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INTRODUCTION

A story that is often presented as history is dependent upon not only accumulated data, but also on three other key factors, the position of the writer, the reason he or she is writing the story, and finally the intended audience. These factors have a direct effect on the telling or the writing of any history (Terence Wesley-Smith 2009, pers. Comm.; Greg Denning 1989).

In presenting the oral-turned-written history of the Anoalo line of the Young family of the Tuimanu’a, and illuminating the differences between the knowledge of the Western and the knowing of the Samoan, this paper shows the value in multiple views of history told through the multi-colored and multi-faceted lenses of the guardians of that history. Indeed, if we were to say that there is only one story, or that all histories must agree, we would be fooling ourselves. Memory is selective. How and what we remember is both selective and subjective. Moreover, how we view that event is affected by our constructs, and, literally, by where we are sitting or standing as an event unfolds. Thus if we have ten people from ten different backgrounds viewing an event, from ten different positions, there will be ten different versions of that event. An issue therefore is not that there are ten different versions, but that there is one version which will be chosen to be published and become canon. Does this make the other nine versions less valid simply because one has been privileged above them?

The purpose of this paper is two-fold. It is written with the intent of re-examining the extant written history of Manu’a and to privilege the oral-turned-written
history of the Young family of the Anoalo or male line of the Tuimanu’a\(^2\) through their own family ‘api or books of genealogical writings. When Samoans became literate, they began to keep written historic records in these notebooks. Many were dictated by the keepers of the family’s oral traditions and tended to follow a similar island-wide format containing creation stories, family genealogies, legends, and generally all the oral knowledge that families consider significant. The second purpose of this paper is to illuminate and show how the history of Sāmoa can be divergent, especially when filtered through the eyes and ears of Westerners and even other family members. In order to do this, it is necessary to look at the historiography through which Westerners, as outsiders, recorded history and to juxtapose it with the historiography of the oral-turned-written tradition of the Samoan ‘api format. The documents in my possession consist of portions of a handwritten copy of the original ‘api, or notebooks, which were dictated, by Tauānu’u\(^3\) to Tuimanu’a Matelita Young, who held the title from 1890 until her untimely death in 1895. These ‘api were copied and augmented by her younger brother Tuimanu’a Taliutafa Le’iesilika (Chris) Young Sr., as well as his son Le’iesilika Young Jr., and Le’iesilika Sr.’s granddaughter, Emily Young.

Just as the purpose of the paper is two-fold, it is also written for two specific audiences. While written in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master’s degree from the Center for Pacific Islands Studies at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, it is

\(^2\) The Tuimanu’a was the paramount title in the Manu’a Island group of Sāmoa (at one time believed to be the paramount title in all of Sāmoa) and has three lines of descent. The Anoalo is the male line which is based in Lalopua which is a compound, or piece of land in the village of Lumā on Ta’ū. The Falesoā and Avaloa are the two female lines which support the male line.

\(^3\) Tauānu’u is the title of the high orator chief for the Anoalo, or male line of the Tuimanu’a.
also written with the intent of adding to the works of Samoan scholars such as
Gatoloaifaana Peseta S. Sio (1984), Malama Meleisea (1985), Tofaeono Misilugi Tulifau
Mata’itusi Simanu (2011), and others who have begun the task of “opening” the ‘api
and sharing their validity as historiographic sources with the academic world. I would
argue that the Young ‘api and this paper will make available, for the first time, a missing
part of this history to all of Manu’a’s descendants.

Until the latter half of the twentieth century, Samoa’s written history was told
from the perspective of the outsider. By publishing interpretations of the past from
their own perspectives, contemporary Samoan scholars such as those mentioned above
have opened the door to a huge library of ‘api which have been taken from the rich and
varied Samoan oral histories and placed in an academic setting in the written form.
These histories are written about Sāmoa by Samoans who do not always agree, but
accept each other’s claim to “truth” since they acknowledge that there are many
variations of stories in Sāmoa and that one version of history may not be considered a
complete history. The Young ‘api is just one of many ‘api and one of the many versions
of a particular story, however, since it has been entrusted to me for this purpose, its
analysis gives voice to the Young’s descendants so that their side of the story can be
heard and respected as a valid contribution to the growing anthology of the histories of
Sāmoa.
While there are those who might feel that this contribution might better be
made by a person of Samoan descent, I would argue that although I am not Samoan, I
have been part of a Samoan family for more than half of my lifetime. My husband’s
grandmother was Rose Young. She was one of the children of Amepeilia and Pa’u Young
and the sister of both Tuimanu’a Matelita Totoluafilo’isāmoa and Tuimanu’a Taliutafa
Le‘iesilika.

Neither my husband’s connection to the Tuimanu’a nor the fact that my children
and their children are also descendants of the Anoalo line of the Tuimanu’a, affords me
any more authority to write on this subject than anyone else. What does afford me this
privilege is the Young family, as they, after generations of silence, have given me the
honor of matūpālapala or special privileges for services rendered and entrusted me
with this ‘api and permission to share its contents. They have also mentored me in this
endeavor. I have worked extremely hard to be critical and unbiased, however, there is
always the possibility that I have fallen short. Therefore, I humbly ask for the indulgence
of those individuals and families whose stories differ from this one. My intent is to
share what has so graciously been entrusted to me.
Chapter Outline

This thesis is presented in four chapters. Chapter 1 provides background information on how the Western oriented and academically accepted accounts of Samoa’s histories were created and on the framework by which they were written through the Euro-American presence in the Pacific and, particularly in the Samoan Islands. This chapter addresses the ethnocentric constructs imposed upon this region by Westerners from the time of first contact, as well as the hegemonic packaging and selling of what has been deemed as Samoa’s history. At the same time, it addresses the fundamental values of Samoan culture and language without which Samoa’s history and traditions are sometimes misunderstood.

Chapter 2 comprises a comparison of diverging accounts or four versions of the chronology of the Tuimanu’a. Two of these accounts are by Western scholars and two are from the Manu’a family ‘api of Galea’i\(^4\) and Young\(^5\) with particular attention to the *gafa*, or genealogy, and stories of the Young family. A set of these note books has been handed down within the family over the years, and on rare occasion, access to them was granted to non-Samoan researchers. As I demonstrate, what has been presented by the two Western scholars is an extremely narrow version in comparison to the two traditional Samoan sources.

---

\(^4\) The Galea’i family is one of the highest ranking families on Manu’a. They are from the village of Aga’e, which was the original seat of the Tuimanu’a. Galea’i genealogical information was accessed through Tofaeono Misilugi Tulifau Tu’u’u’s book, *Rulers of Sāmoa Islands and Their Legends and Decrees*, as well as personal communication with the late High Chief Lilomaiva Galea’i.

\(^5\) Although the name is not Samoan, the Young family is from the *Anolalo* or male line of the Tuimanu’a and is from the village of Ta’u.
Chapter 3 provides an analysis of the possible reasons for differences between the two Western chronologies, and why they are major departures from the traditional Samoan *gafa* contained in the ‘*api*. Here, I use Samoan culture, language, and interpretations of time and space, as well as historical events recorded in the ‘*api*, to enumerate the differences between the Western and traditional or ‘*api* versions of the chronology of the Tuimanu’a. Finally, this chapter presents an example of the rich contextual information contained in the ‘*api* format that is absent in the Western chronologies.

In Chapter 4, I re-examine the research questions for which this paper was written. I also examine my personal plans for work and study, as well as my hopes for other scholars to explore the past through the rich and varied lens of the Samoan people to whom it belongs.
CHAPTER 1

History in a Box: How the West has packaged and sold History in the Pacific Islands

There are many stories and multiple versions of a particular story about the oral past in Sāmoa. Today, some of them have remained oral while others have been written; however, before European contact all of Sāmoa’s stories were transmitted orally. Since European contact, accepted academic Samoan history has consisted of that which has been written predominantly from a Eurocentric point of view (Denning 1989). This chapter addresses the processes and events that led to the corpus of historical accounts of Sāmoa written over the past two centuries; a period of time in which the rich and varied historical and cultural traditions of Sāmoa were filtered and adapted to a narrow view of how Samoa’s history should be told.

In ‘First Contacts’ in Polynesia: The Samoan Case (1722-1848), Western Misunderstandings about Sexuality and Divinity, which addresses the first contact between Samoans and European explorers of the 18th century, author Serge Tcherkézoff (2004) reminds us that Ferdinand Magellan’s mission to circumnavigate the earth was the beginning of the European presence in Oceania. Indeed, in 1521, it was Magellan who called the vast body of water west of the Americas and east of the Philippines the Pacific Ocean. He found the waters quiet and calm, very different from the fierce ocean pounding the Straights of Magellan and Cape Horn through which he had passed during this voyage of discovery for the Spanish throne.

Two centuries later the Dutch explorers charted the coast of Australia and in 1722 Jacob Roggenveen’s Dutch expedition sighted the Manu’a group of the Samoan
Archipelago. Since Roggenveen did not record the nautical coordinates, credit for the actual “discovery” went to the French explorer, Louis-Antoine de Bougainville, forty years later in 1766. On 6 December 1787, Jean-François de Galaup Laperouse sailed into a cove in A’asu, a village in northern Tutuila, the main island in American Sāmoa. His encounter with Samoans ended in violence and for awhile after that, ships avoided calling in for supplies throughout the Samoan Archipelago. It was not until the advent of Christianity, in the early nineteenth century, that more Europeans found comfort calling into Samoan waters; by the middle of the century, the port towns of Apia and Pago Pago had emerged and the missionization of the archipelago had gained a stronghold.

However, the use of the word “discovery” by Europeans somehow overshadows the earlier discovery and colonization of the island by the Samoans themselves.

After Bougainville’s contact with Samoans, we begin to see how Westerners positioned themselves vis-à-vis Samoans through captains’ logs, journals, and later the works of missionaries, early anthropologists, and novelists (Tcherkézoff 2004; Michelle Keown 2007).

For the Europeans, the 18th century was the culmination of an age of enlightenment and discovery which had begun in the 15th century. It was during this time that Europeans no longer hugged their coasts for fear of falling off the edge of the earth, but embarked on long voyages that took them as far as China to the East and Oceania to the West. By the 17th century, European intellectuals were challenging traditional ideas which were not based on scientific thought. They wrote books which
promoted dialogues about such topics as the nature of man and whether man’s sense of morality was based on nature or nurture. In his book *Leviathan*, England’s Thomas Hobbes (1661), posed that for man in his natural state, or “state of nature,” life was “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short” (Hobbes 2011, 77). However, France’s Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1754) countered in his book *A Discourse on Inequality*, that in a state of nature, man has no innate concept of good and evil, but is ultimately corrupted by society because of its moral inequality (Rousseau 1984). Although these intellectual debates in Europe and later America were meant to bring about social reform, there also appears to be an underlying tone of superiority vis-à-vis enlightened Western civilization and the indigenous peoples of already colonized countries and those of the newly discovered and newly acquired islands of the Pacific.

Filtered through the lenses of their own cultural and personal biases, ships captains and literate crew members on these voyages of discovery recorded their experiences and perceptions of Oceania. Early descriptions of Sāmoa include the accounts of Bougainville (1768) and later, fellow explorer, Jean Francois de Galup, comte de Laperouse (1787). Neither of these explorers appears to have made any real attempt to understand the culture or history of the Islanders whose homes they renamed and whose ritual gifts they viewed as commodities. However, since all writing is subjective, it is only natural that as a result of the prevailing attitudes of the time, the Euro-American researcher invariably ended up setting himself both apart from, and above, the people he studied. In this way, Europeans immediately began to devalue the
culture of Pacific Islanders and incorporate it as a footnote into European history (Bougainville 2002; Regis Stella 2007).

Subsequent explorers maintained, and at times magnified, the original constructs set by the first Europeans who planted their countries’ flags on Pacific Islands. Indeed the act of planting the flag was lost on the Pacific Islander who might have considered it rather as a European symbol of ownership to ward off other Europeans, than as a message to the Islanders (Stella 2007). From first European contact, the people of these newly “discovered” islands were ranked and classified by European writers and researchers with little to no regard for the complexity of the cultures. For their own reference and convenience, Europeans partitioned the South Pacific into three regions as Melanesia, Micronesia, and Polynesia. While these regions exist as such today, the names were simply terms with no direct linguistic or cultural relevance to inhabitants of these areas at the time, they were simply relevant to European purposes. Initially based on the size and appearance of the islands in these areas, more recent constructs would have us believe that these names had racial connotations. The islands of Melanesia appeared dark when first sighted, and their inhabitants tended to be dark skinned. The area with a group of many small islands became known as Micronesia, and the one with many larger islands was called Polynesia. Islanders were also ranked by degree of “primitiveness,” with Melanesians considered most primitive and Polynesians the least. The methods of classification were

---

6 From the Greek “melas” meaning “black.”
7 “Micro” as in “small”
8 “Poly” as in “many”
governed by what was most pleasing to the Western eye. For example, the people of Melanesia were ranked as being in a low stage of barbarism, while the people of Polynesia were romanticized hence the “beautiful and felicitous” people of Tahiti were equated with those of ancient Arcadia (Margaret Jolly 2007). Up until fairly recently Euro-American research and discourse about Oceania has been steeped in this kind of Western epistemology, and because such works were written, published, widely read and discussed, they have shaped both the Westerner’s idea of the Pacific Islands, and ironically the Pacific Islander’s own concept of self. Although some early accounts were later revealed as more fiction than fact, once read, discussed and re-read, they became accepted over time as “truth.” Three examples of this molding of truth can be seen in the late 19th century “eyewitness” accounts of Captain John A. Lawson, Edward William Cole, and Reverend Henry Crocker. As reviewed by Stella in his 2007 article, *Imagining the Other*, all three men traveled through the Pacific, wrote works of fiction detailing events, objects and people which did not exist or occur. However, because they created mental images which conformed to dominant constructs regarding the superiority of Europeans over “primitive” Islanders, such representations became accepted as “truth” (Stella 2007).

In the three works of fiction by Lawson (1873), Cole (1873), and Crocker (1876), the Islander’s degree of civilization was never equal to that of the European. Thus the

---

9 *Wanderings of the Interior of New Guinea*, 1873
10 *Account of a Race of Human Begins with Tails, Discovered by Mr. Jones the Traveler in the Interior of New Guinea*, 1873
indigene was always portrayed as a primitive and New Guinea was then understood as “primitive space” which could then be interpreted as “available space,” thus implying the space was literally available for the taking. Writing such as this was so powerful that these works might even be conceived as “acts of colonization” in themselves because they portrayed the European’s mastery of the unknown as well as, within their fictional accounts, a normalization of that same unknown. This, according to Stella, provided Europeans with an impetus for further exploration and colonization (Stella 2007).

*Early accounts of Polynesia: Tahiti and Sāmoa*

The lens through which the Western writer viewed the world had a direct effect on the representation of the Pacific Islander and the early European explorers of the Pacific illustrate this well. Louis-Antoine de Bougainville was accepted into the Royal Society in 1756 and commissioned by the French crown in 1766 to explore the Pacific. An account of this voyage can be found in *The Pacific Journal of Louis-Anton de Bougainville: 1767-1768*. Although Bougainville discovered and claimed many islands for France, he was most impressed with the people of Tahiti. Throughout his account of his time in Tahiti, repeated references were made to the Islanders lack of inhibition in regard to nudity and the sexual act. This behavior appeared to have both attracted and repulsed him. Calling on that which was familiar and in direct relation to the sexual freedom exhibited by the Tahitians, Bougainville re-named the island New Cythera after the Greek goddess of love, Aphrodite. Similarly, recalling classic European history as
well as contemporary ideas, Bougainville described a meal hosted by a local chief as a “golden meal with people who are still living in that happy time.”

Bougainville subscribed to French Enlightenment philosophers such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Denis Diderot who theorized that “primitive” peoples who had not been “corrupted” by Western “vices” would exhibit qualities which Europeans had lost. Indeed, Bougainville expected to find such people on this Pacific voyage (Brij Lal and Kate Fortune 2000).

Although he spent only nine days on the island, Bougainville’s last entry in his journal is reminiscent of the rose colored lens which tints the reality of a love sick adolescent. He wrote:

Nature has placed it in the finest climate in the world, embellished it with most attractive scenery, enriched it with her gifts, filled it with handsome, tall, and well built inhabitants. She herself has dictated its laws, they follow them in peace and make up what may be the happiest society on the globe. Lawmakers and philosophers come and see here all your imagination has ever been able to dream up. A large population made up of handsome men and pretty women, living together in abundance and good health, with every indication of the greatest amenity, sufficiently aware of what belongs to the one and the other for there to be that degree of difference in rank that is necessary for good order (Bougainville 2002, 71).

Sadly, Bougainville’s admiration for the Tahitians did not extend to the Samoans. In contrast to his favorable impression of Tahitian women, a Samoan woman on one of the greeting canoes was described by Bougainville as “hideous.” A newly acquired Tahitian sailor, Ahutoru (Louis), was reported to have said he was unable to communicate with the Samoans who were thought to be less gentle than the Tahitians and their features were judged as “savage” (Bougainville 2002, 81-82). Although in

most areas Bougainville found Samoans to be inferior to the Tahitians, they were praised for their white teeth as well as their swimming and sailing abilities. Even as he praised them, Bougainville appears to have taken the first step toward colonization and eclipsed pre-contact history by ignoring any indigenous place names and re-naming Sāmoa, the “Navigator Islands.”

This name was chosen because of the ease and expertise with which Samoans handled their sailing canoes.

It appears, therefore, that after Bougainville’s nine day experience in Tahiti, all else fell short of his expectations. No Pacific Islander would ever be as handsome, gentle, or refined as the Tahitian, nevertheless it was understood that even the Tahitian would always fall short of the European. It is fair to conclude that these early visitors to Sāmoa readily displayed their condescension of the history and culture of the Pacific Islander, a trend which would continue for the next few hundred years, even as more detailed knowledge of the people of the region became apparent.

Opening the Box: Possible Samoan interpretations of first contact and the European as “other”

With the extant body of Samoan history presented through a Western lens, the European has tended to neglect the Samoan perspective. However in a more recent work, First Contacts in Polynesia: The Samoan Case (1722-1848), author Serge Tcherkézoff (2004) uses the works of scholars as well as the journals of early European navigators (both published and unpublished), and the writings of the early missionaries in order to reconstruct a point of view for the Samoan people at the time of first contact.

---

13 However, Jacob Roggeveen had already noted the Samoan name.
contact. Since the French voyagers were among the earliest visitors to Sāmoa, Tcherkézoff focuses heavily on the accounts written by Bougainville and Laperouse who continually used the people of Tahiti as the standard by which all other Polynesians were to be measured. Tcherkézoff maintains that stories of first encounters between Polynesians and Europeans have, until recently, been told solely by Europeans (Tcherkézoff 2004). While the Samoan was the European’s “other,” Tcherkézoff points out that European was the Samoan’s “other” and each was trying to make some sense out of these first encounters.

As Tcherkézoff relates it, Jacob Roggenveen’s Dutch expedition of 1722 was the first recorded contact with the Samoan Archipelago, but Bougainville was given credit for discovering what he termed the “Navigator Islands.” Although Bougainville made no contact on land, and the Samoans who greeted his ship did not want to board it, he immediately began to compare Sāmoa to Tahiti during the initial exchanges on the high seas. To Bougainville’s surprise, Samoans were completely disinterested in metal, yet they valued the gifts of cloth, particularly red material and blue glass beads which they already had in their possession. Here, Tcherkézoff notes that these were traded by the Dutch to the Tongans and perhaps later by the Tongans to the Samoans. He claims that Bougainville found Samoans inferior to Tahitians in all ways. Bougainville appears to have deemed the women ugly and the men not as “gentle” as those of Tahiti.
Moreover, he found Samoan *siapo*\(^{14}\) inferior in all ways to the bark cloth of Tahiti, and even Samoan fishhooks were thought to be poorly made (Tcherkézoff 2004).

On the other hand, if we look at this first encounter through Tcherkézoff’s lens we are led to believe, that since Roggenveen is said to have traded only a few rusty nails, it is quite possible that Samoans had not yet realized the advantage of metal over the stone and shell tools they had been using for centuries. They did, however, continues Tcherkézoff, recognize the superiority of the woven cloth which did not disintegrate in water as did their bark cloth (Tcherkézoff 2004).

*Cultural misunderstandings: Ritual gifts vs commodities*

In December of 1787, a second French explorer, Laperouse reached Sāmoa and through his journal we are able to read about the first encounters between Samoans and Europeans on land.\(^{15}\) On this first visit, Laperouse stated that he was “convinced that at least in the Navigator Islands girls are mistresses of their own favours before marriage” (Tcherkézoff 2004, 29). Tcherkézoff reminds us that Lapersouse “was among the navigators who had read Bougainville before departing for the Pacific” and that in Europe, Bougainville’s subjective Western interpretation of his experiences in Tahiti had been accepted as real and accurate as had so much other written material of the time. Laperouse’s description of sexually wanton girls is reinterpreted by Tcherkézof from a possible Samoan perspective. He considers the presentation of these

\(^{14}\) Bark cloth

\(^{15}\) Documents copied from the Young ‘api, typed by Taliutafa Chris Young, and submitted to the High Court of American Sāmoa for “future memory” state this event occurred during the tenure of Tuimanu’a Taliutafa Seiuli.
girls as preludes to ritual weddings and offerings to the temporary embodiment of *atua* (god), a chief of high rank, or similarly ranked visitors (Tcherkézoff 2004). He interprets Bougainville’s statement that the French were bombarded with offers of young girl’s “favours,” as misinterpreted by Laperouse as sexual hospitality. Although the young women were presented to the French with a ceremonial branch while surrounded by elders who never ceased their chanting, the French made no connection between the possibility of some sort of ritual act as opposed to wanton sexual encounters in exchange for trinkets such as red material and blue glass beads.

In these first exchanges, we see Samoans offering gifts that would only be offered only to high ranking individuals, such as *sega* or parrot and a tame *manumā*, or dove, as well as young virgins. These offerings were made in ritual fashion and without expectation of “payment.” In fact, many of these offerings are typical of those made by Samoans when hosting a *malaga*, or traveling party akin to those of the courtship practices of the past, in which a paramount son and his entourage sought the hand of a beautiful paramount daughter of another village. In the process, men and women of lesser status would challenge each other to battles of wits, usually during the entertainment known as the ‘aiavā or farewell party. During this time, there would be singing and dancing, and as the night wore thin, couples of lesser status disappeared, however the paramount virgin was heavily chaperoned by the elders of the *auluma* or unmarried females. The gifting of the *manumā* was a demonstration of the esteem in which the Samoans held their visitors as possession of these birds were restricted to
high chiefs. The manumā were sacred pets as they represented a link to the gods (Tcherkézoff 2004).

Although the Samoans accepted the reciprocity of the Europeans, it was not demanded. To the Europeans, the gifts offered by the Samoans were trade goods, or commodities, which required compensation or payment. On the other hand, to the Samoans, they were ritual offerings. Here we have what I believe to be a classic example of Marshall Sahlins’ (1981) theory on structures of conjuncture.16 We have two different groups of people responding to new experiences within the social constructs of which they were accustomed, and it was this difference in response which led to further cultural misunderstandings.

In one of the most important of these misunderstandings, one of Laperouse’s men, Paul Antoine Fleuriot de Langle (Laperouse’s second in command), found a natural cove suitable for landing in a small village.17 The day after discovering it, while Laperouse stayed aboard the ship, de Langle and 11 men set out in longboats to get more fresh water as well as do a bit of bartering. The tide was low and it was difficult to maneuver the long boats through the coral. At first everything was peaceful. The villagers threw ‘ava or kava branches into the ocean to welcome the French. The French began to fill their casks while a row of guards kept the Samoans in check. There were however, women within the group and they managed to find their way past the guards

---

16 See Marshall Sahlins’ work entitled Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities, 1981.
17 Some report the village to have been Fagatele, however the most popular accounts of this event report the village as A’asu. A’asu is also the site of a monument dedicated to the French who died at what is now called “Massacre Bay.”
and made (what the French interpreted as) “indecent gestures.” Others soon took advantage of the confusion. With the aid of some “chiefs,” order was restored and so the French gave blue beads to the “chiefs” who had come to their aid. As the French tried to make their way back to the ship, they found the tide was even lower and one boat, laden with the extra weight of the water casks could not be budged. As the French waited for the tide to return, they found themselves surrounded by disgruntled Samoans both on the shore as well as those in canoes which had returned from bartering with the long boats further out. In the fight that ensued, de Langle and 10 other Frenchmen were killed (Tcherkézoff 2004). A small memorial monument was erected to honor these 11 men; however, Tcherkézoff continues a Chinese member of the expedition was omitted, as were the Samoans who also died in the fray. Today, the bay between the villages of A’asu and Fagatele is known as “Massacre Bay.”

As a result of this one encounter, in the eyes of Laperouse and the rest of the Western world, the generally peaceful Samoans were now viewed as violent thieves and killers who could not be trusted. On the other hand, Tcherkézoff points out that from the Samoan perspective, perhaps the beads had been unevenly distributed, and perhaps to the wrong people. Also, the men who the French had perceived to be “chiefs” were perhaps taulele’a, or untitled men of the village, whose duty it was to serve and in this instance, they may have served by restoring order. Some of the men might have been low ranking tulāfale or talking chiefs, however it seems highly unlikely that a high chief

---

18 While accounts vary regarding the number of people killed in this violent encounter, there are 11 names on the Massacre Bay monument. American Sāmoa travel guide reports 1 Chinese crew member and 39 Samoans also lost their lives in this encounter.
would have been involved in such a menial affair as high chiefs did not generally mix with commoners. Tcherkézoff cites the uneven distribution of beads by the *papālagi*\(^{19}\) may have instilled the idea that all were entitled to some, and the confusion and crowding eventually resulted in escalating violence between the two parties. What Tcherkézoff does not include in his attempt to present a Samoan point of view, is that, perhaps too, the Samoan men, whose sisters may have been some of the virgins presented to these visitors for these ritual weddings, might have been greatly affected by the defloration ritual before the *papālagi*, in a *fale* or house, with lowered blinds—a move which denies what was often done in public and before all eyes.

Though Tcherkézoff offers viable explanations for the misunderstandings between Europeans and Samoans, the fact remains that the majority of early written history of Sāmoa privileged the knowledge of the colonizer and subordinated that of the colonized. For the most part, the early writers had little, if any, understanding of the indigenous language and culture. The “history” of the Samoan islands (from the perspective of the European) was generally about the European experience in Sāmoa and centered on their arrival in the islands. When it came to pre-contact history, the researchers frequent lack of knowledge of Samoan language and culture, forced them to rely on interpreters who may have had their own biases and agendas...and, who may, or may not have omitted pertinent information regarding content and context.\(^{20}\)

\(^{19}\) Used in reference toward European or white people. Literally, “sky breakers”

\(^{20}\) This thesis therefore, on its own axis of truth and bias, acknowledges a fundamental truth to historiography which is that it is from a particular perspective which is then added to existing ones. The argument that is made in this thesis is that earlier histories left out the Samoan perspective.
Although there were early missionary-scholars who were fluent in the Samoan language, most of these men also had agendas. For the missionary-scholars discussed below, the goal was to connect the Samoans with the lost tribes of Israel.\textsuperscript{21} Their claims of the Semitic origin of Samoan words and in particular the custom of circumcision (which is practiced worldwide by many indigenous peoples) were still accepted as theory as late as the end of the last century (Fitigemanu and Wright 1970). Today, with our knowledge of linguistics, anthropology and genetic coding, this line of study seems tenuous, at best. However, for many religious scholars of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, such ideas were congruent with theories of the time.

\textit{The European model continues: Missionary Scholars}

The story does not change much with later explorers, whalers, missionaries, beachcombers, and writers. The portrait of Samoans and other Pacific Islanders, in terms of their culture, language and history continued to be filtered, reconstructed and packaged in a uniquely European model. One such example of how this history was packaged, marketed, and sold can be found in \textit{History of Sāmoa} by the Marist brother, Fred Henry (1979). Unlike Bougainville, Henry lived, taught, collected traditional stories and wrote in Sāmoa for over 25 years between the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries and unlike Bougainville, he had an evident respect for Samoans. However, although he felt he was being of service to the Samoan people by writing this history, Henry was also a man with an agenda. Like many early missionary-scholars, Henry sought to prove a

\textsuperscript{21} More information can be found in the works of later scholars such as Tu’u’u in \textit{Rulers of Sāmoa and the Legneds and Decrees}, and Ala’i’ima’s work, \textit{O Tatou Tupa’aga}, pages 381-386.
connection between the Samoans and the Semitic people of the Middle East. He stated that “many words can be traced to a Semitic origin, many customs are identical with those of Arabs and Hebrews...circumcision, rules of taboo, time reckoning, etc” (Henry 1979, 2).

In just 216 pages, Henry attempted to cover 3000 years of Samoan history. Henry postulated that this understanding of the past would foster a more complete understanding of the present, thus insuring a better future. He divided Samoan history into four distinct eras: 1) Prehistoric (400 BC-1250 AD), 2) from the Tongan War until the arrival of the missionary John Williams (1250-1830), 3) the following period of European hegemony, and lastly, 4) Sāmoa from 1900 until his present time (circa 1930). These divisions were created by Henry in order to frame Samoan history in the familiar Occidental chronology of transitions which was mostly based on outside influences on Sāmoa (i.e. original settlement, Tonga, Christianity, and relations with European powers).

Since Henry was writing in the early 1900’s, the information in his book regarding Polynesia reflects the dominant views of the times. Clearly his work reflected and reinforced prevalent theories which promoted Polynesians as being of Semitic origin. Though Samoans were theorized to have sailed from the West, moving through Oceania to the East, Henry refuted a Polynesian connection to Melanesia and was emphatic in his insistence that Samoan were not related to the people of Melanesia, thus intimating the inherent superiority of the Polynesian over the “primitive”

---

22 See also Vailao J. Ala’iima’s work O Tatou Tupu’aga, pgs.381-386.
Melanesian (Henry 1979). Although Henry’s history was based on other studies and accounts that met with his agenda, he included selective Samoan oral histories which he used as pointers and references to recorded historical events. Henry also juxtaposed migration theories with the Samoan belief that Samoans originated in Sāmoa, and did not migrate from elsewhere.

In his conclusion, Henry stated that because his book was the first attempt to put Samoan history into a chronological order, there were bound to be mistakes, for which he apologized in advance (Henry 1979). In a paragraph just prior to this acknowledgement, Henry stressed the importance of understanding the native “mind and character.” Almost in the same breath, he stated that this understanding was important for anyone “who loves them as they are, and is really interested in their progress and wellbeing,” and most important, it was necessary for those “called upon to guide them” (Henry 1979).

While “called upon to guide them” might relate to a “calling” of the clergy, by this time, the entirety of Sāmoa had become Christian therefore it possibly references “the white man’s burden” to lead the poor natives into the light. Whatever veiled (or outright) allusions to European superiority, Henry’s History of Sāmoa was written in English, back-translated into Samoan and then taught to Samoans in their schools as their own history.

Another book, Sāmoa: An Early History, is also credited to Henry. These two books appear to be the same work edited and translated by different people. While
Kenneth Russell Lambie\textsuperscript{23} edited the prior work (which was circulated mainly in Western Sāmoa), the later was revised by Samoan educator Tofa Pula Nikolao I. Tuiteleleapaga, and used in American Sāmoa. These books are excellent examples of how the re-presentation of a people can have a direct effect upon that people’s perception of themselves as Henry took a great deal of artistic license in his presentation of the oral traditions of Sāmoa. His writing style is reminiscent of the Hawaiian monarch, King David Kalakaua, who attempted to share with the Western world Hawai‘i’s diverse, complex, and ancient history by re-writing it in the style of the Victorian age in which he lived. Whether aware of Kalakaua’s work or not, Henry took many of Samoa’s oral traditions and transformed them into something more appealing and familiar to his Euro-American audience. In this way, Samoa’s history became a Victorian Romance novel. Below is an example of his retelling of one of the many stories relating to Salamasina who lived circa 1500:

Alapepe had long since sensed that his beloved Queen was suffering, but till now had not known the cause. While thus sitting side by side in intimate conversation, they both became aware that their former friendship had developed into mutual love. The boy suddenly realized that his sweetheart would be snatched away. Blinded by love and passion he impulsively took her in his arms and kissed her over and over again and she willingly returned his caresses. Alas, this was only the beginning, for all too soon he forgot her sacredness and her being betrothed to Tapu (Henry 1979, 72-73).

Although Samoans romanticize and embellish depending on the teller’s mood, skill, intended audience and the purpose of the telling, the above excerpt appears to be written for a Euro-American audience. It is also a re-presentation of Samoan culture.

\textsuperscript{23} Lambie was Director of Education in New Zealand/Western Sāmoa from 1945-1959.
that, if not for the names of the protagonists, many Samoans would have trouble recognizing as their own.

Another early missionary-scholar who took quite a bit of artistic license with the translation of Samoan oral tradition was Reverend Thomas Powell of the London Missionary Society, who spent over forty years in the South Pacific. From 1854 to 1885, Powell served the Eastern Islands of Sāmoa, which included Tutuila, and the Manu’a group (Ta’ū, Olosega, and Ofu). During those years he also collected many manuscripts of Samoan oral history. These stories and chronologies were dictated to him by Samoan natives (in the Samoan language) while he transcribed them. Powell died shortly after returning to England having retired from the field and most of his manuscripts un-translated (Fraser 1898).24 He did, however, attempt to render into verse the well-known Samoan creation story/poem, ‘O le Solo o le Vā. Below is stanza twenty of Powell’s extremely editorialized and stylized version which I juxtapose here against a more direct translation by Dr. John Mayer (pers. Comm. 2013):

Powell’s original translation:

The sun, like statue, changeless found,
[Darts his refulgent beams around].
The waters in their place appear,
The sea too occupies its sphere;
The heavens ascend, [the sky is clear];
To visit [the scene] Tangaloa comes down;
To the west, to the east, his wailing cry he sends;
A strong desire to have a place whereon to stand Possesses him; [he bids the lands arise.] (Fraser 1898, 15-29)

---

24 See *Journal of the Polynesian Society Volume 7, Number 1 March 1898, Folk Songs and Myths from Sāmoa* by Robert Fraser, pages 15-29.
Powell’s original Samoan transcription with a literal translation by Dr. John Mayer (2013):

‘O le La se tupua lē fano; The sun is an unperishing idol
‘E tupu le vai, tupu le tai, tupu le lagi. The water rises, the sea rises, the sky rises
Ifo Tagaloa e asiasi; Tagaloa decends to visit
Tagi i sisifō, tagi i sasaē; Crying to the west, crying to the east
Na tutulu i le fia tula’i; Crying for wanting to alight

There is obviously a vast difference between these two translations. Since words create images, and images are not always universal, translation can be extremely difficult.

Also, as culture and language are synonymous, and cultures differ one from the other, it is extremely difficult for a translator to re-create the original author’s intended image in another language. Still, Powell took quite a bit of artistic license in the above translation. Although he was writing for the audience of his time, and in the style of his time, Powell’s attempt to place a Samoan poem in a flowery, Victorian styled, iambic pentameter distances the work from the culture which created it and aligning it with the Western culture for which he was writing. Later, in chapters 2 and 3, we will leave Powell’s poetry behind and take a closer look at his work as a missionary-scholar through his chronology of the succession of the Tuimanu’a.

**Western Knowledge verses Samoan Ways of Knowing: Samoan concepts of space**

For the Westerner, “space” is commonly understood as a defined area that is filled...either with things or information. Samoans would call this type of space, which is limited in terms of fixity with unmoving boundaries, pū. Pū is an empty space or hole that needs to be filled. Another type of Samoan space might be described as the vā. The
vā or social sense of space which is difficult for most Westerners to understand. One way to describe it might be as a point in space with lines radiating outward from that point. There are many points in space with many lines extending outward. Sometimes these lines cross, sometimes they meet, and sometimes they fall short of each other. They are ever shifting. Unlike pū, or the idea of fixed and defined space which is to be filled, the Samoan concept of vā governs social relationships. For instance, there is the space between man and other men, between parent and child, Creator and that which It created, human beings and the land, and so on. Therefore, the vā might be described as the space in-between (Frederic K. Lehman and David J. Herdrich 2002). Another analogy might be made to the mother board of a computer. When the user executes a command, the mother board knows how to accomplish this command. If a process demands more memory than is readily available, the motherboard will automatically re-route memory from processes which are not being used in order to execute that command. This is similar to vā in the sense that space is always shifting depending on which relationship is being tended or cultivated. In the West this might be equated with social etiquette and the use of words and behaviors that are appropriate to the situation.

While the Westerner defines the lines of history and then fills them with information, history for Samoans (who do have their own notion of linearity not defined

by Western time) is captured by chunks based on significant taeao or incidents and allows for variations. The telling of all history, whether written or oral, is dependent on who is doing the telling, who it is being told to, and why it is being told. Therefore it is essential for Western researchers to be critical of all they read and write and attempt to rule out or discount non-standard varieties. On the other hand, because there are so many stories in Sāmoa, it is expected that there will be differences in their telling. This is much like the vā with many points radiating out, ever shifting depending on who is doing the telling, to whom and for what reason.

**Gagaga Sāmoa: the complexity of the Samoan language and culture**

In the relating of oral tradition in Sāmoa, many factors go into deciding on what version of a story will be told at any particular event. Language is complex in Sāmoa, and there are three major spoken registers. First (and most common) is *gagana ta’atele* or the common language, which would include the vernacular, or everyday language spoken in informal situations. Second is *gagana fa’aaloalo* or, polite Samoan which would be used when speaking in public, to someone in a higher position, and upon meeting a stranger. It is always used toward another and never applied to one’s self. Lastly, there is the *gagana fa’afailāuga* or chiefly language (Mayer 2012). The chiefly language is used by all *matai* during public affairs, however more so by the *tulōfale*, or orators. The language of the orators is not commonly spoken or understood by the average Samoan. It is a language of metaphors based on the oral history, stories, and legends of Sāmoa. For example, in order to recognize and greet all present, an orator
must know each and everyone’s *fa’alupega* or honorific address. As thoughts are not verbalized in a straightforward manner during oration, and in order to insure the use of the correct metaphor when speaking, the *tuláfale* must also have a thorough knowledge of the stories and oral histories of Sāmoa to do this. Like a fine mat, Samoa’s history is woven within her ancient stories and the *gafa*, or history and genealogy of the people, as both go back to the beginning of Samoan time.

In Sāmoa, one’s *gafa* is revered. It is only recited by those entitled to deliver them in public. Entrusted as keepers of the genealogy, the *tuláfale* may reveal them only at occasions that make their revelation appropriate. Further, what is revealed is a version that is relative to a particular formal interaction and is tempered by who is speaking and who is being addressed. Orators will reveal only that which is advantageous to the moment (Tūmua Teleiai Ausage 2010, pers. Comm.).

Given the complexities of the language, it follows that oral traditions are also endemic with many levels of variation and creativity.

Although writing was not available to Samoans until the mid to later part of the 19th century, the past was in the stories of the land and the people; it was in the proverbs of antiquity and in the ornate and elaborate oratory of the *tuláfale*. The language of the *tuláfale* or orator chief is a form of Samoan practiced at ritual occasions and is almost like a code. If one is uneducated on the numerous legends and oral traditions in which the history of a *matai* or his village is embedded, one will miss the

---

26 Tumua is an orator chief title related to districts of Upolu. Tumua Teleiai Ausage is talking chief of the third and highest rank.
hidden meanings of the speeches that are extemporaneously created at ritual occasions. For Samoans each hill, rock, village, along with the animal totems and other natural elements have stories and these stories are part of the telling of the history of Sāmoa. Although legends have much variation, depending on who is doing the telling, this variation does not make the story any less true. Each story must fit into the vā of the particular occasion.

In the Western world, history is generally a bundle of knowledge/information placed into some sort of narrative. For the Samoan, Sāmoa’s history is knowledge (as in “knowing of” something) as well as being able to impart that knowledge at the appropriate time and in an acceptable form and manner. This demonstrates the vafealoa’i, or Samoan respect system.

The Samoan respect system is a social structure which may seem rigid, yet, in fact allows one the freedom to navigate within the culture and maintain good relationships or teu le vā. Samoan scholar, Aumua Mataitusi Simanu (2010), relates just how important fa’aaloalo or respect is to Samoans. According to Simanu, fa’aaloalo is described as a gift from God that will lead Samoans through life and as a means to finding peace, harmony, and tranquility. It begins with the obedient and respectful behavior of children and evolves into a philosophy which permeates every aspect of the lives of Samoans. For Samoans, this is especially true of language which is as much about form as it is with content. More so than elsewhere in the Pacific, speakers will

27 This well-known Samoan saying which translates to “tend the space (in between)” or to cultivate relationships
often modify what they say in order to *teu le vā*, paying close attention to the effect of what they are saying and how they are saying it. The accounts of oral traditions, therefore, can vary widely depending on the context of its retelling and the context that a speaker intends to create through the retelling.

**Sharing family histories**

Samoan scholar Malama Meleisea states:

For Samoans, knowledge is power, and the powerful knowledge is historical knowledge: treasured and guarded in people’s heads, in notebooks locked in boxes and matai’s briefcases or with their precious mats under mattresses. The valuable histories of families, lands, genealogies, villages and events long ago are family property as important as *ie toga* (fine mats) but *ie toga* can be distributed. Historical knowledge is only shared to trusted people within the family or made public in the event of serious disputes over lands or titles. (Meleisea 1987, viii)

This begs the question when it comes to the powerful knowledge of one’s *gafa*, why would it be entrusted to an outsider, and just how trustworthy are the works of such scholars as Augustin Krämer, Thomas Powell, George Pratt, and Margaret Mead?

‘*O le ala i le pule o le tautua* is a Samoan saying which translates as “the path to authority is through service.” For Samoans, *tautua* or service to the group is fundamental to Samoan life. Service shows respect to the family and chief. It earns the server the respect and trust of those being served. The bonds of the ‘āiga (family) are extended to all who serve, whether affiliated by blood, marriage, or free association. Exceptional service, whether by blood relative or an outsider, may often result in the bestowal of an honored appointment or privilege (*matūpālapala*). It is not unheard of for an out-lander who embraces the *fa’aSāmoa* and proves to be of service to his
adopted family and the atunu’u\textsuperscript{28} to find himself conferred with special reward and privy to family knowledge. It is even possible to be considered Samoan by Samoans as one’s “Samoaness” is not necessarily determined by blood quantum as is exemplified in the saying E tino Pālagi, ‘ae Sāmoa ilona loto, meaning, the body may be Pālagi, but the heart is Samoan (Tūmua 2010, pers. Comm.). One such example was Robert Louis Stevenson, also known as Tusitala or writer of tales by Samoans. Although a resident of Sāmoa for only five years (1889-1894), it was during these particular years that Samoans were turned against each other in order to win a kingship to please European colonial powers. Tusitala worked hard to find a peaceful solution, even offering to act as mediator between the different factions (Robert Louis Stevenson 2006).\textsuperscript{29} He was so loved and respected that the people of Sāmoa carved a road out of the Vailima forest to his home on the slope of Mount Vaea. This road was presented to Tusitala in gratitude for his service to the atunu’u. Upon his death on 3 December 1894, all of Sāmoa went into mourning (Sāmoa Observer 2012). Many Samoans paid their respects and sat with the body as it lay in his home at Vailima. Matai from around the village came and covered his coffin with ie toga or fine mats and later men carried this coffin and cleared a path to the top of Vailima where he was buried. After the funeral, firearms were barred from Mount Vaea so the singing of the birds would always be heard around Tusitala’s grave. Today, Tusitala is still remembered as a compassionate man, a revered

\textsuperscript{28} Literally “chain of islands,” however commonly interpreted as the people of Sāmoa.

\textsuperscript{29} Stevenson, Robert Louis. A Footnote to History: Eight Years of Trouble in Samoa. Charleston: Biblio Bazar. 2006
historian and a man whose unconditional service to the people of Sāmoa earned him a place as one of them (Sāmoa Observer 2012).

Scholars like Krämer, Powell, Henry, Pratt, and Mead seem to have similarly won the trust of the Samoan people through their service. However, Krämer and Mead depended upon translators and without a profound understanding of Samoan culture (which is embedded in the language), it was very difficult to understand, no less convey, her history. The ability of a non-indigenous researcher to adequately portray and convey a Pacific Island culture has been the topic of much discussion among indigenous scholars such as Konai Helu Thaman (2003), Tuhiwai Smith (1999), and Vilsoni Hereniko (1995). While it is possible for someone who was not born Samoan to understand and convey Samoan culture and history, this cannot be accomplished if the researcher distances himself from the culture. He or she must immerse in it and embrace it, as this will lead to an understanding of it. Through this understanding, the researcher is no longer a collector of knowledge, but someone who now knows and respects the culture and can share that knowledge within appropriate contexts.

Finally, it also must be understood that the discourse of pre-contact history did not begin at contact. It was on an ongoing dialogue which began hundreds of years before Europeans arrived (Tu’u’u 2001; Young 1890-1967). Fortunately, the introduction of writing in Sāmoa helped to preserve some of these precious oral traditions. Recently, many Samoan scholars from Upolu, Savai’i, and Tutuila have begun to share their gafa and stories, while Manu’a has remained aloof for two centuries.
However, current descendants of the Taliutafa\textsuperscript{30} and Tuimanu’a\textsuperscript{31} title have recently become willing to share their stories. It was their ‘api that Krämer claims as one of his primary sources in his brief section on Manu’a. Tofaeono Tu’u’u’s book, \textit{Rulers of Sāmoa Islands & Their Legends and Decrees} is based on information from the ‘api of the Galea’i\textsuperscript{32} family of Manu’a, which Krämer also claims to have accessed. Though the Galea’i and Young manuscripts differ in what the families have chosen to highlight, include, or exclude, and although some stories may be told differently, they are in accord with regard to the chronology of the Tuimanu’a. This contrasts markedly with the works of European experts\textsuperscript{33} whose chronologies appear to be out of order and seemingly incomplete. In the next chapter I will demonstrate how the Galea’i and Young ‘api stack up against the two extant chronologies written by Krämer and Powell.

\textsuperscript{30} Taliutafa is a title specific to Manu’a. It was instituted Tuimanu’a Salofi just after the Tinoimalo wars. Today, Taliutafa is the matai title for the Young family of Manu’a.
\textsuperscript{31} Tuimanu’a was the paramount ruler and chief of Manu’a. The United States government viewed it as a “kingship” and as there can be no monarchy under a US protectorate, the title was banned by law after Manu’a ceded in 1904.
\textsuperscript{32} Information on the Galea’i ‘api was obtained mainly from Tu’u’u’s book which was augmented by interviews with High Chief Lilomaiva Galea’i.
\textsuperscript{33} Chronology of Tuimanu’a per Krämer, Pratt, and Powell differ one from another, however, Galea’i and Young are in accord.
CHAPTER 2

Early Anthropology and Ethnology in Sāmoa: Methods and Agendas of Missionary and Other European Scholars

Although Sāmoa’s written history began with the 18\textsuperscript{th} century explorations of La Perouse, the earliest anthropological and ethnological writings began in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century with scholars such as John Williams, Thomas Powell, George Pratt, Augstin Krämer, and Fred Henry,\textsuperscript{34} became the canon on Manu’ā. Henry, for example, took many of the traditional stories of Sāmoa and tried to place them in some sort of linear, or chronological order so that Sāmoa’s history might make better sense in the Western concept of space and time. As shown earlier, Henry also allowed himself quite a bit of artistic license in the telling of these stories, turning them into more of a romanticized novelette which was easier for his Euro-American audience to read and follow. Although Samoan oral traditions allow for variation, Henry’s romanticism drastically distanced and altered these stories from their Samoan origins. Like the Western concept of space, Henry took what might be perceived as ‘vacant space’ and gave traditional characters intent and emotions which, once written, were forever locked within that space. This is very different from the Samoan manner in which the past was interpreted, allowing for deviation on such variables as intent and emotions depending on the vā of the occasion of the telling.

\textsuperscript{34}Williams, Powell, and Pratt were missionaries who lived in Sāmoa during the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. Williams (1838) provided the first detailed description of Sāmoan life and customs. Pratt and Powell collected and published stories, myths, and legends of Sāmoa as well as the genealogies of the ruling families. Henry based his published Samoan history book on the oral traditions he collected. Krämer was a German ship’s surgeon turned ethnologist who lived in Sāmoa during this same period.
In this chapter I will examine the context in which Krämer and Powell collected their data and synthesized their histories of Manu’a as well as the less filtered and more contextually rich and detailed chronologies of the ‘api format from the Young and Galea’i families of Manu’a and provide a preliminary comparison of the four versions.

**German Ethnologist Augustin Krämer**

In his impressive two volume work entitled *Die Sāmoa Inseln*, Dr. Augustin Krämer compiled a detailed report of the topography, culture, system of government, and genealogies of the entire Samoan archipelago. Krämer first arrived in Sāmoa in August of 1893 in the capacity of a Navy surgeon aboard the SMS *Bussard*, a German light cruiser that maintained a station in Apia harbor from 1891-1898. During his two year deployment in the Pacific, Krämer became more and more drawn toward ethnography (Mönter 2010). He returned again to the Pacific in 1897 to complete his research for *Die Sāmoa Inseln*, which he had conceptualized while enlisted in the Navy.

Using the earlier works of missionary-scholars, as well as his own Samoan informants, beachcombers, and his personal experiences during his years in Sāmoa, Krämer’s main goal appears to have been to gather as much reliable data and artifacts from pre and early European contact culture in a Sāmoa which, as a result of colonization, was rapidly changing. His concern was such that while Sāmoa was still very traditional compared to other places in Polynesia, change was inevitable, hence the need to salvage as much of traditional knowledge as he could. While his intentions

---

35 Translated into English and published in 1994 as *The Sāmoa Islands*.
36 Krämer made five trips to Sāmoa between 1893 and 1899.
were noble and their consequences long-lasting, where the Manu’a knowledge is concerned, his approach is highly questionable and he acknowledges something akin to self-criticism in his introduction.

In exchange for medical treatment and supplies, Krämer was able to strike a bargain with Pa’u Young, whose marriage to Amepelia Tu’upule cemented his relationship to the Tuimanu’a. He was not only husband to Amepelia Tu’upule, but father to Tuimanu’a Matelita and Tuimanu’a Le’iesilika. Bilingual and well versed in both the fa’aSāmoa and Western ways, Pa’u was a huge asset to Manu’a and her understanding of the world outside the Pacific Islands, as well as the development of her government in this time of rapid change. (See figure 11 for an image of Pa’u Young)

Although it appears that Pa’u was quite selective regarding which portions of the ‘api he allowed Krämer to copy, Krämer was one of the few scholars of his time who was given access to a vast collection of the oral traditions of Manu’a which he spent five days copying, and for which he had great difficulty finding a translator (Mönter 2010; Young 2008, pers. Comm.). Although Krämer readily admitted that some of his informants might not have been reliable, he also took great care to try to use these stories as pointers to historical events and to connect the various gafa or genealogies of the chiefly families of Sāmoa.

37 Pa’u Young was the Upolu born, half Sāmoan son of British merchant seaman, ship owner, and entrepreneur, Arthur Stephen Young and his wife Fuatino (born Vitoliomanuoana), she was the taupou from the ‘Aiono family of Fasito’oua. See Figure 11 for a photo of Pa’u Young.

38 Amepelia Tu’upule was of the Anoalo or male line of the Tuimanu’a. Please see Figure 11 for a photo of Amepelia.
Powell, Krämer and the Tuimanu’a

Prior to Krämer, one of the few scholars to write about Manu’a was missionary-scholar Reverend Thomas Powell of the London Missionary Society. Powell served in Sāmoa during the mid to latter part of the 19th century and recorded numerous creation myths and other stories and legends. Unlike Krämer, Powell was fluent in the Samoan language. Though his primary purpose was to fulfill his mission to bring Samoans to Christianity, Powell was a true scholar. One of his greatest works is an extensive manual of zoology which he published, in Samoan, in 1886.39 Like Krämer, he also recorded the genealogy of the tupu, or chiefs of Manu’a. There were, however, a number of discrepancies between the chronologies of the Tuimanu’a collected by Krämer and Powell. As will be seen later in this chapter, the versions offered by the Young family ‘api in my possession, are profoundly different from either those of Powell or Krämer. Some of these differences may be attributed to the fact that Krämer employed men from both Upolu and Tutuila to translate the Samoan language variety of Manu’a,40 other discrepancies may have been errors of transcription (Mönter 2010). Also, Krämer’s Tuimanu’a succession chart was given to him by an orator from Tutuila who claimed to have “many connections with Manu’a,” but who Krämer did not consider entirely reliable (Krämer 1994). However, neither did he consider Powell’s work reliable. As a meticulous researcher and scholar, it is interesting that he published

39 ‘O le tala l tino o Tagata ma mea ola ese’ese; e l ai foi o tala l manu ua ta’ua l le tusi paia = A Manual of Zoology; embracing the animals of scripture; in the Samoan dialect by Reverend Thomas Powell, 1886.
40 There are differences in culture or aganu’u between islands and villages of Sāmoa referred to as aga’ifanua that are also reflected in the language.
research which he questioned as void.\textsuperscript{41} Although Krämer’s work was bilingual with the Samoan translated to German, and later from German to English, the translation is direct, dispensing with the flowery Victorian language used by Powel, Pratt, and Henry. There is, however, one very important commonality. All of these Westerners tried to tell Samoa’s story in a chronological narrative which follows Occidental standards. In these accounts the chronology, succession of titles, and sequence of events were molded into a strict narrative that would not allow for Samoa’s more fluid and interesting flow of historical events and characters.

\textit{Samoans and the Written Word: The ‘api}

Just as Powell, Pratt, Henry, and Krämer attempted to preserve Sāmoa’s stories, customs, and genealogies in writing, Samoans in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century also became fascinated with the idea of using writing as a means of recording their own genealogy and history.\textsuperscript{42} When Christian missionaries introduced the Bible, Samoans recognized the commonalities in the manner in which it was written and the way Samoan oral traditions were told. Both styles infused oral traditions, legends, specialized language and phraseology, as well as references to the land and its relation to titles and political families. In addition, just as Occidentals were noticing how rapidly the islands were changing, Samoans also took note of the need to preserve important family histories and privileges. Thus literate islanders began to record their own family histories by

\textsuperscript{41}With so little information available on Manu’a, is is possible that Krämer wanted to offer something, and therefore published both his own and Powell’s chronologies with a disclaimer?

\textsuperscript{42}The establishment of the Lands and Titles Court, in 1901, during the German rule, which frequently relied on oral tradition to establish or reaffirm family authority over land and chiefly titles may have also provided an incentive for recording family histories.
writing them in carefully guarded ‘api or notebooks. In the case of the Young family, Tuimanu’a Matelita, as the first literate person to hold the Tuimanu’a title, began to record the Young family’s history. It is not clear whether the idea to write their history came from within her family or from the Faletolu. However, it was during her short tenure that Tauānu’u began to dictate to her the sacred stories and gafa of the Anoalo line of the Tuimanu’a. (See Figure 8 for an image of Tuimanu’a Matelita).

Unlike the historiography of Western writers, the ‘api is not bound or constrained to put events in any sort of linear, chronological order, except when it comes to the birth order of the gafa. The stories were not meant to follow any particular order and were meant to be “opened” or, shared with family members on important occasions. The ‘api is a referential repertoire of family and political knowledge that its holder could refer to before representing the family at important extemporaneous oratory events; Thus, only selected tailored glimpses of the ‘api were “opened” at these oral exchanges. It was then closed until the next occasion. Like Samoan oral traditions, the stories chosen to be shared and the manner in which they

---

43 Matelita (taken from Margaret, and also spelled Makerita, Makelika or Makelita) was the daughter of Arthur Stephen “Pa’u” Young and Ameperia of the Anoalo (male) line of the Tuimanu’a. Matelita’s Sāmoan name was Totoluafiloisāmoa, literally two blood/mix of/in Sāmoa. Matelita held the title from 1890-1895.
44 Literally “house of three,” the Faletolu consists of the Taliutafa and 12 usoali’l or related group of orators and chiefs with specific duties and/or privileges relating to the service of the Tuimanu’a and the succession of the title. See Appendix E for a full description of the titles and political and cultural institutions used in this study.
45 Tauānu’u is a Manu’a orator title. One of his duties was to commit to memory the oral history of the Anoalo line of the Tuimanu’a. See Figure 1. In this photo, Tauānu’u is second from the right.
46 Anoalo as well as the two female supporting lines of the male line (Falesoā and Avaloa) were established during the tenure of Tuimanu’a Taliutafa Pule (who was the first to hold the Taliutafa title).
47 The term “tala le gafa” (open/tell the genealogy) is used to describe the act of orally sharing genealogies at important events and gatherings.
48 The ‘api was also used as evidence in court disputes.
were told depended of its relevance to the particular situation or event. Conversely, the works of Krämer and Powell are histories meant to be read by outsiders and the time and place of their “opening” is not subject to any particular event. They were written with the intent of fixing a particular version of history in time.

Matelita’s ‘api begins with these words: “Tala o le Aiga,” or “Stories of the Family.” It then goes on to list the gafa (genealogy or chronology) of the succession of the Tuimanu’a from the 1st to the 35th. The format used for this is similar to the literary style of genealogical sections of the Bible, and probably attributed to the bible being Sāmoa’s main model and reference to the written word at that time. Krämer’s published work is written in a similar style possibly because much of his data was derived from these kinds of ‘api. This style employs the use of two columns in which the names are placed on the left side of the page and their unions, issue and other events of note on the right. This first section of the Young ‘api is a macro view of the succession of the Tuimanu’a title while the next section is more micro, detailing the characters, events, and relationships of Anoalo line of the Young family. In a subsequent section of the ‘api it uses the same format to list the holders of the related Taliutafa title which is specific to the Anoalo and the Young family of that line.\footnote{Tuimanu’a 36 and 37 were added later by Matelita’s brother Tuimanu’a Taliutafa Le’iesilika “Chris” Young. See Figure 9 for an image of Tuimanu’a Taliutafa Le’iesilika (center) with Usoali’I of the Faletolu.}  \footnote{Taliutafa is a title which was instituted by TM Salofi after the civil war (Tinoimalo Wars <circa 1705>) on Manu’a. As Levao had no children he relinquished the title on to his brother TM Pule. The Taliutafa was under the Tuimanu’a and called the sui tupu or deputy chief, yet head of the Usoalii (12 senior orator chiefs of the Faletolu). This was also the time when the male line known as Anoali’i became known as Anoalo.}
In order to better understand the structure of the Samoan ‘api, Figure 2, page 37 shows an excerpt copied from the Young ‘api and provides an explanation of the Taliutafa title and its relation to the male line of the Tuimanu’a, as well as the Young family. As described above, the names are placed on the left side of the page, with the relationships to each title holder on the right. Additional notes are written under the names to the left. The text in Figure 2 is taken verbatim from the Young ‘api and this portion of the hand written ‘api can be found in Appendix C.

Figure 1: Included in this image are five toʻoto’o of the usoali‘i, including Tuimanu’a Taliutafa Leʻiesilika (third from right), as well as Tauānuʻu (second from right).
Faamatalaga ile Āiga Taliutafa ile Lalopua

Suafa o Alii | O le Faamatalagaina i

1. Taliutafa Pule I............................... O le ulu ai tupu lenei na amata mai ai le suafa o Taliutafa ua avea nei ma matua ole aiga o Papā ma Anoalo e o’o mai i ona po nei. O ia lava lea ole Alo-Alii-Tofia ma lona uso o Levaomana na tofia e pule i Ao ma Paia ua motu le gafa o Levaomana e leai sona alo ole ala lea ua na’o falealo ole Taliutafa. Ua pule ma au mai lava i ona po nei ile aiga i Lalopua.

2. Taliutafa Tupolō II......................... O le alo TM-Taalolomana Moa-atoa lona to’a 28 ua o (NA TUPU) ali'i tupu, e pe’i ona iai ile fa’amatalaga ile fa’asologa o alii tupu.

3. Taliutafa Seuli III......................... O le tasi lenei alo o TM-Ta’alolomana Moa-atoa e pei (NA TUPU) ona ta’ua i luga e iai ile fa’amatalaga o tupu.

4. Tailutafa Lipoi............................ O le alo lenei ole ali’i TM-Taliutafa Tupolō e pei ona iai i le fa’amatalaga o Taliutafa Lipoi lenei na usu i Faleasao ia Valasi le afafine o Tinofeā -- (Vaitautolu) e ana le tama Liusā fo’i na Taliutafa e pe’i ona fa’matalaina i lalo nei.

5. Taliutafa Liusā............................. E pei ona fa’amatalaina i luga ole alo moni lenei o Taliutafa Lipoi o alii nei e le’i nonofo i Ao ina ua faaaloalo ina pea O Lana Fanau le finagalo ole Faletolu, a’ua e ui lava ina fai o ia finagalo ini iai ali’i

1-Fa’amausili Lei’aialaufuti a’o pule tonu lava i la’ua. I le ole ali’i la lenei o lona

2-Sāmalā’ulu afafine (Ameperia) Tuuupule lea, e aua le taula o Tui Manu’a

3-Faailo Matelika le tupu tamai’ita’i na soso’o ma TM-Taualima

4-Leiesilika Alalaamua, e pei ona iai ile fa’sologa o alii tupu.

5-Ameperia – Tuuupule

6. Taliutafa Faasua............................. O le tagata ese o ia a ‘ua faaaloaloina ma ua igoa ole suafa o Taliutafa, ina ua nofo tane iai le tasi teine o Faailo. Lona igoa ole afafine o Taliutafa Liusā ole tasi lena uso o (Ameperia) Tu’upule.

7. Taliutafa Letuaina......................... O tama a Fa’ailo ia Taliutafa Faasua. O “Solomua” le igoa ile suafa o Taliutafa ia Letuaina. Ona ua nofotane iai Solomua ia Letuaina.

8. Taliutafa Leiesilika.......................... O le tama lenei a (Ameperia) Tu’upule le afafine o (C.A.L.Young) Taliutafa Liusā ile ole tuagane lenei o Tui Manu’u aofia. Ole aso 3 luni 1917 na amata mai ai le nofo a lenei Alii Matelika. Ole aso 26 lului 1924 na fa’ae’e ai le “Ao” ole Tuimanu’a a lenei Alii’i (aso toana’i 2:30 AM na aofia uma le faletolu ma ole Faleasao auā o tató finagalo au tasi. )

6/3/17 to 7/26/24 -7yrs-1mo-24 days

O le aofai lea o tausaga ua Taliutafa ai lenei ali’i soso’o ai ma le Ao ina ua fa’ae’e iai.
This particular figure is an excellent example of the ‘api format used in the Young manuscript, and as can be seen, it contains information that might be used in a dispute over titles or lands as it documents the relationships of each title holder to the other. For instance, in line six Taliutafa Fa’asua, who held the Talifutafa title, was not of linear descent, but married into the family. His wife, Fa’ailo, was a daughter of Tuimanu’a Liusā. The translated text states, “Taliutafa Fa’asua: this outsider was given the Taliutafa title out of respect when he married Fa’ailo who was the daughter of Taliutafa Liusā (the brother of Amepelia).” Another instance, in line eight, Taliutafa Le’iesilika used documents copied from the ‘api when his title and the lands that accompanied it were challenged in 1924 by the United States government. Underneath his name are the dates during which he received both the Tuimanu’a and Taliutafa titles. Interestingly, the dates to the right were written in English, while the rest of the document is written in Samoan. This portion states:

“The son of Ameperia (daughter of Taliutafa Liusā) and the brother of Tuimanu’a Matelita. He received the Taliutafa title on the 3rd of June, 1917 and on 26 July 1924 was raised to the Tuimanu’a title. He received the title correctly at the assembly (Saturday, 2:30 am), with all the members of the Faletolu at Faleasaō being in accord.”

Continuing in this free flowing, almost stream of consciousness style, the Young ‘api moves from the genealogical section to the Samoan creation story according to Tauānu’u. They then return to the history of the Tuimanu’a, providing more detailed

---

51 One such document, typed by Taliutafa Chris Young was submitted to the High Court of American Sāmoa in a dispute of this kind.
52 Son of Amepelia Tu’upule
53 In 1917 ‘Chris’ Young was at a mariner’s school in San Francisco when his mother, Amepelia wired him and ordered him to come home. It was when he returned that he accepted the Taliutafa title. He was not to receive the Tuimanu’a title until six years later.
and augmented information on marriages, the issue of those marriages, as well as details about the lives of various individuals, and the origins of certain titles and sayings. In this sense, the gafa in the Young ‘api differs from other recently published ‘api, such as Ala’ilima’s, *O Tatou Tupu’aga* (2010), in that these gafa are written like a historiography rather than in generations. The Young ‘api, in their entirety, cover the pre-European era up until the death of the last Tuimanu’a, in the 1960’s. Although most recent births have not been recorded, possibly due to the socio-cultural effects of modernization and subsequent loss of interest because of the Diaspora, notes have been made in the margins where the more recent generations have given insight and new interpretations into past events.

*A comparison of the succession charts of the Tuimanu’a*

While Krämer and Powell differ significantly in their chronologies and succession charts of the Tuimanu’a, the ‘api of the Young family and a second ‘api of the related the Galea’i family of Manu’a⁵⁴ are almost in complete accord in regard to the succession of the Tuimanu’a. One major difference, however, is the inclusion in Galea’i of the Galea’i and Li’a (1-5 in Galea’i) titles before the first Tuimanu’a. Prior to the establishment of the Sā Tuimanu’a, or Tuimanu’a Family, the paramount family of Manu’a was the Sā Tagaloa which was based in the village of Aga’e. In the Galea’i ‘api the first five titles of the genealogy were a succession of the Galea’i title until a shift occurred within the Sā Tagaloa, and the Tuimanu’a title was created. Therefore, while the Galea’i differs somewhat with the inclusion of the five earlier Sā Tagaloa/Galea’i

---

⁵⁴ Taken from Tu’u’u’s work and discussed with High Chief Lilomaiava Galea’i.
titles, once the Tuimanu’a title was created, both the Galea’i and Young ‘api gafa agree with only minor variations.

According to Tu’u’u and Krämer, Galea’i was the first title conferred in Manu’a. Tu’u’u states that the Galea’i clan were the first to hold the Tuimanu’a title however Galea’i does not make that same claim. They simply called it the Galea’i title (Tu’u’u 2001). Also, Tu’u’u claims that Li’alaititi (# 4 on Galea’i) stole the title from Li’amatua (# 6). This same theme is presented in the Young ‘api, however, it occurs much later between holders of the Tuimanu’a title, Tuimanu’a Ali’amatua and his younger half brother Tuimanu’a Ali’atama (Tu’u’u 2001). The Young version explains how the seat of the Tuimanu’a was transferred from Aga’e to Ta’u.

Figure 3 shows numerous inconsistencies and differences in chronology, spelling, and title holders between Krämer and Powell. For example, Krämer’s Tuiaitu (# 15) precedes Taliutafa (# 16), while Powell’s Tuiaitu (# 23) follows two different Taliutafa (#’s 14 and 18). Powell’s Ali’atama (# 7) is represented in Krämer as Leiatama (# 1) and is six generations away from Powell’s. This shows not only chronological inconsistencies,

55 Tu’u’u used Krämer as a primary source, especially in regard to Sāmoan genealogies, however, regarding the gafa of the Tuimanu’a, Tu’u’u and Krämer are not in accord.
56 Stories from the Young and Galea’i tell of Tuimanu’a Lelologatele who was married to four women. Two of these women were both with child at the same time. One woman (Sinafa’alata) was from the village of Fitiuta and the other (Mamalu’ota’ū) from the village of Ta’u. Whichever child was born first was to receive the Tuimanu’a title. The son of the Fitiuta woman, Ali’atama, received the title. When they were older, his younger brother, Ali’antama, tricked Ali’amatua into taking off his title by asking him to climb a coconut tree that he might have coconut water to quench his thirst. While Ali’amatua was up the tree, Ali’atama fled to Ta’u with the title. Since that time, the seat of the Tuimanu’a has been in Ta’u.
57 Ala’ilima (2011) tells this same story, however, in his version it is Ali’amatua who steals the title from Ali’atama.
**Figure 3:** Succession of the Tuimanu’a According to Krämer and Powell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Krämer-Tuimanu’a</th>
<th>Powell-Tuimanu’a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leiataua</td>
<td>1. Taetagaloa (viewed as Lefolasa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Panepinito</td>
<td>2. Ta’aeanu’u (son of 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fa’aeanu’u</td>
<td>3. Saoioiomanu (son of 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Siliavao</td>
<td>4. Saoloa (son of 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Semanu</td>
<td>5. Lelologa (son of 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Moumele</td>
<td>7. Ali’atama (son of 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tuiote</td>
<td>8. Fa’aeanu’u (son of 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lepulu</td>
<td>10. Siliavao (son of 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Toalepai</td>
<td>11. Ti’aligo (son of 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Tauiliga</td>
<td>12. Semanu (son of 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Tuiaitu</td>
<td>15. Ti’aligo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Taliutafa</td>
<td>16. Seuea (daughter of Taliutafa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Ta’alolo</td>
<td>17. Sālofi (brother of Seuea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Moaatoa</td>
<td>18. Taliutafa (son of Sālofi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Levao</td>
<td>19. Talolomana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Lalamua</td>
<td>20. Vaomana (son of Talolomana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Talolofa’aleleinu’u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Tuiaitu</td>
<td>23. Tuiaitu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Ta’alolofana’ese</td>
<td>24. Ta’alolofana’ese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Levao</td>
<td>25. Levao</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 4**: Chronologies of the Tuimanu’a from Young and Galea’i

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young</th>
<th>Galea’i (from Tu’u’u 2001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Galea’i (Tuimanu’a Leo’o)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Li’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Liamatua I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Li’aiitii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Li’amatua II (or Li’atama)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tuimanu’a:**

1. TM Satiailemoa
2. TM Tuiohanu’atele
3. TM Fa’atutupunu’u
4. TM Saoioiomu
5. TM Sao’pu’u
6. TM Saoloa
7. TM SaoTu’ufesoan
8. TM SaoLetupua
9. TM SaoFolau
10. TM LeloLogatele
11. TM Ali’amatua
12. TM Ali’atama
13. TM Tuioligo
14. TM Fa’aeanu’ulua
15. TM Puipuipō
16. TM Sili’aivao
17. TM Tuiomanufili *(f)*
18. TM Fa’ato’alia Soli’atama
19. TM Segisegi A’oe’e
20. TM Sili’aue *(f)*
21. TM Tuiopomele
22. TM Tuiiolite (the predictor)
23. TM To’aleapai
24. TM Seuea’atali *(f)*
25. TM Sālofi
26. TM Levaomana
27. TM Taliutafa Pule
28. TM Ta’alololoma Moa Atoa
29. TM Taliutafa Tupulō
30. TM Taliutafa Seilii
31. TM U’uolela’aoa Tuia’itu
32. TM Ta’alololoma Fanaese
33. TM Tauveve
34. TM Ta’ilima Ala’alama
35. TM Matelita *(f)*
36. TM Elisara
37. TM Taliutafa Leiesilika
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but also spelling differences which may lead the reader to assume that they are
different people. The Krämer-Powell chart exhibits disorder and absence of information
when compared to the two charts obtained from the ‘api of the Young and Galea’i
families.

One could expect some variance between Krämer and Powell, as Krämer’s data
came from an external source and was collected 44 years after Powell’s. It is significant
that Krämer’s list is shorter than Powell’s as information could have been lost over time.
In addition, while many of the same names appear, they are not in the same order in
either chart. As noted earlier, Krämer’s Tuimanu’a succession chart was based heavily
on information received from an orator from the neighboring island of Tutuila. Powell’s
information came directly from the high orator chief Tauānu’u during Powell’s many
stays on the island of Ta’ū. It is possible, though highly unlikely, that the holder of the
Tauānu’u title in Powell’s time was the same holder who provided Matelita with her
information as Holmes (1957) states that Powell’s data was collected in 1854 while
Matelita transcribed the Young version between 1890 and 1895 (placing Tauānu’u at a
minimum of sixty years of age during Matelita’s time).

If we compare the Krämer-Powell chronology with the data from the Young and
Galea’i ‘api (Figure 4) it is evident that Krämer and Powell have much missing
information and widely differing chronologies. For example, both Galea’i and Young list
Tuimanu’a Ali’amatua and Tuimanu’a Ali’atama as numbers eleven and twelve, whereas
Powell lists them as six and seven and Krämer only recounts one name, Liatama, as the
first Tuimanu’a. The following chapter explores these charts further and offers possible explanations for differences, as well as an analysis of the charts and the possible motives of the Samoan informants who provided the information for the Western chronologies.
CHAPTER 3

An Analysis of the Differences of the Chronologies of the Tuimanu’a

This chapter will address the differences and the possible reasons for those differences between the two Western chronologies of the Tuimanu’a title and how they compare to the two ‘api-based Samoan chronologies. I will postulate several reasons for the many discrepancies including the possibility that Krämer and Powell were given misinformation, whether purposeful or otherwise, by their informants; the existence of phonological and morphological variations that may be attributed to the time period in which these works were written; misunderstandings and misinterpretations of the names and titles of individuals; and difficulty in fitting Samoan oral traditions into linear frameworks of history and chronology favored by Europeans. This chapter will show that Powell and Krämer may have been recording their chronologies through European lenses and filters from informants who may or may not have been willing to provide the full and detailed information contained in the oral traditions of Manu’a. In addition, Powell and Krämer may not have been adequately prepared culturally and linguistically, to be able to process the information that they were given. Finally, at the end of this chapter I will provide an example of the kind of contextually rich narratives contained in the Young ‘api that provide historical and cultural augmentation for the gafa of the Tuimanu’a.

Flexible Truths

Both Tuimanu’a Matelita Young and Reverend Thomas Powell received their information from Manu’a high talking chief Tauānu’u who was tasked with keeping the
oral traditions for the *Anoalo* line of the Tuimanu’a. It is unlikely that Powell’s Tauānu’u was the same title holder as the one during Matelita’s time. Because of this, one might expect that, if different men held the title, this could account for the differences between the two versions. However, chiefs within the governing bodies of Manu’a had specific duties, and for the *Anoalo* line, Tauānu’u’s duty was the keeper of their oral traditions. In this capacity, it was necessary for each succeeding Tauānu’u to commit to memory all that his predecessors knew. Powell’s incomplete succession chart raises the question as to why it is so truncated and different from the Young ‘api, especially if these *gafa* were so carefully memorized and guarded so that they might be passed down in toto to succeeding generations. Why then, is the Powell succession chart so very different from the *gafa* in the Young ‘api?  

Samoan’s consider *gafa* as powerful knowledge which is revealed only on special ceremonial occasions and more recently in cases of land and title disputes. While all Samoans guard their *gafa* carefully, Manu’a people have a reputation for being more guarded than most, thus stating that sacred knowledge of Manu’a is only for Manu’a people (Young 2007, pers. Comm.; Tufele 2010, pers. Comm.). It is important then to consider the possibility that the Tauānu’u of Powell’s time may have intentionally misinformed him. This would certainly not be out of line with what has been described as the culture-bound tendency for informants to tell someone what they believe they want to hear, or to offer misinformation as a strategy to avoid tension or disapproval.

---

58 See Appendix D for descriptions of the responsibilities of the titles of the Usoali’i within the Faletolu.
59 See Figures 5a, 5b, and 5c to better understand the how different and truncated Powell is when compared to Krämer, as well as notes containing context from Young and Galea’i.
This is an issue that has been explored in Samoan literature by Derek Freeman in his 1983 book *Margaret Mead and Sāmoa: The Making and Unmaking of an Anthropological Myth*. Freeman states that anthropologist Margaret Mead’s female informants in Manu’a for her landmark work, *Coming of Age in Sāmoa*, may very well have been engaging in “recreational teasing” during her interviews with them on teen sexuality. Samoans are often reluctant to engage in serious and to-the-point discussions of topics within certain “tabu” areas such as sexuality and genealogies, particularly with strangers. Freeman has maintained that it is highly likely that Mead’s informants may have been deflecting any tensions the topic may have created by providing answers that would please and appease Mead. Freeman asserts that Meade’s teenage informants told her “counterfeit tales of casual love under the palm trees” as this is what they believed she wanted to hear (Freeman 1983, 290). This “lying as recreation” and teasing is also addressed in a 1988 film by Frank Heiman titled *Margaret Mead and Sāmoa*. Heiman was able to locate and interview then 86 year old Fa’apua’a Fa’amū, who was one of Mead’s primary informants. When asked if she and her friends made up the stories they told Mead, Fa’amū laughed and told the interpreter, “You know Samoan girls are terrific liars.” The interviewer then queried, “So, you lied?” To this Fa’amū replied, “Yes. We lied, and we lied, and we lied.” Ironically, Fa’amū’s interviewer seems to have used the same faulty methodology that Mead is accused of – asking leading questions for which a culturally appropriate response could be agreement with the interviewer’s point of view. Was Fa’amū telling the interviewer what she thought he wanted to hear?
Perhaps, as has been speculated for Mead’s informants, the informants for Krämer and Powell, an unnamed Tutuila orator and Tauānu’u, were telling these researchers what they thought they wanted to hear in order to deflect potential tension due to the sensitive and secretive nature of the topic – powerful *gafa*. In the case of the Tutuila orator, there is the possibility that he was paid for his services, as Krämer did for Pa’u Young, which may have made the orator more compliant and willing to please Krämer. One must also consider that the list shared with Krämer was indeed the full extent of his knowledge and was incomplete because of the orator’s position as an outsider to Manu’a,

While it is possible and even probable that Krämer’s informant had only a limited knowledge of the *gafa* of the Tuimanu’a, Powell’s Tauānu’u would have been expected to know this information thoroughly. As Tauānu’u, it was his duty to learn and guard this valuable information. Powell claims to have gained the confidence of Tauānu’u (*Notes and Queries* 1892), thus, Tauānu’u could have been making an attempt to teu le vā or cultivate a good relationship with Powell by sharing the requested *gafa*, but restricting how much was revealed. Because of the sensitive nature of the topic, Tauānu’u may have felt obliged to appease Powell, but to edit what he related, thereby giving Powell some of what he wanted, while not revealing the succession in its entirety and/or correct order. In this way he could maintain his duty to the confidential traditions, or *sā*, of Manu’a. While there is no direct evidence to support this theory, it

---

60 Pa’u allowed Krämer to copy selected parts of ‘api in return for medical care.
certainly remains a possibility that Powell and Krämer were given partial or misleading information.

*Orthographic and Morphological Inconsistencies*

At the time of Powell’s and Krämer’s residency in Sāmoa, the written form of the Samoan language had only been in existence for a few decades and there were still inconsistencies in spelling and word composition. The most noticeable inconsistencies that are evidenced in the four chronologies which were written in this time period are in the inconsistent use of diacritics, misspellings, and variations in word composition (Mosel and Hovdhaugen 1992).

The Samoan orthographic system devised by the missionaries followed the English alphabet with the exception of two phonemes that are not commonly found in English – the long vowel and the glottal stop. The symbols the missionaries used to represent these two phonemes were the macron and inverted comma respectively. These two symbols represent phonemic sounds in Samoan and, as such, whether and where they are placed in a word changes both its pronunciation and its meaning. Part of the reason that these symbols were so infrequently and inconsistently used in texts written by Samoans is that they had very little practical experience using them or in seeing them used in early published Samoan language material such as the *Tusi Pa’ia* or

---

61 The Sāmoan word for the glottal phoneme is koma liliu, or ‘inverted comma.’ The phonemic long vowel is indicated by a macron (fa’amamafa) over the vowel. Early versions of the Sāmoan alphabet used these symbols inconsistently or not at all. These areas are still problematic in the Sāmoan language today.

62 For example: ‘ulu and ulu. the former means breadfruit and the latter, head; tamā and tama, the former means father, the latter, boy
Bible. As the most widely circulated source and reference for written Samoan at that time, the Bible set the standard for use of these diacritics. The Bible was printed for a Samoan audience and it was assumed by the missionary writers that Samoans would be able to discern the correct pronunciation and meaning and ritual and ritual and ritual and ritual of words from context, so the diacritics were used very sparingly. For example, John 20:1 is printed in the Samoan Bible as: “O le uluai aso o vaisapati i le taeao, a o pouliuli lava, ua alu ane ai Maria...” whereas the correct version with diacritics reads: [“‘O le ulua’i aso o vāisāpati i le taeao, ‘a ‘o pōuliuli lava, ‘ua alu ane ai Māria...”]. The missionary writers preferred to use the diacritics only in ambiguous situations, which provided them with an economical and effective way to use them, but, in the long term, this practice resulted in succeeding generations of Samoans being unable to use these markings correctly or consistently in their own writings or when translating for non-Samoans.

Since Samoans were not encouraged or taught how to use diacritics correctly, this often resulted in these symbols being left out, used inconsistently, or put in the wrong places throughout their handwritten documents such as in personal letters or family ‘api. An example of this kind of orthographic inconsistency can be seen, for example, in the name Le‘iesilika, which is represented throughout the Young ‘api as Leiesilika. Without the glottal stop, the pronunciation of the name (‘the silk cloth’) in the written form is still apparent to Samoans who can recognize the intended meaning and its correct pronunciation. However, the meaning would not necessarily be apparent
to a non-Samoan unfamiliar with the language. Because the meaning of names in Samoan *gafa* are contextually important, often referring to important historical events or powers and attributes of an individual, this could have been a significant source of error both in the written chronologies and in their subsequent interpretation. Contextual information could be lost if the correct pronunciation was not apparent.

In addition to errors and variations that could have been attributed to diacritic usage, the early European transcriptions and translations of Samoan oral traditions contained numerous other spelling variations, particularly in regards to phoneme pairs t-k, n-g, r-l, and h-‘, which were used interchangeably by Samoans (Mayer 2001). The glottal stop itself was difficult for non-Samoans to hear and account for in their writings. It was also difficult for Europeans to distinguish between several minimal pair vowel glides, such as *au-o, e-ei, ae-ai, o-ou, oe-oi*.

There are numerous obvious instances of these kinds of orthographically based variations, particularly in the Powell and Krämer lists. For instance, the name *Matelita* (Tuimanu’a Matelita) in the informal oral language would likely be *Makalika* but could be written as *Matelika, Makelika, Makelita, and Makerita*. The name is spelled Matelita in Krämer (#21) and Young (#35) but Makerita in Galea’i (#35). Powell’s chart would have predated this Tuimanu’a. Other examples include:

1. Tuimanu’a Tuioligo is listed as Tuioligo in both Young and Galea’i (#13 and #13) but as Tauiliga in Krämer (#12) and Ti’aligo in Powell (#15);
2. Tuimanu’a Fa’aeanu’u is listed as Fa’aeanu’u in Krämer (#3) and both Young and Galea’i and but as Ta’aeanu’u in Powell (#2);

3. Tuimanu’a Ali’atama is listed as Ali’atama in Powell (#7) and both Young and Galea’i (#12) but as Leiatama in Krämer (#1).

4. Tuimanu’a Tuiopomele is listed as Tuiopomele in Young (#21), Tui-o-pomele in Galea’i (#21), Moumele in Krämer (#7) and is absent from Powell.

It is apparent from these examples that misspellings arising from orthographic variations and an incomplete mastery of the Samoan language may have had a significant effect on the abilities for Powell and Krämer to adequately process and record information that they may have received from their informants and this most likely contributed to the presence of discrepancies in their chronologies.

_Misunderstanding the Context and Meanings of Titles and Names_

It is very likely that Powell and Krämer as outsiders may have missed important contextual information related to Samoan naming practices and that was embedded in variations of the names and titles of individuals listed in their chronologies. For example the 22nd Tuimanu’a in Young and Galea’i is listed as Tuimanu’a Tuiolite [Tuio’i’ite] and Tuimanu’a Tuiaitu respectively, because of his supernatural ability to predict.
Figure 5a: The chronological order per Young has been placed in parenthesis next to each name. Gaps between the chronologies are shown as blank cells. In cases of spelling variations, spelling from the Young ‘api are in brackets. Contextual notes are provided from Young and Galea’i on the right while multiple Tuimanu’a who may be the same individual are color coded to the left. All of this shows just how truncated the Powell and Krämer chronologies are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Krämer-Tuimanu’a</th>
<th>Powell-Tuimanu’a</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Taetagaloa</td>
<td>Young <em>gafa</em> cites him as brother of Lefanoga who is said to have broken the 'spell' of the SāTagaloa. He is absent in both gafa as well as Krämer's chronology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(viewed as Lefolasa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fa’aeanu’u [3]</td>
<td>2. Ta’aeanu’u (son of1)[Fa’aeanu’u I (3)]</td>
<td>3rd TM on both <em>gafa</em>. Aka TM Fa’atutupunu’u, possibly after Tagaloafatutupunu’u. Said to have spread the concept of &quot;Tui&quot; throughout Polynesia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Saoioiomanu (son of 2)[4]</td>
<td>4th TM on both <em>gafa</em>. The eldest of the Ati Sao; the 6 sons of Fa’aeanu’u who received the <em>ao</em> at the same time, each of which is said to have swam the seas after receiving the TM title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semanu [Saoioiomanu (4)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Lelologa (son of 3)[Lelologatele (10)]</td>
<td>Absent on Krämer’s chronology, he is cited as the 10th TM in the <em>gafa</em>. Said to have been the eldest son of TM Saofolau (the only Ati Sao who returned from the ocean).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Ali’amatua (son of 5)[11]</td>
<td>11th TM. Eldest son of TM Lolologatele. Said to have been tricked out of his title by his younger brother Ali’atama whose mother was from Agae.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Leiatama [Ali’atama (12)]</td>
<td>7. Ali’atama (son of 5)[12]</td>
<td>12th TM. Younger brother of Ali’amatua from whom he stole the TM title. Known for establishing the Faletolu in Ta’ū as his mother was Mamalu’ota.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fa’aeanu’u (son of 7)<a href="14">Fa’aenu’u II</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>14th TM. 1st son of TM Tuioligo (TM 13, who was the eldest son of the daughter of Ali’atama). Cited by Powell as son of Ali’atama.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Panepinito [Puipuipo (15)]</td>
<td>15th TM. Puipuipo was the 2nd son of TM Tuioligo, the 13th TM in the <em>gafa</em>. Powell lists him as the son of TM Ali’atama.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Puipuipo (son of 7)[15]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Ti’aligo (son of 9)[Tuioligo (13)]</td>
<td>To’oto’o title from the Faletolu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 5b:** The chronological order per Young has been placed in parenthesis next to each name. Gaps between the chronologies are shown as blank cells. In cases of spelling variations, spelling from the Young ‘api are in brackets. Contextual notes are provided from Young and Galea’i on the right while multiple Tuimanu’a who may be the same individual are color coded to the left. All of this shows just how truncated the Powell and Krämer chronologies are.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Semanu</td>
<td>12. Semanu</td>
<td>18th TM. Eldest son of TM Tuiomanufili (TM 17 as well as the 1st female TM). Young lists as 4th TM of the line of TM Fa’aeanu'u II. Not present in Krämer chronology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ Saoioiomanu (4)]</td>
<td>(n of 10)[ Saoioiomanu (4)]</td>
<td>4th TM. Son of TM Fa’aeanu'u and 1st of the Ati Sao. Said to have swam the ocean after receiving the TM title. He never returned to Manu’a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Fa’atoalia (son of 10)</td>
<td>14. Taliutafa (son of Fa’atolalia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Fa’atoalia Soli’atama (18)]</td>
<td>27th TM. Taliutafa I or Pule was the brother of TM Levaomanu (26th TM) who had no issue. This is beginning of the Taliutafa title, Analoa, Falasoā &amp; Avaloa lines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Amosegi</td>
<td>19th TM. Son of TM Fa’a’oala’ia (TM 18) who was the son of TM Tuiomanufili (TM 17). Not present in Powell chronology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Segisegi (19)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Taliutafa Pule (27)]</td>
<td>27th TM. Taliutafa I or Pule was the brother of TM Levaomanu (26th TM) who had no issue. This is beginning of the Taliutafa title, Analoa, Falasoā &amp; Avaloa lines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Moumele</td>
<td>21st TM. Tuiopomele said to be the son of the 2nd female TM (Siliaue). Absent in Powell chronology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Tuiopomele (21)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Ti’aligo [Tuioligo (13)]</td>
<td>Appears to be a repeat. To’oto’o title. There is no Ti’aligo in either gafa, nor is there a Tuioligo II. Not present in Krämer chronology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Seuea (female line)[24]</td>
<td>24th TM. TM Seua’atali. Sister of TM Sālofi (17). Krämer placed her before Sālofi. The Young gafa explains the suffix fa’atoli added b/c she waited for Sālofi to return</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Seuea (daughter of 14)[24]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sālofi [25]</td>
<td>25th TM. Brother of Seua and son of TM To’aleapa. TM Seuea is said held his &quot;seat&quot; while Sālofi sailed the seas on a malaga or journey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Sālofi (brother of 16)[25]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Taliutafa (son of Sālofi )</td>
<td>30th TM. Son of TM Ta’alolomana Moa’atoa and Saleauouma (Upolu woman). One of 4 Taliutafa to also hold the TM title. Missing in Krämer chronology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Taliutafa Seuli (30)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lepulu</td>
<td>31st TM. U’uleleaoa was from outside the family and there was a dispute over his title. He was also murdered. Missing from Powell.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[U’uleleaoa (31)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Ta’alolo</td>
<td>28th TM. Oldest son of TM Taliutafa Pule. With him comes the ao ma pa’ia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ta’alolomana Moa’atoa (28)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Moa’atoa</td>
<td>Moa’ato refers to all of TM Sālofi ’s line as well as TM Moa’atoa.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Talolomana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ta’alolomana Moa’atoa (28)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Moa’atoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Vaomanu (son of 19)</td>
<td>26th TM. 1st of 2 children from TM Sālofi and Tinoimālo woman. He died without issue and the title passed to his brother Pule (who was also the first Taliutafa).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Levaomanu(26)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5c: The chronological order per Young has been placed in parenthesis next to each name. Gaps between the chronologies are shown as blank cells. In cases of spelling variations, spelling from the Young ‘api are in brackets. Contextual notes are provided from Young and Galea’i on the right while multiple Tuimanu’a who may be the same individual are color coded to the left. All of this shows just how truncated the Powell and Krämer chronologies are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name (Father &amp; Line)</th>
<th>Contextual Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Toalepai (To’aleapai)</td>
<td>23rd TM. Said to have been unrest during his tenure. His seat was eventually given to Seuafa’atali until Sālofi returned from his journey. Absent in Powell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Manufuli (Tuiomanufili)</td>
<td>17th TM. TM Tuiomanufili was the 1st female TM and 4th child of TM Fa’aeanu’u the 2nd. Absent in Powell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tuiote (Tuioti)</td>
<td>22nd TM. TM Tuioti aka Tuiaitu. Known as the predictor. Said to have mystical powers. All three appear to be the same person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tuiaitu (Tuioti)</td>
<td>32nd TM. Son of TM Ta’alolomana Moa’atoa and Sao’olemasina. When he died there was no one in the male line to take the title. Absent in Krämer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tauiliga (Taulima)</td>
<td>34th TM. From Lalopua, of the Avaloa line, son of Alaalamua and Peleese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Leva (Levaomanu)</td>
<td>26th TM. 1st of 2 children from TM Sālofi and a woman of the Tinoimalo. Levao had no issue &amp; gave the Taliutafa title to his brother Pule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lalama (Alaalamua)</td>
<td>34th TM. TM Ta’alolomana Fanaese was given the title by the Faletolu. From Lalopua, of the Avaloa line, from the union of Alaalamua and Peleese. Aka Alaalamua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Matelita</td>
<td>35th TM. 4th &amp; last female TM. Of Anoalo, Moa’atoa line. Daughter of Amapelia (daughter of Taliutafa Liusā) and Pa’u Young (Upolu born son of Taupou from the ‘Aiono family and British merchant seaman, Arthur Stephen Young). Marriage sealed the relationship between Young and the Tuimanu’a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The word ‘i’ite in Samoan means to be a supernatural seer or predictor and he is referred to in Young as “the predictor.” He is listed as Tui-Aitu in Galea’i perhaps as a different description of his supernatural ability (aitu means spirit or possessor of supernatural powers). Krämer, however, missed this contextual information and lists him as two different Tuimanu’a - Tuiote (#8) and Tuiaitu (#15). Powell’s list does not have him listed in any discernible variations of spelling or meanings. Other similar variations that seem to indicate a lack of contextual understanding include:

1. Krämer’s Tuimanu’a Tauliga (#12) and Lalamua (#20) who were probably the same individual recorded as Tuimanu’a Alaalamua Taulima in both the Young and Galea’i charts (#34). Again, the European recorders were not fully aware of or fully understood the contextual information that was a necessary part of the history of the Tuimanu’a title. Tuimanu’a Alaalamua could have been referenced by Krämer’s informants as Tuimanu’a Aaalama, Tuimanu’a Taulima or Tuimanu’a Alaalamua Taulima. It is likely that Krämer interpreted this multiple-named title holder as different individuals.

2. Tuimanu’a Fa’atutupunu’u in Young (#3) is recorded as Fa’aeanu’u in Galea’i (#3), Krämer (#3), and as Ta’aeanu’u in Powell (#2) – an obvious misspelling. The Samoan words fa’atupu nu’u means to create populations, and fa’a’ea nu’u means to

---

63 In the Young ‘api, one of the many chronologies of the Tuimanu’a breaks Tuioi’ite into Tui-o-lite. Written in cursive, the capital ‘I’ is easily mistaken for the lower case letter ‘l.’ Had it not been for the contextual information provided, this mistake would have gone unnoticed.

64 Further Young adds a second name, Tuiaitu, to Tuimanu’a U’uolelaoa (#31 on both Young and Galea’i, not listed by Krämer of Powell), whereas Galea’i lists him as only Tuimanu’a U’uleleloa. The contextual information offered in the Young ‘api explains that U’uolelaoa was sauali’i (a respectful term for a spirit).
give rise to populations, so in essence the names are synonymous. A Samoan would immediately understand that these are two variations of names for the same person, while an outsider, without this contextual information, might very well mistake them for two completely different people as they appear different to the eye and ear. Young and Galea‘i further list a second Fa‘aeau‘u (#14) several generations later. Significantly, Young records this Tuimanu‘a as Fa‘aeau‘uluua (Fa‘aeau‘u II). Both Powell and Krämer do not list this second Fa‘aeau‘u in their chronologies. Did they omit this name thinking it was an insignificant reiteration by their informants, or were they just uninformed?

3. Powell lists Taetagaloa as his first Tuimanu‘a, but this name is not listed in the succession of Tuimanu‘a in Young and Galea‘i. While a possible Taetagaloa is mentioned in the Young ‘api, (spelled Taeotagalo) he is not listed as a Tuimanu‘a in the narration of either Young or Galea‘i. The context in which he is mentioned in the Young ‘api, is as a supporting character, with his brother Lefanoga, in the story of a shift in power within the Sā Tagaloa which causes it to become the Sā Tuimanu‘a. In that story, Taeotagalo [Taetagaloa] and Lefanoga are the sons of Tagaloauui and Leatigalu. In the Young and Galea‘i ‘api, Leatigalu, the mother, had two brothers named Lelologa and Leulua‘i, who became the first two Tuimanu‘a. However, the contextual information in Young’s ‘api makes it clear that Lelologa’s name is actually recorded as Satiailemoa or

65 In the context of creation, fa‘atutupunu‘u means to create islands and fa‘aeau‘u is to elevate the status of a village.
66 Lefanoga is an extremely important ancestor as he is the basis for the change in power from the Sā Tagaloa lineage to the Sā Tuimanu‘a. This ancestor also has a significant role in the Young version of the naming of Sāmoa, and in the creation of the title of Moa’atoa.
Satia-‘i-le-moa, and Leulua’i recorded as Tuiomanu’atele as a result of historical incidents related to these two individuals.\\(67\\) These are also the recorded names of the first two Tuimanu’a in Young and Galea’i. This important information seems to have been unavailable or not understood by Powell. Not only does he erroneously list the lesser title Taetagaloa as a Tuimanu’a, but he appears to have been unaware of the tradition of the naming of the first two Tuimanu’a.

4. Ti’aligo is repeated twice as a holder of the Tuimanu’a title in the Powell succession (#11 and #15). According to the Young ‘api, Ti’aligo is an usoali’i matai title. The man who held this title was tasked with calling and serving at the ‘ava or kava of Tuimanu’a.\\(68\\) This was his hereditary right and it was his formal and primary duty in Manu’a. While it would have been possible for a Ti’aligo to be conferred the Tuimanu’a title, it is highly unlikely especially considering he is not listed in the Young, Galea’i, or Krämer charts. It is likely that Powell was not aware of the relative status of the Ti’aligo title and for some reason, included it in the succession of the Tuimanu’a title. Clearly, a deeper understanding of the relative status of Manu’a titles would have been helpful to Powell.

5. According to both Galea’i and Young, Tuimanu’a Fa’atutupunu’u (#3) had six sons, all of whom received the Ao\\(69\\) of Tuimanu’a at the same time and all were referred to with the prefix Sao. The notes in the Young ‘api, state that the all six Sao ruled

---

\\(67\\) Both Lelologa and Leulua’i were injured in the birthing process. Satia’ilemoa means torn solar plexus; Manu’atele means great wound.
\\(68\\) The ceremony is called po le ‘ava
\\(69\\) Ao translates as “head” but in this instance is understood as the anointing or crown.
simultaneously, but all are also said to have gone off into the ocean, never to return, with the exception of Sao Folau who was known as the Tuimanu’a who sailed. His brothers are all said to have died at sea or on other islands. Both Young and Galea’i account for all six of these Tuimanu’a in their chronologies and textual information. Powell only mentions two, Saoioioimanu (#3) and Saoloa (#4), while Krämer makes no mention of any of them. One can only speculate that Krämer was not aware of the possibility of having simultaneous title holders, or was not given information on these six Tuimanu’a, or perhaps he assumed that Sao was a different title and not part of the Tuimanu’a succession.

6. The importance of understanding and accounting for differences in recorded names seems to have been ignored or minimized as Powell and Krämer constructed their chronologies, but this kind of information is evident in the ‘api formats of Young and Galea’. For example, Tuimanu’a Seuea (#24 on both the Young and Galea’i charts) is given the added contextual name of fa’atali or “to wait” in the Young ‘api. In Young’s narration, Sālofi, the brother of this female Tuimanu’a, was on an extended mala’aga or journey throughout the Pacific Islands and Seueafa’atali held the title while she waited for him to return. Seuea (#14) also appears after her brother Sālofi (#13) in Powell’s chronology, but before him in Krämer, Young and Galea’i. Did Powell transpose the two, or did his Tauānu’u deliberately place them out of order?

7. In another example of important contextual information available in the ‘api format, Young provides given names for all the Tuimanu’a who also held the Taliutafa

---

70 Folau means “to sail”
title (#s 27, 29, 30, 37). This is because Taliutafa is a title specific to the *Anoalo*, the Young family, and Lalopua. Galea’i refers to them as Taliutafa I through IV, an assertion that there were four different Tuimau’a who also held the Taliutafa title, although Galea’i only lists three actual Taliutafa (#s 27, 30, and 37), Taliutafa I, II, and IV respectively. That the Galea’i chronology lacks a given name for the Taliutafa title holders is not surprising as a person on whom a title is conferred is seldom referred to by their given name except in historical reference. Just as the birth name of Powell’s informant and Tuimanu’a Matelita’s chief orator Tauānu’u is no longer remembered, it seems reasonable that the Galea’i would only record Taliutafa as the holder of the Tuimanu’a title and not the actual given name of the title holder. As stated above, this kind of information, although important, might be of more importance to the Young family than the Galea’i.

If we look further at the Taliutafa holders, we can see that Galea’i lists the 29th Tuimanu’a as Ta’alolomau (Tuimanu’a Taliutafa Tupulō in Young). This is one of the few variances between these two chronologies. However, if we refer to the Young ‘api, it is explained that Tuimanu’a Taliutafa Tupulō was a son of Ta’alolomana Moa’atoa, and was also called Ta’alolomana Tupulō. Since Galea’i and Young both assert that there were four Taliutafa who held the Tuimanu’a title, it appears likely that Ta’alolomau was copied incorrectly from the original handwritten documents. This is where the context clarifies any mistakes in spelling. Krämer and Powell record only a single Taliutafa (#16

---

71 There is a strong possibility that birth name of Tuimanu’a Matelita’s Tauānu’u may have been Fia’ai, as in 1908, just ten years after Matelita’s death, the Tauānu’u who sat in defense of Amepeia during the appeal of her sentence by Tuimanu’a Elisara was called Fia’ai prior to receiving his title.
and #18 respectively). Were they only given one instance of this name by their informants or did they assume that multiple references to the same name referenced only one individual? It is unlikely that their informants would not have been aware of the multiple Taliutafa holders given that they occur more recently in the succession lines and thus, more likely to have been in recent memory. In addition, this title was created at a very important time in the history of Manu’a in which many changes were instituted. This suggests that Powell and Krämer, yet again, were missing important contextual information.

8. Tuimanu’a Elisara, who held the Tuimanu’a title after Matelita, is also called Elisara Faife’au72 in Galea’i (#36), an obvious reference to his high status within the London Missionary Society73 Church; the Young ‘api refers to him simply as Elisara. The Powell and Krämer chronologies predate this Tuimanu’a so he is not listed. Both Young and Galea’i acknowledge the last Tuimanu’a (#37) as the fourth Taliutafa title holder. He is listed as Tuimanu’a Taliutafa Le’iesilika74 in the Young gafa and Taliutafa IV in the Galea’i. This is interesting as many contemporary sources state that the Tuimanu’a title ‘died’ with Elisara who ceded Manu’a to the United States in 1904, four years after Tutuila did so.75 This obviously is not in accord with the historical information contained in the Young and Galea’i accounts of Manu’a’s history.

72 Faife’au is the Samoan term for minister of pastor-literally ‘the doer of God’s work.’
73 Referred to as LMS or La Mo Sa in Samoan.
74 Not once in the Young ‘api are diacriticals used in the spelling of Le’iesilika.
75 The Young ‘api states that Ameperia was present at this signing at the request of Tuimanu’a Elisara and alludes to her as having the pule (meaning “authority or power”) although he held the actual title.
Incomplete and Out of Sequence Chronologies

Figures 5a through 5c show a clearer analysis of how the Krämer and Powell chronologies line up in comparison to Young. These figures also provide contextual information taken from Young and offer more content about each individual and the time periods in which they lived. In these charts, Powell’s chronology has been left as a control, while Krämer’s cognates have been matched to Powell for ease of comparison.

I have discussed earlier the numerous spelling and word formation inconsistencies found in Powell and Krämer, but we can see that Powell’s list contains more correct spellings as compared to Young. As Powell spent a quarter century in Sāmoa, and spoke the language fluently, it stands to reason that his ear would be more tuned to the language than Krämer. But it is clear from the comparison that the validity of Krämer’s chronology could have been affected by his limited knowledge of both the Samoan language and the cultural contexts of the data he received from his informants.

The most obvious differences that the Powell and Krämer chronologies exhibit in comparison to Young are the many missing Tuimanu’a title holders, the existence of names not found in Young and Galea’i, and the extreme variance in the order of succession. For example, Young and Galea’i list thirty seven Tuimanu’a and Powell lists twenty five, although his data only reached to the latter part of the 19th century. However, Krämer lists only 21 title holders, ending with Matelita (#35 on Young and Galea’i). For Krämer, this high number of missing title holders and novel names can likely be attributed to the fact that much of his data was obtained from a non-Manu’a
source and therefore he would have been limited as to the quality and quantity of
information he could access. In addition, given Krämer’s limited proficiency in Samoan,
his limited understanding of Samoan culture in general, and Manu’a traditions in
particular, it is not surprising that his list is so truncated and contains names not found
in Young and Galea’i. Also, his genealogies were reconstructions from earlier
missionaries like Powell, Pratt, and Turner and therefore copying the same misspellings
was inevitable. As discussed earlier, Samoan history is related in a non-linear manner
which can seem disjointed and illogical to non-Samoans. We have seen that important
considerations for telling history from a Samoan perspective include what is being told,
to whom it is being told, and for what reason the information is being revealed.
Characters may appear and reappear during the telling, and names and roles of
individuals may change to fit into a particular context or even to create context – such
as the addition of the name Faife’au to Tuimanu’a Elisara. Krämer may have been
attempting to reformat what he was told into the linear format with which he was
accustomed and in so doing was unable to reconcile names that seemingly did not fit.

Powell’s chart exhibits the same kinds of problems as Krämer’s, missing data,
novel names, and wide ranging sequencing aberrations. The fact that Powell and
Krämer are not able to provide detailed contextual information that the ‘api format
contains, leads one to conclude that they were not given this information and that their
subsequent analyses and formatting of their chronologies were affected by this. It is
also clear that Krämer and Powell were hindered by their own limitations such as
language proficiency, missing diacriticals in the written language, and a lack of
knowledge and understanding of Samoan cultural and contextual aspects which would have helped them to understand how these titles fit together. Powell and Krämer provide little more than a list of names, and the reader is left with a void. Who were these Tuimanu’a? How did they come to receive the title, and what happened during their tenure as Tuimanu’a? The Young and Galea’i ‘api provide insights as to who these people were, and what was occurring during the times in which they lived, as well as stories about those ancestors on whose shoulders they stood. This kind of information would have been crucial to understanding the significance of names and the interrelationship of the various Tuimanu’a and the other individuals that were important in the history of Manu’a and the Tuimanu’a.

This following section provides an example of the rich contextual information that the ‘api format provides the important context for the retelling of these gafa.

‘O le Āmataga/In The Beginning

With Tu’u’u’s version of the Galea’i ‘api, access to the Young ‘api, as well as published genealogies and histories by other Samoan scholars it is easy to see how the contextual data these works provide could have served to augment works by Krämer and Powell. More than that, access to such knowledge might have helped them to see the world through a Samoan lens, and while it would have answered many questions, it may have raised equally as many as the characters in many stories may have appeared out of place and out of time to the Westerner. Although Powell was fluent in the Samoan language, he did work with informants. Krämer was not as fluent as Powell and
used prior works and Samoan informants and translators. Even with the advantage of the contextual knowledge available in the ‘api, both scholars might have needed informants or interpreters to help them better understand the contents within context.

Though much of the information in the following section has been mentioned above, I will provide just enough more contextual information to illustrate how characters are introduced and re-introduced at different times and for different purposes. Also, although titles (the Tuimanu’a title in particular) were most often passed vertically, this was not always the case, as titles could also be passed laterally, appointed by the Faletolu, and even appointed to more than one person at a time (as with the Ati Sao). Again, this is contextual information that is found within both the Young and Galea’i ‘api.

Although the Galea’i ‘api cites five paramount titles under the family of the Sā Tagaloa prior to the origin of the Tuimanu’a, for purposes of comparison of the Tuimanu’a lineage, this portion of the paper will focus on comparison of the first two Tuimanu’a and how they received those titles when the Sā Tuimanu’a became the paramount family in Manu’a. As has been shown above and will continue below, extraordinary inside insights into Sāmoa’s history can be gained through examining family ‘api.

Sāmoa ma le Ao Tuimanu’a: Sāmoa and the Tuimanu’a Title

Tu’u’u (2001) cites as his sources the Galea’i clans and other noted writers (Smith: 1920 and Jones: 1981) in the preface to the Tuimanu’a succession charts found
in his book. His charts demonstrate that both the Galea’i and the Young versions agree that these first two Tuimanu’a were brothers. Both versions agree, that the elder, Tuimanu’a Satia’ilemoa, was born with his center, or heart, attached to his diaphragm, and that the name he received upon accepting the Tuimanu’a title played a major role in the naming of the Samoan islands as Satia’ilemoa became shortened to Sāmoa. Likewise, Tuimanu’atele, was also said to be born with manu’anu’a, or wounds, thus the three islands of Ta’ū, Olosega, and Ofu, came to be called Manu’a or Manu’atele. However, there is some discrepancy. The creations stories differ between the two families, thus while Tu’u’u’s preface quotes Galea’i as stating the first two Tuimanu’a as the sons of Fatu and ‘Ele’ele, the Youngs’ claim was that they were just from the same gafa or family line as Fatu and ‘Ele’ele rather than their actual sons (Tu’u’u 2001).

Creation According to the Young ‘Api

In the beginning there was Papa, the great creator, as well as two entities called sami ma vai or ocean and water. From these were created nine forms of matter without life or breath. They are known as Papa e Iva. The Papa e Iva then awakened with five vitalities of life, Agagalilo (spirit), Loto (heart), Masalo (doubt), Ma’i (illness), and Finagalo (thought). Transformed into life by these vitalities, Tagaloamana, the first supreme God, created five living beings called Fatu, ‘Ele’ele, Lagituatasi, Itūlagi, and

---

76 Satia: affected, injured. Moa: solar plexus, center
77 The meaning is now changed to Sacred Center. Sa: sacred moa:center.
78 Manu’a: injured, wounded. Tele: greatly
79 Usu o Fatu ia ‘Ele’ele-1. Satiailemoa 2. Manu’aatele
80 Papatele po’o Papatea/the great or white Papa, Papasosolo/the one who takes root, Papa’alā/great slab of rock, Papa’ele/ soil, Papaanoano/the soul/things wished for, Papapuga/underwater spring, Papa’one’one/sand, Papanofo/the one who sits, and Papatū/the one who stands
Mamao (Rock, Earth, Sky, Universe, Infinity). Whereas the Galea’i claim Satia’ilemoa and Tuimanu’atele to be the sons of Fatu and ‘Ele’ele, the Young tell a different story. They say that with the union of Fatu and ‘Ele’ele, spirit and physical united and formed human beings or, Aitu ma le Tagata. Fatu and ‘Ele’ele then had two children who were named Tele and Malae. News of their birth spread throughout the islands and the Young ‘api cites this as the beginning of gafa of the Sā Tagaloa.

Tele and Malae then gave birth to four children; three boys and one girl. The boys were named Sasualei (Lei), Sa’ite (Ite), and Sapu’a (Pua). These three boys were the beginning of the Faletolu, on the island of Ta’ū. When a fono, or meeting, of the to’oto’o was held, each of the houses had their own seat assignment within the Faletolu, it was forbidden for any other to take that seat or position. Their sister was held in such esteem that her birth name was never mentioned. She was referred to simply as Mamalu’oTa’ū, or revered one of Ta’ū, and her presence was both necessary and ever present within the Faletolu. She was venerated due, not only to her high position, but also because Mamalu’oTa’ū was believed to be the source of vitality for the Faletolu. It is from her that all lines of the Tuimanu’a began.

During this time period, the Sā Tagaloa in the village of Aga’e was the paramount family in Manu’a and they married within their family in order to keep the line pure. At some point, Tagaloamana became interested in one of the daughters of Tagaloalefuli. She was known as Sa’umani, or Ui; however, her given name was Sinasā’umani. When

---

81 Literally “spirit and man”
82 Diacritics added.
83 House of Three which is comprised of representatives from the three islands of Manu’a.
Tagaloalefuli heard that Tagaloamana was interested in his daughter, he counseled Sinasā’umani to spread her legs toward the sun as it was rising. It was in this manner that Tagaloaui was conceived. Tagaloaui’s name gives honor to the relationship between his mother and father, and refers to the pursuit of Sināsa’umani by Tagaloamana in order to make her his wife. A generation later, the actions of Lefanoga, the son of Tagaloaui, would make lasting history on Manu’a. 84

The Story of Lefanoga: Power and mystery of the Sā Tagaloa gives way to the Sā Tuimanu’a

Tagaloaui married Leatigalu, the daughter of Tagaloafa’atutupunu’u. They had two sons named Taeotagalo 85 and Lefanoga. 86 As the boys grew, Lefanoga began to notice that his father woke before dawn each morning and left the brothers alone for a long period of time. Lefanoga became curious and one morning, as the father set upon his usual routine, Lefanoga decided to follow him. He found his father meeting with a number of other chiefs. What Lefanoga did not know was that he had stumbled upon a sacred meeting of the Sā Tagaloa. As might be predicted, the chiefs became aware of his presence and decided to chastise Lefanoga for his impudence. His punishment was to prepare the ‘ava. 87 The ‘ava Lefanoga was ordered to prepare was especially bitter and considered a death sentence. 88 However, Lefanoga did not die. In fact, much to the chagrin of the chiefs, Lefanoga let out a loud fa’aumu, or shout, in celebration of his

84 See Figure 6 in order to better understand the creation story per the Young ‘api.’
85 This is the spelling from the Young ‘api. Taeotagalo is only mentioned once throughout the ‘api, however, it is reasonable to assume that since both boys were from the Sā Tagaloaoa, that this may be an error in transcription and the correct spelling may be ‘Taeotagaloa.’
86 According to Young ‘api, Lefanoga lived ca. 700
87 Known in other parts of Polynesia as kava, and the elixir causes a euphoric effect.
88 The word used in the Young ‘api is fe’ai or fierce.
success.\textsuperscript{89} It was at this moment that Lefanoga took the mystery and power and ritual out of the meeting of the Sā Tagaloa. As a result of this, the people of Manu’a were given their own titles and the right to govern themselves, however they still continued to pay homage to the Sā Tagaloa.\textsuperscript{90} It was because of Lefanoga’s actions that there was a shift in the paramount family and the Tuimanu’a title became the highest title in Sāmoa with Lefanoga’s uncles (Lelologa and Leulua’i) on his mother’s side, becoming the first two Tuimanu’a. As noted earlier because of the circumstances occurring at their births, upon assuming the Tuimanu’a title, Lelologa became Satia’ilemoa, while Leulua’i became Tuimanu’atele.

\textit{The Gift of the Written Word}

The two stories above have been taken from the Young ‘apī where each and every name on the left side of the page has contextual information on the right side. Until Tuimanu’a Matelita began to transcribe Tauānu’u’s knowledge, that same knowledge had been committed to the memories of countless Tauānu’u before him. This knowledge is so vast and detailed that it is truly difficult to fathom the skill sets necessary to remember not only the lists of title holders, but their wives and/or husbands, the villages and/or islands from which they came from or went to, how the Tuimanu’a connects to the tupu of Sāmoa, Tonga, Fiji, and other islands throughout Polynesia, as well as all the various contexts and connections between these people and places.\textsuperscript{91} It is unclear if information that has been added in the margins are the result of

\textsuperscript{89} Lefanoga is also credited with introducing ‘ava into central Polynesia.
\textsuperscript{90} See Figures 4 and 5a, 5b, and 5c.
\textsuperscript{91} See also Appendix C and Appendix D
later additions by other people or more of Tauānu’u’s memories, recalled during a recitation of what had been transcribed earlier that day. Whatever the case, if not included on the right side of the page, the left margin will mark a missed historic event that took place during the tenure of a particular Tuimanu’a, or at a particular place name. (See, for example, see line 8 in Figure 2)

Although of great interest, the inclusion of too many of these stories into the body of this paper would detract from its purpose which has been to not only demonstrate the value of the information contained in family ‘api, but to make a case for this information, as well as its format to be given the same merit as its Western counterpart. I believe this paper has succeeded in that endeavor. Certainly an unintended and unexpected outcome of reading the Young ‘api and comparing it to the works of Krämer and Powell, was recognizing the amount of time and effort that went into producing this ‘api. The ‘api of Sāmoa’s high ranking families are not simple family journals. They document the marriages that connect one high ranking family to another, as well as contextual information on, or historiography of these people and places. In this time of computers, smart phones, and instant gratification, it is difficult to imagine the hours of sitting, as Tuimanu’a Matelita did, with pen and ink, transcribing the oral-turned-written history of the Anoalo line of the Tuimanu’a. For her, her father, and later her brother, these ‘api were considered Manu’ā’s official government documents.

Imagine, in the time before scanning, the hours of hand copied ‘api and court documents, as well as letters typed on onion skin thin paper – all of this so that this
history would not be lost. It appears we have come full circle. Just as Matelita
transcribed for Tauānu’u, and Le’iesilika added new information as well as hand copied
the originals for generations to come, Emily Young has scanned and sent me computer
files. In turn, I write this paper. Though those who originally set pen to paper lived in
different time periods, our motives are still the same. We do all of this for those who
come after. We do it so that the information will not be lost, and we do it so our voices
will be heard and recognized as valid.\textsuperscript{92}

\textsuperscript{92} For more contextual stories from the Young ‘api please see Appendix B, C, D, and E.
Figure 6: Visual aid for the creation story from the Young ‘api

Papa e Iva
Papatele (Papatea), Papasosolo, Papa’alā, Papa’elo, Papaanoano, Papapuga, Papa’oneone, Papanofo, Paptū

Five Vitalities of Life
Agagalilo, Loto, Masalo, Ma’a, Finagalo

Tagaloamana
Living Beings

Fatu, Ele’ele, Lagituatasi, Itūlagi, Mamo

Fatu—Ele’ele
Tele ma Malae

Tele—Malae

Δ Δ Δ ○

Sasualei, Saite, Sapua, Mamalu’oTa’ū

Faletolu
Female force venerated as the life and vitality of the Faletolu.
Figure 7: Continuation of Manu’a gafa: The passing of titles: The second column in the chart below shows the lineage of each title holder. Notice that the title is not necessarily passed vertically. It can be passed laterally, skip a generation, by marriage, or chosen by the Faletolu.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuimanu’a according to Young</th>
<th>Lineage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. TM Satia’ilemoa</td>
<td>1st TM from whom Sāmoa takes its name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TM Tuimananu’atele</td>
<td>Married to Fuataileao, the daughter of chief Lelologa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TM Fa’atutupunuu’u (Fa’aeanu’u I)</td>
<td>Married Moetalaluma. Daughter of Tuilega’ula of Faleuta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. TM Saoioiomanu</td>
<td>son of Fa’atutupunuu’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TM Saopu’u</td>
<td>son of Fa’atutupunuu’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. TM Saaoloa</td>
<td>son of Fa’atutupunuu’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. TM Saotu’ufesoa</td>
<td>son of Fa’atutupunuu’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. TM Saoletupua</td>
<td>son of Fa’atutupunuu’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. TM Saofolau</td>
<td>son of Fa’atutupunuu’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. TM Lelologatele</td>
<td>Son of Fa’atutupunuu’u. Four wife: Mamalu’ota’u,(Ali’atama); Sinafa’alata (Ag’a/e)/Ali’aatua; Sinafa’asegi (Ag’a/e)/Galea’i,Suamaile/Sotoa &amp; Fa’asulu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. TM Ali’amatua</td>
<td>Son of TM Lelologatele. His mother was Fitiuta woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. TM Ali’atama</td>
<td>only son of Mamalu’ota’u and TM Lelologatele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. TM Tui’oligo</td>
<td>son of Sinatalaga the only daughter of Ali’atama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. TM Fa’aeanu’u II</td>
<td>brother of TM Fa’aeanu’u II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. TM Puipuipo</td>
<td>brother of TM Fa’aeanu’u II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. TM Siliaivao</td>
<td>son of Siliauē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. TM Tui’omanufili (f)</td>
<td>daughter or TM Fa’aeanu’u II and first female Tuimanu’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. TM Fa’ato’alia Ali’atama</td>
<td>son of TM Tuimanufili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. TM Segisegi Aoe’e</td>
<td>son of TM Fa’ato’alia Ali’atama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. TM Siliauē (f)</td>
<td>daughter of TM Fa’ato’alia Ali’atama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. TM Tuiopomele</td>
<td>son of Sālofi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. TM Tuioiite (the predictor)</td>
<td>son of Tuiopomele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. TM To’alepai</td>
<td>son of Tuioiite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. TM Seueafa’atali (f)</td>
<td>daughter of TM To’alepai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. TM Sālofi</td>
<td>brother of Seueafa’atali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. TM Levaomana</td>
<td>son of Sālofi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. TM Talutafa Pule</td>
<td>son of Sālofi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. TM Ta’alolomana Moa’atoa</td>
<td>son of TM Talutafa Pule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. TM Talutafa Tupulō</td>
<td>son of TM Talutafa Moa’atoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. TM Talutafa Seiuli</td>
<td>brother of TM Talutafa Tupulō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. TM U’uolela’oa Tuiaitu</td>
<td>was appointed by the spirits/sauali’i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. TM Ta’alolomana Fanaese</td>
<td>son of TM Talutafa Ta’alolomana Moa’atoa (into of Christianity to Manu’a by Rorotogon missionary during his tenure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. TM Tauveve</td>
<td>chosen by Faletolu. First TM of the aso mālāmalāma (intro of Christianity to Sāmoa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. TM Tau’ilima Alalamua</td>
<td>Gr. grandson of Peleese, daughter of TM Pule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. TM Matelita (f)</td>
<td>Gr. gr. granddaughter of TM Talutafa Moa’atoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. TM Elisara</td>
<td>son of TM Tau’ilima Alalamua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. TM Talutafa Le’iesilika</td>
<td>brother of Matelita</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8: Tuimanu’a Matelita Totoluafili’osāmoa, the gr. gr. granddaughter of Tuimanu’a Moa’atoa. She was the fourth and last female Tuimanu’a.
Figure 9: The ‘Queen’s Residence.’ Notice the flag and the ‘government house’ (right of center). The government house was shaped like a Samoan *fale* but constructed of *pālagi* building materials. It also featured windows and doors.
Figure 10: Amepelia Tu’upule Young. Daughter of Taliutafa Liusā and mother of Tuimanu’a Matelita Filo’isāmoa and Tuimanu’a Taliuta Le’iesilia Young.
Figure 11: Arthur Stephen Young ‘Pa’u’ Jr. Born in Fasito’outa, he was the son of British merchant seaman Arthur Stephen Young Sr. and the Taupou for the ‘Aiono family. His marriage to Amepelia sealed the relationship between his father and the Tuimanu’a.
CHAPTER 4

Conclusion

The Age of Discovery. How does the average scholar perceive this phase of European History? What images does it create? For those educated in the West, I would hypothesize that most of us picture Europeans sailing across the seas, discovering new lands, oceans, islands and peoples. This stands to reason as the majority of extant history of the Pacific Islands was written by Westerners and for Westerners. However, I would suggest that when the position is changed, the Age of Discovery becomes a reciprocal world event. Just as Europeans were discovering Sāmoa, so were Samoans discovering Europeans.

When Bougainville sighted Manu’a in 1772, Samoans had been established there for over a thousand years and had raised oratory to an art form. Just as the Westerner wrote of the Samoan, so did the papālagi become a part of Samoan oral tradition and though there were misunderstandings on both sides, Samoans took what they found useful from the pālagi, for example, they found writing to be of extreme value. It made the ‘api possible, and ‘api were written by Samoans for other Samoans. Colonization in Sāmoa and annexation in American Sāmoa brought about Western schooling which instituted a change in the way Samoans learned their own history. In the early years, there was no Samoan voice in academia. However in the mid 1980’s Samoan scholar Malama Meleisia reminded Samoans that they had a voice and he challenged them to use it.
At first there were only a few published ‘api. However, more and more Samoans are beginning to publish the gafa and the history in their own family ‘api. Some, like Tu’u’u, have produced/are producing broader works involving multiple gafa. Others, in both Samoas have been interviewing primary sources to document the stories that explain the legends behind place names. These works remind Samoans that the history of Sāmoa did not begin at first contact with the European, and that Sāmoa has not only a voice, but a valid contribution to make to the academic world. Although there may be differences in the orthography and morphology of these written histories, as well as diverging accounts of events in the ‘api of different families, they serve to enhance our understanding of the position of Samoans as they see themselves and others in their world and in their own words. I believe this paper has satisfied its intent to set the oral-turned-written word of the Samoan ‘api on equal footing with its Western counterpart. It has also offered a glimpse of the story of the Young family of the Anoalo line of the Tuimanu’a to both scholars and the children of Manu’a in Sāmoa and in the diaspora. The comparison between the chronologies of the Tuimanu’a as recorded by Krämer and Powell show that they are not in accord with each other nor are they in accord with Young and Galea’i. However, Young and Galea’i are in almost complete accord with each other on both gafa and historiography. This makes an excellent case for the credibility of Samoan oral history and for it to be taken seriously and given the same credit as published Western scholars who have, until recently, been considered canon on Sāmoa and Manu’a. This statement is not made to take away from the works of
such scholars as Krämer, Powell, and Mead, but to lobby for Samoan oral history to stand on equal footing with those scholars.

Although I have made the point that in the past, *gafa* was selectively revealed in a manner that best suited the purposes of the family – omitting or stressing certain details - I have also stressed that histories such as Krämer’s deprive Samoans of these aspects of their oratory and oral traditions. This begs the question, if we publish these family ‘api and open them for everyone, at any time, will we not simply be following in the shoes of Western historiography and fixing them in time and space? I would argue not. The more oral-turned-written histories that are published, the more there is to add to the growing anthology of Samoan historiographies. If each is allowed to stand as valid, then we not only add to the diversity which is found in Samoan oratory and oral history, but we make it available to a broader base of people. Most importantly, we do not lose it!

Although this paper is about the validity of the oral-turned-written traditions of Sāmoa and the very valid contribution Samoan oral history can make to academia, it is also very much about the Young family of the Anoalo line of the Tuimanu’a. As a member of that family, I have a vested interest in making sure our stories are not lost, or do not end up discarded or forgotten. Access to pertinent parts of the Young ‘api afforded me greater insight into the lives of Tuimanu’a, Manu’a’s system of government, as well as the political struggle to keep the title alive, and its subsequent loss. It added texture and flavor to those ancient and not so ancient times.
I have a few projects planned for the future. While I would like to explore the first large migration consisting of one thousand American Samoan military dependents, to the United States on the USS President Jackson in 1952 (of which my husband was one), my passion is to translate the ‘api in their entirety, perhaps providing analyzes and notes in both Samoan and English. At the same time, I have acquired a handwritten copy of the 1908 court case between Amepelea Young and Tuimanua Elisara, and I’m hoping to work with friend and mentor Dr. Manumaua Luafata Simanu-Klutz and develop it into a one act play. It is also my sincere desire to see other scholars, whether they be Samoan or from outside Sāmoa, discover, study, and publish these many versions of Samoa’s past before they become lost, or, (as there are so very few elders remaining who were born in the early 20th century) their meanings become lost upon us.
APPENDIX A

Glossary

‘āiga: immediate family; extended family

afio: (polite) come; dwell; stay

agāgalilo: spirit; soul

aga‘ifanua: customs specific to a village or villages

aganu‘u: shared customs of a country

‘aiavā: evening presentation of food to visitors (often the night before their departure).

aitu: ghost; spirit

ala: road (in the context of this paper)

ali‘i: man of noble birth

alofisā: (polite) ‘ava ceremony

‘āmataga: the beginning

āmio: conduct

ao: paramount title, head (polite)

ao ma pa‘ia: honorific title for the Tuimanu‘a

‘api: notebook

atua: god

atuali‘i: supporters; side with ali‘i

atunu‘u: country; people of the islands

aualuma: semi-formal association of unmarried women in each village, who used to organize the reception of visitors, minister to the tāupou, and perform several other duties.
‘aufaipule: body of authority

‘aumāga: young untitled men; ‘ava attendants

‘umaia: to bring

‘autaupulega: body of chiefs and orators

‘ava: kava

āvā: wife

‘ele’ele: earth

fa’ailo: make aware

fa’alupega: ceremonial style and address of a person or social group traditionally associated with a certain area.

fa’aaloalo: respect behavior

fa’aManu’a: Manu’a style

fa’apūnefu: step aside; dusty

fa’aSāmoa: Samoan style or way.

fa’atali: to wait

fafo: outside

faife’au: pastor

faletama: branch of a family’s title

faletolu: “house of three,” the counsel of 12 Manu’an orator chiefs associated with the Tuimanu’a

fale’ula: the red house. On Manu’a, the first home of Tagaloa and the meeting house of the Faletolu

fatu: heart; center

feagaiga: special relationship; (for example, between a brother and sister)
**fetaia’i**: meet

**finagalo**: thought; desire

**foafoa**: conch shell

**folau**: sail (as in a boat)

**fono**: meeting

**fua**: navy

**fu’a**: flag

**gafa**: genealogy

**gagana fa’aaloalo**: one of three oral registers of the Samoan language (used when speaking in public, upon meeting someone for the first time, or to people of higher status)

**gagana fa’afailāuga**: one of three oral registers of the Samoan language (spoken by orators and chiefs in special settings and special occasions).

**gagana**: language

**gagana ta’atele**: also gagaga māsani’ common language. One of three oral registers of the Samoan language (the vernacular spoken by the people in informal settings).

*‘ie*: cloth; clothing; lavalava

*‘ie tōga*: fine mats

**ipu**: cup

**itū**: side

**itūlagi**: universe

**la’asia**: step over; go around or beyond

**lagituatasi**: sky

**Lono**: Hawaiian god of agriculture

**loto**: the emotional heart; desire; will

**ma’i**: illness, sick
**makahiki**: Hawaiian new year honoring agricultural god Lono; war forbidden during this time; competitive games enjoyed; taxes collected

**malae**: large, open area at center of village

**malaga**: journey

**mamalu**: sacred

**mamao**: infinity; long distance

**manu’anu’a**: to be wounded

**manumā**: crimson crown fruit dove (possession of which was restricted to high chiefs)

**masalo**: doubt

**matai**: chief

**matuātala**: portion of a house for high chiefs to sit

**matūpālapala**: a reward given to an individual for service to a chief

**māvaega**: parting words or promise

**moa**: center; also means ‘chicken’ however on Manu’a it is forbidden to be used in that manner because of the Moa‘ātoa title; the word ‘manu/bird’ is used instead.

‘*o le ala i le pule ‘o le tautua*: saying: the road to authority is through service.

‘*o le tala fale lē la’asia*: a seating area in the fale forbidden to any but certain chiefs

**pa’ia**: holy

**pālagi**: European; also papālag‘i

**papa**: rock

**pāpā**: paramount title

**pāpā ma Anoalo**: the title of the Anoalo

**papa e iva**: nine forms of firmament

**papālagi**: European; also pālagi
pō: a cupped hand clap which produces a different sound than the European flat
handed clap

pō le ‘ava: clapping to announce the ‘ava is ready

potopoto: assemble; gather together

pū: space that needs to be filled, such as a room, or a missing tooth.

pule: authority

pupualii‘i: group of six lesser chiefs under the usoali‘i

sā: family of; sacred; forbidden

sa’o: senior title holder

sauali‘i: polite word for spirit

savali: walk

sāvali fa‘ailo: village crier

sega vao: blue-crowned lorry (feathers used to decorate fine mats)

siapo: bark cloth

sōlo‘i‘esea: banish

sua: formal presentation of specially cooked food

suafa: matai title; (polite) name

sui tupu: crown prince

tala: to tell, to relate; to open, untie

talā fale: seating area of a house

taule‘ale‘a: untitled man

tāupou: a village maiden with specific duties, among which is preparation of the ‘ava

tautega: polite word for meal; repast

tautua: service; to serve
tele: plenty

teu le vā: Samoan saying: to cultivate a relationship

tino: body

to’ona’i: large meal usually served after church on Sunday

to’oto’o: orator’s staff; orator chief (specific to Manu’a and Tutuila)

Tuimanu’a: highest title in Manu’a.

tulāfale: orator chief (outside of Manu’a)

tupu: king

ula: garland; necklace

usoali’i: (on Manu’a)12 higher chiefs of the Faletolu; (other Samoan islands: titled men of the same rank)

vā: Samoan sense of relational space
APPENDIX B

Important Titles, Places, and Persons

Aga‘e: A village on Ta‘ū and the first home of Tagaloa (and later the Tuimanu‘a). It is also home to the sāGalea‘i. Aga‘e is said to have been the Tuimanu‘a governed by spirits/ghosts and Ta‘ū, governed by men.

Tuimanu‘a Ali‘amatua: Elder brother of Ali‘atama. Said to have lost the title to his younger brother when his brother tricked him into setting it down. Ali‘atama not only stole the title, but moved the center of government to Ta‘ū from Aga‘e.

Tuimanu‘a Ali‘atama: Younger brother of Tuimanu‘a Ali‘amatua. Said to have stolen the title from his elder brother by way of a practical joke, in which he, not only stole the title but moved the center of government from Aga‘e to Ta‘ū.


Anoali‘i: Prior to the Tinoimālō war, the sāTuimanu‘a was known by this name.

Anoalo: After the Tinoimālō war, the Anoali‘i became the male (and main) line of the sāTuimanu‘a beginning with Moa‘ātoa.

Arthur Stephen Young Jr.: Son of Arthur Stephen Young Sr. and Vitoliaomanuaanana (the taupou of the Aiono family of Fasito‘outa). Married to Amepealia Tu‘upule (of the Moa‘ātoa/Anoalo line of the Tuimanu‘a) in order to seal the relationship between Arthur Stephen Young Sr. and the Tuimanu‘a.

Arthur Stephen Young Sr.: British ship owner, sailor, and entrepreneur. Married into the Ai‘ono family of Fasito‘outa and established a relationship with Manu‘a which was sealed with the marriage of his son, Arthur Stephen (Pa‘u) Young Jr. to Amepealia Tu‘upule (the daughter of Taliutafa Liusā, a direct line from Moa‘ātoa of the Anoalo line of the Tuimanu‘a).

Ati Sao: seven sons of TM Manu‘atele who all received the Ao at the same time. All left Manu‘a, and only one (Saofolau) returned.

Avaloa: one of two female supporting lines of the three lines of the Tuimanu‘a.
**Tuimanu’a Elisara:** also known as Tuimanu’a Elisara Faife’au (in respect to his position as a pastor in the LMS church). In 1904 (four years after Tutuila did so), Elisara signed the Deed of Session between Manu’a and the United States.

**Tuitoga Faisautele:** The name given to Tuitoga Kau’ulufonua who married Seueatausilinu’u (sister of TM Segisegi). According to the Young ‘api, he was the gr., gr., grandfather of Salamāsina (the first Tafa’ifā of Sāmoa)

**Falesoā:** one of two female of branches the sā Tuimanu’a.

**Faletolu:** a group of 12 titled men with specific duties to Manu’a and the Tuimanu’a

**Fale’ula:** the great meeting house

**Fautino:** taupou for the Ai’ono family of Fasito’outa. Her birth name was Vitolia’omanu’oa’ana and she became the wife of Arthur Stephen Young Sr., and mother of Arthur Stephen( Pa’u) Young Jr.

**Galea’i:** paramount title in Aga’e. Also said to be the first title in Manu’a.

**Tuitoga Kau’ulufonuafekai:** known as Tuitoga Faisautele in Sāmoa. His father was assassinated and he chased the killers all over Polynesia until he found them in Futuna. He is said to have “drunk the blood” of his father’s murderers. It was during his reign that there were huge changes in Togan government. The Tuitoga became more of a figure head with the governing of Toga left to the newly created position of the Tui Ha’atakalaua.

**Lalopua:** Anoalo land on Ta’ū and the seat of Manu’a’s government affairs, including the signing of the Deed of Cession in 1904, also the burial ground for TM Matelita

**Leatigalu:** Wife of Tagaloa’ui and mother of Lefanoga and Taetagaloa.

**Le’aufogapiu:** Before the Tuimanu’a made any other appointments to the Faletolu (priviously cited the Tinoimālō, and is now synonymous with Lumā), he appointed this ali’i along with Togotogo to be in charge of what is now called the Faletolu.

**Lefanoga:** said to have broken the spell of the sā Tagaloa, making way for the sā Tuimanu’a.

**Le’iesilika Christopher Young:** the 37th (and last) Tuimanu’a. Brother of TM Matelita and son of Amepeilia Tu’upule and Pa’u Young.
**Leloaloa**: Village on Tutuila where Chris was held under house arrest after accepting the Tuimanu’a title (the Young family already owned land there).

**Lepolo**: Title in the Faletolu. Lepolo’s job is to prepare and oversee the tupu’s meal. Part of the Usoali’i, he inlists the help of the Pupuali’i to distribute the rest of the food.

**Levao**: known as ‘to’oto’o ali’i’ as the man who holds this title is the only to’oto’o who can collaborate with the usoali’i. Also known as the ‘sa’o fetalai’ as he is authorized to speak on behalf of the Tuimanu’a. He is also authorized to mediate between the to’oto’o and the village, should the to’oto’o of the Fale’ula call a meeting.

**Tuimanu’a Levaomana**: Son of TM Sālofi. Passed the title to his brother Pulesilia.

**Lumā**: village in between Ta’ū and Faleasao. All are of importance to the Anoalo.

**Mālietoa**: One of the paramount titles on Upolu.

**Mamalu o Ta’ū**: Daughter of Tele and Malae and sister of Sasualei, Saite, and Sapua. In the Young versión of creation, Mamalu o Ta’ū and her brothers were the beginning of the Faletolu. She is said to be the vitality of the Faletolu and so sacred that her birth name was never revealed.

**Tuimanu’a Manu’atele**: One of two brothers of Leatigalu and uncle of Lefanoga and Taetagaloa. His birth name was Leulua’i.

**Mata’utia**: The matai name for the head of the Falesoā branch of the sā Tuimanu’a

**Tuimanu’a Matelita Filoisāmoa**: Daughter of Ameplia and Pa’u Young. Fourth, and last, female TM.

**Moa’ātoa**: Son of TM Pule and brother of Sāmalā’ulu. 28th TM. With him begins the Pāpā ma Anoalo.

**Pa’u (Arthur Stephen Jr.) Young**: See Arthur Stephen Young Jr.

**Pele’ese**: One of the daughters of TM Pule with a second wife. With her began the Avaloa line of the TM.

**Pomele**: 21st TM aka Tuiopomele.

**Pupuali’i**: “Cluster of chiefs.” This lower house of the Faletolu was created after the Tinoimālō wars and is comprised of six specific titles. Each of these chiefs, like the usoali’i has specific duties which accompany his title.
**Reverend Thomas Powell:** of the London Missionary Society who served the eastern Samoan islands of Tutuila and Manu’a. Was an early missionary-scholar who is credited with one of the earliest written chronologies of the Tuimanu’a.

**Sā Galea’i:** A Fitiuta (Aga’e) family who is credited with holding the first title on Manu’a.

**Sāmalā’ulu:** daughter of TM Taliutafa Pule and brother of TM Ta’alolomana Moa’ātoa. Like her brother, Sāmalā’ulu and all her posterity would be known under the Anoalo line.

**Sālofi:** Known as the seafaring Tuimanu’a, his sister received and held the title for him until he had finished his malaga. Sālofi also created the Taliutafa title which first conferred on his son Pelesilia.

**Sā Tagaloa:** Believed to be a family of gods in Sāmoa, however the Young ‘api references them as the first Polynesian people who took over Manu’a and from there spread the Polnesian culture.

**Sā Tuimanu’a:** Originally the sāTagaloa, however, a shift in leadership within the family left the sāTagaloa still revered, however the ruling family became known as the sāTuimanu’a

**Satia’ilemoa:** His birth name is said to have been Lelologa (one of Lefanoga’s maternal uncles). He became the first Tuimanu’a.

**Seiuli:** Faletolu title. Faumuinā along with Sōtoa (and in the presence of the tupu) organize the meetings. They also inform the people, the ‘aufaipule, and the tulafale that a meeting will take place. It is also their job to make sure all are dressed properly.

**Sōtoa:** Faletolu title. Sōtoa is also the Vaimāgalo or Vaifofō. He is known as the sa’o fetalai or head speaker. It is his job to keep peace between the people and the Tuimanu’a. This is his first and foremost responsibility. He may also mediate between the village and the to’oto’o at meeting called by the to’oto’o on behalf of the Fale’ula of the Tuimanu’a Ta’alolomana Moa’ātoa: see Moa’ātoa

**Taetagalo:** Probably a misspelling of Taeotagaloa. Brother of Lefanoga and son of Leatigalu and Tagaloaui.

**Tagaloafa’atutupunu’u:** The Tagaloa who causes villages, islands to rise up.

**Tagaloamana:** husband of Sinasā’umani and father of Tagaloa’ui.

**Tagaloaui:** son of Tagaloamana and Sinasā’umani. Father of Lefanoga and Taetagaloa.
**Taliutafa:** Analo title called sui tupu. Created by TM Sālofi for his son, Pule, during the Tinoimālō wars.

**Tā'ū:** Largest island in the Manu’a group of the Samoan archepalgo. Also a the name of the village on that same island which was the seat of the Tuimanu’a from the time of Ali’atama until the title was outlawed by the United States.

**Tauānu’u:** High orator chief and keeper of the Young family gafa. Was considered the fathe of the to’oto’o of the Fale’ula.

**Tialigo:** member of the usoali’i whose only job is to call the ‘ava during the ‘ava ceremony.

**Tinoimālō:** Original name of the Faletolu. Was also the name of a war in which the Tuimanu’a supported the Tinoimālō while a number of ali’i did not.

**Togotogo:** see Le’aufogapiu

**Toliutafa:** daughter of Pule and sister of Pele’ese. With her began the Falesoā line of the TM.

**Tuifiti:** Paramount title of Fiji.

**Tuimanu’a:** At one time the paramount title in all of Sāmoa. Paramount title in Manu’a until abolished by United States.

**Tuimanu’a Manufili:** First female Tuimanu’a

**Tuimanu’a Segisegi:** 19th Tuimanu’a who had no issue. His sisters Ulaleglu and Seaueatausilinu’u married out of Manu’a. Ualegalu to Tuatele Lefa’asala and Seaauaeatausilinu’u to Tuitoga Faisautele. Generations later, distant cousins whose gafa goes back to these two unions would produce Salamāsina, the first Tafa’ifā..

**Tuimanu’a Seueafa’atali:** Sister of TM Sālofi. Suffix “fa’atali/to wait” added to her name as she held to TM title until her seafaring brother returned to claim it.

**Tuimanu’a Tuiolite [Tui-o’i’ite]:** known as ‘the predictor’, this Tuimanu’a’s name was miss-spelled in original transcriptions (probably as a result of not reading context to the right of his name, or context left out of other ‘api where his name appears). Also, as the ‘api is written in cursive and the written Samoan was not standardized, his name appears as Tui-o-lite. The capital ‘I’ takes on the appearance of a lower case ‘I’
**Usoali’i:** “brother chiefs.” This upper house of the Faletolu is comprised of twelve designated titles and was in existence prior to the Tinoomālō wars. Each chief has specific duties which accompany his title and a specific pole designated to his title.

**Vaifofō:** Position held by Sōtoa. See Sōtoa

**Vaimāgalo:** Position held by Sōtoa. See Sōtoa
8. Talintapa - Tepoté II ....... O le aha e Tiatakotemanu
Mon-atai leu Tepoté II
O Aliu Tepoté, e pei ora iai de
Paio matahaua, le sisoa taka o Aliu
Tepoté.

9. - Talintapa - Seiuli III
(Ni Tepoté)

10. Talintapa - Sepúri
(Ni Tepoté)

11. Talintapa - Tepoté e pei
O le ora lea iai de
Paio matahaua O
Tali, tepoté, Sepúri, leha; Na ucu
i foladao in Valas, le
(Tepoté) e o Tepoté
(Valentino) e ana le
Tama. Li kai fo na Talintapa
e pei ora lea iai de
le aha nei.

12. Talintapa - Lua de

6. Ana lavou,
1. Tepoté, leu fia i lua i lau.
2. Samanuku
3. Fia leh
5. Amagena - Langi.
Throughout the world, rulers always have sought to gain power and alliance through marriage. The Samoan Islands were no exception. The following is an accounting of the ties between the Tuiman’u’a, Tuitonga, Maleitoha, Tuia’ana, and Tuiatua:

After the transfer of power from the SāTagaloa to the SāTuiman’u’a, the first title holder was Satia’ilemoa (who had no issue), followed by his brother Tuiman’atele. The third Tuiman’u’a was Fa’aenu’u I, aka Fa’atutupunu’u, which loosely translates to “establishing the kings/kingdoms of the islands” or, “the way of kings over the islands.” Fa’aenu’u I fathered the six subsequent Tuiman’u’a, all of whom have the sao, or spirit, prefix before their names. However, for the purpose of connecting the Tuiman’u’a with other Tui’s of the Pacific, this portion of the paper follows his daughters, Fa’atausala and Seueamatua.

Fa’atausala married an ali’i of Aualumā who was called Leulua’i, or Tui’o’aualūa, and they had two girls who were named Lataiso’a and Vaeilagi. Lataiso’a married Tuita’ū Alamaivao with whom she had a daughter called Pafuti. Pafuti married Tuiman’u’a Fa’atoalia Soli’atama, who was the son of the first female Tuiman’u’a, called Tui’omanufili. Pafuti and Tuiman’u’a Fa’atoalia Soliatama had three girls and one boy. The girls were named, Ualegalu, Sinasaunu, and Seueatausilinu’u. Their brother, Segisegi
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93 Prior name Lelologa
94 Prior name Leulua’i
95 Probably the first Seuea
was the 18th Tuimanu’a and he was without issue. The girls took very different pathes. There is no information on Sinasā, however, Seueatausilinu’u went journeying off into the Pacific and Ualegalu married into a Tutuila family. Below are their stories:

Ualegalu married Tuitele Lefa’asala or Tuife’ai and gave birth to a girl named Fola’alelā who then married Sagapolutele in Saluafata in Upolu. They had a daughter named Letutupu. Letutupu married Nonomaifale (the son of Tuisāmoa of Fale’alili) with whom she had a daughter named Gauifale’ai. Gauifale’ai who married Mālietoa La’auli. Born of Mālietoa and Gauifale’ai were, two daughters, Gato’aitele and Gasolo. Gato’aitele married Manaia Lesā in Upolu and had two daughters, Vae’otamasoa and Leatonugatuitoga, as well as a son named Solovimaua. Vae’otamasoa married Tuia’ana Selaginata Tuisamata, with whom she bore a son called Tuia’ana Tamalelagi.

In order to reconnect the above line with the Tuimanu’a, it is neccessary to go back to Ualegalu’s sister, Seueatausilinu’u. According to the Young ‘api, Seueatausilinu’u traveled to Uvea, where she married the Tuiuvea, but with no issue. She then went to Fiji, where she was said to have married the Tuifiti or Tuifiji, again with no issue. Finally, she traveled to Tonga, where she married Tuitonga Kau’ulufonua96 who was known, in Samoa, as Tuitonga Faisautele. Faisautele was said to have passed through Samoa while chasing after his father’s assasins. He may have decided to return to Samoa after catching the murderers in Uvea, or may have been licking his wounds after his brother, Mo’ungamotu’a, became the first Tuiha’atakalaua, thus deviding the Tongan monarchy. With this division the Tuitonga retained all respect behavior, but was stripped of his

96 Krämer does not support this
secular power. This made the Tuiha’atakalaaua the defacto ruler of Tonga. He is said to have made “far reaching changes in the Tongan government” (Ian Campbell 38). These “changes” may have been the reason for the Tuitonga’s presence in Sāmoa. Whatever the case, Faisautele and Seueatalausilin’u eventually settled in Samoa and produced a daughter, called Painu’ulasi. Faisautele also had a son, by another wife, who was called Tuitonga Manaia. Tuitonga Manaia then married his half sister, Painu’ulasi. Their daughter was called Galue’ivaetoetoe and here is the story behind her name:

As adults, Painu’ulasi and her half brother Tuitonga Manaia were sent by their father to live and work in the vau or “bush.” They obeyed his command, however, the work proved too difficult for them and they returned home. Faisautele told them to go back and continue working until their task was completed. Following their father’s instructions, Tuitonga Manaia and Painu’ulasi went back to the bush to work, however eventually they ended up living as husband and wife. Their daughter’s name, Galue’ivaetoetoe translates to “ceaseless work in the field” and bears witness to her parents’ story.

Galue’ivaetoetoe married her distant cousin, Tui’anana Tamalelagi and their daughter, Salamāsina was the first person to hold all four titles on Upolu, and become the first Tafa’ifā in Samoa. Salamāsina married Tapumanaia of Safata and their daughter, Fofaoivaese, married Tauātama in Nu’ulaita. Fofaoivaese and Tauātama

97 Krämer dates Tuitongamanaia back to an earlier generation and connected to the island of Sava’i
98 The Tafa’ifā title was called so because he or she had four pairs of tafa’i, which were attendants, or protectors, who sat to the right and left of the high title holder. Each of the four original title holders (which Salamāsina now held) had two tafa’i each. Hence tafa’i or ‘two attendants’ fā (four).
had two daughters and a son. Their daughters were called Taufau and Sina, and their son was called Asomualemālama. Sina married Tito’iva and their son, Faumuinā Letupufia had three wives. His first wife was Tumaleulu’a. Faumuinā Letupufia and Tumaleulu’a’s daughter, Sāmalā’ulu married back into the Tuimanu’a when she united with Ta’alolomana. Tuimanu’a Ta’alolomana Moa’atoa was the 28th Tuimanu’a. Their son, Tuimanu’a Taliutafa Seiuli, was the 30th Tuimanu’a.

Faumuinā Letupufia’s other wives, Talaleomalie and a Tongan woman called ‘Atamūlau lead to connections with the ‘Aiono family of Fasito’outa, the Fonotī, Muāgututia, and Leutele’e’ite of Mulinu’u.
APPENDIX E

Duties of the Usoali’i and To’oto’o of the Faletolu

In the days before the *fua* or the administration of the American Navy, all the members of the Faletolu knew the responsibilities involved when accepting a title. Today, Manu’a is so fragmented that many titles are given to people who are outside of the family; to people who have no blood relation. This is done in order to keep the title alive (Tufele 2010, pers. com; Tûmua 2010, per. com.). Since the Tuimanu’a title has been abolished by law, there is no functioning Faletolu. Although they are reluctant to admit it, very few of today’s Faletolu title holders know the history of their title or their original duties (Tûmua 2010, per. com.). Below is a list of the chiefs of the Faletolu which specifies their duties as translated from the Young ‘api.

1. **TALIUTAFA** – Head of the *Usoali’i ma o le Suitupu*. *Taliutafa o le sa’o o le ‘āiga Anoalo ma Papā*. If any new chiefs “come in” to the Faletolu or when donations (*to’oga*, pigs, etc.) are given from the village or other events (like funerals, wedding, etc.), Taliutafa is in charge of the portion that will be given to the Tuimanu’a. Taliutafa is in charge of organizing, gathering, sorting, and distributing all the *sua* and *tautega* from both within and without the Anoalo ma Pāpā clan. If Taliutafa sits as the “Ao” (Tuimanu’a) when there is a gathering in the village (Manu’atele) with the *Usoali’i*, he sits at a specific post in the front in the gathering called “*matuātala.*” It is forbidden for anyone else to sit at this post (*’o le tala-fale lē la’asia* – “forbidden post”). If there is no Tuimanu’a or Taliutafa in the Faletolu, the only *Usoali’i* allowed to sit at that post are Sōtoa or Lefiti.
2. **SŌTOA** – Is the *Vaimāgalo* or *Vailofō*, his duty is to keep peace between the village and Tuimanu’a, and also maintain peace within Manu’atele; he is also responsible for assuring peace on behalf of the *Anoalo ma Pāpā* clan. In collaboration with Levao, he is responsible for handling all current issues and village matters to the benefit of all. If there are any outside protests or disputes, it is Sōtoa who must maintain the peace between the people and Tuimanu’a. This is his foremost and primary duty and it is ongoing. If there is a Sōtoa in place who sides with those who would cause trouble with the Tuimanu’a or if he does not maintain the peace, then Tuimanu’a has the authority to remove his title (*suafa*) in the Faletolu and banish (*sōloi’esea*) all his family (*faletama*) from the village.

3. **LEVAO** – Also known as *to’oto’o ali’i* because he is the only *to’oto’o* who can sit and collaborate with the *usoali’i*. He is known as the head speaker (*sa’o fetalai*). Levao can speak on behalf of the Tuimanu’a. If a meeting is called by the *to’oto’o* of the Faleula of Tuimanu’a, Levao is authorized to mediate the discussion between the village and the *to’oto’o*. When all subject matters and issues are discussed Tuimanu’a is present hence the saying “*Tuimanu’a pe’ā afio ai i ai fono po’o isi aofia potopoto a le Manu’atele.*” As the issues are resolved the Tuimanu’a (also known as *afio ali’i ma le Moa’ātoa*) leaves the meeting.

4 & 5. **LE’AUFOGAPIU & TOGOTOGO** – During the Tinoimālō War these two *ali’i* were appointed by Tuimanu’a to be the leaders of the Tinoimālō or Faletolu (the Tinoimālō was the name in the beginning but in today is called Lumā or Faletolu). This was before Tuimanu’a made any other appointments to the Faletolu because the whole Manu’a (*fale Manu’a*) was resting after the war. They stepped aside (*fa’apūnefu*) and gave their respect to the Tuimanu’a le tupu. Their duty is such: they are messengers
for the Tuimanu’a to the village, and also the whole Manu’a (atunu’u). If there are any issues presented, it is up to the Tuimanu’a which to discuss and approve. These two ali’i are present in the ‘autaupulega (group meetings) with the Tuimanu’a; or to’oto’o Tauanu’u because he is the father of the to’oto’o of the Fale’ula. At the discretion of the Tuimanu’a, these two ali’i can be used to replace any of the usoali’i in the Fale’ula, should the need arise. They were also the same as the Tupu of Tinoimālō. If there was no Tuimanu’a and if only one is living, then he is chosen and respected as the tupu because of the war that is called “Taua o le Itū ma le Tala.” Tuimanu’a Taliutafa Pule reigned during, as well as survived this war.

6. MAUI – Is the one who warns (sāvali fa’ailo) the village with a foafoa (conch shell) that Tuimanu’a is about to pass through. No one is allowed to speak as the Tuimanu’a passes through a village upon his litter. Should the Tuimanu’a become ill or close to dying, Maui blows the conch shell to let everyone know that something is wrong with the Tuimanu’a. Everyone will then stay close as to stay informed of his condition. At the time of the ‘ava ceremony specifically for ali’i tupu (alofisā) Maui blows the foafoa calling to bring in the “ipu” (“āmia le ipu”) into the Fauleula (house of meeting). This is done by a group of men called the ‘aumāga. When Maui blows the conch shell in breaking sounds, it signifies that the Tuimanu’a has called a meeting for the to’oto’o and faipule. When the conch shell is blown long, it means that no one can walk around. All should be in their homes because the ali’i tupu is suffering greatly from his illness. When the conch shell is blown in long and then short blows thereafter, then the usoali’i and to’oto’o must rush to the Tuimanu’a’s home because he passed away. When ali’i tupu has something of importance to declare to the people as a whole (atunu’u) the conch shell is blown with blows that are neither short nor long. If there is no one
assuming the Maui title then either Sōtoa or Tauānu’u can take over this duty.

7 & 8. **POMELE & GAOA** – These two *usoali’i* assign the seating of the *usoali’i* in the meetings in the Fale’ula at which the *ali’i tupu* will be present. They also watch over (like sergeants at arms) the meeting for any disturbance or trouble when the Tuimanu’a is present. These two along with ‘*aumāga* can call out to the village or country (Manu’atele) for a meeting that all must attend. They are the only two who can walk around the meeting in order to keep the place of meeting secure. If they are not present to do this duty, then the Silia or *Atuali’i i fapo* (‘*aumāga* or their supporters) can do the job.

9. **LEPOLO** – Is the one who oversees the meal of the *tupu* or *tautega o le tupu*, even to the point that the *tupu* has finished eating. When there is a distribution of food in the village, Lepolo immediately sorts out and secures the portion for the *tupu*. He is the food keeper and preparer for the *tupu*. Lepolo calls Moliga and the *pupuali’i* to help with the distribution and securing of the food for the *tupu*.

10 & 11. **FAUMUINĀ & SEIULI** – These two organize the meeting before the *tupu*, and call to the people, ‘*aufaipule*, and *tulāfale*, to inform them of the meeting. They also ensure all are dressed appropriately. The high chief must wear a *siapo* and ‘*ula*. Their ‘*ula* must be worn from shoulder to shoulder. But the ‘*ula* of the talking chief or *to’oto’o* must hang down around their neck otherwise it is better if they do not wear one.

12. **TIALIGO** – Is the one who calls and serves the ‘*ava* at the ‘*ava* ceremony. This is the only duty of Tialigo and the *to’oto’o* Tau’e. If neither of
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99 Established after the Tinoimālō wars. A group of six ali’i under the *usoali’i*
these two are available to fulfill this duty then the to’oto’o of Alātauā can do so as they are the servers. Their seat is in the back of the Faletolu.
APPENDIX F

Interviewees

Lilomaiva Lemaefe Feagaimali’i Galea’i: was born in 1900 on the island of Manu’a however, he was raised on Tutuila. Although he held an Upolu title, he was from one of the oldest and most revered families on Manu’a. Lilo was a genealogist for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints and although genealogy was his passion by the time I came to know him, it did not become so until late in his life. Lilo supported his family as a Federal Communications Engineer. He was extremely active in his church and the Laie Counsel of Chiefs. When I first interviewed Lilo, he and his wife Aiaiga (also from Manu’a) welcomed me into their home and both treated me like, and told me I was family. Lilo was an extremely humble man, and I enjoyed our talks immensely. On 18 May 2013, just a few months after Auntie Aiaiga died, Lilomaiva Lemaefe Feagaimali’i Galea’i also passed away. He was a very special man, who touched many lives. I feel blessed to have known him and I miss him very much.

Taliutafa Liusā Young: lives above Three Youngs gas station and six apartments which he has built on Young land in Leloaloa, American Sāmoa. He and his brother Le’ie are the sons of Tuimanu’a Taliutafa Le’iesilika, or Uncle Moa (as he is known to family). Tafa and his brother Le’ie grew up in Leloaloa and were inseparable as playmates from their first cousins, my husband and my husband’s elder brother. At the time of this writing, these ‘boys’ are all are in their mid-seventies. Although Tafa and I spent many hours together when I visited American Sāmoa in 2010 and he appeared genuinely happy to be back in touch with his cousin (my husband), Tafa did not follow through on his offer of access to his copy of the family ‘api, nor did he appear to have much interest in the Tuimanu’a. Although most of our discussions had little to do with Manu’a or the Tuimanu’a, I would be remiss if I did not include the current Taliutafa title holder in this section.

Tufele Fa’atolia Li’amatua: was Secretary of Samoan Affairs when I interviewed him in 2010. Although he was very approachable, upon first meeting him, I suffered through the establishing of boundaries and position. At this time it was made it very clear to me that “Manu’a things are for Manu’a people.” However, within a short time, our conversation became more relaxed and informal and after chatting for awhile, Tufele began to loosen up and share a bit about Manu’a from his perspective; both in general and as a high chief from Fitiuta. During his lifetime, Tufule served as the first Lt. Governor of American Sāmoa and as the Governor of the Manu’a District. He was very involved in American Samoan politics and lobbied for full political autonomy in
American Sāmoa. At the time of our interviews, Tufele was undergoing dialysis treatments. Sadly, he passed in October 2010. He was 71.

**Tūmua Chris Teleiai Ausage:** is a tulāfale of the third and highest rank. Tūmua is an Upolu title. Although Tūmua has been conducting his own research on Manu’a, our discussions centered on the Matai system and how it functions in Sāmoa (meaning Western Sāmoa). Tūmua was gracious enough to make time for me in his busy schedule of teaching at American Sāmoa Community College, his duties as Tūmua, his family, church, and his research. He is an extremely patient instructor and though we do not communicate often, he is still only an email away should I have any questions.

**Emily Young:** is the granddaughter of Tuimanu’a Taliutafa Le’iesilika Young and the keeper of one of the copies of the Young ‘api, as well as any ‘new’ information, such as court cases, and this paper. She has a passion for the history of Manu’a and the Tuimanu’a. Stating that this project would have been impossible without her approval and assistance is truly an understatement. Emily has been and continues to be invaluable as family, friend, and mentor. Although born in the continental United States, both Emily’s parents are from Manu’a and she has lived in Sāmoa for extended periods, which include attending high school at Samoana High School in American Sāmoa. She now lives and works in Utah and is excited about this project and is looking forward to “breaking the spell of the Sā Tuimanu’a.”

**Le’iesilika Chris Young Jr.:** is the son of Tuimanu’a Taliutafa Le’iesilika as well as Emily’s father and brother to Taliutafa Liusā. Le’ie is also my husband’s first cousin and childhood playmate. Le’ie is a wealth of knowledge about all aspects of Manu’a and the Tuimanu’a. He has a sincere desire to serve, and was groomed by his father, Tuimanu’a Taliutafa Le’iesilika (Uncle Moa) to receive the Taliutafa title however, after much political maneuvering, the title went to his brother Liusā. Although Liusā currently holds the title, it is Le’ie who has always been willing to recount and explain, not only the Young family history, but the history of Manu’a and the Tuimanu’a as he has learned and/or remembers it.
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