BOOK REVIEW FORUM

Bradd Shore, *Sala'ilua: A Samoan Mystery*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982. Pp. ix, 338, bibliography, index, glossary.

This past year two important additions to Samoan ethnographic literature have been published: Derek Freeman's book, *Margaret Mead and Samoa: The Making and Unmaking of an Anthropological Myth,* and Bradd Shore's *Sala'ilua: A Samoan Mystery*. Both volumes provide us with new information which enhances our understanding of Samoan culture and behavior. The value of Shore's work lies in his careful exposition of Samoan social structure and the relationship of that structure to behavior. This analysis is contained in the first two sections of his book written as a traditional village ethnography and introduced aptly enough as a murder mystery. The third section of the book is an exercise in symbolic anthropology in which the events of the preceding sections are examined.

One of the difficulties in working with Samoan ethnographic sources has been understanding the cultural process. For example, How do kinship diagrams translate into behavior? How is an *'aiga* actually formed? What forms does cultural change take in a village? Until now, Albert Wendt's novels have been the best source for understanding Samoan behavior and consequently have often been used in the classroom and in research to augment the static scientific descriptions of Mead, Gilson, Holmes, Freeman, and others. Shore, like Wendt, starts his book in a narrative form, and in an exceptionally graceful prose style, transforms storytelling into science, describing the process as well as the structure of Samoan village social and political life. Traditional village ethnographies can also lead to errors of interpretation, extrapolating idiosyncratic events to whole cultures. In the present ethnography, Shore clearly differentiates between the village particular and the cultural generalization.

He has clarified, at least for the present, the lengthy and sometimes tedious argument about Samoan kinship and descent, although regrettably he relegated the history of the anthropological disagreement on Samoan descent groups to an extended footnote rather than incorporating the information into the text. Through the technique of enumerating actual affiliation choices in Sala'ilua, he has presented most clearly the possibilities and implications of male-female descent choices and affiliations. He has also definitively addressed two other ethnographic ambiguities. First, he

has summarized the range of referents for the term *'aiga* and has opted for a very useful definition of *'au'aiga* as the primary cooperating kin residential or commensal unit. (Orans has called this unit an *umu 'aiga.*) Second he has laid out for us, using the Sala'ilua data, the structure of the *matai* system, the ranking of titles, the acquisition of titles, and most importantly the behavioral outcomes.

In effect, Shore has written two different books in this volume. The first one is an exceptionally well written and illuminating scientific endeavor. Besides the substantive addition to Samoan ethnography, Shore has also conveyed the field-work experience in particularly vivid terms--the dual obligations of the participant-observer, the sensitivity to the natural environment, the inertia, and then the intense excitement of the intellectual mystery. It is, therefore, unfortunate that Columbia University Press allowed so many typographical errors to slip by in the text and bibliography and that the photographic reproductions in the paperback edition were of such poor quality. Most regrettably appendix C, which purported to explain the relationships among the major figures in the mystery, was omitted.

The second "book" (Part III) entitled "Meanings," is more difficult to evaluate. In his brief introduction to this section, Shore does not lead us to the structure of his argument, does not explain the relationships of the seven chapters in this section. These chapters seem to stand almost independently and in each case are certainly informative. Undoubtedly this section of the book has great value, and certainly the detailed and lucid explanation of the dualism of social behavior *(aga)* and personal behavior *(amio)* can comfortably include the data of both Mead and Freeman. I found most delightful the review of Samoan naming possibilities, which explains the difficulties of obtaining a single answer, consistent through time to the researcher's indispensable question, What is your name? Perhaps this section would have profited from an introduction that spelled out the theoretical premises and explained the role of each of the chapters in developing the argument of meanings. His conclusion summarizes neither the evidence nor the hypothesis. It is, therefore, impossible to judge the validity of his explanation. Perhaps in the next edition Shore will provide us with a more tightly organized view of how meanings are analyzed. Despite the obscurity of this section, *Sala'ilua: A Samoan Mystery* is a major contribution to the anthropological literature.

Thelma S. Baker
Pennsylvania State University

In the book *Sala'ilua: A Samoan Mystery,* Shore has attempted to produce an ethnographic account of Samoa on two different levels. One level depicts the world of Sala'ilua and the events surrounding the murder of a high-ranking chief of this rural Samoan village. On a deeper level Shore describes the underlying structures of Samoan culture and how these structures impart meaning to behavior. As an ethnographic account of Samoan culture the book succeeds in drawing together more information in a comprehensible form better than any previous work on Samoa. As a cultural explication of the murder in Sala'ilua the book does not quite live up to expectations.

There are some flaws in the production of the book, the most annoying being the numerous typographical errors. In addition, some of the figures are confusing or misleading. For example, Figure 2.1, a sketch map of Sala'ilua, was inadequately labeled. The identity and significance of two of the numbered household compounds is revealed thirty-seven pages later in the text, leaving the reader with the uneasy feeling that he has missed some crucial point of the diagram. Also, clearer marking of the households of the key personalities would have been helpful. Figure 3.2, spatial orientations in a Samoan village, depicts the "ideal" round village and gives spatial orientations in relation to this center versus periphery model. As Shore notes, not only is Sala'ilua a linear village spread along a government road that parallels the coastline, but most of the villages in Samoa also conform to the linear model. While it is interesting to note the ideal village form, it would have been good to discuss more clearly the distinctions between the ideal and real villages and perhaps to develop a model of the spatial orientations in a linear village. These are minor complaints, however, and they do not detract greatly from the value of the book.

There are two potentially more serious problems with the book. First, I am concerned about the somewhat confusing statement of methods in the preface. Shore states that he has resided in Western Samoa for nearly five years. He has conducted two research trips to Samoa: a three-month stay to investigate adoption, incest prohibition, and other aspects of Samoan kinship; and an eighteen-month trip when he conducted his dissertation research. The focus of his doctoral research is not explained; however, it appears from the title of his dissertation that he was interested in the paradox of personal control and aggression in Samoa. It seems unlikely that such an orientation might produce a biased understanding of Samoan culture, particularly in Shore's case, where he has such extensive experience in Samoa outside of a research context. However, potential

biases should be addressed and discussed to permit an accurate evaluation of an author's interpretations.

The list of information sources used by Shore leaves the impression that all first-hand accounts by informants came from interviews conducted in rural Savai'i. However, this clearly is not the case, as informants from Manono (p. 164), Apia (p. 165), and rural Upolu (p. 157) are quoted. It is not disclosed whether these interviews were conducted during the same trip when the author resided in Sala'ilua, or whether they were from the earlier trip that focussed on kinship.

The second general criticism concerns the incomplete integration of the two levels of the book. The first two chapters and the last chapter deal almost exclusively with the murder of Tuatō Fatu, one of the most important chiefs in Sala'ilua, and also one of Shore's key informants. Because of Fatu's position in the village, this murder has wide-ranging social implications. The event is a uniquely apt particularization of the general principles of Samoan culture outlined by Shore in chapters 3 through 13. This appears to be the purpose for discussing the murder in the book, but there are few references to the murder and the surrounding social milieu in the chapters on Samoan culture. After reading Shore's preface I expected the event of the murder to be used like the ax fight in the film "Ax Fight" (Asch and Chagnon, 1975). The film used the event to illustrate points about kinship and social organization among the Yanomamo. There were many instances in Shore's book when a discussion of a general principle of Samoan culture could have been illuminated by a detailed dissection of some aspect of the murder; instead other information was introduced. This criticism in no way impugns the value of the book in explaining Samoan culture, but by not fully exploiting the murder, the usefulness of the three chapters based on the murder is reduced.

I was somewhat surprised to find some key sources on Samoa missing from the bibliography. Three works that I have found useful include Buck's (1930) *Samoan Material Culture,* Grattan's (1948) *An Introduction to Samoan Custom,* and Holmes' (1958) *Ta'u, Stability and Change in a Samoan Village.* If these books were considered and rejected by Shore, it would have been interesting to learn the reasons why.

Overall, this book is a very valuable contribution to the understanding of Samoan culture. The chapters on structures in Samoan society are excellent, especially the sections on the *matai* system and on titles. The chapters on meanings provide insight into the paradoxical nature of Samoan personalities, that is, the blending of politeness and aggression that is necessary to succeed within Samoan society. The problems that I have

noted are more annoyances than serious flaws. This book is clearly a must for any serious scholar of Polynesia.

CITATIONS

Asch, T. and N. Chagnon. "Ax Fight." Watertown, MA: D. E. R., Inc., 1975.

Buck, P. H. *Samoan Material Culture.* Honolulu: B. P. Bishop Museum, 1930.

Grattan, F. J. H. *An Introduction to Samoan Custom.* Apia: Samoa Printing and Publishing Co., 1948.

Holmes, L. D. *Ta'u, Stability and Change in a Samoan Village.* Wellington, N.Z.: Polynesian Society, 1958.

James R. Bindon
University of Alabama

Gregory Bateson's dictum that "the way to phrase scientific questions is with the word 'how' and not with the word 'why' " (Berger 1978:46) applies as well to a whodunit as to a scientific treatise. A detective story that lays out the facts directly, letting them challenge the reader's deductive abilities, satisfies better than one that jumps too quickly to abstractions of motive. *Sala'ilua: A Samoan Mystery* is a satisfying whodunit, an anthropological detective story that sticks to the "how," despite the temptation to pursue the "why."

It tells the story of a village and a crime. The village is Sala'ilua, a settlement on the southwestern coast of the Western Samoan island of Savai'i; and the crime is murder, an infrequent occurrence in the lives of the villagers. But the real mystery does not concern the crime itself, because the details--a rivalry, an argument, a fight, a shooting--make themselves known immediately. Instead, it lies in "the interplay of cultural and social structures that constitute an adequate general context for understanding the crime" (p. xiv). Little resembling the standard whodunit at the outset, this detective story takes unconventional detours to an untraditional dénouement; and in the end, the hypothesis that the mystery "could be resolved" is asserted to be "solution enough" for it.

It's an artificial mystery, of course--a writer's gimmick, and a clever one. Few anthropologists are, as it were, lucky enough to be on hand at the murder of their principal host and smart enough to know how to take literary advantage of their good fortune. Bradd Shore, both lucky and

smart, has turned an ugly affair to good account by sympathetically portraying his former neighbors as semi-novelistic figures in a semi-ethnographic memoir, which captivates as it confounds and inspires as it informs. He has fashioned the first Polynesian ethnological production in which the struggle against the impermanence of human relations forms at once the background and the focus of analysis.

Between an account of the crime (pp. 7-39) and a review of the patterns of thinking that, to an undemonstrated extent, "determined" it (pp. 284-91), Shore makes a penetrating psychosocial study of the people of Sala'ilua. He sifts his evidence with a care toward saving the symbolic and thereby shapes an unusual anthropological treatise. Fascinated by intangibles, he ignores material culture. He admits few items of traditionary lore into his ken. He keeps his mind on analytical goals and does not allow himself the pure but unprocreant pleasures of wallowing in folkloristic delights.[1]

Shore divides this study into two sections called "Structures" and "Meanings." In the first of these, which is disposed in five chapters, he defines the village--once in terms of the land, and again in terms of the people: he describes their chieftainships, their councils, their titles, and their laws. These chapters will stand as a plausible portrayal of the locality and its inhabitants, though, as with earlier ethnographic works on Samoan villages, the reader cannot always judge which attributes describe all native settlements and which are unique to the village under study.

Sala'iluans believe their society to be "founded on God" (national motto of Western Samoa), but they often behave as if it were founded on chieftainships. Their *matai* "overseers" (reviewer's gloss) are normally heads of households who have taken an official title to exercise its authority over lands and people. In chapter 4, Shore describes the powers of the *matai,* in relation to property and persons; he discusses recruitment of *matai;* and he lists the titles of Sala'ilua (in table 4.1). Oddly, he is, by his own admission, confused about intertitular relationships of rank (pp. 63-64). The reader must skip to chapter 6 for a treatment of title-succession, the relationships of titles and genealogies, and the structure that titles provide the village. 'That structure is abstracted in the *fa'alupega* "dove-like thing," a variable list of honorific phrases expressed in allusive and arcane diction; Shore discusses the *fa'alupega* of Sala'ilua in chapter 5, "The Framework of a Local Political Order." He catalogues many of the remaining affiliative classes of persons--formal organizations of young men, of unmarried women, and so on--in the concluding chapter of this section.

By thus setting the stage for his analysis of the structures behind the crime, Shore highlights politics at the expense of other scripts for social action. He expatiates on his actors' civic roles and even takes pains to rehearse the plan of their *fono* "councils'‘--both actual (the one held after the murder, pp. 26-33), and ideal (pp. 79-81, with a seating-plan in figure 5.1). Yet, in the bill of major structures, the absence of the Christian church creates an unexpected mystery.[2]

More Samoans attend more worship-services on a more regular basis at more stages of life than will ever participate in a *fono;* and the ethical instruction they receive in church, with the ritual behavior they witness and follow there, may well affect their lives as deeply, in ways they cannot understand or explain, as any policy or procedure of a political council. Like the seating-plan of a *fono,* that of a Protestant worship-service establishes a critical spatial structure: men, women, boys, girls, and the pastor's family are segregated in groups; and deacons or appointed persons guard assigned doors (which they close during certain prayers). The textual components of the order of worship--hymns, prayers, readings, offerings, sermons, announcements--establish a critical temporal structure.[3]

The lack of a discussion of the structures provided Sala‘iluans by religion prevents us from knowing the full extent of the expression of the rivalry between the murderer and the victim. We learn how the two men could have related spatially in a kava-ceremony, but not in a church-service. We learn how they could have manipulated the order of the events in political councils, but not of those in ecclesiastical ones. We learn about their jockeying for superiority in the *fono,* but not in the congregation.[4]

It is easy to think that in Samoa, as in the rest of Polynesia, the Christian church is still, as it once was, an intrusion on indigenous institutions; but when it ceased to be new, it became indigenous; and when it ceased to be strange, it became authentic: over time, it has become a real presence in the real world of real Polynesians. The fact that the stimulus for the invention of Samoan Christianity came from abroad should not deter the anthropologist from fully including the Samoan church in the ethnographic description, especially since that institution demonstrably offers many structural opportunities for the playing-out of the kind of rivalry which the anthropologist has chosen for the central topic of his concern.

In the section on meanings, Shore outpaces his anthropological predecessors in the islands. He maintains that "human action is in large part symbolic action," and that one of the fieldworker's most challenging problems is to "rescue some of the intentions that inform human acts"

(p. 127). In chapters 8 through 13, he explores the interrelated meanings of six aspects of Sala'iluan life: personality, action, knowledge, conflict, power, and aesthetics. In treating these topics, he delineates boldly the cultural constraints on Samoan character and examines bravely the protean impulses of the Samoan mind. His speculations on the patterns of Samoan symbolic action rise to breathtaking heights of fancy and reach an atmosphere so charged with the revelatory power of his intellect that we are astonished by every thesis and thunderstruck at every page.

Central to the unraveling of the mystery is the fact that Sala'ilua has an inverted hierarchy: orators (*tulāfale*) receive its highest formal honors; but in the rest of Samoa, such honors devolve upon chiefs *(ali'i).* Both murderer and victim were orators, and their titles took the highest honors in the village. Shore believes that "the subordination of the dignity of the *ali'i* of Sala'ilua to the cruder kind of power represented by orators" (p. 290) explains much of the cast of conflict in the village--conflict whose aggressive style of resolution reveals itself in the local tendency toward personal assertiveness, which Shore noticed on his first day there (p. 9) and about which Sala'iluans brag (pp. 289-90). The inversion of the normal order of paired complements--chiefs and orators--becomes, in Shore's hands, the most important clue in the potential solution of the mystery.

Because the perceptual pair that can be represented as "dignity/crudeness" regulates the Samoan view of reality, Shore occupies himself with the study of its behavioral implications. In keeping with ancient anthropological custom, he finds dualities almost everywhere. In the description of the village, he stresses the social resonance of the orientational dyads, *tai/uta* "seaward/landward" and *luma/tua* "front/back" (pp. 48-51). The seaward half of a Samoan house bears a sense of politeness, of courtesy, of dignity; likewise the front, which is the side facing the center of a village or facing a road or path. These pairs find conceptual analogues in the basic human biological polarity, *fafine/tāne* "female/male" (pp. 225-41), and in the basic Sala'iluan political one, *ali'i/tulāfale* "chief/orator" (pp. 216, 241-46). To these, Shore adds *mana/pule* "spiritual power/temporal power" (pp. 246-49), and many others. A magnificent table, which lists eighty-three dyads (appendix B), tells an absorbing ethnological tale in itself.[5]

The key dyad of the mystery, the duality that Shore believes to be central in the Samoan assessment of human behavior, is the distinction between *aga* "social conduct (prescriptive)" and *āmio* "personal behavior (descriptive)" (Shore's glosses, p. 154). In support of these definitions, he quotes the remarks of selected Samoans (pp. 157-58). He presents his fullest analysis of *aga* and *āmio* in chapter 9, "Action"; but references to this

dyad appear throughout the book. Taking his cue from the presented definitions, he develops the thesis that Samoan social structure has "a kind of dual organization, comprising sets of social roles linked through complementary opposition and mutual control" (p. 257). He mentions (p. 154), but does not explicate similarities with, two vaguely analogous Western dualities: superego/id (in psychology), and culture/nature (in anthropology).[6]

The basic polarity conveyed in the dyad *aga/āmio* might be understood as "culture/impulse" or "control/expression." In chapter 12, "The Symbolism of Power: Dual Organization and Social Order," Shore examines the links between local culture and control. He posits that cultural restrictions in Sala'ilua control "aggression, competition, and the unrestrained expression of personal impulses" (p. 221). The Samoan word glossed as "culture," *aganu'u,* is itself based on *aga;* other glosses include "custom(s)" (Milner 1966) and "conduct according to the customs of one's own country" (Pratt 1911).

In examining the structural significance of *aga* and *āmio*, Shore bolsters his thesis with the assertion that "most of the compound terms made from *āmio* refer to acts that are socially disruptive, while *aga* is found principally in compound terms denoting forms of virtue" (pp. 154-55).[7] His assertion may not be right on either count: this reviewer's browsing in the Samoan Bible--a text whose influence on the Savai'ian ideology of behavior cannot be overestimated--yielded a different result: while more compound terms made from *āmio* do have negative (disruptive, nonvirtuous) connotations, those terms present themselves less frequently than compounds bearing positive (nondisruptive, virtuous) connotations; in addition, there seem to be more negative compounds of *aga* than positive ones.

Since Shore places cardinal importance on the distinction of *āmio* and *aga,* the evidence is worth an examination at length. Here follow the positive phrases built upon *āmio.*[8]

—*āmio alofa* "loyal" (II Sam. 22:26, Ps. 18:25), "walking in love (RSV), [to walk] charitably (KJV)" (Rom. 14:15).

—*āmio Atua* "faithful" (Ps. 149:1), "godly" (Ps. 12:1, I Tim. 2:2), "holy" (I Thess. 2:10); *e āmio Atua* "[to] profess religion" (I Tim. 2:10); *e e āmio Atua* "the godly" (II Peter 2:9); *le āmio Atua* "godly" (Titus 2:12), "godliness" (I Tim. 4:7-8, 6:3, 6:5-6, 6:11; Titus 1:1; II Peter 3:11); *lē e āmio Atua* "holy" (Titus 1:9); *[nofo] ma le āmio Atua* "to live a godly life" (II Tim. 3: 12).

—*āmio fa'aaloalo* "reverent" (Titus 2:3, I Peter 3:2).

—*āmio lelei* “good [noun]” (Rom. 2:10), “good conduct” (Rom. 13:3), “good morals” (I Cor. 15:33), “innocent” (Pvb. 1:11); *e āmio lelei* “[to] do well” (James, 2:8); *ē e ā̄mio lelei* “goodness” (Titus 1:8); *ʻia ʻe āmio lelei* “do what is good” (Rom. 13:3); *le āmio lelei* “good [noun]” (II Tim. 3:3), “good behavior” (I Peter 3:16), “good works” (Matt. 5:16), “holiness” (I Thess. 3:13, Ephes. 4:24, I Tim. 2:15), “well-doing” (II Thess. 3:13); *[le] āmio lelei* “doing right” (I Peter 3:16); *ʻua āmio lelei* “does good” (Rom. 3:12).

—*āmio mamā* “chaste” (Titus 2:5, I Peter 3:2), “pure” (II Sam. 22:27, Ps. 18:25); *[le] āmio mamā* “purity” (II Cor. 6:6, I Tim. 4:12), “self-control (RSV), temperance (KJV)” (Gal. 5:23), “self-controlled” (Titus 1:8).

—*āmio mamalu* “dignified” (I Tim. 3:2).

--*le āmio mātagōfie* “respectful (RSV), honesty (KJV)” (I Tim. 2:2).

—*āmio saʻo* “blameless” (Job 1:1, Pvb. 29:10), “innocent” (Philip. 2:15), “pure” (I Tim. 4:12), “upright” (Ps. 11:7, Pvb. 3:32); *ē e āmio saʻo* “the upright” (Pvb. 15:8); *le āmio saʻo* “equity” (Pvb. 1:3), “the right” (Ps. 17:1); *ma le āmio saʻo* “aright” (Pvb. 15:21); *ʻua saʻo laʻu āmio* “my integrity” (Job 31:6); *ʻua saʻo le āmio* “the innocent” (Job 27:17).

—*āmio e tatau* “how one ought to behave (RSV), how thou oughtest to behave thyself (KJV)” (I Tim. 3:15). [Note that this denotation is prescriptive--not, as Shore insists for *āmio* (p. 154), descriptive.]

—*āmiotonu* “blameless” (II Sam. 22:26, Ps. 18:25), “may be justified” (Rom. 10:4), “is justified” (Rom. 10:10), “right” (Job 33:12, Ephes. 5:9), “righteous” (Ps. 11:7; Matt. 13:17; Rom. 1:17, 3:10, 5:7, 5:19, 5:21, 6:13; I Thess. 2:10), “righteousness” (Rom. 4:3, Gal. 3:6), “upright” (Job 1:1); *[e] āmiotonu* “integrity” (Pvb. 28:6), “[to] do right” (Rev. 22:11); *ē e ā̄miotonu* “the righteous” (Ps. 1:5), “the upright” (Ps. 112:2); *ē ʻua āmiotonu* “the righteous” (Jer. 20:12), “the upright” (Ps. 107:42 & 112:4); *fai le ā̄miotonu* “[do] what is right” (Ps. 15:2); *le āmiotonu* “a just cause” (Ps. 17:1), “justice” (Rom. 3:5), “piety” (Matt. 6:1), “prosperity” (Pvb. 8:18), “righteousness” (II Sam. 22:21, Ps. 23:3 & 118:19, Pvb. 25:5, John 16:10, Rom. 1:17, II Cor. 6:7, Ephes. 4:24, I Tim. 6:11, Gal. 5:5, Titus 3:5, II Peter 2:21), “right mind” (I Cor. 15:34), “the just requirement” (Rom. 8:4); *lē ʻua āmiotonu* “the just” (I Tim. 1:9). [For *fai le āmiotonu*, compare Shore’s remarks on *fai le āmio*, p. 155.]

—*taūāmiotonu* “justify” (Job 32:2, Gal. 3:8); *ʻina ʻia taʻuāmiotonuina* ‘brings justification” (Rom. 5:16), “for justification” (Rom. 4:25), “so that might be justified” (Titus 3:7); *lē na te taʻuāmiotonuina* “one

who justifies" (Rom. 4:5); *na te ta'uāmiotonuina* "he will justify" (Rom. 3:30); *ta'uāmiotonuina* "acquittal" (Rom. 5:18), "acquitted" (I Cor. 4:4), "justified" (Rom. 3:4, 3:24, 4:2; I Cor. 6:11; Gal. 2:16, 3:11, 3:24, 5:4), "justifies" (Rom. 8:33), "righteous" (Rom. 2:13), "vindicated' (Job 11:2); *ta 'i lātou* "righteousness reckoned to them" (Rom. 4:11); *ta'uāmiotonuina mai* "[reckon] as righteousness" (Gen. 15:6).

As the listed examples indicate, *āmiotonu* is extremely productive, both in kind and number of forms.[9]

Thirteen negative phrases built on *āmio* were found; here follow those encountered more than once.[10]

—*āmio fa'alēmatau* "godless" (Job 34:30); *le āmio fa'alēmatau* "ungodliness" (Rom. 1:18, II Tim. 2:16).

—*āmio fa'atalanoa* "idle" (II Thess. 3:7), "idleness" (II Thess. 3:6); *'ua āmio fa'atalanoa* "are living in idleness" (II Thess. 3:11).

—*āmio lēaga* "bad [conduct]" (Rom. 13:3), "doing wrong" (I Peter 3:17), "do wrong" (Rom. 13:4), "evil" (Ram. 2:9, II Tim. 3:13, Pvb. 24:1), "impurity" (Ephes. 5:3), "trespasses" (Coloss. 2:13), "wicked" (Job 34:8, Ps. 1:1, I Cor. 5:13, II Thess. 3:2); *e e āmio lēaga* 'bad company" (I Cor. 15:33), "evildoers" (Matt. 13:41), "the unholy" (I Tim. 1:9), "unholy" (II Tim. 3:2), "the wicked" (Ps. 1:1); *le āmio lēaga* "corruption" (II Peter 1:4), "evil" (I Cor. 5:8), "evil deeds" (Coloss. 1:21), "impurity" (Rom. 1:24 & 6:19, II Cor. 12:21, Gal. 5:19, Coloss. 3:5), "iniquity" (II Tim. 2:19, Jer. 31:34), "lawlessness" (II Thess. 2:3 & 2:17, Heb. 1:9), "trouble" (Job 4:8), "uncleanness" (I Thess. 2:3), "wickedness" (Ps. 5:4 & 45:7, Pvb. 10:2, Rom. 1:18 & 2:8 & 6:13), "wrong" (I Cor. 6:1). [Placed within the scope of Shore's thesis, this phrase becomes a conceptual oxymoron, since *lēaga* "bad" may--as Shore points out (p. 312), despite his spelling the word without the macron--be a compound of *lē* "(negative particle)" and *aga.*]

—*āmiolētonu* "iniquity" (Lament. 4:22), "[to] do evil" (Rev. 22:11), "[to] do wrong" (Job 34:10), "unjustness" (Rom. 3:5), "unrighteousness" (Jer. 22:13), "wickedness" (Rom. 3:5); *e e āmioletonu* "the unjust" (Matt. 5:45), "the unrighteous" (I Cor. 6:1); *lana āmiolētonu* "the wrong he has done" (Coloss. 3:25); *le āmiolētonu* "injustice" (Rom. 9:14); *lē e āmiolētonu* "the wrongdoer" (Coloss. 3:25); *ma le āmiolētonu* "by their wickedness" (Rom. 1:18). [The form *āmiolētonu* supplies the negative of *āmiotonu*.]]

—*āmio mātagā* "arrogant" (I Cor. 13:5), "dishonor" (Pvb. 18:3); *le āmio mātagā* "to revel [sinfully]" (II Peter 2:13).

—*āmio pi'opi'o* "perverse" (I Sam. 20:30); *āmio fa'api'opi'o* "crooked" (Philip. 2:15); *ē 'ua āmio fa'api'opi'o* "the faithless" (Pvb. 21:18); *fai le āmio pi'opi'o* "[to] pervert" (Job 33:27).

—*āmio ulavale* "evil (RSV), wickedness (KJV)" (Rom. 1:29), "iniquity" (Rom. 6:19).

On the whole, this evidence constitutes less than overwhelming support for the interpretation that the term *āmio* alone, without qualification, implies "the darker impulses and cruder aspects of experience" (p. 275)--"impulses," perhaps; "darkness" and "crudity," no. The contexts confirm that *āmio* is socially neutral: it denotes a "manner of life" (Ephes. 4:22), inferred from *āmioga* "deeds" (Rom. 8:13). Of the listed compounds, a connotationally negative one (*āmio lēaga*) is, as expected from the argument, the most frequently encountered.[11] However, the most frequently encountered derivative from *aga* is also a connotationally negative one, *agasala* "sin." Since the word *sala* "wrong" brings the negativity to the phrase, Shore could point out that the base *aga* might still denote "virtue"; but he insists that the compounds of *aga* tend to also.

The meaning of *agasala* is best approached through the analysis of a phrase that happens to include both members of the dyad: *āmio lēaga* ma *agasala* "trespasses and sins" (Ephes. 2:1, RSV & KJV). Here, the complementary terms--*āmio leaga* "trespasses" and *agasala* "sins'‘--may refer respectively to actions and tendencies: trespasses can be understood as transgressions of laws; sins, as evidences of a disposition to err.[12] Hence, *āmio lēaga* are outward and visible acts, while *agasala* are inward and spiritual thoughts: *āmio* implies the outer self, the social being; and *aga* implies the inner self, the psychological being. This contrast stands Shore on his head. But the facts do not just leave him wiggling his toes in the air. As we have seen in the case of *āmio*, they buffet him about; and sometimes they flip him onto his feet. For *agasala* are not always "sins"; they can be "trespasses" too. And even "trespasses" can be "sins'‘--as in the "Lords Prayer" (Matt. 6:12, KJV), where violations of divine law are *agasala*, and those of human law, *agalēaga*.[13]

For the current purpose, it matters not that native speakers of English supervised the translation of the Bible into Samoan. The status of their text as the "revealed word of God" gives legitimacy and authority to their diction; the duration and depth of their work with a committee of knowledgeable natives (Turner, 1861: 168-69) ensured that their translation would be accurate in most respects. One of the Samoan members of the committee, Mala'itai, "knew a great deal about the language and customs and old religion of Samoa., which other Samoans did not know, and therefore . . . [the missionaries] were very glad to have his help, and without it

they could not have translated the Bible so well into Samoan" (Barradale 1907:150). A committee of six native pastors revised the Samoan text in 1953-1956 (Faletoese 1961:53).

The Bible constitutes a text from which most Sala'iluans hear or read passages several times a week. Its availability to them, as a frame for their moral judgments, is immediate. However, because the model for the text came from across the seas, the Bible may strike some observers as an unsuitable source for Samoan conceptual material. Other written records would prove useful in filling out the picture. One such record, a manuscript by Penisimane (n.d., probably 1860s), comes from the vicinity of Sātupa'itea (Brown 1915:173), a village about ten kilometers from Sala'ilua. Although the manuscript cannot have influenced modem Sala'iluan thought, its style may be taken for a fair semblance of southwestern Savai'ian linguistic usage of about a century ago.

Penisimane uses compounds of *aga* in several contexts that give clear indications of disapproval; these occur mainly in *fāgono* "tales." In one tale, a man's inadvertent sexual congress with his sister is called his *agamāsesei* "bad conduct" (p. 172).[14] In another text, an eel who has eaten his siblings concedes: *'Ua a'u agavale 'i la tātou 'āiga*, "I've been *agavale* toward our family" (p. 186). In another, a girl who has been raped by her brother calls him *le tamāloa valea 'ua agalēaga lava iā te a'u*, "the crazy man who has really been *agalēaga* to me" (p. 204). In 1972 and 1973, an extremely old but spirited lady of western Savai'i performed the tale in which this last situation occurs.[15] In each of three performances, the girl in the tale says: *'O a'u 'ua agavalea e le tama,* "I myself have been *agavalea*'d by the boy."

Another compound of *aga* occurs in Penisimane's definition of a word, *fa'aagaaganoaina:*

> That's a bad station. It's really good to be *agatonu,* but it's bad to be *fa'aagaaganoaina,* an ugly thing. It's hateful, it's detestable, it's very much aloof from everyone: no one caters to it; people do not befriend it, but they really avoid it.[16]

Although the negative connotations of *fa'aagaaganoaina* could not be clearer, they may support Shore's claim that *aga* involves the social implications of conduct.

A predicted, negative sense of *āmio* is seen in this sentence, also from a tale told by Penisimane: *Fa'auta mai 'i le āmio a Faga ma Lua: e 'ino'ino 'i la lā tama, 'ina 'ua liu pili* "Behold Faga and Lua's *āmio*: they detest their child, because it has become crippled" (p. 89). Unusually, in

view of uses in both contemporary speaking and Biblical writing, *āmio* here denotes an attitude, rather than an action.

Penisimane links *aga* and *āmio* in the definition of another word, the compound term *sealoumänoginogi*: "that's a word applied to a bad-*aga* person, as if he had no pleasant scent, but were malodorous, because there's no good *āmio* there, but just a bad *āmio*."[17] In this commentary, we learn that the absence of a good *āmio* and the presence of a bad *āmio* reveal a bad *aga*. Once again, as with many of the Biblical examples, we find that *aga* comprehends the interior essence of a person, and that other persons can perceive it only through the exterior evidence afforded the senses by *āmio*.

These examples confirm that, in the case of *āmio* and *aga*, Shore has identified a fundamental structure in the Sala'iluan mind; but the facts are messier than the tidiness of his argument implies. By relying only on oral and informal sources, he has missed the connotational correctives that written and formal sources provide.

In chapter 11, Shore examines the meanings of conflict in Sala'ilua. He tries to prove that the murder was not only a crime, but also "an affirmation of Samoan normative categories" (p. 193). The stance that killing one's neighbor achieves affirmative action seems at first untenable, but Shore manages to demonstrate the propriety of violence in the village. He shows that relations of status fit into two sets: symmetrical and complementary. In the first set fall relations of an identical nature, such as those among brothers or among sisters, or--most importantly for understanding the murder--among orators. In the second set fall relations of different natures, such as those between sister and brother, or chief and orator. Bowing in the direction of Bateson's theory of schismogenesis, Shore implies that continued competition between members of a symmetrical set, in the manner of the murderer and the victim for several years before the crime, leads naturally to violence.[18]

The remainder of the chapter on conflict, where Shore begins to find structures within structures, is the most recondite part of the book. To summarize his ideas, he resorts to a two-by-two chart (table 11.2), of which each of the quadrants contains a distinct type of human interconnection, defined according to his criteria. The complementary and symmetrical relationships of the first part of the chapter here divide into the ranked and the unranked to generate four qualitatively different kinds of relationships: "incorporation" (symmetrical, ranked), "competition" (symmetrical, unranked), "authority" (complementary, ranked), and "mutual respect" (complementary, unranked). Shore discusses this differentiation on pp. 211-16. In one of the deepest sentences in the book, he

captures the driving force of Samoan society: "The way of controlling the aggression of . . . symmetrically related units without totally destroying their useful energies is to harness that energy by crosscutting crucial symmetrical relations with stabilizing complementary relations of control" (pp. 218-19). He lists a few symmetrical relations and the complementary crosscutting relations in table 11.4.[19]

In view of the lengths to which Shore goes in probing the significances of his dualities, particularly as they affect symmetrical and complementary relations, it might have been useful for him to have considered salient historical or legendary examples of Sala'iluan dyadic relationships--both between important individuals and among the corporate members of important confederations in the district. The analysis of "Hierarchical Structuring of Relationship Types" (pp. 216-19), an eminently clear but equally cold argument, could benefit from a "fleshing-out" that involved real incidents and real people, portrayed in detail. For the Samoan archipelago as a whole, the periods of the expulsion of the Tongans, and of the dynastic alliances that led to the reign of "Queen" Salamāsina, invite reinterpretation in this respect. We may hope that Shore will some day apply his knowledge to such subjects to produce a structural commentary on Samoan history, perhaps along the lines of the reinterpretation of early regal Hawai'ian history made by Marshall Sahlins (1981).

One figure appropriate for the demonstration of dualities is that of King David (of the Old Testament), a man who holds a powerful, almost archetypal, attraction for Samoans. In the manifestation of characteristics that Shore might accept as evidence of *āmio* and *aga*, he alternately committed great crimes and demonstrated deep contrition for them.[20] It was no accident that Mālietoa Vaiinupō, the first Christian leader of the polity that has become Western Samoa, chose for himself the personal name *Tāvita* "David." The great emotional friendship of the young David--that with his rival, Jonathan, whose love was "wonderful, passing the love of women" (II Sam. 1:26, KJV & RSV)--also bears a symbolic import, which finds expression in Samoan sermon and song. David and Jonathan's relationship was, in Shore's terms, symmetrical and unranked; their intimacy strikes a concordant note in the Samoan understanding of competition.

Since Shore demonstrates, in the quadrated chart, his ability to handle a linked pair of dichotomous qualities, his handling of similarly disposed quantified variables in the examination of moral conflict (appendix A) is surprisingly maladroit. In that discussion, he probes the contrast of "the personal and the social dimensions of experience" (p. 293) through an examination of the opposed "voices" of moral judgment. Having given a questionnaire to 141 schoolchildren of Savai'i,[21] he analyzes the responses

by rough statistical methods; he presents numerical findings in nine tables (A1 through A9). He concludes that "there seems to be a close inverse correlation between the personal voice of desire, an expression of *āmio*, and the more social voice of moral prescription, an expression of *aga*" (p. 299).

In his strongest "correlation," 23 children (16% of the total) said both that thieves should be jailed, and that they themselves would steal if they knew they could get away with the crime.[22] Turning these 23 children into 23 percent (on p. 299), Shore calls this number, and values as low as 10%,"very high figures," which indicate "a striking correlation" (p. 298).

Although desire and the proscription of desire may indeed be mutually dependent in Savai'ian thinking, the "correlation" produced in the responses is no correlation at all. A suitable method for examining the relationship of two dichotomous variables is that of chi square and derivative formulas. Arithmetical manipulation of Shore's figures permits the construction of a two-by-two table requisite for using chi square to test the null hypothesis that the variables are independent. In the case of the 23 little would-be thieves, chi square (corrected for continuity) is 4.91; and at a .05 level of significance, we can reject the null hypothesis. However, we cannot do so at the .01 level. Therefore, we conclude that the observed results are probably significant, and the variables are probably related or associated.

The strength of a relationship between variables is measured by several statistical methods of which the most frequently employed is the coefficient of contingency, *C*. In the case discussed above, $C = .18$. For a two-by-two table, a perfect correlation does not quite reach .71 (Freund 1952:303): the correlation of .18 between a desire to steal and a proscription on theft must therefore be interpreted as weak--not, as Shore would have it, "very high," Since the classifications of table A.9 describe individuals, the correlation of attributes, *r,* which varies from 0 to 1, is also an appropriate statistical tool. In the present case, $r = .19$, which also indicates a weak correlation.

These procedures assume that the sample of Savai'ian schoolchildren was selected randomly from the population of the island. If Shore did not select the 141 respondents at random, then he cannot necessarily use their responses to make valid quantitative inferences about an insular population in the tens of thousands.[23] The problem in administering a questionnaire nonrandomly is epistemological: it is not that the results have no worth, but that the anthropologist cannot weigh their worth by appropriate measures of confidence and validity. The results represent a sample

perfectly, but how well the sample represents the population from which it was drawn remains a mystery.

In chapter 13, "The Esthetics of Social Context: Dual Organization and Expressive Culture," Shore examines Sala'iluan aesthetics, which he seems to equate with the "emotional tone of interactions" (p. 257). He begins with dance. The *siva* "improvised dancing" (reviewer's gloss) attracts *'aiuli* "clowning"; the more grotesque the *'aiuli,* the more dignified the *siva.* The dyad *siva/'aiuli* correlates with that of chief/orator: performing the *siva* befits a chief (or a *tāupou* in her role as chiefly ornament), and performing. the *'aiuli* befits an orator. So patent is this correlation, that dancers of the *'aiuli*--whether men, women, or children; whether titled or not--can be called "orators" (informant's usage, p. 260).

Intercultural evidence supports Shore's distinction of dancing/clowning and its analogy with that of chief/orator. In Tonga, the archipelago south of Samoa, most formal dances are not improvised. Tongans think of improvised dancing as being foreign to their tradition: they call such dancing *tau'olunga,* a Tongan term formed on the model of the Samoan word *taualuga,* which designates the final dance of a party, in which the distinction of *siva/'aiuli* is the most clear. (A high-ranking person leads the final dance, and therein provokes energetic clowning.) To denote the clowning, Tongans have adopted the Samoan term for "orator," *tulāfale*, which they pronounce *tulaufale* (Adrienne Kaeppler: personal communication). In a reminiscence of the Samoan implications of the dyad "male/female," Tongans hold the role of *tulaufule* to be more appropriate for men than for women (Kaeppler 1983:91).

Shore treats only the *siva* (with its *'aiuli),* and thereby gives the impression that it is the only kind of Samoan dancing. While improvised movement characterizes the most frequently encountered styles of Samoan dancing, the islanders do occasionally present formal and rehearsed group-dances. Three genres involve coordinated gesturing: the women's *sāsā*, performed sitting down, has percussive accompaniment;[24] the men's *fa'ataupati,* performed standing up, is likewise accompanied (or has no accompaniment); the *mā'ulu'ulu* requires a mixed chorus disposed in three tiers (sitting, kneeling, standing). Another genre, the *'ailao* "men's club-dance," is performed by a company wielding weapons in synchrony.[25] A distinction of *siva/'aiuli* appears in none of these dances. Descriptions of Samoan dancing in the nineteenth century seem to indicate that other nonimprovised dances existed in the islands.

The contrast of women's and men's coordinated gesture-dances suggests a duality not listed in appendix B: "sitting/standing," as an analogue of "dignity/crudeness." (Shore does list *nofo/gāoioi* [with the latter word

misspelled as *agāioioi*] "sit/move," but the two dualities are not the same.) Such a dyad may also establish the sensibility behind the Samoan stricture of etiquette that it is impolite for a standing person to address at close range a sitting one. It may also explain Samoan resistance to the European custom of rising for the singing of hymns.

Also in chapter 13, Shore treats the phonetic registration of the Samoan language, in which he finds a duality essential to the definition of social interactions: the Samoan phoneme /t/, which reflects Proto-Polynesian /*t/, has a formal allophone [t] and an informal one [k]. At about the middle of the nineteenth century, foreigners began to notice the replacement of [t] with [k].[26] George Brown writes that speaking in the [k], called *'o le nanu fa'a-Tutuila* "Tutuila-jabber," was in 1860 "very rarely heard outside of the Port of Apia and the Tuamasaga district" (Brown 1916:182). S. J. Whitmee adds, "When I went to Samoa in 1863[,] I heard k used on the island of Tutuila, and on the eastern portion of Upolu" (Pratt 1878:1). That foreigners first heard the [k] at a given time does not necessarily reveal anything about the use of [k] among Samoans at that time; but it does, at least., indicate the changing of a linguistic marker of decorum. By the turn of the century, the use of [k] in addressing foreigners had become almost universal: on a tour of Savai'i, including Sala'ilua, A. M. Hocart found the situation "the same as in Upolu, except that a few here and there stuck to their *t's*" (Hocart 1916:42).[27] Shore's guess that the early missionaries chose to represent the /t/ in writing as "t" because it was the culturally preferred form is unquestionably correct.[28]

Shore examines insightfully the contextual implications of the current use of the [t] and the [k]: shifts in pronunciation correlate with shifts in vocabulary, which he illustrates amply, but not exhaustively, in his tables 13.1 and 13.2. The presentation suffers from the employment of a misleading term, "intimate," by which Shore designates the informal register. The [k] is often heard at open and public events--in the delivery of orations, and in the playing of field-games (cricket, rugby)--hardly the sorts of activities that convey notions of intimacy to most speakers of English.

In treating the pronunciation of song-texts, Shore invents a problem where none exists. Whether a social situation is formal or informal ("intimate"), Samoans sing in the [t], not in the [k]. He tries to explain this fact by a circular argument: the preservation of [t]--for use in any linguistic performance--"is linked to European-based institutions (church, schools, pastor, the Bible, books)" (p. 272); and the sung [t] "suggests . . . the coincidence of associating singing with church hymns, hymnals, and the historically older form of pronunciation passed on orally in lyrics" (p. 271). He fails to demonstrate that Samoans actually associate the singing

of secular songs--including bawdy ones--with the singing of hymns. Singing tends universally to be a formally marked speech-event, which, as such in Samoa, requires the [t], no matter how informal the nonlinguistic elements of the situation. Shore does not need to drag "European-based institutions" into the discussion.

When speaking of personality, Samoans tend to refer to "sides" (*itū*) or "parts" *(pito),* rather than to a whole. Shore uses a Manu'an creation-myth and its associated *solo* "intoned poem" to illustrate this tendency, which he explores in chapter 8. The myth depicts human creation as the process of assembling bodies from pieces. Shore takes this depiction as a metaphor and develops a fascinating argument from it, in much the same manner as Freud, who expressed some of his ideas in terms of Greek myths. Shore's insight is that Sala'iluan personality (or, in his nice diction, "the person" in Sala'ilua), like the original bodies in the poem, results from a fragmented development, in which parts mature to an existence independent of the whole (p. 132). A Sala'iluan presents no fixed or focused self to the world, but shows different "sides" in response to different stimuli.

In Shore's view, Samoan behavior is "caused" by external forces, whereas European behavior is "motivated" by internal demands (p. 136): Samoan personalities do not develop into "discrete and self-consistent units"; they become "bundles of different behavioral potentials that are activated in relation to particular social contexts" (p. 143). Shore is so attached to this premise that he denies that the ordinary terms "personality" and "self" can serve as appropriate analytical concepts in understanding Sala'iluan mentation (p. 149). In arguing that the normal Samoan mind is nonintegral, he stakes out an extreme, revolutionary--perhaps impossible--position; and in the coming years, it will be of great intellectual interest to observe how the orthodox psychological establishment responds to his challenge.

Since Shore loads the Manu'an myth and poem with heavy explanatory weight, while failing to show their connection with the village under study, there may be some use in documenting their, history in print. The earliest known text of the *solo* was collected in 1870, by Thomas Powell, from the orator Fofo [= Fofō?] (of 'Ofu Island, Manu'a); it consists of 114 verses or "lines" (for references, see bibliography below). In 1878, S. J. Whitmee published, without attribution, verses 1-17, plus an unattributed English translation. In 1886, Powell at last published the full text, with his English translation and commentary. John Fraser edited and republished the text, with George Pratt's English translation, in 1890; he reprinted it

(with minor changes) in 1897. Ten years later, William Churchill reprinted verses 1-11 of Fraser's second publication, with corrections in punctuation and spelling, plus a reprint and a new translation of verses 16-21. In 1930 and 1969, Margaret Mead republished Pratt's translation of 1890, with newly introduced errors of spelling and punctuation; recently, Marjorie Sinclair published a drastically altered adaptation of Mead's verses 56-69. In 1970 Fitisemanu (a Samoan chief) adapted, without attribution, sections of Powell's translation (verses 13-14 and 16-29). A cognate text was collected about 1895, by Augustin Kraemer, possibly from the lady Matelita (of 'Olosega Island, Manu'a), and from unspecified Tutuilans; Kraemer published it, plus his own German translation, in 1902. An English translation of the German text was issued in a mimeographed edition in the 1940s.[29]

Of these editions, it is Mead's of 1930--the least accurate, and the farthest removed from an indigenous source--that Shore cites. Yet, if any written version had been available to the people of Sala'ilua in the formative years of the murderer and the victim, it would probably have been Kraemer's.[30] Shore cannot easily dismiss the fact that the solo emanates from Manu'a, which it vaunts at the expense of the rest of Samoa (Buelow 1897:376); hence, it is unsuitable for performance by non-Manu'an residents of other districts, although they might know and even quote the first few verses, which possess a universally appreciable majesty of expression. He fails to show that anyone in Sala'ilua is affected by the poem, or cares about it, or even knows it. To say that an author has taken his metaphor from the wrong edition of the wrong version of the wrong poem may seem captious; but in a criminal inquisition, it is of the utmost importance that only relevant evidence be introduced. If Shore's unstated assumption--that Manu'ans wholly resemble Sala'iluans--is not wholly true, then his argument from it is at least partly false.

Although Shore displays dexterity in unraveling the tangled interpersonal strands of the present, he evinces little readiness in trying to understand their past. "Historical explanations deal with events," he writes, but "anthropological mysteries, by contrast, are solved through *structures*" (Shore's emphasis, p. 290).[31] In dealing with the conditions behind one event, the murder of his host, he has made an effort to seek out manuscripts and books (p. xv); but he relies almost exclusively on recent versions of history (as told by villagers) and cites only the most obvious published records for historical evidence.

As a result, the history of crime in Sala'ilua suffers. Shore does mention one well-known murder in Sala'ilua, that of the trader William Fox in 1856; but he fails to note the most famous malefaction in the district,

the murder of as many as twelve foreigners by a man called "Opotuno" (Wilkes 1845, vol. 2, p. 93).[32] In the early twentieth century, a Sala'iluan "chief of small importance," who bore the same title as the murderer in Shore's book, was accused of embezzlement (Rowe 1930:292). Studying this and other criminal information on record could help reveal the character of the village, which Shore admits to be "unusual" (p. 9) and not "typical" (p. 48).[33] Since he has consulted a number of unpublished sources that treat Samoan village-structure (p. 304), we may hope that he will some day tackle another mystery: the extent to which his description of Sala'iluan symbolic action reflects Samoan behavior at large.

Finally, Shore merits acclaim for the very prose of his book, by which he communicates intricate ideas in a style that is always comfortable, engaging, and cogent.[34] The contrast with Margaret Mead, whose academic works often read as if they had been composed by committee, could not be greater.[35] Mead wrote with romance for a popular audience, but with imprecision for a scientific one; Shore combines in one style the grace and imagery that a popular audience enjoys, and the precision and theory that a scientific one demands. Despite a consuming passion for exploring virgin ethnological territory, in order to survey the most abstruse cognitive topologies discoverable, Shore seldom stumbles into the semantic and syntactic brambles that snare and scratch Mead's attempts at serious writing; and students of both anthropology in general and Samoa in particular, together with lovers of the English language, will rejoice.

Jacob Wainwright Love
Cambridge, Massachusetts

NOTES

1. He omits details of the all-night vigil over the body *(leo),* with its rounds of speech-making and hymn-singing; and he does not recognize the other life-cycle observances (such as the *nunu* "first-child ceremonies," and the gift-giving to a *failele* "mother of a newborn child") that must have occurred during his sojourn. He makes nothing of the ephemeral economic transactions of village-life (as opposed to the formal or ceremonial ones, such as the exchange of *tōga* and *'oloa*). He even excludes details that Savai'ians might find indispensable in establishing the tone and authenticity of formal proceedings, such as the names of local chiefly lands *(vāifanua)*, fine mats *('ie tōga)*, kava-cups *(ipu),* and ceremonial hostesses *(tāupou)*.

2. The local congregations and associated organizations rate three paragraphs on page 106; a few references to the church appear passim.

3. The blending of indigenous and introduced customs observed in church--such as in the *Mē* (the annual competitive offering of funds), in the style of homiletic oratory, or in the

tendency (in one parish on Savai‘i at least) for *matai* to partake of Holy Communion in a sequence in which they might otherwise drink the *‘ava*--supplies a marvelous matrix for investigation.

4. Shore paints the victim as a “pillar of morality” (p. 11). But did that pillar stand sufficiently tall to pass the qualifying examination to become A‘oa‘o Fesoasoani, so as to be licensed to lead the service in the absence of the pastor? did the murderer? Did either man achieve the status of deacon? Did one or the other attempt to gain sponsorship (and control) of the *‘autalavou?* How did the rivalry manifest itself in the competition to donate funds to the pastor’s family? The answers to these and related questions might shed additional light on the mystery.

5. The Biblical “New Testament/Old Testament,” as an analogue of “dignity/crudeness,” belongs among these pairs. In the Christian interpretation (as taught at Mālua, the Samoan seminary), many of the images conveyed by the Old Testament provide raw representations of reality that unrefinedly prefigure the unalloyed truth of the New Testament. For example, the passover-lamb, sacrificed for the sake of the people of Israel (Exodus 12:21-27), symbolizes the figure of Jesus as Christ, sacrificed for the sake of all people (Mark 14:24, I Cor. 5:7, Heb. 9:23-24); wherefore Jesus is mystically depicted as a lamb (Rev. 5:6-14).

6. He comments more fully on the latter pair in Shore 1981, a paper that succinctly treats many of the points of duality that are at issue in the present book.

7. He cites five disruptive compounds of *āmio* but only two nondisruptive ones. He discounts two nondisruptive compounds in Pratt’s dictionary: *āmio ali‘i* “polite‘‘--he buttresses his argument by citing instead *aga ali‘i* “chiefly action”--and *āmio tama‘ita‘i* “ladylike” (reviewer’s spellings). He ignores Pratt’s (many) negative compounds of *aga,* such as *aga fa‘aletino* “sensual,” *aga fa‘apua‘a* “piggish, thoughtless,” *aga fa‘avalea* “foolish,” *aga mālosi* “gruff,” *aga tele* “abusive,” and *agavale* “left-handed, thoughtless” (reviewer’s spellings and glosses).

8. Aware that generalizations based on a nonrandom sample are not necessarily valid, the reviewer offers these observations with diffidence and regret; he takes solace in the fact that the sample exhaustively covers the part of the New Testament that gives moral instruction, the Epistles. Samoan terms quoted from the Bible in this review have been edited to conform with standard orthography (Milner 1966), as interpreted by the reviewer; the English glosses quote the Revised Standard Version (RSV), except where the King James Version (KJV) is indicated. One neutral phrase was encountered: *āmio fa‘anu‘u‘ese* “live like a Gentile” (Gal. 2: 14). Unmodified, *āmio* is glossed “[to] behave” (II Cor. 1:2) and “[to] live” (Rom. 8:12-13); *āmioga*, “deeds” (Rom. 8:13), “what he has done” (II Cor. 5:10), and “manner of life” (Ephes. 4:22). Another example is at Rom. 15:18.

9. Uniquely glossed instances of *āmiotonu* are found at Rom. 3:25, 3:26, and 5:18; I Cor. 1:30; II Cor. 9:10; Philip. 3:9; I Tim. 3:16; and Titus 1:8 and 2:12. For *le āmiotonu* “righteousness,” the citations can be expanded to include Rom. 3:10. 3:21-22, 4:5, 4:9, 4:11, 4:13, 4:22, 5:17, 6:16, 6:18-20, 8:10, 9:28 (KJV), 9:30-31, 10:3, 10:5-6, and 14:17; II Cor. 6:14 and 11:15; and II Tim. 2:22, 3:16, and 4:8. For *ta‘uāmiotonuina* “justified,” the citations also include Rom. 3:4, 3:24, 3:28, 4:2, 5:1, 5:9, and 8:30.

10. The unique instances in the sample are: *āmio fa‘aletino* “worldly” (Jude 19); *āmio fa‘amataaitu* “licentiousness” (II Peter 2:7); [*e*] *āmio faigōfie* “being simple [as opposed to

wise]" (Pvb. 1:22; potentially positive, this phrase has a negative connotation in the context); *āmio paʻaʻā* "overbearing" (I Peter 2:18); *āmio valea* "foolishness" (Eccles. 7:25); *le fa* "a shew of wisdom (KJV)" (Coloss. 2:23); and *tagata faʻafiaāmiotonu* "hypocrites" (Matt. 6:2). Uniquely glossed instances of *āmio lēaga* are found at Ps. 107:17 and 107:42, Rom. 1:29, Ephes. 5:5, and II Thess. 2:8.

11. Another negative phrase, *āmio māsesei*, appears in Congregational hymn 168, but did not turn up in the search of the Bible: however, *aga māsesei* "bad conduct, troublesome," an apparently synonymous phrase based on *aga,* may occur more frequently in hymns (see Anonymous n.d.: nos. 141, 142, 173, and 241); and *aga māsesei* is the only member of this pair listed in Pratt's and Milner's dictionaries.

12. Exegesis of the (original) Greek terms--*paraptómata* "trespasses" and *hamartíai* "sins"--has perplexed readers since Augustine (354-430). At the time of the initial translation of the Samoan Bible, the prevailing distinction, which the missionaries undoubtedly discussed with their Samoan colleagues, was that "trespasses" (*āmio lēaga*) referred only to "concrete acts," while "sins" *(agasala),* the more general term, included "the sinful disposition"; modem scholarship treats the terms as possibly synonomous (Abbott 1897:39).

13. Note also the phrase *ʻua mātou agasala atu ʻi le Aliʻi* "we have sinned against the Lord" (Deut. 1:41): Samoan Christians do not--cannot--"sin" *(agasala)* against human beings. Aside from the positive derivatives of *aga* that Shore lists, the Bible has: *agamalū* "gentle" (Thess. 2:7), "meek" (Matt. 5:5), "kind" (I Cor. 13:4); and *le agamalū* "gentleness" (I Tim. 6:11), "kindness" (Rom. 2:4): but it also has the unpredicted terms *aga e sesē* "deceitful spirits" (I Tim. 4:1), and *agapiʻopiʻo* "perverse" (Pvb. 3:32), "unjust" (Pvb. 29:27). An expected social sense figures in an unusual gloss of *agalelei:* "[to bestow]" (Ephes. 1:6, phrased *ʻua agalelei fua mai* "he has freely bestowed on us").

14. All terms quoted from Penisimane's manuscript have been edited and glossed here by the reviewer; most of the editorial changes involve the addition of apostrophes (signs of the glottal stop), macrons, and punctuation marks. Except for these tokens of orthographic precision, Penisimane's spellings almost reach perfection; the man must have written with a fine understanding of the sounds of his language.

15. She was the granddaughter of Malaʻitai, one of the Samoan members of the committee that assisted in translating the Bible; she tended him in his old age, and learned much from him.

16. " *ʻO le tū lēaga lea. E lelei lava ona agatonu, ʻa e lēaga ona faʻaagaaganoaina, ʻo le mea mātagā. ʻUa itagia, ʻua ʻinosia, ʻua matuā ʻalofia lava ʻi tagata ʻuma: ʻua lē taʻitaʻi ane ʻi ai se tasi; ʻua lē faʻauōtia e tagata, ʻa ʻua faʻaʻesea lava"* (p. 476). Penisimane spells *faʻaagaaganoaina* with the indicated reduplication *(aga+aga),* not by joining the nominalizing suffix *-ga* to the base *(aga+ga):* on these distinctions, see Shore, chapter 9, fn. 5, p, 312.

17. *ʻO le ʻupu faʻatusa lea ʻi le tagata agalēaga, peiseaʻī ʻua lē ai sina manogi ʻo iā te ia, ʻa ʻua nāmulēaga, ʻauā ʻua lē ai se āmio lelei, ʻa ʻua nā ʻo le āmio lēaga* (p. 269).

18. In his discussion of the social structure of exchange (pp. 203-7), Shore provides the neatest available treatment of complementary formal exchange-goods, *tōga* and *ʻoloa.*

19. Samoan spatial orientation is rife with examples of crosscutting lines, such as the general seating-plan of a *fono,* where rival orators face each other, or sit in a row facing the same

direction, and chiefs may repose at the axis perpendicular to their line of sight. The architecture of many Samoan churches--by which the floor-plan takes the shape of a cross--permits the pastor to stand opposite the adult members of the congregation (in the nave), while children sit at the perpendicular axis (in the "wings" of the transept).

20. Consider the arbitrary massacre of two-third of the Moabites (II Sam. 8:2), and the sending of Bathsheba's husband into battle to be slain so David could marry her (II Sam. 11:15); for an example of contrition, see II Sam. 12:13.

21. One of the minor mysteries of the book is "The Case of the Missing Schoolchild." According to Shore's disclosure (in table A.1, and in chapter 3, fn. 2, p. 304), 141 children took part in the survey; but, again by explicit statement (p. 293), only 140 did so. On page xv, there are said to have been "approximately" 140 schoolchildren. Table A.1, question 2, supports both totals: addition of the columns of respondents yields a total of 141 children, but recalculation from the relationship of percent in the "true" column yields a total of 140. Perhaps the missing child was only an approximate child.

22. This response is akin to item 135 (or J-45) of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory: "If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do it" (Dahlstrom et al. 1972:431). Adult Americans honestly responding tend to agree with that statement and other statements like it. (Disagreement elevates the "lie" scale of the protocol.) Stealing in Samoa may be a greater crime than sneaking into a movie in America, but that only 32 of 141 Savai'ian children honestly responding (figures from table A.8) would admit to a desire for stealing, seems peculiar, in light of the American findings of the MMPI.

23. Since Shore had good reason to believe that several dualities--especially "female/male" and "chief/orator'--might affect Savai'ian perception of moral behavior, he should have selected a sample stratified by SEX and main parental political affiliation; he should also have controlled for age (it would not have been appropriate to have let the mean age of the boys be 14 years, and that of the girls, 9 years); he might have controlled for other attributes pertinent to notions of morality, such as the religious dyad, "Roman/Protestant."

24. Photographs of the performance of Samoan women's sitting-dances are reproduced at Kraemer 1902:37 and 1903:314, 318, 322, Scheuermann 1926:#99, and elsewhere. The significance of two photographs of men sitting in a row, dancing with a *tāupou* at the center (Kraemer 1903:325 and Scheuermann 1926:#98), is not known; likewise, a photograph of men sitting in a row, dancing with a *mānaia* at the center (Kraemer 1902:35).

25. This reviewer has seen performances of the first two genres; the last two were common through the 1920s and 1930s but are infrequently performed today. Robert Flaherty filmed a performance of an *'ailao* in 1925-1926; cut into segments of a few seconds each, that performance can be seen in his film *Moana.* Photographs of the performance of an *'ailao* appear at Scheuermann 1926:#103-4, Rehearsed group-dances frequently appear today in programs presented by schoolchildren.

26. The allophonic use of [k] probably developed after a shift from PSO /*k/ to SAM [?] had freed for other uses the sound of [k]. In modern SAM, speaking in the [t] can be said to be "marked" behavior, and speaking in the [k], "unmarked"; but unless the phonetic instability of /t/ goes back beyond the beginnings of SAM (and it might, in view of reflexes of

PPN /*t/ in LUA, HAW, and MQA), the situation must once--perhaps as recently as the middle of the nineteenth century--have been the reverse.

27. A shift from [t] to [k] took place also in Hawai‘i. By the early nineteenth century the [k] had become so thoroughly adopted there (and perhaps so little identified with contextual marking), that the missionaries chose to represent the prevailing reflex of PPN /*t/ as “k” in writing; the HAW [t] continued to be used in singing. In 1926, the ethnomusicologist Helen H. Roberts--although beguiled by the common belief that “on Kauai and Niihau formerly *t* was a regular substitution for *k,*” a belief that got the facts right but the interpretation backward--concluded, correctly, “this use of a *t* sound in chanting, or its modification, would indicate that the sound was once common to the people of all the islands, possibly in an earlier home” (Roberts 1926:72-73). Examples of the HAW [t], sung in several performances by a man born in 1845, appear on a recently issued audio-disk (Tatar 1981). In Luangiuan, reflexes of PPN /*t/ are pronounced [k], in both speaking and singing.

28. On the exceptional use of [k] in the formal register, he may err in suggesting (p. 268) that SAM *saka* “to boil” predates European contact: (1) the word does not appear in the earliest Samoan lexicons; and (2) the nineteenth-century missionary George Pratt, a careful lexicographer, states that other words, *puke* and *puketa* [= *puketā*], “were the only instances in which the *k* was used [formally] until the recent corruption of *t* into *k*” (Pratt 1878 and 1911, s.v. “PUKE”; Pratt expresses a similar judgment in the first edition, 1862).

29. The myth has also had a variegated history in print. Shore seems to recognize no importance in the fact that the version he quotes is particular to Manu‘a (and hence, in “meaning,” likely to stand at a far remove from the sensibilities of Sala‘ilua), and that another version he cites (Stuebel’s) is particular to Lufilufi, ‘Upolu. An uncited version from closer at hand--Sāhune, Savai‘i--was published by Wilhelm von Buelow (1899).

30. As a part of German Samoa in the early twentieth century, Sala‘ilua was more closely linked to German publishing than to American; even after German rule gave way to that of New Zealand, the remaining German settlers continued to maintain contacts with their homeland. In 1971, this reviewer interviewed a prominent Western Samoan catechist who proudly displayed his copy of Kraemer’s book (bound in the original covers, not those used in a post-1945 binding, which identifies copies of the book recently offered for sale) but said he had not seen any of the writings of Margaret Mead. Kraemer’s version of the poem, and several other versions (including Mead’s), are now available in the Nelson Memorial Library, Apia.

31. Aficionados of intellectual history will relish a comparison of these wisdoms with the opposed opinions of Marshall Sahlins, one of Shore’s teachers: “Anthropologists rise from the abstract structure to the explication of the concrete event. Historians devalue the unique event in favor of underlying recurrent structures” (1983:534).

32. In a short discussion of these crimes and their consequences, the historian R. P. Gilson identifies the man as “Popotunu” and credits him with the titles “Tualau” and “Tonumaipe‘a” (1970: 152-56).

33. The boast of Sala‘iluans (pp. 12 and 289) that their village is so extraordinary as to be a “second Apia” *(Apia Lua),* a replica of the national capital, may have originated as a pun on *Apialua,* the name of the local unmarried-women’s organization (listed at Kraemer 1902:33).

34. In the printing of Samoan words, a few of the usual kinds of misprints manage to turn up: [1] addition of an unwanted glottal stop (*ʻaugānofo,* for *augānofo* "title-succession line" [from *au* "to continue," not *ʻau* "to send"], p. 83; *ʻuiga,* for *uiga* "meaning, manner," [from *ui* "to go along," not **ʻui*], p. 140); [2] omission of a wanted glottal stop (*i* "in" for *ʻi* "to," p. 64; *uʻu* "oil" for *ʻuʻu* "mollusc-shell used by women to split pandanus-leaves for plaiting," in the phrase *matua ʻuʻu* [better, *matuāʻu* or *matua-a-ʻuʻu*] " *ʻuʻu*-elder," p. 105; *Upolu* for *ʻUpolu,* p. 219; *o* "of" for *ʻo* "[focus-particle, indicating an appositive in the context]," p. 221); [3] addition of an unwanted macron (*pāolo* for *paolo* "affines," p. 20; *māota* for *maota* "chiefs house," p. 79; *tāgata* for *tagata* [despite the alleged pun, on *tā gata* "to strike snakes" and *tagata* "person"], p. 131; *lāgona* for *lagona* "to feel," p. 168; *mamāfa* for *mamafa* "heavy," p. 225; *āfio* for *afio,* p. 265; *Faleālupo* for *Falealupo* [i.e., *Fale-a-lupo* "*Lupo*-house, *Lupo*-town"; cf. Faleapuna, Faleasiʻu, etc.], p. 269); [4] omission of a wanted macron (*fa* for *fā* " ʻbye," p. 13; *ʻauala* "path" for *ʻāuala* "obsequies, bier," p. 21; *Āsaga* for *Asaga,* p. 56; *faiavā* for *faiāvā* "affine," p. 63; *matuatala* for *matuātala* "house-ends," p. 79; *fasi igoa* "name-beater" for *fāsi igoa* "name-pieces," p. 82; *tamatane* for *tamatāne* "descendants of a brother," p. 91; *ʻaumaga* "cluster of forks [?]" for *ʻaumāga* "untitled-men's organization," p. 101; *lavalava* for *lāvalava* "kilt," p. 109; *tuaʻoi* for *tuāʻoi*, p. 133; *faʻapouliuli* for *faʻapōuliuli* "heathen," p. 158; *sese* for *sesē* "wrong," p. 168; *sa* "[pronominal particle]" for *sā* "[past-tense marker]," p. 170; *filemū* for *fīlēmū* "peace," p. 171; *matou* and *tatou* for *mātou* and *tātou*, p. 195; *alataua* for *alātaua* [or *ala-a-taua*] "warpath," p. 217; *taupou* for *taupou* [or *tāupōu*] "ceremonial hostess" [though Shore avoids the common barbarism, *taupo*], passim; *Lafai* & *Sālafai* for *Lāfai* & *Sālāfai*, p. 305); and [5] misspelling (*susī* for *susū* "to come, to go [polite]," p. 249). The English text exhibits a remarkably small number of misprints, the trickiest of which is perhaps "consideration" for "condition" (p. 201, line 8), and the queerest of which is perhaps "homeoerotic" for "homerotic" (p. 230).

35. Take, for example, the first words of her ethnography *Social Organization of Manuʻa:* "The Samoan social organization is an amalgamation and recombination of several distinct principles; the principle of hereditary rank; the functions and privileges of relationship groups; and the recognition of the organized village community with rights and privileges of its own" (Mead 1969:10). What can she be trying to say here? How does a society "amalgamate" its principles? And when have those principles previously been combined in order perpetually to be "recombined"? Can a "function" really be a principle? can a "privilege"? can a "recognition"? (And let us forbear to think on that first semicolon!) Compare Shore's first words: "An alien culture is inevitably a mystery[,] and its comprehension can aptly be described as a piece of detective work" (p. xiii). Although Samoans may be sorry to learn that their culture is alien, they--and any reader--will have no difficulty in appreciating the passage.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, T[homas]. K[ingsmill]., 1897. *A Critical and Exegetic Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; reprinted, 1968.

Anonymous, n.d. *O Pese ma Viiga i le Atua.* Malua, Western Samoa: Malua Press.

Barradale, V. A., 1907. *Pearls of the Pacific, Being Sketches of Missionary Life and Work in Samoa and other Islands in the South Seas.* London: London Missionary Society.

Berger, Milton M[iles]., ed., 1978. *Beyond the Double Bind[:] Communication and Family Systems, Theories, and Techniques with Schizophrenics.* New York: Brunner / Mazel.

Brown, George, 1915. "Some Nature Myths from Samoa." *Folk-lore* 26: 172-81.

———, 1916. "Remarks on Samoan Sound Changes." *Man* 16: 181-83.

Buelow, Wilhelm von, 1897. "Samoanische Schoepfungssage: und Urgeschichte." *Globus* 71:375-79.

———, 1899. "Die Samoanische Schoepfungssage." *Internationales Archiv fuer Ethnologie* 12:58-66.

Churchill, William, 1907. *Weather Words of Polynesia.* Lancaster (PA): American Anthropological Association, Memoir II.

Dahlstrom, W[illiam]. Grant, George Schlager Welsh, and Leona E. Dahlstrom, 1972. *An MMPI Handbook[:] Vol. I: Clinical Interpretation,* rev. edn. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Faletoese, K. T., 1961. *Tala Faasolopito o le Ekalesia Samoa (L.M.S.).* Malua, Western Samoa: Malua Printing Press.

Fitisemanu, Seiuli Le-Tagaloatele, 1970. *The Sacred Hens and Other Legends of Samoa,* ed. Glen Wright. Apia, Western Samoa.

Fraser, John, ed., 1890. "Some Folk-Songs and Myths from Samoa." *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of N.S.W.* 24:206-17.

———, 1897. "Some Folk-Songs and Myths from Samoa." *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 6:19-32.

Freund, John E., 1952. *Modern Elementary Statistics.* Englewood Cliffs (NJ): Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Gilson, R[ichard]. P[hillip]., 1970. *Samoa 1830 to 1900[:] The Politics of a Multi-Cultural Community.* Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Hocart, A[rthur]. M[aurice]., 1916. "A Samoan Sound Change." *Man* 16:42-43.

Kaeppler, Adrienne, 1983. *Polynesian Dance[s] with a Selection for Contemporary Performances.* Honolulu: Alpha Delta Kappa.

Kaeppler, Adrienne, 1983. *Polynesian Dance with a Selection for Contemporary Performances.* Honolulu: Alpha Delta Kappa.

Mead, Margaret, 1930. *Social Organization of Manua.* Honolulu: Bishop Museum, Bulletin 76; reprinted, 1969.

Milner, G[eorge]. B[ertram]., 1966. *Samoan Dictionary.* London: Oxford University Press.

Penisimane, n.d. Sydney, N.S.W.: The Mitchell Library, MS 1686-25.

Powell, Thomas, 1886. "A Samoan Tradition of Creation and the Deluge." *Journal of the Victoria Institute* 20:145-175.

Pratt, George, 1878. *A Grammar and Dictionary of the Samoan Language,* 2nd edn., ed. S[amuel]. J[ames]. Whitmee. London: Truebner & Co.

_____, 1911. *Pratt's Grammar and Dictionary of the Samoan Language,* 4th edn., ed. J[ames]. E. Newell. Malua, Western Samoa: Malua Printing Press; reprinted, 1960.

Roberts, Helen H[effron]., 1926. *Ancient Hawaiian Music.* Honolulu: Bishop Museum, Bulletin 29.

Rowe, Newton Allan, 1930. *Samoa Under the Sailing Gods.* New York: Putnam.

Sahlins, Marshall, 1981. *Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities[:] Structure in the Early History of the Sandwich Islands Kingdom*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. ASAO Special Publications, 1.

_____, 1983. "Other Times, Other Customs: The Anthropology of History." *American Anthropologist* 85:517-44.

Scheuermann, Erich, 1926. *Samoa[:] Ein Bildwerk.* Horn in Baden: Selbst-Verlag Erich Scheuermann.

Shore, Bradd, 1981. "Sexuality and Gender in Samoa: Conceptions and Missed Conceptions," in Sherry B. Ortner and Harriet Whitehead, *Sexual Meanings[:] The Cultural Construction of Gender and Sexuality*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, Marjorie, ed., 1982. The Path of the Ocean[:] Traditional Poetry of Polynesia. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Tatar, Elizabeth, ed., 1981. *Na Leo Haawai'i Kahiko[:] Voices of Old Hawai'i.* Honolulu: Bishop Museum, Audio-Recording Collection Series, No. 1.

Turner, George, 1861. *Nineteen Years in Polynesia[:] Missionary Life, Travels, and Researches in the Islands of the Pacific.* London: John Snow.

Whitmee, S[amuel]. J[ames]., 1878. "On some Characteristics of the Malayo-Polynesians." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 7:372-78.

Wilkes, Charles, 1845. *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition. During the Years 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842.* Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard, 1845. 5 vols.

A Response by Bradd Shore

Reviewing books, especially long ones, is frequently an onerous scholarly duty, taxing already strained work schedules. My thanks go to the three scholars who agreed to critique *Sala'ilua* in these pages. I am particularly grateful to Jacob Love, whose careful and thoughtful review reveals, even in its critical moments, a sympathetic grasp of the approach and the questions that are at the heart of the book. Quite a few questions are raised by the reviews, several requiring extended response, and others more cursory treatment. I'll begin with methodological and organizational issues, leaving the more substantive and theoretical matters for last.