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Abstract. - Based on the first article in this three-part series, this second article describes the form of Samoan genealogies and describes how they are gradually expanded through insertions of additional material until a new form is developed. The unifying element of the multi-generation complex is the genealogical relationship of some of the characters in the separate narratives. Samoan texts on the origin of the universe and human beings are then analysed into three types: those based on the genealogical model, on the creation model, and combinations of the two. Attention is paid to the tendencies of individual reductors and their use of older materials. "Polynesian, Samoan literature, genealogies"
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In an earlier article (Charlot 1990), I described the structure of Samoan single story forms – optional title or titular sentence, introduction, optional transition, narrative, optional conclusion, and optional terminal phrase or sentence – and showed how they could be combined with other stories or materials to form larger complexes. I will now analyse some of the relations between genealogy and narration in Samoan literature, relations indicated by a title such as Gafa ma tala o Saveasi‘uleo und [sic] Nafamua ‘Genealogy and Story of Saveasi‘uleo and Nāfanaua.”¹ The mutual influence among Samoan literary forms will be demonstrated; for instance, genealogies can be told as narration (Krämer 1902: 105 f.).

1. Genealogies

Genealogies have long been recognized as central to Samoan culture, being used for such different purposes as identifying and praising self and family, arranging marriages, awarding titles, and claiming rights and lands. Genealogical information is important for understanding society and politics, from particular policies and alliances to an entire polity; for instance, the political divisions of 'Upolu are referred to the offspring of Pili and their interrelations (Stuebel 1896/1973: 169/9; Krämer 1902: 27 f.). Genealogies are used to understand historical figures: the multigenerational history of Tamafaiga – especially the story of his father and the female god – establishes his iti aitu, the godly side of his personality and family connections and thus his special power (Stuebel 1896/1973: 175/15 ff.). Purely genealogical connections to powerful gods similarly establish prestige and explain power.

Genealogies are an important means of thought and communication in religious thinking. Like human beings, individual gods or aitu can be explained through genealogy. Diverse myths and religious traditions can be unified by arranging gods in genealogical lines, as was done by Hesiod in his “Theogony.” Different attributes of Tagaloa can be treated as separate Tagaloas – name plus epithet – producing a large family. Along with creationism, genealogy provides one of the two dominant thought models for discussions of the origin of the universe, as will be discussed below. The word gafa can in fact be used for origin without indication of lineage, in all likelihood an extended sense.²

¹ Krämer 1902: 104; Hovdhagen 1987: 92–96. Talagaafa is to “Recount a genealogy” (Milner 1966: 233). See the taunting line in Krämer 1902: 434 line 52: ‘Upolu a’iia e te talagaafa ‘Upolu, stop talking about your genealogies.’ The connotation of ‘talking up’ or even ‘telling tales about’ can be felt. – For technical information on the presentation of texts in this article, see Charlot 1990: 416 f. All circumflex accents in Charlot 1990 should be macrons.
² Krämer 1902: 120, ‘O le gafa o tatau ‘The Origin of Tattooing’; cf. 331 ff. Krämer 1902: 263 records the odd use of the word in a chant-terminating formula: ‘O le gafa a, paraphrased e moni lava and translated “So ist es!” ‘So is it!’ – Genealogies are of course tendentious, e.g., Cain 1979: 170; Epling 1970: 164. They must not be conflated
As a major model used in Polynesian thinking, the influence of the genealogy can be found in many aspects of Samoan thinking (Dixon 1916: 21 f.). For instance, the form is borrowed as an organizing device for different types of materials, such as title succession and ownership of mats (e.g., Krämer 1902: 343–348). The sense of *itti’ai* ‘side of the family’ can be extended to mean ‘Kind, sort’ (Milner 1966: 88), as of plants (Krämer 1903: 139, 290, 294 f.).

Formal Samoan genealogies are easily recognized, being cast as stereotyped sets of parallel lines. These can be either one-source or two-source: A to B, B to C, C to D ... or A + B to C, C + D to E, E + F to G.

An example of the rarer one-source genealogies is the following:

O le alo a Papaleleurla ia Papafola, o le alo a Papafola, ia Papasoso, o le alo a Papasoso o Papataotao ...

The offspring of Papapaleulu, this is Papafolu; the offspring of Papafolu, this is Papasoso; the offspring of Papasoso, Papataotao...

(Stuebel 1896/1973: 161/1).

Examples of the much more common two-source genealogies include:

O le tai na le fafine o le igos o le tanes, o Afimasaesae, o le igos o le fafine o Mutatil, na fanau ia ia tama o Papaste, o Papaste na ia usiu ia ia Papasoso, fanau le tama o Papanofo, usu Papanofo ia Papate, fanau le tama o Fatutu, Fatutu na ia usiu ia Ma’saii anxious, fanau le tama o Tapuhi, Tapuhi na ia usiu ia Mutia, fanau le tama o Mauotoga ...

[The male and the female. The name of the male was Aiimatamoe. The name of the female was Mutatila. Their child was born, Papate.] Papaste, he mated with this Papasoso; the child was born, Papanofo. Papanofo mated with Papate; the child was born, Fatutu. Fatutu, he mated with Ma’ai anxious. the child was born, Tapuhi. Tapuhi, he mated with Mutia, the child was born, Mauotoga.  

O Tupu o Atua, Leuteleleitei usu Leuteleleitei ia Iietufalo, fanaus o Tuiatuaumotogafia, usu Tuiatuaumotogafia ia Suleiilafalava tasi o Tuiatuaumofealei ... ‘The paramount chief of Atua was Leuteleleitei. Leuteleleitei mated with Iietufalo; born was Tuiatuaumotogafia. Tuiatuaumotogafia mated with Suleiilafalava; one child was Tuiatuaumofealei’. (Stuebel 1896/1973: 192/32 f.; see also 193/33).

The basic form — “male usu i’a female, child” or “usu male i’a female, child” — is the one found most often with variations. For instance, usu can be omitted to simplify the form to “male i’a female” (Hovdhaugen 1987: 96).

Additions can be made to the basic scheme: usu male i’a female a faaee le gafa child (Stuebel 1896/1973: 162/2; also 193/33 f.). Faee le gafa tasi o designates the first child; Toe faaee le gafa o, the second. Before the name of the child can be put the more elaborate o faaee le gafa fotu ai mai for the first child and toe faaee le gafa fotu ai mai or toe fotu ai mai for subsequent ones. The narrational phrase toni e i ai fea can be placed before the name of the child (Bülow 1898c: 106 f., 109). A number of variations can be used within the same genealogy (Epling 1970: 165, 168–172).

Toe usu ‘mated again’ refers to marriages after the first. Marriages of females in a linage can be expressed by “usua female e male” ‘female was mated by male.’ Multiple offspring can be introduced by toe o or tasi o or the simple ma ‘and.’ Lack of issue is expressed by fak e faka. The origin of side lineages can be expressed by “Sa/Na tupu ai name i’a name” or “Name sa/na tupu ai i’a name” ‘Name originated from name.’

Gata, i’u, and taumu’u can indicate the termination of a genealogy.

A number of words and expressions are used regularly in genealogies, in which they can acquire a special sense, such as usua and fa’aee e le gafa.


---

5 E.g., Bülow 1898c: 103–112; Krämer 1902: 83–104, 167–197, 240–253, 292–302, 333–339, 378–382. The form is authentic, but Krämer may have used it to regularize materials he found in other or less regular forms. This remark applies also to other elements referred to in Krämer’s genealogies. Cf. Epling 1970b: 165, 172; the genealogy he records can be placed firmly within the context of the earlier published texts i cite; that is, genealogies have been published with many of the materials he states were omitted. I have found no parallels, however, for the editorial remarks in his text: 165 §§ 3, 5, 6; 168 § 4; or for what seem to be indented section headings, 169 ff.  
7 E.g., Krämer 1902: 169–173, 481; Epling 1970: 170 f. The practice is common.  
8 E.g., Krämer 1902: 301 f., 380 ff. The practice is again common.  
Hauptlingen gebraucht (siehe Genealogien) in Verbindung mit ita 'gehen zu' ‘to marry, used by chiefs (see genealogies) in connection with ita “to go to.”

The sense of fa’a’e e or fa’a’e e as used in genealogies is not found in Pratt 1960 or Milner 1966. Krämer 1902: 478: “fa’a’e e le gafa ein stehender Ausdruck in den Genealogien der Hauptlinge für ‘geboren werden’, eigentlich ‘hervorgebracht der Ahne’”, ‘a fixed expression in genealogies of chiefs for “to be born,” literally “the ancestor was brought forth.” On 383, he translates fa’a’e e le gafa ‘o le tama as “geboren wurde ein Knabe” ‘a boy was born’; fa’a’e e ‘o le tama ‘o Li’amatu as “geboren wurde der Knabe Li’amatu” ‘The boy Li’amatu was born’; also 105 f. See also Hovdhaugen 1987: 138 f., “found, lay the foundation of.”

Also not in Pratt 1960 and Milner 1966 is fa’a’e e papa in the sense of to confer a title, Stuebel 1896/1973: 187/27, 190/30, 192/32; Krämer 1902: 383 f. Also fa’a’e e ao, Krämer 1902: 383; cf. the use of ‘e e, 392.

Fa’a’e e le gafa may have the literal sense of extending the genealogy to the next named member.

The formal character of genealogies and their related vocabulary make them recognizable when they are used with other genres. A genealogy can be told as narration with the non-stereotyped use of genealogical terms (Krämer 1902: 105 f.). Such terms and expressions can be used in isolation within a narration in place of the more usual ones.12

Genealogies can be included inside complexes. Attached to a māvaega ‘last words’ story of Salamāsina is a genealogy that is introduced by the words ‘O le gafa a Salamasina lenet ‘This is the genealogy of Salamasina’ and that identifies the lineage from her to them.13 In the story “Die Ahnen der Gaoteote in Vatia (‘O le gafa o Gaoteote i Vatia) ‘The Genealogy of Gaoteote in Vatia’ (Krämer 1902: 339 f.), paragraph I introduces two principals with reference to their titles and locations, but not their backgrounds. After paragraph 4, a stereotyped genealogy – usu ... iā ... – is inserted. Paragraph 5 is a māvaega-story and is followed by a short stereotyped genealogy that brings the line up to the present day.14

Samoan stories and complexes most often begin with some genealogical information, which is usually cast in a traditional form. In my preceding article, I have identified a conventional genealogical introduction, which can be short – typically, mention of a man and woman as a couple and of their child – or can be expanded with use of genealogical terms.15

Such introductions can follow the form of a regular genealogy. Two short examples can be found in Bülow:

1898a: 7, O le alii o Loa i Fagalao na usu i le tamaitai o Sina ona fanau lea o Pili ‘Chief Loa lived in Fagalao. He married the lady Sina. Pili was born.’
1899–1900: 145, Usu Faaoletolo i Lauleleete, fae le gafa Pepeolefai ‘Faooletolo married Lauleleete; Pepeolefai was born.’

Longer examples can be found. The introduction to the single story in Stuebel (1896/1973: 163/3), Na usu ... Tonufale, follows a standard genealogy form through five generations; in Krämer (1902: 261 f.), ‘Usu tuu’ ... A usuia e ... Tuufai, through four generations (also 419 f.).

Stories and complexes can also end with genealogies that connect them to a later point in the pertinent genealogy (Krämer 1902: 104 f.) or to the present day, the time of the author or reductor (Stuebel 1896: IV and 1896/1973: 161/1; Krämer 1902: 339 f.). Conventional non-genealogical endings with the same function are common (Charlot 1990: 424 f.) and serve the same important purpose: designating the contemporary relevance of the material.

2. The Development of Multigenerational Complexes

A major Samoan literary structure is the multigenerational complex, the one unifying element of which is the genealogical relationship of some of the characters. This structure was developed, I will argue, from genealogies themselves. Genealogies can consist of names alone listed in one of the available forms of the genre. When the names are famous or familiar, the audience for the genealogy can supply information about them from their own store of knowledge (e.g., Krämer 1902: 176 f.). Information can also be made explicit in a genealogy by means of short, stereotyped descriptions. These are used very often, as can be seen from a reading of the genealogical sections in Krämer.

15 Charlot 1990: 420 f. Examples are given in other sections of that article. Samoan stories can of course begin with an immediate introduction of the characters, without mentioning forebears who play no role in the narrative, e.g., Stuebel 1896/1973: 165/5 f., 170/10 f.
16 See also Krämer 1902: 255, 264, 303, 412 f. (a tūlagi; Charlot 1988: 302 f.).
1902 (above, note 5), and I will offer only a few examples.

A short description can be attached to a person's name: Krämer 1902: 98, Salamasina 'o le afafine tupu 'Salamásina the kingly woman.'

Female children are so designated, not male:

Bülow 1898c: 108, tasi o Salamasina o le teine 'one [offspring] Salamásina, girl.'

Krämer 1902: 95, tasi 'o Sevelefatafata teine 'one [offspring] Sevelefatafata, girl.'

A person's family connection can be provided:

Bülow 1898c: 107, o le atali a Tagaloa faaofonu 'the son of Tagaloa faaofonu.'

108, o le afafine o le Fetafave 'the daughter of the Fetafave.'

109, o le afafine o le Asi 'the daughter of the Asi.'

109, o le afafine a Tui Aana o le Tavea 'the daughter of Tui Aana o le Tavea' (also, 111).

Krämer 1902: 101, 'le uso a Tauiliili 'the brother of Tauiliili' (examples are numerous in the Krämer genealogies).

Epling 1970: 169, le afafine o Alaimana 'the daughter of Alaimana.'

169, le afafine o Lemalu ma le Mamea 'the daughter of Lemalu and Mamea.'

Hovdhaugen 1987: 96, le uso lea o Palauli ma Satupa'itea 'the brothers related to Palauli and Satupa'itea.'

A wife's family connection can be provided even without her name (Krämer 1902: 339). This is common in the genealogy recorded in Epling 1970.

The location of a person can be given:

Krämer 1902: 90, le afafine Sili 'the woman from Sili.'

90, le afafine Faleata 'the woman from Faleata.'

96, Letufugatasi i Saleaula 'Letufugatasi in Saleaula.'

97, Leuluafi mai Fosagasa'i 'Leuluafi from Fosagasa.'

301, le Tuilele i Leone-Tutuila 'the Tuilele in Leone, Tutuila.'

Epling 1970: 170, Levi atana i Manono 'Lei atana in Manono.'

This type of information is provided regularly (Krämer 1902: 101 f.), even without a name (104).

Different kinds of information can be combined, most commonly, family and location:

Bülow 1898c: 107, o afafine toala i Tuisamo i Falealii 'two daughters of Tuisamo in Falealii.'

109, o le afafine a Taimalie i Leulumoe 'the daughter of Taimalie in Leulumoe.'

111, o le afafine o Leitauna i Manono 'the daughter of Leitauna in Manono.'

Krämer 1902: 83, o le afafine o Leutaule 'the daughter of Leutaule' in Faleā.'

83, 'o le afafine o Tuisafua i Iva 'the daughter of Tuisafua in Iva.'

The phrase 'o le afafine o is used regularly in Krämer 1902: e.g., 180–197.

Such stereotyped phrases can be found in narrations, just as were other genealogical elements discussed earlier. In a story of Pili, a bride is designated as o le afafine a Matofai i Aopo 'the daughter of Matofai in A’opo.'

Descriptions or explanations in genealogies can be extended to sentences or short passages with full sentences:

Stuebel 1896/1973: 193/33, O alo uma ia o Tau’a imatagi o le afafine o Li o 'These were all offspring of Tau’a imatagi, the daughter of Li.'

Bülow 1898c: 106, Ua amata ia Fune o le fofa o Sane o le Tagaloa 'With Fune begins the genealogy of Sane and the genealogy of the Tagaloa.'

1900: 66, o tamala o le ausa; o tagata lenei faatoa mana (sic: mana) 'The brothers were young men; these were the first human beings obtained.'

Epling 1970: 165, Tagata na tuputu ai Samoa 'Human beings from whom arose Sāmoa/Samoa.'

These passages can be short narratives or story summaries.

Bülow 1898c: 104, T. A. Tuimavave ... Gatoatele.

109 f., O leenu na luai tupu o le Ofi.

Stuebel 1896/1973: 162/2, O le tapuaga lea ... manaia o Tupelele; placed at end of genealogy.

Epling 1970: 168 last paragraph; 170 paragraphs 7 and last; 171 paragraph 8.

A complete story can be inserted into a genealogy. In Bülow 1900, a long story can be identified in a stereotyped genealogy: p. 66 § 3, travel beginning, Ua sau lea; genealogical introduction, o le ulugaalii leina; narrative, au mai e faanofo through p. 67 § 5, o Mausaulele.

Since the main character or characters have been mentioned in the genealogy, the introductions of the inserted stories are usually omitted, shortened, or otherwise modified, as can be seen in a genealogy with three inserted stories. In fact, even personages unmentioned in the genealogy are usually presented without introduction. As a result,
the inserted story takes on the appearance of pure narrative.21

The insertion of such materials is optional. Examples can be found of the same or similar material being given with and without stories (Krämer 1902: 83–86, 87 ff.). Insertions can also be numerous (Pratt 1890: 657–663, text in English).

The amount of story material can increase until it is roughly equal to or larger than the genealogical within a complex (Krämer 1902: 105 ff.). I would call these multigenerational complexes rather than genealogies with insertions.22 These complexes can be short and simple. In Krämer (1902: 303), a genealogical introduction, a stereotyped line, ends at the child, who is described briefly: Na usu ... ia ... fa’a e e le gafa ... ’o le tama nei e aitu ma tagata ‘this child was both aitu and human.’ The narrative recounts the child’s travel and his successive marriages to two women, using the same genealogy form: ona usu lea ia Maugaoli’i ... Puatau and ‘A usu ai i le aafine ... ’o Talalaufala. The next narrative recounts briefly the settling of a member of this last generation in a new location. The same structure can be expanded simply by increasing the number of generations and lengthening the narrative sections.23

Multigenerational complexes can, however, be extensively elaborated. “Die Einführung des Kava. Die Geschichte des Pili / O le tupuga o le ‘ava. O le tala ia Pili” The Introduction/Growth of Kava. The Story of Pili” (Stuebel 1896/1973: 168/8 f.) is a long and clear example. The title in the text, O le tala i le mea na maau ai e Samoa o le ava ‘The story of how Samoa obtained kava,’ refers only to the first section of the complex.

An introduction, o le ali’i ... maau ai ava Samoa, presents a chief and his two daughters and describes their habitual activity. A long narrative full of incidents, na oo atu tamaita’i nei ... ma a’u nofofoua, recounts the daughters’ departure, their saving the life of the Tuifiti, and his marrying them. The first of a new generation is then born: two boys, who are named, ona fananau ... o Fiti. A girl is then born, and a short story of the origin of her name is told, ona fanau ai ... Mulivoallele. The well-known story is then told of the origin of kava and sugar cane, ona ma’i ai lea ... niniva o le iole i le ava. The story is similar to that of the famous story of Sina and the Eel: the plants grow from the buried body of one of the sons.24 Following the mavaega ‘last words,’ of the dead son, the survivors then take the plants from Fiji to Savai‘i where they are planted, providing the origin of the place name ‘Ai’ava ‘Eat Kava,’ ona fai atu lea o Soalatelele ... ona ta’ua lea o lea mea o le Aiava; a typical conclusion.

Thus far the complex is not truly multigenerational because the second generation still plays a major role alongside the third. However, the third generation now marries, the daughter joining with Tagaloalagali, ona fai avā ... o lona igoa o Pili. Their son Pili will be the protagonist of the next section, while the previous generation disappears after briefly motivating Pili’s fall from the sky, providing him with his name Pilipa’u ‘Falling Pili.’25 The change of generations is expressed very clearly as a division in the complex. Pili’s move from Manu’a to ‘Upolu and then to Savai‘i is presented largely as a tightly constructed series, ona nofo ai lea o Pili i Manu’a ... Tui o Aopo (Charlot 1990: 423). The death of Pili is mentioned briefly, ona malu ai lea o Pili i Aopo ‘Therefore Pili died in A’opo.’ A sentence then appears to bring the whole complex to a close, a o lona gafa ua oo mai i ona po nei ‘But his genealogy reaches till today.’ The redactor then seems to append a brief notice of Pili’s sons and their connection to the polity of ‘Upolu, e ana le fanau ... Sapapalii. A final sentence — o le gafa lea o Pili ‘This is the genealogy of Pili’ — basically repeats what may have been the original termination of the complex.

21 Krämer 1902: 24 f.; 25 §§ 1–6; 334, Ona fa’aapea lea ... o Le’iatoa’aleamua; 337, Ona fai lea ‘o tofiga ... Ao Tulimalē’i, See also Epling 1970: 169 §§ 2–7; 171 § 9, through page 172 § 3. I have not referred to the numerous historical references, sometimes in Samoan, connected to his genealogies by Krämer 1902: e.g., 178, 184, 247, 249, because their relation to the principal text is unclear. Other genres can be included in genealogies, for instance, tofiga ‘established order or assignment of responsibilities’ or mavaega ‘last words,’ (Epling 1970: 168). Brief references to stories can be found in fa’aluepega, the ceremonial address to a village or region, although these are not developed, e.g., Krämer 1902: 63, 72, 79, 81, 290, 371.

22 For such complexes in the Society Islands, see Oliver 1974: 325. For Sāmoa, Freeman (1947: 306) notes “the marked genealogical framework” of a legend. Epling (1970: 164) states “that the Samoans have traditionally constructed and transmitted much of their history in terms of detailed ‘genealogies.’” For examples other than those discussed below, see Hovdaugan 1987: 54–62, 68–78.

23 Krämer 1902: 266 ff., genealogical information in stereotyped form: 266 §§ 1, 5, 6; 267 § 1 (with illegitimate child, 268 § 2). See also Stuebel 1896/1973: 194/34 f.

24 Charlot 1988b: 304 ff. On the mavaega-story beginning, see Charlot 1990: 421. An origin of the name Vailele o Niniva has been incorporated at the end with the clear conclusion, o le mea ... iole i le ava.

25 Ona tupu ai lea o le amio leaga a Pili ... ona ia ai lea o le igoa o Pili o Pilipa’u. Note the typical conclusion of a story of the origin of a name. See the next article in this series for a discussion of the Pili literature.
two generations are mentioned in genealogical introductions and a third generation is sometimes born (Sierich 1902: 176; 1904: 107), the principal characters remain the same throughout, and the narrative is a unity, however complicated.

Multigenerational complexes are, however, prominent in two important fields: texts on the origin of the universe and on history. I will discuss the former in this article and the latter in the next.

3. Samoan Texts on the Origin of the Universe

Texts on the origin of the universe are part of the very large Samoan origin literature: stories that describe the origins of names (of people, villages, and places), titles, sayings, testaments, practices, customs and tabus, treaties, honorific positions, fine mats, and - more proximately - land features. Such texts are also part of an extended Polynesian literature on the origin of the universe that shares settings in life, thought models, devices, terms, names, and tendencies. Samoan texts provide the basis for that literature, which was variously developed in other island groups.

The Samoan texts on the origin of the universe are already numerous, complicated, and diverse, a result of such factors as politics (Bastian 1894: 10 f.; cf. Bülow 1897b: 376), the desire to have one's own special tradition, and genuine intellectual quest.

The use in them as in other Polynesian texts of two models - a genealogical and a creational - has long been recognized.

The distinctions discussed were known to 19th century Hawaiian writers. The oldest example I have found is from around 1840: Malo n.d. (chap. 2, sections 3–8) differentiates clearly in Hawaiian origin texts between those that ascribe origin to birth (hāna), growth (ulu wale 'just grew'), or creation (hāna lima ia 'hand made'). Kamakau 1869 probably follows Malo in differentiating between birth (hāna), growth (ulu wale), and the work of a god or gods (hāna). Wise 1912 bases himself explicitly on Malo in his discussion of the subject.

Waizt and Gerland (1872: 247 ff., 267) theorized that the creational model was the older and the genealogical/evolutional was developed from it in Polynesia as a whole. Bastian (1894: 8 f., 12, 18 f.) argued that the evolutionary model was

---

26 Pratt 1889: 455–463. On the text, see Freeman 1947: 301 f.
27 Pratt 1889: 458 lines 15–19; line 42 through 459 line 4; 459 lines 5–8; 461 line 40 through 462 line 6.
28 Genres: Pratt 1889: 459, 461, 463, māvēega; 455, 457, poetry. Origins: 463 line 2, the origin of a saying (Brown 1914: 405: number 16); cf. 460; 463, of a rock formation.
29 Fine mats: Bülow 1899–1900: 136–141: 136, O Neefunua ... (Loa), introduction with mention of two generations; 139 § 6, use of genealogical terms, and § 8, usu ... iā ... fāna; 141 §§ 1–4, five generations in stereotyped form, usu ... iā ... fāna; 141–143: 141 §§ 1–2, genealogical introduction; 142 §§ 7–9 (use of terms and form); 143 §§ 2, 9 (informal), §§ 10–15, seven generations in stereotyped form, usu [mai] ... iā ... fāna [ona] e i ai [ilea] ...

Titles: Krämer 1902: 382 ff.: 382, generations one and two; 383 § 1, generation three; §§ 2, 3, generation four; § 4, generation five; 384 § 3, generation six.

Cf. Krämer 1902: 343–348; 343, stereotyped genealogical material in §§ 1, 3.

30 For my working historical outline, see Charlot 1983: 144 ff.; 1985; also Cain 1979: 208. This article does not attempt an exhaustive analysis of the texts. The subject requires a full-scale treatment with modern methods. Charlot 1985 was published with numerous typographical errors that I had reported on the galley proofs, and the Journal de la Société des Océanistes has not responded to my requests to publish a list of errata. I would be happy to supply such a list to whoever requests one.
developed more in Hawai’i and that texts were formulated with combinations of the two models; cf. 1881: 14 f., 19–23, 56, 68, 107. See also Achelis 1895: 229 f.; Bülow 1897b: 375 f., 1899: 58. The distinction was emphasized by Dixon 1916: 4–23, and seems universally accepted today, Shore 1982: 129, 132 f. (with his interpretation of the two types). In view of this fundamental distinction, the use of the word creation for all accounts of the origin of the universe can be recognized as a misleading ethnocentrism.

Samoa texts thus fall into three types: genealogical, primarily creational, and balanced combinations of the two. Other models were also used, as will be seen.

Of these three types, the genealogical is the oldest, being the most widespread and forming everywhere the basis of later developments. A major genre of this type is the high chiefly genealogy that extends back in time to the origin of the universe. The tradition of this genealogical type of text can be developed into an increasingly abstract speculation on the origin of the universe, as will be seen.

In Sāmoa, the creational model is confined almost exclusively to the literature connected to the god Tagaloa, which, according to the available evidence, begins with the chant ‘O le Solo o le Vā o le Foaoaga o le Lalolagi ‘The Song of Contention of the Origin of the World which is under the Firmament.’

The chant – referred to as the Solo o le Vā or the Solo – will be discussed below. It was first published in Powell 1887, in Sāmoan and English, along with an English translation of its prose explanation, “O le Tala i le Tupaaga o Sāmoa Atoa Fo‘i ma Manu‘a o Amata le Tala ona Fia i Manu‘a” (titles vary; I will refer to this text as Le Tupu‘aga o Sāmoa ‘Atoa). Powell collected both texts from the same person, Tuaumanu, “the official legend keeper of Manu‘a” (Editors 1892: 273; Freeman 1893: 133; Powell and Pratt 1890 published the Solo alone, in Sāmoan and in translation, as did Fraser 1897: 19–26. Fraser (1891: 261–286) published a different English translation of the explanation with an introduction and notes; and then, Fraser 1892 published the Sāmoan text of the prose explanation along with the same translation as in Fraser 1891. Krämer (1902: 395–400) collected an independent version from two sources. Charlott 1988: 302 f. and note 5 (the above explanation is more detailed). For more information, see Love 1983: 136 f. (his Powell 1886 is my Powell 1887).

Some textual problems are immediately apparent. Powell (1887: 155) mentioned that the poem he published “has only 114 lines; I have another of 197.” Fraser (1892: 185) mentions “another reading”; his section 28 is given as a note in Powell 1887: 152.

I will refer to the line numbers of the Solo in both Fraser (1897: 20–26) and Krämer (1902: 395–400) and will regulate the text, noting any relevant variations. A comparison was made between those texts by Henningsen 1977. Bülow 1897b: 376, is, to my knowledge, the only one who has questioned the authenticity of the Solo.

The translation of the title of the Solo is based on the sources to which I refer. I am tempted, however, to translate The Song of the Time of the Origin…. The sense of vā as time period survives in such expressions as vā i to elau ‘tradewind season’ and vā i palolo ‘palolo season’ (Krämer 1903: 112) and has a firm place in the origin literature of Hawai‘i in the division of the Kumulipo into sixteen vā.

This chant – like the Kumulipo, a poetic and intellectual masterpiece – provides the origin of the known islands, of human beings, and of the priority of Manu’a and the Tui Manu’a title along with that of the Sā Tagaloa, the organization of house- and boat-builders. It also introduces the notion of creational activity by the god as an explanation of the origin of the islands of ‘Upolu and Tutuila.

33 Priority of Manu’a (other than taunting sections): Fraser 1897, lines 16–17, 33–37, 77–78, 84–87; Krämer 1902, lines 14–15, 26–27, 60–64, 112–113. For the late prose explanation of the Solo, Le Tupu‘aga o Sāmoa ‘Atoa, see Fraser 1892: 173 section 27; 175 section 42; 186. – Priority of the Tui Manu’a: Fraser, lines 81–83; Krämer, lines 72–74; also Fraser 1892: 173 section 31.


This creational activity is developed and extended in later Tagaloa texts until it provides the origin of almost all elements of the universe. Besides extent, these texts can vary in the mode of creative activity: fashioning, commanding, arranging, and so on.

These two strains of thinking about the origin of the universe – the genealogical and the creational – interact in various ways. Because the genealogical model is older, texts can be found that use it without any trace of creationalism. The creational model is always found in conjunction with genealogical and other elements because it is imposed on those older materials and incorporates them in various ways.

The creational Tagaloa theologians can absorb various genealogical elements by placing them under the god’s control. On their side, the genealogists, both within and without the Tagaloa literature, can absorb Tagaloa in various ways. Just like the archaic god Fe’e ‘octopus,’ Tagaloa can be made part of a genealogy. Chiefly families can use him either as a forebear or a family alliance.34 Tagaloa can be given parents and can be the father of gods or otherwise genealogically connected to them.35 He can even be the father of all Samoans.36 Tagaloa can also be expanded through the multiplication of separate Tagaloas differentiated by epithets – to the Sā Tagaloa ‘the Tagaloa family.’37 These interactions produce the different, alternative schemata of the origin texts to be discussed: they can begin with land (rock) or with water; Tagaloa can appear at the beginning or after one or more sections. These schemata can be combined; for instance, the rock can be covered by a later flood. The schemata developed can also be found in other island groups (Charlot 1985: 170 f.).

The basic texts to be discussed have their setting-in-life in the high chiefly and intellectual levels of Samoan society, to which the major chants and the genealogies of the great families and titles belong. Archaic and chiefly vocabulary is used. Moreover, the less naturalistic one-source genealogy form, A to B to C ..., seems to be a philosophical abstraction from the more usual two-source one, A + B to C, C + D to E ...

The materials used in such texts – especially those of the Tagaloa literature – can, however, be adapted to the folk literature, with its own shorter forms and more limited interests, its own motifs, devices, and fabulous elements, such as those that can be studied in fāgogo ‘night tales.’39 Such elements seem more abundant in the earlier phases of, say, a multigenerational complex and can, as common means of thought and communication, always be used to create stories.40 Texts can, therefore, be found that contain folk elements alongside archaic passages of high intellectual speculation.

The Tagaloa literature can use common Samoan story motifs, such as that of a child asking who its real or blood parent is or that of looking for the right person, object, or place.41 Other recurring motifs are developed within the Tagaloa literature itself. For instance, at a key moment in the Solo o le Vā, Tagaloa looks down from the sky and later descends.42 This seems to be the basis of major motifs of the Tagaloa stories: Tagaloa looks down, comes down, or sends someone or something down to the subcelestial region.43

Genealogical thinkers can be equally creative. From the standard genealogy, a war or conflict model can be developed that relates to numerous

34 Turner 1884: 4 f.; Bülow 1898c: 109; Krämer 1902: 92 f., 168. Other examples will be discussed below. For references also for the following points, see Scheffran 1965: 166 f.; Cain 1979: 215.
35 Bülow 1897b: 375; 1898c: 109; Krämer 1902: 105, 393 f., 413.
38 Krämer 1902: 22; Cain 1979: 224 ff., on the subject of one and multiple Tagaloas. Traditions differ of course. The prestigious syndicate of house- and boat-builders is also named the Sā Tagaloa.

39 Turner 1884: 10 f., elements from the genealogy of the rocks are combined with an aitu story (Charlot 1990: 427): the rocks and the earth become characters in the story, and the god is transformed into the loose stones from which plants will grow; see also Turner 1884: 223; Stuebel 1896/1973: 174/14 f., 228/68; Brown 1914: 405 nr. 12; Schultz 1965: nrs. 197, 392, 406, 450; Krämer 1902: 104 f., Papa and Mahau Papa as parents in a typical genealogical story introduction; see the report of the story, Krämer 1902: 44; also 283; cf. Pratt 1889: 457 f. On this practice, see Bastian 1894: 10 f.
40 For a modern example, Nelson (1925: 127) seems a conflation of such texts as Krämer 1902: 167 f. and Stuebel 1896/1973: 161/1 f.
42 Looks down: Fraser 1897, line 15; Krämer 1902, line 13. – Descends: Fraser, lines 22, 36–37, 61, 115 (cf. 83, 88, 106); Krämer, lines 26–27, 48, 107, 101 (cf. 74–75).
Samoan stories of conflict in the environment: that is, instead of one generation giving birth to the next, the latter overcomes the former.44

The following discussion will reveal also the use in Samoan origin texts of terms and models found in other Polynesian groups.

a) Genealogical Origin Texts

The key to the interpretation of Samoan texts on the origin of the universe is, I would argue, the recognition of the genealogy of the rocks as the foundation tradition upon which the others are built. Versions of that genealogy are formed as lists of names formed mainly of papa ‘rock, foundation layer of the land,’ plus epithets. Within Polynesia, this origin tradition appears to be the most widespread,45 contains archaic language,46 and, in the analysis of composite texts, is revealed as the earliest level. The published Samoan examples vary in length, sequence, and in being in either one- or two-source form, but preserve with remarkable consistency the same set of names. Indeed, papa tū ‘standing rock,’ appears in all the Samoan-language texts examined as well as in Hawai‘i and the Society Islands. I summarize examples of the genealogy of the rocks along with related material that will be used in the discussion:

Stuebel 1896/1973: 161/1, Papalevulevu to Papafolole to Papasoso to Papatoato to Papanofo to Papa Tu to Paparlo to Siupapa [to Fee to ahi muesaes ...].

162/2 (“O le tupuga o le Eleлеle o Samoa ma tagata”): [Afinu-

saes + Mutalali to] Papaele + Papasoso to Papanofo + Papatu to Fatutu + Maatanao [to Taputiti + Mutia ...

...].47

162/2 (“O le gafa o Tagaloaalaagi o le ali sa pule i le lagi na ia faia Samoa”): [Fagagatete] + Papato to Papelo + Papalēgæe to Maatanao [to Faalulu to Imao ...].

Krämer 1902: 105 f., [Papaga and ‘Ele’ele: ‘Ele’elemū + E Ele’elemæa to] Papátia + Pap’ele to Papatea + Papaga [to Lagi and Fati and Eโล and Masa malu letuapapa and Taufailematagi] (see also 22 f).

167 f., [Lupe +] Papatia to A’alua + Papamau to Papaoa + Ma’ata’aanoa to Papa’ele + Palapala to Papamavae [+ Imao to Sasaalua + Taqaloaonimono ...].

Bülow 1898c: 105 f., Papatia + Papamau to Papalaua + Papa-

lega to Papaoa + Papalece to Papasauia + Maatanao [to Si Imao + Sagamai to Mateolai ...].

Turner 1884: 3, [Eleple to] Papato + Maatanao [to Mount-

ains + Maleuin “changeable meeting place” to Fasielu “piece of dust” + Lave i fulufelo tolo “down of the sugar-cane flower”].

4. high rocks + earth rocks to earth [+ high winds to solid

clouds (cloud list) ... cloudless heavens + spread out heavens to Tagaloa ...].48

6. [Ilu (Ilo?) + Mamao to] Papa tu, Papa one, Papa ele, Masina, La, Sami, Vai.

Patt 1890: 657, “Papato (Standing-rock) married Papaele (Earth-rock). Their son Ma’ataanoa (Loose-stone) married Papapala (Mud). Their son Le-tagata (Man) was called Le-tupu-fua (Grown-from-nothing).”

Stair 1896: 35, Papa-taatou to Papa-sosolo to Papa-pe to O le

elele, “which was then spread over with grass (Ona uifia ai lea o le elele e le mutia). After this the Fue (convolvulus) grew, and overcame the grass”.

Fraser 1892: 171, different generations from the same rock, which Tagaloa has commanded to generate:

section 14: Papa-ta’oto, Papa-sosolo, Papa-lau-a’au, Papa-a-

no’ano, Papa’ele, Papa-tu, Papa-’anu’amu.

section 15: ‘Ele’ele (parent of humans), Sami.

section 16: Lagi, Ilu, Mamao, Niiao, etc.

Bülow 1899: 60–62, (war model), [ahi muesaes defeated by

Fee, Fee, by] papaetele, papa le gae, papa fofole, papa sosolo, papa lana, papa mau, papa tete, papa nene, papa fefe, papa tū, papa inu, papa lelei, papa tatau, papa ofo, papa tagula, papa ele, papa alā, papa solo, papa fo agia, papa su aiia, papa tuia (elele, le maa talanu, le mutia, le latamia, le Taataa, le Falifatu, le Falimala, le Lautamatama, le Maotofo, le Ateate, le laau, le fue (change to genealogy) ... tagata ... Imoatele).

The genealogy of the rocks provides an answer to the speculative question – couched within the context of genealogical thought – about the origin of the universe: that from which all came was the papa, the rock, the bedrock, the foundation layer of the land. The genealogy of the rocks is

47 A full text and translation are provided at the beginning of this article. Note the full introduction to this two-source genealogy.

48 Turner 1884: 3 and 3 ff. are two distinct genealogies, although they have been confused by Reinecke 1900: 282 f.
different from the tradition of the earth mating with the sky in that the papa alone is the source. The use in Polynesia of the earth-sky model, found world-wide, appears on the available evidence to be later.\(^{49}\) Despite variations, the general direction of the genealogy is from large rocks to smaller ones – as seen in the steady position of Ma’ata’aanoa ‘Loose rocks’ – until the earth is capable of bearing plants (the least directional of the texts is the war model variant, Bülow 1899: 60 ff.). This follows the pattern of the transformation of volcanic fields and of the preparing of an area for horticulture.

The genealogy of the rocks can be followed by a section on plants; a section that is much less regular, although mutia appears more than once in the texts cited.\(^{50}\) The appearance after the plants of a small animal, ‘imoa ‘rat,’ in several texts suggests that a section on animals could have followed that on plants. A section on the origin of human beings can be attached to that on plants by means of the tradition that human beings emerged from the ffe ‘vine.’\(^{51}\)

The expected place for the genealogy of the rocks is at the head of a genealogy.\(^{52}\) Genealogies that contain the genealogy of the rocks but begin with other elements fall into three types, all clearly secondary absorptions of that older genealogy into new composite texts. The first type is the result of intellectual speculation seeking some cosmic origin more ultimate than rocks. The abstract conclusion of that quest is leai ‘nothing, absence.’

There was first of all Leai, nothing. Thence sprang Nanamu, fragrance. Then Efuefu, dust. Then Iloa, perceivable. Then Maua, obtainable. Then Eleele, earth. Then Papatu, high rocks. Then Maataanoa, small stones. Then Muanga, mountains. Then Muanga married Malaeulu, or changeable meeting-place, and had a daughter called Fasieu, piece of dust. She married Lave i fulufu tolo, or down of the sugar-cane flower, and to her was born three sons ... [human beings].\(^{54}\)

From nothing, the one-source genealogy moves to the imaginably least material of material objects, fragrance, and then to progressively more material or, more precisely, hard objects: dust, the visible (Iloa), the palpable or graspable (Maua), the earth, the rock. The older version of the genealogy of the rocks moved from rock to earth, from hardest to soft. Because it starts with nothing, the Turner genealogy must move in the opposite direction and, once it has reached rock, must then move back in the traditional direction to provide a ground suitable for plants. The pattern is broken by Muanga and Malaeulu, perhaps because they mark the point at which the one-source genealogy changes into a two-source one; they are corresponding names, discussed below. Ma’ata’aanoa is traditional in Samoan cosmogonic texts; Fasieu appears in this text alone of those discussed. The genealogy of the rocks has, therefore, been modified to fit a later speculation on the origin of the universe.

The second type of text simply places two or more figures in the genealogy before the rocks. These figures can have some traditional place within Samoan origin texts. Afi misaeasae ‘blazing fire,’ appears after the genealogy of the rocks in one text and – along with a mate with a corresponding name, Mutalali ‘knisternde Feuer’ ‘crackling fire’ – in front of it in another.\(^{55}\)

---

\(^{49}\) The earth-sky mating was developed extensively in the Society Islands (Charlot 1985: 175). The papa can be the origin of the sky in Samoan texts (Frazier 1892: 171 section 16; Krämer 1902: 106).

\(^{50}\) Stuebel 1896/1973: 162/2 § 1, from Mutia till the end of the paragraph; cf. the significant name Faalula ‘to make grow’ in the next text, placed between the genealogy of the rocks and lmoa. Turner 1884: 3, “Fasiefu, piece of dust ... married Lave i fulufu tolo, or down of the sugar-cane flower ...” Stair 1896: 35; Bülow 1899: 62 f.

\(^{51}\) Stuebel 1896: IV, addition to 1896/1973: 161/1; 162/2 (“O le gafa o Tagaloaalagi o le alii sa pule i le lagi na ia faia Samoa”). Bülow 1898c: 106; 1899: 62; Krämer 1902: 168 (see note 1 for the archaic version of the word and Krämer’s speculations); cf. 240. Cf. the use of Fe’e in such texts, e.g., Stuebel 1896/1973: 161/1. This animal section seems to have been developed into one on the origin of animal-shaped gods.

\(^{52}\) Bülow 1899: 62. Imoale is placed after human beings, which may be a displacement caused by the connection of human beings to the vine. Cf. the creational texts, Stuebel 1896/1973: 161 f.1; Stair 1896: 35; also Fraser 1892: 175. Pratt (1890: 657) has human beings emerge directly from the loose stones and mud. The sequence – elements, plants, animals, human beings – can be found also in the Kamudipo.

\(^{53}\) As in Turner 1884: 4; Stuebel 1896/1973: 161 f.1; Pratt 1890: 657; Bülow 1898c: 105 f.

\(^{54}\) Turner 1884: 3. Interpretations in Bastian 1889: 70–73; Reinecke 1900: 282 f., who confuses the two separate texts, Turner 1884: 3 and 3 f. Leai texts are mentioned by Bastian 1894: 20, 22; Achelis 1895: 229, who refers to Maori Kore texts from New Zealand. The use of other abstractions can be found in Samoan texts; see, e.g., below, notes 99, 106.

\(^{55}\) Stuebel 1896/1973: 161/1 f. Cf. Turner 1884: 6 f.; Bülow 1899: 60, in which afe misaeasae and Fe’e have been placed at the head of a war-model variant of the genealogy of the rocks, in all likelihood because of the tradition of their conflict; Stuebel 1896/1973: 161/1. Afi misaeasae may have been suggested by ritual uses of fire, e.g., Turner 1986: 166, “A flaming fire ... was the regular evening offering to the gods ...”; 1884: 75, 116, 149, 156 f.; also Pritchard 1968: 123 f. Fe’e can be found in texts on the origin of the universe in the Society Islands (Charlot 1985: 174 note 43) and Hawai’i (Beckwith 1972: 95, 203 line 615).

Examples of the process described can be found in Anthros 86.1991
Some such figures can be found, however, who have little or no traditional place in Samoan origin texts, such as Malamagaga’e and Malamagagaifo ‘Eastward Light’ and ‘Westward Light.’ The names of such couples often correspond, which connects them to the folk tradition of story-telling. In fact, such names from genealogies can be found in genealogical story introductions. Genealogical speculation seems in these cases to have borrowed from the folk tale tradition.

The third type of text, those in which the genealogy of the rocks has been subordinated to the Tagaloa tradition, will be discussed in the next section.

b) The Tagaloa Literature

The Tagaloa literature can best be studied as a body of interrelated texts of different genres, beginning with the Solo o le Vā and developed both by intellectuals – who resolve speculatively the problems of that chant and add new materials – and by exponents of the folk literature.

The founding document of the Tagaloa theology is the Solo o le Vā, a long and complex chant, only a few aspects of which can be discussed here. The Solo is related to a number of Samoan genres. For instance, it is in part a taunting chant against other islands and thus resembles other taunting chants and genres in Samoan literature. E.g., Krämer 1902: 219 f., 434, 461; 1903: 336 (a saying). Indeed, a standard taunt against Savai‘i may be related to the taunt in the Solo, Fraser 1897, line 76; Krämer, line 69, E namala fua i manu, ‘ina tetete ‘[Savai‘i] draws its dignity in vain from its mountain, because it is big’; also, against Fiji, Fraser, line 71; Krämer, lines 56–57. The taunt states that Savai‘i is lalafafa, an archaic word, Fraser 1895: 391; Stuebel 1896/1973: 170/10; Savai‘i le nau lalafafa; Krämer 1902: 418 line 69, O Savai‘i se nu’u e lalafafa; 426 line 169, I Savai‘i, se nu’u lalafafa; 461 line 7, Savai‘i lalafafa. The word does not appear in Milner 1966 and is given two relevant glosses by Pratt 1960: 170, “the level top of a mountain . . . chiefless; a land without chiefs.” The latter is the translation preferred by Krämer 1902: 461 note 7, “keine Häuptlinge haben” ‘to have no chiefs’ (see also 46); and Fraser 1895: 393. However, that sense might be an extension of the more basic sense “flat,” as translated by Stuebel 1896: 71; see also Milner 1966: 198, “sālafafla . . . be flaten.” Cf. the similar taunting of Savai‘i as a flat-topped teve plant, discussed below. Hovdhaugen comments: “lalafafa has undoubtedly the basic meaning ‘flat’ and the word with this meaning is well attested in other Polynesian languages. But as chiefs sometimes are considered tall or even compared favourably to mountains, it could also have the metaphorical meaning ‘without chiefs’ and I have got this interpretation from a number of Samoans and I think it is the current one in Samoa, Savai‘i included” (private communication).

The Solo o le Vā can also be related to songs of praise for places and persons. In its turn, the Solo has had a major influence on later themes, motifs, and expressions in Samoan literature.

Of course the texts I will discuss were not the only Manu‘a traditions on the subject.

56 Genealogical texts that do not contain the genealogy of the rocks: Ma‘ata’anao and Imoa are used to begin the genealogy in Krämer 1902: 101. Similarly, fe‘e ‘octopus,’ is used after the genealogy of the rocks in Stuebel 1896/1973: 161/1, but is elsewhere used to form a couple with corresponding names, Feenaga and Feecata, Bülow 1898c: 105, who begin a genealogy. Compare the use of Pō and Ao ‘night and day’ in similar materials, Krämer 1902: 393 f., 413, 415; also Fraser 1891: 243 f.; 1892: 172 f.; 1897: 113, 117 f.; Hovdhaugen 1987: 68–78. On Pō and Ao elsewhere, see Charlot 1977: 498–501; 1985: 171.

57 Krämer 1902: 167. These names may be the result of a speculation similar to that which produced the genealogies that begin with lea‘i; but note the parallel with the Samoan Bible, Tusia Paia 1884: I 16. I have followed the Pratt 1960 glosses of malama or malama. A Malamalama can be found in Smith 1898: 153. Cf. the use of such names to begin genealogies that do not contain the genealogy of the rocks, Krämer 1902: 246: Tuiousisifo and Tuiousasa‘e; 378: Aga‘eta and Aga‘etai.

58 Krämer 1902: 378, 382; the names used in a genealogy on 378 appear in a genealogical story introduction on 382; see also 246 and 261. For corresponding names, see above, notes 55, 56; Charlot 1990: 419.

59 See above, 133. A variety of genres is mentioned in my discussion. For proverbial sayings, see Schultz 1965: nrs. 477, 478, 479; and, above, note 36. I will discuss Samoan bodies of literature in the next article in this series. On the Hawaiian body of literature around the pig god Kamapua‘a, see Charlot 1987.

Anthros 86, 1991
Variations can be found in the available published texts of the Solo, and a complete analysis of the poem would require a professional establishment of the text. Besides variations in spelling, capitalization, and word and line division from the original publication (Powell 1887: 156–162), Powell and Pratt (1890: 207–212) displace some verses and add a section (208 lines 18–24). Fraser (1897: 20–27) follows the Powell-Pratt text and translation. The Krämer version (1902: 395–400) was collected from two sources (5, 394) and is the longest of the three.

Like some other long chants, the Solo can be divided into sections that largely preserve their form even when they are placed differently within the whole. For instance, the Powell-Pratt addition referred to above is placed towards the end of the Krämer version. Multiline portions of sections can also be displaced, as seen in the references below. Some of these sections are long, while others are so short as to resemble easily quotable sayings.

Long: e.g., the wave list (Fraser 1897, lines 1–11; Krämer, lines 1–10); the tupu of islands (Fraser, lines 16–17, insertion, 25–35; Krämer, lines 14–21, 110–113); Tagaloa’s creative activity (Fraser, lines 36–48; Krämer, lines 23–25; with displacement of three lines); creation of human beings (Fraser, lines 49–69; Krämer, lines 36–54); the priority of the Tui Manu’a in regard to boat- and house-building (Fraser, lines 110–114; Krämer, lines 96–100).

Short: e.g., Fraser, lines 79–80; Krämer, lines 58–59. Fraser, lines 81–83; Krämer, lines 72–74, the priority of the Tui Manu’a, placed between different verses by each version. Fraser, lines 93–94; Krämer, lines 90–91; cf. Schultz: nr. 502.

This division of the chant into sections may be reflected in and facilitated by the composition of sections with end rimes, which were emphasized in chanting (Powell 1887: 155). For instance, following the Fraser text, all but the last three lines of the section on the creation of human beings consist of two rimed passages: the first twelve lines rime in -a (previous vowels irregular: alilulelo), and the next six in -o (previous vowel regularly i).

A chanter could, therefore, vary the chant by placing its sections in somewhat different order, although the major sequence is preserved: wave list, Tagaloa’s desire to rest (Fraser 1897, lines 12–15; Krämer 1902, lines 11–13), tupu and creation of islands, creation of human beings, and the priority of Manu’a and the Tui Manu’a with the guild of house- and boat-builders. Within those sections, especially the last, considerable variation can be found in the sequence of lines. Indeed, some lines or sections seem easily moveable, such as those that taunt other islands; that is, sections that do not impinge on the major sequence (Fraser, lines 70–78; Krämer, lines 55–57, 65–71).

As is typical of major Polynesian chants, the Solo is based on earlier materials and traditions. It is, therefore, a multilevelled text like those found in the Society Islands and Hawai’i and must be interpreted in the context of its traditional background. Moreover, the Solo itself must be recognized as the basis in turn of later Tagaloa texts.

The problems of interpretation can be illustrated by those surrounding the ambiguous relation in the solo o le Vā of Tagaloa to the Tūi, a bird prominent in Samoan origin texts and arguably the subject of an independent tradition. Both are mentioned together early in the chant, but then the Tūi disappears and all the action is carried out by Tagaloa. Tagaloa himself, however, possesses bird-like characteristics in that he flies and alights.

Diverse solutions are recorded in Samoan literature and tradition to the problem of this ambiguous relationship. The Tūi can be simply called an incarnation of Tagaloa. The Tūi can be Tagaloa’s son or daughter. More philosophically, the Tūi can be called the ata of Tagaloaalagi or of another Tagaloa. Ata is glossed “a shadow … A spirit … The emblem or representative of an

---

63 Fraser, lines 18–24. Krämer, lines 103–109; see p. 399, note 12.

64 Fraser, lines 13–14; Krämer, lines 11–12. – Krämer’s version follows that of the first publication, Powell 1887: 156 lines 12–13, in which the Tūi is mentioned before Tagaloa, giving it a certain emphasis. The placement of the Tagaloa line before that of the Tūi seems to be an attempt to weaken the problem by absorbing the Tūi into Tagaloa. Contrast Lesson 1876: 592, in which the actions of Tagaloa and the Tūi are differentiated.

The word tūli can be used for more than one kind of bird; Powell (1887: 151) identifies the tūli of Tagaloa as the sea-plover; cf. Stair 1896: 36; Bülow 1895: 139; 1898d: 257.

65 Fraser, lines 13–14; Krämer, lines 11–12. – Tālai is glossed by both Pratt 1960 and Milner 1966 as ‘to stand or stand up’ and is so translated by Krämer. But the sense in the passage Fraser, lines 22–24; Krämer, lines 107–109, seems to require the sense ‘alert;’ that is, Tagaloa is descending from the firmament and needs a place to land. But see Fraser, line 36, in which tīmāu is used instead of the tālai of Krämer, line 26.
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aitu . . ." (Pratt 1960: 35); "Shadow . . . Reflection . . . Copy, duplicate . . . Picture, illustration," etc. (Milner 1966: 26); "sichtbare Manifestation" 'visible manifestation' (Cain 1979: 29); "das Emblem einer aitu, Inkarnation, Pratt" 'the emblem of an aitu, incarnation, Pratt.' The Tuil'i can also be called a servant of Tagaloa (Stuebel 1896/1973: 162/2). The collaboration of Tagaloa and the Tuil'i can be found in other texts, which are in all likelihood influenced by the Solo o le Vai.69

The connection of Tagaloa to a bird is developed variously in other island groups, such as Tonga (Dixon 1916: 19), and avian characteristics for the god himself are highly prevalent in the Society Islands.70 Traditions referred to in the latter group of laying an egg on the water to form islands (Kirtley 1971: A641) find a partial parallel in the Samoan story of the origin of the god Moso: the lupe 'pigeon or dove,' dropped an egg onto the ocean from which Moso was hatched (Bilow 1899–1900: 145).

One can speculate, therefore, whether the ambiguous relation of Tagaloa and the Tuil'i in the Solo o le Vai is the result of an appropriation into the Tagaloa tradition of the Tuil'i along with its associated imagery: such as flying, looking down, and dropping something from the sky onto the water. Another example of this would be the story of the naming of human body parts after the Tuil'i, to be discussed below. There is, of course, evidence in Polynesia for the connection of birds to human beings and for the view of birds as go-betweens between the sky and the earth (Kirtley 1971: A165.2.2; Shore 1982: 131). Moreover, theriomorphic gods seem to be anterior to anthropomorphic

in much of Polynesia (Charlot 1983: 146 f.; 1987: e.g., 8 ff.), more Samoan evidence of which can be found in the traditions of Pili, to be discussed in the third article in this series.

A less speculative example of the Solo's relation to its background is its extensive and explicit use of the widespread tradition that the land tupu 'grew, emerged,' out of the water. Tupu is a conventional term of Polynesian origin speculation71 and, in the Solo o le Vai, is used for the origin of Manu'a, Fiti, Tonga, and all the other or "little" lands.72 The statement that all the other islands also grew or emerged contradicts the statement elsewhere in the Solo that 'Upolou and Tutuila were created by Tagaloa.73 Such contradictions indicate that an earlier tradition is being incorporated into a later context. In this case, a tupu tradition of the origin of all the islands is being placed in a chant

71 For uses in other Samoan, origin-of-the-universe texts, see, e.g., Pratt 1890: 657; Stuebel 1896/1973: 161/1 ff.; Bilow 1899: 59; for more references, see Cain 1979: 216 and note 174. Cf. tupuna'a, Pratt 1960: 354; also, the expression ia faatupu ma'a le malo 'may the government be [established] as firmly as a rock,' Stuebel 1896/1973: 176/16; and the line in the chant, Krämer 1902: 419 line 13, I le malo 'ia tupa ma'a. For the Society Islands, see Charlot 1985: 171 f. For the similar tradition that the land fotu "Appear . . . Blossom out . . ." (Milner 1966: 68) out of the water, see Krämer 1902: 84.

The word used regularly in Samoan cosmic origin texts for land is na'u. This is a somewhat archaic sense; although Pratt (1960: 236) glosses "A country, an island," the sense can be apprehended in Milner 1966: 159, only in the combination ma'utuātū "Islet." The sense in Krämer (1903: 305) seems clearly 'place' rather than 'village.' See also Fraser 1892: 182, Versus Shore 1982: 310.

72 Manu'a: Fraser, lines 16–17, 84–87; Krämer, lines 14–15, 60–64. – The others: Fraser, lines 25–29; Krämer, lines 16–18, 110–111. Cf. Fraser, line 20; Krämer, line 105. Note the similar use of the word gofoa for Manu'a, Fraser, line 33; Krämer, line 112 (translated "erstand"). The word is not in Milner 1966, and neither of the senses in Pratt (1960: 159) is appropriate. The word seems to be archaic with a sense related to those given for foa in Milner 1966: 67; the title of the Solo contains the word foafoaga; also, Fraser 1897: 32. Kenese 1849 uses foafoaina instead of faia, as discussed below. Cf. Shore 1982: 130.

73 Tupu: Fraser, lines 29, 35; Krämer, lines 18, 113. – Creation of 'Upolou and Tutuila: Fraser, lines 43–46; Krämer, lines 30–33. Another contradiction can be found in Fraser, line 21; Krämer, line 106: the vai 'fresh water,' tai 'sea water,' and the lagī 'firmament,' are said also to have originated in the tupu process. This contradicts the rest of the chant, in which the firmament and the ocean are already present (fresh water is not mentioned). This line occurs in a section that does not appear in the Powell 1887 text, mentioned above, 137, and may provide an argument for its secondary character, perhaps a product of the same sort of speculation that produced the extension of Tagaloa's creativity in Fraser 1892: 171 f.

68 Krämer 1902: 352; also 1903: 159, "Sinnbild." Fraser 1892: 182, "spirit-emblem." Fraser 1892: 186. For examples, see Powell 1887: 156 (see also 150 f., 153); Bastian 1894: 13; Fraser 1897: 20. For uses of ata in other contexts, see, e.g., Stair 1895: 48; Stuebel 1896/1973: 163/3; Moore 1881: 132 ff., 140. See Cain 1979: 209; for further references: 28 ff., 76–79, 479–504, for his extensive discussion of ata. The use of ata in the texts discussed is clearly an extension of the literal sense, but the choice of an English gloss is always problematic.

In 'O le Tupu aaga o Sama'a 'Aonia, Fraser 1892: 173 section 32, the sun and the moon are called ata of Tagaloa (see also 187); the same text provides another philosophical connection between the god and the Tuil'i, 172 section 22: Tagaloa fa'a atupu the Tuil'i, that is, he made it grow or arise. On tupu, see below.


70 Waitz and Gerland 1872: 236; Charlot 1985: 178. For a possible, rare Hawaiian tradition of the origin of land from the laying of an egg on the ocean, see Westervelt 1963: 168 f.
in which two of those islands are being claimed as products of Tagaloa's creative activity.

Moreover, Tagaloa's relation to the *tupu* process is unclear. There is no indication whatsoever within the chant itself that Tagaloa has caused that process. He is described only as flying above the ocean, being frightened by the waves, and desiring a place to rest (Fraser 1897, lines 12–15, 24; Krämer 1902, lines 11–13, 109). The *tupu* of the islands—and later his creation of 'Upolu and Tutuila—provide places for him to alight. Tagaloa's desire and the *tupu* are juxtaposed, but no creative activity is made explicit.

Later thinkers in the Tagaloa tradition expanded his creativity to the *tupu* process. One device for doing this was to provide the god with the epithet *fa'atutupuni* 'who made the lands to *tupu*. The epithet is in fact so common that it can be used as a name. I will discuss below the use made of the epithet and other aspects of *tupu* in the late prose explanation of the Solo, *O le Tupa'aga o Sāmoa 'Atoa*.

A major tradition to be absorbed by the Solo *o le Vā* was the genealogical, of which a variety of evidence can be found in the chant. The genealogical relation between Tagaloa and the first Tui Manu'a is explicit: he is not only the first ali'i 'chief,' but also *O le alo o Tagaloa* the offspring/son of Tagaloa,' who slid down from the firmament (Fraser, lines 81–83; Krämer, lines 72–74). Since no mother is mentioned, the genealogical connection seems to be one-source, as in a text of the genealogy of the rocks (Stuebel 1896/1973: 161/1).

That genealogy itself has been used in various ways in the Solo. Again explicit is the phrase *Fā'ana le papa* in a couplet that is placed differently in the Fraser and Krämer versions and could have been an independent saying expressing the fertility of the universe. Fatu and 'Ele'ele are mentioned (Fraser, line 78; Krämer, line 71); both names or variations appear in the genealogical texts cited above. Moreover, these two names are connected to the genealogy of the peopling of Savai'i and thus clearly appropriate to the context of the passage: the taunting of that island. That taunting follows the pattern of genealogical chants in Fraser, lines 72–76; Krämer, lines 65–69. Fiji and Tonga are named and called the *papa sesee* e, which could be translated either the slippery or the floating rock. The image is one of instability as opposed to the fixity of Manu'a, as described later in the passage: *fatu lē gā'e* 'immovable stone.' Following the *papa sesee* e, the next three lines form a plant section, as proper to a genealogy of cosmic origin, but that section is used to taunt Savai'i. That is, the plants mentioned— the *māsoā* 'arrowroot' and the *teve* 'stink lily'—recall the tradition that they were used to prop up the sky after it was separated from the earth. Savai'i is compared to the flat-topped *teve* and in the next line is described as basing its dignity in vain on its mountains, which are nothing compared to Manu'a. Fiji is elsewhere taunted in the same fashion (Fraser, lines 71–72; Krämer, lines 55–57), and the mountain of Manu'a is emphasized as the resting place of Tagaloa (Fraser, lines 36–37; Krämer, lines 26–27). The passage seems to be a multilevelled taunt against Savai'i, arguing that it should not boast of its mountain, which was perhaps considered the prop of the sky in a Savai'i tradition.

Finally, acquaintance with the genealogical traditions anterior to the Solo *o le Vā* makes possible the recognition that the Manu'a chanter follows the basic scheme of beginning an origin text with a typologizing list. However, in this case, the list is not one of the rocks, but of the surging waves.

---

74 Krämer 1902: 174. Curiously, the epithet and the tradition were unknown to Bülow 1897b: 376; the wording of the passage makes me suspect that Bülow was leading his informants. He translates "Städtegründer" 'founder of cities,' using the modern sense of *ni'u* as village. In other writings, Bülow is more open to the authenticity of Samoan creational texts; see above, 132.

75 Fraser, lines 79–80; Krämer, lines 58–59. The repetition of *fua* in the second verse emphasizes the sense of fertility. Note the text variation of *mannu* in Fraser and *ni'u* in Krämer 1902: 397 note 9, Krämer's translation contradicts his note 9, Fraser 1897: 50 clearly connects the phrase to genealogies.

76 Krämer 1902: 44, 398 note 7, Fraser 1897: 25 translates: "[Whose father is] the stone, and [mother] the earth." See also Fraser 1892: 172 section 20, subsections 1, 5: 173 section 31; 174 section 38; 187 f.; also 1891: 269 Note; 1895: 392; 1896: 178. Note the uses of *fatu* in the Solo *o le Vā*, Fraser, lines 44, 77; Krämer, lines 31, 70. Cf. *foaga* below, note 95.

77 See Pratt 1960: 273. The word does not appear in Milner 1966. On the following, cf. the above discussion of the taunting of Savai'i as "flat."

78 Fraser, line 77; Krämer, line 70. The phrase is part of a play on words with the next line in which Fatu is mentioned; vs. Fraser 1897: 30. Cf. Fraser, line 18; Krämer, line 103 (?; also p. 399 note 10), in which Manu'a is called a *papa* that the sea cannot reach. Cf. *O le Tupa'aga o Sāmoa 'Atoa*, Fraser 1892: 171 section 15, e o o leva le tia ia te oe. Not directly related to our subject is Fraser, line 101; Krämer, line 86.

79 Fraser 1897: 29 f; Krämer 1902: 398 note 3. See also *O le Tupa'aga o Sāmoa 'Atoa*, Fraser 1892: 172 section 20 subsection 6; the author states that they were also the first plants to *tupu*; also p. 185.
and breakers of an uninterrupted expanse of ocean (Fraser, lines 1–11; Krämer, lines 1–10). The sequentially ordered rocks have been dissolved into an image that stimulates Tagaloa’s fearful vertigo and desire for a place to rest – the motive for his creative activity. The chanter is choosing the tradition that begins with water rather than the one that begins with rock, but is using a device of the latter to render the former more vivid. The power of the poetry is considerable and must have been even more impressive to those first hearers who would have been expecting the genealogy of the rocks.

As in the case of the tupu process, the exact relation of Tagaloa to the genealogical elements in the Solo o le Vā is not clear – except in the case of the god’s relation to the Tui Manu’a – and needed to be made more explicit by later thinkers of the Tagaloa tradition. Moreover, many of those thinkers apparently wanted to incorporate a larger quantity of genealogical elements into their complexes. There are thus a number of texts in which the genealogy of the rocks is explicitly absorbed into a Tagaloa framework. This can be done in a number of ways. Tagaloa can simply be placed ahead of the genealogy of the rocks, thus according him priority. That genealogy can follow on Tagaloa’s creative activity, such as the Māui-like tradition of Tagaloa’s fishing up land.

Stair 1896: 35 f.; Bälow 1899: 59 f., the genealogy of the rocks appears in the variant war or conflict model; for Bälow’s analysis, 63–66. The connection between the land-fishing section and the following war model is very loose. Each has a separate quasi-titular sentence, respectively, O le taofii leni o Samoa ‘This is the view of Samoans,’ and O le taofii lea o le tupuga o le anaualau ‘This is the view of the emergence of the earth.’ Between the reference to catching the land and the war model rock section is found the battle between the afi mūsēaeae and the fe’e; this reference to their traditional conflict (e.g., Stuebel 1896/1973: 161/1) is clearly beginning of the rock conflict section, which was originally independent of the Tagaloa land fishing section. The connection between the sections is made by the repetition of manu ‘caught,’ in reference to the land. For the land-fishing tradition unconnected to the genealogy of the rocks, see Bälow 1898b: 81. For references, see Cain 1979: 216. Waitz and Gerland (1872: 242, 259 f.) emphasize the fact that Tagaloa and Māui traditions can be confused in several parts of Polynesia.

In some texts, Tagaloa follows the genealogy of the rocks, producing complexes in which the genealogical and the creational seem to be co-ordinated, each having its proper sphere. Two major examples are “O le tala i le tupuga o Samoa”

‘The story of the growth/emergence of Sāmoa’ and “O le tupuga o le Eelē o Samoa ma tagata” ‘The growth/emergence of the earth of Sāmoa and human beings.’ In the latter, the genealogy of the rocks (initiated by Afimsuasesae and Mutalali) and a plant section are followed by a series of motifs of the Tagaloa literature. The god looks down and sees that the previously mentioned trees are big, so he sends down his servant, the Fue ‘Vine,’ to lower them. He then sends down the Tuī. Both will be used in the concluding account of the origin of human beings, to be discussed below.

“O le tala i le tupuga o Samoa” follows the same scheme but incorporates more elements into a framework that emphasizes the genealogical. The one-source genealogy of the rocks extends to Siupapa and then connects to two other figures found elsewhere in cosmic origin texts, Fe’e and afi mūsēaeae, introduced as succeeding generations. The one-source pattern is then broken as Fe’e and afi mūsēaeae each have two offspring, respectively, sami ‘sea’ and vai ‘fresh water,’ and Lili and Vilo. 82

The genealogical model then gives way to that of war, the result of which is that the ground is covered with water. This is accomplished in two ways. The offspring of the Fe’e, sami and vai, win the war, which, according to the model, would mean that water covered all. Another image is added in an unusually poetic formulation: the Fe’e squirts its ink, ona lōfia ai lea o le ‘Ele’ele mātātitā ona moana ‘uma ai lea o le Lalolagi (text regularized) ‘so the dry ground was inundated, so all the subcelestial region was ocean.’

Using traditional devices, the redactor has incorporated a number of traditions into this first section of his complex: the genealogy of the rocks,

81 Stuebel 1896/1973: 161/2 and 162/2. – Bälow 1895: 139, published a German translation of the latter and was apparently the source for other texts as well, Bälow 1898c: 102; see also 1899: 58 f. For traditions similar to each text, see, respectively, Smith 1898: 153 f. and Stair 1896: 35 f.; also Turner 1884: 6 f. For the same scheme in the Society Islands, see Charlott 1885: 170.
82 For the former two, cf., e.g., Turner 1884: 6. I have not found the latter two in other relevant texts. Fe’e and afi mūsēaeae seem also to be treated as contemporaries rather than parent and offspring with this change of pattern. In Bälow 1899: 59 f., they are simply paired opponents; note also the switch from war model to genealogy, p. 62. The awkwardness in the text under discussion is caused by the use of the one-source progression of the genealogy of the rocks to introduce the two figures.
83 Cf. Fraser 1892: 171 section 15. – Having land that could not be covered by water is a theme found in various forms, e.g., the Solo o le Vā, Fraser, line 18; Krämer, line 103 (7); Stair 1896: 35.
Fe’e, afi mūsaesae, war, and flood. Moreover, he has now arrived at the same situation as that of the beginning of the Solo o le Vā. The text now continues with the motif derived from that chant: Tagaloa looks down.

The following section through the story of the creation of human beings is made up of familiar motifs both from Samoan literature in general and from the Tagaloa literature. Framing devices include genealogical succession and conventional devices of series building. Again, the redactor includes more material than found in “O le tupuga o le Eleele o Samoa ma tagata.”

Rather than moving immediately toward the story of the creation of human beings, an intermediate generation is inserted. Tagaloaalagi sees a piece of coral, puga, floating on the water, has it fetched and scratched or carved, and has mauli and aagāa brought from Tagaloa a nimono, with which he makes the female body live, o opeapea le puga ... ona ola ai lea.84 The story is told in extremely close parallel - both in events and language - to the later one of the origin of human beings.

Coral story: ua aave le puga ia Tagaloaalagi ua fai atu Tagaloaalagi ia gaio e alu ane e totoisi le puga, ua uma ona totoisi o le puga, ... ona fai atu lea o Tagaloaalagi ia Gaio e alu se feau ia Tagaloa a nimono e aumai mauli ma agaga. ... Maggot story: ona aave lea e le Tuli ia Tagaloaalagi o le Tuga ona fai atu lea o Tagaloaalagi ia Gaio e alu ane e totoisi le Tuga ona totoisi lea o le Tuga ... ona fai atu lea o gaio ia Tagaloaalagi ua uma ona totoisi o le Tuga, ona fai mai lea o Tagaloaalagi e alu se feau ia Tagaloaanimonimo e aumai mauli ma agaga. ...

Tagaloa takes the female coral to wife, and she bears the Tuli, ua ola ... Tuli. The motif of a child asking about and looking for his rightful home is used to motivate the creation of land by throwing down a rock: the Tuli’s home would be like his mother, a rock on the ocean.85

The Tuli descends to his home, and the section then begins on the fue ‘vine,’ from which will come the maggots to be made into human beings. This section, as similar ones in other texts mentioned, contains a number of themes - such as the control of the sun and the discordancy in nature - and motifs, such as following the vine.86

The story of the creation of human beings consists of redactional sections that parallel the coral story and the story of the naming of human parts after the Tuii, which has been inserted between those sections. That is, ae tu le Tuli ... aua foi tulivae has been inserted between totoisi lea o le Tuga and ona fai atu lea o gaio. Note that tulivae is the last word in the version of the story in “O le tupuga o le Eleele o Samoa ma tagata” and in Stair (1896: 36; cf. Lesson 1876: 593). The redactional work of the insertion is clear. From the first story, the redactor has taken the sentence ua uma ona totoisi o le puga ‘the scratching of the coral was finished.’ He has used this sentence in two ways. The first time – ona totoisi lea o le Tuga ‘then he scratched the maggot’ – expresses an incomplete action to which the Tuli story is then attached, ae tu le Tuli ‘but the Tuli stood.’ The redactor uses the sentence a second time after that story in exact parallel to its use in the coral story: ua uma ona totoisi o le Tuga ‘the scratching of the maggot was finished.’

A short story of the origin of the words tāne ‘male,’ and tagata ‘human being,’ is then given, ona sau ai le o le gata ... ma le tagata, as well as a genealogy that reaches to the time of composition and concluding remarks (Stuebel 1896: IV). The redactor has clearly been able to incorporate a large amount of material into his complex, coordinate both pre-Tagaloa and Tagaloa traditions, and place them in a framework that is made up of both genealogical and creational elements.

One of the most extensive uses of the tupu and genealogical models can be found in “O le Tala i le Tupuaga o Samoa Atoa Foi i ma Manu’a a e Amata le Tala ona Fia i Manu’a” (referred to as ‘O le Tupu’aga o Sāmoa ‘Atoa). The text is a tilagi or explanation of the chant ‘O le Solo o le Vā and both adds traditions and interprets unclear points in the chant. I will describe it briefly.87 The first paragraph, section 13, resembles a single story introduction in that the protagonist, Tagaloa, is introduced and general information is given about him: he is an atua ‘god,’ lives in the vānimono

84 Milner 1966: 141, mauli “Seat of the emotions”; 7, aagāa “Soul ... Spirit.” – The coral is called faimē, which can mean either ‘female’ or ‘woman,’ but it is called Puga ‘coral,’ again shortly afterwards, so it should not be considered human. The story may, however, be based on a possible alternative tradition of the origin of human beings, several of which are mentioned below.

85 For the motif, see above, note 41. A close parallel is Fraser 1900: 128 f. Voyage motivations will be discussed in the next article in this series.

86 E.g., Bīlow 1898a: 11; Brown 1914: 414 nr. 63; Schultz 1965: nr. 550. For the vine used in a curse, see Fraser 1896: 180.

87 Fraser 1892: 171–175; the relation between the two works and their publication history have been discussed above. Charlot 1988: 302 f. In the following discussion, I will refer to passages by section number. See also Bastian 1894: 9 f., 23, 30–38 (translation); Scheffrahn 1965: 157–166; Freeman 1983: 181 f. Anthropos 86.1991
space,' and made all things. The beginning of his creative activity is also described, as will be discussed below: he stands and, at that place, the Papa *tupu* 'grows, arises.' The last section (43) is a conclusion to the whole complex.

The complex is divided into three parts, each of which incorporates earlier traditions into a redactional framework. The first, sections 13–20, describes the origin of a number of elements — the genealogy of the rocks, earth, ocean, firmament, space (the raising of the sky), and human beings — and their being put into their proper places. The framework seems to have been invented by the redactor and is most original. The second part, sections 19–32, is based mainly on earlier traditions about Pō, Ao, and the sun, describes the origin and raising of the second through the ninth firmaments, the origin of other Tagaloas with different epithets, the Tuì, the sun, the moon, day and night, the stars, Sāmōa, Manuʻa, different lands and their peopling, the house- and boat-builders, the Tuï Manuʻa, and so on, and their placement. The third part, sections 33–42, is closely modeled on the *Solo o le Vā* and other Tagaloa literature and describes the origin of Savaiʻi, 'Upolu, Tutuila, Fiji, and Tonga, their naming and peopling, the creation of human beings, and the priority of Manuʻa. Each part is organized very rigorously through redactional devices, especially the series.

The serial organization of the first part will be discussed below. In the second, section 21, the raising of the different skies is told in much the same language. The third part is organized through two series with much stereotyped phrasing: a four-part series of the origins of Tonga, Savaiʻi, 'Upolu, and Tutuila, sections 33, 34, 39, *ona silatia ifo lea Tagaloa ... ona fagafui tupu aiia e lea ...*; and a three-part series of the origins of the names *asu sase,* Atu-Fiti, and Atu-Toga, sections 35–37, *ave ... le ulaga aiga naue iga aiia ...* The latter seems to be a redactional composition based on the independent, widely known stories of Sava and l'i, section 38, and Tutu and Ila, section 40. Standard devices for building a series are used throughout, such as the use of the word *toe* 'again,' (Charlot 1990: 423).

The redactor has obviously incorporated a number of alternative traditions for the origins of several objects — such as, most obviously, land and human beings — and integrates them in various ways into his framework, which emphasizes the priority of Tagaloa. That framework is based generally on the *Solo o le Vā*; Tagaloa is first seen flying in the immensity of space, travels to the different lands, holds a *fono* 'ceremonial meeting,' creates human beings, and so on. But the genealogy of the rocks and the Pō-Ao tradition are the materials at the basis of, respectively, the first and second parts; and motifs generalized in the Tagaloa literature — looking down, descending, and sending someone — are used extensively. The third part of the complex also uses traditions similar to those found in the two texts discussed above, "*O le tala i le tupuga o Samoa" and "O le tupuga o le Eleele o Samoa ma tagata," with Tagaloa-savali replacing the Tuì. This intensifies the assimilation of the tradition to Tagaloa and helps unify the second and third parts of the complex.

Even late Biblical influence can be suspected, for instance, in section 35, where Tagaloafaʻatuʻapunuʻu looks at his works, rejoices, and says, *Ua lelei* 'It is good.'

The language of section 35 — *e silatia i nuʻu, ua fiafa; ua fetalai aie; Ua lelei* 'he looked at the lands, rejoiced, said, "It is good"' (compare section 29) — is obviously near to the Samoan translation of Genesis, *Tusi Paia 1884: na silatia atu i ai le Atua, ua lelei* 'the god looked at it, it was good' (I 10, 12, 18, 21, 25; cf. 4, 31). The chiefly word *fetalai* for the god's speech is used in Genesis 13, 6, 9, 11, 14, 20, 24, 26, 28–29, II 16, 18; also in the *Solo o le Vā*; Fraser, line 62; Krämer, line 49; Fraser 1897: 29. Needless to say, older Samoan terms were naturally and appropriately used to translate the Bible: such as *tupu,* line 11, 20, 21, 22, 24, 29, II 5, 9 (*fautuapua*), 29; *lagi* and *iulagi,* line 4, 2, 8–9, 15, 17, 28; IV 4; *eleʻele* and *lauʻeleʻele,* line 19, 22, 24–26, 28–30; II 15, 17, 19, 18, 7; *sua,* line 10, 21–22, 26, 28; *ao* and *po,* line 5, 14, 16; *fatu* 'seed,' II 12, 29; *fansaʻau,* 128. For *silatia* see above, note 88; and for *fai* see the discussion below. Other linguistic similarities to the Biblical account are *ufuia,* II, and section 15; *poulii,* 12, 18, and *Ao-uli,* section 35. The odd expression *ina ia iloga ai,* section 40, may be influenced by *ela iloga ai,* section 40; but may remain in his tradition, as discussed below.
of fresh and sea water and their peopling, sections 15-16, 20
subsections 3-4. I see no reason to relate the use of mātālo, II 2-3, to Fraser, line 13; Krämer, line 12.

I have quoted Tusi Paia 1884 for convenience, since it is still in
print. However, the text of ‘O le Tupu’aga o Sāmoa ‘Åtoa
was collected in or before 1887, Fraser 1892: 261. I have
not been able to obtain the 1844 and 1862 editions of the
Samoa translation of the Bible, but a comparison with the
first publication of a Samoan translation of Genesis, Kenese
1849; 3–7, reveals only minor differences from the 1884 text:
11, 27: II 4: faoaosaina instead of faia; 11, 12, 21, ua silisila atu le
Åtoa i ai instead of ua silisila atu i ai le Åtoa; 120, vai instead of
sami; 122, tupu not used; 128, fānau instead of fanafanau;
129, fua instead of futa; 130, II 19–20, have vāniminimo; II 16,
polōa instead of fetailai. Tusi Paia 1872: 1. f. agrees in every
case with Tusi Paia 1884.

Compare Bülow 1897b: 376; 1889: 58.

Although the redactor’s thought may have
been stimulated by his contact with the Bible, it
remains definitely in the line of the increasing
extension of the god’s creative activity in the
Tagaloa literature and also within the conceptual
framework of that tradition. For instance, the need
of the god for a primordial space shows that he
is physical, not spiritual, and his creation is not
described as ex nihilo, but, in a key passage, by
the traditional devices of the Tagaloa literature: the
growth and genealogy models, especially the
genealogy of the rocks. As a result, his use of words
is closer to uses in distinctly Samoan traditions
such as opeapea, Stuebel (1896/1973: 161/1) and
Fraser (1892: 172 section 19) – than in the Bible
(see also above, note 88, for vāniminimo). In ‘O
le Tupu’aga o Sāmoa ‘Åtoa, opeapea expresses the
Polynesian tradition of the need to fix the islands
in place; the redactor is thus including an important
point missing from the Solo.

Moreover, although the redactor is interpreting
the Solo, he can disagree with it on important
points: ‘Upolu and Tutuila originated through the
tupu process rather than by Tagaloa throwing down
a rock, section 39, and Manu’a and Savai’i are
close rather than rivals, section 38.

A characteristic of the thinking of the redactor
is the expansion of earlier ideas or models to new
areas; for instance, he uses ata not only for the
Tuli, but for the sun and the moon as well (above,
note 68). Similarly, tupu is used in all three parts of
the complex, extensively in the third. The author
uses, of course, the traditional epithet for Tagaloa,
-fa’atupunuku, and identifies the god of that ephe-
thet as the highest of the Tagaloas, section 22. The
epithet is prominent in the redactor’s description
of the god in his quasi-introduction, section 13,
and in his prose reworking of the Solo o le Vā,
sections 33–40. Tagaloa is said to fa’atupu Fiji

and, in a regular four-part series, other islands,
including ‘Upolu and Tutuila, sections 33–34, 39.
The growth model impinges even on passages
normally genealogical. In a series of births, fānau,
the Vai ‘fresh water,’ is said to tupu.99 Tagaloa’s-
a-tutupunu’u, is said also to have fa’atupu ‘made
grow,’ Tagaloas with other epiteths as well as
the Tuli, section 22, although the relation of the
Tagaloa gods to each other is commonly consid-
ered genealogical. Tupu assumes a generalized or
abstract sense in section 40: human beings are said
to tutuap after their creation has been described,
and Teli and Upolu are said to tupu shortly before
they are described as the fānau ‘offspring,’ of the
Fue ‘Vine.’100

Similarly, the redactor incorporates genealo-
gical materials into his framework. The genealogy
of the rocks is absorbed into the redactor’s very
original description of Tagaloa’s creative activity,
to be described below. Subsidiary genealogies are
initiated by Tagaloa’s command (sections 16–18,
20 subsections 3–5, 21, 25–27, 31, 35–38). El-
ements from other cosmic origins texts appear:
Ele’ele is described with the words ‘O le matua
lea o tagata uma i le lalo lagi ‘this is the parent
of all human beings under the firmament.’91 All
human beings are described as the offspring of
Tagaloa (sections 35–37). As is his custom, the
redactor extends the genealogical model to new
elements, such as the components of human be-
ings, section 18, Manu’a and Sāmoa, section 27.
In such cases, it is not clear whether the redactor
is being original or has some traditional basis for
his extension. For instance, in the case of the
story of the origin of human beings from the
fue ‘vine,’ section 40, the maggots are said to
have been born, fānau, from the vine, whereas
the process by which the maggots emerged from
the vine is usually either undefined or ascribed
to the tupu process. However, tagata can be found
as the child of fue and la’au ‘tree, wood,’ in a
genealogy.102 The question is whether this or a
similar tradition was known to the redactor. In any
case, he seems definitely to have developed the
idea in his own way: he describes the Fue as the
alo ‘offspring,’ of Tagaloa and interprets the two
names for the vine in the Solo o le Vā, Fue-tagata
and Fue-sā (Fraser, lines 49, 56; Krämer, lines

99 Section 16. The redactor may be following the Solo, Fraser,
line 21; Krämer, line 106.
100 Note also that the word used for the title of the Tuli Manu’a
is tupu, section 31; the reason given is that tupu is the title
for Tagaloa-le-fuili in the ninth sky.
91 Section 15. On Fatu and ‘Ele’ele, see above, 140.
102 Bülow 1899: 62. Note, however, that tupu is also used.
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Krämer, lines 8, 23, 55, 108. 'O le Tupu'aga o Sāmōa 'Ātoa emphasizes these directions, e.g., Fraser 1892: 171–174 sections 15–16, 20 subsection 5, 33, 35–38; 183. But an adequate discussion of this aspect of the chant would depend on the establishment of the text.

Creationalism was, however, later to be used regularly as a manifestation of the god's power in that the origin and placement of more elements was ascribed to it. The extreme example of this is the late prose explanation, 'O le Tupu'aga o Sāmōa 'Ātoa. The quasi-introduction of the complex, as stated above, emphasizes repeatedly that at the beginning are present only Tagaloa and unbounded space, the vânimonimo: ua na o ia e leai se Lāgi, e leai se Nu'u ... e leai fo'i le Sami, ma le Lāu'ele'ele 'there was only him, no sky, no land ... there was also no sea and earth.' Everything else originates afterwards, including the papa and the sky and the sea, which formed the framework within which Tagaloa flew in the Solo o le Vā. The introduction emphasizes also that ua na faia mea uma 'he made all things.' This statement at the beginning of the complex subsumes all of Tagaloa's actions to be described—fashioning, commanding, ordering, and so on—under the category of his creative work.

The use of the word fai for the god's creative activity is unusual in Sāmoan texts, but can be found in "O le tupaga o le Eleke o Sāmōa ma Tagata," Stuebel 1896/1973: 162/2, ona fai ai lea e le Tiapolo o le Tagata i le Ilo ... ua fai lima ... ua fai vae 'then the human being was made by the devil from the maggot ... he made hands ... he made feet'; the use is also found in the title of the next text and in a limited sense on 234/74, ua fai e Savea Siulea Pulotu 'Pulotu was made by Savea Si'uleo.' The use of the word is prominent in the Sāmoan translation of the Bible, Tusi Paia 1884: 11, 7, 16, 25–27; II 1–4, 7–8, 18–19, 22; cf. 129–30.

The redactor develops in an original way the theme of the Solo that Tagaloa needed a place to rest from his flight, a o le mea na ia tu ai na tupu ai le Papa 'but the place where he stood, there arose the Papa'; a ua tupu ai le Papa i le mea na ia tu ai 'and the Papa arose in the place he stood.' The phrases have the concentration of a proverb and are perhaps based on the similarity of the words tā 'stand' and tupu.96

Tagaloa then commands the Papa to divide, Mavae ia, and the generation is born, fānau, that consists of a papa-list: Papa-ta'oto, Papa-sosolo, Papa-lau-a'au, Papa-ano'-ano, Papa-'ele, Papatu, Papa'-amu'amu (Fraser 1892: 171 section 14; 36, 43), as separate entities, section 41, thereby rendering the story two-source in conformity with his many previous descriptions of the peopling of different areas by parent pairs.93 The genealogical connection of human beings to Tagaloa through the vine articulates the redactor's position that they are all offspring of the god.

In view of the later importance of creationalism in the Tagaloa literature, its small beginnings in the Solo o le Vā—other than the creation of human beings, to be discussed below—are surprising. Tagaloa measures the space between Manu'a and Savai'i and finds he needs a resting place, so he takes small stones from the firmament and fashions them into the islands of 'Upolu and Tutuila.94 The passage is a clear taunting of those islands: they do not tupu like the other islands, Fiji, Tonga, and Savai'i. Moreover, the smallness of the stones used is emphasized in the words chosen: 'ili'ili 'pebble,' la'iitiiti, and the archaic lāgisiisi 'small.' This impression is reinforced by the word sina 'a little of a quantity,' and the repetition of i sounds, especially as end-rimes in this section.95 The point of creationalism in the passage is more the diminution of the importance of 'Upolu and Tutuila than the demonstration of the power of the god. This accords with the fact that the connection between Tagaloa and the tupu of the islands is not explicit. Tagaloa's power and position are manifested not so much in that he creates lands, but in that he uses them for his own convenience. His priority is revealed in that he overlooks all from the firmament and, unlike the usual local god, can travel to all lands.

There is some indication that the traveling was divided into eastward and westward journeys, Fraser, lines 10, 23, 38, 70;

93 The uncommon word fa'aatagataina 'to people,' used in section 41, seems with fa'atagata to be a favorite of the redactor since it can be found throughout the complex.
94 Fraser, lines 43–47; Krämer, lines 30–34; Kirtley 1971: A814; A814,1–3; A953; A955,0.2; A955,15; A955,18.
95 Cf. Nelson 1925: 127, "a pebble carelessly thrown formed into an island, Tutuila..." For other references, see Scheffrahm 1965: 156; Cain 1979: 216. For lāgisiisi, see Pratt 1960: 172. Krämer (1902: 396 note 9) mentions the variant lani misima; Herman (1955: 3) uses lani misima in his rewrite, to which he adds the commoner laitiiti 'small,' in parentheses. On the possible connection of this tradition to one of a bird laying an egg on the water, see above, 139. Later traditions seek to render the process more positive by increasing the size of the stones, an example of the use of gigantism, Pritchard 1968: 400; "two great stones," "Upolu and Savai'i"; Turner 1986: 151; also 1884: 7. Cf. the use of the word fouga 'grindstone,' for the rock thrown down in Stuebel 1896/1973: 161;1; also Smith 1898: 158. There might be some connection of this use to Brown 1914: 422 nr. 114; cf. Schultz 1965: nr. 466; Vaikelli 1959: 12.

96 For a curious parallel, see Bülow 1899–1900: 138, Ona na nofo ai Ua na faatiupu moa i tonutu o le ava, e i ai o le moa i nei onapū i le tuava sase 'So Ua stayed there and raised stones inside the reef. The stone is there up to this time on the east side of the reef channel.'
translating, 183). Papa-nofo, found in other texts (Stuebel 1896/1973: 161/1 f.), is mentioned in section 15. They are, therefore, siblings, and the progression from one rock to another has been changed into a merely temporal sequence to fit the new framework into which the genealogy of the rocks is being placed. In the next four sections, further generations are born from the Papa at Tagaloa’s command and, in one case, after his striking the rock, section 15. Terms and expressions found in genealogies are used, such as famine and ‘o le tama and ‘o le teine, sections 17, 18.

Older models are being both absorbed into the creational Tagaloa framework and used to articulate the process of creation. Tagaloa is placed first, the Papa arises through his doing, and the genealogical process begins at his command. Nevertheless, the genealogical element is still very evident. In fact, the entire process is described in genealogical terms in section 19, Ona gata lea le fanaua a Tagaloa na fanau lava i le Papa ‘Thus ended the births by Tagaloa that were born of the Papa’; gata is a term used to express the end of a genealogy.

This explicitness about and detailed articulation of the god’s creativity contrasts strongly with the Solo o le Vā. Moreover, the redactor of ‘O le Tupu’aga o Sāmoa ‘Atoa uses a large number of other means to express the same theme, such as fa’atuupu and faa, as seen above. Tagaloa commands the Papa to divide, sections 14–18, 20, 35; he also commands lower Tagaloa gods and others, sections 23–24, 26, 31, 38 (poloa‘iga), 40; and Tagaloa-savali can also issue commands, sections 25, 29. Tagaloa’s māvaega establish order, sections 26, 42–43, as do his tōfuga ‘appointments, arrangements,’ sections 17, 20–21, 25, 27, 30, 32. He strikes the rock, section 15, and tramples down the mountains to make them into land habitable by human beings, section 35, possibly more of the anti-mountain polemic described earlier. Tagaloa’s fashioning of human beings will be discussed below. All the above are classic methods of assimilating earlier traditions and exalting the god of the redactor. In his use of so many devices to assimilate a large number of traditions – as well as in his use (and reification) of abstract terms and epithets that are either intellectual or abstracted from stories – the redactor’s work resembles those of the very speculative theologians of the Society Islands.

4. The Origin of Human Beings

Samoan traditions of the origin of human beings are also diverse, the different models having a long history and varied use. That origin can be described with the genealogical model. In Pratt (1890: 657), for example, human beings are born from loose stones and mud as an extension of the genealogy of the rocks.100 The origin of human beings from rocks can be expressed also with tupu, for instance, in Stuebel (1896/1973: 229/69), O le tagata Sataua na tupu i le puga ‘The man from Sataua grew from the coral.’ In fact, one name ascribed to the first human being, Le-tupu-fua, “grown from nothing,” suggests an absolute use of the growth model in this case.101 Creational thinking may have been connected to the tradition of human beings emerging from coral or rocks.

97 The Samoan text could be interpreted as designating Tagaloa as the father and the Papa as the mother, but this would not fit the preceding description. The use of māvaega may also have a sexual connotation; see Fraser 1892: 183; Krämer 1902: 167, Papamavae teine. The epithet may be based on speculation similar to that in the text discussed. The genealogical model is used also in other parts of the text as mentioned elsewhere in my discussion.

98 Shore (1982: 130 f.) emphasizes this ordering activity of the god. He does not mention the creation of ‘Upolu and Tutula from stones in the Solo o le Vā. Similarly, Scheffrahn (1965: 170) does not include that act in Tagaloa’s creational activity. Some sense of ordering can be felt in that chant in Fraser, line 39; Krämer, line 24; Krämer 1903: 65, 229.


Of course, a number of other creational models can be found in Samoan traditions, e.g., vomiting up the land, Turner 1884: 229.

100 See also above, note 95; cf. Turner 1884: 8: “The ants and the small coral made the small stones. The small and large stones caused the loose rocks, and from the loose rocks and the fire sprang a man called Ariari, to appear, and from him and a woman sprang the cuttlefish and the race of men.” Cf. Powell 1887: 149. In his translation-interpretation of the text Fraser (1892: 171 section 18) adds in brackets that the parents of the tagata ‘human being’ were types of coral (“a branching zoophyte … a coral rock”), a point he must have been given in an informant’s explication of the text; no support can be found in Pratt 1960 and Milner 1966. There are a number of traditions I will not discuss in this essay, e.g., Turner 1884: 8.

Bīlōw (1897b: 377) speculates that there was a Samoan tradition of the earliest human ancestor being a lizard that mated with a bird; also Bīlōw 1898a: 8; 1898d: 258.

by adding the element of creative fashioning or carving. The scratching or carving of a coral, puga, to form a living being is presented as a stage preliminary to the creation of human beings in two texts (Stuebel 1896/1973: 161/1; Smith 1898: 153).

The reductor of Le Tupu’aga o Sāmoa 'Ātoa bases his first account of the origin of human beings on this genealogical tradition, which he absorbs into the creationalism identified with Tagaloa. The god commands the Papa to give birth to Aoalālā and Gao-gao-o-ole-tai who, in turn, generate Tagata and, as his siblings, reifications of Samoan words for soul, will, desire, and opinion. Following his usual two-stage pattern of describing first origination and then ordering, the reductor has Tagaloa and the Papa place the reified terms inside the tagata so that he becomes atamai 'intelligent'.

A widespread story in Western Polynesia is that of the origin of human beings from the vine, fūe, either directly (Bülow 1899: 62) or, more often, first in the form of maggots. Their emergence from the vine can be left undescribed or various models can be used for that purpose: birth, growth, and flowering or fruiting. The change of the maggots into human beings can occur spontaneously, without outside intervention. Creatonalism can be introduced by the fashioning of the bodies of the maggots into human shapes and, in certain texts, also by rendering their insides intelligent so that they will be true human beings. The creation can be performed either by Tagaloa himself or those under his command. The origin of human beings can be further absorbed into a Tagaloa framework by connecting the elements and actors in various ways to the god, as was seen above in the case of the Tuli. A connection to Tagaloa can also be established by giving human beings a purpose. Considerable redactional variation can be found in the way connections are made and the elements are coordinated to formulate a text.

Considerable redactional variation is found also in the incorporation into the creational Tagaloa literature of the story of the naming of human parts after the Tuli, a wordplay on tuli, a name for certain birds, and tuli “Articulation, joint of the body (usually specified by the next word): tūlima “Elbow,” tūliulu “Back of neck,” tūliuva “Knee,” and tūlimana “Loin.” That this story of the origin of the names of body parts need not be

---

102. Lesson 1876: 592 f.; Kirtley 1971: A1245.2. The text in Lesson seems to show Biblical influence: the desire for a human being to rule (gouverner) the land, his resemblance to the god (comme vous), and the animation of the body by the god breathing into it, Genesis I:26–28; II5. 7. Moreover, rather than being carved, the body is drawn on a board, which would seem to be a Westernism. However, these problems could be the result of easy misunderstandings: tasi i le papa could be understood as 'write or draw on the board'; tasi i le papa would be 'scratch or carve the rock.' The absence of the Samoan-language text is more than usually regrettable.

103. Fraser 1892: 171 section 18. On the passage, see Bastian 1894: 13 ff. The parents are possibly coral, above, note 53.

104. Fraser 1892: 172 section 20 subsection 1. This is identified with the tradition of Fatu and 'Ele'ele, above, 140, 144.


106. Undescribed: Stuebel 1896/1973: 161/1. Birth: Fraser, line 56; Krämer, line 43; Fraser 1892: 174 f., sections 40–41 (see the above discussion). Growth (tutupu): Stuebel 1896/1973: 162/2. Flowering or fruiting (fua): Fraser, line 63; Krämer, line 50. Bülow (1899: 62) uses both tutupu and fānau as he places the story within a genealogy. O le fūe tutupu o le tagata. Ua usu o le lau i le fūe, na fānau o le tagata .... This is further evidence that the terms are becoming generalized or abstracted; see the similar use of tutupu and fānau in Fraser (1892: 175 section 40) and the above discussion.

107. Pritchard 1968: 396; Turner 1884: 8; Smith 1898: 154; worms came out of the fūe: "These worms became a woman, and she was taken to wife by Tuli. From them was born a son," a daughter, and a second son. "These children intermarried, and from them sprang mankind -- hence the people of Samoa." Cf. Bülow 1897b: 377; 1898d: 258, where he speculates on a lizard and a bird as the earliest ancestors of human beings.

108. Fashioning only: Stuebel 1896/1973: 162/2; Stair 1896: 35 f. -- Both: Fraser, lines 64–65; Krämer, lines 51–52; Fraser 1892: 175 section 40; Stuebel 1896/1973: 161/1.

109. Tagaloa himself: Fraser, lines 49–69; Krämer, lines 36–54; Fraser 1892: 174 section 40 (Scheffrahn 1965: 164 f.f.);

110. The connections of the fūe to Tagaloa parallel those of the Tuli: sent down by Tagaloa: Fraser, line 48; Krämer, line 36; Stuebel 1896/1973: 161/1; servant of Tagaloa: Stuebel 1896/1973: 162/2: offspring, alo: Fraser 1892: 175 section 41. In Stair (1896: 35) and Bülow (1899: 62) the fūe is the result of a long process (with war model) initiated by an action of Tagaloa. No explicit connection is made in Smith 1898: 154.

111. Fraser, lines 68–69; Krämer, line 54; Stair 1896: 35 ("reside"); Lesson 1876: 592 (gouverner). In the text in Fraser (1892: 171–175), peopling is an end in itself.

112. Milner 1966: 286. -- Lesson (1876: 592 f.) adds tuli-tua "L'épines dorsale" 'spine' and tapu-va'e "pieds" 'feet'; tino is mentioned, but does not receive a tuli-name. Stair (1896: 36) adds tūlimata "a portion of the eye." While in Sāmoa in 1972–1973, I was told of a story of a foetus left lying on a beach and being formed into a full human being by various animals, which action linked him to themselves.
connected to one of the origin of human beings can be seen in the facts that it can appear in a different context (Krämer 1902: 405) and that the latter can be told without it. Moreover, the connection between the origin stories differs in different texts, clearly revealing that connection as redactional.

The Samoan redactors had, therefore, a variety of traditional materials on the origin of human beings and selected and combined them to compose their complexes.

Conclusion

The subject of human origins stimulated the same pattern of intellectual and literary activity as that of cosmic. Considerable effort was made to preserve traditions and, with a general ideal of comprehensiveness, to incorporate them into complexes. This effort extended to new materials, such as the Bible, but the intellectual framework remained Samoan.

Moreover, Samoan speculation can be seen to advance, for instance, in the extension of the genealogy of the rocks back to Leai ‘Nothing,' and in the expansion of the creational model for the activity of the god Tagaloa. More systematic and comprehensive rationales are devised for one’s position, as can be seen in the relation of Le Tupu’aaga o Sāmoa ‘Atou to the Solo o le Vā. The former text evinces also an accommodation to the changed political situation of Manu’ā, in that its priority is used to protect it rather than to export its influence (Fraser 1892: 175 section 42; cf. 1895: 391, 393). That changed political situation stimulated new intellectual activity, notably the body of literature concerning Pili, which will be discussed in the third article in this series.
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