

SPECIAL ISSUE INTRODUCTION

**‘ATAMAI-LOTO, MOE FAKA‘OFO‘OFA-‘AONGA:
TONGAN TĀ-VĀ TIME-SPACE PHILOSOPHY OF MIND-HEART AND
BEAUTY-UTILITY**

Pā‘utu-‘O-Vava‘u-Lahi
Adriana Māhanga Lear
University of Wollongong

Kolokesa Uafā Māhina-Tuai
Lagi-Maama Academy & Consultancy

Sione Lavenita Vaka
Auckland University of Technology

Maui-TāVā-He-Akó
Tēvita O. Ka‘ili
Brigham Young University Hawai‘i

This collection of critical essays seeks to explore as a text some key aspects of Tongan concepts and practices of the sino body, ‘atamai mind, and loto heart, on the one hand, and faiva performance, tufunga material, and nimamea‘a fine arts, on the other hand, in the broader context of Indigenous Tongan Tā-Vā Time-Space Philosophy of Reality. These physical–bodily, psychological–emotional, and social–cultural, and artistic and literary aspects will be reflected upon at the fakafelavai intersection, or fakahoko connection and fakamāvae separation, of ontology (i.e., ways of being) and epistemology (i.e., ways of knowing) and

of beauty/quality (i.e., what is of knowledge) and utility/functionality (i.e., what does of knowledge). As inseparable but indispensable temporal–spatial, formal–substantial, and functional–practical entities, ontology and beauty/quality are considered to be taking the lead over epistemology and utility/functionality, in that logical order of precedence.

Talakamata Introduction

THIS COLLECTION OF ORIGINAL ESSAYS critically focuses on the specific Indigenous Tongan Tā-Vā philosophy of mind and heart, i.e., psychology and psychiatry, as well as beauty/quality and utility/functionality of art and literature, derived from the general Indigenous Tongan (and Moanan Oceanian) Tā-Vā Time-Space Philosophy of Reality. The general Indigenous Tongan Tā-Vā Time-Space Philosophy of Reality is based in tā and vā, translated as time and space, and dwells at the fakafelavai intersection, i.e., fakahoko connection and fakamāvae separation,¹ of epistemology (or “ways of knowing”) and ontology (or “ways of being”). By mediating both epistemology and ontology, it calls into question the classical dispute between “reality as we know it” and “reality as it is,” in which the fundamental issue is not “how we know what we know,” “when we know what we know,” “where we know what we know,” or “why we know what we know” but rather “what we really know.” The former four issues are the broader earmarks of German Idealism and French Rationalism as mind-dependent philosophies, and the latter issue is the particular hallmark of Tongan (and Moanan Oceanian) Tāvāism and Sydney Realism as reality-based philosophies. The same applies to the specific Indigenous Tongan Tā-Vā philosophy of ‘atamai mind and loto heart, i.e., psychology and psychiatry, as well as art and literature by way of beauty and utility, which take into account the gamut of reality in both their partiality and their totality.² Because it is reality based, the Indigenous Tongan Tā-Vā Time-Space Philosophy of Reality embraces both time and space as ontological entities that are considered the common vaka mediums, vessels, or vehicles of the existences of all things. As epistemological identities, tā time and vā space are socially organized in different ways across cultures (and languages), and knowledge is knowledge of time and space. Tā Time and vā space—like fuo form and uho content, in which tā time and fuo form are verbs and definers of vā space and uho content that are, in turn, nouns and composers of tā time and fuo form—are indivisible but unavoidable ontological and epistemological entities on both abstract and concrete levels. All things stand in eternal relations of exchange, giving rise to felekeu/fepaki conflict and maau/fenāpasi order, variously manifested by way of fakamāvae separation and fakahoko connection, i.e., fakafelavai intersection; mata eye and ava hole, i.e., mata-ava eye-hole; and inseparable albeit indispensable hoa pairs/binaries, i.e.,

hoakehekehe/hoatamaki opposite/different/dissimilar and hoatau/hoamālie equal/same/similar pairs/binaries. It is therefore in the variations of distinctions and relations, viz., exchange relations, mata-ava eye-hole, and hoa pairs/binaries, that *ivi* energy as *me'a* matter is dense and intense in reality. These material–physical, psychological–emotional, and social–cultural tendencies are mediated through sustained *tatau* symmetry and *potupotutatau* harmony in the production of *mālie/faka'ofa'ofa* beauty and utility, transforming them from a condition of *felekeu/fepaki* chaos to a situation of *maau/fenāpasi* order. Both *felekeu/fepaki* conflict and *maau/fenāpasi* order are of the same logical order, in which order is a form of conflict defined as when two or more equal and opposite energies, forces, or tendencies meet at a common point that is defined by a state of *noa* 0, or zero point.

The classical dispute between the “ways of knowing of reality,” involving the *hows*, *whens*, *wheres*, and *whys*, and the “ways of being of reality,” i.e., “reality in and of itself,” in which the former cannot be done in isolation from the latter, is the ultimate measure of the knowledge of reality. Both the Tongan (and Moanan Oceanian) “ways of knowing/feeling of mind and heart,” i.e., psychology and psychiatry, as well as beauty and utility³ of art and literature, is based on the “ways of working of reality.” From a *tāvāist* philosophical view, ‘*ilo* knowledge is ‘*ilo* knowledge of *tā* time and *vā* space, and of ‘*iai* reality. The acquisition of ‘*ilo* knowledge is done in the material–physical, intellectual–emotional, and social–cultural process of *ako* education as a philosophy. It is defined as a *tā-vā* time-space, *fuo-uho* form-content (and *ngāue-‘aonga* practical–functional) transformation of the *fakakaukau* thinking in the ‘*uto* brain and *ongo* feeling in the *fatu/mafu* heart (in plural and circular ways) from *vale* ignorance, to ‘*ilo* knowledge, to *poto* skill. In this, knowledge production precedes knowledge application, and the former is critical–classical and the latter is practical–technical, in that logical order of precedence.⁴ That is, *ako* education is primarily concerned with things as they really or objectively are, in reality, as opposed to their imagining as we prefer them to be, ideally or subjectively.

However, as a specific Indigenous Tongan *Tā-Vā* Time-Space Philosophy of Reality, both beauty and utility of art and literature embrace *tā* time and *vā* space by way of *fuo* form and *uho* content within and across the spectrum of reality, be it *faiva* performance, *tufunga* material, and *nimemea‘a* fine arts. By embracing both *tā* time and *vā* space, on the abstract level, and *fuo* form and *uho* content, on the concrete level, both art and literature are therefore four-dimensional rather than three-dimensional—that is, *ta‘etā* timeless and *ta‘efuo* formless—when in reality they are temporal–spatial and formal–substantial (and *ngāue-‘aonga* practical–functional) in *modus operandi*. All forms of art and literature are subject to *tā* time and *fuo* form as verbs (or action led)

and definers of *vā* space and *uho* content, which are nouns (or object based) and composers of *tā* time and *fuo* form, all as inseparable *hoa* pairs/binaries (see essay 2). *Tā-vā* Time-space and *fuo-uho* form-content relate to “what art and literature are,” i.e., art and literary work, whereas *ngāue-‘aonga* practicality-functionality is linked to both “what art and literature are for,” i.e., art and literary use, and “what art and literature are by means of,” i.e., art and literary history, logically in that order of precedence. The former is concerned with beauty/quality and the latter two are concerned with the utility/functionality of art and literature. Thus, art and literature deal by way of *‘ilo* knowledge with *‘ilo* knowledge of *tā* time and *vā* space, in which reality is orderly in arrangement because of beauty/quality succeeded by utility/functionality.

Tongan *ako* education⁵ and *‘aati* art (and *litilesā* literature) were synonymous in ancient/old Tonga in that they were special ways of life closely aligned with each other by way of *ha‘a* professional classes across the three main genres: *ha‘a faiva* professional performance arts or artists, *ha‘a tufunga* professional material arts or artists, and *ha‘a nimamea‘a* professional fine arts or artists. This ancient axis, viz., *ha‘a* professional-led *ako* education, was slowly but purposely changed by missionaries, proceeding contact with Europe through colonialism and imperialism as political and economic agendas, into *‘apiako* school-based education that is conducted by means of subjects mainly across the social and physical sciences and mathematics. The general thrust of this shift is duly reflected in the states of both *ako* education and *‘aati* art (and *litilesā* literature), as well as in the negligence and exclusion of both *‘atamai* mind and *loto/fatu/mafu* heart—i.e., Tongan psychology and psychiatry and the imposition of Western ways of seeing things on Tongan art and literature in terms of beauty/quality and utility/functionality—especially in academia and the school curriculum. As a critical response, we set out in this collection to counter this adverse trend, reflecting on Tongan ways of knowing and doing Tongan *‘atamai* mind and *loto/fatu/mafu* heart or psychology and psychiatry on the one hand and Tongan *‘aati* and *litilesā* literature on the other hand by way of beauty/quality and utility/functionality in mediation with other ways of knowing, seeing, and doing things, especially of the West.

The collection is made up of seven essays on Tongan *‘atamai* mind and *loto/fatu/mafu* heart or psychology and psychiatry followed by beauty/quality and utility/functionality of art and literature, which are critically examined in *tāvaist* philosophical ways:

1. “Sino, ‘Ilo, Moe Ongo: Body, Knowing, and Feeling” by Pā‘utu-‘O-Vava‘u-Lahi, Adriana Māhanga Lear; Kolokesa Uafā Māhina-Tuai; Sione Lavenita Vaka; Maui-TāVā-He-Akó, Tēvita O. Ka‘ili; and Hūfanga-He-Ako-Moe-Lotu, Ōkusitino Māhina

2. “Tongan Hoa: Inseparable Yet Indispensable Pairs/Binaries” by the same authors
3. “Sio FakaTonga ‘ae ‘Aati FakaTonga: Tongan Views of Tongan Arts” by Pā‘utu-‘O-Vava‘u-Lahi, Adriana Māhanga Lear; Manuesina ‘Ofakihautolo Māhina; Kolokesa Uafā Māhina-Tuai; and Hūfanga-He-Ako-Moe-Lotu, ‘Ōkusitino Māhina
4. “Loto, Tu‘a, Moe Fale: Inside, Outside, and House” by Tavakefai‘ana, Sēmisi Fetokai Potauaine; Bruce Sione To‘a Moa; Sione Lavenita Vaka; and Hūfanga-He-Ako-Moe-Lotu, ‘Ōkusitino Māhina
5. “Vaka, Fale, Moe Kava: Boat, House, and Kava – Mana Structures, Mana Spaces” by the same authors
6. “Siueli ‘oe Pasifiki: Jewel of the Pacific – A Sung Poetry of Praise and Rivalry” by Pā‘utu-‘O-Vava‘u-Lahi, Adriana Māhanga Lear; Sione Lavenita Vaka; Maui-TāVā-He-Akó, Tēvita O. Ka‘ili; and Hūfanga-He-Ako-Moe-Lotu, ‘Ōkusitino Māhina
7. “Tuaikaepau: ‘Slow-but-Sure’ – A Sung and Danced Poetry of Tragedy” by the same authors
8. “Lofia, Koe Kumi Tu‘i: The Search for a King – A Sung and Danced Poetry of Tragedy” by the same authors
9. “Faiva Lovā‘alo: Performance Art of Rowing” by Pā‘utu-‘O-Vava‘u-Lahi, Adriana Māhanga Lear; Maui-TāVā-He-Akó, Tēvita O. Ka‘ili; and Hūfanga-He-Ako-Moe-Lotu, ‘Ōkusitino Māhina

In essay 1, “Sino, ‘Ilo, Moe Ongo: Body, Knowing, and Feeling,” the authors deal with Tongan ‘atamai mind and loto/fatu/mafu heart, or Tongan psychology and psychiatry, as well as their bearings on both the beauty/quality and the utility/functionality of Tongan ‘aati art (and litilesā literature), informed by the Indigenous Tongan Tā-Vā Philosophy of Reality. Specifically, they enquire into ‘ilo knowing in the ‘uto brain and ongo feeling in the loto/fatu/mafu heart, all situated in the sino body. These fakafelavai intersecting (or fakahoko connecting and fakamāvae separating) psychological-emotional, physical-bodily, and social-cultural entities, identities, or tendencies are organic yet mediated in both their individuality and their totality as a *modus operandi* for a common purpose. The ‘ilo knowledge as ‘ilo knowledge of reality, i.e., tā-vā time-space, is channeled through the five ongo‘anga, senses—viz., sio sight, ongo hearing, ala touch, nanamu smell, and ‘ahi‘ahi taste—to both the ‘atamai mind and loto/fatu/mafu heart as “knower” and “feeler,” where they are both “known” and “felt.” Both ‘ilo knowing and ongo feeling by way of Tongan mind and heart, i.e., psychology and psychiatry, are largely neglected in academia. Yet they are considered real states of affairs as opposed to seeing the latter as an obstacle to the former, as in science. This is most evident in their treatment in Tongan ‘aati

art and *litlesā* literature by way of beauty/quality and utility/functionality—especially Tongan mythology, poetry, and oratory,⁶ where they are highly developed, as well as music (and dance)—all with utilitarian affects and effects of some therapeutic, hypnotic, or psychoanalytic significance. Several examples of sung and danced poetry across the genres are critically examined for both their beauty/quality and their utility/functionality, as in their therapeutic, hypnotic, or psychoanalytic affects and effects (see essays 2, 3, and 6–9).

This is followed by essay 2, “Tongan Hoa: Inseparable Yet Indispensable Pairs/Binaries,” which informs the Indigenous Tongan *Tā-Vā* Philosophy of Reality and its derivative, Indigenous Tongan *Tā-Vā* Time-Space Philosophy of ‘*atamai* mind and *loto/mafu/fatu* heart psychology and psychiatry, of beauty/quality and utility/functionality of ‘*aati* art and *litlesā* literature. The authors explore the *tāvāist* philosophical underpinnings of *hoa* pairs/binaries, i.e., *hoatatau/hoamālie* equal/same/similar and *hoakehekehe/hoatamaki* opposite/different/dissimilar pairs/binaries. Based on the general *tāvāist* philosophical tenet that all things in reality stand in eternal relations of exchange, giving rise to conflict and order, it follows that as a corollary, everywhere in reality is an indivisible but inevitable *hoa* pairs/binaries and there is nothing beyond pairs/binaries of *hoatatau/hoamālie* equal/similar/same and *hoakehekehe/hoatamaki* opposite/different/dissimilar entities, identities, or tendencies. The authors draw on a multiplicity of *hoa* pairs/binaries from across the spectrum of reality on the ontological level, as well as *tatau* symmetry and *potupotutatau* harmony in the production of *mālie/faka’ofo’ofa* beauty and their collective outcomes, viz., *māfana* warmth and *vela fieriness* in the exhibition of *tauēlangi* climatic elation on the epistemological level. As far as ‘*atamai* mind and *loto/mafu/fatu* heart psychology and psychiatry by way of beauty/quality and utility/functionality of education and ‘*aati* art and *litlesā* literature are concerned, these equal and opposite *hoa* pairs/binaries are orderly in arrangement and mediated in the investigative, transformative, and communicative process in the name of both knowledge and beauty (and utility) (see essays 1 and 3–8).

In essay 3, “*Sio FakaTonga ‘ae ‘Aati FakaTonga: Tongan Views of Tongan Arts*,” the authors set out to critically examine the imposition of Western ways of knowing and doing arts on Tongan ways of knowing and doing arts in terms of beauty/quality and utility/functionality. By way of response, the authors argue for a shift in this problematic axis from a condition of imposition by means of domination to a situation of mediation as a form of liberation, in which a unified front is provided for different ways of knowing reality to battle it out in the creative process, specifically in terms of the beauty/quality and utility/functionality of ‘*aati* art and *litlesā* literature. In doing so, they situate by means of critiquing their subject matter of investigation as a text in several contexts, such as in both the distinctiveness and the relationality of the metaphorical

and historical dimensions of the kuohili/that which is passed, kuongamu'a/age in the front past; lotolotonga/that which is now, kuongaloto/age in the middle present; and kaha'u/that which is yet to come, kuongamui/age in the back future. Metaphorically yet historically, the past, which has stood the test of time-space, is placed in the front of people as guidance. Contemporaneously, the future, which is yet to happen, is situated in their back, guided by refined knowledge and experiences. Both the illusive past and the elusive future are constantly negotiated in the everchanging, conflicting present (see essays 1, 2, and 4-8).

In "Loto, Tu'a, Moe Fale: Inside, Outside, and House," essay 4, the authors critique the fale house in terms of both tu'a outside and loto inside as artistic elements with architectural (and engineering) merits, with a focus on tufunga langafale material art of house-building. All three are arbitrated in both their diversity and their unity in the production of beauty, quality upon which their collective utility/functionality is dependent in terms of social use. The authors put their topic of exploration as a text in the context of tã time and vã space and in the context of fuo form and uho content as four-dimensional rather than three-dimensional.⁷ The authors argue that the fale house is associated with the fefine woman and rooted in fa'ē mother and fa'ēle birth as variations of kekele earth. This is seen in the fonua placenta/people/environment/burial place,⁸ temporally and formally defined by a "person" and spatially and substantially composed of a "place." An example is the three fonua generated by the plural and cyclical movement of the valevale fetus and fonua/taungafanau mother's womb/placenta through the fonua/kakai people and 'ātakai environment to the mate dead and fonualoto/fa'itoka/mala'ē burial place. By way of association, fale house can be considered a vaka fakafō'ohifo downside-up boat and a vaka boat can be considered a fale fakafō'ohake upside-down house. The kava,⁹ a lasting social institution of immense beauty/quality and utility/functionality named after Kava, daughter of Fevanga and Fefafa, is said to have been created at the mata-ava eye-hole or meeting point of the fale house and vaka boat. All three can be, by closer association, considered fefine female (see essays 2, 3, and 5).

The authors in essay 5, "Vaka, Fale, Moe Kava: Boat, House, and Kava – Mana Structures, Mana Spaces," set out to critically examine their proximity as a text in Tongan oral history in the broader context of the movement of people through navigation in the earliest settlement of Tonga. In doing so, the authors provide hindights, insights, and foresights into the dynamics of the connection or separation, i.e., intersection of the vaka boat, fale house, and kava. By dealing with their engineering, architectural, and ceremonial significance, we tend to appreciate them as material and performance arts, viz., tufunga fo'uvaka boat-building, tufunga langafale house-building, and faiva taumafa kava kava-making and kava-drinking¹⁰ ceremony, in terms of beauty/quality and by way of application/

utility/functionality (see essays 5 and 8). The kava as a lasting social institution at the intersection (i.e., connection and separation) of the vaka boat as a fale fakafo'ohake downside-up house and, by the same token, fale house as a vaka fakafo'ohifo upside-down boat is underpinned by intersecting (or connecting and separating) hydrodynamic, aerodynamic, and sociodynamic tendencies. These are beautifully and usefully defined as artworks by way of their internal/intrinsic and external/extrinsic qualities. In utilitarian terms, vaka boat and fale house protect people from the elements, notably matangi winds, peau waves, la'a sun, and 'uha rain, as in kava, which as a social and cultural institution of immense psychological and emotional and political and economic significance, gives them a sense of solidarity over adversity.

In essay 6, “Siueli 'oe Pasifiki: Jewel of the Pacific – A Sung Poetry of Praise and Rivalry,” the authors focus on the unique sense of originality and creativity endowed by Queen Sālote as one of Tonga's best contemporary poets. In tāvāist philosophical ways, as especially witnessed in her dealing with several genres, notably faiva ta'anga viki-mo-sani poetry of praise and faiva fetau poetry of rivalry as an inseparable yet indispensable hoatatau/hoamālie equal/same/similar and hoakehekehe/hoatamaki opposite/different/dissimilar pair/binary. Queen Sālote puts her subject matter of investigation within the three types of heliaki involving “metaphorically/symbolically saying one thing yet really/historically meaning another,” viz., heliaki fakafetongiaki qualitative epiphoric heliaki, heliaki fakafekauaki associative metaphoric heliaki, and heliaki fakafefonuaki constitutive metonymic heliaki. She praises the best of qualities and utilities of Fiji, Sāmoa, Tahiti, and Hawai'i, yet at the end of the piece she elevates above all the unrivaled beauty and utility of Tonga as the siueli 'oe Pasifiki jewel of the Pacific (see kupu, veesi, verse 4, kohi, laini, line 8). On her guidance, the poetry was matched with the accompanying hiva/fasi music, composed by the notable Lavaka Kefu, the lead singer and instrumentalist of the renowned royal vocal-instrumental Fuiva-'o-Fangatapu/Fuivaofangatapu group who performed the work (see essays 1, 5, and 6).

Essay 7, “Tuaikaepau: 'Slow-but-Sure' – A Sung and Danced Poetry of Tragedy,” examines a hiva haka ta'anga lakalaka composed by Queen Sālote and put to both hiva/fasi music and haka dance by Noble Ve'éhala (Leilua) and Malukava (Tēvita Kavaefiafi). The piece involves a retelling of the tragic story of the shipwreck of the Tongan vessel Tuaikaepau on Minerva Reef on her voyage to Aotearoa New Zealand in 1962, which is only partially retold in history books, let alone oral history. The retelling of this tragic history through poetry as a special language within a language is done in different ways and means, all of which are subject to the element of human selectivity at the intersection (or connection and separation) of objectivity and subjectivity. Queen Sālote, by retelling the same tragic history, makes excellent use of heliaki as an artistic and

literary device by mediating “what is said” versus “what is meant,” which engages the movement between the metaphorical and the historical languages by way of translation. She uses in both affective and effective ways the three types of heliaki by way of exchange, association, and reconstitution of events, occurrences, or states of affairs of toutaivaka navigational or faifolau voyaging significance, generally comprising celestial and terrestrial objects such as matangi winds,¹¹ peau waves,¹² la’ā sun, and māhina moon, as well as their collective but creative instinct for survival through self-rescue. By portraying the navigators as both villains and heroes, Queen Sālote nevertheless celebrates their extreme ordeal when they emerged triumphantly from the encompassing tragedy as a heroic feat and in the spirit of immense courage (see essays 1, 5, and 7).

In essay 8, “Lofia, Koe Kumi Tu’i: The Search for a King – A Sung and Danced Poetry of Tragedy,” the authors delve into the possible controversies surrounding Tāufa’āhau as Tu’i Ha’apai and later Tu’i Vava’u, who followed his confidant and relative ‘Ulukalala II first as Tu’i Vava’u and second as Tu’i Ha’apai and, more so, became the incumbent of the new and fourth Tu’i Tupou kingship as George (Siaosi) Tāufa’āhau Tupou I. In both instances, this was a movement of things, occurrences, or states of affairs from a relatively unknown pre-Velata Tāufa’āhau to a highly respected post-Velata Tāufa’āhau. Both poets, Kaliopasi Fe’iloakitau Kaho and Queen Sālote, were actively yet creatively engaged in retelling history as works of ‘aati art and litilesā literature in poetry by way of heliaki, involving “symbolically saying one thing but really meaning another” and in which both the poetical and the historical languages are mediated in the productive process. As a form of translation, the metaphorically “said” and the historically “meant” are deciphered in both their unity and their diversity for better critical appreciation of history and poetry not only as types of disciplinary practice but also as forms of social activity. Both poets make affective and effective use of the three types of heliaki, viz., heliaki fakafetongiaki qualitative epiphoric heliaki, heliaki fakafekauaki associative metaphoric heliaki, and heliaki fakafefonuaki constitutive metonymic heliaki. From a tāvāist philosophical perspective, errors in thinking and feeling are a problem of mind and heart, not of reality. There is one thing we know for certain: Tāufa’āhau, formerly a Tu’i Ha’apai-Tu’i Vava’u, became Tu’i Tupou, thus pointing to the inevitable historical fact that the history of kingship goes beyond the Tu’i Kanokupolu at the mercy of the eternal plural, complex, and cycle of tā time and vā space.

In the last essay, “Faiva Lova’ālo: Performance Art of Rowing,” the authors critique the faiva ‘ālo performance art of rowing as a specific text, especially ‘alopōpao/‘alopōpao canoe rowing, in the wider context of the fakahoko connection and fakamāvae separation (or fakafelavai intersection) of peau waves and matangi winds. The same is witnessed in the closely related performance arts such as faiva toutaivaka navigation, faiva toutaiika fishing, faiva fānifo

surfing, faiva lovavaka boat racing, faiva kakau swimming, and faiva uku diving, all conducted amid such helix-like, vortex-type, spiral-led entities. These points of fakahoko connection, and fakamāvae separation (or fakafelavai intersection), are defined by mata eyes and its hoatatau/hoamālie equal/same/similar and hoakehekehe/hoatamaki opposite/different/dissimilar pair/binary, ava holes, inseparably but indispensably defined by mata-ava eye-holes. The handling of mata-ava eye-holes, by rowers, including navigators, fishermen, surfers, boat racers, swimmers, and divers, as performance artists requires a sense of mastery of their cyclical, plurality, and multiplexity. This is specifically because it is in the mata-ava eye-holes, that ivi energy as me'a matter is most dense and intense. This is most evident in the movement of ivi energy as me'a matter by means of both matangi winds and peau waves in the case of peau kula red waves (variously known as tidal and seismic sea waves and tsunamis), which are also characterized as both peau ta'ane female waves and peau tangata male waves, which are, because of their sheer power and force, known as peau tāmāte killer waves.

NOTES

1. Where fakahoko connection and fakamāvae separation are an inseparable yet indispensable hoatatau/hoamālie equal/same/similar and hoakehekehe/hoatamaki opposite/different/dissimilar pair/binary, like mata eye and ava hole in mata-ava eye-hole.

2. That is, both particularity and generality as an inseparable yet indispensable hoa pair/binary of hoatatau/hoamālie equal/same/similar hoakehekehe/hoatamaki opposite/different/dissimilar.

3. Or quality, i.e., beauty, and functionality, i.e., utility, of art and literature.

4. As opposed to the foregrounding of practical–vocational training over critical–classical education, as in the privileging of art use and art history over artwork, like putting the cart before the horse, heliaki metaphorically speaking.

5. Ako education, like art (and literature), is concerned with “what education is,” “what education is for,” and “what education is by means of,” with the former one dealing with knowledge production and the latter two dealing with knowledge application.

6. All as a special language within a language, which involves heliaki, i.e., metaphorically saying one thing but historically meaning another (see essays 1, 3, and 5–7), requiring translation from a metaphorical language to a historical language, as in siueli 'oe Pasifiki jewel of the Pacific for Tonga and peau kula for killer waves.

7. To see reality, i.e., tā-vā time–space/fuo-uho form–content, as three-dimensional is to treat it as both tā'ētā timeless and ta'efuo formless, leaving vā space and uho content undefined.

8. This variously exists throughout Moana Oceania as hanua, honua, vanua, fonua, fanua, fenua, and whenua; herein, places are temporally defined by people, which are, in turn, spatially composed.

9. By way of comparison, it can be said that sacred kava is the holy sakalamenti sacrament of fonua culture and, by the same token, the holy sacrament is the kava of Christianity. That is, the tala 'oe fonua tradition of Tonga is rooted in the tala 'oe kava tradition of kava, and similarly, the tala 'oe lotu tradition of Christianity is grounded in the tala 'oe 'akaufakalava (or kolosi) cross. Both institutions were commonly originated in feilaulau sacrifice of Kava as the only daughter of Fevanga and Fefafa and of Christ as the Son of God the Father. It follows that the former revolves around kona bitterness and melie sweetness, in which the best and permanence in all human endeavors are acquired through kona bitterness and succeeded by melie sweetness. The latter centers on mo'ui life and mate death, in which the former is gained through the latter.

10. As a performance art, the making and drinking of kava is specifically called faiva milolua, i.e., vilolua/viloua, which literally means "double twisting and turning." The actual performance is carried out as hoa pairs/binaries ranging from making through serving to drinking.

11. Or avangi wind, i.e., hole of the wind.

12. Or ngalu wave, a term reserved for the fānifo performance art of surfing.