The pre-contact connectivity between the West Polynesian archipelagos of Sāmoa, Tonga and Fiji has been well documented through genealogical (Gunson 1997, Krämer 1994, Schoeffel 1987), linguistic (Geraghty 1995, Marck 2000, Pawley 1996), ethnographic (Burrows 1938, Kaeppler 1999, Krämer 1994, Schoeffel 1999, Tuimalealiʻifano 1990) and archaeological (Burley and J. Clark 2003, G. Clark 2002, J. Clark et al. 1997) evidence. This article represents an analysis of previously published Samoan oral traditions in the investigation of Sāmoa’s pre-contact connections to Tonga, Fiji and other islands of the Pacific. From our study we draw three conclusions:

- The strongest is that there appears to be a high degree of interaction between Sāmoa, Tonga and Fiji in pre-contact times.
- The weakest is that Sāmoa’s pre-contact relationship with Tonga may have been more continuous and one of distinct practicality (involving marriage, politics and war), while its pre-contact relationship with Fiji appears to be more mythic (concerned with ghosts and monsters, and with time long ago).
- The most striking is that there is little or no evidence for pre-contact interaction between Sāmoa and the islands of far East Polynesia, such as the Cook, Society, Tuamotu and Marquesas Islands, especially when compared to the mountain of evidence linking Sāmoa, Tonga and Fiji in pre-contact times.

SĀMOA-TONGA-FIJI

Sāmoa, Tonga and Fiji, the major archipelagos of West Polynesia, offer a favourable environment for interaction and voyaging. Seasonal winds and sea currents have been shown to be advantageous for both outgoing and return voyages between most islands in the region (Irwin 1992). The distances between islands, compared with those elsewhere in Polynesia, are not very great. From Tonga to the nearest islands of the Lau Group in Fiji is about the same distance as from the Lau group to the largest Fijian island of Viti Levu. The distance from Sāmoa to Niuatoputapu, the northernmost island of Tonga, is considerably less than the total length of the Tongan archipelago.
and about the same distance as from Savai‘i to Manu‘a (Davidson 1977). Hence, distances between and within archipelagos are relatively short in West Polynesia, and a voyage to any neighbouring archipelago is generally never longer than a voyage from one end of the home archipelago to the other. Moreover, West Polynesia, as a cluster, is relatively isolated in the Pacific. A gap of c.800km to the west separates it from the major island groups of what is traditionally termed Melanesia, while the major islands of far East Polynesia (the Cook, Society, Marquesas and Tuamotu Islands) lie a nearly equal distance to the east (Burley and J. Clark 2003).

ORAL TRADITIONS: ACCURACY AND AUTHENTICITY

Vansina (1985:27) defines oral traditions as “verbal messages which are reported statements from the past beyond the present generation”. The extent to which oral traditions can be relied upon when making inferences about the past has been a source of enduring controversy (see Finney 1997 for a discussion of differing views on the oral traditions of voyaging).

C. Kehaunani Cachola-Abad (2000) has argued that Hawaiian oral tradition can often be considered more accurate than written histories. She points to
the importance Hawaiian chiefs placed on oral tradition and genealogy, as shown by a specific class of “court oral historians” responsible for keeping oral histories. Cachola-Abad argues that the courts and historians of different chiefs would have served as a system of checks and balances against the altering of oral traditions in favour of any one chief. In this way, accuracy would be maintained throughout generations.

However, Olaf Nelson (1925), a highly regarded leader in the Samoan independence movement of the 1920s, claimed that Samoan legends and genealogies could be very fluid depending on the waxing or waning social status of the teller or the subject. He argued that as a chief increases in honour and dignity, genealogies and oral traditions relating to that chief were often revised, but such revisions were quite justified by Samoan custom.

Nelson (1925) also argued that the accuracy of oral traditions was dependent on cultural factors. He offered a very practical example of how oral history can change to suit cultural needs. He told of an old man who wanted to settle a boundary dispute with his neighbour (a very delicate matter in Samoan culture). Instead of provoking a face to face confrontation that would not only be culturally inappropriate but possibly violent, he begins to tell his son invented stories of how, in days gone by, their family owned the land in question and how it was lost through some weak family link in the past. The father then allowed his son to grow up believing a version of altered oral tradition. In this way, the father gave the son a way to make a claim on that land by blaming a past member of his own family, through an invented legend, while avoiding placing blame on any living member of the other family. Direct confrontation and interpersonal conflict are thus avoided. Thus, the land claim may be peacefully cemented through altering of oral traditions. Nelson (1925) argues that legends and genealogies are altered, little by little through time, through situations like this. Indeed, in Sāmoa today, there is a Lands and Titles Court that regularly operates outside the realm of Western law and often deals specifically with disputes in oral traditions.

In addition to investigating the accuracy of oral traditions, one must also practice what Tosh (2000) called internal criticism. This is the investigation of the authenticity of oral traditions. As distinct from accuracy, the authenticity of oral traditions has more to do with errors and biases in transcription and translation. In this article we deal primarily with Samoan legends that have been, for the most part, recorded in the late 19th century by missionaries and outside government officials. To accept these writings as authentic Samoan oral traditions is to imply that those who recorded them were motivated by nothing other than an interest in history. Clearly, this was not the case, as no less an authority than Tuiätua Tupua Tamasese (1994), the patriarch of one of the “royal” families of Sāmoa and a former Prime Minister, pointed out.
Tupua Tamasese argued that the early recorders of many of these legends may have had the best of intentions, but were surely influenced by outside factors. Missionaries from the London Missionary Society (LMS) were the first to record the *faʻalupega* ‘honorific greeting’ of each village. These ‘honorific greetings’ are important in Samoan custom as they may spell out the rankings of major matai ‘chiefly’ titles in a village. Members of the LMS were hardly unbiased and objective observers. From the time its first missionaries arrived, the LMS had been firmly in the camp of the chief Mālietoa. Hence, Tupua Tamasese contended that the honorific greetings recorded by the LMS show a marked bias toward the Mālietoa line.

The German ethnographer, geographer and medical doctor Augustin Krämer wrote a massive two-volume treatise on all things Samoan in 1901 that has become the foundation for most work on Samoan ethnography. However, Tupua Tamasese (1994) pointed out that Krämer was in the service of the German government, which controlled Sāmoa at that time and vigorously supported the high chief Mataʻāfa, a rival of Mālietoa.

Tupua Tamasese (1994) argued that the influence of outside forces becomes evident in many of the genealogies and legends recorded by Krämer and the missionaries. He claims that the LMS missionaries altered what they recorded to favour the Mālietoa line while Krämer did the same to favour the Mataʻāfa line. Later writers, including the present authors, repeat the stories these early writers recorded. This repetition serves to make the stories appear to be some sort of unbiased standard when, in reality, they may be a reflection of the internal political machinations of both the outsiders that originally recorded them and the indigenous informants that offered them.

These issues of accuracy and authenticity are very real concerns when using oral traditions to investigate history. Indeed, any perusal of the literature on Samoan oral traditions presents the reader with multiple versions of any one story. However, our hope is that the evidence presented here reflects a larger historical pattern. We analysed over 200 published legends, multiple genealogies and personal interviews. The evidence from Samoan oral traditions presented here appears to be clear both in the strength of Sāmoa’s connection to Tonga and Fiji and the weakness of its connection to East Polynesia. It is our second conclusion (practical connection to Tonga versus mythical connection to Fiji) that makes the kind of inferential leap of faith that is most susceptible to the nuanced altering of oral traditions described above.

**CREATION LEGENDS**

The roles of Tonga and Fiji are pronounced in Samoan oral traditions and these connections go back to the very beginning. Fraser (1892, 1897) records numerous Samoan creation stories. Most of these tell of the creation of Fiji
and Tonga at the same time as Sāmoa’s creation. These stories may include such pan-Pacific themes as fishing up Tonga, Fiji and Sāmoa with a magical fishhook or a more unique idea of creation of islands by appeals to the god Tagaloa. But most tell a tale of creation that involved three island groups and not just one. Thus, Samoa’s oral traditions creation are intertwined with those of both Tonga and Fiji.

WEST POLYNESIAN CONNECTIONS AND SAMOAN ORAL TRADITIONS

In order to assess the degree to which Tongan and Fijian connections are expressed in Samoan oral traditions, published Samoan legends were analysed. The following table illustrates the percentage of Samoan legends, as recorded in six published accounts of oral traditions, that specifically state an explicit connection with Tonga or Fiji. An “explicit connection” as defined here requires both a mention of Tonga or Fiji and a physical connection such as “X travelled from Fiji to Sāmoa” or “Y sailed from Sāmoa to Tonga”. Some versions of these legends are repeated in one or more of the accounts used. A summary description of each legend can be found in the appendix. It must be emphasised that there is some overlap of these legends. The 218 legends analysed do not represent 218 distinct stories. There are multiple versions of some stories and the versions can be so different that it is nearly impossible to decide whether we are dealing with one story or several. Instead of trying to define and count distinct stories within these sources, all legends from each source are recorded, regardless of their similarity to legends in another (e.g., the story of Sina and the eel may be recorded in more than one book, and hence it will be recorded here more than once).

Table 1: Samoan oral traditions connecting Sāmoa with Tonga and Fiji.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Total Legends</th>
<th>Tonga Connection (%)</th>
<th>Fiji Connection (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Fitisemanu and Wright 1970)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>16 (20%)</td>
<td>10 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pouesi et al 1994)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3 (17%)</td>
<td>3 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stuebel 1995)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Faatonu 1998)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sio 1984)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>5 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Krämer 1994)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9 (14%)</td>
<td>12 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>36 (17%)</td>
<td>42 (19%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences in the Relationship of Sāmoa-Tonga versus Sāmoa-Fiji

Table 1 above shows that the connections with Tonga and Fiji in Samoan oral traditions appear to be strong. It is clear that pre-contact Samoans were aware of the existence of both Tonga and Fiji. However, there also appear to be some distinct differences in the nature of Sāmoa’s relationship to each. In looking at the Samoan legends in the Appendix, some thematic differences stand out. Legends that involve Tongan interactions tend to focus more on practical matters such as political machinations, marriages and war, while legends that involve Fiji usually deal with more “mythical” themes, such as monsters and the supernatural. Also, it is notable that Fijian interactions occurred mostly in the distant past, e.g., the foundation of a village in a time long ago. Indeed, Turner (1984), in his survey of legends involving the founding of villages found that 18 out of 39 (46%) of these legends involve Fiji, while only 6 out of 39 (15%) involve Tonga.

Table 2 provides a summary of thematic differences in the legends recorded in the appendix of this paper. The numbers refer to the legends given in the appendix.
Figure 2 illustrates the same data in graphic form as a percentage of the 37 total legends in the appendix involving either Tonga or Fiji.

There is, of course, an inherent danger in attempting to categorise and define the theme of a Samoan legend. This leaves room for an enormous amount of subjective bias. There should be legitimate concern over one’s definition of “supernatural” and how pre-contact Samoans might have viewed the thematic description. These interpretations of thematic difference, as subjective as they may be, only serve as an attempt to show a trend in West Polynesian relationships.

SĀMOA AND EAST POLYNESIA

The contrast between West and East Polynesia in Samoan oral traditions is significant. There is strikingly little mention of the distant archipelagos of East Polynesia in any of the sources of Samoan oral history used in this study, particularly in comparison to the mountain of oral traditions that connects Sāmoa with Tonga and Fiji (but see Krämer 1994:537-39 for some possible connections from Manu‘a to the east). Samoan oral traditions are effectively silent on any connections to East Polynesia. This lack of connection is evident in both published Samoan oral traditions and interviews conducted with Samoans recognised as knowledgeable in oral traditions. However, it must be noted that this study is, by no means, exhaustive. It would be useful to consult the oral traditions of Manu‘a, the most easterly Samoan island group, to look for links to the east. However, there are many more oral traditions published from the more western islands of Sāmoa than from Manu‘a. It should also be noted that we limit our analysis to mostly published material; yet there are far more Samoan oral traditions kept only in living memory than published in any book or journal.

The Cook Islands (the nearest eastern archipelago to Sāmoa) may be an exception for the legendary silence of East Polynesia. There is an oral tradition, from at least one source, linking Sāmoa and Rarotonga, which features a Samoan chief, ‘Ali‘a, reputed to be Karika, a founding chief of Rarotonga (Stair 1895:101-108). However, Stair appears to have drawn this account more from Cook Island than Samoan oral traditions. There have been clear archaeological connections found between Sāmoa and the Cook Islands (Allen 1996, Allen and Johnson 1997, J. Clark et al. 1997, Walter and Sheppard 1996), but these connections are far less extensive than those in the Sāmoa-Tonga-Fiji interaction sphere. Perhaps the Cook Islands served an intermediary role between east and west, in the same way (but to a lesser extent) that Tonga may have served an intermediary role in West Polynesia, as we shall see.
GENEALOGIES

We are your friends, your sons and daughters. You know that Tonga chiefs are chiefs in Samoa, and Samoa chiefs are chiefs in Tonga.” - Samoan orator speaking to Tongan chiefs in the mid 19th century (quoted in Gunson 1993:176).

The genealogies of West Polynesia show extensive interconnection but, upon examination, there is clearly a greater genealogical connection seen between Sāmoa and Tonga than between Sāmoa and Fiji, suggesting a more practical and possibly more continuous relationship between the former. (Henceforth, following Samoan usage, the paramount chief of Tonga will be referred to Tuitoga [Tu'i Tonga in Tongan] and the paramount chief of Fiji [Fiti in Samoan] as Tuifiti.)

In Polynesia, marriage partners of rank were often sought outside of one’s own borders. A number of cultural reasons have been given for this practice. There was often, especially in Tonga, an idea that the body of a high chief is taboo (Kaeppler 1978). This would preclude Tongans from touching the body of the Tuitoga. However, this taboo was not applicable to non-Tongans. For example, in former times, only a Samoan or Fijian could cut the hair of the Tuitoga as no Tongan was allowed to touch the head of the king (Gunson 1997). This made the importation of foreign workers, slaves and spouses advantageous, a niche that early Europeans in Tonga came to quickly fill (see Martin 1981, Vason 1973).

Another factor at work in foreign spouse selection is the idea held in Tonga and to a lesser extent in Sāmoa that sisters are of inherent higher rank than are their brothers. In this logic, the sister of the Tuitoga would, theoretically, outrank him (Kaeppler 1978). However, this ranking is more about social prestige and deference than political authority and power. A problem might arise, however, if the sister of the Tuitoga married a high-ranking, politically powerful Tongan man. Such a union might produce offspring possessing both more prestige and more political power than the actual paramount. In the cultural logic such an imbalance could lead to war. In order to avoid this, high-ranking Tongans, Samoans and Fijians have traditionally exchanged spouses. If the sister of the Tuitoga married a high-ranking Samoan, their offspring would not be in direct competition with either the Tongan or Samoan paramount lines for power and prestige solely by nature of their birth (although such offspring may choose to seek power and prestige later on). This would be considered a “safe” marriage politically (Kaeppler 1978).

Another reason for acquiring a foreign spouse is simple avoidance of incest. In Sāmoa, the four tamāliʻi ‘noble’ families (Mālietoa, Tupua Tamasese,
Tuimaleali‘ifano and Matā‘afa) are closely related (Krämer 1994). It may be quite difficult to arrange a marriage between these families without breaking the strict incest prohibitions of Samoan culture (Kaeppler 1978). In such a situation a marriage to a foreigner might be ideal.

As we present the genealogies it is important to notice both the basic interconnectivity of the whole of West Polynesia, but also the stronger specific genealogical connection of Sāmoa and Tonga.

Salamāsina

Salamāsina is the most renown member of Samoan royalty remembered in oral traditions. She was the first person to hold all four pāpā ‘highest titles’ of Sāmoa and became known as its first “queen” (Meleisea 1987). Through her, most of the highest titles of Sāmoa are connected to this day, making her a central figure in the history of Sāmoa.

The genealogy of Salamāsina is important in understanding early connections in West Polynesia; she was able to receive her paramount status precisely because of her genealogical connections to Tonga and Fiji, and even ‘Uvea (Wallis Island). The abbreviated genealogy of Salamāsina presented below is taken mainly from Krämer (1994) and Schoeffel’s (1987) synthesis of many sources.

Figure 3. Abbreviated genealogy of Salamāsina, modified from Schoeffel (1987).
The exact years at which she lived is open to question (Gunson 1997, Krämer 1994, Turner 1984), but most genealogies place her birth around the late 15th century. Her heritage can be traced through three distinct lines. These lines are of Tongan, Fijian and Samoan royalty. Her ancestry is discussed below in a simplified genealogical description (following Fig. 3), in order to show the connections in West Polynesia. This account of Salamä sina’s genealogy is taken from multiple sources (Krämer 1994, Meleisea 1987, Schoeffel 1987, Turner 1984).

Salamä sina and Tonga.
Tuitoga had a daughter named Fitimaupaloga who travelled to Sämoa in search of a husband. While in Sämoa, she met a man named Sämoanagalo (see Appendix: Legend 35 “The Forgotten Boy”). They married, lived in Tonga and produced a son named Sänalala. While out fishing one day, Sänalala was blown by a strong wind and landed at the village of Säfata in Sämoa. He settled in Säfata and eventually married Gasoloaiaolelagi. They had two daughters, Le’atogaugatuitoga (to be discussed below) and Vaetamasoa. Vaetamasoa married a high chief of Sämoa named Tuiä’ana and bore a son, Tamalelagi. This boy was kidnapped and brought to Leulumoegam, where the Tuiä’ana title was bestowed upon him and he married a daughter of a Tuitoga, named Vaetoeifaga. Salamä sina was the daughter of Tamalelagi and Vaetoesifaga.

Salamä sina and Fiji.
Tuifiti was a king of Fiji who was given land in Sämoa in return for services offered to Mälietoa in wartime. He founded the village of Poutasi (see Appendix: Legend 22 “Falealili”). He married a Samoan woman and had a daughter named Totogatä. Totogatä married Mälietoa La’auli, who was the great-grandson of Mälietoa Sävea, the first of the Mälietoa line (see Appendix: Legend 33 “Mälie Toa, Mälie Tau”). They had a daughter named Gasoloaiaolelagi. As has been stated above, Gasoloaiaolelagi married Sänalala (the grandson of Tuitoga) in Generation B of Figure 3. As already mentioned, they gave birth to Vaetamasoa, the grandmother of Salamä sina.

Salamä sina and ‘Uvea.
The final line of progenitors of Salamä sina starts with Säveasi‘uleo, a half-man, half-demon creature who guarded the entrance to Pulotu, the Samoan Afterworld. Säveasi‘uleo married a woman named Tilafaigä who, along with her twin sister Taemä, was said to have swum to Fiji and introduced tattooing to Sämoa (see Appendix: Legend 18, for an alternative version).
Sāveasi‘uleo and Tilafaigā gave birth to the Samoan war god, Nafānua. In the Nafānua line, after several generations, there appeared a woman named Leutogi. Leutogi was kidnapped by Tuitoga and taken to Tonga where she was eventually sentenced to death. However, she escaped with the help of bats (see Appendix: Legend 31) and was marooned on a deserted island. She was saved from this island by the king of U‘ea (‘Uvea or Wallis Island) and taken back to Sāmoa. They married and had a son named Tonumaipe‘a. Tonumaipe‘a married Le‘atogaugatuitoga (daughter of Sānalala and Gasoloaiolaolelagi) in Generation C of Figure 3. They had a daughter named So‘oa‘emalelagi. So‘oa‘emalelagi eventually adopted the daughter of her mother’s sister’s son, who was Salamāsina.

The genealogy of Salamāsina offers a glimpse into the tangled genealogical lines of West Polynesia. To sum up the oral traditions presented above:

- Vaetoeifaga (Salamāsina’s mother) was the daughter of the Tuitoga.
- Tamalelagi (Salamāsina’s father) was the great-great-grandson of both the Tuitoga and Tuifiti.
- So‘oa‘emalelagi (the woman who adopted Salamāsina) was, by her mother’s line, the great-great-granddaughter of both the Tuitoga and Tuifiti, while on her father’s side, she was the granddaughter of the King of ‘Uvea who saved his bride from the Tuitoga.

**Tu‘i Kanokupolu**

The current King of Tonga, Taufa‘ahau Tupou IV, is the 22nd in the Tu‘i Kanokupolu line. This royal family line of Tonga was founded in a direct connection to Sāmoa. In the middle part of the 17th century, the Tu‘i Ha’a Takalaua (a line of ruling chiefs that had split from the Tu‘i Tonga six generations earlier) married a Samoan woman named Limapō from Sāfata on ‘Upolu. As a part of her wedding dowry, Limapō brought with her to Tonga an exquisite Samoan fine mat she named “Maneafaiga’a”. Limapō and Takalaua had a son named Ngata who became a very powerful chief and eventually split from the Tu‘i Ha’a Takalaua line to create a new line of chiefs in Tonga. Ngata was often called in Tongan kano kupolu ‘flesh of ‘Upolu’ in honour of the island his mother came from. The new line of chiefs was called the Tu‘i Kanokupolu. At his investiture ceremony, Ngata wore the Samoan fine mat, Maneafaiga’a, which his mother had brought with her. The present King of Tonga at his investiture ceremony in 1967, 22 generations later, was presented with this same Samoan fine mat, Maneafaiga’a. Both the fine mat and the name of his title show a direct link to Sāmoa (Kaeppler 1999).
Tongan and Samoan Intermarriages

Krämer (1994, I:648) offers a genealogical survey of marriage patterns between the Tuitoga line and various Samoan families. The last ruler in the Tuitoga line (Laufilitoga) died in 1865 (Collocott 1924). The generation numbers below represent generations removed from Laufilitoga (listed as “GFL”) and hence generations since 1865.

20 GFL — Tuitoga Tamatou’s daughter, Laufafa, marries the Samoan Tupa’imatuna to give rise to many families of Savai’i.

18 GFL — Tuitoga Talakaifaiki (the Tongan king from Legend 33, “Mālie Toa, Mālie Tau”) produces a son, Poluleuligaga, with a Samoan woman who is then adopted by Mālietoafaiga, a notorious cannibal chief of Sāmoa.

16 GFL — Tuitoga Tuionu’ulava sends his two daughters to Sāmoa to marry into the Mālietoa family.

15 GFL — Tuitoga Tafueikimeimua travels to Sāmoa to marry a girl from Sāfata whose ancestors would become part of the Tuiā’ana line.

13 GFL — Tuitoga Faisautele marries the Samoan girl, Vainu’ulasi, a union that gives rise to many families in Fagaloa.

11 GFL — Tuitoga Puipuifatu comes to reside in Sāmoa and takes a Samoan wife from Palauli. He leaves the chiefly title, Puipuifatu, in Palauli where it resides to this day.

9 GFL — Tuitoga Tupoufei’a’s daughter, Oloitoa, marries into the Tagaloa family on Savai’i.

8 GFL — Tuitoga Uluakimatata marries Sapioamoa of the Mālietoa line.

Here we note a very regular pattern of intermarriage between the Tuitoga line and families of Sāmoa. In the span of 12 generations of the Tuitoga family, at least nine intermarriages are recorded. Each of these weddings would have required the ceremonial events befitting the Tuitoga: the voyaging to and fro of relatives and travelling parties, bringing with them not only fine mats (‘ie tōga) from Sāmoa and barkcloth (ngatu) from Tonga, but also ideas and language (see Martin 1981:109-11 for an account of such a wedding ceremony).

Fijians do appear in the Samoan genealogies, as Krämer (1994) and Tuimaleali’ifano (1990) have shown. However, Fijian genealogical influence is far outweighed by that of Tonga. As Kaeppler (1978:249) remarks on her research on West Polynesian genealogies: “Samoans I have consulted could remember a number of historic Samoan/Tongan marriages, but had difficulty thinking of any Samoan/Fijian marriages.”
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The Tongan War

The single most written about event in the pre-contact relationship between Tonga and Sāmoa is the Tongan War. During this period, it is said that Tonga established some kind of control over Sāmoa. Most sources concur that this war took place in the 13th-14th century (Ella 1899, Faatōnu 1998, Krämer 1994, Meleisea 1987, Stuebel 1995, Turner 1984). Samoan oral traditions record that Tongans launched an invasion of Sāmoa and successfully took control for a time until Tuitoga Talakaifaiki was forced out of Sāmoa by the brothers Tuna and Fata, founders of the Mālietoa line (see Appendix: Legend 33). The genealogies of both the Tuitoga and Mālietoa lines agree almost exactly on the names and generations of the main characters involved in the Tongan War (Collocott 1924, Ella 1899, Krämer 1994). This is fairly strong evidence that some kind of important conflict took place, indicative of the kind of regular and extensive contact that may have existed between these two archipelagos in the past.

TRADE

Not all interaction between Sāmoa, Tonga and Fiji involved warfare and marriage. There are other practical reasons for interconnection. There appears to have been regular trade going on between these archipelagos in pre-contact times.

What Fiji had to Offer

The three principle Fijian trade items of West Polynesia, according to oral legends, were sega ula ‘lory bird feathers’ for decoration of fine mats (‘ie tōga in Sāmoa and kie hingoa in Tonga), sandalwood for production of fragrant oils and the Merbau or vesi (Intsia bijuga) hardwood for canoe manufacture (G. Clark 2002, Kaeppler 1978, Tuimaleali‘ifano 1990).

The archipelagos of West Polynesia have very different geological origins, which have had definite consequences for flora and fauna production on each one of them. Sāmoa is a volcanic shield archipelago; Tonga, an archipelago of raised atolls and volcanic islands; while the main islands of Fiji are of true continental origin, with more complex geological and ecological histories (Kirch and Green 2001). Hence, Fiji is able to support a larger variety of plants and animals than Tonga or Sāmoa. Fiji possesses many different species of colourful birds and exceptionally large hardwoods such as Merbau. These items are scarcely found on the other archipelagos of the region (Davidson 1977, Geraghty 1995, Kaeppler 1978). Fiji marks the eastern boundary of where Merbau hardwood is found in the Pacific. This wood is remarkably strong and trees can grow up to 25m tall, making it well suited for large
canoe manufacture (Smith 1985). The Merbau trade between Tonga and Fiji was extensive and has been well-documented (G. Clark 2002, Haddon and Hornell 1975). In both Fiji and Tonga, the chiefly titles Leha and Lemaki are recognised. In Tonga, they are highly ranked advisors. In Fiji, their kin group is known for their canoe building skill. Both Fijian and Tongan tradition recognise that Leha and Lemaki are descended from the Lei‘ataua Lesā and Lema‘i (Samoan cognates of Leha and Lemaki), chiefly titles of the Samoan island of Manono. On Manono, Lei‘ataua Lesā and Lema‘i were also known as tufuga ‘expert’ canoe makers (Tuimaleali‘ifano 1990). It is this connection with Fiji (and more specifically Fijian hardwood) that could help explain Manono’s prominence throughout Samoan oral history as a strong military power (Meleisea 1987, Turner 1984). Manono is strategically located between the major islands of ‘Upolu and Savai‘i. A direct connection to Tongan canoe design and Fijian hardwood (or perhaps Fijian hardwood via Tongan middlemen), may have allowed Manono to flourish as a formidable Samoan naval shipyard in early times.

**What Sāmoa had to Offer**

In exchange for feathers and wood, Sāmoa and Tonga offered several trade items. Samoan fine mats were highly prized throughout West Polynesia (Buck 1930; Kaeppler 1978, 1999; Tofaeono Tu‘u’u 2000). They were manufactured in Sāmoa, adorned with imported Fijian feathers and distributed throughout the region. An example is the fine mat “Maneafaiga‘a”, which, as described above, is said to have come to Tonga from Sāmoa 22 generations ago and was used in the investiture ceremony of the current King of Tonga in 1967 (Kaeppler 1999). Indeed, many of these heirloom mats exchanged in pre-contact times are reported to be still in the possession of families in Tonga and Sāmoa (Kaeppler 1999).

Sāmoa (and particularly the island of Tutuila) appears to have supplied basalt adzes in significant numbers, to the other archipelagos of the region (Best *et al.* 1992, G. Clark 2002, J. Clark *et al.* 1997; also see below).

**What Tonga had to Offer**

Tonga offered goods and services to both Fiji and Sāmoa. Fijian and Tongan traditions record that Tongans were often the source for highly prized whale-teeth (*tabua*) in Fiji (Aswani and Graves 1998, Martin 1981). Tongan bark cloth seemed to have been as prized throughout the region just as Samoan fine mats were (Kaeppler 1978). In addition to trade objects, Tongans had a long tradition of offering their services as warriors in intra-archipelago warfare (Aswani and Graves 1998, Geraghty 1995). As discussed below, Tonga also appears to play an important intermediary role in the movement of goods and ideas through West Polynesia.
SÄMOA-TONGA-FIJI RELATIONS IN EARLY HISTORIC TIMES

Connections between Sämoa, Tonga and Fiji were extensive in early historic times. An examination of these historic connections may well offer a glimpse into the similar interconnected world of pre-contact West Polynesia.

The relationship between Sämoa and Tonga in the last five centuries has been governed by the tulätala compact—a kind of non-aggression pact that refers to the promise that the Tuitoga called out never to invade Sämoa, after being expelled from Sämoa by Tuna and Fata (see Appendix: Legend 33). Samoan oral traditions analysed in this study do not record any large-scale hostilities with Tonga after this compact. However, there is some historical evidence that the tulätala era has been less than one of perfect peace between the two. In Tonga, Captain James Cook was told in 1777 that Tongans had conquered Sämoa and the Tongan royal family of Paulahö lived there (Beaglehole 1999). Various whalers and traders reported that Samoans acted as mercenaries for intra-Tongan wars (Gunson 1993). An English traveler claimed that a fleet of ten Tongan war canoes sacked the village of Falealupo on Savai‘i in 1827 (Boddam-Whetham 1876). This post tulätala-compact conflict may be indicative of previous pre-contact Tonga-Sämoa tension.

William Mariner, a castaway in Tonga from 1806 to 1810, recorded many interactions he observed between Tonga and Sämoa. One of the more humorous incidents involved a fleet of six Samoan canoes carrying about 300 people that arrived in Tonga delivering the bride for the Tuitoga’s son. The Samoans participated in the wedding festivities, which involved club fighting for sport. Mariner observed that there was some confusion between the two parties as to whether they would follow the Samoan or Tongan rules for club fighting. As Mariner reported,

…the difference of which is that the Hamoa custom allows a man to beat his antagonist after he is knocked down, as long as he perceives signs of motion; while the Tonga mode only allows him to flourish his club over his fallen foe and the fight is ended (Martin 1981:110).

This kind of interaction and exchange of ideas between large groups of Samoans and Tongans may be representative of the kinds of festivities that took place at the numerous Tongan/Samoan weddings recorded both historically and in oral traditions (see the many recorded marriages of the Tuitoga and Samoan families listed above).

A good historically documented example of non-violent Tonga-Sämoa connection is the introduction of Wesleyan Methodism (known in Sämoa as lotu Toga ‘Tongan religion’) to Sämoa. Methodism was first introduced to Tonga in 1797, but did not take hold until 1826 (Meleisea 1987). Since this introduction, Tonga has developed a reputation as one of the most Methodist
countries on Earth, with over 60 percent of the current population belonging to the faith (Fletcher 2001). Credit for the introduction of Methodism to Sāmoa is often given to a chief from ‘Upolu named Tuioneula. Tuioneula was connected to the Tu’i Kanokupolu of Tonga through his mother and resided in Tongatapu for a time as a guest of Tongan royalty. During this time he converted to Methodism. He appears to have come back to Sāmoa in 1829 and is credited with being the first Samoan to begin converting his countrymen to Methodism (Gunson 1993). His familial connections to Tonga and his travels to and from the islands offer an example of the ease of movement between Tonga and Sāmoa in early historic times.

Another early convert to Methodism was Sālata. Sālata was the Samoan wife of Taufa’ahau of Ha’apai in Tonga. She was also the daughter of Matetau of Manono and returned there from Tonga in 1832. On her way from Tonga to Manono, she met the legendary missionary John Williams on the island of Niuatoputapu (Gunson 1993). Williams glowingly described the 20 year-old Sālata and then mentions his elation that a canoe with 100-150 converted heathens was destined for Sāmoa (Moyle 1984). It is perhaps very telling that Williams did not express particular surprise at a canoe large enough to hold 150 people voyaging between Tonga and Sāmoa, suggesting that such voyages were not unusual. Indeed, in 1830, Williams recorded that seven large Tongan canoes had recently visited Sāmoa in order to collect fine mats. Four of these had returned to Tonga, while the other three were still in Sāmoa awaiting favourable wind to return. Williams went on to mention seeing a fleet of some ten voyaging canoes, carrying around 400 men, in Ha’apai preparing for an inter-island journey (Moyle 1984). Lafond de Lurcy also reported regular visits to Sāmoa by Tongan canoes in 1831 (see Tcherkézoff 2004). In 1616, two Dutch ships, the Eendracht and the Hoorn, recorded seeing two large double-hulled Tongan canoes headed north, presumably for Sāmoa (Kirch 1988).

One tangible result of these early historic Tonga-Sāmoa contacts may be the mysterious blue beads that have been reported as being so highly valued by Samoans at early contact. Roggeveen, the first known European to sight Sāmoa in 1721, reported a young woman at Manu‘a wearing a “string of oblong blue beads” (Sharp 1970:151). These seemingly out-of-place glass beads were reported as being a most desired trade good in Sāmoa by La Perouse in 1787 (Dunmore 1995), Edwards in 1791 (Thompson 1915), von Kutzebue in 1824 (von Kutzebue 1967), and whalers Macy and Plasket in 1824 and 1826 respectively (Richards 1992). Indeed, nearly all European ships that put in at Sāmoa until the 1830s remark on the beads as a kind of curious currency (Tcherkézoff 2004). From where did Samoans obtain European glass beads to begin with? The Roggeveen Expedition reported
being told by Samoans that the beads came from Tonga. Such beads were originally given to Tongans by LeMaire and Schouten in 1616 and by Tasman in 1643 (Tcherkézoff 2004). It would appear that the beads reported by Roggeveen had their origin in the Dutch expeditions of the 17th century and later made their way from Tonga to Sāmoa. Here we may have a historically documented example of a European-manufactured object introduced to Sāmoa by Tongans and preceding European arrival there. We may speculate that other European introductions reached Sāmoa by way of Tonga, such as European diseases with their potentially devastating impacts.

These examples show that in historic times, contact between Tonga and Sāmoa by means of traditional canoes is well-documented. But again, there does not appear to be as extensive a network of early historic connections between Fiji and Sāmoa. There is also no record of significant interaction between Sāmoa and the more distant archipelagos of East Polynesia in early historic accounts, although Williams reported a Raʻivavae man living in Manu‘a in 1832 who claimed to be the sole survivor from a canoe blown off course from Tubuai (Moyle 1984:99-100).

ARCHAEOLOGY

Archaeological evidence for human occupation of West Polynesia begins when people using Lapita-style pottery first came from the west to settle in Fiji, Tonga and Sāmoa at roughly the same time nearly 3000 years ago (Kirch 1997). It is important to remember that some of the most important trade goods in West Polynesia, such as fine mats, barkcloth and hardwood, are not preserved in the archaeological record, and thus are absent from the archaeological inventory. Still, we have evidence of inter-archipelago interaction through pottery, volcanic glass and basalt adze exchange.

Pottery

The early ceramic histories of Sāmoa, Tonga and Fiji are similar. Ceramic sequences begin with an elaborate set of finely decorated vessel forms. Decorated vessel forms rapidly disappear after initial colonisation leaving a relatively simplified plainware. Finally, pottery manufacture was abandoned in Tonga and Sāmoa, but continued in Fiji. Temper analysis has shown most pots made in Tonga, Fiji and Sāmoa were of local origin. However, the style of pottery in these areas is very similar (Dickinson and Shutler 2000). This suggests that, while there may have been little physical trade of pottery between archipelagos, ideas about pottery styles may have travelled freely and contributed to a relatively uniform style sequence between the archipelagos (Burley and J. Clark 2003, Davidson 1977).
Still, there is some petrographic evidence of pottery being transported between islands of West Polynesia. Petrographic analysis of ceramics found in Tonga have identified sherds of Fijian origin (Dye and Dickinson 1996); analysis of 3000 year-old ceramics from the Mulifanua site on ‘Upolu indicate a Tongan or Fijian origin (J. Clark et al. 1997); a Fijian origin has also been suggested for ceramics found in Tuvalu (Dickinson et al. 1990). Further afield, Dickinson and Shutler (1974) reported a small number of ceramic sherds found in the Marquesas to be of Fijian origin. This is noteworthy because it remains the only evidence from which a link between West Polynesia and far East Polynesia may be inferred.

Volcanic glass

Volcanic glass or obsidian for making sharp cutting tools has long been used and traded in the Pacific. One known source of volcanic glass in Polynesia is on the island of Tafahi in Tonga, but it remains poorly documented (J. Clark and Wright 1995). Volcanic glass has also been found in abundance at one site on Tutuila, but is generally rare in West Polynesia, and this cache appears to represent an unidentified source on Tutuila (J. Clark and Wright 1995, Sheppard et al. 1989). Small amounts of volcanic glass have been found in archaeological deposits on ‘Upolu, Niuatoputapu, Lakeba (Lau Group) and Futuna (J. Clark and Wright 1995). Unless local sources are discovered for all these volcanic glass-yielding sites, we can assume that these artefacts have moved around West Polynesia in the past.

Basalt

Basalt was the primary rock for making adzes and other tools in Polynesia. The quality of this volcanic rock can differ dramatically from island to island, depending on their geologic character. Fine-grained basalt is predictably worked, durable, and can be sharpened to a fine edge (Best et al. 1992). Sources of good quality fine-grained basalt are rare in West Polynesia, but the geologic history of the island of Tutuila in Sāmoa has produced basalt of exceptional quality (Weisler and Kirch 1996).

Because basalt sources vary significantly in their chemical composition, recent work has shown the provenance of artefacts can be established (Weisler 1998). Basalt provenance studies thus offer a method of establishing direct empirical evidence of contact between islands. In the past, archaeologists have noted the presence of adzes in Fiji and Tonga that appear to be of a Samoan type (Best et al. 1992, Birks and Birks 1968, Green 1974).

Basalt compositional analyses have demonstrated that basalt from Tutuila appears on many widely separated islands of the Central Pacific. J. Clark et al. (1997) reported many basalt quarry sites in Tutuila. The oldest quarry
use dates from around 2000 years ago, and this quarry was in continual use until the recent introduction of metal. The Tataga-matau site consists of several quarry areas, each measuring several thousand square metres. Other quarries have been identified at Fagasā, Alega, Asiapa, La‘aeno, Faga’iitua and Lau‘agaе on Tutuila (J. Clark et al. 1997). The number and size of these quarries suggest that Tutuila was an adze manufacturing centre, which produced basalt tools exported all over the region.

These data confirm that stone from Tutuila found its way to distant islands of the region. Whether this represents a direct connection or down-the-line transfer of tools is a question that cannot currently be answered. Here again, it is significant that basalt from Tutuila appears in many islands of the area, including such distant locations as the Solomons, Cook Islands and the Phoenix Group, but still does not make an appearance in the more distant parts of East Polynesia.

**Monumental architecture**

Foreign influence can be seen in Samoan monumental architecture, particularly in *tia seu* ‘hunting or star mounds’, and, as some suggest, in fortifications (*’olo*). Star mounds are a feature unique to Sāmoa. These are mounds of earth and piled rock that have a circular or square shape and between one and 11 projecting arms that give the appearance of a cog or star (Herdrich 1991). When inquiring about the purpose of these ancient mounds, Shawn Barnes heard many different answers from Samoan people he asked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Age (years bp)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taʻū (Sāmoa)</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>Best <em>et al.</em> (1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Upolu (Sāmoa)</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Best <em>et al.</em> (1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>J. Clark <em>et al.</em> (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokelau</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>J. Clark <em>et al.</em> (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>J. Clark <em>et al.</em> (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manra (Phoenix)</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>DiPiazza &amp; Pearthtree (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>J. Clark <em>et al.</em> (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>J. Clark <em>et al.</em> (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taumoko (Solomons)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>J. Clark <em>et al.</em> (1997)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Basalt artefacts sourced to Tutuila in Sāmoa
Explanations of former use provided by informants include foundations for the chiefs’ houses, shrines for family-god worship, lookout posts to watch for invading fleets, platforms built by Samoan slave labour under Tongan control, and even shelter from bombing raids during the Second World War. However, the most common explanation, both in the literature and from personal inquiries, is that ‘star mounds’ were used in the ancient sport of pigeon snaring (Herdrich 1991, Krämer 1994, Turner 1984). Samoan oral traditions contain many references to pigeon hunting and the ceremonial chiefly language (*fa’amatai*) of Sāmoa uses many pigeon hunting metaphors, suggesting a sport of great importance in the past (see Schultz 1953). Tonga also has a tradition of pigeon snaring. Although Tonga has no identified star-shaped mounds, circular or square mounds of earth and rock, associated with pigeon hunting, have been reported (Herdrich 1991).

Samoan ‘olo’forts’ are defensive structures often carved out of a hill. Best (1992) claims that Samoan and Fijian forts are very similar in their basic design, age and use, although constructed with different available geologic materials. Green (2002), however, asserts that Samoan forts lacked a typical ring-ditch shape, are of relatively recent age, and served as temporary refuges. He argues that Samoan forts are more closely related in form and function to Tongan forts. Here again, if these comparisons are homologous and not based on similar functions, we see a stronger connection to Tonga than Fiji.

**CONCLUSIONS**

*Compelling Evidence of Pre-contact Interactions in West Polynesia.*

We have established that Tonga or Fiji is mentioned in almost 40 percent of the Samoan legends we analysed. At the very least, this demonstrates that pre-contact Samoans were well aware of the existence of Tonga and Fiji. Drawing on European accounts, we have documented regular canoe voyaging between these archipelagos (or at least through Tongan as an intermediary) in early historic times. We have also presented evidence that trade of goods and exchange of spouses was well established by the time of European contact. Finally, archaeology provides us with empirical evidence of connections between Sāmoa and West Polynesia through provenance analyses of basalt artefacts, which strongly supports the existence of regular inter-archipelago voyaging and communication in West Polynesia.

*The nature of Sāmoa’s pre-contact interaction with Tonga may have been different than with Fiji.*

Granting that this conclusion is particularly susceptible to subjective bias in or misunderstanding of Samoan oral traditions by foreigners, the evidence is still quite compelling.
Table 2 and Figure 2 show that in Samoan oral traditions Tonga interaction appears more practical, continuous and direct, while Fiji contacts appear more distant and mythical. In many Samoan oral traditions, various kings of Tonga are specifically named, such as the kings of Tonga named in Krämer’s list of Tuitoga marriages to Samoans or Tuitoga Talakaifaki of the Tongan War (see Appendix: Legend 33). By contrast, the king of Fiji (if there ever was one “king” of all Fiji) is always referred to in Samoan oral traditions as simply Tuifiti with no other specific or personal names. Samoan oral traditions also record the names of specific islands of Tonga such as Niuafo’ou, where Fe’etane’s parents fled (see Appendix: Legend 34), or the Vava’u group, where Sāmoanagalo was taken (see Appendix: Legend 35). By contrast, the entire Fijian archipelago is simply referred to as Fiti in Samoan oral traditions, with no specific Fijian islands named.

What could account for this difference in the role of Tonga and Fiji in Samoan oral traditions? Perhaps the Samoan connections to Fiji have always been limited. Perhaps there was an older connection that has been supplanted in more recent pre-contact times by Tonga. In reviewing the Samoan oral traditions of Fiji, one gets the sense that they tell of Fiji as if they were hearing about Fiji second-hand from someone else. Possibly much of the Fijian presence in Samoan oral traditions comes through Tonga as an intermediary. Indeed, extensive direct contacts have been shown in pre-contact and historic times between Tonga and Fiji, especially the easternmost Lau group in Fiji (reviewed in G. Clark 2002), but very little evidence for direct contact between Samoan and Fiji has been found in our study. In the simplest terms, geography—along with distance and configuration of islands—places Tonga in the middle of interactions between the main archipelagos of the region. The effects of geography alone are shown in models of connectivity (Hunt 1988).

The notion of Tonga as an intermediary in both trade and cultural diffusion is not a new one and is usually described as the “Tongan maritime empire”, asserting Tongan domination (whether in actual political power or through cultural or economic influence) of nearby archipelagoes (Geraghty 1994, Gunson 1993, Kaeppler 1978, Peterson 2000). This extended “imperial” influence in the region could facilitate the movement of goods and ideas to islands that have little or no direct contact. Aswani and Graves (1998) most convincingly portray the environmental circumstances that favour an outward-looking and expansionist Tonga, which could have provided information about Fiji to Sāmoa. Indeed, when discussing Samoan views on cannibalism, whaler J.W. Osborn wrote in 1835: “They often have heard of the Fegees from the Tongataboo people, who visit here often. They cannot bear the idea of being thought cannibals” (Richards 1992:45). The influence of Tonga as a
second-hand source of knowledge about Fiji and a lack of direct Samoa-Fiji contact may account for the mystical and far-removed role that Fiji tends to play in Samoan oral traditions.

Archaeological evidence has long supported the idea that Samoa-Tonga-Fiji were most extensively connected at the earliest colonisation times about 3000 years ago, followed by a waning of interconnections as archipelagos became more independent and self-sufficient (Burley and J. Clark 2003, Green 1996, Kirch 1978). While archaeological evidence offers insight over extended periods of time, the use of oral traditions and early historic evidence allows us to better characterise, even if not so concretely, the more recent relationship between Sāmoa and its neighbours. If Sāmoa-Tonga-Fiji were all closely interconnected during their initial colonisation phase, it appears that Samoa has maintained closer ties to Tonga, as recorded by oral traditions and early historic evidence.

Little evidence of direct pre-contact interaction between Sāmoa and far East Polynesia.

The main focus of this paper has been the interconnectivity of West Polynesia.

However, it is striking how little connectivity Sāmoa shows with the more distant archipelagos of East Polynesia. This is not to discount any possibility of interaction between these places. Indeed, basalt artefacts sourced to both Samoa and the Society Islands (Sheppard et al. 1997) have been excavated in the Cooks, suggesting a possible intermediary role similar to that described above for Tonga. However, that far East Polynesia is not remembered in Samoan oral traditions (or at least the oral traditions analysed in this study), while Tonga and Fiji are mentioned again and again, strongly suggests that any contact with East Polynesia was much less extensive. Indeed, it appears from oral traditions that the existence of the more remote parts of East Polynesia may not have been recalled in pre-contact Sāmoa. This may not be especially surprising since the distances between East and West Polynesia are substantially greater than within West Polynesia. As Irwin (1992) shows, this results in much smaller voyaging target angles from West Polynesia to the far away islands of East Polynesia (6° from Sāmoa to the Societies as compared with 55° from Tonga to Sāmoa), making voyaging significantly more difficult than within West Polynesia.

Perhaps the lack of Samoan oral traditions involving far East Polynesia is a relatively recent phenomenon and represents a contraction of the voyaging sphere between West and East Polynesia, while the Tonga-Sāmoa-Fiji voyaging sphere remained active until historic times. In any case, our present
study has focused only on Samoan oral traditions. It would be interesting to investigate this question from the perspective of East Polynesian oral traditions. Indeed, on the map that Tupaia, a Tahitian navigator and priest, helped to draw for Captain Cook in 1769, one can find both Manu’a and Savai‘i listed (Dening 1962).

Finally, our study has tried to demonstrate that evidence from oral traditions can be valuable tool in attaining a greater understanding of the picture that archaeological, linguistic and early historic evidence paints of past interactions within Oceania.

APPENDIX: SAMOAN ORAL TRADITIONS RELATING TO TONGA AND FIJI

Note: These are abbreviated summaries of previously published legends. There are usually multiple versions of each story—and these are referenced—but the summaries below represent only one version of each.

SĀMOA—FIJI (LEGENDS 1-25)

1. Maluafiti’s Shadow (Pouesi et al. 1994)

A Samoan couple, Taifofau and Ogafau very much wished to have a little boy. They were able to have two children but they were both girls. The girls, Sinaleu‘una and Sinaeteva, learned of their parents’ desire to have a boy and ran away from home in shame. Taifofau and Ogafau eventually did have a boy and named him Maluafiti.

Some years later Maluafiti learned of his run-away sisters and ventured out to find them. After many days travel he found Sinaleau‘una and Sinaeteva. The three siblings were very glad to finally be all together. In the evening, Maluafiti told his sisters that he must go back home. The sisters knew they would miss him very much so they captured his shadow in a bamboo bottle so they could always be reminded of him.

Some time later, the sisters heard there was a beautiful girl living in Fiji named Sina. They decided that the best gift they could give Maluafiti was a wife. They travelled to Fiji and met with Sina. They explained that they had a very handsome brother that would make a wonderful husband. However, Sina was suspicious because Maluafiti did not come himself. Sina rejected the sisters’ offer and sent them away rudely. Later that night the sisters went to Sina’s bathing pool and let Maluafiti’s reflection out of its bamboo bottle. Sina saw the shadow on the water and immediately fell in love but did not know whom the shadow belonged to.

Maluafiti went off to search for his sisters again. He went to Fiji where he found them near Sina’s house. As soon as Maluafiti and his sisters met they threw their arms around each other and were happy to see each other again. Sina came out of her house, saw Maluafiti, and immediately knew it was his shadow that she had seen and fallen in love with. Sina offered herself to Maluafiti, but after hearing how rudely Sina had initially treated his sisters, he rejected her and returned to Sāmoa with his sisters.
2. Sina’s Pillow (Pouesi et al. 1994, Tuimalealifano 1990)

Futi and Sao lived in Fiji with their daughter Sina but one day decided to go live in Sāmoa. They packed up all their valuables and left Fiji. When they reached Savai‘i, it was already dusk, so they decided to sleep on the beach for that night. In the morning they climbed the mountain ‘Olo’olo to build their new home. However, they realised that they had forgotten Sina’s pillow of soft mats at the beach. Inside the pillow they had packed a valuable necklace of whale’s teeth. They decided they would have to go get the pillow, but on the first day at their new home, they were too tired. They put the journey off for another day and then another until finally they agreed that they didn’t need the pillow after all.


In the village of Vailele, there lived a man named Faleaseu. One day while he was out pigeon hunting, his daughters Tinupoula and Sina’afaua went to look for him. They searched all the way across ‘Upolu and finally came to Mulifanua where they met a boat that was about to return to Fiji. The Fijians had come to Sāmoa in search of a healer to cure Tuifiti (the king of Fiji) who was ill. The Fijians thought the girls might be healers and took them to Fiji. Along the way, the girls drank some coconuts and filled the shells with seawater.

When they arrived in Fiji, they were presented to Tuifiti who was suffering from stomach pains. The girls gave him the coconuts filled with seawater to drink and he was cured. Tuifiti then told all his other wives to go home and announced that he would marry Tinupoula and Sina’afaua.

They were married and the first-born son was named Suasamiava‘ava. However, the boy soon became ill. He told his mother that if he should die, she should take whatever plant grows from his grave to Sāmoa. The boy died and after he was buried, a strange plant that looked like a human bone was seen growing from his grave. This was the first kava plant and the girls took it back to Sāmoa as the boy had requested.


In Savai‘i, there lived a girl named Sina. Tales of her beauty were famous throughout Sāmoa and even reached Fiji. Tuifiti heard about Sina and wanted to see her beauty for himself. By using magic, Tuifiti changed himself into an eel and swam to Sāmoa.

One day, Sina was swimming in the ocean and saw a small eel. Not knowing it was Tuifiti, she wanted to keep it as a pet. She put the eel in a small bowl and took care of it every day. However, the eel grew too large for the bowl so Sina put it in a spring near her house. Sina continued to take care of the eel until it became too large even for the spring. Sina was now very frightened of the eel so she fled to the next village. However, the eel followed her. She continued fleeing from village to village but the eel followed her each time. She fled to ‘Upolu and the eel continued to chase her. She reached the village of Moata’a. Here the chiefs of the village were having a meeting. Sina entered the meeting house and sat down exhausted in the middle of all
the chiefs. The eel slowly slithered up to the meeting house and finally entered. He then spoke and said that he was really Tuifiti who changed himself into eel to win Sina for his wife. However, the eel explained that he had lost the ability to change himself back into human form and now that he had travelled so far, he was exhausted and would soon die. He then instructed Sina to bury his head after he died. He explained that a very useful tree would grow from it. After the eel died, Sina did as she was instructed and buried his head. From the eel’s head the first coconut tree in Sāmoa grew. To this day, drinking from a coconut is called “kissing the eel” as the drinking hole of the coconut represents the mouth of the eel.

5. How the Sega Got to Fiji (Stuebel 1995)

In the village of Salelologa on Savai’i, there lived Sinainofoa. She was the daughter of the god Tagaloa. Sinainofoa gave birth to a clot of blood, which later turned into a *sega* bird. Sinainofoa later gave birth to a daughter, Sinaalela.

On a visit to Sāmoa, Tuifiti courted and married Sinaalela. While staying in Salelologa, Tuifiti saw the *sega* and wanted to take it back to Fiji. Sinaalela forbid him to do so as it was her brother. But Tuifiti stole the *sega* and brought it back to Fiji where it gave rise to the *sega* that live there now.


[Between the large Samoan islands of ‘Upolu and Savai’i are the two small islands of Manono and Apolima. There are two versions of the story of Manono that involve Fiji but are different enough from each other to warrant two separate listings. The first story relates that Manono is not an island at all, but a huge Fijian war canoe.]

The Fijian, Lautala came to Sāmoa in an enormous warship. Lautala first anchored between Manu’a and Tutuila but found the distance between them too great. He then anchored his ship between Tutuila and ‘Upolu, but again the distance between the islands was too great. Finally he anchored between ‘Upolu and Savai’i and found the distance just right.

Once anchored, Lautala began warring with his neighbours. So many men were killed during the fighting that Lautala had to call a halt (*nono*). The dead were so great that they could not be counted (*mano*). Lautala’s great warship became an island and was named Manono.

7. The Origin of Manono (b) (Turner 1984)

Nono and Sa’uma were Fijian chiefs. They traveled to Sāmoa to find a new home. The Fijian god Tapuivao came with them. When they brought their canoe in between ‘Upolu and Savai’i, Tapuivao vomited up some land that he had eaten in Fiji. He then named the land after Sa’uma and Nono and called it Manono.

8. The Origin of Apolima (Nelson 1925, Turner 1984) [Apolima is the small remnant of a volcanic cone in between Manono and Savai’i. It also has an origin related to Fiji.]

The son of Tuifiti made a dinner for his father one day. He included banana, taro and breadfruit, but no fish. Tuifiti was very angry by this insult so the boy went to spear a fish. Still angered, Tuifiti grabbed the spear and threw at the boy. The boy ran
away to Sāmoa where he settled between Manono and Savai‘i and became an island. The island came to be named apo i le lima meaning ‘poised in hand’ as the spear was held by the boy’s father. This became Apolima.

9. Pili and the Yam of Sina (Fitiseanu and Wright 1970, Henry 1980, Krämer 1994, Tuimaleali’ifano 1990) [Pili is a central character in Samoan legend. It is he who divided ‘Upolu into the political districts Ā‘ana, Ātua and Tuamasaga that are still recognised today. This is the story of his connection to Fiji.]

Tagaloa had four children, the boys Pili, Ma‘oma‘o and Fuialaeo and one girl, Sina. Tuifiti came to Sāmoa and married Sina. Pili changed himself into a small gecko in order to hide in Sina’s pocket and accompany her to Fiji. On the canoe, Tuifiti was hungry and wanted to eat Sina. But Pili whispered into Sina’s ear that there were bananas hidden on the starboard side of the canoe. Sina uncovered the food Pili spoke of and gave it to Tuifiti. Later, Tuifiti again became hungry and wanted to eat Sina. Pili whispered in Sina’s ear that there were some sweet potatoes hidden on the outrigger side of the canoe. Sina found this food and gave it to Tuifiti, satiating him. However, during the canoe journey, Pili fell out of Sina’s pocket and into the water. He crawled onto a piece of driftwood and called for help. Pili’s brothers, Ma‘oma‘o and Fuialaeo heard his cries and turned themselves into birds to rescue him. They found Pili floating on his piece of wood. The brothers wanted to go back to Sāmoa but Pili insisted that they go to Fiji to be with their sister.

When the brothers arrived in Fiji they were too ashamed to show themselves to Sina because they were unable to turn themselves back into human form. They began making a plantation not far from Sina’s house but Sina did not know they were there. Pili planted a yam and turned its stem towards Sina’s house. The yam grew right to Sina’s door. Each day, Sina would cut a little off the yam until she eventually made it all the way to Pili. Now that all the siblings were reunited, they were able to live together and cultivate the plantation the brothers had started.


Fale and Olo were the sons of ‘Ia and Sau, a Samoan couple that lived in Fiji. The Tuifiti decreed that all families had to provide a human sacrifice to him. ‘Ia and Sau were ill and told the boys that when they died, they should not bury the bodies but lay them out on mats and feed coconuts to the maggots that would infest them. They ordered that the boys should offer as a sacrifice to Tuifiti the animal that grows from the maggots.

After ‘Ia and Sau died, the boys did as they were told. From the maggots on their bodies grew the first pig. In time, the pig had a litter. The boys then offered the pig as a sacrifice to Tuifiti. Tuifiti loved the meat of the pig so much that he forbade anyone to take live pigs out of Fiji so that the Fijians could have a monopoly on pork. But Fale and Olo wanted to bring pigs to Sāmoa so they set out to trick Tuifiti. They caught and cooked a large pig and asked Tuifiti if they could bring it to Sāmoa, since it was already dead. Tuifiti allowed them passage, but he did not know that Fale and Olo and placed two live piglets inside the body of the roasted pig to be transported to Sāmoa. This is how the first pigs came to Sāmoa.
11. The Dolphins of Tuifiti (Fitisemanu and Wright 1970)

Tuifiti sailed to Sāmoa and came to rest at the village of Fagasā in Tutuila. When they landed, Tuifiti told his daughter Sina to go and collect water. After a while Tuifiti was ready to leave and asked his crew if Sina had returned. They said that she was already asleep on the boat. But the crew was mistaken. Sina was still on shore collecting water. She was left behind.

Sina came back to the beach to find her father’s boat had left. She wept inconsolably. The Samoan chief Togamana saw her and comforted her. They eventually married. Tuifiti eventually returned to Fagasā. When he saw that his daughter was married he told Togamana that as Sina’s dowry, he would send dolphins to Fagasā every year. Still to this day, dolphins can be seen there at a place called “Sina’s rock”.


There was once a great famine in Fiji. At the same time, Mālietoa had large yam plantation in Sāmoa. One night Mālietoa’s men heard voices in the sky and when the morning came he found that his plantation had been looted. He suspected Fijians and sent his servant Le‘epai to Fiji to question Tuifiti about the matter. Le‘epai reported back that indeed Fijians had stolen the yams, but that there were also certain people in Fiji that had wings and could fly, thus explaining the voices in the sky. Mālietoa was so amazed at this that he did not attempt to retrieve his yams.


Sina was a Samoan girl whose beauty was well known. Both Tuifiti and Tagaloa wanted to marry her. But Sina was only in love with Tuifiti. When Tuifiti came to call on Sina they planned to sail off to Fiji together. Sina’s brother Masefau feared that Tagaloa would try to take his revenge on Sina for jilting him so he hid Tuifiti’s canoe in hopes of protecting her. However, Tuifiti found his canoe and set sail for Fiji with Sina. Tagaloa saw this and, in anger, turned Tuifiti and Sina into stone.


Vaea was a giant who lived in Sāmoa. His reputation of great strength reached Fiji and a group of Fijian brothers went to Sāmoa to test his strength. They took with them their sister Apa‘ula.

The anchored their large double-hulled canoe at Mulinu‘u near Apia and planned to fight Vaea in the morning. However, during the night, Vaea lifted their canoe and placed it in the treetops while the Fijians slept. The next morning the Fijians awoke and, discovering their predicament, they told Vaea they were sorry for their arrogance and if Vaea spared their lives they would offer their sister Apa‘ula to him. Vaea agreed and had sex with Apa‘ula. The brothers then took Apa‘ula back to Fiji. Vaea stood on a stone in ‘Upolu and watched the boat all the way back to Fiji.

Apa‘ula bore a son, but her brothers killed and ate the boy as revenge for their humiliation by Vaea. Apa‘ula went back to Sāmoa to tell Vaea of the death of his son. Vaea had already heard of the death of his son and was so saddened that his body
had turned to stone while his head was still alive. He told Sina to go see his brother Va‘atausili in Savai‘i who would get revenge on the evil brothers.

Apa‘ula traveled to Savai‘i but was surprised to see Va‘atausili who was short and skinny. She told Va‘atausili her story and he reassured her that he would get revenge. He went to go sleep in a magic cave and when he awoke he was a tall, strong man. He went to Fiji and killed Apa‘ula’s brothers.

Eventually, Vaea’s head also turned to stone and he is now Mt. Vaea in Apia.

15. O le Fale o le Fe‘e (Faatonu 1998, Freeman 1944)

Tuifiti had heard stories of the prowess of Samoan soldiers such as Vaea (see Legend 14). He wanted to test the Samoans’ skills so he turned himself into an octopus (or fe‘e) and swam to Sāmoa. He swam up the Vaisagano River at Apia and, using his strong tentacles, he knocked aside boulders along the way.

When the fe‘e came to a spot he liked he decided to build a house. He forced Samoan men to carry large slabs of coral from the sea, seven miles inland to build his house. This house was like a traditional fale but had stone posts instead of wooden ones. The fe‘e eventually left Sāmoa to go back to Fiji, but a structure of large stone slabs called o le fale o le fe‘e [the house of the octopus] still exists seven miles inland in Magiagi.

16. The Forest of Tuifiti (Faatonu 1998)

Two brothers, Utu and Taua, and their sister, Lega, lived in Fiji but decided to go to Sāmoa to live. They sailed to Savai‘i and landed at Fagamalo. Utu decided to live there while Taua and Lega moved west. When they arrived at the most western part of Savai‘i, Taua decided to stay but Lega kept moving south. Lega eventually settled in the southern part of Savai‘i. These siblings eventually had many descendants and the villages of Matautu, Sātaua and Sālega are named after them.

Tuifiti eventually heard of these Fijians that had settled Savai‘i and wanted to visit his people. He sailed to Savai‘i and landed in Fagamalo. Near where he landed he found a patch of woods that provided perfect shelter. Tuifiti resided here for a time. To this day, that patch of forest in Fagamalo is called o le vaosā o Tuifiti [the sacred forest of Tuifiti]. The forest is still considered sacred.

[Tuimaleali‘ifano (1990) adds the interesting note that in 1978, the Governor-General of Fiji, Ratu Sir George Cakobau, was given a chiefly title in Fagamalo during a state visit in recognition of the ancient connection between the forest of Tuifiti and Sāmoa.]


In the village of Papa Sātaua in Savai‘i, there lived a couple named Mu and Vea. They were fishing one day and Vea found a shiny piece of coral. She carried the coral with her when she walked home. Birds continued to swarm over her as she walked. When she got home, she covered the coral with a bowl. Still the birds hovered over the bowl. The couple became suspicious and removed the bowl. Now, instead of a piece of coral, there was a baby boy there. They named the boy Moso and raised him as their own.
Moso became a wild child. He terrorised people in his village. He was also known to have magical powers. He was able to walk on water and could walk all the way to Fiji. To this day there is a large rock in impression in the village of Falealupu that is called o le tulaga vae o Moso (the footprint of Moso) where he stood with one foot in Sāmoa and one in Fiji.


Tuifiti taught his two daughters named Tupou and Fileleu the art of tattoo. The two Fijian girls travelled to Sāmoa in search of Samoan hospitality. As they sailed, they sang their song of tattooing “Tattoo the women and not the men”. As they approached Falealupu in Savai‘i, they spotted a large clam in the ocean and dove in to catch it. They were very tired after these exertions and they continued to sing their song but they had mixed up the words in their tired state to say, “Tattoo the men and not the women.”

The two girls travelled around Sava‘i but were not satisfied with the hospitality. They finally arrived in the village of Lefaga in ‘Upolu. Here they were given a very warm reception by Sua, who provided them with everything they could need. The girls were so impressed with Sua’s hospitality that they taught him the art of tattoo.

19. Tigilau of Sāmoa and Sina of Fiji (Tuimaleali‘ifano 1990)

Tigilau from Sāmoa and Sina from Fiji had never seen each other, but had heard of each other. They fell in love with each other without ever meeting. One day Sina went to Sāmoa to seek out Tigilau. She found him, but to test his love, she did not reveal her identity. Tigilau married this “stranger” but his thoughts continued to turn towards Sina in Fiji, all the time Sina did not reveal her identity. Tigilau could no longer bear what he thought was this separation, and took a fleet of many canoes, along with his wife (whom he did not know was Sina) to Fiji to be with this girl he had heard of but never met. When they arrived in Fiji, Sina revealed her true identity, now finally convinced of Tigilau’s love.

20. Fasito ‘outa and Fasito ‘otai (Turner 1984, Seve 2002 pers. comm.)

Tuifiti once swam from Fiji to Sāmoa carrying only a long pole (to‘o). He arrived on ‘Upolu and married a Samoan woman. He had two sons. One day he called on his two sons. He took out the to‘o he had brought with him from Fiji and told the boys to go out and make two new villages. He broke the to‘o and gave one piece (fasi to‘o) to each boy. He told one boy to go inland (uta) to establish his village and the other boy to go towards the ocean (tai) to establish his village. These villages became the present villages of Fasito‘outa and Fasito‘otai.


Moiu‘ule‘apai, the daughter of Tagaloa, travelled to Fiji and married the Tuifiti. Tuifiti had an argument with Moiu‘ule‘apai and sent her to the inland woods. Her brother, Taeotagaloa, heard of this and travelled from Sāmoa to Fiji to console her.
Taeotagaloa went to his sister and planted a large plantation of yams, bananas and taro in the land inland from her house. Tuifiti was so impressed by this that he made up with Moiu’ule’apai and named the fertile place of Taeotagaloa’s plantation “Fiti-i-uta”, literally meaning “inland Fiji”. Taeotagaloa returned to Manu’a and changed the name of his own village from Aga’e to Fiti-i-uta.

22. Falealili (Turner 1984)

Lili was a chief of Fiji whose mother was Samoan. He was banished to Sāmoa and there was given some land in the district of Atua. He called this area the “house of Lili” or Falealili. This is the name of that district to this day.

Faleulu is a village of Falealili that was so named because a large fleet of Fijian canoes stopped there and rested under a breadfruit tree (ulu). Another village of Falealili was named Poutasi when a chief there ordered his house to be built in the Fijian style with one pole (tasi le pou) in the centre. Yet another Falealili village, Lotofaga, is named after the Fijians Loto and Faga whom Tuifiti sent to Sāmoa to find a missing boy.

23. Tapuitea the Horned (Turner 1984)

Tapuitea was a Samoan girl who travelled to Fiji and married Tuifiti. She bore him two sons, Toiva and Tasi. As time went on, Tapuitea grew more and more wild and uncontrollable. She grew horns and practised cannibalism. Tuifiti was horrified by this and told Toiva and Tasi that their mother was becoming a demon and that they should flee to Sāmoa. The boys fled to Falealupo in Savai‘i. Tapuitea searched all around Fiji for her sons and eventually found their footprints on a beach leading to Sāmoa. She jumped in the water and swam to Savai‘i.

When she landed in Falealupo, she began to eat people. Tasi was so afraid of his mother that he had himself buried alive (there is a stone in Falealupo named after him). One day Tapuitea followed Toiva’s footprints to a bathing pool. She saw his reflection in the water and frantically jumped in the water. In doing so, she broke off her horns on a rock. As she surfaced she saw her son by the side of the pool. Toiva scolded her for eating his friends. She was overcome with grief because of her actions. She agreed to go away to live in the sky, but she promised that she would provide light for her son at night. Thus she went to live in the sky and became the planet Venus.

24. The Rat-Faced Woman (Faatoninu 1998)

Two women named Sinafatuimoa and Talai sailed from Fiji to the village of Pu‘apu‘a in Savai‘i. When the two sisters walked down the road in the village all the people laughed. They didn’t know why everyone was laughing. As they walked out of the village, they came across a bathing pool. When Sinafatuimoa leaned over the water to drink, she screamed in horror. She saw her reflection in the water and she had a rat’s face. Sinafatuimoa decided to live inside a cave near the pool and Talai lived on the road next to the pool in order to be close to her sister. To this day, the pool is called O le Vaitilofia (The Reflecting Pool).
25. Mata‘ulufotu’s Head (Krämer 1994)

Fine and Sau were a couple that lived in Tufutafoe on Savai‘i. They had a boy and named him Mata‘ulufotu. When this boy was young, his mother tried to kill him by cutting off his head. The boy’s head survived and could speak. Fine and Sau felt very sorry for the boy and decided to wrap his head in a mat and go visit the village of Sataua. At this time, there was a travelling party from Fiji in Sātaua. They had come to find a healer to help the daughter of the Tuifiti. Mata‘ulufotu told Fine and Sau to accompany the Fijians back to Fiji. As the approached Fiji, the boat wanted to avoid a certain passage because there was giant fish that lived there. Mata‘ulufotu instructed the crew to sail through the passage and they arrived without harm.

After meeting Tuifiti, they learned that Tuifiti’s daughter had died. Mata‘ulufotu decided to try and save her and the head entered Pulotu (Afterworld) and brought her soul back. Tuifiti’s daughter awoke revived. As a gift, Tuifiti gave Fine and Sau the giant fish that lived in the passage. They took this fish back to Sāmoa.

SĀMOA – TONGA (LEGENDS 26-37)


In Sāmoa, there once lived Pulelei’ite who was known as a very clever man at solving riddles. He had heard that the Tuitoga was also skilled in this art. Pulelei’ite traveled to Tonga to test his skill. Tuitoga received him graciously and they spent many days exchanging riddles and tests of mental skill. Finally, Pulelei’ite decided to return to Sāmoa. He thanked Tuitoga for his hospitality and requested that he be allowed to take some Tongan coconuts back to Sāmoa as he thought the Tongan coconuts were bigger and more delicious than Samoan coconuts. Tuitoga told him that he enjoyed Pulelei’ite’s company so much that he would like to visit him in Sāmoa and deliver the Tongan coconuts personally. All that Tuitoga asked in return was a few chickens, as he had heard that Samoan chickens had more meat than the Tongan variety. The two men agreed and Pulelei’ite returned to Sāmoa to await Tuitoga’s visit.

Tuitoga wanted to play a trick on Pulelei’ite and ordered his men to pluck two hundred coconuts, remove the nut and prepare only the empty husk, which they placed in sealed baskets. Meanwhile in Sāmoa, Pulelei’ite ordered his people to capture as many owls as they could, tie them up and place them in sealed baskets. When Tuitoga arrived in Sāmoa, Pulelei’ite greeted him warmly and they had festivities for many days. When Tuitoga was ready to return to Tonga, he boarded his canoe and ordered his men to send over his baskets. Pulelei’ite ordered his men to send his baskets to Tuitoga. As Tuitoga was sailing out of the harbour he thought he got the better of his friend and shouted “Pulelei’ite, niu, niu…pula (nuts, nuts…husks)!” Pulelei’ite shouted back in glee “Tuitoga, moa, moa…lulu (chickens, chickens…owls)!”


The Tongan chief Ae once visited the Samoan chief Tigilau. After many days as an honoured guest, Ae asked Tigilau if he could provide transportation back to
Tonga. Tigilau reluctantly agreed to lend Ae his two prized riding turtles. Ae was very grateful and after two days of switching between the turtles’ backs, he was carried back to Nuku’alofa. However, upon his arrival on shore, he ordered his men to kill and eat Tigilau’s turtles. They killed one turtle but the other escaped and swam back to Sāmoa. Enraged, Tigilau sent his demons to Tonga to bring Ae back to Sāmoa. Tigilau took his revenge and killed Ae.

28. The Rocks at Leauva’a (Stuebel 1995)

Lua and Tonoa lived near the present-day village of Leauva’a. Their daughter, Sina, was very beautiful. One day a large fleet of sailing canoes arrived with the courting party of Togamilagi of Tonga. Togamilagi and Sina fell in love and planned to marry. Then a mysterious man appeared in the village. His name was Uila (Lightening). Sina asked Uila why he had come and how he got his unusual name. He told her that he was the servant of the Samoan god Tagaloa and that if Sina did not marry Tagaloa, he would bring thunder and lightening to her village. But Sina was in love with Togamilagi so they decided to flee. They sailed in Togamilagi’s canoe but Tagaloa was angered by this rejection and destroyed the canoe, turning Sina, Togamilagi and the crew of his boat into stone. That is how Leauva’a got its name [meaning ‘the boat crew’].

29. The Boat of Lata (Fitisemanu and Wright 1970, Henry 1980, Krämer 1994) [Lata is a hero known throughout Polynesian myth. In Sāmoa, Lata was born in Pago Pago.]

Lata’s grandfather was killed by a Savai’i man named Matu’uta’ota’o. Lata went to Savai’i to find this assassin. However, Matu’uta’ota’o had already fled Savai’i. Lata was able to build a large double-hulled canoe with the help of fairies. In this canoe he chased Matu’uta’ota’o. Lata finally found him on a small island in Tonga. He killed Matu’uta’ota’o but not before the assassin uttered a curse that wrecked Lata’s canoe. The Tongan’s were able to take apart Lata’s canoe and learn how to build a similar one. This is how the Tongans learned how to make double-hulled canoes.


A girl named Futa lived in Manu’a and wove a beautiful fine mat. Tagaloa asked for her hand in marriage but she did not love him. She jumped into the ocean with her mat and swam to Tutuila where she married Fe’ealoalo of Utumua. She passed the mat to her daughter and it was passed on for generations until coming to Tau’olo. Tau’olo was kidnapped from Tutuila by the Tongan Lautivugia, while carrying her mat. She was taken to Tonga where Lautivugia’s brother, Tuitoga, wanted to marry her. Lautivugia did not want to give Tau’olo up but did not want to refuse his brother. He gave an order to his men that if Tuitoga asked about him, they should say they did not know where he is. Lautivugia then killed himself. Tuitoga came looking for his brother but no one knew where he was. Someone suggested that he search for him in Sāmoa so Tuitoga prepared a fleet. Tuitoga met with Leutele in Falefā. Leutele told him that if he returned Samoan captives, he would tell Tuitoga where his brother is.

Tuitoga returned to Tonga in anger. Instead of returning Samoan captives he planned to kill them all. When the execution time came, Tau’olo presented her mat to Tuitoga. Tuitoga was taken aback by the beauty of the mat and called for all of
his mats to see if he had any as beautiful. Tuitoga proclaimed that the mat of Tau‘olo was worth a thousand of his mats. He decreed that the Samoans should live and be returned. This mat came back with Tau‘olo to Sāmoa and hence, fine mats are called ‘ie toga (Tongan mats) in Sāmoa.

[Tau‘olo’s mat is said to still exist in Sāmoa and goes by the name Fala o Futa (Futa’s mat) or Tasi ae afe (Only one but worth a thousand).


Leutogi was a Samoan woman who lived with Tuitoga in Tonga. Tuitoga also had another wife, a Tongan. One day when the two women were bathing, the Tongan woman gave Leutogi her child to hold and told her to wait while she bathed. Upset by this disrespect, Leutogi killed the child. Tuitoga was greatly angered by this deed and decided to execute Leutogi by burning her alive. Leutogi was tied and put on a pile of kindling. However, as soon as the kindling was lit, a large number of bats flew around at beat out the fire with their wings.

Tuitoga then decided to execute Leutogi by marooning her on a deserted island with no food. However, when she was dropped off on the island, the bats returned and dropped fruit for her to eat. Eventually Tuu‘ea [the king of ‘Uvea or Wallis Island] came across the island and rescued Leutogi. He married her and their son, Fa‘asega returned to Sāmoa with title “Tonumaipe’a” (‘the rescue of the bats’). Tonumaipe’a is now one of the highest titles of Savai‘i.

32. Tuitoga and the Pool of Tuimanu‘a (Fitisenmanu and Wright 1970, Henry 1980)

Tuitoga Fakapouli and Tuimanu‘a Salofi were very good friends and visited each other often. On a visit to Manu‘a, Tuitoga asked his friend if he could bathe in Tuimanu‘a’s sacred pool. Tuimanu‘a apologised, saying that he has great respect for Tuitoga, but only Tuimanu‘a could bathe in the sacred pool. Tuitoga accepted this and they bid farewell. However, once out of sight of Manu‘a, Tuitoga turned his canoe around and called at the house of Faitolo, the keeper of the pool. Faitolo warned Tuitoga not to bathe in the sacred pool, but Tuitoga dove in anyway. As soon as he touched the water he was killed. Tuitoga’s men pulled his body out of the pool and began sobbing:

Aue, Aue, Tuitoga E!
Alas, alas, Tuitoga
Aue, Aue, Tuitoga E!
Alas, alas, Tuitoga

Faitolo heard Tuitoga’s men chanting and ran to tell Tuimanu‘a. When he arrived at his house, Tuimanu‘a already knew what had happened. He told Faitolo to go and tell the Tongan men to change their chant to:

Tuimanu‘a e, lo‘u ali‘i e!
Oh, Tuimanu‘a, my lord
Tuimanu‘a e, lo‘u ali‘i e!
Oh, Tuimanu‘a, my lord
The Tongan men sang this chant and instantly, Tuimanuʻa was brought back to life. To this day, when a high chief dies, people can be heard singing the chant of Tuimanuʻa.


[Of all the legends that connect Tonga with Sāmoa, none is more famous than the story of Tuna and Fata and the origin of the Mālietoa title. In order to sum up a long preamble to this story, we will merely say that at around 1200 AD (according to genealogical dating), Tonga invaded and conquered Sāmoa. The Tongans were said to be very cruel and despised. They ruled for about 200 years. This is the story of how they were expelled from Sāmoa.]

During the Tongan rule, there lived a great Samoan club-fighting champion named Leatiogio. He had many children and this story concerns his sons Tuna and Fata. Tuna and Fata wished to fight off the Tongan yoke in Sāmoa. They first traveled to Falelatai where, at night, they stole the anchor of the main Tongan war canoe. This anchor was a large wooden post driven into the seafloor. Tuna and Fata split the anchor lengthwise and fashioned two war clubs out of it. They buried these clubs in Aliepata and waited for the day that they could fight the Tongans.

Later, the Tongans came to ‘Upolu for a festival. Tuna and Fata used this opportunity to strike. They killed hundreds of Tongans and drove them back to a spot called Fatuosofia in northern ‘Upolu. It was here that the Tuitoga was staying. Tuitoga saw that his men were badly defeated by Tuna and Fata. He got in his canoe and ordered a full retreat back to Tonga. As he was sailing away, he called back to Tuna and Fata:

_Ua mālie toa! Ua mālie tau!_  
_Ou te le toe sau i le auliuli tau._  
_Ae o le a ou sau i le auliuli folau_  
_Congratulations heroes!_  
_I am pleased with your fighting!_  
_I shall return to Sāmoa not as a warrior but as a visitor._

The Tongans were never again to establish rule in Sāmoa. The title Mālietoa was created from the first sentence called out by Tuitoga and given to Savea, the brother of Tuna and Fata.

[Mālietoa is now the highest title in Sāmoa and Mālietoa Tanumafili II is the current Head of State of Sāmoa.]

34. How Tuitoga Owes his Authority to a Samoan Boy (Fitisemanu and Wright 1970)

Nuʻutele and Nuʻulua had a child named Feʻetane. Feʻetane was a very wild and uncontrollable child. Nuʻutele and Nuʻulua were so frightened of their son that they decided to flee Sāmoa and leave him behind. They fled to Niuafoʻou, an uninhabited island in Tonga. While there, they had a daughter and named her Sina.
Fe‘etane grew hungry and waited for his parents to bring him food. They never came so he went out to look for them. He eventually found his way to Niuafo‘ou where he found Nu‘utele and Nu‘ulua. While they were preparing a meal for Fe‘etane, he killed them. Sina came home and cried after she saw what Fe‘etane had done. He told her that he murdered Nu‘utele and Nu‘ulua because they abandoned him in Sāmoa. He then looked after her.

Later he sent her to Tongatapu to marry Tuitoga. At this time, Tuitoga had a rival, Tuitoga the younger. Sina married Tuitoga the elder and bore a son. Tuitoga the younger attempted to kill Sina’s sons but was not successful. Sina sent the boys to Fe‘etane for protection. Fe‘etane made the ocean rise up to swallow the men of Tuitoga the younger. Having seen this, Tuitoga the younger proclaimed that he would forever recognise the authority of Tuitoga the elder. Hence Tuitoga’s authority comes from the help of a Samoan boy.


There once lived a couple named Toamatamu and Mualepu in Sili, Savai‘i. One day they visited the village of Ämoa with their son, a young boy. At this time there was a large Tongan ‘alia (or double-hulled canoe) anchored in Ämoa. That night there was a celebration or pōula on the Tongan canoe. The couple went on board with their son to participate in the festivities.

In the morning, the couple departed but accidentally left their son on the Tongan canoe. Soon after the Tongans left Ämoa they found the boy sleeping under some mats on the canoe. They named the boy Sāmoanagalo ‘Samoan who was forgotten’. The Tongans took this boy with them on their journey. They first stopped at ‘Upolu. Here the boy went ashore to sleep. When he awoke he saw the Tongan canoe sailing away without him. He called to the canoe and it came back to get him. When the canoe turned to pick him up, he was so happy that he danced wildly on the beach. From then on, that village was called Leonesa’a ‘Dancing on the sand’.

The Tongans then took the boy to the Vava’u islands. Here the boy was left behind a third time. The Tongans sailed away and Sāmoanagalo lived in Vava’u.

At this time, Tuitoga was married to a Samoan woman. His half-Samoan daughter was named Fitimaupologa. She heard about the forgotten boy and wanted to marry him. She sent for him and he came to Tongatapu from Vava’u. They were married and had a son named Sānalala. Sānalala would give rise to the Mālietoa family.

36. Leutelele‘i’ite (Krämer 1994)

Tuitoga had a brother named Lautivunia who had an affair with Tuitoga’s wife. Tuitoga was very angry at this and Lautivunia tried to get back in Tuitoga’s good graces by preparing a large feast for him. Tuitoga was still angry so Lautivunia made an even bigger feast. Still Tuitoga was angry so Lautivunia decided to kill himself by drowning himself beneath his double canoe. No-one knew of Lautivunia’s death and Tuitoga now sorely missed his brother so he sent a search party to Sāmoa to look for him. The Tongan search party called at Falefā on ‘Upolu and asked if anyone knew where Lautivunia was. The Samoan chief, Leutele told the Tongans that Lautivunia was dead and lying under his canoe. When the Tongans returned they found this to
be true and they proclaimed that Leutele must be a psychic. This is how he got the name Leutele'i'te ‘Far-seer’. There is still a title of that name in Falefā.

37. Fua'autoa Defeats the Tongans (Krämer 1994)

In the days of Tongan domination, there was one chief on Tutuila that would not bow. His name was Fua’autoa. At this time, the Tongans had invaded and established themselves on Tutuila. Most of the Samoan chiefs had resigned themselves to their fate. However, Fua’autoa noticed the toa trees growing on his malae in the village of Fatugau. He cut down a toa tree and was advised by his fellow chief Vaoia to make a weapon by sharpening the wood into a blade and tying coconut fibre around the handle. This he did and equipped his people in this way. The next day, Fua’autoa and his warriors drove the Tongans from Tutuila.
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