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In the general Polynesian political system chiefly titles are organized on a genealogical principle. All the titles in a polity are traced to the senior line through kinship link and are ranked according to their genealogical distance to it; thus they are integrated into a pyramidal structure of political authority. But, although the Samoan political system is based on the chief system as are other Polynesian societies its titles are not organized on the same principle. Rather, chiefly titles are integrated on territorial bases, in which each title is somehow related to others. 

In order to analyze the traditional political system of Samoan society it is important to examine territorial organization, which has been highly developed in Samoa as basis for the integration of chiefly titles. This paper examines in detail a particular territorial organization of a small district, Faleata, located on the north coast of Upolu Island, Western Samoa, in order to analyze the manner in which chiefly titles are integrated in the Samoan chief system. First, the fa'alupega, or formal address, of Faleata is examined. Then the fono, or meeting of chiefly council of Faleata, in which decisions for the territorial group are made, is checked with respect to its seating arrangement of title holders, to its order of kava cup presentation, to its order of giving formal speeches and finally to its information networks. Then important titles are examined in regard to their genealogies, historical relationships, geographical formations and legitimacy for their representability. 

Detailed analysis of the complicated territorial organization of Faleata shows that, in Samoa, there is nothing like the single overarching principle observed in Tonga in integrating chiefly titles. Instead, inconsistent and contradict are the historical explanations which relate titles to form territorial integrations. Lack of centralization is the main feature of the Samoan political system. A territorial organization is composed on the multi-dimensional symbolic oppositions, binding various authorities of different origins. Though the order of such a territorial organization is realized on the several levels from the village level to the entire society level, it is relatively independent as the society lacks the all-over principles of integration like Tonga. Because of the specific system of territorial organization, the Samoan system is unique among Polynesian traditional political systems. 
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INTRODUCTION

The main aim of this paper is to describe in detail the territorial organization of a particular Samoan region, in order to analyze the traditional political system of Samoan society which, although based on the chiefly title system as in other Polynesian societies, is unique among them.

In most other Polynesian societies, chiefly titles are ranked on the basis of the genealogical order. Tonga is a prime example. In the later half of the eighteenth century, during Captain Cook's visit to the area, all the Tongan chiefly titles were integrated into a single genealogy based on the seniority principle under the king title of Tu'i Tonga. The legend says that the first Tu'i Tonga was Ahoeitu, a son of the god Tangaloa, from whom most of the later Tu'i Tonga title holders descended by primogeniture. Later, the Tu'i Ha'a Takalaua title branched out from the Tu'i Tonga line, the first title holder being a younger brother of a Tu'i Tonga title holder. The other important title, Tu'i Kanokupolu, subsequently branched out from the Tu'i Ha'a Takalaua line. The origin of almost every title can be traced to either of these three main branches of the Tongan genealogical tree. All titles are ranked according to their distance from the centralized political authority [Gifford 1929: 48-87; Sahlins 1958: 139-151; Murcus 1980: 53-55].

In contrast, Samoan society had no title like Tu'i Tonga and never developed a centralized political system. Although there are several titles recognized throughout Samoa, these were not necessarily the main trunks to place their younger titles in the total schema of the ranking system. Genealogical order is not the first principle for ranking titles. Instead, a system of relatively autonomous territorial organization determines the domain in which titles are related and ranked.

There was a heated dispute in the 1960s between Sahlins and Freeman on how the Samoan chief system was organized [Sahlins 1958, 1964; Freeman 1961, 1964]. Sahlins in his Social Stratification in Polynesia distinguished between two different systems of political integration in Polynesia, the ramage type, to which Tonga, Tahiti, Hawaii and most of the Polynesian chief systems belong, and the descent-line type, to which only Samoa, Futuna and Uvea belong, whereas Freeman insisted that the Samoan political system is basically similar to other Polynesian systems, in that Samoan descent groups are also ramified and the Samoans have an elaborated title system. Although I do not accept Sahlins' explanation of how different systems

---

1) The research on which this paper is based was conducted from June, 1978 to September, 1979, in February and July, 1980, and from May to September, 1981. The first and the last research periods were financially sponsored by the East-West Center, Honolulu and the Hōsōbunka Foundation, respectively. I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to the above institutions. The first draft of this paper was read at the seminar on "Studies on the Folk Culture of Micronesia" at the National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka. I appreciate the kind criticism of the members of the seminar. Above all, I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to those Samoans who assisted me in many ways, especially to my main informant on Faleata, whose name should be withheld lest harm befall him. I owe much to him in writing this paper, but the responsibility is mine alone.
are formed, which is highly tinged with ecological determinism, I appreciate his sociological insight which differentiated the Samoan chief system from other major Polynesian systems of integration. Owing much to his sociological analysis as the starting point, my discussion here is focused on analyzing the elaboration of the Samoan title system, based on my own field data. It discusses how titles of not necessarily the same origin are related within a unit of territorial organization. The theme will be examined in the process of describing and analyzing the territorial organization of Faleata.

First the relationship of Samoan chiefly titles to kinship organization will be outlined and the categories and roles of these titles briefly described.

In Samoa, chiefly titles belong to an 'aíga (kin group) which shares a common ancestor and is based in a village. An 'aíga owns housing lots, plantation land, and one or several matai (family head) title names. Title names originate from legends and are succeeded to by 'aíga members. Normally, about 50–100 members live on the land owned by the 'aíga, and occupy the housing lots and plantation. However, there are also many latent members of the group living elsewhere who can somehow trace their descent to the 'aíga and retain some right to it. The body which selects the successor to the highest title of the 'aíga includes both resident and latent members. There is no rule of primogeniture stipulating that the eldest son of the deceased succeeds to the title. Rather, all the 'aíga members, including latent non-residents, gather and unanimously select a suitable person for the title. Such a person might be even a spouse of a member or an adopted son who is not necessarily related to the family blood line. Other title holders are appointed by the highest matai of the 'aíga when necessary.

While in a family, a title holder takes the leadership as matai in the management of his household and 'aíga, and performs the political role of either ali'i (chief) or tulaafale (orator) outside his 'aíga. The distinction between chief and orator is inherent in the title name. A chief takes the role of embodying chiefly dignity, sitting quietly while an orator takes up the actual work, such as making ritual speeches, distributing food, delivering messages, etc., on behalf of the chief. The orator, although humbling himself before the chief as his attendant, actually holds the real power and handles most of the actual duties by himself. Furthermore, since chiefs and orators are ranked according to their respective categories, some orators are of high rank whereas some chiefs of low rank and may not have an orator to make speeches for them. Thus Samoan territorial organization is a microcosm composed

2) The real power of orators is somehow created under the circumstances of the title system peculiar to Samoan society, where chiefly titles are not necessarily related by genealogical evidence. Because, in a territorial organization, titles and title groups are related and mediated by unstable and inconsistent oral traditions, which are controlled by orators, whose most important duty is to make formal speeches referring to appropriate traditions while covering the inconsistencies in order to mediate among titles from one occasion to another. There are also ceremonial attendants, called matapule for eiki (chiefs: same etymology as ali'i) in Tonga, but they never assumed real political power.
of several complex factors such as differences in rank among title holders, chief/orator dichotomy, prescribed roles for each title, etc. In order to analyze the territorial organization of Faleata, we will first examine the titles referred to in the *fa'alupega* (formal address) of Faleata. All the important titles should be referred to in a *fa'alupega* although the 'importance' of any particular title is relative to the level of integration of the organization. This relativity will be considered by making a comparison with the *fa'alupega* of Toamua, one of the component villages of Faleata.

Secondly, the chiefly council of the territorial organization will be analyzed as a ritual of intensification for the ranking order of the titles. Seating arrangement, speech order, kava-drinking order, and the information network used to send summons for the council of Faleata will be examined.

In the later three sections, relationship among important titles in Faleata will be considered along with some additional data. Three dimensions of relationship among different category of titles will be analyzed; the relationship among chief titles, between chief and orator titles, and among orator titles.

All data in this paper unless annotated otherwise was obtained from an well-versed orator who serves for a title of the powerful orator group called To'afa, of Faleata. Information concerning titles is difficult to obtain in Samoa because it can only be transmitted by a person who is directly related to it. It is also difficult to obtain a subjective information irrespective of one's own point of view, because conflicting groups and sections always insist on different stories and explanations. Accordingly, the information given here tends to favor To'afa. What has been attempted in this paper is not the analysis of different versions based on several sets of information, but, prior to it, the reconstruction of the organization from a body of information consistent with itself.

**FA'ALUPEGA OF FALEATA**

*Fa'alupega* is a formal address to a territorial group—here meaning a group of titles which share a common *fono*, or council, which exists on different levels, *i.e.*, from the village level to the whole Samoa—including important title names and title group names in the territory. The Samoan custom *fa'alupa* is to greet a person or a group in a formal occasion by reciting his or its formal title name face to face. One must be very careful not to omit any important names nor confuse the order of names when making *fa'alupa*. *Fa'alupega* is a conventional phrase of address for a particular territorial group in order to avoid difficult situations that could arise from mistakes. One needs to learn various *fa'alupega* for territorial groups all over Samoa before one can be said to be a capable orator. *Fa'alupega* thus shows the ranking order of titles of a particular territorial group, an order recognized both by the group itself and by those outside the group.

Prior to analyzing the *fa'alupega* of Faleata, a brief description of this district is in order. Upolu, the second largest island of the Samoan Archipelago, has long
been the arena for political conflict involving the entire society. It is traditionally divided into three districts: Atua, Tuamasaga, and A'ana, from east to west. Faleata is a small district situated in the center of the northern coast of Tuamasaga. Most houses are situated along the coastal road, which is about 6.6 km long, and plantations are located on the slopes behind the villages. The population of Faleata has increased to about 15,300 (1976)\(^3\), as it is near to the capital town of Apia. Faleata is divided into 8 villages (nu'u); Vaimoso, Lepea, Vailoa, Vaiusu, Vaigaga, Vaitele, Saina and Toamua, from east to west. Although a village is basically the smallest autonomous unit having a fono for decision-making, some larger villages are divided into several subvillages (pitonu'u), each having its own fono. In such cases, the village fono is reserved for important decisions and everyday decision-making is left to the lower fono. There seems to be a tendency for larger villages to break-up into several sections, because the fono does not function well when it grows too large.

\(^3\) Along with recent urbanization, not a small number of non-traditional communities have been set up for those who have jobs at Apia, in the constitutional district of Faleata. As this census includes those settlements the population of the traditional villages probably may be less than half this number. On the other hand, many title holders who belong to Faleata live outside of the district—in other districts, Apia, or overseas—and they often come to Faleata to join in the important rituals.
It is assumed that Faleata, now a small district composed of several villages, used to be a village, though people no longer regard Faleata as a village.

In Samoan vocabulary, Faleata is itūmalō (lit. “part (itū) of the nation (mālo)”), a term applied to any territorial organization larger than a village, either to Tuamasaga, a large division of the island of Upolu or to Faleata, a part of Tuamasaga. People use proper names only, like Faleata or Tuamasaga, when referring to a territory or to territorial organizations.

The Fa‘alupega of Faleata is as follows:

Fa‘alupega of Faleata

1 Afio mai Tapa‘au,
2 lau afoa Faumuina o le tupua.
3 Susū mai Mata‘a o le tama a le fale.
4 Susū mai Seiuli o le alo o Malietoa.
5 Maliu mai lo outou To‘afā ma lau fetalaiga Va‘aulu.
6 Maliu mai le Saofa‘iga,
7 ma le Fa‘apito Saofa‘iga.
8 Maliu mai le Pulelua ma le Faiga.
9 Maliu mai le Nofoapule.
10 Maliu mai Lauati ma Motuopua‘a.
11 Maliu mai Pua‘asegisegi ma Pua‘alatamai,
12 ma lautī ma laulelei.
13 Ia te‘ oe Faleata.

(translation)

1 Welcome to the highest titles of Faleata,
2 the king, Faumuina.
3 Welcome to the prince, Mata‘a.
4 Welcome to Seiuli, the son of Malietoa.
5 Welcome to To‘afā, and an orator, Va‘aulu.
6 Welcome to Saofa‘iga,
7 and Fa‘apito Saofa‘iga.
8 Welcome to Pulelua and Faiga.
9 Welcome to Nofoapule.
10 Welcome to Lauati and Motuopua‘a.
11 Welcome to Pua‘asegisegi and Pua‘alatamai,
12 and other small titles.
13 To all you orators of Faleata.

The phrases ‘afio mai’, ‘susū mai’, and ‘maliu mai’, which appear at the beginning of every line, are all honorific words which mean ‘welcome’ or ‘please come here’ and are used both by hosts and guests alike in fa‘alupega. The first two are used when addressing chiefs, and the last one is for orators. The first four lines of the fa‘alupega refer to the three high chiefs of Faleata, the 1st line being for all three, the

4) In Samoan, many honorific words applied to chiefs are different from those to orators.
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2nd to the 4th for Faumuina, Matai'a, and Seiuli, respectively. Faumuina is the highest title name of Lepea village.

Some explanation is needed for the title name of Matai'a. Faleata has two Matai’a names, one each in Vaimoso and Vaitele villages, where both names occupy the highest position. It is assumed that there was once only a single Matai’a title which was divided when two persons were simultaneously inaugurated to it. Not only the title but also the kin group which owns the title and its land are also divided. This type of phenomenon—here we call it title split—is a common occurrence in Samoa, though it is difficult to find in other Polynesian societies in which title systems are also well developed. The main reason for this seems to be the difficulty of managing the entire ‘aiga under a single title when the ‘aiga becomes too large. Among several title holders of the same name, only one will represent the ‘aiga to the outside.

Seiuli belongs to the village of Vaiusu. Malietoa is the highest title for all of Tuamasaga, a part of which is comprised by Faleata. The first title holder of Seiuli is known to have been a son of a Malietoa title holder, thus this title is given the honor of being addressed as ‘son of Malietoa’.

The 5th line and below refer to the orators serving for the three high chiefs, an orator group composed of four main orator titles. Two of them, Manuleleua and Une, are situated in Vaimoso village, at the east end of Faleata, whereas the other two, Ale and Ulu, are in Toamua village, at the west end. Va’aulu is from Toamua where it occupies the third position, being an additional title to To’afä in the fono of Faleata. It is sometimes counted as the fifth orator of the group.5) Saofa’iga is the orator group which serves the high chief, Faumuina, at Lepea village, and is composed of many orator titles among which A’i and Vaitagutu are the important leaders. Fa’apito Saofa’iga on the 7th line here refers to the Ulugia family, Ulugia and the orators under him. The name of Fa’apito Saofa’iga refers, in a broad sense, to all the orator titles of Faleata except those of Vaimoso, Toamua and Lepea, and is sometimes used in this meaning. On the 8th line and below, lesser orator titles are referred to. The names on the 8th line are of orators in Vailoa village, Pulelua referring to the titles Nu’u and Atinu’u. Nofoapule on the 9th line refers to the Toi, Tūlaga, and Pula titles of Vaitele. The names on the 10th and 11th lines are the orators at Saina and Vaigaga villages, respectively. ‘Lauti and laulelei’ are titles of lower-ranking orators assigned to unimportant duties. Faleata on the 13th line refers to the titles which represent the territorial group rather than the district name. Who can represent Faleata is a very important question which will be examined below. At this point, attention should be paid to the fact that Faleata is the name of a place and, at the same time, a fono and also its representatives.

Table 1 clarifies the arrangement of titles in Faleata. The highest chiefs of Faleata here are the three titles of Faumuina, Matai’a, and Seiuli. They are served by many orator groups, among which three, To’afä, Saofa’iga, and Fa’apito Saofa’iga

5) The combination of To’afä and Va’aulu is called Falelima (the five houses).
Table 1. Important Title Names of Faleata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>village names</th>
<th>title names</th>
<th>chief orator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>east</td>
<td>Vaimoso</td>
<td>Matai'a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lepea</td>
<td>Faumuinā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vailoa</td>
<td>Saofa'iga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vaiusu</td>
<td>Seluli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vaigaga</td>
<td>Fa'apito Saofa'iga (Ulugia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vaitele</td>
<td>Matai'a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saina</td>
<td>Nofoapule (Toi, Tūlaga, Pula)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west</td>
<td>Toamua</td>
<td>Ale, Ulu (two titles of To'afā), Va'aulu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ulugia family), are the most important. The roles assigned to each title or title group and the differences in ranking of these titles will be analyzed in detail in the following sections. Here we are examining another fa'alupega, the fa'alupega of a component village of Faleata, in order to analyze the relationship between the whole and the part of the territorial organization.

Faleata is composed of eight villages on the northern coast of Upolu, each of which has its own fono and fa'alupega as an autonomous body. Here we analyze the fa'alupega of Toamua village, which is composed of four sub-villages and has a population of 1,300 (1976) [GOVERNMENT OF WESTERN SAMOA 1978].

**Fa'alupega of Toamua**

1. *Maliu mai ło lua To'alua, Ale ma Ulu,*
2. *ma lau fetalaiga Va'aulu.*
3. *Susū mai le Gafa o Ātoe,*
4. *ma le Itūlua Sā Tūnufono.*

(translation)
1. Welcome to you two, Ale and Ulu,
2. and the orator Va'aulu.
3. Welcome to the chiefs of Ātoe,
4. and the division of Tūnufono family.

Toamua is the village of Ale and Ulu of To'afā, an important orator group of Faleata. This village has orators at the top of the ranking order, as does Vailoa, Vaigaga, and Saina in Faleata. However, such is not necessarily the case throughout Samoa. Toamua village is divided into four sub-villages: Toamua, Usoali'i, Safune, and Puipa'a, from east to west. The east sub-village of Toamua is composed of Ale and his family and the west sub-village of Puipa'a of Ulu and his family. Ale and Ulu have many orators under them. Those under Ale are called Inailaunao'o as a group and those under Ulu are Aogāmalie.

The names of Ale and Ulu of Toamua village are split into two and four branches
respectively. Either of the title holders can represent the whole 'āiga in which he may not necessarily lead the whole group. There is no difference in rank between the co-title holders, one of whom can replace another when representing the 'āiga. But when more than two title holders present themselves in a meeting, some compromise is usually made to avoid embarrassment. Normally, in such a situation, one of them performs the duty ascribed to the title, while the others take malolō (a rest) and just sit. As for fa'alupega, the same title will be repeated according to the number of the title holders of an identical name, such as "Ale and Ale" when two are present, or "Ulu and Ulu and Ulu" when three are present. Since each Ale and Ulu title holder leads his own orator group there are two sets of Inailaunao'o and four sets of Aogāmālie.

The title of Va'aulu, the third title of Toamua village, is of the Safune sub-village, located between the Toamua and Puipa'a sub-villages. This title is well known because it is often used in addresses as an additional name along with Ale and Ulu of To'afā in large meetings, although it does not have its own orator names to serve it. There are also some chief titles in Toamua where orator groups led by Ale and Ulu are powerful. These are unimportant and less-known titles in the Usoai'i and Safune sub-villages. Gafa o Ātoe, the chiefs of Ātoe, are the three titles of Pepe, Fānene, Fa'aiitu of the Safune sub-village while Itūlua Sā Tunumafono, the branch of the Tunumafono family, are four chief titles and many orator ones represented by three chief titles of Aumuagaolo, Palusālue, and Manu'a. The branch of the Tunumafono family in the Usoai'i sub-village originated from the powerful Tunumafono family of Sāfata, a small district on the south coast of Tuamasaga. They settled in Toamua village under the protection of Ale, after some serious disputes in the family. Accordingly, this part of Toamua village is thought either to be an independent 'āiga or to be a part of the 'āiga of Ale, depending on the context.

As shown above, though there many title names exist in Toamua village, not all of them appear in the fa'alupega. Even when the whole village is addressed, the title names and title group names representing the four divisions of the village are different according to the context. Gafa o Ātoe and le itūlua Sā Tunumafono in the 3rd and the 4th lines are seen in the fa'alupega of Toamua only, though they are omitted in the fa'alupega of the whole Faleata, in which Toamua village is represented only by To'alua (lit., "two persons", Ale and Ulu) or by To'alua and Va'aulu.

THE COUNCIL OF FALEATA

A territorial group has a fono, a council to make decisions for itself. In Samoa, decision-making should not necessarily be made by a person of high rank, but unanimously by a fono. This shows that a highly ranked title holder may have much prestige but no strong power. But aside from the decision-making function of fono, consideration should be given here to the ritual functions of fono, its seating arrangement, speech and kava-drinking orders. Fono acts as a mechanism which verifies the ranking order of titles in a certain territorial group.
Fono are formed on different levels of territorial integration—(sub-village), village, (small district), district. The fono of Faleata is at the intermediate level.

The council meeting place

A territorial group has one or more malae (an open space for fono). Usually, a district has more than two malae, used for different functions. One is called malaefono filemū, or clear malae, and is used for councils seeking peace. Another, called malaefono o le 'a'ava, or malae of war, is used for councils in which the decision to start or join in a war is made. In Faleata there is a malaefono filemū called Lepea at Lepea village, where the high chief Faumuina resides, while a malaefono o le 'a'ava called Vaitagutu exists at Vailoa village. Although Lepea is used even today for council meetings, the malaefono o le 'a'ava, Vaitagutu, is now a bush area covered with tall weeds, not known even to Faleata people, except those well-versed in traditional culture. This is probably because wars have long been prohibited by missionaries and the colonial government.

The seating arrangement

A village fono is usually held in a large traditional guest house on the malae. District fono may be held in the same way, while sometimes held outdoors with the representatives of each section of the group standing on the malae and each section seated in different houses. The latter is called fono tauati and is for important decision-making. Formal outdoor fono of Faleata are said to be held at Vaitagutu.

First, let us examine the normal style of fono,8) in which the council meets in a house. A traditional Samoan house is an oval structure whose longer axis runs parallel to a road, usually along the coastline. Two round parts of the architectural plan are called tala. The front of the structure is the side nearer to the road, between the two tala. Both tala and the front part of the house give the seats for the high

6) Most researchers of Samoan political system, like the Keesings, emphasize that the decisions should be made unanimously in fono [KEESING & KEESING 1956: 103–104, 114–118], whereas Freeman insists that a paramount chief is aristocratic and accorded strong power on the basis that the decision made by a paramount chief is final and termed tonu in Samoan [FREEMAN 1983: 131–2]. Though both inclinations are found when Samoans explain their own system, we understand the unanimity is nonetheless important in their decision-making. For example, people often describe fono in which they attended, saying, “Finau, finau, ae e le maus se tasi.” (“We discussed again and again but we could not reach a unanimous decision.”) Samoan people are greatly concerned about reducing the differences among the sections of the territorial group through discussion and ritual process of fono, and probably tonu should not imply the despotic power nor almighty status accorded to a paramount chief of Samoa though it may be the final.

7) Kava, 'ava in Samoan, is water extract of pounded root of a plant called 'ava (Piper methysticum). It is customarily drunk in rituals throughout Polynesia. In the Samoan fono the people never drink kava without strict drinking order and etiquette.

8) Although the council is held in a house, it is possible to observe the process, as a Samoan traditional house has no walls.
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ranking title holders. Chiefs sit in *tala* while orators sit at the front, each against poles. The lower title holders are all crowded together at the rear of the house. This arrangement is used not only for *fono* but even for *'āiga* when sitting in a house, where a *matai* (family head) and his wife sit in either *tala* with the guest in the other *tala*, other title-holders in the front, and young people in the rear.

The seating arrangement of Faleata is shown in Figure 2. The three high chief title holders, Faumuinā, Matai’a, and Seiuli sit in *tala*, the former two facing each other. Of the two Matai’a title holders of Vaimoso and of Vaitele, either may sit in *tala* while the other must sit in the rear. Seiuli may sit in either *tala* with one of the two high title holders. The front seat is divided in two, To’afā and Va’aulu seated on the Matai’a’s side and A’i and Vaitagutu, representing the entire Saofa’iga and the orators of Fa’apito Saofa’iga, on the other. All the split names are represented by only one title holder each. The other title holders sit in the rear seat. A kava bowl is set in the center of the rear seat.

The seating arrangement for the outdoor *fono* is as follows. Three houses should be prepared. Manuleleua, Une and other title holders of Vaimoso village except Matai’a are in one house, Ale, Ulu, Va’aulu and others of Toamua village in another house. The high chief titles, Faumuinā, Matai’a, and Seiuli are in the house with Saofa’iga and Fa’apito Saofa’iga. This arrangement is similar to the first arrangement except To’afā and Va’aulu are divided in two groups sitting in the other houses, according to the arrangement for each village *fono*.

Here the seating arrangement should be analyzed briefly. First, concerning the
seats for high chiefs, it appears that Faumuina and Matai’a are the two highest titles whereas Seiuli is a little lower since the former two occupy the opposing tala whereas the latter has no reserved seat. But it may also be said that this arrangement merely represents the compromise made in the special case of Faleata to resolve the conflict of having three high chief titles and only two tala. Normally a village has no more than two high chief titles, which of course fit into two tala without any problem. We will further examine the relationship of these three titles later.

As for the seats for the orators, it can be deduced from the seating arrangement that To’afa is the most important orator group. To’afā occupy half of the high orators’ place in the indoor fono arrangement, leaving the other half to Saofa’iga and Fa’apito Saofa’iga, and, in the outdoor fono, it also occupies the two houses while the latter titles are crowded into one house. We will return to this problem later.

The chief/orator relationship is not necessarily the most decisive; a chief title holder may be served by different orator titles in different contexts. Nevertheless, there are loose served/server pair relationships between Faumuina/Saofa’iga, Seiuli/ the Ulugia family, and Matai’a/Une and Manuleleua. Although Ale and Ulu of To’afā have no high chief title to serve in their own village, it seems that the entire To’afa is somehow related to the Matai’a title, since all of them sit on the same side with Matai’a at the indoor fono. On the other hand, in the outdoor fono, To’afa, and even Une and Manuleleua, sit in houses different than where Matai’a resides. The pair relationship of Matai’a/To’afā is different from those between other pairs in Faleata.

The process of fono ritual

First, let us examine the process of fono held indoors. Fono commences with lauga which is a very formal speech in Samoan style. The first speech is the most honored duty of an orator in high rank, and who will make it must be decided in the fa’atau (bargaining: the ritual debate) before it. The first speech is customarily ascribed to certain orator titles in some territorial organizations, while it is given to one of several high orators of relatively same rank. In any case, fa’atau is a very important process and cannot be dispensed with. In Faleata this duty is assigned to either A’i or Vaitagutu of Saofa’iga. The first speech is followed by the kava-drinking ceremony in a usual village fono, but by other speeches in fono of larger organizations like Faleata. Each To’afā; Ale, Manuleleua, Ulu and Une, successively, makes speech. When Une finishes his speech, all the title holders in fono clap their hands and the kava-drinking ceremony is started. The kava cup order in Faleata is shown below:

The kava cup order in Faleata

1) Faumuina
2) Matai’a
3) a title holder of Saofa’iga who made a speech (A’i or Vaitagutu)
4) Ale
The first two cups are given to Faumuina and Matai’a whichever takes the first one, while Seiuli takes the last. The kava drinking order is based mainly on the ranking order of titles, although the last cup is as honorary as the first one and is usually given to a high chief. Because the ranking order is sometimes vague and inconsistent, this rule is very good device to avoid serious conflict between titles in Samoa, where there are two or three high titles at the same ranking level competing each other. In the case of Faleata, it is well emphasized that the three high titles,—Faumuina, Matai’a and Seiuli—are of the same rank.

Discussion begins after the title holders have finished tea and snacks following the kava-drinking. This is not as formal as the first speeches and one may give his opinion rather freely without worrying about the speech order. A chief himself may speak and an orator may be opposed to the opinion of a high chief. Each speech is more informal and shorter in comparison with opening one, but still is more formal and longer than those of our society. Those who sit in the rear seats cannot join in the discussion. One can predict who will give an opinion on which side, because an opinion is formed not by the ideas of the title holder himself but through the relative position of the titles and may have been already prescribed in the title name. In Samoan custom it is more important to ascertain the order of the territorial organization disturbed by an accident through a process of discussion in order to maintain the power structure of titles than it is to solve a problem.

Whether the fono reaches a unanimous opinion or not, the last speech should be made by one of the To’a’afā, since it is assigned the role of mediation and arbitration. On the other hand, to give the first speech, and to raise a question is the role assigned to Saofa’iga.

In the case of outdoor fono, the process is similar except that all speeches are made by orators standing on malae with to’oto ‘o (stick) and fue (fly-whisk), which

9) For example, in Leulumoega village, the tumua (capital) of the A’ana district, the orator group called To’aiva has a duty to make a scolding speech, while an orator called Alipia may make a speech to forgive those who have been scolded by To’aiva.
symbolize the orator's role. An orator's speech made outdoors is more formal and has more mamalu (prestige) than one given inside. The kava-drinking ceremony in each house is initiated when the title holders in the house of Saofa'iga start clapping their hands. In this method of fono all the speeches should be made outdoors, and the opinions of chiefs are usually represented by orators who make speeches on their behalf.

Attention should be paid to the relationship between the two orator groups: To'a'afā and Saofa'iga. Saofa'iga have exclusive control of the first speech, the most honorable duty for an orator, and receive the first kava cup as orator. On the other hand, only the first cup for orator is given to one title holder of Saofa'iga whereas the second to fifth cups are given to all the To'a'afā titles and the second to the fifth speeches are also made by each one of the To'a'afā. Thus, in a sense, To'a'afā is shown respect in another way. The relationship between the two groups will be discussed again in detail in section "The Relationship among Orators".

The summons for fono and the information network

The summons for fono in Faleata is being discussed briefly here. Sāvalu is the role for carrying formal messages and is usually assigned to a certain orator title within a territorial organization. In Faleata, the role of sāvalu is played by Ulugia, an orator of Vaiusu village.

Sāvalu carries not only messages of the opening of fono but also notifications of funerals for important title holders. For example, if a Faumuina title holder passes away, his 'a-iga notifies Saofa'iga, who send messages to Matai'a and Ulugia. Then Ulugia fills his duty as messenger of Faleata, and goes around the district. He gives his message only to Ale in Toamua village and Manuleleua in Vaimoso village, who pass it on to Ulu and Une respectively. The information network of Faleata is

![Figure 3. The Information Network of Faleata](image)

10) Ritual objects, taken by an orator who makes a speech outdoors. A fiae is a stick of about 50 cm length and on the top of which a bundle of sennit is fixed. It is called a fly whisk in English because an orator waves it as if he was driving away flies before he starts to make a speech. But it is never used as such.
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shown in Figure 3. All the important titles of Faleata are organized in a symmetric structure. The position of To’afā may seem strange, as Manuleleua and Une of Vaimoso do not pass messages to Matai’a of the same village apart from Ale and Ulu on the west end. Instead, Matai’a receives information from Saofa’iga. This fact is not in accord with the served/server relationship between Matai’a and To’afā, as analyzed from the data concerning the seating arrangement of fono.

Some titles may give messages to Ulugia to carry but some may not. One of the three high chiefs, Faumuina, Matai’a, and Seiuli may issue a summons for fono. The former two send for Saofa’iga first to transmit the message to Ulugia, whereas the latter sends the message directly to Ulugia. Either orator group, Saofa’iga and To’afā, may propose the opening of fono. In the case of To’afā, after either pair, Ale and Ulu of Toamua or Manuleleua and Une of Vaimoso talk to each other and find themselves sharing the same opinion that the title holders of Faleata should meet, they notify Saofa’iga of their opinion. Then Saofa’iga ask Faumuina if a meeting should be held. Usually, neither Saofa’iga nor Faumuina would reject a proposition made by To’afā. Saofa’iga may propose a meeting, too.

It is worth noting that any of the three high chiefs by himself may also issue a summons. They do not share the right, but any of them may exercise it without the other’s consent. In this sense they are in similar, interchangeable positions. Nevertheless, Faumuina seems to occupy a slightly more privileged position than the other two since fono are held in his village and he is the one who makes the final decision concerning the propositions made by To’afā and Saofa’iga.

Now we will integrate the findings through the analyses above made on the fa’alupega and fono of Faleata. The ranking order of titles which appears in fa’alupega is roughly repeated in the ritual phase of fono. The three high chief titles and the three orator groups are of primary importance, being respected and given important roles. However, when we analyze the data in detail we find that the relationships among titles are very complicated and that some of the data are inconsistent. First a brief summary of the relationship among chiefly titles is given, followed by an outline of the chief/orator relationship, and that among the orator titles, using the data above.

Faumuina appears to be the most powerful of the three high chiefs of Faleata, since the fono is held at malaefono of Lepea, Faumuina’s village, and he is the one who makes the final decision concerning propositions made by To’afā and Saofa’iga. There appears to be a difference in rank among the chiefly titles; the Faumuina title holder today is rich, his title possessing a large tract of land which he leases to the National Trust Estate Corporation, while the title holder of Matai’a at Vaitele even lives on a piece of land which he leases from the present owner because one of his predecessors sold the entire plot to a Westerner, which otherwise he is entitled to own as

11) Most of the land, traditionally belonging to Matai’a of Vaitele, has been developed as a commercial plantation by the Western Samoa Trust Estate Corporation. On the gentle slope near the road, is located the only industrial development area promoted by Government.
was attached to his title name. Nevertheless, the three titles relate equally on the same level, and certain devices have been created to emphasize their equality. For example, the kava-drinking ritual is structured to show their equal status though the ritual itself is liable to give an successive ranking order among the participants.

What about the three orator groups? In contrast to the chiefs who just sit in a dignified manner, orators take up different roles of differing importance, and thus seem to occupy different positions in the ranking order. Fa’apito Saofa’iga is thought to be ranked next to Saofa’iga, since the literal meaning of Fa’apito is “next” or “something like”. The sāvali (messenger) role which is ascribed to the title name of Ulugia is important but not appreciated as an obligation for a high orator’s title. Nor does Ulugia give any speech in the first sequence of the fono. He is given the 10th cup in the kava ceremony. Thus we may conclude that Fa’apito Saofa’iga is the third orator group in Faleata. However, the relationship between To’afā and Saofa’iga is somewhat more complicated and difficult. To’afa seems to occupy a strange position in the district.

First, it is not necessarily clear which high chief To’afā serves. Usually, a chief and an orator or orator group make a pair relationship, though it is relative. Although people of Faleata say that the three high chiefs are served by three orator groups, the two pair relationships of Faumuina/Saofa’iga and Seiuli/Fa’apito Saofa’iga are clear (Table 1).

Matai’a and To’afā also somehow make a pair relationship, but one which is looser than the other two. This is partly because the four titles of To’afā are divided into two pairs situated in two different villages at the east and west ends, one pair being left with one of the two Matai’a titles whereas the other pair belongs to a different village without any high chief title to serve. Also, in the case of outdoor fono, To’afā occupy two houses leaving Matai’a sitting with the other two high titles and the other two orator groups. To’afā may not represent Matai’a in their speeches. And again, in the information network, Matai’a and Ulugia are connected not by To’afā but by Saofa’iga. Matai’a of Vaimoso, in particular, depends on Saofa’iga of the next village although it seems easier to depend on Une and Manuleleua (two To’afā titles) of the same village. The relationship between Matai’a and To’afā is not parallel with those between Faumuina/Saofa’iga and between Seiuli/Fa’apito Saofa’iga.

It is worth noting the conflict between To’afā and Saofa’iga; there is the opinion that To’afā is higher in rank yet Saofa’iga monopolizes the most honored orator’s role. It is one of the Saofa’iga who makes the first speech and who is the first orator to drink. On the other hand, there is also an evidence that To’afā is higher than Saofa’iga in rank. Although the first speech and the first orator’s cup are ascribed only to either of Ai or Vaitagutu of Saofa’iga, all the four title holders of To’afā occupy half of the front seats with Va’aulu and fully participate in the fono ceremony, all the titles making speeches and drinking their cups. Also, in the case of outdoor fono, To’afā occupy two houses whereas all other titles sit in the third house.
In the remainder of this paper, we will further analyze the political structure of Faleata. We will examine the genealogies of the high chiefs and relate a story concerning a power shift from one orator group to another. The two questions on the status of To'afā in Faleata will be cleared up in the process. The analysis is divided into three parts: the relationship among chiefs, the relationship between chief and orator, and the relationship among orators.

THE RELATIONSHIP AMONG CHIEFS

In this section, the genealogies of the high chiefs are examined in order to consider the historical formation of Faleata. Faleata is a historic territorial group whose origin is older than that of Tuamasaga, the large district to which Faleata belongs. It is important to note that Tuamasaga and Faleata are based on different principles of integration; Faleata is assumed to have been developed from a village whereas Tuamasaga seems to have been later integrated into a federation of villages. The highest chief of Tuamasaga is Malietoa, upon whose genealogy the integration of the district is based. Faleata is integrated irrespective of this title, although it is respected in a different sense. In order to examine Faleata in the context of the entire organization of Tuamasaga, let us first outline the structure of Tuamasaga.

The organization of Tuamasaga

*Fa'alupega* of Tuamasaga

1. *Tulouna Faleono o Atigana,*
2. *ma le itūtulo o Sāgana.*

(translation)

1. Our respect to the Six Families of Atigana,
2. and the three portions of Sāgana.
3. Our respect to Faleata and Sāfata.

The highest title name of Tuamasaga, Malietoa originates from the story about Samoa being saved from Tongan invaders. The story goes like this:

Long ago, when Samoans were slaves of the Tongans, two brothers, named Tuna and Fata, sons of Atiogie, defeated Tuitoga (the Tongan King) and his party and drove them away from the coast of Upolu. The king ran away crying, "Malie toa! Malie tau!" (What brave worriers! How brave they fought!) The title name of Malietoa has been derived from this incident. [STUEBEL 1897: 86, 182; KRÄMER 1902: 259; HENRY 1979: 23]. But, because Tuna and Fata quarrelled as to who should take the name, Atiogie decided to give the title to another son named Savea and told him to go to Sāgana.

---

12) This *fa'alupega* is obtained from the holder of an important orator’s title from Malie village, one of the capital villages of the Tuamasaga district.
and organize a political center. He also ordered Tuna to go to Faleata to form the iti’au (a territorial group which takes the role of the main force in a war), and Fata to go to the south coast of Tuamasaga to form the alataua (a territorial group which takes the role of praying to the gods for the victory of the entire group), which is now called Sāfata [KRÄMER 1902: 260; HENRY 1979: 26].

Therefore, up until today, Sāgana has been the center for politics in Tuamasaga district, leaving Faleata and Sāfata well-known as iti’au, fierce worriers, and alataua, mediators for peace, respectively. The pair relation of iti’au and alataua is an important factor in the formation of a district. The 3rd line of the fa’alupega is for this pair, Faleata and Sāfata. Three parts of Sāgana are the villages of Tuana’i, Afega, and Malie. Of the three, Afega and Malie are called laumua, the capital villages of Tuamasaga. Afega has an orator group called Tuisamau while Malie has another called Auimatagi, both called upon to represent the whole of Tuamasaga when all of Samoa meet.

Malietoa Savea had a son called Ganasavea who also took the title of Malietoa. Ganasavea had six sons whom he sent to different places all around Tuamasaga to form villages. Luatua was sent to Saleimoa village, Seupule, Taogana, and Nu’ualii’i were sent to Faleula, and Fuataogana was sent to Vaimauga, while Saveatama was sent to Si’umu. Their descendants are the six families of Atigana [KRÄMER 1902: 242; HENRY 1979: 33].

Figure 4 shows the relationship between the genealogy of Malietoa and the territorial organization.

Here we must consider how the genealogy of Malietoa is referred to when the integration of Tuamasaga is emphasized. In the village of Saleimoa there still exists

![Figure 4. The Formation of Faleata](image)

13) The capital village of A’ana district is Leulumoega while that of Atua district is Lufilufi. Both villages are called tumua although the capital villages of Tuamasaga district are called laumua.
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the title name of Luatua, whose first holder was a son of Malietoa Ganasavea. But not all the titles can trace their own descent either to Luatua or Malietoa. Still, the entire territorial organization of Saleimoa is related as the brother villages with Faleula, Vaimauga and Si'umu because of the genealogy of Luatua (Figure 4). Thus, the genealogy of Malietoa is not referred to at all to determine the ranking among titles. The genealogy connects not the title names but the territorial groups which the names represent. The other titles in a territorial group are connected to one another irrespective of their own descent. Although we no longer find the name of Tuna in the list of the important title names of Faleata, it is important in relation to Safata because of the story of the appointment of Tuna and Fata by the father Atiogie. Faleata takes the role of itti keu while Safata fills the duty of alataua. Therefore, the genealogy of Malietoa does not rank the territorial groups but emphasizes their solidarity, distributing different roles among them. Even when a territorial group includes many names of different origins it may be connected to another as a whole group in the name of its important titles or through certain historic events.

The relationship among high chiefs

Now we will examine the high chief titles in Faleata. The origin of Faleata goes back further than that of Malietoa, although Faleata is related to other small districts and villages as the itti 'au formed by Tuna, a brother of Savea, the first Malietoa in the entire context of Tuamasaga. The genealogy of Malietoa, which was recorded by Krämer, goes back eight generations to Si'usei'a [KRÄMER 1902: 241]. Ata, a grandson of Si'usei'a, is said to have started Faleata, which literally means the house of Ata or "the family of Ata". It is known that Fe'epō, the grandfather of Savea, lived in the inland village of Aele, behind Toamua, whereas Savea was born to Atiogie, the son of Fe'epō, and Tauaiupolu, a daughter of Ale, an orator of Toamua. Faleata is recognized as the place where the title name of Malietoa originated.

The genealogy of Malietoa Savea back to Si'usei'a [KRÄMER 1902: 241] is shown in Figure 5. The title name of Matai'a seems to originate from that of a grandson of Ata by his first marriage. The name of Matai'a seems to go back further than the origin of the name of Malietoa.

On the other hand, the name of Seiuli exists in several villages as a title name of a son of Malietoa. Seiuli is customarily the name for a son born to a daughter of a high chief or an orator of a certain village by a Malietoa title holder, being left as a high chief title there. Being a name brought in by the maternal kin to raise the prestige of the village, it is much respected in the village, but there is little probability that the person so named will succeed to the title of Malietoa. According to the data collected by Krämer, Seiuli of Faleata was started by a son of Malietoa 'Ae'o'ainu'u, the 13th title holder [KRÄMER 1902: 244]. Here we find the fact that the pair relationship of Seiuli/Ulugia was formed when the title name of Seiuli came

14) Similar title names are Tuilaepa and Papali'i, and both names are found in villages which seem once to have had special connection with the Malietoa family.
Although Matai’a and Seiuli are at almost the same ranking order in Faleata, the origin of the title name of Matai’a goes back twenty generations further than that of Seiuli. Pride in the Seiuli title is based on the fact that it can be traced back to Malietoa, since it is ‘alo o Malietoa’ (a son of Malietoa). The Matai’a name, instead, depends on its legitimacy to reign in Faleata as a grandson of Ata. Thus, both titles share the same ancestor although each is based on different kind of legitimacy. They may not feel that they are of the same family, nor the need any longer to do so.

The Faumuina title seems to originate from Tuia’ana Faumuina, who held the highest title in A’ana, the district in west Tuamasaga, and was probably two generations older than Malietoa ‘Ae’o’ainu’ü. It is a pity that I lack data on how the title name of Faumuina came to Faleata. Faumuina of Faleata may not be an old name since Tuia’ana Faumuina himself did not seem to live so long ago.

15) See p. 211.
The genealogical data given above shows that the title name of Matai’a has the most ancient origin of the three high chief names existing today in Faleata. This assumption is also confirmed by the fact that the name of Matai’a is split into two, the title holders residing in Vaimoso and Vaitele villages respectively. A title-split usually happens within a village, the smallest unit of territorial organization. Then why do the split titles of Matai’a name belong to different villages separated by several other villages? It is assumed that both titles resided next to each other just after the title split, and that, later on, many titles have been created and several villages have been set up between them as the population increased. It is thus probable that the name of Matai’a is thus an ancient and historic title.

Here we might mention the title name of Mata’afa which used to reign as the highest title in Faleata but has since moved to another district. The name of Mata’afa does not exist in the fa’alupega of today, shown in section “Fa’alupega of Faleata” of this paper, but it is found in the old fa’alupega. Here we show two portions of fa’alupega from Krämer’s text [KRÄMER 1902: 227] and from the Fa’alupega book compiled by the Congregation Christian Church of Samoa [1978: 150].

Fa’alupega of Faleata by Krämer

1 Tulouga a ‘oe Faleata,
2 tulouga a ‘oe Tauaitu,
3 tulouga a ‘aiga e fā,
4 tulouga a ali’i e lua:
5 susū mai lau susuga a Matai’a,
6 afio mai lau afoaga a Faumuina,
7 susū mai lau susuga a Seiuli,
8 ‘o le alo o Malietoa,
9 ae tulouga a lou ali’i ‘o le Mata’a’afa.

(translation)
1 Our respect to you, the orators of Faleata,
2 our respect to you, Tauaitu,
3 our respect to the four ‘aiga (refers To’afā),
4 our respect to the two high chiefs:
5 welcome to Matai’a,
6 welcome to Faumuina,
7 welcome to Seiuli,
8 the son of Malietoa,
9 welcome to your chief, Mata’a’afa.

Fa’alupega of Faleata from the Fa’alupega book by the Church

1 Tulouna oe Faleata.
2 Tulouna oe Tauaitu.

16) The number on the end of each line shows the line number of the fa’alupega of Faleata (p. 210).
The name of Mata’afa appears on the 9th line of Krämer’s *fa’alupega* and on the 10th line of Church’s *fa’alupega*. We also find this name in Figure 5, the genealogy of the first Malietoa from S’use’i’a, according to which, Mata’afa was the last of five sons of Tafa’igata who was a son of Ata by his second marriage. Having named his last son Mata’afa, he called for Tauaitu—assumed to have been an orator group—and made them serve Mata’afa as the *ao* title of Faleata [Krämer 1902: 255].

The genealogy suggests that Mata’afa originated in Faleata in the same generation as Matai’a and seems to have been ranked higher than the latter, even though he has moved to Amaile village in the large district of Atua, the eastern territory of Upolu island. The title name of Mata’afa is also very high in rank in that district and can replace Tuiaiuta, which is now vacant but is the highest of all titles in Atua. Letele, appearing on the 10th line of Church’s *fa’alupega*, was a female title ranked as high as Mata’afa. It might have been the *täupou* title for Mata’afa, though it is the *täupou* title for Faumina today. Tauaitu, an orator group appointed to work for Mata’afa by Tafa’igata, still belongs to Lepea village. From these data,

17) Tafa’igata is the name of an inland place where the national jail is now located, while a person of the same name is found in the several legends of Faleata.

18) An honorary title conferred by a certain orator group instead of an ‘a’iga, kin group.

19) A ‘princess’ title attached to a high chief title, which is given to an unmarried girl of the ‘a’iga of a high chief. Assumed as a female symbol of a territorial group, *täupou* is the hostess in the official situation in a village. *Täupou* has nothing to do with political power and authority, but is greatly respected.

20) The name of Tauaitu is found both on the 2nd line of *fa’alupega* of Krämer and that of the Church. For details see the next section.
we conclude that the title name of Faumuina has come into the territorial organization of Faleata in place of Mata'afa who left for Amaile village. Nevertheless, the Faumuina title is not as highly ranked as Mata'afa.

Next we should consider what these findings tell us about the relations among high chief titles of Faleata. Although two of the high chief titles in Faleata can trace their descent back to Ata, this fact is not necessarily used to prove the legitimacy of the titles. For example, the Seiuli title is proud of the fact that it is a son of Malietoa, the name which became powerful later in history, rather than of the fact that it can be traced back to Ata, the founding father of Faleata. Although there is a very large time lag between the origins of the two titles, Matai'a and Seiuli, they are the same in the ranking order of Faleata. Then there is the title of Faumuina, which cannot be traced back either to Malietoa or Ata. Thus, we can see that the Samoan title system does not emphasize the importance of the differentiation of lineal/collateral lines and the ranking order of titles according to their genealogical distance from the lineal line based on the seniority principle, which provide the main logic of organization in other Polynesian societies. The reason why a Samoan title holder displays his own genealogy proudly is not because he is trying to find his position in a larger genealogical ranking order, as a Tongan title holder does, for whom the genealogy serves as the framework of the society by enabling distinctions to be made according to lineal/collateral lines. For a Samoan title holder, this is no more than one of the strategies to emphasize his own legitimacy in the territorial organization. If it only can show its legitimacy, even a new title like Seiuli may occupy a position as high as an ancient title like Matai'a, which has reigned for a long time in Faleata.

Tuamasaga is integrated into an overall organization on the authority of the title of Malietoa which intermediates and relates its various communities, within which, however, integration is not necessarily achieved in the same way. While Faleata is related to another small district or village in the name of Tuna in the federation of Tuamasaga, which is rather recent organization, the ancient authority of Ata and Tafa'igata is more powerful as far as the integration of villages inside of Faleata is concerned, though there is a new title like Seiuli which depends largely on the authority of Malietoa. The territorial organization of Faleata is integrated on the basis of these plural authorities.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHIEF AND ORATOR

Though loosely structured, in most cases one chief and one orator make up a pair in a served/server relationship. This relationship is clearly evident in private events concerning 'aiga or kin group of a chief, rather than in public events like fono. Therefore, in this section, our analysis is focused on the roles played by orators in lagi (funeral for a high chief). As well as all of those related to the deceased who come to the funeral, many orators gather from all over Samoa to participate in an 'auala, a procession of bereavement by orators, each holding a palm frond and crying words in praise of the deceased high chief. The larger the 'auala,
the happier the bereaving 'āiga, as 'āuala is thought to be an indication of the authority and power accorded to the title name.\textsuperscript{21)} When the funeral is over the 'āiga of the chief must distribute 'ie toga (fine mats)\textsuperscript{22)} for the orators who have participated in the bereavement ritual. The distribution itself is a kind of ritual and has a form of its own, being held outdoors in public and accompanied by very formal speeches. On this occasion, two parties, the 'āiga party and the orator party sit facing each other, while two orators representing each party stand and make speeches and bargain for the fine mats. The orator called talia (tali toga) represents the interest of the 'āiga, trying to promote the reputation of the 'āiga and the dignity of the title name of the deceased as much as possible within a limited number of fine mats.

On the other hand, the orator who represents the orators in the bereavement procession attempts to obtain as many mats as possible for the participants. These opposing roles are distributed among the orator groups of Faleata, as follows, when a funeral for a high title holder\textsuperscript{23)} takes place:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deceased High Chief</th>
<th>Talia</th>
<th>Orator of 'Āuala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faumuina</td>
<td>Saofa’iga</td>
<td>To’aफā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matai’a (Vaimoso)</td>
<td>Une, Manuleleua</td>
<td>Saofa’iga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matai’a (Vaietele)</td>
<td>Toį, Tūlaga</td>
<td>Saofa’iga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seiuli</td>
<td>Ulugia</td>
<td>Saofa’iga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faumuina is served by Saofa’iga, Seiuli by Ulugia, Matai’a of Vaimoso by Une and Manuleleua (two titles of To’aफā), and Matai’a of Vaietele by Toį and Tūlaga. Toį and Tūlaga represent the 'āiga of Matai’a of Vaietele village, although they are not necessarily important titles in the overall Faleata context. On the other hand, the representative orator of the 'āuala group is the one who represents Faleata. This is Saofa’iga in most cases, and To’aफā when Saofa’iga takes the role of talia.

The fact that the pair relationship of Matai’a/To’aफā is somewhat different in nature from the other two pairs is again confirmed here, when we look deeper into the lagi for high chiefs. The other two pairs are formed in their own villages, Lepea and Vaiusu. In the case of Seiuli in particular, the relationship is confirmed by the story that the daughter of Ulugia bore Malietoa a son. On the other hand, the pair relationship of Matai’a/To’aफā is looser, as their titles are dispersed all over Faleata. Consideration of the geographical arrangement of the titles of Matai’a and To’aफā will help to understand the reason why.

\textsuperscript{21)} The detailed analysis of the Samoan funeral and the role of 'āuala has already been given [YAMAMOTO and YAMAMOTO 1981: 148–156].

\textsuperscript{22)} Samoan valuables for exchange. Fine mats were the most highly appraised valuables before money was introduced. They are still important in exchange rituals and are always needed.

\textsuperscript{23)} It is said that any one of the chiefs of Faleata is customarily prohibited to hold lagi for himself. Nevertheless, according to the recent generalization, or democratization of the title system, lagi is often held in this district, as well as in others.
Just as is rare the situation where the title name of Matai’a is split into two villages separated from each other by several other villages, so is the case of the orator group of To'afā, which is divided into two villages at each end of the district. Further, this division of To'afā seems to coincide with the Matai’a title split. The geographical arrangement of the titles is symmetric; the title of Matai’a in the east (in Vaimoso village) being accompanied by Manuleleua and Une, and the Matai’a title in the west (in Vaitele village) by Ale and Ulu, even though the latter combination is divided into two different villages and accordingly has lost the served/server relationship. Those who serve for Matai’a in Vaitele are Toi and Tulaga, of the same village.

This geographical arrangement suggests the following assumption: A long time ago To’afā used to serve Matai’a. In those days all the titles of To’afā lived surrounding the Matai’a title, Ale and Ulu being located on the west side of Matai’a, Manuleleua and Une on the east side. Later on, when the title of Matai’a and its

![Figure 6. The Topological Change of the Titles of Matai’a and To’afā](image)

24) While it is easy to assume from the genealogies of Faleata that the title name of Matai’a is of ancient origin, it is not in the case of To’afā, as it is an orator group whose genealogy is not recorded in the common historical traditions. Nevertheless, in the case of Ale, it is assumed that this title is older than the origin of the title of Malietoa, because it is recorded that the mother of Savea, the first Malietoa title holder, was Tauaiupolu, a daughter of Ale.
'aiga were split into two, To'afa was also divided in two, Ale and Ulu serving the west Matai'a title and Manuleleua and Une serving the east Matai'a title. Later still, as the population of Faleata increased and more villages were founded, the geographical distance between the two Matai'a titles increased. Accordingly, the west Matai'a and To'alua (two titles: Ale and Ulu) have failed to keep the served/server relationship between them. Ale and Ulu started their own villages while Matai'a began to use Toi and Tūlagā as his orators (Figure 6).

Not only the west pair of Matai'a and To'alua (two titles: Ale and Ulu), but also the east pair of Matai'a and To'alua (two titles: Manuleleua and Une) have lost such a close relationship as exhibited by Faumuina/Saofa'iga and Seiuli/Ulugia. This is suggested by the fact that Manuleleua and Une sit in a different house than the one in which Matai'a sits in the outdoor fono and that Matai'a and Ulugia are connected by Saofa'iga but not by To'afa when the summons for fono is made. One of the reasons for this is probably because the west Matai'a and To'alua (Ale and Ulu) have already lost their pair relationship. The collapse of the western pair seems somehow to have affected the symmetric arrangement of the east pair. There is even the apparent tendency for the east To'alua to become independent from the mastership of Matai'a.

THE RELATIONSHIP AMONG ORATORS

In the previous section, we discussed how the pair relationship of chief/orator is manifestly expressed in the rituals concerning the 'aiga of chiefs. On the other hand, as explained in section “The Council of Faleata”, the neutral position of an orator is emphasized mainly during fono. For example, if anyone of Saofa'iga makes the first speech in the fono, it is not for Faumuina but for the whole Faleata. If Saofa'iga is absent and To'afa makes the speech, it is the same. Thus, a chief and an orator differ not only in whether one makes a speech or not but also in terms of representation. In fono, while chiefs represent their own sections of the territorial organization and manifest the authority of these sections, the orators' duties are to mediate among these sections and to integrate them into one organization which they themselves represent. Chiefs may exist on almost the same rank while only one orator may perform one duty as a mediator. This is probably why conflict is more clearly observed among orators than among chiefs. In this section, a close examination is made of the conflicting relations among orators in the fono of Faleata.

There seems no question that the third position is occupied by Fa'apito Saofa'iga, of the three orator groups in Faleata. The focus in this section is on the conflict which can be observed between To'afa and Saofa'iga, already mentioned. When all the titles of Faleata come together, the most important role is performed by one of the Saofa'iga titles. On the other hand, although coming after Saofa'iga, all four To'afa titles make speeches and drink kava cups. Again, on the occasion of the outdoor fono, To'afa occupy two houses of the three and make speeches and drink kava cups. Here we should examine the legend concerning the relationship
between Saofa’iga and To’afā.

This legend was obtained from the main informant and recorded by the author. The informant related this oral tradition explaining the relationship between the two orator groups. He said he himself heard the story told by the then Faumuina title holder in his speech when the whole Faleata had a fono to settle the dispute between Saofa’iga and To’afā.

_Tofiga (appointment) of Saofa’iga_25)

The tama (high ranked chief) named Tafa’igata of Faleata came down from Aele village with a basket in his hand. There was an _atu_ (or an _aitu_: a spirit) in the basket. He first came to visit Ale. Ale served kava to him. He said to Ale, “Of To’afā, you may drink the first cup, and make the first speech.” Henceforth, Ale drinks the first cup and makes the first speech when Faleata gather. Then, Tafa’igata came to Vaimosovi village to visit Manuleleua. He also drank kava here. While drinking kava, he put his basket behind him. There was an _aitu_ in it. He said to Manuleleua, “Of To’afā, you may drink the second cup, and make the second speech after Ale.” After that, he came back to Lepea. He visited Veletaloolua at Lepea. Many _matai_ came in. There was the basket which Tafa’igata brought. The kava ceremony started. When he drank kava with Ale, he had spilt some kava before he drank. He did the same in Vaimosovo village, and again did the same in Lepea. It was the _matai_ of Lepea that first found the meaning of his basket. People saw him spilling some kava on it. Veletaloolua said, “Stop it. Why do you first give kava to the _aitu_ behind you and drink yourself later?” Tafa’igata said, “Thank you for your guess. Your name is Saofa’iga a Atua (lit., ‘gathering for spirits’). You are _moa vini mua_ (the first cockcrow) of Faleata.” Since this appointment was given, an orator of Saofa’iga gives the first speech and drink the first kava cup whenever Faleata gather.

This legend follows the usual pattern of a story of origin used to explain the legitimacy of some position, role, or privilege. That is, because so-and-so did something for someone in authority, he was appointed to the present position. The story explains how Ale and Manuleleua of the already existing To’afā obtained the present position in the group, and also how Saofa’iga was formed and promoted to the position above To’afā.

The aim of this legend is to explain the origin of the honored role of Saofa’iga to make the first speech and to drink the first cup in order to show its legitimacy. Here To’afā appears as an already existing group, and Saofa’iga is created in a position surpassing the privilege of To’afā. Thus, this legend may be interpreted as one which explains and authorizes the power shift from To’afā to Saofa’iga.

---

25) This description is a rough translation made by the author from the tape recorded in Samoan.
26) The Samoan term ‘atu’ is now reserved only for the Christian God, but formerly used for their own deities.
It has been suggested in section “The Relationship among Chiefs” that Matai’a appears to be the oldest title of the three high chiefs of Faleata. Again, in the previous section, it has been assumed that To’afa used to serve the Matai’a title and is the oldest orator group in Faleata. Since Saofa’iga serves the Faumuina title, which seems to be relatively new in Faleata, it is natural to assume that Saofa’iga is younger than To’afa.

We can also approach this legend using the method of structural analysis as well as in terms of historical facts. The historical explanation of the legend was not started by the author but the people of Faleata. This legend was told with some regret by a person who belongs to the To’afa side, while the authenticity of To’afa is proudly expressed as “To’afa do fa’amāepaepa (just sit solemnly) like high chiefs in the rituals.” The statement of the legend that To’afa was an already existing group might be the expression of its authenticity. Therefore, this legend tries to settle the conflict between Saofa’iga and To’afa, providing the former with the most important privilege for its merits and the latter with authenticity. To’afa has the reputation while Saofa’iga has the substance.

It is worth noting that it is Tafa’igata who mediates between Saofa’iga and To’afa. The name Tafa’igata often appears in the legends of Faleata which explain the origins of titles, though it has never become a title nor had it been a title like Mata’afa. Tafa’igata is a name which has nothing to do with any particular part (either a village or title) of Faleata, yet still has authority over the whole district. In this sense, it is the most appropriate name for mediating between Saofa’iga and To’afa.

The inland village, Aele, from which Tafa’igata came, is also worth noting. Usually, inland villages are newly developed from plantations exploited by people from coastal villages of which they are politically a part. But Aele village is the name of a historic place where it is said that Fe’epē, the grandfather of the first Malietoa title holder, lived. It does not belong to any coastal villages. There is no fa’alupega nor titles in Aele village. Aele is the locality which transcends the title system of Faleata prevalent in the coastal communities. As a place which has nothing to do with any partial interest of Faleata, Aele is an appropriate place of origin for the mediator of the conflict between To’afa and Saofa’iga.

Therefore, the legend may be interpreted as the story of the mediation of the conflict between the two orator groups by Tafa’igata, who transcends any partial interest on Faleata and who originates from an impartial place. Through mediation To’afa was given the honor of authenticity while Saofa’iga was given the prerogative.

The above analysis suggests that there are differences between chiefs and orators in the quality of legitimacy for position, role, and privilege. The legitimacy of a chiefly title is determined by its pedigree. The first Matai’a title holder was a grandson of Ata, the founding-father of Faleata, and the first Seiuli was a son of Malietoa ‘Ae’o’aiunu’u, while Faumuina is probably related to Tuia’ana Faumuinā, who held the highest title in the A’ana district. On the other hand, legitimacy for orators is by tofiga (appointment) for their merits. Though we have to refrain from
further examination of other cases of tofīga here, we may mention that Krämer recorded several tofīga and I have some more data on other cases. Even if there are even some legends of tofīga for chiefs, such as the story of the appointment made by Atiogie and that made by Malietoa Ganasavea in the founding story of Faleata, those chiefs were given their appointments because of their pedigree, as shown in the story, rather than because of their deeds. Indeed, receiving an appointment means being dependent on some other authority. When asked how the appointment for his title was made, one reputed high chief became sullen and said that there was nothing like that. Consequently, the legitimacy of chiefs is by ascription while that for orators is by achievement.

No legend has been found concerning the tofīga for Toʻafā. In the legend of the tofīga for Saofaʻiga, Toʻafā already existed. The authenticity of Toʻafā is thus proved in the story. Ale, a title name of Toʻafā, also appeared in the legend of the origin of the title name of Malietoa and it is thus believed that the origin of the name of Ale is at least more ancient than the title of Malietoa. Therefore, in the case of Toʻafā, its authenticity rather than its achievement is emphasized, its legitimacy resembling that of chiefs in spite of the fact that they are orators. Toʻafā title-holders are more like chiefs when they do ‘fā‘amaeapaepa‘ (sit still solemnly) with dignity like chiefs in the fono of Faleata, leaving the first speech for Saofaʻiga. In fact, although the honorific words ‘tōfā’ (Mr. for orators) and ‘malīu maʻi’ (welcome for orators) are to be applied for Toʻafā, people sometimes recognize Toʻafā as tūlaʻaliʻi aliʻi. (The title names of this category, unlike other titles, are allowed to take either chief’s or orator’s roles as they choose in rituals. They are free to choose between the role of making a speech like orators or of sitting solemnly like chiefs.) Also, in the inauguration ceremony for one of the Toʻafā titles, fine mats are distributed, which is the custom with the inauguration ceremonies for high chief titles [YAMAMOTO and YAMAMOTO 1981: 144–148]. Furthermore, Toʻafā has no master to serve. In these respects, Toʻafā does not look like an orator group.

The reason why Toʻafā has chiefly attributes although they are orators may be explained in two ways, depending on the interpretation of the legend. The historical explanation is this: Since a long time has elapsed after achievement served as the basis of legitimacy for orators of Toʻafā, their legitimacy is now based on authenticity. However, although orators of Toʻafā have taken on chiefly attributes, they may not become chiefs. Consequently, Toʻafā, the ‘prestigious orators’, had to give up the best privileges to Saofaʻiga. On the other hand, this may be explained differently. Toʻafā’s chiefly attributes are the consequence of the conflict between Toʻafā and Saofaʻiga. Since Saofaʻiga has taken the real power as orators, Toʻafā has no other way to seek the prestigious positions. In either explanation, one of the important implications of this legend is the existence of conflict between the two main orator groups of Faleata.

CONCLUSION

The formation of the territorial organization of Faleata has been described and
analyzed. In section “Fa’alupega of Faleata”, the fa’alupega, the conventional phrase of address of Faleata was examined. And that of Toamua, which is a component village of the former, was also discussed. It was found that the title names referred to in fa’alupega represent each division of the territorial organization and their representation depends much on the context. The three high chief titles, Faumuina, Seiuli, and Matai’a, and the three orator groups, To’afä, Saofa’iga, and Fa’apito Saofa’iga, are the most important titles in Faleata.

In section “The Council of Faleata”, relationships between titles expressed in the council of Faleata were discussed. The ritual phases of fono were mostly analyzed through examination inter alia of seating arrangement, speech and kava-drinking orders, as fono acts as a mechanism which verifies the ranking order of titles in a territorial group. The ranking order of titles which appears in fa’alupega is roughly repeated in the ritual phase of fono, but the relationships among titles are complex and some data are inconsistent. The three high chief titles are mostly related equally on the same level, and certain devices have been created to emphasize their equality. On the other hand, there seems to be conflict among the three orator groups.

In sections “The Relationship among Chiefs”, “The Relationship between Chief and Orator”, and “The Relationship among Orators”, the genealogies, private ceremonies, topological dispositions, and oral traditions of important titles of Faleata were examined. Through the analysis of the genealogies of high chiefs of Faleata and Tuamasaga, in section “The Relationship among Chiefs”, it was revealed that the Samoan title system does not emphasize the importance of the differentiation of lineal/collateral lines and the ranking order of titles according to their genealogical distances from a lineal line based on the seniority principle, as occurs in most other Polynesian societies. There is no single principle to integrate titles, as in Tonga. The integration of Faleata as a territorial organization is attained through its being an important sub-group (iti ‘au) in the total organization of Tuamasaga, in the name of Tuna, a brother of the first Malietoa. Nevertheless, neither the high title nor offspring of Tuna now exists in Faleata. Instead, Faleata today is reigned over by those three high chief titles, Faumuina, Matai’a and Seiuli, which are different in their origins and in their genealogical depth. These high chief titles co-exist in a common territorial organization, having different authorities in each of their backgrounds.

In section “The Relationship between Chief and Orator” the pair relationships between chief and orator were analyzed in the context of the private ceremony of high chief. The topological disposition of orator titles in Faleata was also examined. Again no single principle was found to relate a chief to certain orators that serve him. Whereas Seiuli and Ulugia are related through their original affinal relationship, Matai’a and To’afä lack any such relationship.

In section “The Relationship among Orators” the legend which explains the origin of the privileges accorded to Saofa’iga in Faleata was analyzed to elucidate the nature of the relationship among orators, which seems to differ from that among
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chiefs. Unlike high chiefs who represent each sub-division of the territorial organization, there exists much conflict among orators—whose role is to relate and mediate the sub-divisions—as between Saofa’iga and To’afa, in Faleata. However, the legend in question mediates conflict between the two orator groups. Thus the titles are related on the basis of different reasons, and the total organization exhibits many contradictions. As a consequence the Samoan title system is a sort of *bricolage* revived again and again by efficient orators through their speeches.27)

Some features of Samoan political structure have been made clear in the process of describing the title system of Faleata. First, the titles are ranked on the basis of symbolic opposition. The seating arrangement of *fono*, discussed in section “The Council of Faleata”, clearly shows the opposition. Both of the round ends (*tala*) are seats for the high chief title holders. In Faleata three high chief names, Faumuina, Matai’a and Seiuli, are said to be equal in rank, although some say that Faumuina is the highest. But the slight difference in rank among orators are more evident (section “The Relationship among Orators”), because, unlike high chiefs who just sit still to represent each territorial subdivision, orators are given different duties to integrate them into an entire district. Nevertheless, in Faleata, this problem is solved through the separation of duties and honor, and To’afa and Saofa’iga are opposed on the distorted phase. Samoan territorial organization is thus realized on the various symbolic oppositions without its center.

The second feature is the interchangeability of the representative of the territorial group. Any one on the three high chief titles or the three orator groups may represent the whole Faleata and behave as if he was the sole authority or power in the territorial group. For example, any title holder of the three high chief names may alone decide to summon *fono* of Faleata. Any one of the three orator groups may represent Faleata and make a speech for the district in the *fono* of Tuamasaga, and sometimes even one of the three high chiefs may make a speech to represent Faleata. It is the same with the title holders of a title name split; any one of them may behave as if he was the only title holder. Splitting titles does not mean dividing authority and privilege, but means creating similar authority and privilege which is interchangeable among the sets.

Third, in Samoan society authority is not always but often given from outside an organization, instead of originating from inside, as in the cases of Malietoa and Saofa’iga. For it is difficult in most cases to find an authority over the sub-groups of an organization. High titles are often either traced by their descent to Tuimanu’a (the king of the Manu’a Island Group28), Tuifiti (the king of Fiji), and Tuitoga (the king of Tonga), or given their title names by these oversea authorities which have no political power in Samoa. Malietoa was given its title name by a Tongan

---

27) See p. 207 note 2).
28) Small island group situated in the easternmost part of the Samoan Archipelago. It does not belong to the other inclusive political organization composed of Western Samoa and Tutuila Island (Figure 1).
king. And it is also pointed out that Tafa'igata, examined in section “The Relationship among Orators”, is an authority transcendent in the power relations of the territorial organization of Faleata, though it is not from the outside.

Thus Faleata is a microcosm without centricity, exquisitely composed on the multi-dimensional symbolic oppositions—that among chiefs, that among orators, and that between chiefs and orators—which binds various authorities of different origins. The order of such a territorial organization is realized on several levels, starting from the village at the bottom to that of the entire society level, at the top. Indeed, an organization on the lower level is in a sense subordinate to one on the upper level, which includes the former, but it is relatively independent as the society lacks the overall principles of integration like Tonga. Because of the specific system of organization, the Samoan chief system is unique among Polynesian traditional political systems.
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