INTRODUCTION: *TĀ-VĀ* (TIME-SPACE): THE BIRTH OF AN INDIGENOUS MOANA THEORY

Tēvita O. Kaʻili (Maui-Tāvā-He-Ako)
Brigham Young University Hawaiʻi

ʻŌkusitino Māhina (Hūfanga)
Moana University of Technology and
Vavaʻu Academy for Critical Inquiry and Applied Research

Ping-Ann Addo (Kula-He-Fonua)
University of Massachusetts Boston

THE DISPUTE between ontology (ways of being) and epistemology (ways of knowing) is a dispute over reality as it is and reality as we know it. The issue is, therefore, not how you know what you know, nor when you know what you know, nor where you know what you know, nor why you know what you know, but rather what you really know.

In paradoxical ways, it is, in the Moana, symbolically thought that people walk forward into the past and, contemporaneously, walk backward into the future, both in the present, where the elusive, already-taken-place past and illusive, yet-to-take-place future are, and in the social process, constantly mediated in the ever-changing present.

In historical ways, however, it logically follows that the past, which has stood the test of time-space, is placed in the front of people in the present as guidance, and the unknown future is located in their back in the present, informed by past experiences, with the past and future permanently negotiated in the conflicting present.

Pacific Studies, Vol. 40, Nos. 1/2—Apr./Aug. 2017

Tā-Vā **(Time-Space) Theory of Reality**

This collection of critical essays emerged from an Association of Social Anthropology in Oceania (ASAO) session that was first convened by Tēvita O. Kaʻili (Maui-Tāvā-He-Ako)[1] and ʻŌkusitino Māhina (Hūfanga)[2] in 2009 in Santa Cruz, where they held a Working Session entitled "*Tā-Vā* (Time-Space): The Birth of An Indigenous Moana Theory." The session was later joined by Ping-Ann Addo (Kula-He-Fonua)[3] at the ASAO meeting in Honolulu in 2011. At that time-space, a total of thirteen papers were presented, most of which are represented here, together with three additional papers presented on their behalf in absentia.

As the title of the session indicates, the formulation of the Tā-Vā (Time-Space) Theory of Reality marked the birth of an indigenous Moana theory, based on the Moana notions of "time" and "space," locally variously known across the Moana (Oceania/Pacific, including Tonga)[4] as *tā* and *vā* or *kā* and *wā*. As a groundbreaking Moana theory, its formulation around 2000 was originally developed, in close collaboration, by Tongan cultural anthropologist Tēvita O Kaʻili (Maui-Tāvā-He-Ako) and Tongan historical anthropologist ʻŌkusitino Māhina (Hūfanga). The Tā-Vā (Time-Space) Theory of Reality was first introduced to the academic world when a paper entitled "*Tā*, *Vā* and *Faiva*: Time, Space and Art"[5] was presented by Māhina at a Philosophy conference in Chico, CA, in 2001 (Kaʻili 2008). Apart from a range of extensive and diverse writings on Tāvāism as a Moana theory on a multiplicity of subject matters across disciplinary practices and forms of social activity, some twelve PhDs, Masters, and BA (Hons) tāvāist scholars have used the Tā-Vā (Time-Space) Theory of Reality, as well as an increasing number of current ones, in the production of their theses, mainly in the fields of anthropology, architecture, art, dance studies, education, health, and philosophy.

The chief rationale behind the session, as strictly suggested by its title, was to provide an academic environment for scholars generally and anthropologists specifically to actively and collectively engage in the ongoing critique of the newly born Tā-Vā (Time-Space) of Reality. That is, the rationale was that the *modus operandi* of the indigenous Tā-Vā (Time-Space) of Reality, based on the locally led concepts and practices of tā (time) and vā (space)—as opposed to the imposition of externally driven Western tempo-spatial concepts and practices on the Moana cultures (and languages)—be rigorously critiqued across disciplines in general and anthropology in particular. In addition to this ongoing collective but unified critique and peer-review of papers over a number of ASAO meetings, in view of both thematic theoretical and ethnographical, formal and

substantial (and functional) coherence and relevance, the participants in the session were urged to variously critically engage by responding to the Tā-Vā (Time-Space) of Reality generally and responding to their specific use of tā (time) and vā (space) in the investigation of their respective topics within and across disciplinary boundaries, including anthropology and forms of social activity.

As one of the tāvāist tenets states, that knowledge is knowledge of (skills in) tā (time) and vā (space), which are critically acquired through the intellectual process of education, that is, knowledge investigation, which is then used for practical purposes, that is, knowledge application. This is most evident in the classicist, realist, or tāvāist Tongan theory of *ako* (education), which is a tempo-spatial, substantial-formal (and functional) transformation of the human intellect, mind, or thinking from *vale* (ignorance) to *'ilo* (knowledge) to *poto* (skills), in that logical yet dialectical order (Māhina 2008). Such knowledge and skills are tempo-spatially composed or constituted in culture as a human spectacle and historically communicated or transmitted in language as a social vehicle in tā (time) and vā (space).

The philosophically driven, Moana-based Tā-Vā (Time-Space) of Reality is general in form, content (and function) that it enters all disciplinary practices and forms of social activity across the whole spectrum, as largely demonstrated by the diversity of subject matters of investigation in this collection of critical essays. The Tā-Vā (Time-Space) of Reality has a number of general and specific ontological and epistemological tenets, which include, *inter alia*, the following (Māhina 2010):

- that tā (time) and vā (space) as ontological entities are the common medium in which all things exist, in a single level of reality;
- that tā (time) and vā (space) as epistemological entities are socio-culturally organized in different ways across cultures;
- that tā (time) and vā (space) are the abstract dimensions of *fuo* (form) and *uho* (content), which are, in turn, the concrete dimensions of tā (time) and vā (space);
- that tā (time) and vā (space), like fuo (form) and uho (content), are inseparable in reality, as in nature, mind, and society;
- that the inseparability of tā (time) and vā (space), like fuo (form) and uho (content), renders reality or tā-vā (time-space) to be four-dimensional and not three-dimensional;
- that it is in the nature of mind to know or be aware or conscious of things out there in reality, including mind;
- that all forms of knowledge are knowledge of tā (time) and vā (space);
- that errors in thinking are a problem of mind but not of reality;

- that errors in thinking are caused by the separation of mind from reality and its failure to comprehend conflicts (that is, intersection or connection and separation) in the transcultural arrangement of tā (time) and vā (space);
- that all things in reality stand in eternal relations of exchange (that is, intersection or connection and separation), giving rise to order or conflict; and
- that order is when equal and opposite forces or energies intersect or connect and separate at a common point.

As inseparable ontological entities, tā (time) and vā (space) are the common medium in which all things are, in a single level of reality, as in nature, mind, and society. It justly points to reality or tā-vā (time-space) as having four dimensions and not three dimensions (Anderson 2007; Potauaine 2010). Quite simply, tā (time) is correspondent to fuo (form) and vā (space) to uho (content), which is composed of *lōloa* (length), *maokupu/fālahi* (width), and *loloto/maʻolunga* (depth/height), thereby making reality or tā-vā (time-space) four-dimensional rather than three-dimensional (Potauaine 2010; Potauaine and Māhina 2011). To regard reality or tā-vā (time-space) as three-dimensional (and not four-dimensional) is to privilege vā (space) over tā (time), on the abstract level and, by extension, to privilege uho (content) over fuo (form), on the concrete level, when they as abstract and concrete manifestations are indivisible (and of equal logical status) in reality, as in nature, mind, and society.

On the other hand, as indivisible epistemological entities, tā (time) and vā (space), like fuo (form) and uho (content), are culturally and historically organized in different ways across societies. Tā (time) and vā (space) are arranged in plural, cultural, collectivistic, holistic, intertwining, and circular ways in the Moana—as opposed to their arrangement in singular, techno-teleological, individualistic, atomistic, analytic, and linear modes in the West (Potauaine 2010; Potauaine and Māhina 2011; Māhina 2008). The Moana way of organization of tā (time) and vā (space) is witnessed in their treatment of the past, present, and future, where, in paradoxical yet circular modes, the past is put in front of people and the future is placed in the back of people, both in the present, where the past and future are constantly mediated in the process (Hauʻofa 2008; Māhina 2010). In historical but circular ways, the knowledge and skills from the past, which have stood the test of tā-vā (time-space), are situated as guidance in front of people in the present, and the future, which is yet to take place, is put in the back of people in the present, informed by the refined experiences of the past, with a sense of realism and aestheticism. This is in stark contrast to the predominant Western manner in which the past, present, and future are problematically arranged, with the

past in the back, present in the middle, and future in the front, dictated by a state of linearism, informed by a sense of both evolutionism and rationalism.

One of the tenets of Tāvāism states that tā (time) and vā (space), like fuo (form) and uho (content), are inseparable in reality, as in nature, mind, and society. By this, the tenet simply points to tā (time) as a temporal marker or definer of vā (space), and vā (space) a spatial composer of tā (time) (Anderson 2007; Potauaine 2010; Potauaine and Māhina 2011). From a Tongan perspective, tā (time) is verb-led, action-oriented in nature, and vā (space) is noun-based, object-driven in character (see Kaʻili in this volume), as in *tala matangi* and *tanu hala*, which mean "telling the conditions of winds" and "making roads," respectively, with the former as tempo-marking of winds as a specific space and the latter as tempo-marking of roads as a certain space.

In a temporal sense, tā signifies the marking of time, in terms of tempo, beat, pace, rhythm, and social act. For example, in Tongan, *tānafa* (rhythmic beating of drums), and *tāsīpinga*, setting (tempo-marking) examples, are both processes of marking time in space. Vā, on the other hand, signifies a relational space between time-markers (tā). It is a space that is fashioned through the relationship between time-markers such as beats, markings, objects, or people. Furthermore, vā signifies the nature or quality of the relationship. For example, in Tongan, *vāmamaʻo* indicates a distant physical space between things, and *vālelei* signifies a good (harmonious) social space (relations) between people.

The Tā-Vā Theory of Reality argues that tā (time) and vā (space) are inseparable in reality and both dimensions must be examined together, and in relation to one another, in order to gain a deeper understanding of natural, mental, and socio-cultural concepts and practices. As mentioned above, tā and vā are (epistemologically) arranged in various ways across cultures, and tā and vā are conflicting in nature. In Tonga, as well as most Moana cultures, artists mediate/reconcile conflicting times-spaces by symmetrically or rhythmically marking time (tā) in space (vā) to give rise to *mālie/fakaʻofoʻofa* (beauty). This indigenous and artistic marking of tā (time) in vā (space) is visually displayed in the *kupesi*, intricate and elaborate geometrical designs, that adorn Moana tattoos, carvings, fine mats, decorated barkcloths, sennit lashings, jewelry, and garlands. Furthermore, it is acoustically expressed in the rhythmic patterns that are the defining signature of Moana drumbeats, music, dance movements, and poetic compositions (myths, legends, folktales, proverbs, poems). Last, tā-vā (time-space), configuration is manifested in social relations, especially within *tauhi vā*, the indigenous Tongan art of sustaining harmonious and beautiful sociospatial relations (Kaʻili 2005, 2008).

Major Themes in the Papers

The collection of papers critically examines a diversity of themes across disciplinary practices and forms of social activity at the common intersection or connection and separation of ethnography and the Tā-Vā Theory of Reality. Ka'ili identifies the intertwining nature of time and space in Moanan ontology and epistemology and its linguistic expression in the Tongan language. Herein, Māhina puts forward a new form of Moana anthropology, informed by time and space as both ontological and epistemological entities, in addition to his second paper, where he, in both theoretical and ethnographical ways, examines the Tongan concepts and practices tā-vā (time-space) and *takohi* (drawing). Likewise, Potauaine continues with the tempo-spatial concept and practice *tatau* (symmetry), the subject matter of investigation by Māhina-Tuai in her paper on the work of Potauaine. Refiti and van der Ryn examine architecture, technicity, and bodily ascriptions in space constructions in space. Va'a, Georgina, Ka'ili, and Refiti unpack power, chiefliness, and ritual interactions in Oceania. Addo reexamines exchanges and economics in contemporary Tonga. Kalavite, Williams, Rosi, and Addo critique art and education in the context of diaspora and identity. Williams and Kalavite delve into Pacific (Moana) education and Pasifika (Moana) ways of knowing. Finally, Addo, Rosi, and Māhina critically observe visual art, performing arts, and expressive culture, with Addo dealing with her case as a response to transnationalism and place-making or identity, that is, tempo-marking self's sociospatial relations.

Summary of the Papers

As one of the Tā-Vā theorists, Māhina's paper sets both the tone and the direction of this volume. Māhina explores tā, vā, culture, and anthropology (as both discipline and practice)[6] and challenges how we move conceptually from data to theory when the theorists are also the subjects of power-laden historical constructions of time, place, identity, and knowledge. He states: "Culture, like all historical occurrences within and across nature, mind and society, takes place in time and space, i.e., reality. By extension, culture is, in actuality, a spatio-temporal human entity. A subject of anthropological investigation, culture is a social process, underlined by both complexity and historicity." This essay investigates what is valued in Moanan culture and, drawing heavily on the Tongan tradition, the analysis presented is one that suggests that harmony, or balance of give and take, in social relations is valued above all else in Tongan society. Such harmony is termed *faka'ofo'ofa*—often translated as beautiful—and suggests the constantly changing form of relationships

that, ideally, return to a state of balance, only to be shifted from this with further social interaction. The history of Tongan people can be described as one of acting and reacting in order to return to (an often unpredictable place or form of) beauty. Other authors in the volume likewise examine their people's own day-to-day ontology and epistemology, using them to broaden Māhina's theory into one of Moana societies more generally.

Albert Refiti's (Leali'ifano)[7] paper is firmly grounded in the Western philosophical tradition, but it applies ethnographic lenses to the bodily hexis and social interactions that traditionally took place in Samoa and that still do pertain today. Refiti grapples with what he, borrowing from Leroi-Gourhan, refers to as the work of "technicity"—the creation of lines in space by our gestures and movements (Leroi-Gourhan 1993). Such lines serve to orient us and those we interact with to the relations that we coconstruct. Refiti considers the technicity of the *tufunga*—or artist—whose role it is in Moana cultures to produce things of value, thereby facilitating the production of relations and society. This paper is, therefore, very much drawing on a Weberian and constructivist notion of the world coming into being through the subjects. To illustrate, he presents a "spatial exposition" of Samoan architecture as the work of the *tufunga-fau-fale* in order to demonstrate such material movements, for they make manifest the Tā-Vā theory in action. He further employs the specific Samoan concepts of tā and vā, which are *teu* (to decorate) and vā (space), to explain "the affects and effects in the system of actions and intentions" that produce subjects/objects in space and, through particular rituals, produce (a local sense of) time as well.

Related directly to the exposition of architecture as physical manifestation of spatial relationships interacting with intentionality with the built environment is Micah van der Ryn's paper. In it, he examines the underlying cultural assumptions about the constitution and production of space and time in Samoan culture as they are embedded in language, architecture, and social practices. The paper addresses how these concepts and the physical constructions of homes and other buildings are integrally related to Samoan ways of dealing with conflict and developing and maintaining social order.

Sēmisi Fetokai Potauaine's paper deals with tatau, translated as symmetry, which also means mirror image, image, copy, likeness, same, and equal (Potauaine 2010, Potauaine and Māhina 2011). As an artistic device, tatau (symmetry) is used for the mediation of *kohi-vā* (line-space) intersection, defined as connection and separation—in the broader tāvāist context, where all things in reality or tā-vā (time-space) stand in eternal relations of exchange. This point of intersection of *kohi* (line) and vā (space) gives rise to the *mata* (eye) as a form of connection or, its mirror image, *ava* (hole) as a type of separation, for example, *mata'i fa'o* (eye of the nail) and *ava'i fa'o* (hole of the

nail). A point, that is, mata (eye) or ava (hole), is the common place or space of intersection of two or more kohi (lines), a kohi (line) a collection of mata (eyes) or ava (holes) and vā (space) a set of kohi (lines). In artistic ways, the symmetrical mediation of kohi (line) and vā (space) intersection, like all types of conflict on the natural, psychological, and social levels, is done through sustained harmony to create beauty.

Moving the volume toward a discussion of the spiritual relevance of examining tā and vā in culture, Felise Va'a (Unasa Leulu) presents a treatise on tā and vā as one unified concept in Samoan culture. Samoan ta-vā is a daily reality in his life. He argues that Samoans further integrate tā and vā in relationships with each other and the natural environment "to provide a harmonious balance in Samoan culture and society" as well as in the proper relationships between humans and supernatural spirits. His essays is also a linguistic exposition of how time-space categories for where subjects are situated in the course of the day—morning, afternoon, and evening, for example—shape their shifting sense of connection to place, people, and activities like subsistence in rhythmic, cyclical fashion. The import of this discussion is the reminder that all significant activity is ritualized in the mind and body and, in turn, produces time as subjects come to know it through their interactions in the space of society.

The final paper on Samoan ways of knowing and being through tā and vā is by Dianna Georgina. Georgina examines how vā constitutes both notions of (diffuse) boundaries and space between people. She considers *mana*—the potency and influence—that is both encountered and mediated by particular ritualized use of space as a marker for rank differences between subjects. In the ethnography of Samoan dance she provides an example of how personhood—the recognized state of being a respectable human being in a given society—emanates from interaction in time and in space. When a *taupou*—highest ranking woman in villages, traditionally the daughter of a chiefs—dances, she embodies what Georgina refers to as "controlled mana," whereas clowns who mimic respectable dance with deliberately inelegant movements embody "uncontrolled mana." The space between these two categories of persons becomes, in a sense, charged with the movements that each creates in concert with the other—a form of "technicity" to borrow from Refiti and Leroi-Gourhan. Thus, Georgina presents a microcosmic look at Samoan socio-spatial practices through the lens of rank, age, gender, power, and practice. The discussion is a useful counterexample to Refiti's analysis of chiefly and tufunga powers of creativity radiating outward from chiefs who organize labor in the production of Samoan society.

Pamela Rosi's paper, an analysis of the art practice of Shugeiyuki Kihara, is an interdisciplinary exploration of how vā—and its relationship to tā—has

existed in different contexts and times for Moanan cultures. A Samoan-Japanese *fa'afāfine*, Kihara challenges the notions that male and female—and past and present—cannot exist in a single subject or a single vā. Kihara's work, which is in the visual, performance, and installation veins, thereby challenges negative theorizing about Samoan Third Gender liminality as being either recently derivative or lacking indigenous cultural value for "vā" as the space in between.

Ping-Ann Addo's paper follows the discussion of Samoan diasporic visual art with one about Tongan diasporic visual art: barkcloth made by Tongan women in New Zealand (Addo 2009, 2013). The paper demonstrates how traditional temporal and spatial concepts are particularly applicable to analyzing material culture as the focal point of the (re)crystalization of contemporary diasporic identities. In her paper for this volume, Addo argues that women *nimamea'a koka'anga* (makers, artists) of this most sacred object (re)create Moanan sacred social space in assembling and exchanging barkcloth, fine mats, and other traditional valuables as gifts. They also fill space with evolving materiality of plaited fine mats, echoing Refiti's notion that the gift—both as object and as form and force of relationship—is vā, or a connection forged between people.

Māhina's second paper in the volume theoretically and ethnographically examines the Tongan concept and praxis takohi, translated as drawing. He argues that, since all social activity takes place in space and time, it follows that art can be generally defined as tā-vā transformation, a stance echoed by Refiti, Ka'ili, Māhina-Tuai, and Potauaine. Drawing ethnographically from the three divisions of Tongan art—material (or carving and sennit rope lashing) arts, performance, and fine (textile) arts—Māhina describes takohi as a "tool of line-space intersection." Māhina extends his approach in the first essay by arguing, in this paper, that various forms of conflict are mediated in the creative process. The notion of conflict applied here is an idea reminiscent of the Manchester School of Social Anthropology but also deeply reflects Moana philosophies of seeking the broader benefit over gain for oneself. Such conflicts are regular features of society and manifest in artistic subject matters, Māhina argues, whose symmetrical forms mediate conflict in the creative process itself.

Kolokesa Māhina-Tuai's paper presents a specific analysis in the vein of Māhina's paper on takohi. Māhina-Tuai discusses recent works of Sēmisi Fetokai Potauaine, a male contemporary visual artist practicing in diaspora—primarily in New Zealand, but also in his recent residency at the Cambridge Museum. The author uses these works to explore the role of symmetry, or tatau, an essential aspect of all Tongan traditional arts, be they visual or performing arts. As Addo discusses for barkcloth, art-making creates a

connection between past and present, and Māhina-Tuai argues for an analysis of the time-space movement created by Potauaine as he depicts his message using the intersecting lines and spaces, mediated through the concept of tatau (symmetry) to produce that supreme Tongan "value": harmony or beauty.

The papers then turn to the theme of education and Moana ways was of knowing. The next two papers grapple with the much remarked-on "low achievement" of students of Moana background in diaspora in majority white nations. Examining the competing expectations put on Tongan–New Zealander students by their families, churches, and schools, Telesia Kalavite suggests that it is not the educational system per se that students struggle with or in, but their very *kāinga* (families). She uses kāinga as an umbrella term for communities in which students are embedded with concomitant responsibilities toward the needs and directives of others: educational bureaucracy, their families, churches, and teachers. She sees each of these contexts as a set of time-space relationships that overlap and intertwine in students' lives, each context having its own sort of pull, challenge, and reward—in short, there are tensions within and between these different contexts, and students experience them all while trying to achieve academically. Kalavite also engages thoughtfully with diaspora as a space for identity construction.

Nuhisifa Seve Williams's paper provides data from ethnographic interviews with such students—Pasifika (Moana), or students of Pacific Islander heritage, in New Zealand. Williams thinks about space in the tā-vā construction literally as the locus within the university classroom, but her analysis necessarily engages with the fact that physical spaces manifest a sense of belonging or outsiderness, depending on how students inhabit them (Williams 2009). Thus, Pasifika (Moana) students who populate the back rows of lecture theatres are not necessarily disengaged in a university lecture hall but are often embodying respect for the lecturer and solidarity with one another. Some are quiet out of respect, and others are vocal in tutorials out of a sense of collective "face" for their Pasifika (Moana) brothers and sisters. Her discussion is rich with analysis of the displacement felt by Pasifika students whose families and teachers often expect and hope for different outcomes from the students' educational experiences. She highlights how homeland and hostland, family house and lecture theatre, self and group achievement all influence the choices a student makes in positioning herself—physically and socially—within a given educational context.

Tēvita O. Kaʻili, the author of the final paper in the volume, is perhaps the author who most directly uses the Tā-Vā Theory of Reality in his own. Kaʻili's paper returns our attention to the production of rank in Moana societies with

its focus on Tongan use of time and space in the *taumafa kava* (royal/chiefly *kava* ceremony) and the *lakalaka* (dance) performing art. More specifically, it contends with the *tāvani*, intertwinedness, of tā with vā in specific Tongan language terms and, thus, he argues, in Tongan consciousness. Like Refiti, Ka'ili shows how people's positioning and circumscription (spatiality) of their movements (temporality) in space during particular rituals is directly related to their rank: chiefs sit at the front (*mu'a*) of the kava circle or perform at the front-and-center position between the rows of dancers in the lakalaka. The terms used to describe these positions clearly indicate the tempo-spatiality of the experience of rank: people of high rank (chiefs, also known as mu'a) trump those on or from the outside (commoners, known as *tu'a*, "outside" and *muli*, "following or coming from outside"; a term that also means "foreigner").

Critiquing the Privileging of Space over Time

The Tā-Vā Theory of Reality takes a strong position that tā (time) and vā (space) are both ontologically and epistemologically inseparable in reality,[8] and both dimensions must be examined together, and in relation to one another, in order to gain a holistic understanding of our natural, mental, and socio-cultural world. Moreover, the Tā-Vā Theory maintains that tā-vā (time-space) simultaneously connects and separates or intersects. Although scholarly writings have contributed to our understanding and appreciation of Moana concepts and practices, they have failed to take into account both time and space. Most of the writings focus solely on spatiality with almost no critical attention to temporality; a form of privileging space over time. This is the case with the writings of Wendt (1999), Halapua (2000, 2003), Thaman (2004), Taufe'ulungaki (2004), and Hau'ofa (2008). Wendt, Halapua, and Thaman focus solely on the spatiality (vā) of social relations with no account of temporality (tā). The writings of Taufe'ulungaki concentrate on *fonua* as community and space, and Hau'ofa emphasizes oceania as a vast space. Both provide little analysis of the time dimension of fonua and oceania. In addition to the exclusive focus on space and the neglect of time, most of the scholars view space as connecting or relating, with no account of space as separating, when they are, in reality, two sides of space as intersecting. This is contrary to tāvāism, which argues that all things in reality or nature, mind, and society stand in relations of exchange, giving rise to order and/or conflict, that is, that all things intersect (*fakafelavai*) or connect (*fakahoko*) and separate (*fakamavahe*)—as in the case of mata (eye) and ava (hole), for example, mata'i fa'o (eye of the nail) and ava'i fa'o (hole of the nail) (see Māhina, Māhina-Tuai, and Potauaine this volume).

Like the privileging of space (vā) over time (tā), there is also the privileging of fakahoko (connection) over fakamavahe (separation), when both time and space, like both connection and separation, are inseparable in reality, as in nature, mind, and society. The treatment of the Moana as space (vā) that connects or relates (fakahoko) but not space (vā) that separates or divides (fakamavahe) attributes *fenāpasi* (order), a privileged position, over *fepaki* (conflict), informed by a sense of idealism of both the rationalist and functionalist sort (Hauʻofa 2008; Wendt 1999). As a fact of history (and of life), the Moana is a place of both *moʻui* (life) and *mate* (death), a place where people are connected or related through life (and of life sustenance) and, at the other times-spaces, a place where they are separated or divided through death (and of life crisis) (Māhina 2010). A classic case would be *folau* (voyaging), which can be either a *folau moʻui/folau hao/folau tonu* (safe voyage) or *folau mate/folau mole/folau hē* (lost voyage). This was most probably the case with the settlement of the huge Moana by our ancestors in the past, as is the seascape movement of our people in the present, where voyages were either saved or lost along the way, with some arriving and others not arriving at their points of destination after leaving their points of origin. The same applies to what can be called model infestation of Moana scholarship, specifically in the fields of art, education, health, and peace studies among others (see, for example, Thaman 1997; Halapua 2003), where *mōtolo* (models) are drawn from Moana cultures (and languages), taken as vehicles, paradigms, or frameworks for Moana education and research, including teaching and learning (Thaman 1997; Taufeʻulungaki 2004). The use of models assumes the exchange between two states of affairs, where one is deployed as a model for the other, when there is commonly a failure of establishing the actual temporal-spatial, formal-substantial, and functional connections or relations between them as separate or distinct entities. Like the privileging of space (vā) over time (tā) and of fakahoko (connection) over fakamavahe (separation) or, for that matter, fenāpasi (order) over fepaki (conflict), there is, in modeling, a privileged position attributed to separation over connection, in view of the fact that states of affairs are, by nature, separate or distinct in themselves, thereby leaving the task of making their time-space, form-content, and function connections or relations unresolved in the process, both theoretically and practically (Thaman 2004; Manuʻatu 2000; Vaioleti 2006).

The academic fixation with only space is still dominating in recent scholarly writings in Moana. The recent *Ethos* "Special Issue: Senses of Space: Multiple Models of Spatial Cognition in Oceania and Indonesia" (Mawyer and Feinberg 2014) is a case in point. The authors of this special issue, which also emerged from an ASAO conference session, engage primarily

with only the spatial dimension of cognition. They argue for the value of a "multiple-models" approach to "space-in-culture" and "culture-in-spatial cognition" (Mawyer and Feinberg 2014, 243). There are no explanations of "time-in-culture" or "culture-in-temporal cognition." Moreover, the authors provide spatial conceptualization of navigation, orientation, and experience with almost no examination of temporality. For example, Bennardo (2014) discusses mainly the spatial, linguistics, and localized knowledge of the way Tongans give directions. His account on the way Tongans give directions provides no investigation of the temporality of giving directions or on moving in a certain direction as a form of time. Mawyer (2014) examines Mangarevan orientation and the multiplicity of spatial models with minor attention to the time-space in Mangarevan grammar. Mawyer is the only author in the collection who provides a section on time and space, specifically the multiple models for the location of time and space. Feinberg (2014) explores the multiplicity of spatial models on Taumako, a Polynesian community in the Solomon Islands. He focuses on models based on a binary/linear conceptualization of space, a Taumako form of radiality. There is no examination of the relationship between temporality and radiality. Likewise, Genz (2014) examines Marshallese models of hydrodynamics in relation to spatial layout in the Marshall Islands and how navigators use those models to navigate landscapes and seascapes. Even though navigation involves both time and space, Genz only focuses on the spatial dimension of navigation. In a similar approach, Ammarell (2014) explores the conflicts between indigenous spatial models and the global capital spatial models in the Indonesian island of Balobaloang. He provides no analysis of indigenous temporal models or the global capital temporal models. Lastly, Shore (2014) summarizes the three main areas of spatiality: (1) the close relations between spatial cognition and social cognition, (2) the relevance of allocentric and egocentric perspectives for cultural models of space, and (3) the importance in cognitive anthropology of studying multiple models. Shore provides no consideration to temporal cognition, cultural models of time, or the studying of multiple models of time. All the authors primarily see only space. Time appears to be invisible and insignificant.

In contrast, our collection of critical essays bring visibility and significance to both time and space, tā and vā, as fundamental and inseparable dimensions of reality. The authors herein share—and prove—the theoretical assumption that time and space are ontologically equal and one should not be privileged over the other. The topics and approaches covered in these essays underscore the abiding importance of ancestral guidance across time, privileging indigenous people's own analysis of their current lived realities. Thus, even when nonindigenous individuals write about indigenous processes—among them Addo, Georgina,

Rosi, and van der Ryn—they foreground indigenous ontology and epistemology about indigenous things, like other indigenous analyses that have emerged from Moana relationships that recognize genealogies and harmoniously interweave talk. A prime example of this remains Tengan, Kaʻili, and Fonoti's (2010) edited collection, which also emerged from a series of ASAO sessions in the early 2000s. The editors seek to affect the anthropology done in and of Moana by suggesting that "articulating visions of anthropology's future . . . can be done only through genealogical work—the search for, production, and transformation of connections across time and space" (140). They clarify that "genealogies lead us to seek far into our past for answers to modern-day questions of who we are, where we belong, and where we are going" (141). These conversations and cosmological reconnections are basic, crucial, and reality-affirming for Moana peoples. It is no surprise that many of the authors in this Tā-Vā volume interwove their voices in that previous *Genealogies* volume: Addo, Kaʻili, Māhina, and Vaʻa. Thus, we invite you to join our "talanoa, talking-critically-yet-harmoniously" (Māhina 2008) of the indigenous Moana Tā-Vā Theory of Reality.

NOTES

1. Maui-Tāvā-He-Ako is a *matāpule* (master of ceremony) title. Bestowed by Hūfanga, a chief of Maʻofanga, in recognition of Tēvita O. Kaʻili's work in formulating and advancing the Tā-Vā Theory of Reality in ako (academia). Kaʻili completed his PhD fieldwork among the Tongans in Maui, Hawaiʻi. He is a descendant of Maui, the famous Moana/Oceanian culture hero, liberator, freedom fighter, and trickster.

2. Hūfanga is a chiefly title. Bestowed by Fakafanua, the chief of Maʻofanga, Tongatapu, in recognition of ʻOkusitino Māhina and the ways in which his scholarly writings (e.g., Tā-Vā Theory of Reality) provide a *hūfanga* (refuge, sanctuary) for students from Moana/Oceania.

3. Kula-He-Fonua is a matāpule (master of ceremony) title. Bestowed by Hūfanga, a chief of Maʻofanga, in recognition of Ping-Ann Addo's tireless work to promote the fonua (land and its people; nation) of Tonga, both in the Tonga and in the diaspora, in her academic writings (Addo 2013). Addo was adopted by a Maʻofanga family during her fieldwork. Kula is a matāpule title from Maʻofanga.

4. Moana is the Indigenous Polynesian name for Oceania/Pacific Ocean, the inhabitants of which are also called the Moana people.

5. As a result of ongoing research in the field, Tongan art is now established to have three main divisions, namely, *faiva* (performance), tufunga (material) and *nimameaʻa* ([fine] arts). There is no Tongan word for art, which is translated as *ʻaati*.

6. Culture (fonua) and language (*tala/lea*), like time and space, are inseparable in reality, with culture as a receptacle for the dialectical composition or constitution of refined ʻilo

(knowledge) and poto (skills) and language as a vehicle for their historical transmission or communication (Māhina 2008).

7. Leali'ifano is Albert Refiti's Samoan title.

8. While that is the case, the epistemological questions are of secondary importance to the primary questions, given that reality as we know it is dependent on reality as it is, in that logical order of precedence.

REFERENCES

Addo, Ping-Ann
2009 Forms of tradition, forms of transnationalism: Cloth and cash as ritual exchange valuables in the Tongan diaspora. In *Migration and transnationalism: Pacific island perspectives*, ed. Helen Lee and Stephen Tupai Francis, 43–56. Canberra: Australia National Univ. Press.
2013 *Creating a nation with cloth: Women, wealth, and tradition in the Tongan diaspora*. New York: Berghahn.

Ammarell, Gene
2014 Shared space, conflicting perceptions, and the degradation of an Indonesian fishery. *Ethos* 42:352–375. doi:10.1111/etho.12053

Anderson, John
2007 *Space, time and the categories: Lectures on metaphysics 1949–50.* Sydney: Sydney Univ. Press.

Bennardo, Giovanni
2014 Space and culture: Giving directions in Tonga. *Ethos* 42:253–276. doi:10.1111/etho.12054

Feinberg, Richard
2014 Multiple models of space and movement on Taumako, a Polynesian Island in the Southeastern Solomons. *Ethos* 42:302–331. doi:10.1111/etho.12055

Genz, Joseph
2014 Complementarity of cognitive and experiential ways of knowing the ocean in Marshallese Navigation. *Ethos* 42:332–351. doi:10.1111/etho.12056

Halapua, Sitiveni
2000 *Meaning in unity-building: A holistic Talanoa perspective*. Korolevu, Sigatoka, Fiji: Pacific Islands Development Program, East-West Center.
2003 Walking the knife-edge pathways. Pacific Islands Report. Accessed September 20, 2016, http://166.122.164.43/archive/2003/July/07-08-halapua.htm

Hauʻofa, Epeli
2008 *We are the ocean: Selected works*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawaiʻi Press.

Kaʻili, Tēvita O.
2005 Tauhi vā: Nurturing Tongan sociospatial ties in Maui and beyond. *The Contemporary Pacific* 17 (1): 83–114.
2008 Tauhi Vā: Creating beauty through the art of sociospatial relations. PhD thesis, Univ. of Washington.

Leroi-Gourhan, André
1993 *Gesture and speech* (translated by A. Berger and R. White). Cambridge MA/London: MIT Press.

Māhina, ʻOkusitino
2008 From *vale*, ignorance, to *ʻilo*, knowledge, to *poto*, skill, the Tongan theory of ako, education: Theorizing old problems anew. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Scholarship* 4 (1): 67–96.
2010 Tā, vā, and moana: temporality, spatiality, and indigeneity. *Pacific Studies* 33 (2/3): 168–202.

Manuʻatu, Linitā
2000 *Kātoanga Faiva*: A pedagogical site for Tongan students. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 32 (1): 73–80.

Mawyer, Alexander
2014 Oriented and disoriented space in the Gambier, French Polynesia. *Ethos* 42:277–301. doi:10.1111/etho.12057

Mawyer, Alexander and Richard Feinberg
2014 Senses of space: Multiplying models of spatial cognition in Oceania. *Ethos* 42:243–252. doi:10.1111/etho.12058

Potauaine, Sēmisi F.
2010 *Tectonic of the fale: Four dimensional, three divisional*. Master's thesis, Univ. of Auckland.

Potauaine, Sēmisi F. and ʻOkusitino Māhina
2011 Kula and ʻuli: Red and black in Tongan thinking and practice. In *Tonga: Land, sea and people,* ed. T. Steen and N. Drescher. Nukuʻalofa: Vavaʻu Press.

Shore, Bradd
2014 A view from the islands: Spatial cognition in the Western Pacific. *Ethos* 42:376–397. doi:10.1111/etho.12059

Taufeʻulungaki, ʻAna
2004 Fonua: Reclaiming Pacific communities in Aotearoa. Paper presented at the Lotumoui: Pacific Health Symposium. Waipuna Hotel, Auckland, New Zealand.

Tengan, Ty Kāwika, Tēvita O. Kaʻili, and Rochelle Fonoti (eds.)
2010 Genealogies: Articulating indigenous anthropology in/of Oceania. *Pacific Studies* 33 (2/3): 259–279.

Thaman, Konai Helu
1997 Kakala: A Pacific concept of teaching and learning. Keynote address, Australian College of Education National Conference, Cairns.
2004 Tauhi Vahaʻa: A possible foundation for peace and inter-cultural understanding. *Intercultural Education* (Summer 2004).

Vaioleti, Timote M.
2006 Talanoa research methodology: A developing position on Pacific research. *Waikato Journal of Education* 12:21–34.

Wendt, Albert
1999 Afterword: Tatauing the postcolonial body. In *Inside out, literature, cultural politics and identity in the New Pacific*, ed. Vilsoni Hereniko and Rob Wilson, 399–412. Lanham, MD: Rowman.

Williams, N.
2009 *A view from the back, times between spaces: Equality of educational opportunity and Pacific students at a university*. PhD thesis, Univ. of Auckland.