" 3	" "	1810-1820
6.	" Takumasiva "	" "	" 12	" "	1820-1910
	(dynasty of Lavelua)				

I will not attempt to discuss the probable accuracy or otherwise of a list going back to 1450. I may point out that one tribe or family or dynasty, or whatever else I should call it, appears to have come into power three times; and suggest that, whatever uncertainty there may be as to accuracy of names of kings, it may well be that the particulars given represent, broadly, traditions as to successive groups of kings of Uvea, going back to the distant past.

<sup>1</sup> Mangeret, vol. 1, p. 130.

<sup>2</sup> Caillot, *Mythes*, pp. 310 sq.



TOKELAU

The Tokelau or Union Islands are situate due north of Samoa, and the main islets of the group are Fakaofu (Bowditch), Atafu and Nukunono. Lister was told that the people of Fakaofu were great fighters in the old time, and that the islands of Nukunono and Atafu were subject to them<sup>1</sup>, and a statement to the same effect is made by Bird<sup>2</sup>. On the other hand, Turner refers to a time when the group was ruled by the chief of Nukunono<sup>3</sup>, but this is not necessarily inconsistent with a customary supremacy of Fakaofu.

According to Newell, the so-called king of Fakaofu bore the title of *ariki*, or chief, and was until quite recently the only person so designated. Newell gives a genealogical tree which refers to two brothers, Kava and Pi'o, the original owners of the soil, of whom the former had three children, Te-laue-fue, Foua, and Kava, and the latter a child Pi'o; and these were the four ancestors of the four principal families of the island. The *ariki* was always the oldest male member of these four families. No others possessed the title, and there were no clan names or titles outside this circle. The Samoan custom of conferring the name of the head of the family upon the heir [that is, on the death of the predecessor] did not prevail in the Tokelau; and no young man would under any circumstances become head of the clan so long as an older man was left to take the headship. The old men formed the ruling council, and were known as the *kau kolo-matua*<sup>4</sup>. According to another tradition of Fakaofu, the kings were descended from Kava and Singano, the first men, derived from two stones; but an indefinite period was supposed to have elapsed between them and Kava, whose name heads a list of fifteen kings given by Lister, and which terminates also with the name Kava (or Tetaulu). Lister says (1889) that the then present king was the seventh who had reigned during the previous fifty years, and explains this by the custom of choosing an old man as king<sup>5</sup>. Fakaofu had another tradition that man was derived from a stone in the island which became changed into a man called Vasefanua<sup>6</sup>; and this leads us to an Atafu tradition attributing the ancestry of the then (1895) present king of Atafu to Fatu, whose descendant or son

<sup>1</sup> Lister, *J.A.I.* vol. XXI, p. 56.

<sup>2</sup> Bird, *Ausland*, vol. XXXVII, p. 418.

<sup>3</sup> Turner, p. 274.

<sup>4</sup> Newell, *A.A.A.S.* vol. VI, pp. 604 sq.

<sup>5</sup> Lister, *J.A.I.* vol. XXI, pp. 52, 59 sq.

<sup>6</sup> Turner, p. 267

was Singano, from whom came Kava and Vasefanua, from whom came Pi'o and Tevaka (both originally belonging to Fakaofu), the only two families bearing rank as chiefs<sup>1</sup>. Turner says the government of Fakaofu was monarchical, and the king, *tui-Tokelau* was high-priest as well. There were three families from which the king was selected, and they always chose an aged man, because, they said, a young man was a bad ruler. Their great god was Tui Tokelau, or king of Tokelau<sup>2</sup>. According to Bird, the patriarchal mode of government prevailed in Fakaofu. The king was father and high-priest of the family. The heads of the families formed the government, and the king was selected from them, and was always an old man. He seemed to be by no means an absolute monarch, and it appeared to Bird that the orator seemed to be the ruler. They had a house of parliament, where they met from time to time to make laws; but did not meet, as in Samoa, in the open<sup>3</sup>. Wilkes says the only person seen who appeared to have any authority was an old man whom they called Taungainga, designated as a priest and considered *fakatapa* or sacred; but lower down on the same page, he refers to a "king" called Taupe<sup>4</sup>.

Small though all these particulars are in quantity, they offer some interesting information, the most important of which is, I think, that relating to the old men. The question of gerontocracy has been the subject of interesting comment by Frazer and Rivers, and no doubt by other writers to whose works I have not referred. Frazer describes this form of government as it has been found among the primitive aborigines of Australia. These savages are ruled neither by chiefs nor kings. So far as their tribes can be said to have a political constitution, it is a democracy, or rather an oligarchy of old and influential men, who meet in council, and decide on all measures of importance, to the practical exclusion of the younger men. Their deliberative assembly answers to the senate of later times. The elders who in Australia thus meet and direct the affairs of their tribe appear to be for the most part the head men of their respective totem groups—and while they have certainly to perform what we should call civil duties, their principal functions are sacred or magical<sup>5</sup>. Rivers, in discussing the subject of gerontocracy, says it might be thought that a ruling

<sup>1</sup> Newell, *A.A.A.S.* vol. VI, p. 605.

<sup>3</sup> Bird, *Ausland*, vol. XXXVII, p. 418.

<sup>5</sup> Frazer, *E.H.K.* pp. 107 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Turner, p. 268.

<sup>4</sup> Wilkes, vol. V, p. 13.

class whose power depended on age could not have been very sharply marked off from the general population. Even among ourselves, with our quantitative standards, old age is not a stage with any definite limit, and it might seem that this must have been even more the case among people with no means of expressing age in numerical terms. As to this, however, he refers to the custom of initiation, suggests that in the state of gerontocracy there may have been a rite of initiation into old age, and points out that the rite of initiation would not be determined merely by age, but that other features, such as special physical or mental advantages, would be taken into account, as a qualification, though no young man would ever be allowed to rank as an elder<sup>1</sup>. In the gerontocratic state it would be incorrect to speak of chieftainship at all. The government would not be vested in any persons as individuals, but in the whole of a class. Further, even if it were possible to speak of the old men as the chiefs of the community, such chieftainship would certainly not be hereditary. Even if the term "chieftainship" were extended to cover the gerontocratic condition, there could be no question of succession<sup>2</sup>. He associates the gerontocracy of Melanesia with the belief in the magical powers of the old men<sup>3</sup>. He holds that the condition of dominance of the old men in Melanesia was earlier than the incoming of the kava people<sup>4</sup>.

We have seen that, according to Frazer, there were not any ruling chiefs or kings among the Australian people to whom he refers, whilst Rivers says that with a gerontocracy it would be incorrect to speak of chieftainship at all, as the government would be vested, not in any persons as individuals, but in the whole of a class, and that, even if it were possible to speak of the old men as the chiefs of the community, such chieftainships would not be hereditary—there could be no question of succession. Now the evidence shows that in the island of Fakaofu they had head chiefs or kings, and I propose, admitting that under these circumstances the government of the island could not properly be called gerontocratic, to see whether the mode of the selection of these kings was not based on gerontocratic principles. According to Newell, the king had to be a member of one of four families; the tradition given by Lister points to two mythical ancestors from whom the kings were descended; Turner says the king had to be selected from one of three

<sup>1</sup> Rivers, *H.M.S.* vol. II, p. 68. <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 324. <sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 564. <sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 313.

families. There is nothing gerontocratic, on the face of it, in this, but there is a possible explanation. I believe there was, in parts at all events, of Polynesia, and perhaps generally, a system of family relationship, the sub-chiefs being related to the chiefs, and the middle classes to the sub-chiefs, and so on; and if this was so in Fakaofu, it may be that all persons regarded as being descendants of the original population of the island were recognized as eligible for the kingship, and that the requirement that the king should be a member of one or another of certain ancestral families arose from the fact that there had been some later immigrants into the island, who and whose descendants had been allowed to remain there, and who, perhaps, had intermarried with the original families, but who nevertheless were not regarded as being members of the community for the purpose of supplying its rulers. This is, of course, merely a speculation as to a possibility; but if it is a possibility, the confinement of the kingship to certain families is not necessarily so inconsistent with gerontocracy as it seems to be.

Let us assume, however, that my suggested possibility is not correct, and that we find, up to this point in the discussion, that there was a system of rule by a member of one or other of certain families of chiefs, such as is not consistent with true gerontocracy; it is still open to us to see whether the method of selection of the ruler was not gerontocratic in principle. We are told that the *ariki* was always the oldest male member of the families; that the Samoan custom of conferring the name of the head of the family upon the heir did not prevail; that no young man would under any circumstances become head of the clan so long as an older man was left to take the headship; that they selected an aged man to be king; that he was always an old man. Now in other parts of Polynesia the successor to a title, at all events in islands other than those where he was deemed to succeed immediately on birth, would often be at least a middle-aged man; but he was not necessarily so, and there is no suggestion that he had to be an old man, and any idea that among a number of possible successors the choice necessarily fell upon the oldest man forms, so far as I can ascertain, no part of Polynesian customs of succession. So far, therefore, as the evidence goes, we must, I think, believe that the system of selection of a head chief of Fakaofu, was different from that of other Polynesian islands, and that the difference was that it was gerontocratic in principle.

I refer also to the statements that the king was until quite recently the only person who bore the title of *ariki* or chief, that no others than he possessed the title, and that there were no clan names or titles outside the circle of the few families, and again to the statement that the practice of conferring the name of the head of the family upon the heir did not exist. It is not clear whether at the period to which this evidence relates there were other members, besides the king, of the special families entitled to be called *ariki*; but the impression which this evidence produces is, I think, that the use of the term *ariki* had until lately been confined to the head chief of the island, but its use had since developed and spread to some other members of the special families, and this leaves us free to speculate whether the use of the term was not a relatively modern development, and whether we should not find, if we could trace the matter further back, that at one time there was no one to whom the title of *ariki* was given. If this was so, Fakaofu perhaps had a system which had arisen, owing to the development of the recognition of chieftainship, out of what had once been pure gerontocratic government. I must point out that it is possible that what had occurred was, not a change of system, but merely a widening of the class to whom was offered the complimentary title of *ariki*<sup>1</sup>; but, on the other hand, the statement that they did not confer the name of the head of a family upon an heir points to the absence of any system of succession.

## ELLICE ISLANDS

There are a number of groups of islands, near and distant, to the north-west of those of western Polynesia, some at all events of which must be regarded as partly Polynesian; the introduction into this book of material collected from most of those islands would, I think, have been out of place, and I decided to confine myself to the Ellice Islands, though I might perhaps with some advantage have extended my area of investigation a little further to the north-west, so as to include the Gilberts.

The Ellice group consists of a number of clusters of islets, to the west and north-west of the Tokelau Islands, stretching from the south-east to the north-west. In the south-east are Nukulaelae, Funafuti, Nukufetau and Vaitupu (Oaitupu); to the north-west are Nanomea, Nanomanga and Niutao. Between the south-easterly and north-westerly islands is Nui (Egg

<sup>1</sup> See, as regards Samoa, Turner, pp. 173 sq.

Island); but Brigham, in his Index, says that, though geographically of the Ellice group, the people and language of Nui are derived from the Gilbert group<sup>1</sup>.

Hedley, referring to the position at the end of last century, says the Ellice islanders seem ethnologically to have segregated themselves in groups—Nukulaelae and Nukufetau were anciently more or less dependents of Funafuti, with whom Vaitupu was allied; all four, for instance, were united in the worship of Foilape or Firafi. In 1841 the Nukufetau people described their world to Wilkes as consisting of Funafuti, Vaitupu and the Tokelau. Nanomanga and Nanomea were closely linked by their extraordinary quarantine rites, and Niutao, by its position and skull worship, was associated with them. The north and south also differed in their way of making the *titi* (kilt)<sup>2</sup>.

Whitmee says the forms of government differed in the different islands; some had one king exercising despotic authority; in one there was a king and council of chiefs; in another there were two kings upon an equal footing; and in one there was a king and a chief, the chief being nominally inferior to the king, but really possessing superior power owing to his greater force of character<sup>3</sup>.

Funafuti is the island from which the bulk of our information has been obtained, and it discloses a system of alternating succession to the throne. Newell says the people were descended from five clans, all of Samoan origin<sup>4</sup>. According to Turner, the kingship alternated in four or five leading families, and when one king died another was chosen by the family next in turn<sup>5</sup>. Hedley was told that a system had long prevailed on the island of government by a king and subordinate chief, the latter succeeding to the supreme office on the death of the former, and being himself succeeded in the subordinate position by the late king's son<sup>6</sup>. Sollas says there were two branches of the royal family, and when one king died his successor was generally chosen from the other branch<sup>7</sup>. Mrs David (1899) refers to the *tupu* or king, and to another person called Opatia, who was next to the *tupu* in rank, and was the real ruler of the island. This position is associated by her with the fact that it was he who was appointed by and responsible to the British Commissioner; but she adds that he was also the sub-chief chosen by the people,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Moss, pp. 200 sq. Whitmee, p. 19. Hedley, p. 43.

<sup>2</sup> Hedley, p. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Newell, *A.A.A.S.* vol. VI, p. 607.

<sup>6</sup> Hedley, p. 43.

<sup>3</sup> Whitmee, p. 27.

<sup>5</sup> Turner, p. 282.

<sup>7</sup> Sollas, *Nature*, 1897, p. 354.

and that he would probably be *tupu* some day<sup>1</sup>. Then, again, she says the government of Funafuti seems to have been at all times somewhat republican; the people had a voice in the choice of both king and sub-chief, the latter of whom was apparently both prime minister and probable successor to the throne. All state matters, great and small, were discussed fully by all the people in big palavers conducted by the king and sub-chief<sup>2</sup>.

Illustrations of the system are perhaps given by a list, provided by Hedley, of the kings of the island<sup>3</sup> and by some traditional history given by Sollas<sup>4</sup>. I propose, without giving details from either one or the other, to pick out a few bits of information which seem to bear on the question. The names of the kings given by the two writers tally in some respects but not in others. They both begin with Terematua or Tilimatua as the first king, but Sollas says the people did not know who he was, or where he came from. According to Hedley, the third and fourth kings in his list "were kings together," but he does not tell us what he means by this. Sollas says that during the reign of Tilotu a subordinate king or chief named Paolau was appointed, but he could not ascertain whether there was any blood relationship between the two. On the death of Tilotu, Paolau became king, and Tilotu's children became sub-kings or chiefs. Subsequently another Paolau became head king, and his brother Masaleika sub-king. According to Hedley's list, some of the successions in which relationships are stated were from brother to brother, and a number of them were from father to son.

The historical evidence indicates, so far as it goes, that the curious system of double succession referred to by Hedley and suggested by Mrs David, was by no means universal, but it illustrates it to a certain extent, especially if there were only two alternating branches of the royal family. In that case we should expect that the branch which for the time being was not ruling would be of great political importance, and a member or members of that branch might well occupy the position of "subordinate king or chief." Thus it is possible that Tilotu belonged to branch *A*, and Paolau, who became his subordinate, was of branch *B*. Then on Paolau (branch *B*) becoming king, Tilotu's children (branch *A*) became his subordinates. Sollas, at all events, does not say the custom of alternate succession was universally

<sup>1</sup> Mrs David, p. 126.

<sup>3</sup> Hedley, pp. 43 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 191.

<sup>4</sup> *Nature*, 1897, pp. 353 sq.

followed, and according to Hedley's list, this was not the case; perhaps the second Paolau, like his predecessor of the same name, belonged to the same class *B*. This second Paolau had his "brother" as his subordinate, and this may have been a variation of the custom referred to by Hedley, involving the same underlying idea. Hedley's reference to the third and fourth kings reigning together may mean that when the third king was reigning he had as his subordinate a chief, who afterwards succeeded him. All the information has been obtained at a somewhat recent date, but the system which it discloses must, I think, have been of native origin. Newell (1895) thought that the Funafuti people had more elaborate religious rites than had those of the other islands of the group<sup>1</sup>.

Graeffe (1866) says that the people of Nukufetau were under a chief, *tui*..., which means that he was a king<sup>2</sup>; I think the use of the term *tui* justifies the assumption that he had jurisdiction over the whole island. He refers to a native statement that the first chief of Vaitupu was named Vaviti-tera, and says that they enumerated sixteen subsequent chiefs who had ruled over the island<sup>3</sup>. He learnt that in Nanomea there were two chiefs, of whom only one bore the name of *tuinanomea*, who, together with the priests, about seven in number, ruled the people<sup>4</sup>; and Whitmee (1870) refers to two kings in this island<sup>5</sup>. In Nanomanga, according to Turner, the government consisted of a king and five others who, with him, formed a council; but for all important business thirteen other heads of families united with them<sup>6</sup>. Graeffe says that Niutao was ruled over by a king, though he was little more than a president of a republic<sup>7</sup>; but Whitmee says that a king and a chief had sole authority over the island, and that the king had the higher title, but nevertheless paid great deference to the chief<sup>8</sup>. Scruppy though this information is, it does suggest the possibility that there were political systems in Nanomea and Niutao somewhat similar to that which we are considering of Funafuti. As regards this matter, we must not assume from Whitmee's general statement as to the different forms of government in the several islands, or from the absence of any reference, as to some of them, to a dual form of government, that this was not one of the prevailing systems in the group generally.

<sup>1</sup> Newell, *A.A.A.S.* vol. VI, p. 607.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 1184.

<sup>5</sup> Whitmee, p. 25.

<sup>7</sup> *Ausland*, vol. XL, p. 1187.

<sup>2</sup> *Ausland*, vol. XL, p. 1187.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 1189.

<sup>6</sup> Turner, p. 291.

<sup>8</sup> Whitmee, p. 22.



## CHAPTER XI

### POLITICAL AREAS AND SYSTEMS

#### MANIHIKI

THE island of Manihiki (Humphrey Island) lies almost due north of the Hervey Islands. Its traditional history begins with the arrival there of a Rarotongan named Iku, after which he fetched his sister Tapairu and her husband Toa, and they settled down in the island. According to Gill, Toa had five daughters by Tapairo, but no son, though he afterwards married, and had a son by one of his daughters. Gill gives no names of these children. From Toa and Tapairu all the inhabitants of Manihiki and Rakaanga [a neighbouring island] were descended. In after times Mahuta (Gill does not say who he was) and his clan migrated to the Penrhyns, so the people of that island had the same ancestry<sup>1</sup>. William Gill, in telling the same legend, says that Toa and his wife had four daughters, named Vai, Navenave, Pae and Nannau. Nannau then married her father, and had three sons, Tepori-akaivai, Makatangaro, and Ikutau. Ikutau married the daughter of Navenave, and their children were Temokopuongorotonga, Temokopuama, Temokopuongaroepe, Meau and Vaitiri. He says that Toa and his wife were the parents of all the people on these lands, and the lands were divided among their children<sup>2</sup>. Smith refers to this family, in connection with other legendary matter. He says Toa had many children, among whom he mentions Kae, Poe, Naunau and Nanamu (all girls), and a son Ngaro-taramaunga. He refers to Toa's practice of having connections with his daughters<sup>3</sup>.

The main interest, for my present purpose, of traditions of this sort is the opportunity they give us, by references to genealogies, comparisons of names, or in other ways, to associate specific groups of people with specific ancestors, separate or related, real or mythical, and in this way acquire a starting point from which to consider their political systems and group-

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *Myths*, pp. 72-5. Cf. Turner, p. 279.

<sup>2</sup> W. Gill, *Gems*, vol. II, pp. 280 *sqq.*

<sup>3</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. xxiv, pp. 280 *sqq.*

ing in later days. In this case, unfortunately, I have found no material from which to do this; but I have introduced the legendary names in view of the possibility of further information becoming available hereafter.

Moss (1889) was told that Manihiki had two villages at opposite ends, each with its own king; at this time the king had, it is said, no direct power, but apparently this was due to missionary influence, and so loses its interest<sup>1</sup>. There is a reference in 1899 to a conversation with a chief<sup>2</sup>; but this was followed by a retort by one who had been in the island for twelve months in 1862-3, that there were no chiefs there, the system having been absolutely democratic, and no man having higher rank than another, though some social distinction could be acquired by wealth<sup>3</sup>.

#### BUKABUKA

According to a tradition of Bukabuka (Danger Island), to the west of Manihiki, collected by a missionary in 1904, whilst a god named Tamaye was watching the island, then merely a rock, it burst asunder and a man named Uyo appeared, who enlarged the island. He had a Tongan wife called Te Vao-pupu, and they had a son Tu-muri-vaka and a daughter Mata-kiate. Uyo was the ancestor of the people. In very ancient times two warriors, named Tokai-pore and Taupe-roa came from Tonga, and settled the people in three districts, of which one was called Avarua or Kotiporo, another Te Awea or Pana-uri, and the third Taka-numi or Ure-kava. There is a reference to a king of the islands in ancient times. It is stated that the people reckoned their "descent" from the mother's side. The tribe which was the most ancient, probably the first settlers, was called Te Ua-ruro, descended from an ancestress called Te Raio. The next most ancient tribe was called Te Mango; the third was called Te Uira, and the fourth Te Kati. These four were the most important tribes of the island, but there were a number of sub-tribes<sup>4</sup>. I have no means of co-ordinating any of these names of people, districts and tribes; but I may point out that Avarua was the name of the Karika district of Rarotonga. Further material, collected by Gill and found among his papers, has been published. This begins with the god Tamaei

<sup>1</sup> Moss, pp. 108, 110.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 222.

<sup>2</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. xxix, p. 88.

<sup>4</sup> *J.P.S.* vol. xiii, p. 173.

and his son—also a god—Matariki, and the creation by the latter of the earth and sea. Matariki founded a number of villages, the names of which are given, two of them being Muriutu and Angari-pure. The *ariki*, or high chief, of the island was named Akau-te-vaka, and lived in Muriutu. At a later period the *ariki* was Akamora, who appointed his granddaughter Akovika, the daughter of Kui, chief of Angari-pure, to succeed him on his death; but when she reached womanhood he delegated to her the chieftainship<sup>1</sup>. This discloses a system under which the island was divided into districts or villages, tribes and sub-tribes, and had a head chief who lived in one of the villages, and an under chief who lived in another.

### TONGAREVA

There are a few traditions as to the places from which settlers from other islands reached Tongareva or Penrhyn Island; but the prevailing idea in the island seems to have been that the people owed their origin to Mahuta, a chief of Manihiki<sup>2</sup> to whom I have already referred. I have found no information as to the political constitution of the island, except a statement that there were formerly eight different tribes whose spare time was spent in quarrelling with one another<sup>3</sup>.

### AUSTRAL ISLANDS

The only information of present interest concerning the Austral Islands that I have found is that the ears of their images were long<sup>4</sup>, and that Gayangos (1775) said that the people had *large* (my italics) perforations in their ears<sup>5</sup>; possibly this points to a Melanesian element there.

### RAPA

A few short references to the constitution of Rapa are too modern to be of any value. Ellis, however (1839), says that the island was divided into several districts, and was governed by one supreme ruler or king, and a number of subordinate chiefs<sup>6</sup>. I may say that Vine Hall provides what appear to be good maps of the island and of its principal inlet<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* vol. XXI, pp. 122 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Gill, *L.S.I.* p. 26; *Myths*, p. 75. Moss, p. 200. Lamont, p. 159.

<sup>3</sup> Moss, p. 106.

<sup>4</sup> Brown, *J.P.S.* vol. XXVII, p. 75.

<sup>5</sup> Corney, *Tahiti*, vol. II, p. 179. Cf. p. 312.

<sup>6</sup> Ellis, vol. III, p. 364.

<sup>7</sup> *N.Z.I.* vol. I, facing pp. 80 and 76.

## EASTER ISLAND

Easter Island, originally called Te Pito te Henua (the navel and uterus), but more recently Rapanui<sup>1</sup>, celebrated for its megalithic structures, its huge stone images, and its script tablets, which have been and are the subject of so much discussion, is the most south-easterly of the islands of Central Polynesia, being some distance south-east of the Paumotu. A map of the island by Thomson is published in the *Smithsonian Institution Reports*<sup>2</sup>, and another by Palmer in the *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*<sup>3</sup>. Mrs Scoresby Routledge, in her book recording the results of the recent investigations by her husband and herself, gives three maps; one of these is a general physical map<sup>4</sup>; another is almost identical, except that in it are marked the ancient roads<sup>5</sup>; the third has marked in it the political divisions of the island<sup>6</sup>. All these maps are substantially in accord with one another as regards the shape of the island, and, subject to detailed differences, the positions and names of villages, mountains, etc.; but Mrs Routledge's third map is the only one that shows the political divisions.

The map in this book is taken, by Mrs Routledge's kind permission, from her political map, which shows the names and positions of the divisions, and to which I have added the names of a number of villages appearing in her physical map, and some volcanic mountains, the names and situations of which are based on material supplied by her to me. The political divisions were intended by her to indicate broadly the geographical distribution of a number of groups of people, called by her "clans"; and I shall use this term in speaking of them. She informed me, however, shortly before she and her husband departed again for the Pacific at the end of 1920, that the marking of these divisions was only a rough and inaccurate indication of what appeared to be the actual distribution of the clans, they having become more or less mixed; and she very kindly offered to prepare for me, in the very limited time at her disposal, more detailed particulars of what was, so far as she had been able to learn, this actual distribution. I received from her the promised material, just

<sup>1</sup> W. J. Thomson, p. 452. Cf. Geiseler, p. 5; Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. XIX, p. 172.

<sup>2</sup> *Smithsonian Institution Report for 1889*, Pl. XII.

<sup>3</sup> *J.R.G.S.* vol. XL, facing p. 167.

<sup>4</sup> Mrs Routledge, p. 121.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 194.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 222.

as she was starting; it was therefore impossible for me to investigate it and communicate with her with reference to it before she sailed. Since then I have examined it, and, though there are matters of detail concerning which I have not been clear, and I may have made mistakes, I think I have followed her information correctly in the main; but Mrs Routledge stipulated that in making use of it I must point out that she was not responsible for my accuracy—a most obvious and necessary requirement, seeing that she had no opportunity of checking the correctness either of my understanding of the information she so kindly gave me or of my mode of exhibiting it in the form of a map. I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Mrs Routledge for the trouble she took for me in this matter at what must have been an exceedingly busy and strenuous time.

The boundaries, as shown by division lines, and names of clan districts appearing in my map are, as already stated, those indicated by Mrs Routledge's map; but I have indicated in my map, by means of geometrical figures, the actual distribution of the several clans, according to my understanding of Mrs Routledge's information. The distribution of the clans round the coast appears in parallel lines of figures; but I must point out as to this that my placing of the figures in lines is simply done for convenience and clarity to indicate intermixture, or in some cases perhaps overlapping, of clans, and not to suggest that they dwelt in separate outer and inner strata along the coast. In dealing with mountains and certain special *ahu* (burying places), as to which Mrs Routledge has given me information, I have, in each case, to avoid confusion in printing, put the name of the mountain above, and the figure or figures representing the clan or combinations of clans below. I have indicated the *ahu* by crosses, placing the figures below them, as with the mountains.

Close to the headland formed by Rano Kao, at the south-westerly corner of the island, are little rocky islets, called Motu Nui, Motu Itu, and Motu Kao-kao, which, especially Motu Nui (the largest of them), are specially important in connection with the bird cult of the island and the annual egg competition associated with it. By the sea shore, at the base of the slopes of Rano Kao, and immediately opposite these islets, was a village of stone houses called Orongo, and inland of Rano Kao—that is, at the base of its northern slope—was a village called Mataveri; and these two villages, especially Orongo, occupy

a prominent position in the accounts of the ceremonies of the cult.

There were, according to Mrs Routledge, two main divisions of the island, Kotuu (or Otuu) and Hotu Iti, which corresponded roughly with its western and eastern parts<sup>1</sup>. She speaks of the ten clans of the island as having been grouped, "more especially in legend, or speaking of the remote past" into these two major divisions, which, she says, were also known as the *mata-nui*, or greater clans, and *mata-iti*, or lesser clans<sup>2</sup>. This dual division was reflected in the line dividing the islet of Motu-Nui (the scene of the annual egg competition) between Kotuu and Hotu Iti, the line passing through the centre of the cave in the island where the competitors lived<sup>3</sup>; it was again reflected in the separation, east and west, in the group of houses at Orongo (where the people lived during the competition) allocated to the *tangata rongo rongo* (the script experts), of those coming from Kotuu and Hotu-Iti respectively<sup>4</sup>. Mrs Routledge says that legends disclose continued wars between the two divisions, and that fighting seems to have been constant in recent times, and to have taken place even between members of one clan<sup>5</sup>; from which I infer that there may also have been fighting between two or more clans in the same division. The Easter Islanders were also, as was the case in other parts of Polynesia, divided into two parties—the conquering and defeated groups. Mrs Routledge uses the term *ao* for the former, and says the men of the ascendant clan were also often spoken of as the *mata toa*, or warriors, the other clans being the *mata kio*, or servants<sup>6</sup>. The people were divided into these ten groups or clans (*mata*), which were associated with different parts of the island, though the boundaries blended and overlapped, and members of one division settled not infrequently among those of another. "Each person still knows his own clan"<sup>7</sup>. So also at Orongo there were separate groups of dwellings, each apparently having its own name, associated with the several clans, by whom they were said to have been built<sup>8</sup>. I have put the sentence as to knowledge of their clans in inverted commas, because it shows that Mrs Routledge, in discussing the clans, is not making a statement based merely upon hearsay evidence as to the past.

<sup>1</sup> Mrs Routledge, p. 221.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 260.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 257.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*


<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 223.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 261.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 259 and note 1.

# EASTER ISLAND



The names of the ten clans, given by Mrs Routledge, and appearing in the map are Miru, Hamea, Raa, Marama, Hau-moana, Ngatimo, Ngaure, Hitiuira (Ureohei), Tupahotu and Koro-Orongo. She says that the Rano Kao area was not apparently part of a specific clan district; but that the Marama, Hau-moana and Miru people had spread over the mountain, and formed settlements by the margin of the crater lake. She refers to the mixture with the Miru group of the smaller Hamea group, and says that the Raa group was spoken of in conjunction with those of Miru and Hamea<sup>1</sup>.

As regards the meanings of these names, Mrs Routledge points out that *raa* means "the sun," and *marama* "light"<sup>2</sup>; but the latter term is also used widely in Polynesia for "the moon." She could get no native explanation of the others, but obtained from Mr Sidney H. Ray the following information derived from other Polynesian sources. Kotuu appears to be a contraction of *ko-otuu*, meaning "the hill"; I suggest that it may refer to the important crater Rano Kao. *Hotu iti* signifies a "small hill," probably, Mrs Routledge suggests, Rano-raraku. *Hau-moana* means the "sea breeze." *Hitiuira* is probably *hiti-ra*, or "sun-rise"; and *Ure-o-hei* another version of *ura-o-hehe* or "red of sundown." *Koro-o-Rongo* is probably derived from the well-known Polynesian god Rongo, and means the "ring of Rongo"—that is, the "rainbow"<sup>3</sup>. As regards *Miru*, I may point out that it is in several of the islands the name of the demon of *Avaiiki*—the lower world; but this meaning may be in no way connected with the name of the clan.

If we compare the linear delineation of the island into clan districts, as reproduced from Mrs Routledge's map, with the actual coastal distribution of the clans, as shown by my geometrical figures, based on her subsequent more exact information, we shall see that the difference between them is not very great. The following are, I think, the main points to be noted—I shall use the terms "district" and "distribution" in considering them.

The Miru distribution practically coincides with their district, except that they spread further southward on the western coast. The Hamea distribution is all within the Miru district. The Raa distribution is broadly in the "Hamea Raa" end of the Miru district, and there are also there Miru and Hamea elements. The Marama distribution, so far as its

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 221 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 223 note 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*



coast line is concerned, coincides practically with their district on the south coast, but on the west coast it spreads northwards and southwards into the Miru and Haumoana districts. The Haumoana distribution extends beyond their district into the Ngatimo district on the south coast, and into the Marama and Miru districts on the west coast. The Ngatimo distribution spreads westward into the Haumoana district. The Ngaure district and distribution are very similar. As regards the Hitiuira, Tupahotu and Koro-orongo people, no separate districts are shown for them in the original map; and their distribution places them practically in their joint district. I think the results of Mrs Routledge's detailed investigation justify her map, rather than her anxieties as to its inaccuracy or insufficiency; though, as regards the latter, she has certainly made her particulars more exact and minute.

The groupings of the people round the mountains and close to the *ahu* do not in most cases involve removals to any great distances from their districts, these only appearing in the cases of some of the people by the mountains Otuu and Kataro-tetaka and one of the *ahu*; and even as regards these, we must bear in mind that the length of a line drawn from the south-western to the eastern point is only about thirteen or fourteen miles. In most of the cases of these inland groupings the clans represented were grouped together on the adjacent, or somewhat adjacent coast; the inland populations do not seem to disclose much clan association which was not more or less present on the coast.

I now turn, in connection with this division into groups and their districts, to Thomson's account of the tradition as to the division by Hotumatua, the first king of Easter Island, among his sons, adding my own comments in brackets. Hotu-matua, feeling his end approaching, summoned the chief men to meet in council. He nominated his eldest son Tuumae-Heke as his successor, and divided the island into districts, which were apportioned out to his six children as follows:

To Tuumae-Heke (the eldest son) the royal establishment, and lands extending from Anakena to the north-west as far as Mouna (mount) Tea-tea.

[Anakena is near the easterly end of the northern coast of the Miru district, and Mt Tea-tea is in the extreme easterly end of the island; so apparently there is something here which is not clear. As, however, Tuumae-Heke was made king of the whole island, the land given to him might have been only a sort of royal demesne.]

To Miru (second son) the lands between Anakena and Hanga Roa.

[This allocation practically coincides with the Miru district.]

To Marama (third son) the lands between Akahanga and Vinapu.

[This practically coincides with the southern coast lines of Marama, Ngatimo and Haumoana.]

To Raa (fourth son) the land lying northward and westward of Mouna Tea-tea, called Hanga Toe.

[Hanga Toe does not appear in any of the maps, but Mrs Routledge, in a rough map prepared for the purpose of her explanation of group distribution, shows Vai Toa in the position shown by my map. *Hanga* means a bay, and *Vai* is a wide-spread Polynesian word for water; *toa* is a Polynesian word for a warrior or brave man, and *toe* is perhaps the same as *toa*. So Hanga Toe and Vai Toa may have the same meaning. In any case the Raa district is north-west (more west than north) of Mt Tea-tea, so the district of Raa is in the neighbourhood of the land said to have been allotted to Raa.]

To Korona-ronga (fifth son) lands between Anakena and the crater Rano-Raraku.

[This coincides roughly with the northern part of the district of the Tupahotu, Hitiuira and Koro-orongo groups, except that it includes the Raa district. Perhaps the names Korona-ronga and Koro-orongo are the same, in which case the general similarity of names and districts is obvious.]

To Hotu-iti (sixth son) lands on the east side of the island.

[Hotuiti is the eastern division of the island, but it is not the name of one of Mrs Routledge's groups and districts<sup>1</sup>.]

I have not been able to identify Tuumae Heke with any of Mrs Routledge's district groups, and Hotu-iti's name is that of one of her two main divisions. On the other hand, there are no sons with whom we can identify her Hamea, Haumoana, Ngatimo, Ngaure, Tupahotu and Hitiuira groups. It is quite possible that the Hamea group was a branch of the Miru, that the Haumoana and Ngatimo groups were branches of the Marama, and perhaps Ngaure, Tupahotu and Hitiuira may have been connected in some way with the two sons Korona-ronga and Hotu-iti, though there is no indication that this was so. Looking at the matter broadly, however, any differences between an earlier distribution, attributed by tradition to Hotu-matua, and the division into ten clans reported by Mrs Routledge, are not at all in excess of what we might expect.

Several writers speak of the traditions as to the arrival in Easter Island of this man Hoto-matua and his followers. The

<sup>1</sup> W. J. Thomson, p. 527.

question whether or not they came from the island of Rapa, as is alleged by some, is not material to my present purpose, which is concerned only with the political organization of the island. According to the version given by Thomson, the island was discovered by King Hotu-matua, who came with three hundred chosen followers in two large double canoes, and first landed on the north coast; the two canoes then explored the coast, travelling in opposite directions, and ultimately, on again meeting at Anakena Bay, on the north coast, they landed and named the landing place Anakena in honour of the month of August, in which the island was discovered. In this account Thomson tells us also something of certain previous matters relating to the expedition, in connection with which is introduced the name of Oroï, an enemy of Hotu-matua, who also landed, and the subsequent capture and killing of Oroï by Hotu-matua's people<sup>1</sup>. Thomson also refers to a tradition that the old name (Pito-te-Henua) of the island had been given to it by Hotu-matua<sup>2</sup>. Lapelin refers to the Hotu-matua tradition, speaking of the king as having been named Hotu or Tuouyo; he says the expedition came in two great vessels and landed at Anakena, and established itself there, and that shortly afterwards the king divided out the land, and established colonies at Hanga Roa, Mataveri, Vaihu (see map for these) and Utu-iti (? Hotu-iti)<sup>3</sup>. Jaussen refers to the tradition that Hotu-matua was the first to discover the island, and to people it with his followers, and was its first king, and had about thirty successors, whose names had been transmitted<sup>4</sup>. Smith gives another version, in which he calls this king Hotu-rapa (king of Rapa), and says that he was the first of twenty-two generations of kings reigning in the island<sup>5</sup>. Finally we have Mrs Routledge's account, giving some further details of alleged events previous to the landing, including the arrival and killing of Oroï, and telling us that Hotu-matua had many sons, of whom Tuumahiki was the eldest, and that the different clans of the island were descended from these sons, and bore their names<sup>6</sup>. In one of her letters to me, Mrs Routledge said that the ancestors of the several clans were said to have been sons, or in some cases grandsons, of the common ancestor Hotu-matua; the reference to grandsons might be based on traditions of clan fissions.

<sup>1</sup> W. J. Thomson, pp. 526-31.

<sup>3</sup> Lapelin, *R.M.C.* vol. xxxv, p. 108.

<sup>5</sup> Smith, *J.P.S.* vol. xix, p. 172.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 452.

<sup>4</sup> Jaussen, p. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Mrs Routledge, pp. 277 *sqq.*

Other traditions concerning early settlements of Easter Island, are reported; but I have confined myself to those relating to Hotu-matua, as they are the only accounts which suggest any clue to the political division or organization of the island. Without considering for the moment the question whether there had been previous inhabitants, akin to the Melanesians or otherwise, it does seem that there had probably been an arrival of some sort, such as these traditions allege. The tale of Hotu-matua's distribution of the land among his sons may be based more or less on historical fact, and it may be that these sons were the ancestors of the several groups of people who afterwards inhabited the islands; even though this cannot be assumed, that is, even if, for example, the tale may have been a subsequent invention, it is probable that such an invention would be made in accord with the *status quo* at the time it was made. In that case we are led to think that there were separate social groups in the island, which were at all events believed to be, or represented as being, related in the sense of having a common ancestor; and the similarity between the positions of the areas said to have been allotted by the king to some of his sons, and the actual positions of the districts bearing those sons' names, as given by Mrs Routledge, is a matter to be noted.

A few lists of the kings of Easter Island have been published. They differ widely; but a common feature of them, which is of interest in connection with the subject now under consideration, is the appearance in these lists of names identical, or similar to, those of the districts, as given by Mrs Routledge. The following are extracts from these lists, the comments in brackets being my own.

Thomson's list<sup>1</sup> contains fifty-seven names, of which the first is Hotu-matua and the second Tuumaeheke, and it includes the following. The queries in brackets are mine:

- 4. Miru.
- 7. Raa.
- 19. Korua-Rongo [? Koro-orongo].
- 44. Haumoana.

A list by Lesson (apparently of queens)<sup>2</sup> contains eighteen

<sup>1</sup> W. J. Thomson, p. 534.

<sup>2</sup> Lesson, *Poly.* vol. II, pp. 292 sq. Cf. Lapelin, *R.M.C.* vol. xxxv, p. 109 and Tregear, *J.P.S.* vol. I, p. 101, referring apparently to the same list.

names, of which the first is Hotu and the second Inumeke (see next list as to this), and which includes

4. Marama roa.
7. Mira [? Miru].

Lapelin gives a list<sup>1</sup> containing thirty-two names, of which the first is Hotumotua and the second Tumaheke (which is, he says, the same as Inumeke), and which includes

3. Miru-a-Tumaheke.
4. Lata-Miru.
5. Miru-o-hata.
7. Ataraya-a-Miru.

Jaussen's list<sup>2</sup> of thirty names begins with Hoatumatua, followed by Tumaheke, and includes

3. Miru-Tumaheke.
4. Hata-miru.
5. Miru-o-hata.
7. Atahenga-a-Miru.

Mrs Routledge, in one of her letters to me, draws attention to the hard lines of separation on the north coast between the Tupahotu people and their neighbours to the west, and on the south coast between the Ngaure and the Marama people to the west. A glance at the map will show how marked these separations are, as compared with the internal intermixtures that appear among the groups of each of the two main divisions in the west and east respectively. I think that this is probably a feature in the modern grouping of the people which may possibly be associated with the ancient hostility between west and east, to which I have already referred. Mrs Routledge also refers in this letter to the distribution on the southern part of the western coast, where the Miru, the Marama and the Haumoana are "continually intermixed," and compares it with the situation among the eastern clans, who, she says, are "practically amalgamated, but keep their individuality." I gather from this, that, though in each case there is a geographical intermingling, there is among these south-western groups of people some social or political bond which is not present in the east; but unfortunately I had no opportunity of ascertaining exactly from Mrs Routledge what she meant. Having referred to the fact that the Miru people are not found on the southern coast, she says that the Marama and Haumoana "spread across the plain,"

<sup>1</sup> *R.M.C.* vol. xxxv, p. 109 note 1.

<sup>2</sup> Jaussen, p. 3.

and occupy quite distinct territories on the southern coast. These two clans are continually spoken of as "the Marama of Tahai" and "the Marama of Vaihu," and "the Haumoana of Mataveri" and "the Haumoana of Vinapu." [The names of these four places appear in the map.] Then again, as regards the interior, she says there are practically no remains of life in the "higher ground inland," and this was why she did not deal with the interior in her published map. She, however, had given me some information based on statements made, these dealing principally with the hills, simply because these were definite points about which she could ask. She warns me that this confinement of the information mainly to the hills is misleading, as it looks like settlements. If I follow correctly Mrs Routledge's meaning in this matter, her point is that we must understand that these clans shown in my map as clustered by the hills were not isolated settlements, but rather specific spots, concerning which she could get information, and which may be regarded as land marks to indicate a probable distribution of the clans in the respective neighbourhoods of the hills.

Mrs Routledge has also told me that most of the clans are divided into sub-clans, and has given me some information about these; but I will deal with this information in a later chapter.

We have up to this point been confined to the question of an old division of the island into two parts, west and east, and the separation of its people into a number of what Mrs Routledge calls clans, which were to a certain extent mixed up, but the districts of which were in other respects fairly well defined. I now propose to consider the main features of the political constitution of the people so distributed.

J. R. Forster says that in Easter Island there was hardly a distinction observable between the magistrate and the subjects. They (that is, the magistrates) had the name and the dignity, and some attendance, and were, on the arrival of strangers, better dressed; but he thought their authority was more like that of a benevolent parent than the imperious dictates of a king<sup>1</sup>. Forster was only a very short time in Easter Island, but I gather that there were people whom he regarded as being chiefs. Eugène (1864) says it would not be easy to characterize the authority of the chiefs, and he did not even know on what basis it rested; it appeared to be simply influence taken by some

<sup>1</sup> Forster, *Obs.* p. 380.

over their neighbours, which was recognized gradually<sup>1</sup>. Ollivier (1866), after saying that the people had forgotten largely their religious cults, says that there was no longer authority or subordination; Frère Eugène, during a sojourn of nine months, was unable to discover chiefs really recognized as such, though some parties, headed by individuals who were bolder, disposed of the peace of the island. It had not always been like this. Even quite lately they had recognized an hereditary monarchy, but the last king, carried off by pirates, had died in Peru, and his son, a boy of 12 or 14 years old, was the first adult catechumen. They still had a certain respect for him, and brought him first fruits of the yam; but he did not interfere at all in the affairs of the island, his power being usurped by agitators who succeeded each other each year in tyrannizing the population<sup>2</sup>. The way in which these petty tyrants transmitted power was most original. Towards the month of September the candidates were transported with their respective partisans to the highest mountains of the island, where they camped, generally for six to eight weeks. It was a question of making choice of the chief. It was the discovery of one of the nests of certain birds that appointed the elected man. The happy bird's-nester was immediately recognized as chief and invested with tyrannical power. His people accompanied him to the bay where he resided, and served him as slaves for two or three months. If the nest had been discovered by a partisan of the last chief, the party returned home with honour; if he belonged to another party, the fallen party was shamefully relegated to a corner of the island, where all its adherents perished with poverty and cold. Then, with the installation of the new man, pillaging and conflagrations began; the chief, escorted by his people, swooped down on the houses like a bird of prey. It was this practice that had reduced the island to a state of extreme distress<sup>3</sup>. Palmer (1868) says that he met one of the chiefs, of whom there were at that time only four<sup>4</sup>. The monarchy was elective; after the death of the sovereign, all the high chiefs met together near the Terano Kau [he evidently refers to the mountain Rano Kao], and the candidates, to show their capability, descended the cliff there, swam to the islets, secured sea fowls' eggs, and returned with them, the succession going to him who showed the greater dexterity<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *A.P.F.* vol. xxxviii, pp. 62 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* vol. xxxix, p. 255. <sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 255 sq.

<sup>4</sup> *J.E.S.*, N.S., vol. 1, p. 372.

<sup>5</sup> Palmer, *J.R.G.S.* vol. xl, p. 173.

Lapelin (1872) says kings were regarded as divine; they enjoyed absolute power over the lives and property of the people, their persons were sacred, and the people owed them first-fruits. Besides the king there was another principal chief, whose power lasted for a year, and whose character [by which I imagine he refers to the character of the office] seems to have been exclusively military. Then, referring to the egg-getting performance, he tells of the general gathering of the people on the edge of the volcano Kau, and says that he who secured the first egg was elected chief, and from that moment enjoyed the prerogatives of his position. Two or three persons, selected by him, were sacrificed to ensure the prosperity of his reign; and the choice of these victims often led to war. He refers also to a statement by one of the missionaries, from which I gather that this person, spoken of as a king, held office for one year, "without prejudice to him who reigned by right of primogeniture"<sup>1</sup>. According to Geiseler (1882), in former days the king ruled the common people almost despotically. After him, the chiefs had the most authority, and formed the counsellors in all cases<sup>2</sup>. In these earlier days the kings were equivalent to priests, and directed and led the religious feasts<sup>3</sup>. Thomson (1886) says the island was divided into districts, having distinct names and governed by the chiefs, all of whom acknowledged the supremacy of the king; there was no confederation, each clan being independent of all the rest, except so far as the powerful are naturally dominant over the weak. The king reigned over the entire island, and was not disturbed by defeat or victory of any of the clans<sup>4</sup>. Speaking of the script tablets, he says that only the royal family, chiefs of the six districts and their sons, and certain priests and teachers, understood their character<sup>5</sup>. As regards the egg collecting, he says that according to the most reliable information that could be obtained, the stone houses at Orongo [the village on the shore side of Rano Kao, referred to above] were built for the accommodation of the people whilst celebrating the festival of the "sea birds' eggs," and were probably unoccupied during the rest of the year. The competitors started on their race on the call to "go," pronounced by the king, who was about the only able-bodied man on the island who did not participate. According to an

<sup>1</sup> Lapelin, *R.M.C.* vol. xxxv, pp. 109 *sq.*, and *note* p. 110.

<sup>2</sup> Geiseler, p. 41.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 33

<sup>4</sup> W. J. Thomson, p. 472.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 514.



ancient custom, the fortunate individual who obtained possession of the first egg, and returned with it unbroken, became entitled to certain privileges and rights during the following year. No special authority was vested in him, but it was supposed that he had won the approval of the great spirit Meke-meke, and was entitled to receive contributions of food and other considerations from his fellows<sup>1</sup>.

Mrs Routledge's evidence is extremely recent; but, on the other hand, she was on the island for a considerable time, during which she was able to make enquiries. She says that with the exception of the Miru, there were no chiefs, nor any form of government, any man who was an expert in war becoming a leader<sup>2</sup>; and again that the Miru were the only group that had a headman or chief, who was known as the *ariki*, or sometimes as the *ariki-mau*, the great chief, to distinguish him from the *ariki-paka*, a term which seems to have been given to all the other members of the clan; as regards this last statement she says the evidence was rather contradictory; but no Miru could be found, male or female, to whom the title was not given<sup>3</sup>. Mrs Routledge reports another curious difference between the Miru group and the others. That group was, she says, on the border-line between religion and magic, and its members had, in the opinion of the islanders, the supernatural and valuable gift of being able to increase all food supplies, especially that of chickens, and this power was particularly in evidence after death. She says that the skulls obtained from Easter Island that were marked with designs, such as the outline of a fish, were Miru skulls, and were called *puoko-mua*, or fowl heads, because they had in particular the quality of making hens lay eggs; and gives an example of a man who made his own skull an heirloom, as "it was so extremely good for chickens," and that he did not wish it to go out of the family<sup>4</sup>. As regards Mrs Routledge's statement that there were no chiefs but those of Miru, I draw attention to references to chiefs by other writers. Perhaps most of the chiefs had been carried off by the Peruvian raiders.

Mrs Routledge tells us something about the *ariki* or *ariki-mau*, the chief of the Miru, the only group who, according to her account, had a chief. His office was hereditary, and he was the only man who was obliged to marry into his own clan [probably

<sup>1</sup> W. J. Thomson, p. 482.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 241.

<sup>2</sup> Mrs Routledge, p. 224.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 240.

to avoid the dilution of the royal blood by the introduction of a less sacred strain]. It was customary, when he was old and feeble, that he should resign in favour of his son. The last man to fill the post of *ariki* with its original dignity was Ngaara, who died shortly before the Peruvian raid, and becomes a very real personage to anyone enquiring into the history of the island<sup>1</sup>. This raid took place as recently as the "sixties" of last century<sup>2</sup>; so we may well believe that Mrs Routledge would be able to secure fairly accurate information about Ngaara. Ngaara was short, and very stout, with white skin, as had all his family, but was so heavily tattooed as to look black. He wore feather hats of various descriptions, and was hung round, both back and front, with little wooden ornaments, which jingled as he walked. At the time when Mrs Routledge's informants could remember him his wife was dead, and he lived with his son Kaimokoi<sup>3</sup>. [The name of Kaimokoi appears next after that of Ngaara in both Thomson's and Lapelin's lists.] It was not permitted to see Ngaara and his son eat, and no one but the servants was allowed to enter the house. His head-quarters were at Anakena, the cove on the island where, according to tradition, the first canoe landed [see above]. He held official position for the whole island; but he was neither a leader in war, nor the fount of justice, nor even a priest; he could best be described as the custodian of certain customs and traditions<sup>4</sup>.

Mrs Routledge tells us a number of specific things about Ngaara, which will help us to realize what he was. He was the highest authority on the tablet scripts<sup>5</sup>. He was said to have hundreds of them in his house<sup>6</sup>. He himself gave instructions in the art of writing the scripts, and he examined the candidates prepared by other professors—generally their own sons—inspecting their work, which he made them read, and either passing them or turning them back according to the results. Every year there was a gathering at Anakena of *rongo-rongo* men (the professors of the art, of whom there were some in each clan), of whom it is said several hundreds would be present. The people of the neighbouring districts brought offerings of food to Ngaara for distribution among the multitude. He and his son Kaimokoi sat on seats made of tablets, and each held one in his hand. They wore feather hats, as did all the professors. Both old and young *rongo-rongo* men read their tablets

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 241.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 241 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 205.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 243.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 241.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 245.

and if a young man failed, he was called up and his errors pointed out to him, whilst if an old man did not read well Ngaara caused him to be taken away, and he was deprived of his hat. The performance lasted all day, and when it was over Ngaara stood on a platform, borne by eight men, and addressed the *rongo-rongo* men on their duties and doing well, and gave each of them a chicken. According to another account, Ngaara sat upon his stoep, and the old men stood before him and prayed. There were, besides this "great day," minor assemblies of the *rongo-rongo* at Anakena at new moon, or the last quarter of the moon, when Ngaara walked up and down, reading the tablets, whilst the old men stood in a body and looked on. Ngaara used also to travel round the island, staying a week or two in different localities with the resident experts<sup>1</sup>. He also held receptions from time to time at Anakena; they were special occasions for exhibiting the tattooed decorations for his criticism, and were also attended by men who had made boats, and by twins, to whom Ngaara gave a "royal name"; also he was visited once a month by "all people," who brought him a plant called *pua* on the end of sticks, placing the *pua* in the house, and retiring backwards; so also he attended the inauguration of any house of importance, and he and an attendant *ivi-atua* (a sort of priest) were the first to eat in the new dwelling<sup>2</sup>. Mrs Routledge tells us, as regards what I may call more definitely religious functions, that the Easter Island act most nearly approaching a religious ceremony was conducted under his auspices, though not by him personally. In time of drought, he sent up a younger son and other *ariki-paka* to a hill top to pray for rain to Hiro, who was said to be the god of the sky<sup>3</sup>. At the time of the egg-gathering ceremony the *rongo-rongo*, assembled at Orongo, and chanted all day; they went there at the command of Ngaara, but he himself never appeared at Orongo, though he sometimes paid a friendly call at Mataveri<sup>4</sup>. [A possible significance of this discrimination may be found in the fact that Orongo was the centre of the ceremonies, where all the people engaged in them assembled, whilst Mataveri was, according to Mrs Routledge, only a temporary abiding place prior to the actual performances<sup>5</sup>.] It was he, apparently, who had more especially the fount of the power possessed by

<sup>1</sup> Mrs Routledge, pp. 245 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 242.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 259. But see Thomson's statement (*ante*) that the king started the competitors.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 243.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 260.

some of the Miru people of producing chickens. If the people wanted chickens, they applied to him, and he sent an *ariki paka* with *maru* (strings of white feathers tied on sticks which they placed among yams to make them grow), and his visits were always attended with success. He never ate rats, and one day, coming across a youthful *ariki paka* in his entourage watching rats being cooked, he was very angry, because if the youth had eaten them, his [the youth's?] power for producing chickens would have diminished, presumably, Mrs Routledge suggests, because the youth would have imbibed ratty nature, which was disastrous to eggs and young chickens<sup>1</sup>. I imagine that the rats would be taboo to both Ngaara and anyone who took part in procuring chickens for fear of the action of imitative magic. Ngaara was evidently a magician, for once, when this same youth had his long hair cut off whilst he was asleep, Ngaara, by means of a spell, blasted the offender who promptly died<sup>2</sup>, [before, I presume, he had been able, by means of the purloined hair, to practise contagious magic on the boy]. The great Ngaara was, however, subject to the vicissitudes of life. The Ngaure clan, having acquired the ascendancy, carried off the Miru as slaves; Ngaara, with his son and grandson were taken to Akahanga [in the Ngaure district], where they remained in captivity for five years, at the end of which, the Miru and Tupahotu clans uniting in an effort, they were rescued; but the old man was ill and died shortly afterwards<sup>3</sup>.

I have already quoted Mrs Routledge's statement that outside Miru there were no chiefs, nor any form of government, any man who was an expert in war becoming a leader; but I must refer, in connection with this matter, to certain statements of hers concerning the egg-finding ceremony. She says that it was a solemn matter, and not one for a general scramble. Only those who belonged to the clan in the ascendancy for the time being could enter on the quest<sup>4</sup>. Sometimes one group would keep it [by this she evidently means the egg] in their hands for years, or they might pass it on to a friendly clan [she is evidently using the terms "group" and "clan" with the same meaning]. This selection gave rise, as might be expected, to burnings of hearts, and the matter might be, and probably often was, settled by war. One year the Marama were inspired

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 242.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 242 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 246.

<sup>4</sup> Query. See Mrs Routledge's reference to the dual division of the islet of Motu-nui and the separation of the houses at Orongo.

with jealousy because the Miru had chosen the Ngaure as their successors, and burnt down the house of Ngaara. Sometimes several clans combined<sup>1</sup>. The actual competitors were men of importance, and remained in Orongo, and employed others to engage in the competition as their representatives<sup>2</sup>. Prior to a competition an *ivi-atua*, a divinely gifted individual having the power of prophecy, would dream that a certain man was favoured by the gods, and would win<sup>3</sup>; and in the actual hunt the gods intervened, so that the representative of a man who was not destined to win would go past the egg, even when it lay in his path<sup>4</sup>. I gather from this that the result of the competition was governed by arrangements made beforehand, upon which the prophet's dream was perhaps based; and such a situation might well often be the subject of mutual jealousy and trouble among the clans. The successful competitor took his egg to a house the use of which was apparently confined to the egg-winner of the year, and remained in this house for a year, of which five months were spent in strict taboo. Whilst the taboo lasted he did not wash, and spent his days in sleeping, only coming out to sit in the shade. His correct head-dress was made of human hair, and if it were not worn the *aku-aku* (a god or spirit) would be angry. The house was divided into two halves of which one was occupied by another man, who, Mrs Routledge says, was apparently a poor relation of the hero. There were two cooking places, as even this attendant might not share that of the "bird-man." Food was brought as gifts, especially the first sugar cane, and these offerings seem to have been the sole practical advantage of victory; those who did not contribute were apt to have their houses burnt<sup>5</sup>. We are not told what this man did at the expiration of the five months' taboo.

There were evidently a number of villages in the island, but we have no information as to any system of local self-government of these villages. As regards families, "since the decay of political independence" the whole organization rested simply in the family. Each family lived according to the instructions of its head, who was the highest person. Young people remained in the family till they founded their own household, and the father exercised all the privileges over the individual members of the family, and permitted or appointed their

<sup>1</sup> Mrs Routledge, p. 258.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 260.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 262.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 260 sqq.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 263 sq.

marriage. Much was thought of relationship, and good relations generally existed between the separate members<sup>1</sup>. This statement apparently refers to domestic rather than to consanguine families; and no doubt it represents the state of things prior to the decay of political independence, as well as afterwards, so far as the domestic affairs of the household were concerned.

I think that a consideration of the evidence given above enables us to construct what seems to me to have been most probably the main outline of the political system of Easter Island, and I will now suggest what I think this was, though in some cases the evidence is conflicting.

This is not the place in which to discuss the origin of the Easter Islanders, or the hypothesis of an original Melanesian population, followed by a migration or migrations of Polynesians. There were a number of traditions of an immigration into the island, and according to some of them, to which I have referred above, Hotu-matua was at the head of the party. Thomson, from whom we have the fullest account of the division of the land by Hotu-matua among his sons, was only, I think, on the island for a couple of weeks; but we find this tradition mentioned by Lapelin (who refers to Hotu-matua's distribution of the land), by Jaussen (who says he peopled it with his followers), by Smith, and by Mrs Routledge (who says the clans of the island were descended from the sons of Hotu-matua, and bore their names); and there is the substantial correspondence of the areas allotted, according to Thomson, to some of the sons and certain actual district group areas, as stated by Mrs Routledge. It seems clear that, whether or not the tale about the arrival of Hotu-matua, and the division among his sons, is true, it at all events represents an Easter Island tradition, and it is the only available explanation of the origin of the division of the island into districts. I shall therefore take Hotu-matua as the starting point in discussing the political system of the island.

Hotu-matua was the head chief of his party of immigrants, and according to these traditions he was the first of a long line of head chiefs or kings of the whole island. We have, as regards these kings, Ollivier's reference to a past hereditary monarchy, entitled to first-fruits; Lapelin's statements that these kings were divine and their persons sacred, and that they enjoyed

<sup>1</sup> Geiseler, p. 41.

absolute power over the lives and property of the people, who had to offer them first-fruits, and that the other principal chief, to whom he refers, held office for a year "without prejudice to him who reigned by right of primogeniture"; we have also Geiseler's reference to the almost despotic power of the king, and to his priestly duties and control of religious feasts; and Thomson's statements that he reigned over the entire island, and was not disturbed by defeat or victory of any of the clans, and that the chiefs of the districts acknowledged his supremacy, and that it was he who started the race for the egg, but did not take part in it. The title *ariki mau*, which Mrs Routledge says was given to the king, is suggestive, for, according to Tregear's dictionary, the word *mau* had in Polynesia a wide-spread general meaning involving ideas of retaining and holding fast, continuing, lasting, remaining perpetually. Mrs Routledge identifies him as having been the head chief of the Miru group; and we have her statements that his office was hereditary, and that, though not a leader in war, he held position for the whole island, and her evidence of the taboo which applied to him.

The evidence points to the presence in past times of an hereditary family of kings ruling over the whole of the island, possessing great sanctity, performing religious functions, and also enormous—apparently absolute—secular powers. According to Mrs Routledge, these kings or *ariki-mau*, were the head chiefs of the Miru clan. This would be consistent with the traditions of the landing of Hotu-matua at Anakena, which was in the Miru district, and which, according to Mrs Routledge, was the seat of the head-quarters of King Ngaara. It is also consistent with the statement that on the defeat of the Miru people by the Ngaure clan, the Miru king Ngaara and members of his family were taken to captivity in Akahanga in the Ngaure district, and the Miru people were carried off as slaves. Some of the sanctity and supernatural powers of the king seems to have been possessed by the other members of his clan—that would, I imagine, refer mainly to the upper classes who would be related to him—and we perhaps see this reflected in Mrs Routledge's statement that it was in the Miru district that they had the minor titles of *ariki-paka*, there being, as she puts it, no chiefs outside this district, and, in her further statement as to the extensive use of the term *ariki* in that district. As regards this, my suggestion is that, even after the powers of the Miru chief and his people had passed away, or partly so,

there was still a lingering recognition of the importance of the Miru people.

Apparently in the relatively recent period of Ngaara, and perhaps before then—we know nothing as to this—the king had adopted a practice of delegating some, at all events, of his religious duties to others; and the evidence suggests that at some period his religious power, and apparently his secular authority, had declined. This is illustrated by the defeat of the Miru people by the Ngaure group, and the carrying off of Ngaara and his son and grandson to Akahanga. Ollivier (1866) refers to the hereditary monarchy as a thing of the past, only recently discontinued; Palmer (1868) seems to confuse the sacred and secular kingship; Lapelin (1872) refers to the divinity and absolute power of the kings, but is apparently speaking of past times; Geiseler (1882) speaks of his priestly duties and despotic powers in former days; and Thomson (1886) refers in the past tense to his acknowledged supremacy. Mrs Routledge says, concerning the recent king Ngaara, that, though he held official position over the whole island, he was neither a leader in war, nor the fount of justice, nor even a priest, and could be best described as the custodian of certain customs and traditions; it is evident, however, from her own account of this king that, if he did not actually engage in strictly religious duties himself, he directed their performance by others, was the subject of a taboo, was credited with magical powers, and performed certain ceremonial duties. I do not think we must assume that the statements as to the loss of power of the kings point solely to a process of natural, social or political evolution. We do not know to what extent it may have been due to the carrying off, in the "sixties" by the Peruvian slavers, of the last king, leaving only a young boy, and the conversion, referred to by Ollivier, of the latter to Christianity.

I have adopted the view that the sacred king of the whole island was the head chief of the Miru people; but I must draw attention to a difficulty which attends this assumption. In referring to the long lists of kings I have picked out and mentioned some names that were identical with those of certain groups, including the Miru and others, the latter being Raa, Koro-orongo (?), Haumoana and Marama; and one would imagine that these must have been head chiefs of, or in some way specially associated with, the groups whose names they bore. Mrs Routledge is our only authority for the direct statement



that the king was the Miru chief, which he apparently was at the relatively recent period of which she gives specific detailed information; and the question is whether this had always been so. Ollivier speaks of the monarchy as having been "hereditary"; Palmer's "elective" monarchy refers to the chief who secured the egg, and who was, I think, the secular king; Lapelin speaks of the king as reigning "by right of primogeniture"; Mrs Routledge says the office of *ariki-mau* was hereditary; and Kaimokoi, who succeeded Ngaara, was his son. We may therefore believe that, whether or not succession to the kingship necessarily went to a son or other descendant of a deceased king, it at all events went to a member of his family, which would keep the succession within the clan; and this alone would be inconsistent with its passing backwards and forwards, as between the clans. We also have Thomson's statement that the king reigned over the entire island, and was not disturbed by defeat or victory of any of the clans, which, if correct, eliminates one possible source of change in the clanship of the king; and we have Mrs Routledge's statement that the *ariki-mau* was obliged to marry into his own clan, which, if true, removes the possibility of the throne passing to another clan as the result of clan intermarriage. The combined effect of this evidence is, I think, a fairly strong presumption that the kingship remained with one of these clans or groups, and apparently the Miru were the royal group. How then are we to account for the apparent inconsistency involved by the inclusion of these other clan names in the lists of kings? If we look at Thomson's list of fifty-seven kings, we find that these names are Nos 7, 19, and 44, whilst in Lesson's list of queens, the name is No. 4; and these are the only two lists which present the difficulty. I think, therefore, a possible explanation of the matter is that the people from whom these two writers obtained their lists had made mistakes, perhaps introducing into lists of the true kings of the island one or two names of people who had only been the secular or minor kings, a thing which they might easily do, especially as regarded the earlier parts of the lists; and I do not think the lists must be regarded as militating seriously against any conclusions at which we may arrive on a consideration of the other evidence. As a matter of fact, the earlier parts of the lists must be utterly untrustworthy, and indeed they differ widely from one another.

The evidence points also to a minor, and apparently only

secular, kingship of the whole island, whose election was dependent on success by one of the parties in the egg-finding competition. This practice is referred to by Ollivier; I think it is to this secular king that Palmer refers; the custom is mentioned by Lapelin, who distinguishes between this person and the real king, and says that his duties appear to have been exclusively military, and that his power lasted only for a year; Thomson says that the successful competitor, whom he distinguishes from the king, became entitled to certain privileges and rights during the following year, though no special authority was vested in him. Mrs Routledge's account of the matter points to what may well have been a relatively recent continuance in form only of what had probably been originally a genuine and important competition, the winner being, according to her, decided upon beforehand by the gods who doubtless inspired the dream of a prophet, or in fact perhaps by a human arrangement with which the prophet made his dream coincide, the competitors—men of importance—only acting by deputy, the representative of any but him who was destined to win passing by an egg, even if it lay in his path, and the subsequent position of the winner being apparently only that of a taboo person, and not involving the active duties of a ruler. It seems clear that this office, obtained by competition, was distinct from that of the hereditary kings; and as to this we have Thomson's statement that the king did not participate in the competition. Palmer refers to the competition only as taking place on the death of the king (which I interpret to mean secular king), whereas there is evidence that it occurred annually. Possibly a similar competition took place on the death of a king during his year of office, or perhaps in this case the selection of a new king was postponed until the seasonal date at which the next annual ceremony was held.

I must refer, in connection with Thomson's statement that the winner in the competition only had certain privileges, and was vested with no special authority, and Mrs Routledge's account of what he did, to the great importance of the bird cult in Easter Island. I draw attention here to Mrs Routledge's comment on it that the whole of social existence revolved round the bird cult, and it was the last of the old order to pass away<sup>1</sup>. At this annual performance large numbers of people collected for months beforehand at the village of Mataverí, feasting,

<sup>1</sup> Mrs Routledge, p. 254.

among other things on human victims, and dancing, and afterwards went to Orongo, the centre of the real ceremonies, where there was solemn chanting<sup>1</sup>; there is also Lapelin's statement that two or three persons selected by the successful candidate were sacrificed. There is, I think, a natural improbability that the outcome of all this would be merely the giving for a year to the successful candidate of a few privileges, or his seclusion for a time in a house. It may have dwindled down to something of this sort; but I cannot believe that such a result represents the original intention of the competition. I think that on the whole the weight of the evidence supports a belief that the contest was, at all events at an earlier period, for the secular kingship. I may also point out that a custom of this sort would be in accord with practices that have been reported from other countries. In the first place, a triennial or annual period of kingship has been found in various places<sup>2</sup>. In the second place, there are or were customs under which kings were selected for their physical qualities, and had to prove these by athletic displays. Frazer refers to the relative unimportance, under systems of matrilineal descent, of the rank of the husband of a princess<sup>3</sup>. Hence the basis for selection of such a husband, whose royal alliance would often carry with it, in a sense, succession to the throne, was often one of physical fitness or valour<sup>4</sup>; and we thus find examples of competition for the double honour by racing and other trials of the skill, strength and courage of the suitors<sup>5</sup>. Similarly, it would be natural to require of him that he should from time to time submit himself to an ordeal in order publicly to demonstrate that he was still equal to the discharge of his high calling; and Frazer associates with this idea the annual flight from the forum of the kings of Rome, which, he conjectures, was originally a race for an annual kingship, which may have been awarded as a prize to the fleetest runner. At the end of the year the king might run again for a second term of office; and so on, until he was defeated and deposed or perhaps slain<sup>6</sup>.

If we accept the statements that the successful competitor was elected as chief, the Easter Island custom seems to agree fundamentally with customs found elsewhere, and I am not restrained from doing this by reason of the very modified

<sup>1</sup> Mrs Routledge, pp. 258 *sqq.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* vol. II, pp. 274-7.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 299-308.

<sup>2</sup> Frazer, *G.B.* vol. IV, pp. 112-19.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 296-9.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 308 *sq.*

benefits that accrued to the victor according to Thomson and Mrs Routledge, and the merely formal character of the competition as described by her. Thomson was only on the island for about a fortnight, and may well have been wrong; and a possible explanation of the information obtained by Mrs Routledge only a few years ago is that this competitive method of determining the succession had in the meantime died out, but that the people had continued to have in form at their annual bird festival an interesting and dramatic feature which in days gone by had possessed a special importance.

In discussing the division of the island into named areas we have to distinguish between the dual division into Kotuu to the west and Hotu Iti to the east, on the one hand, and to the more minute division of the island into districts as described by Mrs Routledge; and I will first consider the dual division. Mrs Routledge, whilst she associates the districts, into which she says the island was divided, with ten distinct groups or clans of the people, tells us nothing of any political or social differentiation between the two main divisions; nor between the groups or clans occupying one of them, taken together, and those that occupied the other. She says, however, that the people of these two divisions, known as *mata-nui*, or greater clans, and *mata iti*, or lesser clans, were grouped into these two divisions, more especially in legend, or in speaking of the remote past, and refers to the constant wars between them which these legends disclose; apparently, then, in those earlier days there was a more clearly marked differentiation between them than that which prevailed afterwards.

I have already referred to the way in which this differentiation was reflected in the division of the bird island by a line between the Kotuu and Hotu Iti people, and a separation into two groups (east and west) of the houses in Orongo occupied by their respective *rongo-rongo* men; but there seem to have been other somewhat similar examples of this. The return of the winner was signaled by the lighting of a fire on Rano-Kao, and the position of the site of this fire depended upon whether this man was of the west or east part of the island<sup>1</sup>. Then, again, Mrs Routledge, in describing the dancing of the victor with a rejoicing company down the slope of Rano-Kao and along the south coast, and before explaining the method of his subsequent seclusion in a house, says "If...the winner belonged to

<sup>1</sup> Mrs Routledge, p. 262.

the western clans, he generally went to Anakena for the next stage, very possibly because, as was explained, he was afraid to go to Hotu Iti; some victors also went to special houses in their own district; otherwise the company went along the southern shore till they reached Rano Raraku"<sup>1</sup>; and it was on that mountain that the seclusion described by Mrs Routledge took place, as above mentioned. Mrs Routledge's meaning in this is not very clear; but I am inclined to suspect that the explanation of it all is that a Kotuu winner generally went into seclusion at Anakena, and a Hotu Iti man on Rano Raraku.

All these matters of detail tend to emphasize the marked distinction, in the minds of the people, between east and west, which seems to have survived, even if an original social or political separation had become modified, and the very survival of these later distinctions points, I think, to a fundamental and important line of cleavage in the past. We also see this in the clean cut lines of separation between the neighbouring east and west groups on the north and south coasts of the island. Unfortunately the tradition of the will of Hotu-matua offers us no assistance concerning the subject.

Passing now to the division of the whole island into districts, occupied by ten groups of people, this seems to have been a system which, whatever its origin may have been, has been recognized by the people in recent times—indeed up to the present day—and we find its reflex in the separation of the clans at Orongo during the egg ceremony. It is noticeable that, though the names of some of these ten groups were identical with the names of some of the six sons of Hotu-matua, there is no true correspondence between the division of the country according to the legend, and that which seems to have prevailed subsequently. One reason for this might be that Thomson's version of the tradition of the distribution by Hotu-matua is incorrect, for the accounts of these things, given by natives, are apt to vary according to the memories of the narrators, who tell what they remember and leave you to assume that their narrative is correct and full. Another reason might be that Mrs Routledge's ten groups were not all contemporaneous in origin, some of them having perhaps been subsequent branches of others, or perhaps subdivisions of older original groups, whose identities had been lost sight of or forgotten. It is possible, for instance, that the Hamea group was an offshoot

<sup>1</sup> Mrs Routledge, p. 263.

of the Miru, and the Haumoana and Ngatimo of the Marama. The main point is, I think, that there was a division into a number of more or less distinct groups, coupled with a tradition of an original common ancestor.

The only other fundamental feature to be mentioned is the distinction between the dominant, or *mata-toa* party, and the defeated, or *mata-kio* party. This separation was probably similar to what we have found in other islands. I do not imagine that the composition of the two parties would be always the same, as it would be altered by changes in clan alliances. In particular there is no evidence that the two parties necessarily were the people of Kotuu and Hotu Iti respectively.

## CHAPTER XII

### POLITICAL AREAS AND SYSTEMS

#### TIKOPIA

THERE are certain islands in Melanesia in which definite Polynesian elements have been found, generally mixed up in a greater or less degree with those of Melanesia. In dealing with Fiji, with its Melanesian and Polynesian features, I am, as already indicated, only introducing into this book certain selected matter which I think desirable for its purpose, and the same principle will be applied to these Polynesian "settlements," as they are sometimes called, in Melanesia. I have found it difficult to determine what material to adopt, and what to discard, and I can hardly doubt that readers who are well acquainted with the ethnology of these islands will have just ground for criticism of my errors of commission and omission, the latter of which will probably be due to a large extent to my failure to discover the matters omitted.

The island of Tikopia, or Tucopia as it is sometimes called, is situated between the Banks and Santa Cruz groups; its inhabitants must, according to Rivers, be classed, so far as their physical characters are concerned, with the Polynesians, though Melanesian characteristics are found there also<sup>1</sup>. A map, provided by Rivers<sup>2</sup>, shows it to be somewhat oval in form, its broader end pointing south-west and the other north-east; and at this north-eastern end there is, occupying a very considerable portion of this half of the island, a large lake surrounded by high hills<sup>3</sup>.

According to Gaimard, the island contained in 1828 four villages, called Lavenha, Namu, Outa and Faea; and there were four principal chiefs, namely Kafeka (chief of Lavenha and living in that village), Tafoua (chief of Namu and living in the village of Faea), Fanharere (living in the village of Namu, but his area of jurisdiction not stated), and Taoumako (living near the village of Mapsanga, but area of jurisdiction not stated). The authority of these chiefs was almost equal; but they were

<sup>1</sup> Rivers, *H.M.S.* vol. 1, pp. 302 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.* p. 335. <sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 334.

placed by the writer in the above order<sup>1</sup>. The most important of these *ariki* or chiefs was called the *ariki tabu*<sup>2</sup>. Dillon (1827) says the island was governed by one principal chief, with several petty chiefs who acted as magistrates<sup>3</sup>; but d'Urville denies that there were any petty chiefs in Tikopia<sup>4</sup>. The information recently collected by Rivers, though not identical with that given above, is in some respects remarkably like it. He says the island was divided into two districts, called respectively Faea and Ravenga, these containing a number of villages; that a big rock at Tufenua marked the division between the two districts; and that there seemed to be an inveterate feud between the people of the two districts<sup>5</sup>. Turning to his map, we find the division line between the two districts passing longitudinally through the centre of the island, from its north-eastern to its south-western end, Faea being on the north-western side and Ravenga on the south-eastern side of this line; and the map shows the village of Tufenua close to the boundary point at the north-eastern end, and nineteen other villages, of which eight are in Faea and eleven in Ravenga. Rivers also says that the people of the island were divided into four divisions, called respectively the Kafika, the Taumako, the Tafua and the Fangarere; and that each of these groups had its own district of the island, and its own chief, called by the name of his group, *te ariki Kafika*, *te ariki Taumoko*, etc., and, so far as could be judged, formed an independent section of the community<sup>6</sup>; of these groups Kafika was the most important and Fangarere the least so<sup>7</sup>. The statement, above quoted, as to each group having its own district, obtained by Rivers from one source, is qualified by a statement, obtained by him from another source, to the effect that the groups were mixed together in the villages, and that there seemed to be no obvious connection of the groups of people with the two districts<sup>8</sup>. This last statement is illustrated by the marking in the map, under the name of each village, of the names of the group or groups which occupied it; and a curious factor is the entire absence from these markings of the name of the Fangarere group, a point to which Rivers draws attention<sup>9</sup>. He refers to secondary chiefs<sup>10</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> D'Urville, *Astro.* vol. v, pp. 306 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 119.

<sup>3</sup> D'Urville, *Astro.* vol. v, p. 307.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 303. Cf. Speiser, p. 288.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 334.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Dillon, vol. II, p. 135.

<sup>5</sup> Rivers, *H.M.S.* vol. 1, p. 334.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 354.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 338, 340.



It is somewhat remarkable that, when Rivers visited the island, not only the number of the groups into which the people were divided, but the names of these groups, seem to have been the same as they had been about three-quarters of a century before<sup>1</sup>. There is confusion between villages and districts; Gaimard's village of Faea is presumably either the same as Rivers's district of that name or a village in that district bearing the same name, and Gaimard's village of Lavenha must, I think, be Rivers's district of Ravenga; Gaimard's village of Namu appears in Rivers's map as a village (Namu) in Ravenga; but I cannot identify his villages of Outa and Mapsanga. It will be noticed that, according to Gaimard, the chief of the Tafua group was in his time regarded as the chief of Namu (in Ravenga?), but lived in Faea; and he lived in a village in the district of that name in Rivers's time<sup>2</sup>. There is evidently some confusion here, probably on the part of Gaimard, whose references to villages, taken together, are not very clear. The important question which arises is whether we are to believe that these four groups of people, each with its own chief, occupied separate areas of their own, or were mixed and spread over the island. I agree entirely with Rivers in his view that probably each group had originally occupied a separate area, and that in his time this localization still persisted in some respects although the people lived scattered all over the island<sup>3</sup>.

Dillon's statement that the island was governed by one principal chief, with petty chiefs acting under him, might have its origin in some dominating influence, based on military prowess or some other foundation, of one of the four chiefs of the four groups of the people, and not in any recognized political overlordship of the island; but the statement that the most important of the chiefs was called the *ariki tabu* suggests something more than this. Gaimard refers to a high priest called *taoura-doua* [? *tahua atua*], who was the minister of the first chief Kafeka, and had three other priests under him<sup>4</sup>; and Rivers was told of a high priest Paefakofe, who had surrendered his sacrificial powers to the chief of the Taumako, and had not acted any longer as high priest<sup>5</sup>. According to Gaimard, Kafeka was chief of the village of Lavenha. From

<sup>1</sup> The names given by Gaimard are those of the chiefs; but we may believe that it was, as in Rivers's time, that of the group also.

<sup>2</sup> Rivers, *H.M.S.* vol. 1, p. 334.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 354.

<sup>4</sup> D'Urville, *Astro.* vol. v, p. 307.

<sup>5</sup> Rivers, *H.M.S.* vol. 1, p. 354.

these statements, taken together, it seems possible that at one time, at all events, the chief of one or other of the groups had, in some form or other, some dominating power over the whole island; and it does not necessarily follow that the dominating chief was always the same.

If this has been so, a still more interesting feature seems to be suggested by this material. We have Gaimard's reference to the title of *ariki-tabu* given to the most important of the chiefs, Dillon's statement that in about 1827 there was a principal chief who governed the island, Gaimard's indication that at about that time the Kafeka chief was the most important, and the fact that he was so also in Rivers's time. Then we have Gaimard's statement that Kafeka had a high priest, who acted as his minister, and the information collected by Rivers as to the surrender by a high priest of his sacrificial powers to the chief of Taumako, which may at that time have been the dominating group. The suggestion which I make is that in the early part of last century there were, perhaps, in Tikopia a leading secular or war chief and a sacred chief or high priest, corresponding in a way to the *hau* or *tuikanokubolu* and the *tuitonga* of Tonga; and that, just as in Mariner's time the *tuitonga* was deprived to a very large extent of his sacred rights, so in Tikopia, probably at a later date, the same fate befel the sacred chief of Tikopia. The similarity between the two cases, as suggested by these scrappy pieces of information, is only broad, for we have no evidence that the high priest had been what I have been calling a sacred king; but he may have been so.

#### DUFF ISLANDS

In the time of Quiros there was a chief of the islets of Taumaco<sup>1</sup> which is the name of the Duff cluster, whose inhabitants are said to have been largely Polynesian. According to information obtained by Fox, the people were divided apparently into clans named after fish; for example, the *pakewa* (shark) clan, the members of which were forbidden to kill or eat a shark; the *fonu* (turtle) clan; the *alala* (ray?) clan; the *takuo* (a long fish) clan; and others. None of the clans could kill or eat the fowl *kio*. A boy belonged to the clan of his mother<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Quiros, vol. I, p. 226; vol. II, p. 488.

<sup>2</sup> Fox, *J.P.S.* vol. xxvi, p. 190.

## ONGTONG JAVA

Ongtong Java, or Lord Howe Island, is a cluster of islets to the north of the Solomons. Woodford refers to two islets, Luaniua at the eastern end and Pelau at the western end, as being the only two that were permanently inhabited<sup>1</sup>, and I see in a map in Brigham's Index two named islets, and no others, Leuneuwa to the east and Kalau to the west. In Stanford's atlas the name Leueneua appears as another name for the whole cluster. Finsch speaks of a large place with many houses, where the king lived, the native name of which, seemed, so far as he could make out, to have been Niua or Njua, and which he identifies with Leueneua<sup>2</sup>. Parkinson, in distinguishing between the various classes of the people, says that the highest chief and his male relations belonged to the *tu'u* class, and that they were descended from the legendary ancestors, who were still worshipped by their posterity. He says the ancestors of the then present *tu'u* were known pretty exactly by tradition, and could be enumerated back for several generations; and he gives particulars of some of what appear to have been the head *tu'u* and their wives and families, and of a series of successions, from which it appears that the succession generally passed on death to a relative<sup>3</sup>. Woodford gives a list of ruling chiefs of Luaniua, so far back as his informant was able to supply it, and a few of the names in it appear to be the same as those given by Parkinson<sup>4</sup>.

## NEW HEBRIDES ISLANDS

There are some small islands to the south or south-east of the New Hebrides, and north or north-east of the Loyalties, which are commonly regarded as forming part of the New Hebrides group, but in which Polynesian elements, or traces of them, have been found.

A map of Futuna is provided by Gunn<sup>5</sup>, and shows it to be divided into a number of districts; but he tells us nothing of their political system.

Aneiteum was, according to Murray, divided into five districts, each of which was under the authority of a principal

<sup>1</sup> Woodford, *Geog. Journ.* vol. XLVIII, pp. 31 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Finsch, *Z. f. E.* vol. XIII, pp. 113 sq.

<sup>3</sup> R. Parkinson, *I.A.E.* vol. XI, p. 198.

<sup>4</sup> Woodford, *Geog. Journ.* vol. XLVIII, p. 38.

<sup>5</sup> Gunn, facing p. 3.

chief<sup>1</sup>. Lawrie says there were six coast districts, each governed by a high chief; but that there were two inland chiefs, who were in some way subsidiary to the shore chiefs<sup>2</sup>.

## UVEA

The Loyalty Islands are situate south-west of the New Hebrides and north-east of New Caledonia; they form a group of islands and islets, extending from south-east to north-west, of which there are three better-known islands, the usual names of which are Mare (to the south-east) the larger Lifu (in the centre), and the small Uvea or Uea to the north-west. Uvea has long been recognized as being partly Polynesian. This is not the place to discuss inter-island migrations, but I will refer shortly to the traditions, without giving references. The best known tradition is that the people came from Wallis Island (Uvea); there are also stories of immigration from Tonga; and there are references to an earlier aboriginal Melanesian population. It is stated that the correct name of the island was Tai<sup>3</sup>. Another name given to it is Iai<sup>4</sup>. In Brigham's Index the name of Halgan is given. Erskine (1849) speaks of three tribes in the island and says the original inhabitants were driven back by the Wallis Islanders, and were said to occupy the centre of the island<sup>5</sup>. Ella says the Wallis Island people lived at the northern end of the island and the Tongans at the southern end, the former therefore calling their end Uvea, whilst the latter called its southern end Tonga<sup>6</sup>. Fraser says the same thing, and adds that the original inhabitants (Iaians) occupied the central portion<sup>7</sup>. Mrs Hadfield says that the original tongue was evidently that known as Iaian. She refers to the immigrant people in the north and south of the island, both of whom she associates with Wallis Island, saying that these people still speak their own language. Then she speaks of the people in the centre of the island as the real aborigines, or Iaians, and comments on their language<sup>8</sup>.

Ray deals with this subject in an article on the people and language of the island of Lifu, based upon information obtained from native sources, but evidently written after a study also

<sup>1</sup> Murray, *Martyrs*, p. 119.

<sup>2</sup> Lawrie, *A.A.A.S.* vol. iv, p. 709.

<sup>3</sup> Ella, *A.A.A.S.* vol. iv, p. 634.

<sup>4</sup> Turner, *Nineteen Years*, p. 511. Fraser, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. xxvii, p. 166. Mrs Hadfield, p. 16 note.

<sup>5</sup> Erskine, p. 340.

<sup>6</sup> Ella, *A.A.A.S.* vol. iv, p. 634.

<sup>7</sup> Fraser, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. xxvii, p. 166.

<sup>8</sup> Mrs Hadfield, p. 125.

of existing literature, the large extent of which is indicated by his bibliography<sup>1</sup>. He gives a map of the Loyalty group, and in this he gives Uvea or Halgan as the name of the north-western island<sup>2</sup>. He does not say anything of a triple differentiation between north, centre, and south, but refers to Iai as the native name for the island, says that Uvea is properly only the name of the Polynesian people in the northern part of the island, said to have come from Wallis Island<sup>3</sup>, and in his map names the northern part Uvea and the southern part Iai. Ray says four languages are spoken in the islands of the Loyalty group, namely (1) Mare and (2) Lifu, and on the island of Halgan (3) Iai, and (4) Uvean; and that of these the Uvean, spoken on the northern part of Halgan, is a purely Polynesian language, and totally unlike the other languages of the Loyalty group<sup>4</sup>. He illustrates this with tabulated comparative vocabularies of the four languages<sup>5</sup>. I may point out that, whilst this geographical linguistic differentiation is quite consistent with the presence of a strong Polynesian element in the northerly part of Uvea, it is difficult to co-ordinate it with the presence, at all events *now*, of any strong Tongan or other Polynesian element in the south. Whitmee refers to the mixture of Melanesian and Polynesian elements in the island which had kept themselves somewhat distinct, and to the presence of two languages<sup>6</sup>.

Mrs Hadfield refers to the presence in Lifu of a court or chiefs' language which differs so much from that of commoners as to form quite a distinct language, and gives examples of this<sup>7</sup>; she says, however, that the Uveans do not seem to have the same exalted ideas of rank and chieftainship as the Lifuans, instancing this by the fact that they have only one pronoun for the second person<sup>8</sup>. Ray says that the use of a ceremonious language when addressing or referring to a person of high rank is an interesting and peculiar custom in Lifu and Nengone [another name for Mare; see p. 298], but is strangely absent in the neighbouring island of Uvea. It is used by all persons of low rank, but is only used by a chief when addressing other chiefs, and not when speaking to inferiors. In speaking of himself, he uses the common terms to inferiors, but the ceremonious words when his audience is composed of men of rank. Ray

<sup>1</sup> Ray, *J.A.I.* vol. XLVII, pp. 318-22.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 242.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 298.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 241.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 308-14.

<sup>6</sup> Whitmee, *J.A.I.* vol. VIII, p. 265. Cf. de Vaux, *Rev. d'Eth.* vol. III, p. 484. Murray, *M.W.P.* p. 276.

<sup>7</sup> Mrs Hadfield, pp. 38, 121.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 125.

follows this statement with examples of these alternative words<sup>1</sup>, and they appear in his vocabulary. All this is to me most surprising. I presume the non-Polynesian people of the Loyalty group are Melanesians or akin to them, though Ray says that their languages, though generally classed as Melanesian, are very different from the typical Melanesian in the islands to the north of them<sup>2</sup>; and if this is so, the evidence points to the adoption in a Melanesian part of the group, and its absence in the Polynesian part, of a practice which I have believed to be specially Polynesian.

Cheyne (1852) says the island was divided into two tribes. The southern tribe was governed by king Whiningay who possessed much power; the northern tribe had no king, but was governed by a council of chiefs. The two tribes were constantly at war, and were extremely jealous of each other<sup>3</sup>. Garnier (1864) says that the people of Uvea were under a number of little chiefs, who were always quarrelling about their rights, but that there was a great chief of the island called Dumai<sup>4</sup>. Turner (1859) says the people were divided into two parties, the one in the district called Vekinie, under a king named Pasil and six tribal chiefs, and the other in the district called Fazaue, under king Whenegay and seven tribal chiefs. These two parties kept up two distinct dialects, but understood each other, and had not fought for some time. It was Whenegay and his people who called the island Iai, and not Uvea<sup>5</sup>. I have no means of finding out where these two districts were; but presumably Vekinie would be the district of the Wallis Islanders in the north, in which case Fazaue would presumably be that occupied by the Melanesian aborigines, or perhaps the alleged Tongan immigrants.

<sup>1</sup> Ray, *J.A.I.* vol. XLVII, p. 291.

<sup>3</sup> Cheyne, p. 23.

<sup>5</sup> Turner, *Nineteen Years*, p. 511.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 298.

<sup>4</sup> Garnier, *Océanie*, p. 303.

## CHAPTER XIII

### POLITICAL AREAS AND SYSTEMS

#### OBSERVATIONS

##### *Sacred and Secular Kingship*

ONE of the most interesting features of the political systems of Polynesia disclosed in the previous pages is, I think, that of the separation of the sacred and secular rule in some of the islands. It must be understood that I do not suggest that what I am calling secular kings might not also be sacred, for chiefs as a class were more or less so, and great chiefs were often very sacred. I am merely using the terms sacred and secular to designate the dual system which I am discussing. In Tonga the office of the sacred king, or *tuitonga*, was distinct from that of the secular king or *hau*, though the legends suggest that at one time the two had been united. The sacred office was hereditary, generally, apparently passing from father to son, and at all events to some member of the sacred family; whilst the office of *hau* seems to have been subject to the vicissitudes of war and other matters, through which the *tuitonga* passed, as the legend says, unharmed. Apparently the *tuitonga* and the *hau* were really chiefs having local jurisdiction over separate and distinct portions of Tongatabu, and to one of them belonged the sacred dominion of the whole island, while the other held a corresponding secular dominion. It seems from the observations of writers that, whatever may have been the original cause of the separation of the religious and secular power, both were possessed, at least to a certain extent, by the *tuitonga* within historical times. We have on this point the evidence preserved in the missionary archives at Lyons; and some information collected in Cook's time points in the same direction. Then, again, it is said that, when at a later period there was a plot to assassinate the *tukanokubolu*, the consent of the *tuitonga* was first obtained, and afterwards one of the murderers went to the *tuitonga* to secure his good graces. In Mariner's time, however, the secular jurisdiction of the *tuitonga* seems to have been lost, at all events in the northern islands as

between him and Finau, and presumably in Tongatabu also, in view of what he had done and of the fact that he had ceased to reside in that island. The sacred power of the *tuitonga* also was on the wane. Probably he was originally not only the secular king, but also the high priest of Tongatabu; but it is said that in Mariner's time he apparently was never inspired; and finally he was deprived of the annual offerings presented at the great *inaji* ceremony. Then in comparatively modern times, though he was still accorded the deference which might be attributed to a recollection of his old sacred office, and which very likely was based more or less on that, the visible indications of deference did not go beyond what he would have been entitled to claim on the ground of his traditional ancestry.

The offices of sacred and secular rule of Mangaia also appear from the lists of their holders to have been originally united; the office of sacred king was hereditary in the sense of remaining in the same family, whilst that of the secular kings depended on the fortunes of war; and they were members of separate families. To this extent the dual system of Mangaia seems to have been similar to that of Tonga. On the other hand, the sacred kings were in Gill's time still active in religious performances, warding off by their prayers the evil spirits and sacrificing to Rongo, whose high priests they were; and war, with its shedding of blood, could not legitimately be commenced, nor peace restored, nor a change of secular kingship resulting from war be attained, without their co-operation. It is this last feature that adds interest to the statement as to the obtaining of the approval of the *tuitonga* before the assassination of the *tuikanokubolu*, and afterwards trying to secure his good graces.

We have no evidence of the separation of sacred and secular rule in Rarotonga, but the statement that when Tangiia offered his submission to Karika, he presented him with the emblems of supremacy, *both civil and religious* (the italics are mine), points to the idea that the two elements of authority were regarded as being separate and distinct. The same idea is suggested by the installation of an Aitutaki chief as "Divider of food, priest, and protector of Avarua."

In the Marquesas the power and influence of a high priest seems, as we shall see in a subsequent chapter, to have been very great; but I have found no evidence of a divided sacred and secular jurisdiction. I may, however, mention a reference



by Vincendon-Dumoulin to a Marquesan chief "who differed from his subordinates in the fact that he was not tattooed"<sup>1</sup>. The interest in this information arises from the fact that the *tuitonga* was neither circumcised nor tattooed<sup>2</sup>, and was exempt from the duty of wounding the head and cutting the flesh in time of mourning<sup>3</sup>, and that the sacred kings of Mangaia were not tattooed<sup>4</sup>. This feature of similarity might conceivably point to there having been sacred chiefs in the Marquesas comparable to those of Tonga and Mangaia, even though with only geographically and socially local jurisdiction; but it in no way justifies an assumption that this was so. If, as seems probable, the exemption from blood-letting operations was based on a general idea of the great sanctity of the blood of very holy men, it would, of course, apply to the cases of the sacred chiefs of Tonga and Mangaia; but it must not be assumed that the political position of a chief in another island, who also was subject to the exemption, was necessarily comparable with that of the sacred chiefs whom we have been discussing.

We have seen that in a district of Fiji, in which the Polynesian element was strong, there were both a sacred and a secular king. The former was the upholder of religion and the special patron of the priests and never personally engaged in war; the latter was less sacred and inferior in rank, but more powerful, being described as the commander in war, the great state executive officer and prime minister of all political departments, and as the commander-in-chief and executive sovereign, who never consulted the other in temporal affairs. Here, as in Tonga, these two sovereigns were of two separate and distinct clans or families; and we have Thomson's statement as to the separation of the religious and secular power in other parts of Fiji, and as to the presence there of the process of scission in every stage of evolution.

In Rotuma the offices of the sacred and secular rulers were, in Gardiner's opinion, originally united; but in his time they were distinct, and evidently had been so for a very long time previously. The sacred king clearly had no secular authority in historical times, but his religious duties at feasts were, I may say, important. He is to be distinguished from the sacred kings of Tonga and Mangaia in that his office was not hereditary, the

<sup>1</sup> *J.M.* p. 95.

<sup>2</sup> *Mariner*, vol. II, p. 86. *Cook*, vol. v, p. 427. Cf. d'Urville, *Voy. pitt.* vol. II, p. 47.

<sup>3</sup> *Cook*, vol. v, p. 408.

<sup>4</sup> Gill, *Myths*, p. 293.

appointment being made by periodical elections of members of one or other of the districts of the islands; and the records indicate that he was liable to be dethroned and replaced as the result of quarrels among the secular chiefs. It must not, however, be assumed that this had always been so.

In Fotuna (Horne Island), where they had their two conquering and conquered parties, and were constantly engaged in wars, after which the secular power apparently passed to the great chief of the victors, we have Bourdin's statement that there was, governing the whole island, a single king, regarded as the tabernacle of the great god of the island, and credited with divine wisdom in dealing with affairs, and so surrounded with respect, and obeyed beyond limit; and he says that this king had to be chosen from among members of the same family. This suggests a sacred and secular kingship, and if it could be shown that there was such a sacred dynasty during the historical period of warfare and consequent alternations of secular kingship, the situation would be clear enough; but this is not proved, so there is no sufficient evidence of a concurrent dual kingship.

In Uvea (Wallis Island) there seems to have been a distribution of power between three great families occupying districts that bore names identical with those of the three great families of Tongatabu, so we should not be surprised to find political similarity in other respects. I have suggested that perhaps it was so, that the chief of Mua was the sacred king, and the chief of one or other of the other two districts of the island was the secular king.

I believe there had been a sacred and secular kingship in Easter Island; but the sufficiency or otherwise of my reasons for this belief can only be weighed by a consideration of all the data on which it is based.

I have suggested that there had perhaps been a dual sacred and secular rule in Tikopia.

Samoa does not present an example of a dual kingship, by which sacred and secular rule were separated, such as has been found in some of the other islands, but it evidently had some differentiation in time of war between those whose duty it was to go out and fight and those who stayed at home and prayed; and if we look into the Samoan evidence, we shall, I think, find that the system there was not perhaps, as regards this fighting question, quite so different in underlying principle from those prevailing in other islands as at first sight it seems

to have been. Prayer to the gods for success was a practice in war widely spread in Polynesia, and there are indications of beliefs that success depended on divine help as much as, or even more than, upon the valour of the warriors. Both priests and chiefs engaged in prayers and other religious offices, and in fact I think the differentiations between them suggested by writers are in many cases erroneous. I shall in a later chapter adduce evidence that the official head of a social group, whether small (as for example a domestic household) or large (as in the case of a whole clan) was very commonly regarded as its high priest, even though in many places the performance of religious duties or some of them, had been delegated by the chiefs to others; and if this is correct the duty of prayer would fall primarily upon this person. The place for prayer would as a rule be the *marae* or some other sacred spot; so, if the supplications were to be continued after the warriors had departed on their expedition, the head of the group and his assistants, if any, would or might have to stay at home. The *tuitonga* does not appear to have fought (I can produce no actual evidence of this), and we are told that the sacred king of Mangaia did not leave the *marae* "as his presence at the *marae*, as well as his incantations, were deemed necessary to the success of the expedition"<sup>1</sup>. Turner, referring to the sending forth by David of his people to war, and his proposal to go with them, and their objection to his doing so, quotes their request that he would "succour us out of the city" (2 Sam. xviii. 3). He refers to the doubt as to the meaning of this sentence; but says that a Samoan in like circumstances would persuade an aged chief, or a chief of high rank, not to go with them to the war, but to remain in the village, and help them with his prayers<sup>2</sup>. It is in the light of these ideas that I look at the information, to which I have referred in previous pages, as to the praying and fighting villages of Samoa.

I will first take the cases of Aana and Atua. In each of these divisions of Upolu the duty of praying, instead of fighting, lay to a certain extent with its principal village district, its seat of government, which, I may say, was also the royal residence. In the case of Atua, Krämer in one place qualifies his broader statement by suggesting that the religious duty doubtless only concerned one part of Lufilufi; and it is very possible that a similar qualification might have been made regarding Leulumoenga in

<sup>1</sup> Gill, *S.L.P.* pp. 2 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Turner, *Nineteen Years*, p. 351.

Aana. The exclusion from fighting applied then, as regards each of these divisions of Upolu to the village district in which its king lived; in one of them and possibly in the other also, it was confined to a section of that village district, and that section may have been the village of the village district in which was the royal residence. We find therefore that it was, either broadly or minutely, the home of the king that did not take part in the fighting, but only prayed; the other inhabitants of these village districts or villages, excluding the middle classes and work-people, were probably the high aristocracy closely related to the king, who would form his royal court, and probably took part in the supplications to the gods for victory.

I imagine that in both Aana and Atua the people who fought would be the general body of warriors of the other parts of the division. As regards Aana, Krämer refers on one page to two village districts, with which Leulumoenga had a brother-bond, as being called the vanguard of the *tuiaana*, from which it may be assumed that their people were great fighters. On another he speaks of another village district of renowned warriors as having been in a sense the *itu'au* to the *alataua* Leulumoenga. The probable interpretation of this is that certain districts, of proved valour, had the honour of being recognized more especially with the defence of the king and his division. It was, as we shall see hereafter, the duty of all Aana to support the king in war. Here, then, we appear to have a system of differentiation between the most sacred persons and those around them and the rest of the people as regards the respective duties of praying and fighting, the former taking that most important part in the matter which their sanctity and close association with the gods enabled them, and them alone, to perform adequately.

I now turn to the other parts of Samoa, where there were a number of *alataua* village districts scattered about, whilst, according to Krämer, this was not so in Aana and Atua. What is the possible explanation of this? All Samoa had its districts, divided into village districts, these being subdivided into villages, and I shall contend in a later chapter that these were to a large extent occupied respectively by related groups, sub-groups and sub-sub-groups of people. In some cases, as we shall see, a social group was more or less separated geographically, but the social bond prevailed, notwithstanding this geographical separation. We should expect then, on the basis of my hypo-

thesis, to find that some of these different groups of people, possible antagonists in war, would have each its own *alataua* village district or village, probably the place of residence of its head chief, and this would account for the fact that there were a number of them. We have had an interesting example of this in the Tonumaipé'an village district of Falealupo in Savai'i, specially associated with Nafanua, the great ancestral Tonumaipé'an war goddess. This, however, could hardly, I think, have been the position in either Aana or Atua, for though these great divisions might fight against each other, I shall contend that each of them was, speaking broadly, a great united social group, in which case internal fighting between, say, one district and another would probably at all events be unusual. I have referred in a previous page to the custom for disturbances between village districts within a district to be quelled by the district as a whole, and I imagine a similar restraint would be applied by either Aana or Atua as a whole to internal quarrels between districts. In these comments, I am, of course, disregarding internal disputes between rival claimants for the kingship, which is another matter. Restraints of this sort would not, I imagine, generally be applied to quarrels between the separate families and social groups occupying the districts of Savai'i and Tutuila, because the special family or clan motive for it would not be there; they had not great mutually connected areas comparable with those of Aana and Atua.

I am unable to explain why, in Tuamasanga, part of Safata was the *alataua* district and Faleata the *itu'au*. It may be that the matter was connected in some way with the history of the division already outlined, and I may point out as to this that Safata seems to have been, according to the traditions, the district with which the origin of the great titles of Tamasoali'i and Ngatoaitetele was connected, and that, indeed, the former of these is said to have been a Safata name. The material from Manu'a is too trifling to discuss the matter with reference to it.

My suggestion concerning these Samoan systems is that they point perhaps to a practice under which it was the special duty of the head of a social group as its natural priest, or of certain powerful priests, some of whom would probably be chiefs also, collected together in a locality, to pray for success in war, leaving the actual fighting to others, and that this involved a separation of religious and secular functions comparable in a way, or to a certain extent, with the system of

separation of sacred and secular rule reported from some of the other islands.

*Malo and Vavai Parties*

Another feature of the political systems of Polynesia is the division, in some cases more or less permanent, reported from some of the islands, into two opposing groups, the strong or conquering party and the weak or conquered, called in Samoa *malo* and *vaivai*. The whole history of Polynesia is one of constant warfare, in which the combatants were not always the same, and after which the conquerors would, for a time at all events, exercise the dominating power over their opponents which their victory gave them. We might well expect therefore to find constant feuds for power over a whole island between two or more dominating groups, to one or other of which the smaller groups would attach themselves, the combinations of the dominating groups, and the siding of the smaller groups with one or other of the great opponents being dependent upon family or clan relationship, personal feelings of friendship or the reverse, political exigency, and other motives, and in many cases upon more motives than one. This twofold hostile division is referred to by names—*malo* and *vaivai* in Samoa, *malo* and *lava* in Fotuna, *malo* and *tokilalo* in Uvea, and *mata toa* and *mata kio* in Easter Island; but the evidence shows that the system prevailed in several of the other islands also. The main interest of the matter depends, I think, upon the extent to which we can associate political combinations with bonds of social kinship, which I shall consider in a later chapter.

*A possible explanation of past political evolution*

Frazer, after referring to a number of taboos to which kings and priests are subjected in different parts of the world<sup>1</sup>, says: "The burdensome observances attached to the royal or priestly office produced their natural effect. Either men refused to accept the office, which hence tended to fall into abeyance; or accepting it, they sank under its weight into spiritless creatures, cloistered recluses, from whose nerveless fingers the reigns of government slipped into the firmer grasp of men who were often content to wield the reality of sovereignty without its name. In some countries this rift in the supreme power deepened

<sup>1</sup> Frazer, *G.B.* vol. III, pp. 1-17.

into a total and permanent separation of the spiritual and temporal powers, the old royal house retaining their purely religious functions, while the civil government passed into the hands of a younger and more vigorous race"<sup>1</sup>.

Polynesia provides examples of kings, the original basis of whose power and authority was, I suppose, largely magical or religious, and who in some cases had, according to tradition, been both sacred and secular rulers, but who were, or had become purely sacred, and of the subsequent gradual loss or diminution as regards some of them of even the sacred power. It is quite possible that there had been in Polynesia cases of reluctance or refusal to accept the office on account of the burden of taboos by which it was surrounded; but I must point out that in Polynesia great chiefs or kings—I am not now referring merely to what I am calling sacred kings—were in various islands subject, because of the sanctity supposed to be in them, to taboo restrictions of a more or less irksome character, and I have only found one example (it comes from Samoa) of refusal to accept office on this account, and the example was only legendary<sup>2</sup>. So far therefore as the actual evidence is concerned, we cannot arrive at any assumption that the separation in Polynesia of what I am calling the sacred and secular rule was due to this cause. Mental and moral degeneration and loss of manhood of pampered sacred kings may have been a cause of the loss by them of secular power, but we have no evidence as to this, so I do not think we must assume that in Polynesia it was a cause, and still less the only cause; the partial abdication may have been voluntary, at all events in its commencing stages. The Tongan traditions of the evolution, first of the *tuihaatakalaua*, and afterwards of the *tuikanokubolu*, evidently carry us to a very distant past, and the traditional lists of the sacred and secular kings of Mangaia show the separation of the two rules at the very beginning; and this is consistent with a belief, which I imagine we are justified in holding, that the separation had probably occurred long ago. Prior to that time the groups of people over whom these kings had ruled were probably relatively small, and their political organization simple. The dual task would not then be great, and there would be no serious motive for wishing to reduce it. In course of time, however, a group would become larger; sub-groups would form them-

<sup>1</sup> Frazer, *G.B.* vol. III, p. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Powell, *R.S.N.S.W.* vol. XXVI, pp. 295 sq.

selves, and the social organization would become less simple, and would spread over a wider area, thus requiring more extensive administration. Thus the duties of the king would increase; he might wish to depute some of them to another person—probably a near relative of his own—he retaining the sacred office, upon which his power was based, and the ultimate control over the secular matters committed to his deputy. This devolution might almost be expected to include military matters to a greater or less extent, as the king's main duty would probably be to pray; and if the king were an old man, or had suffered from the degeneration referred to above, it might well be that there would be a special reason for delegating the responsibility of seeing to the preparedness of his people for war, and the generalship of his army in time of battle, retaining for himself the great religious duty of praying to the gods for success. I am not in this picturing what I conceive to have been a single act; I am imagining a process of devolution and evolution which might extend over centuries, during the lapse of which the separation of sacred from secular duties might become intensified, virile and ambitious secular kings, as I may now call them, might strive to extend their power, and the position of the sacred king might become little more than that of the high priest, though in this capacity he would probably still retain, at all events at first, immense power.

The sacred king and his family, the trunk family of the group, would probably continue to occupy the ancestral demesne, and there would be a number of families of chiefs, branches of the original royal family, each occupying its own area. The office and over-riding jurisdiction, so far as retained, of the sacred king, would remain with the trunk family, in which the original godship and sanctity would be believed to be specially immanent; and each chief would be subject to that over-riding authority, such as it was, and to the authority of the secular king, retaining, however, some local jurisdiction over his own area<sup>1</sup>. As time went on, the growth and development of the group would continue; the branch families of the chiefs would increase in numbers; and a powerful aristocracy would be evolved. There would be among them a competition for power and predominance, which would show itself in

<sup>1</sup> In later days sub-chiefs were largely independent of their head-chiefs in the control of their sub-groups, except in matters affecting the whole group; but I am here considering the possible development of changes in the past.



intrigue and inter-family fighting within the group; matrimonial connections between families, and inter-family military alliances would affect the powers of the respective families; and the tendency would be for them to group themselves into mutually hostile combined parties who would contend with each other for secular dominance, success first falling to one, and then to the other. Thus would come into being the division of the people into two great camps—the conquerors and the conquered, the strong and the weak—as described by writers.

The position and authority of the sacred king himself might readily be affected, and perhaps undermined, by developments of this character. Thus, whilst in some islands, as in Mangaia, he continued to retain immense power, in others as in Tonga, his power, and even his sacred duties as a high-priest, died out altogether, or nearly so; whilst in Rotuma his office became a matter of periodic election from one or other of the families of the island, its hereditary character being lost, and indeed the evidence suggests that he was subject at any time to deprivation of office and replacement as the result of conflicts among his subjects.

It must be understood that I have not in all this discussion imagined that I was tracing out what actually had been the history of these main features of Polynesian political organization; this is a thing which presumably no one will ever be able to do. I have merely been suggesting what seems to me to be a reasonably possible explanation of it. I have confined myself to the subject of the original sacred kings and the evolution of the secular king; matters of further evolution, including that of the priesthood, will be considered in a later chapter.

#### *Triple Division of Rule*

There appear to have been ideas, disclosed by traditions, and having, perhaps, some bearing upon subsequent systems, of a triple functional distribution of duties, these being (1) prayer, (2) secular rule, including war, and (3) food supply. The Mangaian myth of the gift by Rongo to his three grandsons, Rangi, Mokoiro and Akataura respectively, of the “drum of peace,” the direction over food of all kinds, and the *karakia* or prayers, comes under this category, the “drum of peace” being, I think, symbolic of the secular rule by which the beating of it would be followed; and we have seen that the political system of triple division of official duties was consistent with the myth,

though we know hardly anything of the duties of the "Rulers of Food."

The same idea appears in the Samoan story of the gifts by Pili to his three sons, Tua, Ana and Sanga respectively, of the plantation dibble, the spear, and the orator's staff and fly-flapper, these being obviously associated with food supply, war (connected with secular rule), and oratory (closely connected in the persons of the great "orator chiefs," as they were called, with religious duties). I draw attention to the observations of Pritchard and von Bülow, pointing to consistencies between these gifts and what was known of the three divisions of Upolu in comparatively modern times; and as regards the "orator chiefs," to my previous reference to the *alataua* districts, and their absence in Aana and Atua and presence in Tuamasanga.

I have found no legend of the character now under discussion emanating from Tonga; but I am not sure that the idea of a triple division was not present in the Tongan political system. They had their sacred king and secular king; and as regards the question of food supply, old Tubu, who controlled it, was evidently an exceedingly important and powerful person; but he belonged to either the Haatakalaua or the Kanokubolu family, and may only have occupied the position of a departmental official. It is just conceivable that the same idea is in part suggested by the Rarotongan tale of the offer by Tangiia to Karika of the long-legged (man), the short-legged (the turtle, symbolic of religious supremacy) and the source of every treasure; the last item, taken by itself would not necessarily imply food; but Tangiia's reservation of the food within his own district suggests that this was perhaps what was meant. We have seen that in the Hervey Island of Aitutaki the high chief or king was installed as the Divider of food, Priest, and Protector of Avarua (the seat of government of the island), "as his descendants are to this day"; and the term "protector" might well refer to his office as a secular war lord.

I cannot suggest any explanation of these Mangaian and Samoan traditions, and of the matters which seem to have been associated with them afterwards. I believe that, in some at all events of the islands of Polynesia, the responsibility of seeing to and supervision of the provision of food rested to a large extent with the head of the social group, great or small, and I shall discuss the question in a later chapter. His duties were both secular, in the sense that he controlled his people, and

sacred, in the sense that he was in a way their priest, and in the case of certain high chiefs, he seems to have been himself credited with magical powers affecting fertility. There appears, therefore, to be no obvious reason why food supply should be regarded as a department in itself, as distinguished from sacred and secular rule, except perhaps savage mentality, which would think of food, war, and prayer as the three important matters of life, and would not engage in an intellectual study of their relationship.

#### *Alternating Succession to Kingship*

The evidence points to the prevalence in the Ellice Island of Funafuti of a system of alternating succession, four or five leading families, according to Turner, providing the king in rotation, whilst Sollas says, and Hedley apparently implies, that it was confined to two families, or, as Sollas puts it, two branches of the royal family. A curious feature of the system, as described by Hedley, as I interpret him, was that the king for the time being, belonging to one of the groups, had as his subordinate chief the son of his predecessor of the other group, who was also his presumed successor; from which I gather that the succession went on passing alternately to the two groups with this same system of alternating subordinate chieftainship. Mrs David's statements are, so far as they go, consistent with this, as also is, I think, the fragmentary available information as to actual successions. In Rotuma also the sacred king or *sou*, who only reigned for six months (Gardiner) or twenty months (Lesson and Hale) was elected by each district in turn. In the Society Island of Borabora there were, we are told, two chiefs "whose laws were recognized in turn"; whilst in Huahine the sovereignty of the island "passed in turn to one or the other of two rival families"; and the Fijian *koro* was in some places divided into two sections, and its head chief was chosen from each section in turn. There is a possible source of misunderstanding in this evidence concerning Borabora, Huahine and Fiji. Under the *malo* and *vaivai* system the sovereignty would alternate between the two contesting groups, according to the fortunes of war, but this is not the system with which we are now dealing. If, however, the statements mean, as they seem to do, at all events so far as Funafuti and Fiji are concerned, not that first one competitive party and then the other ruled for a period, including perhaps a number of reigns, according to the fortunes of war, but that on each death of a head

chief of one party the succession passed to the chief of the other, then they are examples of alternate family or group succession.

The Funafuti system involved something in the nature of a dual kingship—that is, there was always a king and, under him, a sub-chief; and whatever may have been the relative social ranks of any two concurrent rulers, it is clear that the governmental difference must have been only official and alternating as between the two families from which the kings and sub-chiefs were selected. The sub-chief, though officially inferior to the king, might in fact sometimes be his superior in rank of blood, being a member of the superior family. It might well be that a white observer would regard the system as being simply one of dual kingship, not knowing anything of the method of alternation by which it was regulated. This impels me to refer to the case of the dual kingship of the Makea people of Rarotonga, both kings enjoying regal honours, whilst only one of them wielded authority, which, however, he did in the names of both of them. The position was apparently somewhat similar to that of Funafuti, except that there is no indication of any alternation. A curious feature of this case is Gill's explanation that the origin of the system was a desire to make a suitable provision for the eldest sons of the two wives of a previous Makea king; and as to this I may say that Frazer, in giving examples of cases in which the chief may or must be chosen from one of several families in a certain order, refers to a case of a Togoland tribe which had two royal families, descended from two women, which supplied a king alternately<sup>1</sup>. He does not, however, say that these women were wives of a common male ancestor. Following up this same question of dual kingship, I may just refer to the two brothers, the white king and black king, of Mangareva; the evidence with reference to them does not enable us to consider the possibility of their having represented an alternating system, and indeed the fact that the lists of kings only introduce the white king and his son, and do not mention the black king and his son, points, if and so far as it may be relied upon, in the other direction. I also draw attention to the statement that in the Marquesan island of Hivaoa there were two lines "which ran together in connection with a pair of brothers," whatever this may mean.

According to Schultz, there was a system of alternate succession in Samoa. He says that if the founder X had two sons

<sup>1</sup> Frazer, *G.B.* vol. II, p. 293.

*A* and *B*, he could appoint either of them to be his heir. If, say, he appointed *A*, then on *A*'s death it was, not his children, but the surviving brother *B*, who had *the right* (the italics are mine) to inherit. Then, if *B* died, the name *might not* (my italics) remain in his family, but must return to the children of *A*; and so on alternately (*felafoa'i*, to throw to and fro)<sup>1</sup>. I am not sure that I understand Schultz's exact meaning. On the death of *B* the succession went, I suppose, to one of *A*'s children, after whose death it would, I gather, go perhaps to one of *B*'s children, if there were any, "and so on alternately." But *A*'s and *B*'s children would not be available as possible sources of supply for more than, say, perhaps two or three generations, so I think the meaning of the statement is simply that the succession would continue to alternate between the descendants of *A* and *B* respectively—that is, between two families.

We have seen Thomson's statement that in Tonga a custom "seems to have grown up" of choosing the successor [the secular king or *hau*] alternately from the families of the *tuihaatakalaua* and the *tuikanokubolu*. If, as is possible, this was a Tongan custom—not merely a recent innovation, but an old established custom—it helps us, I think, to account for much of the confusion as to these families, some of which has appeared in the preceding pages; I refer especially to apparent doubts as to whether certain named persons belonged to one family or the other, to cases in which a chief, having been a *tuikanokubolu*, afterwards became a *tuihaatakalaua*, and to d'Urville's indication that these names were not merely family names, but official or departmental distinguishing terms.

I propose to draw attention to some of the evidence, looking at it in the light of an assumption that there was some system, not necessarily always followed, of alternate chieftainship, and that when a chief belonged to one of two families, he had or might have, a sub-chief provided by the other, and this sub-chief would or might succeed him. For this the traditions as to the origins of the two great secular titles give us a good starting point, as they disclose beliefs that the *Haatakalaua* family was a branch of that of the *tuitonga*, and the *Kanokubolu* family was a subsequent branch of the *Haatakalaua*, which is consistent with the statements that, as between the *Haatakalaua* and *Kanokubolu* families, the former was regarded as being the more important of the two. The two families would be

<sup>1</sup> Schultz, *J.P.S.* vol. xx, p. 51.

the senior and junior branches of the same original family. A part of the scheme of my argument is the further assumption that the confusion had arisen partly from this superiority of the Haatakalaua family, and from the apparent use of the terms *tuihaatakalaua* and *tuikanokubolu*, not merely to designate chiefs of the two respective families, but with the meanings of the king and his sub-chief respectively for the time being. I will, for shortness, call the ruling king (that is, of course, the secular king) for any time being "the king," and his sub-chief "the chief," and will use the terms "H. family," "K. family," "T.H.," and "T.K.," to designate the two families and their respective head chiefs.

The story of the origin of the T.K. title discloses the T.H. Mounga-Tonga holding the position of king, and employing the T.K. Ngata as chief. The latter is said to have been the son of the former. I will deal with a later series of successions in the form of two columns, quoting in the first the information actually given by d'Urville, who (as I think wrongly) regarded the titles of T.H. and T.K. as titles of office [the former being that of the king, and the latter that of the chief], and adding in the other my suggestions as to the possible explanations.

Tube-lahi had been the T.K. [this follows from the statement as to inheritance next referred to]

This means that Tube-lahi had been the chief, and presumably had above him the king; though we do not know who he was.

His younger brother Mariwagui inherited from him the position of T.K.

Tube-lahi had probably succeeded to the kingship, and thereupon his brother Mariwagui succeeded to the position of chief.

Mariwagui was raised to the rank of T.H., and Tube-lahi's son Finau was made T.K.

Tube-lahi had probably died or abdicated, and Mariwagui became king, whilst Tube-lahi's son Finau became chief.

If we regard these devolutions in the light of my experimental assumptions, first as to alternate succession, and next as to confusion—assumptions on which my comments on the statements are based—we find that, on the chief Tube-lahi becoming king, the succession to the chieftom passed, not apparently to the son of his predecessor (of another family) as king, but to his own brother; but that when the chief Mariwagui became king, the chieftom did pass to the son of his predecessor as king, which is in accord with the system reported from Funafuti.

I now turn to the evidence as to Mumui, Tukuaho, Tubumalohi and Tubutoa, whose names appear in West's list as successive T.K.

Mumui was T.K., but was afterwards, according to d'Urville, raised to the rank of T.H. Tukuaho, became, according to d'Urville, apparently at the same time, T.K. He was the son of Mumui. Tubumalohi succeeded Tukuaho as T.K. He was the eldest son of Tukuaho, according to West, but was his brother, according to d'Urville and Sarah Farmer. Tubutoa succeeded Tubumalohi as T.K. He was his brother.

I will tabulate this material on the assumption that on the death of a king the chief became king, and in doing so I shall assume that Tubumalohi was the brother, and not the son of Tukuaho, because I think that d'Urville is more to be relied upon as to this than West.

<i>Kings</i>	<i>Chiefs</i>
?	Mumui
Mumui	Tukuaho (Mumui's son)
Tukuaho?	Tubumalohi (Tukuaho's brother)
Tubumalohi?	Tubutoa (Tubumalohi's brother)

It will be seen that these particulars are in accord with the idea of succession by the chief to the office of king so far as Mumui is concerned; but that as regards the others we have no information. If we assume, however, that they did succeed, as suggested in the table, then, whilst the evidence shows no continuing alternation as between one family and another, it indicates succession, one after another (except in the case of Tukuaho) as between brothers, and that Tubumalohi, who became chief when Tukuaho became king was in fact the son of the previous king Mumui.

Tubutoa died in 1820, and after this there was an interregnum until 1826<sup>1</sup>. D'Urville tells us that when he visited Tonga in 1827 there was a question of succession, the missionaries saying that a son of Tukuaho should be the successor whilst "others" said that the son of Tukuaho's brother was the proper claimant<sup>2</sup>. Then again, passing to a later date, Coppinger says that the heir presumptive of king George<sup>3</sup>, being the lineal heir by direct

<sup>1</sup> Thomson, *D.P.M.* p. 344. Cf. Sarah Farmer, p. 123.

<sup>2</sup> D'Urville, *Astro.* vol. iv, pp. 81 sq.

<sup>3</sup> I am not here using the term "king" with the defined meaning mentioned above.

descent, was his grandson; but that it was very doubtful whether he would succeed that king, as Maafu, the son of King George's deceased brother, was older in years, and was consequently, by Tongan laws, the legitimate heir to the throne<sup>1</sup>. The latter of these two statements suggests a conflict of ideas as to the right of succession by a brother or the descendant of a brother, as distinguished from that of a lineal descendant; but the former, going back as it does to the earlier Tukuaho, might simply be a question of succession regarded in the light of a principle of alternation.

I recognize that my evidence, taken by itself, is obviously insufficient, some of it being merely constructive guess-work, even admitting my construction of it, to prove the custom referred to by Thomson, even as a merely occasional practice, of alternating succession (though some of the evidence seems to be consistent with this custom), more especially as it depends so largely upon presumptions of my own; but if these presumptions offer a possible explanation of statements which are otherwise apparently inconsistent or difficult to understand, this adds to the likelihood of their correctness and strengthens the value of the evidence. I again draw attention, as regards this, to the fact that d'Urville, though he recognized that the T.H. and T.K. were the head chiefs of two great families, living in different parts of Tongatabu, thought that their names were official titles of departmental secular chiefs. He says that below the *tuitonga* came the great offices of state, the T.H. and T.K. (which were civil), and the Hata (which was military). The office of T.H. was the first office of the kingdom for the powers it conferred. The T.H. and T.K. were both charged with all civil and military affairs and the policing of the state, but the T.H. was at the head of temporal and military affairs. The T.K. had to act in concert with him, and it was only when the T.H. was too old, or had not been elected, that the rule fell to the T.K. All this is consistent with my interpretation of the evidence, except that, according to d'Urville, my king would always be of the H. family and my chief of the K. family. The question is whether he is correct in this; if he is so, then my construction of some of the evidence falls to pieces; but I think he is wrong. I think that if one of these two great families had held a permanent civil over-lordship (as distinguished from a possible temporary, even if long continued,

<sup>1</sup> Coppinger, p. 172.



over-lordship, arising out of a *malo* and *vaivai* system), and the other a permanent under-lordship, some other writer would have mentioned it, as it would be an important and fundamental feature of the government of Tongatabu; but no one does so. Young says the T.K. had been the crowned heads for about 200 years before 1853, though prior to that period the T.H. had been above him; so he is, according to my view, making, as regards the relatively recent period with which we are dealing, a similar mistake, but in the opposite direction. Also d'Urville's view is hardly consistent with the evidence that shows that a T.K. sometimes became a T.H., and someone else then became T.K. Then again, if d'Urville is right, how came it that there was all this confusion between the T.H. and the T.K.? If they were the heads of two distinct families, of whom one always provided the king, and the other the chief, there seems to have been no reasonable ground for confusion, whilst an alternating system, with its kings and chiefs, such as we are considering, might very well give rise to it. D'Urville himself refers to the confounding of the two offices, and to confusion as to the matter; and then winds up by insisting at all events on the priority of the office of the T.H. The presence of this confusion becomes obvious by a study of the disagreement of writers as to the families to which persons mentioned in history and in the tables belonged. I think it possible that the confusion arose from the error, into which many Polynesian observers have fallen, of not distinguishing between rank of birth and pedigree, and rank of official position. The T.H. as heads of the older stock family, would have a recognized social superiority over the T.K., as heads of the later branch family, and would probably receive more ceremonious respect, even when the branch family held the position of king, whilst the stock family only held that of chief. This is what we should expect from our knowledge of Polynesia, and if it was so, it would be a fruitful source of misunderstanding. There was a mental confusion between social superiority and political superiority. If there was some system of alternate succession to the secular kingship, not necessarily always followed, and still more, if there was a corresponding alternate succession to the chieftaincy under the king, we cannot be surprised at confusion of ideas. I am inclined to think there had been a system, not by any means always followed, of alternating succession in Tonga, which may sometimes have included the feature attributed by

Hedley to that of Funafuti; but the evidence in favour of the latter proposition is very meagre. There does not appear to have been any one system consistently followed.

When we consider the subject of succession we shall find that it often might pass in parts of Polynesia to brothers or other collateral relations, and it is possible that in some cases a brother to brother system had been connected with or had led to, an idea of alternation, even though we may be unable to investigate the matter from that point of view.

#### *The tafa'ifa of Samoa*

I have refrained hitherto, in discussing the question of dual kingship, from considering the peculiar political system of Samoa, with its *tafa'ifa*, or king of all Samoa. In tracing the origin of this office we have not to go back to ancient myths; it was apparently of relatively recent date, the office, if it may be called so, having been created long after the commencement of the rules of the two great families of the *tuiaana* and the *tuiatua*; indeed the account of its origin comes within the period of what seems to be almost that of comparatively well-authenticated island history. This history contains no suggestion of an original sacred head chief; it merely points to a concentration of official headship which had not before been recognized. There is no indication of any special or peculiar sanctity attributed to the *tafa'ifa*, in excess of that which he would possess as holder of the two titles of *tuiaana* and *tuiatua* and the two other titles that covered the whole of Tuamasanga. This system of kingship of all Samoa, was, so far as I know, not exactly comparable with anything that prevailed anywhere else in Polynesia. Doubtless leading families of chiefs did, pretty generally throughout the other islands, acquire increased influence and power not only by war, but by intermarriages with other families; it undoubtedly often happened that two or more titles became in this way concentrated by succession or otherwise in one person, who would thereupon become in effect the ruler of the dominions of all the chiefs whose titles he held; but his right to rule in each separate district would depend upon his holding the title of the head chief of that district, without reference to his holding other titles; and I think this was so with the Samoan *tafa'ifa*. Another curious feature of the matter is that no Savai'i title was requisite, although the rule of the *tafa'ifa* extended over that island, nor a Tutuilan title—but that

island was politically unimportant. I am unable to suggest any reason, beyond what appears in history of the matter, for this local Samoan system.

### *General*

It must not be assumed from the information given above concerning political systems that the villages, districts and islands of Polynesia were under the sole jurisdiction of the chiefs; in some, at all events, of the groups a considerable part of the work of internal government and arriving at decisions in matters of importance fell upon their assemblies or councils—called in Samoa *fono*—at which representative heads of families attended. An attempt to introduce the subject matter of these assemblies into a discussion of political areas and systems would, however, have complicated the matter greatly; it is therefore reserved for treatment by itself hereafter.

I have tried, as regards each island, to indicate its division into districts, and subdivision into minor districts or villages, and in some cases I have quoted numbers, and even given names. It must, however, be remembered, as regards all this, that the books from which I have collected the material differ very widely in date, and that during the period covered by them collectively constant changes must have taken place. Old villages would pass out of existence and new ones would come into being; district boundaries, and even the division of an island into districts would change. Each statement only represents the situation as observed by the writer, or as told him by those from whom he got his information; and this information would sometimes refer, not to what was then the present time, but to some previous period. Probably the apparently contradictory character of many of the statements is due to this cause, though in many cases it must be attributed to a lack of a common defined terminology.