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*A tabua, a ulu ni weimami iyau*

The whale tooth is supreme among [the head of] our valuables

This statement was made during a wide-ranging conversation in May 1978 with Tevita Soro of Naikelenaga village on Kabara Island in Lau, eastern Fiji. He was an elder in a non-chiefly herald clan in Naikeleyaga, and had long experience of Fijian customary procedures. I had asked him about the significance of *tabua*, sperm whale teeth, pierced at each end for the attachment of a cord (Fig. 1), which I had seen presented on numerous formal occasions in Lau during the previous year (and have seen presented on many occasions since). Tevita went on to explain, “The *tabua* is a chiefly thing. It is their valuable, the chiefs. They decide about it. The *tabua* is their valuable.” He also observed that money (*ilavo*) was a European thing, whereas *tabua* was Fijian, and if a Fijian was engaged in any serious purpose, then it would be appropriate to take there a *tabua*.

Anyone familiar with Fijian cultural practice will be aware that *tabua* have high value.¹ They are presented with speeches on great state occasions and during exchanges involving kin, such as at weddings, mortuary rituals and receptions for honoured guests (Fig. 2). They are also offered when making a special request or entreating forgiveness for some misdemeanour. Given the cultural importance of *tabua*, and the relatively limited discussion of them in the anthropological literature, this article has three main aims: (i) to provide an account of their recent use in Fiji, (ii) to assess the historical evidence for their use since the early 19th century, and (iii) to analyse why they were and are considered highly valuable and suitable for the important roles they have played in Fiji for over 200 years and possibly longer. My article complements that by Fergus Clunie in this volume, which considers the role of whale teeth in Tonga before Christian conversion in the early/mid-19th century, after which they have featured very little in Tongan cultural activities. This diminution in significance in Tonga is in contrast to Fiji where their use has increased and they now serve as the pre-eminent valuable (*iyau*), adding gravitas to any formal occasion.
A full review of references to *tabua* in the Fiji literature cannot be attempted here. Sahlin (1978, 1983, 2004: 34-35) and Thomas (1991: 65-82, 110-21, 189-200) provide the most comprehensive discussions to date of the cultural and historical significance of *tabua*, but most authors mention their importance without attempting analysis. For example, Thompson (1940: 125) gives an explanatory gloss to the effect that they are “important objects of ceremonial exchange” and Legge (1958: 7) described a *tabua* as an
Figure 2. Joeli Vakarau, on behalf of the host clan, Muanaicake, presenting a *tabua* with mats, barkcloth, cotton cloth and bottles of scented coconut oil to participants at a final mourning ceremony (*vakataraisulu*), Udu village, Kabara, October 1977. (Photo: © Steven Hooper.)

...article of great importance in the exchange of gifts..., whose ceremonial significance endowed it with a social value far in excess of its cash price. The gift of a whale’s tooth placed upon the recipient the obligation to assist the donor; any request, whether for the hand of a bride, for assistance in time of war, for the forgiveness of an offence, or for any other favour, would be accompanied by a tooth, and the force of the request would be enhanced thereby.

Legge was writing about the 1858-1880 period, but, apart from the war reference, his description holds good for the 1950s and, indeed, today. Roth (1953: 96-106) provided an overview of their use up to the mid-20th century, while Hocart, the great ethnographer of Fiji, wrote surprisingly little about them that was analytical, though he observed they were “valued as potent presents” (1929: 99) and used as offerings in “ceremonial[s] clearly religious
Fijian writers such as Nayacakalou (1975, 1978) and Ravuvu (1983, 1987) provide useful descriptive accounts and general statements, the latter explaining that they are “the highest symbol of respect, deference, loyalty, goodwill, acceptance, recognition and even submission, which an individual or a group may offer to another” (Ravuvu 1987: 22). From an earlier generation, Deve Toganivalu (1918: 9) wrote: “[W]hales’ teeth were the property most highly prized, and chiefly property; everything was obtainable (or possible) by them which the chiefs set their minds on, also the desires of the people of the land were obtainable by them.” Rokowaqa (1926-: 38) named tabua in a list of valuables that included shells and other items made of ivory. Among recent writings, Arno (2005) has discussed them in the context of an “economy of sentiment”, Van der Grijp (2007) has reviewed commercial contexts of their use and Tomlinson (2012) has analysed the paradox of their involvement in Christian attempts at transcendence on Kadavu. Let me begin to add to these studies by considering first how they are used.

RECENT TABUA USE IN FIJI

My first experience of seeing tabua in action in Fiji was in February 1977, when a state reception (veiqaravi vakavanua) was held before a large crowd at Albert Park in Suva for Queen Elizabeth II, then head of state of independent Fiji. Among other presentations, a sequence of four tabua was offered to the Queen, with speeches by four men dressed in decorated barkcloth, their upper bodies glistening with scented coconut oil. After each presentation speech the Queen received the tooth and passed it to her Fijian herald, who made a speech on her behalf. After this, kava (yaqona) was presented and mixed in a large circular wooden bowl (tanoa). The Queen drank the first cup and her herald the second. This was followed by a presentation of food—a feast (magiti) called iwase ni yaqona—and finally the Queen made a speech full of appreciative sentiments about her reception and her wishes for Fiji to flourish. I later learned that this kind of state reception was a standardised procedure for honouring those of high status, especially visiting high chiefs, Fijian and non-Fijian. Veiqaravi is a term with very positive connotations involving hosting, serving and doing honour. It is a compound of the word qara (to serve, even to worship); veiqaravi implies being in an active and respectful relationship with the person or group being served.

Tabua presentation

Grand public occasions of this sort are not, however, how most Fijians experience tabua. They most regularly appear during inter-clan exchanges at weddings and first birthday rites for a first-born, during visits between kin
and after a death. Fijians are born into exogamous clans, and the maintenance of active and productive affinal relations between inter-marrying clans is regarded as essential to the conduct of healthy cultural life.

A death is not only a deeply personal loss for close relatives, it also affects the deceased’s natal clan and other clans connected by marriage, leading to a series of exchanges which activate and give material expression to the ‘pathways of kinship’ (wakolo ni veiwekani) between affinal clans. Most parts of eastern Fiji have patrilineal inheritance, and in Lau when a man dies his natal clan usually take responsibility for arrangements as hosts or ‘owners of the death’ (itaukei ni mate). When a married woman dies, virilocal post-marital residence means that the husband’s clan usually act as hosts during mortuary rituals. This was the case on the afternoon of 23 August 1978, when Luisa Paea died unexpectedly in Naikeleyaga village on Kabara Island in southern Lau. She had been born into Matasoata clan in Udu village on Kabara and had moved to Naikeleyaga in 1936 when she married Maikeli Kotobalavu, a man of Naivotavota clan, one of two clans of chiefly status in the village. Widely liked and respected, Paea was an expert in the decoration of stencilled barkcloth (masi kesa) and her finely cut stencils were in demand all over the island and beyond.

During the late afternoon envoys conveyed the melancholy news of her passing to the other three villages on the island. In the evening groups began to arrive to pay their respects, taking no heed of the darkness or the long and difficult paths. Close female relatives gathered in the upper part of Paea’s house behind a Tongan-style barkcloth screen, having prepared her body on a special bed of fine mats and stencilled barkcloth, with a sheet of Tongan-style barkcloth (gatu vakatoga) to cover her. The old vesi wood (Intsia bijuga) posts of the house she had lived in all her married life rose up from the soft matting, and the dim kerosene light barely penetrated the shadows beyond the timbers of the roof, where her fishing net still hung across an ancient beam. As the women wailed behind the screen, men remained outside drinking yaqona with serious formality, two of them periodically entering the house to attend to the condolence presentations of visiting mourners. An atmosphere of solidarity and common purpose prevailed throughout the night, as the community seemed to close ranks against this attack upon its vitality.

In all, 28 presentations of condolence tabua (called ireguregu) were made that night and the following morning on behalf of the villages and clans of Kabara, and by non-Kabaran residents such as the head of the local Methodist Church, the nurse and some visitors from nearby islands. The first delegation from outside the village arrived about 9 p.m., a group of close kin from Tokalau village some two miles distant. Once they were seated in the lower
part of the house, a murmured request to make a presentation vakavanua ‘in the manner of the land’ was assented to by one of the two men sitting facing them in front of the barkcloth screen. He was acting as ‘herald’ (matanivanua) for the other man who belonged to the host Naivotavota clan. The leader of the Tokalau delegation, Isireli Rarawa, eased forwards on his knees, cradling two tabua in his left hand, their cords in his right. His voice faltering with emotion, he began to speak, his body moving gently backwards and forwards, his hands lifting and lowering the tabua to emphasise his words:

In the chiefly manner, sirs, to Naikeleyaga, to all the chiefly house foundations in the chiefly village of Naikeleyaga, and especially, sirs, to you our chiefs, to the Tui Kabara, of the clan of Naivotavota. The people of Tokalau were at home. The chiefly envoy arrived there, sent because of the serious tragedy which touches us all, sirs, this evening. They remained there, but they just could not be at ease. As you can witness, the land is dark and it is late at night, but they have come here to you, the chiefs of Naikeleyaga. It is not an easy task for me to express to you the purpose of this tabua. The chiefs of Tokalau know very well that, with respect to you the chiefs of Naivotavota, your tragedy is their tragedy, your weeping is their weeping, your distress is their distress. This is why they have travelled along the coast to come here on this dark night, it is their earnest desire to show themselves here to you…. A weighty tragedy, a chiefly tragedy, a tragedy of kinship has touched our whole island of Kabara this evening. They were not able to stay away; they wished to come to appear before you our chiefs of Naikeleyaga. This tooth which I hold, as you know, this tooth is the condolence of the gentlemen and ladies of Tokalau to you, sirs, the chiefs of Naikeleyaga, especially to the clan of Naivotavota, at the house foundation of Savena [Paea’s house foundation]. They know well the tragedy which assails us. Therefore they wish to appear here, according to chiefly custom and because of the chiefly envoy that came to them…. They know that this tabua is suitable for them to appear with before you this evening. You behold it, it is small, poorly-sounding its presentation; it is requested that this be forgiven. The tabua is offered up to you our chiefs of Naikeleyaga, particularly to the house foundation Savena, that it may be correct, sirs, and accepted.

Isireli passed the two tabua to Jiosefate Volauca, a senior man of Naivotavota, who clapped his hands resonantly with crossed palms before receiving them. He began in a quiet voice:

Ah, I receive, sirs, the tabua, the chiefly tabua, the tabua of kinship which have appeared along the chiefly pathway from Tokalau. It is received in the spirit of thanksgiving: that we may remain healthy, that our responsibilities be fulfilled, that God may be just, and firm may remain our kinship customs. Effective, be it true.
He then passed the teeth to his herald, Jone Mate of Valenikato clan, who raised the two tabua to his nose in a sniffing gesture and then spoke at greater length:

Ah, I take up the chiefly tabua, the tabua released in the chiefly manner from the sacred village of Tokalau, from all the high house foundations. You have come along the coast tonight because of the weighty tragedy that presses upon the village of Naikeleyaga, likewise on them the clan Naivotavota. A chiefly delegation, in the manner of kinship, has come ashore this evening. The tabua, the condolence from the centre of the chiefly village of Tokalau, from all the house foundations, likewise from the ladies, from the children that live under its protection, from there have come magnificent tabua, offered to the village of Naikeleyaga, to the clan of Naivotavota, who are being mourned with on this night…. Their call of tragedy, call of distress, their voices have been heard and you have come here to them tonight as kin. The tabua are beheld and given up to heaven that the loving God may behold them, that we all may be blessed, that death may recede, that infectious sicknesses may recede, that chiefly customs be firm, and thick be the blood of kinship in all future times.

All present then called out in unison, Mana, e dina, ‘Effective, be it true’, followed by amuduo and four claps in unison, then duo and two claps in unison, followed by random clapping and words of thanks, after which the visitors withdrew.³

This speech sequence has been given at length, though abridged, to convey something of the emotional intensity that can accompany tabua presentations. Especially poignant was the speech by the leader of the delegation from Paea’s natal clan, which arrived from Udu village just after midnight. They had waited for the moon to rise to guide them on their five-mile walk up the coast. The condolence speeches made by them, and by Tokalau and Lomaji village visitors later the following morning, all expressed the same general theme: distress at bereavement and their wish to come to demonstrate in the appropriate way their continuing respect for the bonds of kinship which linked them with Naivotavota clan and Naikeleyaga village. In presenting the condolence from the Bete clan of Tokalau, their spokesman stressed the blood links between the two groups:

I weep for the blood of kinship, the chiefly blood which flows away…. We were distressed, we wept, we remembered the importance of the blood of kinship from the past, from long ago, right up to our lifetimes…. We are bound together, sirs, by the chiefly blood which links Naivotavota, the house foundation of Savena, and all the other chiefly house foundations. You behold it and it is small [the tabua], it is not good enough for the blood, the chiefly blood that flows away....
On these occasions tabua become the focus of powerful sentiments which are transferred in physically embodied form by the presenter to the recipients. There is a dynamic performative dimension, as the body of the presenter and the tooth move forwards and back to emphasise the sentiments expressed. The importance of the occasion is also enhanced by the use in speeches of honorific vocabulary, including the term kamunaga for tabua, which may be translated as ‘treasure, great valuable’. This was the case in the condolence speeches for Paea. In general talk a tooth on a cord is tabua, but in formal speeches it is kamunaga. (In subsequent translations this term will be left as spoken, and not translated as tabua.) Thus, during presentation, a tabua is a publicly witnessed vehicle for the profound expression and transfer of wishes, hopes, requests, allegiance, invocations and blessings, which are sometimes explicitly stated to vodo kina ‘get aboard’ the tabua, vodo being the word used for boarding a canoe, nowadays any kind of boat.

Structure of speeches
The structure and form of the many dozens of tabua speeches that I have witnessed in Lau is highly consistent, as is the status, actual or putative, of the three speakers who make them. Where possible, the presenter and first recipient should be from clans of chiefly status (turaga), and the second recipient from a non-chiefly clan of herald status (matanivanua). If the presenter is a very high chief, then a herald may make the tabua presentation on his or her behalf, acting as the chief’s mouthpiece. This practice is consistent with the more general custom of particular clans undertaking particular roles.

In the Koro Sea chiefdoms of eastern Fiji, villages are composed of several patrilineal exogamous clans with different statuses, which may be chiefs, priests, heralds, gardeners, fishermen, navigators, carpenters, etc. These statuses are manifested most regularly in a ritual division of labour. There is also a broad binary distinction between chiefs (turaga) and non-chiefs/landspeople (vanua). When ritual tasks are undertaken senior members of different clans will take on specific roles, such as the division of a communal fish catch (chiefs), the division of a feast (landspeople), the presentation of first fruits, feasts and yaqona (landspeople), and the presentation and division of valuables, including tabua (chiefs). With respect to tabua, the greatest valuable, it is members of chiefly clans who should present and receive them with speeches.4

Chiefly clans in villages may or may not be connected by common ancestry to the eminent chiefly clans (originally of foreign origin) of major chiefdoms in Fiji such as Bau, Rewa, Cakaudrove and Lau, but their members have
responsibilities and play roles expected of chiefs throughout Fiji. When no-one from a chiefly or herald clan is available for a *tabua* presentation, then participants will assume the roles of chief and herald in order for it to be done properly. If a ritual procedure is deemed necessary, arrangements can be flexible and anyone available can take an appropriate role. A sports team on tour may designate the manager or captain to take the role of chief for ritual purposes, whether they belong to a chiefly clan or not in their own chiefdom or village. Ritual speechmakers also will be chosen because of their oratory skills, knowledge of titles and familiarity with honorific vocabulary, such as *kamunaga.* Titles and not personal names are used in formal speeches because the people involved do not act as individuals but as instantiations and embodiments of their clan, village or chiefdom, and indeed, as shall be argued later, of their ancestral god.

The speech structure of *tabua* presentation is largely the same throughout Fiji and has become standardised as a fundamental procedure in national culture. The form of *tabua* speeches can be set out as follows:

I. Presenter (*turaga*, of chiefly status)—at length
  
i To whom presented, using honorific titles
  
ii From whom presented, using honorific titles
  
iii Nature and occasion of presentation
  
iv Presentation is inadequate and small; forgiveness requested
  
v Offered up to senior title of recipients (by implication to their ancestors/gods)

II. Recipient (*turaga*, of chiefly status)—brief
  
i From whom presented, using honorific titles
  
ii To whom presented, using honorific titles
  
iii Nature and occasion of presentation (optional)
  
iv Received with thanks and approval
  
v Gives blessings, invokes Christian God and calls for beneficial things to occur

III. Recipient’s herald (*matanivanua*, of non-chiefly status)—at length
  
i From whom presented, using honorific titles
  
ii To whom presented, using honorific titles
  
iii Nature and occasion of presentation
  
iv Presentation is large, magnificent and received with thanks
  
v Gives blessings, invokes Christian God and calls for beneficial things to occur
Status tabua presentations

This model sequence was illustrated during a major veigaravi vakavanua ‘state reception’ offered to the paramount chief of Lau at the meeting of the Lau Provincial Council at Naikeleyaga village, Kabara, on 5 May 1980. The paramount chief, Ratu Sir Kamisese Mara, bearer of the titles Tui Nayau, Sau ni Vanua and Tui Lau, was chairman of the Lau Provincial Council and at that time Prime Minister of Fiji. Tui Nayau was his senior title, the one used by Lauans, so will henceforth be used here.

Before the business of the meeting began a series of offerings was made, lasting over an hour, involving the presentation by Kabarans of a coconut-leaf mat (tabakau), some coconuts on a stalk (ivono), a sequence of tabua presentations (see below), a yaqona root (isevusevu), some yaqona specially made and served to Tui Nayau (yaqona vakaturaga), and finally a feast (iwase ni yaqona) of cooked pork and root vegetables. Tui Nayau responded with speeches when he received each tabua and at the end of the presentations he made a longer speech called vakatatabu ‘sacred pronouncement’. In his vakatatabu he expressed positive sentiments about the Kabaran hosts, gave benedictions, invoked God’s blessing, called for prosperity and appealed for wise discussions during the meeting. The ritual sequence was closed with a short appreciative speech by a Kabaran, called ulivi ni vakatatabu.

The four tabua presentations made during the state reception were called cavu ikelekele ‘pulling up the anchor’ (in fact done the previous night on board ship), qalovi ‘swimming’ (out to invite the guest to land), luva ni tawake ‘lowering of the pennant’ and vakamamaca ‘drying’. These were the same four tabua presentations (though not the same whale teeth) that had been made to the Queen three years previously in Suva.

These tabua presentations, and others described below, are classified by me as “status”, as distinct from “kinship”, because the speeches made reference not to blood and kinship, but to the reciprocal status relations between Kabara and the paramount chief, the political and diplomatic character of which was affirmed by pledges of allegiance. In this context any existing kinship relations were a secondary consideration. What was desired from the paramount chief was the conferring of blessings on the polity.

Although each of Kabara’s four villages has chiefly clans in the context of village ritual activities, the villages of Naikeleyaga and Tokalau each have two clans who are considered to be descended from famous immigrant chiefs who arrived in antiquity, settled in various parts of Fiji, married women of the autochthonous population and produced descendants who today comprise the great chiefly houses of Fiji. The clan of the paramount chief of Lau and the four chiefly clans on Kabara all trace descent from these original immigrant chiefs. During the 1980 state reception, senior men of the four Kabara chiefly clans each presented a tabua.
To illustrate the kind of sentiments expressed, I give an abridged version of the *iqalovi* ‘swimming’ *tabua*. This appears to be, and to have been in the past, the main presentation epitomising allegiance. It was made by Kevueli Bulu of Naivotavota clan, the effective chief of Kabara and its elected representative on the Lau Provincial Council. Bulu was eligible by birth in a chiefly clan to be installed in the senior title Tui Kabara, but because of rival claims in other chiefly clans and a lack of agreement, the leaders of the Kabara landspeople (*vanua*) had not installed a Tui Kabara for several generations.8

After the initial presentations of the mat and the coconuts, a call of “*A, oi, oi*” went up from the Kabarans, which was echoed by Tui Nayau’s two heralds. Then Bulu stood up, strode forward and knelt in front of Tui Nayau, a large dark-coloured *tabua* in his left hand, its coir cord in his right. His voice firm, Bulu began, “In the chiefly manner, sirs, to my Big House”, to which Tui Nayau’s two heralds responded by calling out, “*A, oi, oi, a tabua levu ea* [‘a big tabua’], *wooo*”, the last word delivered in a crescendo. The call “*A, oi, oi*” was explained as a form of *tama* or acclamation, an honorific call made when approaching a chief, used when a *tabua* appears for presentation on a celebratory occasion. Chiefs and *tabua* are thereby accorded the same respect. Bulu continued with a forceful speech which followed the structure outlined in I above. Although respectful, he spoke in a manner that could be described as *yalo qaqa* ‘bold-spirited’ because Kabara holds the honoured status of *bati* ‘warriors, border’ to the Tui Nayau.

You followed, sir, the pathway here with the noble chiefs of Lau. You are now secure, sir, on your crag of rock [*ucu ni vatu*—honourific self-deprecating term], and we now present the *iqalovi*, sir, to you this morning. The *kamunaga* is here as the *iqalovi* for you…. We usually say, sir, that Kabara is poor, but we are now wealthy, sir, on account of your decision [to hold the Provincial Council on Kabara].... You behold, sir, the *kamunaga*. If it be small, let it be forgiven. If the speech concerning it sounds badly, let that be forgiven. Too long, sir, is the speech of the *kamunaga*, offered up today, that it may be correct, sir, and accepted.

When he had finished, Bulu stood up and placed the *tabua* in the hands of Tui Nayau, who replied (Fig. 3):

I take hold of the *kamunaga*, the chiefly *kamunaga*, the *kamunaga* according to the customs of the land. A *kamunaga* here, offered up by you our people of Kabara, from the Tui Kabara and from you the barkcloths [title holders] of the land who attend at our reception today. It is offered up to the Chairman of the Council, to the gentlemen, the chiefly representatives [elected members] of the Province who have arrived here today, the representatives from the Government [*Matanitu*], the Land [*Vanua*] and the Church [*Lotu*]. *Kamunaga*
of life, kamunaga of permanence; may our gathering be blessed, be well made its decisions, and may our Land of Kabara be prosperous forever. Effective, be it true.

Tui Nayau then passed the tabua to his herald, Peni Vakaruarua, holder of the title Mata ki Cicia, who amplified Tui Nayau’s sentiments. When discussing the event afterwards with Kabarans, it was felt that the whole veiqaravi, which had been a source of anxiety mixed with confidence beforehand, had gone off well. The speeches had been good, the honoured
guests (*vulagi dokai*) had been well fed and entertained. More crucially, Tui Nayau had expressed himself well-pleased with Kabara’s gu ‘energy, commitment’ in hosting the whole meeting, feeding the guests and paying them great respect. Kabara had enhanced its reputation, and the blessings and approbation of the paramount chief, elicited by the presentation of *tabua* and other marks of respect, had been received with satisfaction. A chief’s words are *mana* ‘effective’, *mana* being an efficacy of divine origin linked to causation, so pronouncements made by a paramount chief, be they blessings or curses, will come to pass.

Status *tabua* presentations can also be on a national scale. For example, at a meeting at Somosomo in July 1986 of the Great Council of Chiefs (an administrative organisation of colonial origin, dismantled by the current regime), all 14 Fijian provinces made a major public presentation and pledge of allegiance to the Governor-General, Ratu Sir George Cakobau, Vuniivalu of Bau. One *tabua* was held by the main speaker and a *vulo* (a bunch of ten *tabua*) was held by each of the 14 bearers kneeling behind him (Fig. 4). The *tabua* had been supplied by the provincial offices, and after presentation to

*Figure 4. One *tabua*, plus 14 *vulo* (bunches of ten) being presented to the Governor-General, Ratu Sir George Cakobau, Vuniivalu of Bau, at the Great Council of Chiefs meeting, Somosomo, Cakaudrove, June 1986. (Photo: © Steven Hooper.*)*
the Governor-General most were redistributed among the provinces. When ministers or other government administrators make visits beyond the capital they are likely to be respectfully received vakavanua ‘in the manner of the land, in Fijian style’ by local communities with a welcoming tabua.

Status relations between chiefs and people may also be predicated on ancient kinship relations, especially because in pre-Christian times polygamous paramount chiefs had many wives drawn from within and beyond their realm, establishing important affinal connections with their own sub-chiefdoms and external chiefdoms. These links through women, often expressed as ‘pathways’ (wakolo/sala), permitted brothers-in-law to call upon each other for mutual assistance, while the operation of vasu rights meant that the children of a marriage, especially a chiefly one, could have access to their mother’s brother’s resources. The missionary David Cargill observed in 1835 that the Tui Nayau, Roko Taliai, had many wives, 34 of whom were listed by Richard Lyth (1850-51: 61). Cargill opined that, “I fear the principal obstacle in the way of his conversion is his reluctance to part with them” (1977: 70), perhaps appreciating how those wives locked Tui Nayau into important affinal relations of a very extensive kind.

Another status-type tabua presentation is isoro ‘entreaty’, where a tabua is given by someone who has committed a misdemeanour in relation to the health of the chiefdom and who wishes to entreat forgiveness. This tabua can be known as matanigasau ‘point of the arrow’ or matanimoto ‘point of the spear’, names which indicate former methods of entreaty. A recent example of a (failed) matanigasau was an attempt in 2001 by representatives of the Great Council of Chiefs to present one to Ratu Mara, Tui Nayau and President of Fiji, who had been forced from Government House during the previous year’s political crisis. When he became aware of their intentions he said he could not accept the tabua and the issue remained unresolved. In the past, isoro was an act of obeisance after defeat, when a basket of earth and a woman could also be offered to the victor with a request for life, since power over life, and prosperous life, was attributed to the victorious chief and manifested in the words of forgiveness which it was hoped would thereby be elicited.

Status tabua may also be presented by chiefs to their people to acknowledge special services. These tabua may be called ivakatale ‘return’ or igaravi ‘facing’ (implying a reciprocal gift), and specific kinds of igaravi are iluva ni moto ‘removing (a fish) from the spear’, icula mata ni ika ‘needle from the eye of the fish’ and iseresere ni dali ‘untying the rope’ (from a turtle). For example, in Lau I was told that turtles and certain large fish, such as saqa ‘giant trevally’ (Caranx ignobilis) and donu ‘coral trout’ (Plectropomus leopardus), should not be eaten privately but be taken to the chief, who should reciprocate with a tabua and other valuables, such as a mat or sheet of
barkcloth. Tabua are also given by chiefs on other occasions in recognition of services, including iluva ni vesa ‘removing of dance ornaments’ after a major dance performance, ivodoki ni waqa ‘boarding of the canoe’ when a canoe is completed and iqusi ni loaloa ‘wiping off black paint’ to those returning from a solevu ‘ceremonial exchange’ (instead of as in the past to a successful
returning war party). I witnessed a iqusi ni loaloa in May 1980 when the Kabara delegation returned from a major ceremonially exchange at Rewa.

House-building, like canoe-building, is also an occasion for tabua presentation. On 7 July 1977 the newly built Methodist church in Tokalau village, Kabara, was formally handed over to the village by the master builder, a man from Vitilevu. Separate from his cash salary, the builder received a tabua as idola ni vale ‘opening of the house’, plus many other valuables and a feast from the chiefs and people of Tokalau in recognition of his great labour, which had taken over two years.

Methodist Church meetings are also occasions for tabua presentation because these gatherings involve visits by guest delegates. Appropriate respectful behaviour is expected between hosts and guests and towards senior church members, who are treated as chiefs whether they have that status by birth or not. In July 1980 representatives of the Kabara Methodist Church travelled to Tubou, Lakeba, for the annual regional meeting and choir-singing competition. Kabarans made a variety of tabua presentations during the trip, including to church officials as vakavinavinaka ‘thanksgiving’ for hosting the meeting (Fig. 5). Tabua were also given to relatives as rai ibulubulu ‘seeing the grave’, in honour of clan members who had passed away recently and for whom it had not yet been possible to present condolence tabua (ireguregu).

Other tabua presentations by chiefs, or representatives of polities, be they chiefdoms or villages, include butabuta, an initiating gift to specialist carpenters to begin work on a canoe or a house, and ikerei ‘requesting’ of some other enterprise or service, which in the past including ikerei ni ivalu ‘requesting of assistance in war’. Inter-chiefdom tabua transactions can also be occasioned by dynastic marriages and alliances through women. This is an area where “status” tabua presentations overlap with “kinship” ones.

Kinship tabua presentations
Nowadays kinship (veiwekani) and rites of passage provide the most frequent occasions when tabua are brought out from their secure storage in the private upper part of a house. Relations with affines are regarded as particularly important and ‘heavy’ (bibi), sentiments expressed repeatedly during formal speeches and in everyday talk. Young people are regularly reminded that wakolo vakaveiwekani ‘pathways of kinship’ are foundational to social and cultural life and are neglected at the clan’s peril. Geographical and climatic conditions in island groups such as Fiji, especially in remote islands, can still make populations periodically vulnerable to drought and food shortages, so even though Fiji has a cash economy, there remains a strong ethos that survival, physical and cultural, is primarily dependent on the maintenance of active and productive kin relations.
As seen earlier with the condolence speeches after a death, kinship *tabua* presentations can be intensely emotional. The same applies to those connected to marriage, when the emotions are of a different order. A marriage involves two key *tabua* presentations, though additional *tabua* may be used as ‘decoration’ (*iukuuku*) for other exchanges that take place if families with ample resources are involved. However, essential to Fijian marriage rites in present-day Lau are the *ilakovi* or *ilave ni tikina* ‘proposal’ for the hand of the woman, presented by the man’s side, and the *itatauvaki* ‘farewelling’ of the bride presented by the woman’s side. Isireli Rarawa, of Tokalau village, Kabara, discussing the marriage of his son in 1978, explained the importance of both *tabua*.

This thing, the ‘proposal’ *tabua*, is a very important valuable for the father of the man. The proper procedure for us is that the most important valuable, the best, be taken as the proposal for the woman. This is the reason. The woman is a person and she lives with her father and mother, and this means that the best things should be taken, so that she may come here and be married to my son. The father and mother of the woman will see this and they will know that I am sincere about them giving away their child…. The ‘farewelling’ of the woman, this is the most important thing. The life of the woman is thereby farewelled/entrusted to the man’s people. The meaning of it is for them to look after her, love her, attend to her and give her the things she needs. The woman is leaving her father; the life/welfare of the woman becomes the responsibility of the man’s relatives.

Shortly after this discussion a wedding took place in Tokalau. The bride came from Udu village and two sides (*taba*) were formed, that of the bride and the groom, by members of Udu and Tokalau villages respectively. A series of exchanges took place throughout the day, during which the bride and groom were repeatedly robed and disrobed in new barkcloth and escorted back and forth between the houses used as their respective headquarters. The women of each side used them literally as vehicles to facilitate inter-clan exchanges. The climax was when the bride was brought for the last time to the groom’s house and the farewelling *tabua* was presented. Her father, her mother and all her village relatives would make their way back down the coast to Udu, but she would remain. The groom’s side were waiting in their house when a whisper came from one of the ladies who had a clear view out of the lower door. “They’re coming.” Backs were straightened, cigarettes put out and the bride’s party entered, led by their herald, the chief of Udu and the bride’s father. The bride, Tagi, in finely stencilled barkcloth and glistening with scented coconut oil, was led up to be seated next to the groom on a dais of decorated mats and barkcloth provided by ladies of both sides. When all
were settled, crowding the house, the chief of Udu, Ilaitia Ledua, then eased forward onto his knees and held out a fine large *tabua*, cradling it in his left hand and lifting it occasionally as if assessing its weight. He spoke firmly but with emotion, moistening the eyes of many present. After the preliminary references to titles, he continued:

Firstly, sirs, I hold before you a *kamunaga*. The *kamunaga* here, sirs, you know, firmly established in present times, is not a new *kamunaga*, it is an ancient *kamunaga*. It has been presented many times since the time of our forefathers who have passed away, and it is their path that we follow here. It is held here before you again this evening. We are not dispirited. We rejoice, for we know that we are bringing here an end of a cord that our chiefs who have fallen [died] have kept tied together between Valelevu and Vanuamasi [names of house foundations of the two sides]. Secondly, Tagi is here presented to you.... Thirdly, her life is here. I know that when a child is brought up in a household, no-one can tell where she will eventually be settled. This evening, sirs, we rejoice, we give thanks, for we know that Tagi will be protected and cared for and that our ancient kinship bonds will remain tied…. Here is the proper valuable, in the proper manner. Weighty, sirs, is the speech of the valuable which is offered by the elders of her clan. I speak on behalf of Udu village in the belief and confidence that everything will be carried out, as we know it will. I know that my words will be heeded and, as the presentation is carried out, so it is witnessed. Too lengthy, sirs, is the speech of the *kamunaga*, offered up in the chiefly manner to Valelevu, that it may be correct and accepted….

The senior man on the groom’s side, Isireli Buli, received the tooth with:

I take into my hands the *kamunaga*, a *kamunaga* acceptable to us, a magnificent *kamunaga*, a *kamunaga* which has reopened the door to Valelevu. May thick be the blood of kinship. May Christianity prosper and may all those who come to Valelevu be cared for in all future times. Effective, be it true.

All present called out the last words (mana, e dina) in unison, and Isireli Buli passed the *tabua* to his herald, Isireli Rarawa, who clapped softly before he took it, brought it up to his nose in a sniffing gesture, and spoke:

I take up the *kamunaga*, the *kamunaga* released in the chiefly manner from you the chiefs of Udu, from the chief Tui Udu, from the chief’s assistants of the clan of Muanaicake [bride’s clan], from the sacred house foundations, the great house foundation, from her parents, from her brothers, from her grandmothers, indeed from everyone at the chiefly village of Udu. A *kamunaga* is brought up to Tokalau, to the chiefs of Tokalau, brought up to the house foundation Valelevu, the house foundation occupied by the chiefs linked by the blood of kinship with Udu…. This tooth is a weighty tooth. The reason, sirs, is that a child from within a chiefly village is being farewelled thereby. We know well, sirs, that
our chiefs are tied with those who come from Udu and have come to Valelevu. We also know the new path that follows the old path. Women have gone to you, they have been counted as belonging to Udu. The children of Valelevu, sirs, are bound together with the blood from Udu. It is as if the pathway had become overgrown, but now it is being re-established.... Kamunaga of life, that we may live. Kamunaga of firmness, that firmly established may be your chiefly blood of kinship at Udu, and at Tokalau, at the house foundation Valelevu. Kamunaga also of honour, that honourable may be our chiefly kinship relations, that we may go to one another in accordance with the customs of our forefathers. I pray to heaven that blessings may descend on us, that our lives be firm, that God on high be just and that the children of Udu be successful gardeners in all future times. Effective, be it true.

The last words, Mana, e dina, were repeated by all present. The sentiments expressed in these speeches need little amplification. The value of the bonds of kinship between clans and villages, forged by women who marry out and bear children, is expressed through a vivid imagery of connecting pathways, binding ties and uniting bloods. More powerful still, complementing the verbal imagery, is the tabua itself, silent bearer of all these potent sentiments, passing from hand to hand, and clan to clan.

I have seen numerous similar tabua presentations at weddings, funerals, first birthdays of firstborn and affinal visits, such as one between Udu village and Moce Island in 1978. The Udu people needed planting material, which could be obtained from affinal relatives on the fertile island of Moce, some 35 miles distant by canoe. The Udu delegation took several tabua and wooden kava bowls, which on arrival were presented as rai ibulubulu ‘seeing the grave’ in respect of relatives on Moce who had passed away since the last visit. After a few days the Moce relatives responded with baskets of planting material for the Udu visitors. Although everyone knew a need for crops had triggered the expedition, it was always referred to as a visit to rai ibulubulu.

Elopement (veitubaitaki) is another occasion that demands the deployment of tabua if honour is to be satisfied. Elopement is regarded as a very serious matter by the family of the girl, and there is only one appropriate method by which the family of the boy can resolve the crisis and make reparation—presentation of tabua as ‘the burying’ (ibulubulu), which is in effect a type of isoro. Tabua can be great coolers of anger and on these occasions are best brought into action without delay. In Kabara an elopement took place in Udu village. After late night confusion (retrospectively hilarious) during which the couple ran away to the boy’s house, the boy’s parents assessed the situation, established that the teenagers intended to get married, and decided to approach the girl’s parents, who were near neighbours and affinal kin. A few days later the boy’s father told me the story:
So I said to my wife, “Mere, please bring the *tabua* that are in that box, so we can go to Jone [girl’s father] to do the ‘burying’ and carry out the customary procedure.” Mere took two *tabua*—we only had two *tabua* in our house. I said, “With these *tabua* I shall go and do the ‘burying’ and also present the ‘proposal’ in the customary manner.” So we went together. Yes, it was late at night, but we didn’t wait till next day. With this sort of problem you want to take the swiftest route possible to sort it out, because, if you delay, her father or brothers or someone else will hear, and it will cause—if no customary procedure is done to set things right—it will cause some trouble. Because, according to Fijian standards in the old days, this was an insulting act. According to Fijian standards, elopement is considered disrespectful. Yes.

After this, we went straight away and we entered the girl’s house together. Jone looked at us and realised that Una was at our house and that we were going to him for a particular reason. I said straight away to Jone, “Jone, our formal visit faces you” [standard words preliminary to a presentation]. When Jone heard ‘our formal visit’ he knew straight away that Una was with us. Up spoke Jone, “Will you wait please, let us talk first…” However, even after this talk, my mind was not at ease, because I wanted the customary procedure to be done, and the reason is that she is a special child to her parents, and in the morning it would be heard about if we only discussed that the young people be married, and no customary procedure was done. There are some in the village, and some in the chiefdom, who will be inclined to criticise us, and so I want to abide by the customary procedures of the old days that are usually done in these circumstances. If it happens that a couple get up and run away together, then the customary procedure should be done. So I then presented our *tabua* to Jone, reckoning them as ‘burying’ and ‘proposal’. If I had had ten *tabua* I would have taken all ten, because I know that people are greater than *tabua*, people are important. But we had only two *tabua*, so we presented them together as our ‘burying’ and our ‘proposal’. After that Jone took hold of them and received them. Having completed that properly, Jone then brought out another *tabua* and presented it to us as our reciprocal gift (*iqaravi*) on account of our formal visit. But, as far as I can judge, it wasn’t correct for Jone to present another *tabua*. There are types of customary procedure that when completed should be reciprocated, and there are customary presentations that when completed are finished—a discussion concludes the matter. To me, for the customary procedure that we went to perform, it was not correct for it to have been reciprocated. Anyway, we were reciprocated and we respected that, we received the *tabua*, and when that was finished we had a discussion about the marriage arrangements.

This account has been given at length because of the insights provided into the significance of *tabua* for a family of non-chiefly status living in a remote village. *Tabua* are regarded as essential to the effective functioning of cultural life; they have a potency that is capable of bringing about desired effects.
To move from the microcosm to the macrocosm, the final examples to be provided of contemporary tabua use in a kinship context relate to large ceremonial exchanges (solevu) connected to the paramount chief of Lau. The first relates to his children’s relationship to their mother’s people, the second concerns his own mortuary ritual.

In May 1980, shortly after the Provincial Council meeting on Kabara, several hundred Lauans travelled to Rewa, where they were joined by hundreds more who were resident on Vitilevu. They and their clans and villages had all produced valuables and food to take to Rewa to participate in a large-scale ceremonial exchange called ‘the taking of children’ (kau mata ni gone). This is a ritual carried out at clan or chiefdom level when the children of a marriage, who are normally resident at the father’s place, are taken formally to their mother’s natal clan, or chiefdom, and presented together with valuables to their mother’s brothers, with whom they have the special vasu relationship. Until this ritual is done it is not considered appropriate for children of a marriage to exercise their vasu privilege, which allows them to take property and in other ways take advantage of their maternal kin, especially the mother’s brothers. At the 1980 event the eight children (in their teens and twenties) of Ratu Mara, paramount chief of Lau, and Ro Lala, paramount chief of Rewa, were being taken to Rewa to be presented formally to their mother’s people. Given the high status of the parents, and the extensive reach of the chiefdoms which they led, the resources they could count on were substantial. The whole of Lau participated with enthusiasm because despite the work involved in making valuables such as canoes, kava bowls, mats, barkcloth, coir cord and scented coconut oil—all things classified as iyau—a solevu is an exciting time when people travel to meet up with relatives, catch up on news, stay up all night dancing and drinking yaqona, and generally have a memorable time that contrasts strongly with the usual rhythm of village life. In my experience of this event, it had the character of an exciting three-day festival during which the resources of both chiefdoms were mobilised in a highly public way, and for which large quantities of food and useful objects were created and exchanged. Vitilevu-based Lauans, with limited access to village resources, contributed cash to buy modern valuables such as kerosene, washing soap and bolts of cotton cloth, and to pay for transport.

Space does not allow a comprehensive treatment of this event, but the role of tabua will be briefly highlighted. At the core was a simple ritual, the participants forming two sides as they do at a wedding. The father’s side present the children to their mother’s side with tabua and other valuables (iyau). The mother’s side act as hosts and reciprocate the valuables with a feast (magiti). After the exchange the children return to their natal home,
their links with their mother’s clan having been publicly acknowledged and celebrated. However, when both father and mother are paramount chiefs, ‘the taking of the children’ is an occasion that prompts chiefdom-wide participation in a *solevu*, and what Kevueli Bulu of Kabara described to me as a ‘battle of abundance’ (*ivalu sautu*). On such occasions members of neither chiefdom wish to be defeated (*druka*)—reputations are at stake. Accordingly, everything is done on a grand scale, and at Rewa in 1980 as the eight children were led across the ceremonial ground on a barkcloth pathway, each holding a fine *tabua*, they were followed by 19 men each holding a *vulo*, ‘a bunch of ten *tabua*’ (Fig. 6). After this vanguard came bearers of vast quantities of decorated mats, several enormous 80-metre-long barkcloths, thousands of metres of cotton cloth, hundreds of bottles of scented coconut oil, dozens of drums of kerosene, over 170 wooden kava bowls, several wooden gongs and three fully-equipped sailing canoes with their sails up (Fig. 6). Everything was presented with a speech to the waiting Rewans by Tevita Loga, a senior title holder of Lau, holding a large deep honey-coloured *tabua* of obvious great age. The *tabua* was received with a speech by the Vunivalu of Rewa,

Figure 6. The eight Lauan ‘children’, elaborately dressed and holding *tabua*, are escorted across the ceremonial ground (*rara*) on a long barkcloth pathway on the occasion of the ‘taking of the children’ (*kau mata ni gone*) to Rewa. Numerous valuables, including barkcloths, wooden bowls and three canoes with their sails up are ready to be carried behind them. Naililili, Rewa, May 1980. (Photo: © Steven Hooper.)
who then passed it to his herald for the usual longer speech. In the afternoon the Rewans reciprocated not only with the expected feast, consisting of vast quantities of root crops and pigs, turtles and cows, but also with large quantities of valuables, including 30 tabua, mats, barkcloth, cotton cloth and three launches, one with an outboard engine, to match the three Lauan canoes. Each side subsequently divided its spoils among all those sub-chiefdoms who had contributed, and the tabua were likewise mostly redistributed and dispersed among those who had attended, with the chiefly families keeping the finest examples. Tabua in these quantities are rarely seen, though as will be apparent shortly, such numbers were also amassed in the 19th century.

Large numbers of tabua were again seen in May 2005 at Tubou, Lakeba, when the final mortuary ritual (vakataraisulu) was carried out for Ratu Mara, paramount chief of Lau, who had passed away the previous year. Vakataraisulu means the ‘allowing of (normal) clothes (after mourning)’ and is an exchange that can be held for anyone whose surviving relatives wish to undertake it and thereby honour their deceased relative. This can be at the village level, involving limited numbers of people and modest

Figure 7. The eight Lauan ‘children’ stand before their mother’s relatives as tabua are presented on the occasion of the ‘taking of the children’ (kau mata ni gone). Lauan valuables, including barkcloth, drums of kerosene and wooden bowls are piled behind them. Naililili, Rewa, May 1980. (Photo: © Steven Hooper.)
quantities of valuables, or, when done at the chiefdom level, it can involve
the whole chiefdom and other chiefdoms who wish to express kinship (as
well as political) solidarity. Ratu Mara, born in 1920, was the most eminent
Fijian of the second half of the 20th century. Paramount chief of Lau since
his installation in 1969, he had also been a member of the colonial Legislative
Council, and then Prime Minister and President of independent Fiji. At his
final mortuary ritual, besides a delegation from Tonga headed by Princess
Pilolevu, 38 delegations from all over Fiji came to present tabua and large
quantities of valuables, similar to those presented at Rewa in 1980. The
valuables were brought onto the ceremonial ground and piled up before a
large cylindrical memorial image (lawanimate) made of many thousands of
metres of coir cord wound round a wood post made by the people of Cicia
Island. The image was dressed in barkcloth in chiefly fashion, with a turban of
smoked barkcloth (masi kuvui), and was the focal point of the presentations;
dozens of tabua eventually accumulated around its base (Fig. 8).

Figure 8. Lead mourners, each with a tabua, stand before the memorial image
(lawanimate) of Tui Nayau, Ratu Sir Kamisese Mara, as their relatives
pile up large barkcloths and other valuables at the vakataraisulu
(alloowing normal clothes) final mourning ceremony for the deceased
chief, May 2005. (Photo: © Steven Hooper.)
Once all the presentations had been made to the image and to the host clan (of the deceased chief), everything was put away for redistribution the following day, when all the valuables, including the *tabua*, were assembled on the ceremonial ground and presented by the hosts to the guests (Fig. 9). They were then sorted into numerous piles allocated to the contributing delegations, care being taken to avoid the same items being returned to those who brought them and to distribute island valuables to urban participants, and *vice versa*.

**Tabua: quality, quantity and change**

The foregoing has demonstrated that *tabua* are used in Fiji on a wide range of occasions for a variety of purposes, but it should be emphasised that the names of the *tabua* refer to the occasion or the ritual procedure, rather than to the *tabua* itself. Another type of valuable can be presented on these occasions if a *tabua* is not available. Obviously, all *tabua* are not the same. They differ in size, shape and colour, depending on the age and sex of the sperm whale from which they came, the position of the tooth in the jaw and the degree to

---

*Figure 9. The heap of *tabua*, prior to the presentation and distribution of all valuables to participants at the *vakataraisulu* (allowing normal clothes) final mourning ritual for Tui Nayau, Ratu Sir Kamisese Mara, May 2005. (Photo: © Steven Hooper.)*
which they have been worked, smoked, oiled and polished. It is generally stated that if a tabua is needed, then one will suffice, but on some occasions more than one, and even hundreds, are presented at the same time. In theory, size, colour and quality do not matter; in an emergency any tabua will do, as was the case with the elopement at Udu. But assessments of the resources of donors are also made on the basis of the quality and quantity of tabua offered. Individual or group prestige is at stake when tabua are transacted, and people will endeavour to avoid accusations of being dravudravua ‘poverty-stricken’ or vakaloloma ‘piteable’ by not only producing a tabua when required, but also by producing more than one, or a high-quality one, when circumstances permit. At the state reception for Tui Nayau at Kabara only one tooth was appropriate for each named presentation, but it needed to be a large and handsome one. Additional teeth were available, but were not considered necessary. However, when competitive exchanges take place, large numbers may be temporarily accumulated for distribution to demonstrate access to resources. Large quantities of other types of valuables and food are similarly deployed. As the “supreme” valuable, the strategic deployment of tabua not only brings prestige, it is also intended to elicit chiefly blessings and approbation.

Quality is also a factor in tabua assessment. For a natural whale’s tooth to become a tabua appropriate for a prestigious occasion, it needs to have been scraped, polished, oiled and then smoked over a fire of sugar cane (dovu) and Cordyline roots (masawe, Lauan qai). This gives the tooth a rich, dark reddish patina which can be maintained by oiling and protection from light. Teeth of this kind, especially if large (over 20 cm in length), are very highly regarded. To complete the transformation of a tooth into a tabua a cord, usually made from square-plaited coconut husk fibre (magimagi), is attached through a small hole at each end. Some examples have cords of square-plaited pandanus leaf. Many teeth in circulation now are relatively small, their shape little modified and their colour pale; some have an old piece of rope for a cord. These are not regarded as suitable for prestigious occasions because keen judgements of quality are still made about tabua, both in the selection for specific occasions and by observers at presentations.

During the 20th century there was an increase in the range of occasions when tabua could be presented. In my 1978 conversation with Tevita Soro, I observed that although I had frequently seen tabua presented with other things classified as valuables, such as mats (yaba), barkcloth (masi, gatu), scented coconut oil (waliwali) and cotton cloth (isulu), I had also seen them presented, including by Tevita himself as a non-chiefly herald, with a feast (magiti) of pig and root vegetables. I said that he and others had taught me that valuables and feasts (iyau and magiti) were distinct categories with
distinct ritual procedures appropriate to them, presided over by chiefs and non-chiefs respectively. So why was a tabua, which he had described as a chiefly valuable, presented together with a feast by a non-chief? Tevita replied that the valuables/chief and feast/non-chief division of ritual labour was true, and that when he was young (he was born around 1900) a feast would have been presented with only a coconut leaf, being a thing of the land, by a member of the vanua (the land, i.e., not a chief). He added that nowadays people use tabua as a decoration/ornament (iukuuku) when presenting a feast and on other occasions.

It appears that increasing availability of tabua, and their link to status generally, has resulted in them now being used to decorate and enhance the prestige of any occasion. Access to tabua, or acquisition of them, is no longer restricted to those of chiefly status, but is governed by two things—active participation in events during which tabua flow between groups, or resort to a pawn shop and cash payment if one cannot be borrowed from kin.

Ilaitia Ledua, an elder of Udu village, confirmed the distinction between required and optional occasions for tabua use, the latter now being quite frequent because tabua were numerous and people wished to demonstrate their ample resources. He said, “Formerly, when a feast was done, the feast alone was presented, the ‘leaf-tray of the land’ (draudrau ni vanua), a thing in the manner of the land. Only recently has a tabua been presented with it. It is just the decorating of it. It wasn’t like that before.”

So what was it like before? What are the historical conditions that have led to the high value and proliferation of tabua? For how long have tabua been deployed in Fiji, and by whom? The next section will discuss what is known of tabua since the arrival of Europeans in the region.

**TABUA IN HISTORY**

Polynesians did not hunt whales, but archaeological evidence and collections made by 18th-century voyagers in the Pacific show that islanders had access to sperm whale teeth and whale-bone from occasional strandings. Polynesians in Tonga, Hawai‘i, New Zealand and elsewhere made neck pendants from whale ivory, examples of which were collected during Cook’s voyages in 1768-80 (Kaeppler 1978a, 2009; Skinner 1974: 45-98). This was before ivory teeth of various sorts were imported from outside the region (see below). Although Cook called at Vatoa in southern Lau during his second voyage in 1774, no landing was made and little information was gathered. However, Cook and other crew members met Fijians in Tonga in the 1770s and acquired several distinctively Fijian types of artefacts there, including clubs, spears and bowls (Kaeppler 1978a: 226-28, 237, 239; 2009: 173-74, 179-84). In 1777, William Anderson admired the craftsmanship of things he was told were
of Fijian origin, “which have all a cast of superiority in the workmanship” (Beaglehole 1967: 959). No tabua were reported, but several Tongan-style items inlaid with ivory or made from it were obtained in Tonga, including figure pendants (Kaepppler 1978a: 207-8; 2009: 164, 174-75; Neich 2007).

The existence of these figures and other whale ivory items indicates that ivory had high value in Tonga (confirmed in Clunie’s essay herein), and it is from Tonga that the first published reference to Fijian interest in whale teeth comes. William Mariner, a wreck survivor who lived in Tonga from 1806 to 1810, reported Tongan frustration at the difficulty of obtaining Fijian sandalwood with which to perfume their cosmetic coconut oil. He observed:

> The Fiji people, demanding a greater number of axes and chisels for a given quantity of wood, these implements are growing very scarce at the Tonga islands, and plentiful at Fiji. Before the Tonga people acquired iron implements, they usually gave whales’ teeth, gnatoo [ngatu; barkcloth], mats for sails, and platt [coir cord]; but whales’ teeth are exceedingly scarce, and the other articles are too bulky for ready exportation. The sting of the fish called stingray was also occasionally given. Another article of exchange is a particular species of shell, which they find only at Vavaoo, and is also scarce. (Martin 1818 v. 1: 322)

Here is evidence that whale teeth, acquired locally or imported from Tonga, were highly valued in Fiji. Mariner also gives two examples of whale strandings in Tonga that resulted in the extraction of the teeth for manufacture into ornaments and for burial in the foundation of a house which was to be “consecrated to some god” (Martin 1818 v. 1: 298-302).

**Sandalwood and bêche-de-mer traders**

Among the earliest written records made by people who actually interacted with Fijians in Fiji are those provided by the sandalwood traders who spent several months at a time on the coast of western Vanualevu in the early years of the 19th century. Several accounts were published by Im Thurn and Wharton (1925), including that of Richard Siddons who, referring to the period 1809-15, recounted how he tried, but failed, to save the life of a widow from strangulation by offering a whale tooth, “which I knew to be more valued there than gold” (Siddons 1925: 169). Whether the incident records Siddons’ own experience or was appropriated for dramatic effect (other trader narratives give similar accounts) is immaterial; his observation on the value of whale teeth rings true, especially when set alongside other evidence, including his own. He later recorded:
One of the most extraordinary circumstances among them is, the excessive value they set upon large teeth, such as those of the whale or sea elephant [walrus]. So that persons going to procure sandal wood from them generally take with them as many of these teeth as they can procure.

The principal things they barter for are axes, knives, or razors; but they will give as much wood for one large tooth, as for five or six axes. This regard they put upon large teeth is the more extraordinary, as they do not seem to make use of them, except as ornaments.

When a native, by purchase or any other means, becomes possessed of a large tooth, he hangs it up in his house, and for the first few days scarcely ceases looking upon it and admiring it. He frequently takes it down, and rubs it with a particular kind of leaf, and polishes it; some of them almost for a month continue to labour upon it.

The vessels from Port Jackson [Sydney] usually carried the teeth of the whale or sea elephant; but some vessels from India carried elephants [sic] teeth, which they cut into pieces, and made in the shape of other teeth. These, being very large, were considered of the greatest value, and procured vast quantities of sandal wood. So great an account was set upon them, that some chiefs actually came from islands more than a hundred miles distant to see them. (Siddons 1925: 174-75)

William Lockerby, a sandalwood trader resident in western Vanualevu in 1808-9, related that the local chief Tui Bua had been

… presented [by another trader] with a brass laced hat, with a brass crown, but he would much rather have had a whale’s tooth, that being the most valuable article among them. They hang them about their necks on great festivals, and give them with their daughters in marriage—as their marriage portion—in short, he who is possessed of a quantity of them, thinks himself extremely rich. (Lockerby 1925: 25)

A Lockerby manuscript in Salem entitled Directions for Fegee Islands, written about 1809-11, is even more emphatic concerning the value of whale teeth. He wrote:

… the Articles of Traid to pleas the Natives are Ivory Iron Work such as Tools…. Beads they are very fond of—White Shels & Cloth… however Ivory is the Most Vallable Article Made in the form of a Whales Tooth and those of them that is possessd of any of them lays them up as graet riches as porshens for their Daughters & Making peace with their offended Supirurs etc. (Dodge 1972: 184).

Lockerby then provided a non-alphabetical “vocaboulary”, for which the first item is “Ivory Tamboo”, a signal of its primary importance and almost
certainly the earliest written reference to *tabua* in Fiji. Somewhat astounding, with respect to the relative values in play, is his further statement: “A piece of Ivory w't [weight] about one lb [pound] is worth two tons of [sandal] wood.” Later in the document Lockerby provides additional evidence that teeth were sometimes pre-cut by traders into sections: “Ivory made in the form of whale tooth… 400 lb. will make 2000 teeth for [from] 1 lb [ounce: c. 28 gm] each.” He adds that “Ivory of any Description is good”, including pieces of Chinese fans and ivory-handled knives (Dodge 1972: 184-87). The superordinate value of ivory to Fijians at that time can hardly be more plainly put, and it is little wonder that traders were cutting up teeth, perhaps literally into smaller denominations, given the colossal value of a single tooth (which from an adult whale can weigh 1-2 pounds). As trade increased, and supplies of teeth were relatively easily obtained by traders from whalers calling at Port Jackson (Sydney) and Rotuma, it is likely that whole teeth were more generally traded. At this time Samoan and Tongan canoe-building specialists living in Fiji began to cut them into sections for use as breastplates and other regalia (see below). By 1809 whole teeth were clearly in great demand and Lockerby records his frustrations at a chief refusing to accept “ironwork” for sandalwood, demanding for it a large tooth that Lockerby did not possess. Given the usefulness of metal tools for canoe- and house-building, this suggests that northern and eastern Fiji must by then have been flooded with sufficient quantities of “ironwork”, whereas whole whale teeth were still relatively scarce.

Early traders were nothing if not sensitive to local trading conditions. *The Sydney Gazette and New South Wales Advertiser*, no. 272, for 19 March 1809 contains an entry that shows how quickly they had realised the significance of whale’s teeth for the success of their enterprise: “[S]ame day (15th) arrived the brig ‘Fox’, Captain Cox, with between 13 and 14,000 skins and 190 whale’s teeth, which are of considerable importance in our trade to the Feejees” (Im Thurn and Wharton 1925: 200). Evidence that large numbers of whale teeth continued to be taken to Fiji by trading ships is provided by William Cary in his account of the wreck of the *bêche-de-mer* ship *Glide* at Macuata in 1831, when about 80 teeth were lost after a Fijian tried unsuccessfully to get them ashore in a blanket (Cary 1928: 69). By this time teeth were spreading throughout eastern Fiji. After being wrecked in the whaler *Oeno* at Vatoa in 1825, Cary spent time at Lakeba under the protection of Tui Nayau, whose muskets he cleaned and repaired. He accompanied Tui Nayau on an expedition to Bau, recalling that messengers “were dispatched to every part of the island [Lakeba] to inform the different chiefs that the king was going to Ambow, and that they must send all the coconut oil, tappah [barkcloth], and whales’ teeth they could produce for presents to the king of Ambow” (Cary 1928: 69).
1928: 26). A little later, William Endicott, who was also aboard the *Glide*, wrote that in 1829 at Bua Bay in Vanualevu, the “principal articles of trade were muskets, ammunition, whales’ teeth, iron tools, beads and ornaments” (Endicott 1923: 25).

Sailors who became beachcombers quickly understood the place of whale teeth in local value systems. John Twyning, who was shipwrecked in 1829 on the Minerva Reef and managed to get to Lakeba, wrote an informative account of his time in Fiji. He related how on one occasion he closely avoided serious trouble after he reneged on the exchange of a large whale tooth with Tui Nayau. Only the intercession of another chief saved his life (Twyning 1850: 46-47). Later, more sensitive to local protocols, he describes how he and a fellow sailor decided to build a boat. “We went to the king and presenting him with a musket and a whale’s tooth, asked his permission to build a Schooner. He gave his consent freely, and promised to supply us with provisions during its construction” (Twyning 1850: 52). This arrangement seems to correspond to that which Tui Nayau made with Tongans who wanted to build canoes from the fine *vesi* wood (*Intsia bijuga*) of Kabara (where Twyning built his schooner) and on other Lau islands. Twyning wrote:

> The king of Lakembo derives considerable advantage from this timber, in permitting the inhabitants of the Friendly and other islands to build canoes in his dominions. He supplies the persons building them with provisions during the time they are constructing, and receives in return muskets, hatchets, whale’s teeth, kava roots, and other such articles as are either useful or desirable to him. (Twyning 1850: 96)

Twyning provides us with perhaps the first eye-witness account of what Fijians actually did with these “Most Vallable” teeth, and how they used *tabua* in important rituals. He was present during a visit to Lakeba (c. 1832-33) by Tanoa Visawaqa, exiled Vunivalu of Bau, in a fleet of 21 war canoes. The visit appears to have involved Tanoa’s installation as Tui Levuka (Twyning erroneously writes Tui Lakeba), a title in the gift of the Levuka people resident on Lakeba who were former inhabitants of Bau. On this occasion, Tanoa was

> … attended by two priests who were to conduct the ceremony. Baskets were placed near him, filled with rolls of tapper [tapa] cloth, sennett [sennit/coir cordage] balls, and whale’s teeth, which were to be presented to him. The whale’s teeth, were by the priests hung on all parts of his body; on his neck and arms, and in such profusion, that he staggered under the weight of them…. He soon freed himself from the burden, and let the teeth fall from his arms into the baskets, and at the end of the ceremony, he distributed these riches amongst his chiefs and warriors. (Twyning 1850: 55)
Twynning was in Lau for more than two years, and he later wrote that whale teeth were “important articles among the natives of the Feejee Islands, who not only use them as money, but pay them a kind of religious homage” (Twynning 1850: 46). This is one of the rare insights among early visitors to Fiji of the ritual and religious significance of tabua. For most Europeans tabua were “ornaments” and a kind of money—for traders the only logical explanation for the value attributed to them. Twynning, however, was an astute observer, realising that there was more to the lading of the Vunivalu’s body with tabua than a monetary transaction.

Missionary sources
Critical reading of first-hand observations contained in missionary journals (separate from their often disapproving generalisations), can provide insights into pre-Christian Fijian practices and concerns. The first European missionaries to live in Fiji were the Methodists William Cross and David Cargill, who arrived in Lakeba from Tonga in 1835 (two Tahitians had preceded them). Over the following 20 years they were joined by several others who settled in or near the main chiefly centres of eastern Fiji, surmising that if they could convert the chiefs the people would follow en masse. They became fluent in Fijian and some of them, including Thomas Williams, John Hunt and Richard Lyth, took an active interest in what would now be termed Fijian culture. They were certainly intent on discrediting behaviour of which they disapproved, but they also possessed a genuine spirit of enquiry. The edited 1840-53 journals of Thomas Williams (1931) were, with other sources, the basis for his influential book Fiji and the Fijians (1858). These journals provide a rich source of information on Fiji at that time, including the use of tabua. Other published and unpublished missionary sources amplify these accounts.13

The missionaries not only observed the use of whale teeth among Fijians, they were also obliged to deploy them in their relations with Fijians as a means of achieving their evangelical aims, influencing chiefly politics and obtaining food supplies and other assistance. The quarterly stock accounts of Cross and Cargill on Lakeba show they had difficulty in keeping a supply, while other trade items remained in surplus. For 1837-38 there are the following entries, “September 1837: Received 48; Expended 38. December 1837: On hand 13; Expended 13. March 1838: On hand 15; Expended 15. June and September 1838: On hand—none; Expended—none” (Account books 1835- ). Thomas Williams and his wife arrived at Lakeba on 11 July 1840 and one of his first duties was to pay his respects to the paramount chief. “It was late in the evening before we could spare time to visit Tuinayau the King; but it was evident that a razor, and especially a large whale’s tooth, presented to him, rendered us welcome visitors” (Williams 1931: 8). The following year
Williams and his fellow missionary James Calvert attempted unsuccessfully to persuade Tui Nayau not to take a Christian woman from Ono-i-Lau in a polygamous marriage. On 23 March 1841 he wrote,

The property which we presented on the 19th or thereabouts to redeem Jemaima Tovo was returned today. Bro. C. [Calvert] and myself supplied 19 whales’ teeth, deal [timber planks], 1 large cedar box and a new fowling piece; to this the Ono [Christian] people added a good roll of cynet [coir cord], three fine mats and four whales’ teeth.... The Ono property was detained. (Williams 1931: 24-25)

The fact that 23 teeth, a gun and other valuables were refused probably indicates the great importance to Tui Nayau of this marriage, and also perhaps the plentiful availability of whale teeth by 1841. The use of tabua, with varying success, when petitioning chiefs to spare the lives of widows or to rescue Christian women from polygamous marriages was regularly reported by the missionaries. At Somosomo on 25 September 1844 Williams successfully entreated Tanoa Visawaqa, Vunivalu of Bau, to spare a woman from strangulation after the death of her husband (1931: 291), but tabua proved less effective on 22 September 1849 when he accompanied Richard Lyth to Bau “to present a large six gallon pot, and three whales’ teeth to Tanoa with a request that he allow Mary, a daughter of Ratu Mele who lately lived with Mr Lyth, to remain in Vewa [Viwa].... His suit was unsuccessful” (1931: 500).

These episodes show that tabua, although powerful, were not irresistible, and other factors such as existing alliances or commitments, temporary plentiful supply and the exigencies of politics could weigh more heavily in the deliberations of a chiefly recipient. An unsuccessful petition could lead to the return of tabua, though not always, as in the case of the Ono Christians who may have been regarded as impertinent by Tui Nayau. Nowadays Fijians describe the refusal of a petition, once a tabua has been accepted, as requiring the return of another tabua as idiriki (breaking), in effect returning matters to the status quo ante. This may be a matter of courtesy, because it is clear that if chiefs are angry (cudru; in honorific language toka wale ‘sitting idle’) then they may either refuse to receive a tabua or not return it once presented. In the past a tabua could be offered by a rival party to bika ‘press down’ or ‘crush’ one already presented, and thus neutralise the earlier request. Whether a tabua was presented from a position of weakness or strength could also influence the outcome. So, aside from the missionaries having mixed fortunes in their tabua offerings to chiefs, for Fijians such matters also could be in the lap of the gods.

With this in mind, the missionaries give regular accounts of tabua being offered by Fijians to petition divine assistance in temporal matters. John Hunt witnessed a propitiatory ritual in 1840 at the temple in Somosomo on Taveuni at which the executive chief Tui’ila‘ila presented coconuts and a
‘Supreme among our Valuables’

tabua to the priest to discover the prospects for an impending war against Vuna, a chieftdom at the southern end of the island. Prospects were declared good, and the war was indeed won, leading to submission by the Tui Vuna and the presentation of a tabua and a basket of earth to Tui‘ila‘ila as isoro ‘entreaty’, begging clemency, which was granted in terms of lives, if not of property (Williams 1931: 223-27). On 6 November 1845 Williams noted that “a quantity of food and two whales’ teeth were presented to Mai natavasara [the principal god of Somosomo] to ensure success in an anticipated descent upon a town in the Natewa district” (1931: 328).

The persuasive power of tabua was not lost on the missionaries who, perhaps out of necessity, turned a blind eye to the explicitly religious use of them by Fijians who enthusiastically embraced their use in their own, adapted, religious practices. Williams recounts (1931: 520) how, at the dedication of the new chapel at Tiliva in Bua on 24 April 1850, “My dear little Jane with her brothers Will and Ben accompanied by Mr Moore’s little boy, took each a large whale’s tooth, and presented them to Ra Esekaia as the subscriptions of Mrs Williams and themselves.” At a ceremony, which clearly took the form of a solevu, with hosts and guests, converts and heathens alike making offerings, tabua were transferred back and forth, culminating when

Ra Esekaia… took the teeth presented by my children and Mrs Williams adding six or eight smaller ones, and rose to answer Ra Jioje [who had just presented several tabua], which he did with spirit, welcoming him and all our friends; thanking God for His ministers, for the chapel and for what they saw that day.

It very much seems as if the Fijians involved were adapting indigenous practice to the performance of the new religion.

Fijian chiefs could be presented with tabua on more private occasions. On 15 November 1845 Williams was in Tui‘ila‘ila’s house in Somosomo when a young woman was brought to him by her relatives, prior to her being sent to Bau as part of Tui‘ila‘ila’s ongoing attempts to enlist Bau’s support for his war with Natewa.

She was oiled and had on a new liku [skirt], and her neck was adorned with a necklace of whales’ teeth. She had two whales’ teeth in her hands. These she gave to the King on approaching him. The King received her... and, as she sat at his feet, he ran over a list of their gods, and finished by praying that ‘the girl might live and bring forth male children.’ He then called for a musket which he presented to two male relatives of the young female requesting them not to think hardly of his having taken their child: it was connected with the good of the land in which their interest as well as his was involved.... Tuilaila next proceeded to take the necklace from her neck. (Williams 1931: 329)
Here is a reference to whale teeth that have been modified into “ornaments”, though this term inadequately encompasses the role and power of teeth that have been transformed into visually stunning body adornments. Given they usually adorned chiefs’ bodies, “regalia” might be a better term. On the occasion described above, the girl’s body was used as a vehicle for the transfer to Tui‘ila‘ila of tabua and a necklace, equivalent valuables which, along with her, were destined for Bau. It is notable that Tui‘ila‘ila made a speech similar in form to those made by Tui Nayau in 1980, referring to titles (“a list of their gods”) and finishing by calling for positive things to occur.

The following year Tui‘ila‘ila’s efforts in relation to Bau bore fruit, though he got more than he bargained for in terms of the depredations of 3,000 lingering Bauan visitors. Ultimately his strategy did not produce the longed-for crushing of Natewa, and his own resources were substantially depleted, not only by his obligations as host, but also by several years of sending inducements to Bau in the form of canoes, coir cord, barkcloth, women and “hundreds of whales’ teeth” (Williams 1931: 347). Thomas Williams, who witnessed the Bau visit, wrote an exceptional account of the state reception given by Tui‘ila‘ila for Cakobau in June 1846, which was not dissimilar in its fundamental elements from the 1977 and 1980 state receptions described earlier. Williams recorded:

On the 19th [June] Tuilaila and about 40 of his head men went on board a canoe and sailed to Vuna to perform the ceremony of taking up the anchors (cavu elieli [cavu ikelekele]) which is only a euphemism for taking property to the Bau people. He and his men... presented a large bale of cloth and 50 whales’ teeth. Thakombau spent the Sabbath at Vuna, and on the 22nd came up to Somosomo. The fleet consisted of 66 double canoes and 16 single.... They had but little time on shore before the galove [qalovi: ‘swimming out to invite guests to land’] was performed. This was done by formally presenting the Bau people with 100 large masis [barkcloths], a number of small ones and 20 whales’ teeth. (Williams 1931: 347)

Williams attended the major reception that Tui‘ila‘ila put on for Cakobau the following day. After a grand military parade by the visitors, “Tuilaila took about 100 whales’ teeth on his shoulders towards Thakombau; stooped, kneeled and made his speech”. Later Cakobau presented Tui‘ila‘ila with a single tabua, offering assurances of help against Natewa (Williams 1931: 349-50).

These accounts are sufficient to demonstrate how tabua played a major role in facilitating strategic relationships between chiefdoms in Fiji, and how chiefs deployed them not only in propitiating gods but in propitiating fellow chiefs, who were equivalent to and embodiments of the ancestral gods on
whose behalf the tabua were received. Tabua also were deployed alongside other valuables such as barkcloth and mats, canoes and coir cord, and women in establishing and maintaining affinal relationships. As Sahlins (1983, 2004: 221-44) has comprehensively argued, relations through women were vital to strategic alliances, if sometimes problematic through the enthusiastic exercise of vasu privileges. Tanoa’s favourite wife, Adi Talatoka, was from Somosomo (Cakobau’s mother was from Bau), and it was at Somosomo that Tanoa took refuge during his exile from Bau in the 1830s, as well as at Rewa, where he was vasu. Tanoa also had strong interests in Lau, regarded as a source of great valuables, especially canoes, and in February 1843 Williams recorded how Tui Nayau sent to Bau an “immense new canoe, 15 large packages of native cloth (some marked) and a great quantity of mosquito screens (about 150), 7 large balls of cynet [coir cord], 10 whales’ teeth of from 1½ lb. to 4 lb. weight and the favourite daughter of the King”. In May of the same year, Tanoa’s son, Cakobau, in quest of another massive canoe still unfinished on Kabara, paid Tui Nayau a visit, presenting quantities of barkcloth, spears, clubs, an immense root of yaqona and 20 whale’s teeth, these presentations accompanied by a dance that “had quite a warlike character”. This was a menacing gift, and the following day Tui Nayau presented Cakobau with quantities of barkcloth, yaqona, a feast and a tabua as an entreaty (isoro), with a speech which begged forgiveness for the slow progress on the canoe and promised its completion (Williams 1931: 145, 163-65). In July 1851 Cakobau was back again on Lakeba, when Richard Lyth (1850-51: 85-89) witnessed a three-speech sequence that parallels exactly the A-C structure outlined above.

Tui Nayau arose and approached Tui Viti [Cakobau] with a string of whale’s teeth (10 in number on this occasion). Holding these in his hand he made the following speech [Lyth gives it in Fijian: it is a isoro, that they might live and Cakobau be patient, etc.]. Tui Viti then stood and received the teeth at Tui Nayau’s hand [Lyth gives it in Fijian: Cakobau expressed wishes that the Lauans might live, their land be firm, and that anyone who moved against them should die, finishing with “Mana”]. His retinue add ei dina and clap their hands. Tui Viti’s mata-ni-vanua then stands forth to take the bundle of teeth and makes the following prayer to the gods [Lyth gives this longer speech in Fijian, which invoked names of gods, called for life and a fair wind for the return to Bau].

Lyth finishes his account with the observation that the barkcloth that was presented with the tabua was afterwards divided up by Cakobau’s chiefs: “[T]he chief does this not the matanivanua—his work is to distribute or apportion food.” Here is clear evidence for the ritual division of labour,
mentioned above, in which chiefs are responsible for presenting and dividing up valuables and landspeople are responsible for presenting and dividing up feasts.

As well as occasions of state involving eminent chiefs, the missionaries also mention the frequent use of *tabua* by chiefs for kinship purposes. David Cargill witnessed a *vakamasi* initiation ceremony at Nasaqalau village on Lakeba in 1835 when a young classificatory son of Tui Nayau was circumcised and clothed in special barkcloth. Preparations for the feast had been going on for two weeks and “[w]hales’ teeth were in great requisition” (Cargill 1977: 70-71). In October 1839, after Cargill had transferred to Rewa, he attended the death of one of the king’s brothers and witnessed a sequence of *ireguregu* condolence *tabua* presentations which, although the speeches are clearly abridged, is strikingly similar to those described above for Kabara in 1978.

Each tribe presents a whale’s tooth to the deceased. This tooth is suspended by a string, and whilst the chief or principal spokesman of the tribe is holding it in his hand, he pronounces the following oration: [Fijian text] ‘This is our offering to the dead; we are poor, and cannot find riches; this is the length of my speech.’ All the persons present return thanks by clapping their hands and then the king or a chief of rank replies,—‘Ai mumudui ai mate’—‘the end of death’, the people simultaneously respond, Mana,—edina:—‘let it be so;—it is true.’ (Cargill 1977: 151)

Cargill’s “this is the length of my speech” is his translation of the self-deprecatory “a balabalavu noqu vosa” (too long is my speech), an expression still heard today.

Many other examples of *tabua* use could be provided from missionary sources. However, for the present it is sufficient to note that, besides their own direct participation in the ritual economy of *tabua*, the missionaries provide ample evidence for the circulation of large numbers of whale teeth during the 1830s to 1850s, referring both to their religious character and, when transformed into regalia, their use as adornments for chiefly bodies.

*Other 19th and 20th century sources*

Voyagers, travellers, colonial administrators and researchers, Fijian and European, have also left valuable accounts of *tabua* use in the 19th and 20th centuries. These reports corroborate and extend the accounts provided by traders and missionaries.

Charles Wilkes, commander of the United States Exploring Expedition that visited Fiji in 1840, well understood the value of *tabua*, though, having seen sperm whales in the Koro Sea, he could less understand why Fijians, “who value whales’ teeth so highly, should have devised no means of taking the animal that yields them, although it frequents their seas for three or four
months in the year” (Wilkes 1845 v. 3: 194). On first meeting Tui Levuka, Wilkes wrote: “As is customary, I at once gave him a present of two whale’s teeth and two fathoms of red cotton cloth, with which he was well satisfied, clapping his hands several times, which is their mode of expressing thanks” (p. 47). Teeth were also given to Tanoa and to Tui Cakau (pp. 58, 299). Wilkes noted that whalers had been calling at Kadavu, providing additional supplies of teeth. In 1838 the notorious Rewa chief Veidovi obtained 50 whale teeth by ransom from the captain of the whale-ship \textit{Nimrod} (p. 138; Derrick 1950: 70-71). Wilkes’s observation, “A whale’s tooth is about the price of a human life” (p. 103), will inform later discussion.

Lieutenant Walter Pollard of HMS \textit{Bramble} was witness to the ongoing drama of the relationship between Cakaudrove (Somosomo) and Bau. In July 1850 he was at Bau when a visit was paid by 500-600 “Somo-Somo people”, accompanied by Maʻafu and over 100 Tongans in a large double canoe. The hosts provided vast quantities of food, to which the visitors responded with enormous quantities of valuables, especially barkcloth. As a finale, “The old chief [Tui‘ila‘ila] then walked up to the Bau people with a bundle of whales’ teeth, I should think from eighty to a hundred pounds weight, and apparently as much as he could carry with both hands, and delivered them to the orator, who received and made an oration over them, which I was told was presenting them to the gods” (Erskine 1853: 297).

\textit{Tabua} could also be used in less public, more stealthy ways, for instance to procure a murder. In the 18th century the first Tui Nayau, Niumataiwalu, was killed at Ono-i-Lau, a black stone \textit{tabua} having been supplied by Bau for the purpose (Brewster 1937: 43-49, Hennings 1918, Reid 1990: 10; \textit{tabua} made of materials other than whale ivory will be discussed below). In 1867 a \textit{tabua} went ahead of the Reverend Thomas Baker, sealing his death at Nabutautau in the interior of Vitilevu (Brewster 1922: 25-31). This kind of contract killing was also responsible for the death of the Bauan labour recruiter Koroi i Latikau in Ra in 1873, and Kaplan’s analysis of Navosavakadua’s resistance movement in Ra—his “war over religion” against Bauan and British/Christian colonial interference—shows how Navosavakadua, though of priestly rather than chiefly descent, tapped into the power of \textit{tabua}. A reliable source in 1885 reported that he amassed and presented 400 whale’s teeth at a \textit{solevu} at his village of Valelebo (Kaplan 1995: 19-22, 87).

Numerous further instances of \textit{tabua} presentation could be given (Hocart 1929: 70-75; Nayacakalou 1975: 54-55; Spencer 1941: 13, 26; von Hügel 1990: 70; Wallis 1851: \textit{passim}), but they follow patterns similar to those already described. They all deal with whale teeth that are transactable, whose power lies in their distribution not in their retention and whose effectiveness is activated by their deployment in strategic situations. These \textit{tabua} do not
nowadays carry with them a specific identity, name or transaction history, nor is such information provided in presentation speeches. For example, when I was present at Lakeba in May 1978 during preparations for the state reception of the Governor-General of Fiji, Ratu George Cakobau, Vunivalu of Bau, Tui Nayau called forth a large Tongan-style basket which contained several large honey-coloured tabua. As he drew them from the basket, he and his principal heralds, Mata ki Cicia, Mata ki Bau and Tui Tubou, discussed their relative merits in terms of size and colour. At no stage was reference made to their particular histories—only their visual qualities and their suitability for the four major presentations in prospect. Thomas (1991: 67) insisted that “past transactions are not remembered and in no way [bore] upon the ‘weight’ of a tabua. These articles have no histories.”

However, this is unlikely to have always been the case and the analysis of tabua cannot be restricted to the transactable examples alone, however numerous and frequent their use. Indeed, there is a highly important category of tabua that does not, or should not, move. These are named and their histories are vital to their value and to the people who possess them. Quain (1948) called them “heirloom” tabua (I am unaware of a specific Fijian term for them), and they may be characterised as inalienable (Weiner 1992). In any case, they provide a major clue to the source of the value and power of those that are transacted.

Heirloom whale’s teeth
Because heirloom tabua are seldom seen and kept closely guarded they have largely escaped notice, but some 19th century sources and the 1930s research of Buell Quain, in particular, provide substantial evidence for their existence and importance. It is likely that in pre-Christian times they were widespread, but with the arrival of Christianity many may have “leaked out” into the flow of transactable tabua or into ethnographic collections and become dissociated from their specific histories. One occasion when this may have happened was recorded by Baron Anatole von Hügel on 4 December 1875, when he was staying in Nadroga and well stocked with “trade”.

A good red tabua came in from Nadi today. It was some time before the owner, an old man, let out what he had come about. After a long rambling conversation he produced from the folds of his isulu [skirt-like cloth wrap] the tabua, most carefully wrapped in masi [barkcloth]. He did not at all approve of my hanging it up on the wall with my other treasures and evidently wishes to keep dark his having parted with it. No doubt it has a history… what that history may be I have not much chance of finding out. (von Hügel 1990: 224)
An early reference to non-circulating heirloom teeth is found in the papers of Reverend James Royce. From Kadavu Island on 6 December 1859, he wrote:

This morning the Kadavu god was brought to me. It had been kept secret till the present time; the god is no more or less than a fine whale’s tooth, and by appearance and report a venerable fellow. Its name is Takei, from takelo, crooked, being curved like the new moon; it is said to have been the god of food, and always to dwell in the land of plenty. (Royce 1855-62: 277)

The following year, in August 1860, Berthold Seemann was shown what he referred to as the “crown jewels” at Namosi, Vitilevu.

They were kept in a wooden box, and carefully wrapt up in soft pieces of native cloth and cocoa-nut fibre. There were among them a large whale’s tooth, highly polished, and quite brown from repeated greasing, a necklace made of pieces of whales’ teeth, the first that ever came to these mountains, and a fine cannibal fork in the shape of a club. (Seemann 1862: 187).

Other tabua have been noted on Vitilevu, including a large composite example from Naitasiri (see Fig. 3 in Clunie’s essay), and two bearing the titles Adi Waimaro and Tui Waimaro, which take the form of figures; the Adi Waimaro figure was constructed from several sections of whale ivory (Larsson 1960: 29-32, Parke 1997). With respect to these two figures, Larsson (1960: 116) noted that they held “in themselves the welfare of the group of people whose vu [ancestors] they were and this concerned the high-born line of this kin group”. These, and the double-figure hook image from Nadi, named Nalilavatu, “the double wife of… the Chief God of Nadi” (Larsson 1960: 27), are carved in Tongan style, suggesting an ultimate origin in Tonga (Fig. 10). An elephant tusk tabua with the title Tui Nasavusavu has already been mentioned (note 11 below).

The evidence for heirloom teeth, and a Tongan connection, is even stronger in Vanualevu. Buell Quain provided the most comprehensive account of heirloom tabua, based on his 1935-36 research in Lekutu, inland Vanualevu. The chiefly title-holder was custodian of the ancestral tooth Tu Lekutu (“King Forest” in Quain’s translation), that “contained within itself the right of kingly authority”, and furthermore, to “maintain proper rapport with the ancestors who controlled the region’s fertility, the kingly office had to be held by a hereditary member of the chiefly caste” (Quain 1948: 190). Chiefly leaders of other villages also held hereditary titled teeth, and Quain distinguished hereditary teeth, such as “King Forest”, which “embodied the power” of Lekutu’s greatest ancestors (1948: 223), from anonymous tabua of the transactable kind, the exchange of which he described frequently in
his excellent study. Transactable teeth were expected to flow inwards and outwards as indices of prosperity, both for the transactors and the chiefdom generally, whereas heirloom teeth, closely connected to the fertility of the land and embodying divine ancestors, could only be transferred to new custodianship within the chiefly clan.

Figure 10. Double-figure hook, carved from a sperm whale tooth, known as Nalilavatu; height 12.2 cm. Found in Nadi, western Vitilevu and acquired by Sir Arthur Gordon in 1876 (see Larsson 1960: 27-28, Herle and Carreau 2013: 55-56); MAA 1955.247. (Photo: © Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Cambridge.)
Heirloom teeth have titles and are in effect embodiments of ancestral gods, passed down to successive holders of chiefly titles who themselves embody divine ancestors. Also on Vanualevu, Hocart (1952b: 238) noted a title in Wainunu, Buli Muanaicake, associated with a tooth called “The Land” (Na Vanua), presented to the title-holder on installation. In this way whale teeth and the bodies of chiefs were rendered equivalent. It is probable that the transactable teeth which became so plentiful in the 19th century were treated as distributable versions of heirloom teeth, participating in a ritual economy of sacrifice where substitutes for the core body were deployed in chief-to-chief, and thus god-to-god, exchanges.

Quain and Hocart noted the influence of Tonga in many parts of Vanualevu and eastern Fiji, and parallels for teeth-as-gods can be found in Tonga, as Clunie asserts (herein). One reference will suffice to make the point. Visiting Tonga in 1850, Reverend Walter Lawry triumphantly recorded:

> [O]n the day that Tungi lotued [converted to Christianity], all the gods that could be found were secured…. Of these gods the first in rank and power is Feaki [Fekai], the fountain-head of all the minor gods. This is a large whale’s tooth, which has not fallen under the gaze of mortal men from time immemorial. (Lawry 1851: 35)

On the role of Tonga and teeth supply, the beachcomber William Diaper (alias John Jackson or “Cannibal Jack”), author of a narrative of his long sojourn in Fiji, gave a plausible observation on the origin of “red” teeth or “tambua-damu”. He wrote:

> [They] are used as money, though not exactly as our money, there being no certain value put on them; but in that country [Fiji] they are invaluable, as life and death depend on the circulation of these teeth, and especially the red ones. I used to consider the difference between the white and the red teeth the same as between our shillings and sovereigns, estimating the number of white whales’ teeth throughout the Feejees to be twenty times as many as the red ones. The red teeth, which have become red by frequent handling and oiling for a number of years, they always told me were brought to the Feejees by the Tongans, by whom they were first introduced, and from whom also they learned the art of building the large double canoes. (Jackson 1853: 439)

This insight may indicate a distinction between an older supply of teeth from Tonga, worked to be symmetrical in shape (called tabuabuli by Tatawaqa [1914: 2] and Clunie [herein]), subject to intense smoking and oiling, versus the bulk supplies of raw teeth that began to be obtained from traders at the beginning of the 19th century. It is likely that in the 18th century or earlier, impressive large “red teeth”, sourced from Tonga, became, like the outsider
chiefs who held them, the embodiment of ancestor gods in most of the polities of the Koro Sea and eastern Fiji (see Sahlins 1981 and further discussion below). These were kept in *kato ni tu* ‘foundation baskets’, likely to be Tongan *kato mosikaka* or *kato ‘alu*, similar to the one I saw at Lakeba in 1978. Though Tongan involvement with whale teeth waned after the mid-19th century, King George of Tonga still saw fit to present Cakobau with a large tooth in a *kato mosikaka*, both of which were later presented by Sir Everard im Thurn, a Governor of Fiji, to the British Museum (Fig. 11).

Figure 11. Presentation whale tooth (*tabua/tapua*) and bag (*kato mosikaka*), presented by the King of Tonga, George Tupou, to Ratu Seru Cakobau, Vunivalu of Bau, probably 1850s-1870s; length 21.0 cm (tooth). Acquired by Sir Everard im Thurn, Governor of Fiji 1904-10; British Museum, Oc1920.0322.33 and Oc1920.0322.34. (Photo: © The Trustees of the British Museum.)

**Myth, etymology and previous incarnations**

The occurrence of whale teeth in myth is surprisingly limited. Myth is a problematic area because in most cases myths were not recorded until after Christian evangelism had introduced biblical and other elements, including knowledge of global geography, with which indigenous accounts became mixed. Two myths featuring *tabua* have survived. The first, written in English and recorded in the 1870s, has been analysed by Sahlins (1983: 72-78) and Thomas (1991: 69-75). In brief, a stranger called Tabua appears from overseas on the Nadroga coast and succeeds in obtaining the daughters of
the land through a miraculous ruse involving the substitution of whale teeth (the value of which he knew, but which were unknown locally) for four of his own teeth, which he said he had planted and had grown. The teeth, called *tabua*, are given as brideprice. The myth is entitled “How Fijians First Became Cannibals”, since the story closes with a statement about shipwrecked voyagers being eaten, but it encapsulates many other foundational issues to do with stranger/local, sea/land, male/female and valuables/food, with an underlying emphasis on the importance of the exchange of categorically different things. It is notable that exchange, through a ruse, also is a theme of the second myth involving whale teeth, recorded by Brewster in highland Vitilevu (Roth 1953: 96-97). In this story, the ancestor of the Nadrau people, Tui Taladrau, meets a man carrying a basket of *tabua* and, by a trick, switches it with his own basket of food and makes off with it. The use of a trick as an exchange mechanism is a widespread theme in Fijian myth, and here the valuables-for-food exchange is clearly central.

Roth (1953: 97-99) undertook a review of the etymology of *tabua*, citing Hazlewood’s suggested link to the collar bone (1850: 131-32) and favouring, as did Hocart (1929: 99), an association with *tabu* ‘sacred, marked, restricted’. Roth notes Brewster’s information about examples previously made of *bua* wood (*Fagraea berteriana*), leading to contentious rationalisations such as *bua-ta* (*bua*-‘cut’, hence *tabua*). However, the Vitilevu use of *bua* wood for *tabua* is supported by Emosi Tatawaqa (1914: 1), and there is a polished dark brown (and therefore “red”) wooden *tabua* in the Fiji Museum that does not look of recent manufacture (see Clunie Fig. 6 herein).

With respect to alternative materials used for *tabua* in the past, I have already mentioned the stone *tabua* used to obtain the murder of Niumataiwalu. In addition, early sources record that a *tabua* named *vatu ni balawa*, ‘stone of the pandanus’, was buried with chiefs, to be thrown at a pandanus tree *en route* to the other world (Hazlewood 1850: 170). The term *vatu*, for an ivory *tabua*, is still heard occasionally in presentation speeches.

Certain shells are also recorded as having been used as *tabua* in the past. Emosi Tatawaqa (1914: 2) stated:

Those near to the sea or living on the coast used as ‘tabua’ a certain sea-shell called the ‘cava;’ this is a sea-shell which is the same as the ‘Aivaoqo’ or the shell called the ‘Mua-ni-waqa.’ When one of these shells was found, it was well sunned, that the outer skin might fall off; when the skin had fallen away, the surface of it was a bright red, like, perhaps, the appearance of a red tooth of a whale.

Deve Toganivalu (1918: 8) added:
It is said that there was a sea-shell which was their property in ancient times before whales’ teeth reached here; and it was used as the tabua for women, for war, for feasts, etc. The name of that shell in some places is the Sauwaqa; the name at Bau is Cava.

In a letter to the colonial administrator Kenneth Allardyce, Toganivalu (1913) also observed:

Their former tabua was a species of shell, named sauwaqa, a long shell and pointed at the end, some are very long, about a span in length [c. 20-25 cm] and the body is coloured red and yellow. This was their prized valuable in the old days, as a ‘proposal’ for a girl, a ‘condolence’ for the dead and as a means of turning enemy villages [into allies]. However, when whale’s teeth were brought to Fiji they discarded the shell and used whale’s teeth in its place. Some of the old house foundations at Bau were levelled in Ratu Cakobau’s time, about 1874, and some sauwaqa were found there and the elders said, ‘These are the prized valuables of former times by which villages were turned and people were killed.’

There appears to be some confusion in the literature about the species identity of sauwaqa and cava shells, if indeed those terms applied to a single species. Nevertheless, it is clear that certain shells were highly valued, especially ones classified as red, including the sovui (Spondylus) and the bulikula (golden cowry, Cypraea aurantium; see Clunie 1986: 158-59). Clunie explains below that other shells such as bulileka and civa (pearl shell) were also highly valued, and Hazlewood (1850: 133) records a saying “A tabua e taka emuri, a bulileka na kamunaga levu” (the whale tooth arose later, the bulileka was the great valuable [before]). So, for eastern Fiji a picture emerges of materials associated with the sea being formerly deployed as powerful valuables, alongside items made from land products, including woods such as vesi (Intsia bijuga) and probably bua (Fagraea berteriana).

Later developments
By the early 19th century, skilled canoe-builders of Samoan and Tongan ancestry were already settled in eastern Fiji, working in the service of chiefs of the Koro Sea chiefdoms, especially Tui Nayau in Lau, who, as detailed above, was obliged through a combination of inducements and threats to supply Bau and Cakaudrove with large double canoes. These craftsmen had metal tools of European origin, including axes, saws, chisels and fine drills, which allowed them to create composite forms of ivory regalia based on simpler pre-metal types. Space does not permit discussion of this dynamic development, but in effect chiefs sponsored the production of what might be regarded as super-tabua in the form of breastplates and necklaces, both for public display on
Figure 12. Ratu Tanoa Visawaqa, Vunivalu of Bau, wearing a composite breastplate (*civa vonovono*) made of whale ivory and pearl shell. Engraving by Rawdon, Wright and Hatch after a drawing by Alfred Agate of the United States Exploring Expedition, 1840. (Wilkes 1845 v. 3: fp 56.)
their bodies and as barely resistible offerings to allies. Tanoa, determined to
make a big impression when first visiting the American commander Wilkes
at Levuka in 1840, arrived in a 100-foot canoe of “magnificent appearance…
ornamented with a great number (two thousand five hundred) of the Cypraea
ovula shells; its velocity was almost inconceivable” (Wilkes 1845 v. 3: 54).
The following day he went aboard the Vincennes, wearing a large turban of
white gauzy barkcloth and “on his breast, hanging from his neck, he wore
an ornament made of mother-of-pearl, tortoise-shell, and ivory, not [sic –
transcription error?] very neatly put together, and as large as a dinner-plate,
(called diva ndina); on his arms he had shell armlets, (called ygato,) made
of the trochus-shell by grinding them down to the form of rings” (Wilkes
1845 v. 3: 56, punctuation as in source). It is hard to imagine a more vivid
expression of sea-related power than that conveyed through the embellishment
of Tanoa’s canoe and his own body. The artist Agate made a sketch of Tanoa
(Fig. 12) which enabled Clunie (1983) to identify the breastplate as that later
acquired by the first governor, Sir Arthur Gordon (Fig. 13). It was almost

Figure 13. Composite breastplate (civa vonovono) of whale ivory and pearl shell
(the triangular segment that resembles turtle shell is actually dark pearl shell); width 28.0 cm. Acquired by Sir Arthur Gordon in 1875-80,
probably from Ratu Seru Cakobau, Vunivalu of Bau the son of Ratu
Tanoa Visawaqa (Clunie 1983); MAA Z2730. (Photo: © Museum of
Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Cambridge.)
certainly received from Tanoa’s son, Cakobau, possibly as an offering through Gordon to Queen Victoria, who, from a Fijian point of view, was then the most powerful chief on earth. Wilkes would almost certainly have liked to acquire it in 1840, as he collected much else, but items made of ivory seem not to have been acquirable at that time.

At Somosomo in December 1842 Thomas Williams had seen Tui Cakau wearing a “large whale’s-tooth-mounted breastplate hung round his neck”, while three years later, when Tui Cakau’s body was being prepared for burial, his head was “turbaned in a scarlet handkerchief secured by a chaplet of small white *cypræa [bulileka]*, a shell highly valued in Feejee. Of the same kind of shell were his armlets, and his neck was adorned with a whale’s tooth necklace, radiated and slightly curved so as to give its points an inclination upwards (Williams 1931: 134, 313). This type of “split-tooth” whale ivory necklace with curving points is possibly what was called *wasekaseka* by Toganivalu (1918: 8)—“whales’ teeth which the Tongan carpenters sawed into small pieces, and then strung them together for necklets” (Fig. 14).

Figure 14. Necklace (*wasekaseka*) of polished split whale tooth sections on a plaited coir neck cord; width 32.0 cm. Acquired by Alfred Maudslay 1875-80; MAA 1931.203. (© Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Cambridge.)
association of ivory necklaces with chiefly bodies, in life and in death, is
confirmed by Williams (1931: 200), who saw one on a corpse at a chiefly
burial at Somosomo in October 1843, and by a reference to displays in the
Fiji Museum where two ivory necklaces are listed:

These were fashioned from whales’ teeth, and were buried with Ratu Tanoa
(father of Ratu Cakobau) at Bau. During the digging of a new grave in 1930,
the necklaces were discovered and handed over to the Museum by the late
Ratu Pope Seniloli, Ratu Cakobau’s grandson. (Anon 1946: 15)

Items of regalia constructed of whale ivory, sometimes in combination with
shell, were finding their way all over Fiji by the mid-19th century, as chiefs
of the Koro Sea attempted to extend their networks by making alliances and
waging war. The Fiji Museum has a breastplate that was presented by Cakobau
to the Rokotui Waimaro as a ka ni bula, a gift made for sparing Cakobau’s
life following a defeat in one of the Nasorovakawalu wars, probably in the
early 1850s (Clunie 1986: 164-65).

In the 1860s and 1870s a subtle yet profound shift appears to have taken
place in the deployment of tabua and regalia made from whale ivory. Before
this time, the supply of teeth had been almost exclusively one way, from
Tongans and Europeans into Fiji, supplemented by occasional local sources
from stranded whales. Few items made of whale ivory were acquired by
European collectors before the 1860s, indicating reluctance on the part of
Fijians to part with them. The virtual absence of whale ivory in the collections
in Salem (from early traders before 1850), Paris (from Dumont d’Urville
1820s-30s) and the Smithsonian Institution (from Wilkes 1840) bears this out.
However, a concatenation of circumstances appears to have influenced a shift
in practices and attitudes on both sides in the second half of the 19th century.
With increased European settlement in the 1860s and, especially, the arrival
of colonial administrators in the 1870s, Fijians began to deploy tabua and
whale ivory regalia in relation to these new government chiefs, who seemed
amenable to their charms. This deployment was by formal presentation or via
the operations of a nascent curio market based in Levuka, partly prompted
by an introduced tax regime. The Europeans, led by Governor Gordon and
stimulated by the presence of the avid young collector Baron Anatole von
Hügel, became obsessive and competitive purchasers of Fijian ethnological
material of all kinds, including that made of whale ivory. Government
House at Nasova, Levuka, resembled a museum, and much of that material
is now in Cambridge thanks to von Hügel becoming the founding curator of
the Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology there in 1884, and persuading
his Government House associates and their descendants to donate material
(Herle and Carreau 2013: 98-105). Gordon relished his participation in “tabua
culture”, receiving propitiatory offerings, including a ‘swimming’ tabua (iqalovi) at Bau in December 1879 (Gordon 1912: 138), and distributing new insignia in the form of “staves of office—very long poles of vesi headed and ornamented with whale’s-tooth ivory” to newly appointed Roko, who were key (and chiefly) Fijian administrators in his system of indirect rule (Gordon 1897: 209). These staves appeared to echo the appearance of high-status staffs and clubs, liberally inlaid with segments of whale ivory, which Fijian chiefs distributed as diplomatic gifts—including to the Governor (see Hooper 2006: 269 for a splendid ivory-inlaid club given by Cakobau to Gordon).

For the first time tabua and many other objects made of whale ivory began to flow out of Fiji. This situation was compounded by the widespread conversion of Fijians to Christianity, which rendered problematic the possession of objects that had heathen associations, and by the cessation of warfare, which reduced the need for diplomatic gifts to secure alliances. Europeans, previously the source of supply, now became recipients of teeth in the course of their administrative duties and in their quest to collect “traditional” artefacts. Museum store-rooms around the world now hold evidence of Europeans acting, from the 1870s, not as suppliers of tabua, but as recipients.

This outflow of tabua, probably combined with increasing use of them by non-chiefly Fijians throughout the country, led to an actual or perceived drain on supplies during the first half of the 20th century, accentuated by gifts to American servicemen stationed in Fiji towards the end of the Second World War. The colonial officer and ethnographer Kingsley Roth considered they were becoming scarce in the 1930s (1953: 106) and to help remedy this perceived shortage, the British administration imported about 400 sperm whale teeth in the mid-1950s from Scotland—a legacy of the whaling industry. Adi Lady Maraia Sukuna described the process of scraping, smoking and oiling she and other ladies used to transform these raw teeth into tabua. They were then put into circulation throughout Fiji via the Provincial offices (Roth n.d.).

**TABUA IN CULTURE**

What might be gleaned from this accumulation of information, ancient and recent, heaped up like so many tabua before the reader? So far, I have resisted analysis in order to allow the material to be assembled, but I am now ready to try to answer the question, “Why whale teeth?” What is it that motivates a villager to reach for tabua when a relative dies or his son runs off with someone else’s daughter? What is it that drove chiefs to stagger under their weight in major public rituals, and why were certain teeth preserved as foundational to the welfare of the polity? It will now be apparent that part of the answer is that they were originally considered to embody ancestral divine power and were used as an effective mechanism for managing and channelling divine
power for human purposes. With the arrival of Christianity and acceptance of Jehovah as the superordinate god, the ancestral power embodied in *tabua*, and for which they were a *waqa* ‘vehicle’, has become muted—implicit rather than explicit—though still culturally significant. But how does this power work and what are its origins and associations? Here I address these issues by invoking the importance of equivalence and substitution, and by emphasising the role of sacrificial exchange—offerings for blessings—that underlies cultural/religious practice not only in Fiji but globally.

*Whale teeth, chiefs and gods*

Certain themes have emerged, among the strongest being the explicit association, in testimony and in practice, between *tabua* and chiefs. As Tevita Soro explained, “The *tabua* is a chiefly thing. It is exclusively their valuable, the chiefs” (*A tabua a ka vakaturaga. Odratou iyau ga a turaga*). And by “chiefs” he meant the chiefly clans that hold senior titles in many parts of Fiji. But who are the chiefs? What are their characteristics? I have discussed this matter in detail in an earlier essay (Hooper 1996). Here, as a supplement to the “stranger-king” analysis of Marshall Sahlins (1981), I provide an account given me by Ilaitia Ledua of Udu village on Kabara in 1978, when he explained that the current form of Lauan society was based on the incorporation of immigrant ‘chiefs’ (*turaga*) by autochthonous ‘landspeople’ (*vanua*).

When there is a land and they have their chief, or customary leader, if a greater chief comes along, he will lead them. The thing that will be done—the chief will marry a woman of the land. In their marriage, when they have offspring, he will be chief in the land. Formerly the ladies, the first-born ladies, were the ones who married the chief…. If a lady is married to a chief who has arrived, gardening land will be given to the chief…. It is possible for the chief [leader] of the land to give all the gardening land to the chief who has come by sea…. Everything is his. The first fruits can be done—then will come the first fruits of the earth to the chief and the lady, because their child, when their child is born, will be the great chief in this land. Because: the mother—the land; the father—the chief…. So the things which come from the sea the chief will bring, the valuables of the chief.

Tevita Soro was even clearer about this chiefs/landspeople distinction in ritual procedure, signalled and embodied in specific things of sea and land origin. He said:

At the distribution of valuables, it is not possible for us the landspeople to go and distribute them. The chiefs, they will distribute the valuables. The feast is ours, a thing of the landspeople. Formerly… if a feast was taken and placed before the chiefs, we would just take along a coconut leaf, or the leaf of some
tree we would take along in our arms. Yes, that was our customary thing. We
would not be able to take a tabua. If there was no yaqona we would just bear
in our arms a leaf…. Only the chiefs, they would hold out a tabua for us.
This is the proper ancient procedure…. Yes, the tabua we didn’t present, the
landspeople. It is their valuable the chiefs.

Space will not allow a full analysis of what Sahlins (1978:1) has called a
“system of objects” as “the concrete dimension of a system of offerings: to
the gods or, what is the same, to priests whom the gods temporarily inhabit,
and above all to chiefs, who are by descent successors and instantiations
of gods”. However, it can be emphasised that, certainly in the Koro Sea
chiefdoms, tabua, and probably sauwaga, bulileka and other shells, suitably
red or reddened, played a key role in this system as the prime embodiment
of chiefs/gods in portable form.

Tabua and chiefs may be regarded as equivalent, the former metonymically
standing for the latter, and possibly vice-versa, since both are culturally
constructed artefacts of external origin that embody or enshrine ancestral
gods and can be deployed to ensure prosperity. It is clear that whale teeth are
quintessentially “sea” things of foreign origin, from Tonga or, latterly, from
Europeans. Coastal people knew they came from a colossal leviathan of the
seas that, like turtle and human, breathes air. Teeth are not made, they arrive,
like the chiefs in the foundation myth of society. And not only is the honorific
term for the chief’s body kuli ni tabua ‘skin of the whale tooth’, both body
and tooth are culturally treated in equivalent ways. Considering first the
heirloom teeth, they are smoked, oiled and kept wrapped in barkcloth, usually
within special containers. This is much as the chief’s body is treated, when
at installation and on other ritual occasions the chief wears a turban, body
wrappings and ties of red smoked barkcloth (masi kuvui), and is liberally oiled
with scented coconut oil. The chief’s dwelling is a special house which, as with
chieflly canoes and with temples, is elaborately decorated with cowry shells—
valued items from the sea. Transactable teeth, also smoked, oiled and tied with
a “red” coir cord, derive their potency from being equivalent to heirloom teeth
and chiefs’ bodies, but in a form that can serve as sacrificial offerings. They are
portable, are handled by chiefs and can be laden in quantity on chiefs’ bodies
and adapted as body ornaments. The evidence for the tabua/chief association
is compelling, as is the evidence for the chief/sea association. It may be seen
in the distribution of ritual tasks and on chiefly mausolea, crowded with
conch-shell trumpets that were blown during the initial mourning period—
human wailing being tabu. This sea origin of tabua, besides their desirable
visual characteristics, provides the logic of their appropriateness to fulfil their
important cosmological work as chief/god equivalents in sacrificial rituals.
With respect to the relationship between chiefs (turaga) and gods (kalou), Hocart and others, including the missionaries, referred to their equivalence. Thomas Williams wrote (1858: 233), “there is very little difference between a Chief of high rank and one of the second order of deities. The former regards himself very much as a god, and is often spoken of as such by his people, and, on some occasions, claims for himself publicly the right of divinity”. Hocart considered that a chief, consecrated through installation, was equivalent to a god, observing (1952b: 26): “If reverence and devotion are required, as a well as a belief in the supernatural, to make up religion, then the true religion of the Fijians is the service of the chief.” The comprehensive review and analysis of the chief/god relationship by Sahlins (1978:13-22, 1983:77-79), taken in combination with the other sources, leaves little room for doubt about the equivalence of turaga and kalou. But if a chief is an embodiment of a god, what is a god? What are the attributes which determine this designation?

Gods are personages, usually ancestral, who through the operation of mana or sau—power of divine, not human, origin—are attributed with the ability to bring about effects in the world. These effects can be wonderful or terrible, and the work of religion as a cultural practice is to manage divine power for human benefit. Humans have created artefacts and procedures through which to channel and manipulate this ineffable power and, in the Fiji case, among the principal artefacts created for ritual deployment are chiefs and tabua. Specific techniques are used to transform appropriate raw “bodies” into cultural artefacts, embodying divinity in material form, through which exchange relationships can be established with gods to tap into divine power. Worship, materialised through offerings of time, skill and things, such as valuables and feasts (which are sacrificial substitutes for the sacrifier), is in essence an exchange relationship between humans and gods in which offerings are made in return for blessings. The closing communal chanting of “mana, e dina” at presentations, uttered by participants who embody their titled divine ancestors, ensures the efficacy of the procedure. Numerous examples have been cited of tabua being offered as a means of eliciting chiefly blessings for life and prosperity. Religion, in Hocart’s terms “the quest for life”, is at a fundamental level, beneath the extraordinary cultural elaborations that are manifested globally, a profoundly practical matter. For Fijians, as others, crops need to grow, sickness needs to be overcome and the land needs to be prosperous—the Fijian word for which is sautu, lit. ‘power/chief standing-established’. If the chief is active, dispensing mana blessings, abundance will follow.

A crucial mechanism for achieving sautu is sacrifice, and Fijian sacrificial substitution takes three forms. Men produce and present feast foods, notably root crops, women produce and present soft valuables (barkcloth, mats and scented coconut oil), and chiefs and their associated specialists of foreign
origin produce and present great valuables, notably *tabua*, canoes and *yaqona* bowls. In the past, as Sahlins (1983) has shown, substitutes were not always used, and “cooked men” and “raw women” took their place in sacrificial rituals, but the life-giving potency of the chief/god seems usually to have been embodied in a substitute artefact such as a *tabua*—sometimes in many of them. Thomas (1991: 71) considered that *tabua* “can be substituted for women because of the divine power they embody”, which is a legitimate reading of their role in affinal exchanges, but the *tabua/woman* association seems not to be primary. They are comparable but different embodiments of power, and the primary substitute artefacts of women’s reproductive power are the core valuables barkcloth and mats, made by them, regarded as equivalent to their bodies and used to capture and control external chiefly potency (see Sahlins 1981: 116-19).

How does equivalence and substitution work in ritual practice? For Hawai‘i, Valerio Valeri (1985: 301) proposed that certain things—trees, birds, feathers, *‘ie ‘ie* vines—could be “particularisations” of divinity, material manifestations of divine potency that were amenable to human action, notably in the manufacture of great valuables such as cloaks which performed key roles in sacrificial rites. The mechanism by which such equivalence can work has been theorised by Alfred Gell (1998) in his discussion of the agency of art (for which read valuables), where he proposes that art objects are substitutes for persons, and they derive their power and value, and their agency, from this consubstantial association with significant persons, whether gods, kings or artists. Maurice Godelier dedicates a whole chapter of *The Enigma of the Gift* (1999) to the topic of “Substitute Objects for Humans and Gods”, in which he argues for the crucial role of substitution in explaining the logic of valuables, both those that move and those that do not. After listing several examples of circulating valuables, he writes, “these articles are all to a varying degree substitutes for human beings”, but he goes on to consider “sacred things, which, far from being simple substitutions for persons, are themselves seen as persons, but superhuman ones” (Godelier 1999: 100). Aside from the issue of what a “simple” substitution is, and what a “superhuman” person is, his analysis probes perceptively at the nature of the gift/sacrifice and its relationship to sacred objects, persons and gods.

For Fiji, there is a comparable network of associative equivalences and substitutions involving gods, chiefs, heirloom valuables and transactable valuables, notably *tabua*, which bear on these theoretical propositions. But such ontological issues are not how Fijians usually express their thinking about *tabua* nowadays. For Fijians, *tabua* are linked, through long customary use, to appropriate and effective ways of doing things *vakavanua* ‘in the manner of the land’, in a way that shows respect to one’s kin and one’s seniors.
The fact that tabua could be characterised as portable “god particles”, deriving their intrinsic potency from being materialisations of divinity, is not relevant when someone has died or a misdemeanour needs to be resolved. What is relevant in these circumstances today is that there is a culturally approved and familiar way to deal with such events that is effective and enhances or repairs the reputation of the actors involved. Tabua, as embodiments of respect, perform this role.

This state of affairs is likely to remain the case for a very long time. Berthold Seemann, at Namosi in 1860, wrote that the chief, Kuruduadua, “on seeing us handling some money, expressed his astonishment that we should prefer coins to whale’s teeth. We told him not many years would elapse before he would change that opinion, but he thought that time would probably never come” (Seemann 1862: 188). They were probably both right, because however much Fiji is locked into the global cash economy, it seems unlikely that tabua will ever be discarded. Mana, e dina.
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NOTES

1. The research upon which this paper is based has been conducted since 1977. I have spent over three years in Fiji, mostly in Lau, eastern Fiji, and particularly on Kabara Island. Because of this emphasis on research in eastern and coastal Fiji, I am aware of the hazards of making general statements about the whole country when writing about matters “Fijian”. Fiji was, and is, linguistically and culturally diverse, notably between east and west, and between coastal and interior regions of the two main islands (which is not best expressed as a Melanesian-Polynesian distinction). This paper refers mainly to what Arthur Hocart (1952b: 8) called the “Koro Sea” chiefdoms of eastern Fiji, notably Bau, Rewa, Lau and Cakaudrove, so generalisations made here about “Fiji” need to take this into account, because some general statements may not apply to western and other parts of the country.
2. The presentation called *ireguregu* can be translated literally as ‘sniffing’. Touching with the nose and sniffing, whether a chief’s hand, or when receiving a *tabua*, or on the cheek when greeting, is a highly respectful gesture still practised today in Fiji and elsewhere in Polynesia.

3. *Mana* has been discussed widely in Oceanic literature, for example by Firth (1967) and Shore (1989). In Fiji it implies an efficacious power of divine origin that can bring about effects in the world (Hooper 1996: 254-60). *Dina* means true or genuine, and *e dina* means ‘it is true’ or ‘it is confirmed’, hence the translation here as ‘Effective, be it true’, to convey the invocation that the blessings uttered should come to pass. *Amuduo* and *duo* are respectful acclamations, the latter used in Bau as the *tama*, the respectful call when approaching a chief.

4. For discussion of these statuses and categorical distinctions, see Hooper (1996: 243-46). In Fiji there is also an important distinction between guests and hosts (*vulagi* and *itaukei*). This influences behaviour and responsibilities at events and is also applied to distinguish chiefs from landspeople, the former regarded as of foreign origin (with sea and sky associations) and the latter autochthonous (with land associations).

5. For example, the condolence *tabua* speech for Paea from the Tokalau delegation was made by Isireli Rarawa, who belonged to the *bete* ‘priest’ clan at Tokalau, and not to one of the two chiefly clans there. Because of the urgency of the occasion, and a member of a chiefly clan not being available or well enough to make the nocturnal journey, Isireli undertook the task because he was a gifted speaker who normally acted as a herald.

6. *Vakatatabu* means ‘speech’ in chiefly honorific language. See Hooper (1982:112-22) for a full account of this state reception for Tui Nayau, which included an additional *tabua* presentation called *rova* ‘race’. *Rova* in Lau is a race by young men of the visiting party, who pursue local women waving barkcloth, one of whom hides a *tabua*. Whoever finds the *tabua* is feted as victor and keeps the *tabua* and barkcloth. On this occasion the race was not run because the visitors arrived after dark, so a *tabua* was presented at the state reception. The race was run at Rewa when the Lauan children were taken there later that month (see below), a young Lauan man from Moce Island getting the *tabua* from the Rewa ladies in mock flight across the ceremonial ground.

7. There is no clearly expressed indigenous division between *tabua* presentations that are occasioned by status relations or by kin relations, but there is what might be regarded as a continuum, with “state” presentations at one end, such as those performed for the paramount chief at Kabara (where the status relationship between the parties was made explicit), and “kinship” presentations at the other, such as those at weddings, deaths and other rites of passage (where affinal/kin relations are made explicit).

8. Installation into Fijian chiefly titles involves a selection process from eligible candidates (belonging to chiefly clans) by leaders of non-chiefly clans, who also are responsible for organising the installation ritual. This varies from place to place, but core procedures are offering a cup of *yaqona*, tying on barkcloth and giving a forthright speech on the duties of chiefship. *Tabua* may be presented
in some instances, as noted shortly in the installation of Tui Levuka. There is a general sense that a chiefdom is healthier and has more solidarity if it has an installed chief, although uninstalled strong leaders, such as Kevueli Bulu on Kabara, may temporarily remedy the situation, being a focus for, and generator of, the productive capacities of the chiefdom. At the moment in Fiji two of the major chiefdoms, Bau and Lau, have been without an installed paramount chief for a number of years.

9. Tevita Loga held the non-chiefly title Vaka, but he was a well-known broadcaster on Radio Fiji and a skilled orator (see Note 5). Because the paramount chief of Rewa, the Roko Tui Dreketi, was the mother of the children, the role of senior male on the mother’s side was taken by the second major title-holder of Rewa, the Vunivalu.

10. Clunie (1986: 178) described the process with these ingredients, as did Adi Lady Maraia Sukuna, who supervised the smoking of tabua in the 1950s (Hooper 1982: 90). Hocart (1929: 99) mentions the use of turmeric. Some teeth in use today have an orange-coloured glaze which may be commercial varnish or kauri pine resin (makadre) of the kind applied to clay pots. Whatever the ingredients used, the intention was always to render the tooth damudamu ‘red’, a term which applies to the colour spectrum from pink to dark brown.

11. Roth (1953: 100) mentions a deep-coloured elephant tusk tabua with the title Tui Nasavusavu he saw and photographed in Namosi, probably in the 1930s (Herle and Carreau 2013: fig 4.3). Tabua made of elephant and walrus ivory are occasionally found in collections (Roth 1938: pl. XV) and, if cut, can be identified because of the distinctive internal patterns.

12. The procedure described by Twyning is validated by an account provided around 1910 to Hocart (1929: 69-70) of the installation of Cakobau as Tui Levuka (probably about 1860). Four-hundred tabua were said to have been presented to him by two Levukans, successively hung in bunches on his outstretched arms.

13. The State Library of New South Wales (Mitchell Library) in Sydney holds extensive Methodist missionary archives, notable among them the writings of Williams, Lyth, Hunt, Cross, Cargill, Calvert, Jaggar, Malvern and Hazlewood. French Catholic missionaries arrived in Fiji in the 1840s, and they too have left extensive records.

14. Matthew Tomlinson (2012: 215), to whom I am indebted for this reference, goes on to analyse the implications of the surrender of this tooth for the local people.

15. The original is in the Stanmore papers in the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology at Cambridge. As Thomas notes (1991: 224) the status of this myth is not entirely satisfactory because there is no Fijian version and the place and circumstances of its transmission are uncertain.

16. Hazlewood’s dictionary identifies sauwaqa as “the Javan murex, highly prized on the north-east coast of Vanua Levu” (1850: 321), while Hocart (1952b: 201) was told in Macuata, Vanualevu, that before whale teeth were introduced Fijians “used a shell called sauwangga, which is like a cowry, only pointed at both ends, like a conch, but smaller.” Capell’s dictionary (1941: 187), citing the French missionary Neyret as a source, gives sauwaqa as “a shell-fish of a fine...
red colour, a smaller kind of yaga. It was an offering to the kalou [god] next in value to a tabua.” For yaga is given Pterocera and Lambis species of shellfish (p. 285), which are types of spider conch, and for cava is given “a shell fish Conus marmoreus, used formerly as a tabua.” (p. 27). For mua-ni-waqa Capell, citing the Methodist missionary Heighway, gives “a shell-fish, Murex tenuispina” (p. 150). Roth (1953: 98) considered that sauwaqa were Terebra shells, probably based on Toganivalu’s description, and he also mentions Trochus shells. It is a confusing picture, worthy of further research.

ABSTRACT

This article draws on recent ethnographic research and on records and observations from the early 19th century onwards to demonstrate the great importance of transactable tabua ‘modified whale teeth’ in Fijian cultural life. It argues for a distinction between these post-contact transactable tabua and heirloom tabua of greater antiquity, but suggests that the role of the latter as embodiments of pre-Christian gods partly accounts for the high value still accorded to transactable tabua and their close association with chiefs.
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