

FAIVA FAKAOLI: THE TONGAN PERFORMANCE ART OF HUMOR

‘Okusitino Māhina

*Massey University—Albany Campus and Vava‘u Academy for
Critical Inquiry and Applied Research*

This essay will critically examine *faiva fakaoli*, literally translated as “the art of funny things,” in a number of separate but connected unique and universal contexts. I wish to make clear right from the outset that this essay is not an exercise in theoretically and practically reviewing the existing literature on humor, nor an attempt to make a comprehensive examination of *what humor is*, i.e., its form and content, nor, for that matter, *what humor does*, i.e., its social function.¹ While the theoretical and practical, ontological and epistemological, or qualitative and utilitarian questions are extremely important, my principal concerns are with *faiva fakaoli*, i.e., the Tongan art of humor. I will situate my topic in the broader theoretical-practical, ontological-epistemological, qualitative-utilitarian contexts of the subject of humor, but only insofar as some of its relevant associated aspects have merged with my investigation of Tongan humor. I hope, then, to contribute some answers to these broader-based, more generalized questions as to, at least, what Tongan humor *is* and *does*. There have emerged some new insights into Tongan humor, amidst many other things, when it is theorized within my new general *tā-vā* (time-space) theory of reality (Ka‘ili 2005; Māhina 2003a, 2004b: 186–98; Māhina et al. 2004; Māhina, Ka‘ili, and Ka‘ili 2006; cf. Adam 1990; Harvey 1990).

Specifically, this Tongan art form will be examined in the wider context of the ontological and epistemological dimensions of *tā* and *vā* (Māhina 2002b, 2004b: 86–98). In ontological terms, *tā* and *vā* are the common medium in which all things are, in a single level of reality, connecting nature, mind, and society. But, in epistemological ways, *tā* and *vā* are social constructs, involving their relative human arrangement within and across cultures. In particular, Tongan arts, like arts in general, are underpinned by *tā* and *vā* as a common medium of

existence and of art as a special way of life. As such, the ontological dimensions of *tā* and *vā* are epistemologically transformed by means of form and content, and are peculiar to each of the arts, as in the individual art forms such as *faiva hele'uhila* (cinema or film), *tufunga faitā* (photography), and *tufunga tātatau* (tattooing), among many others. In an attempt to redefine art in a novel way, I will situate it in the broader context of both the ontology and epistemology of *tā* and *vā*.

In doing so, a number of unexamined issues of immense aesthetic significance such as the form, content, medium, and function of art will be briefly scrutinized. Some specific examples from Tongan performance and material arts will be examined, mainly in view of their universal *tā-vā* basis. Similarly, I will consider the lack of distinction in Tongan thinking between humor as a work of art concerning human absurdities and the laughter arising as the human response to them, as well as the general ambivalence in academic and popular attitudes toward humor. Following, I shall discuss a particular kind of humor by one of the well-known Tongan humorists or comedians, the late Selemā, who effectively produced it in the context of a dream. In this context, both humor and dreams, like art generally, have common investigative, transformative, and communicative capacities which lie in close proximity to both psychoanalysis and hypnosis. While psychoanalysis involves a transformation from the conscious to the unconscious, hypnosis undergoes a movement that begins with a myth and ends with a dream within an environment of total concentration and complete silence (Māhina 2003b). Thus, humor, dreams, and myths have a universal psychoanalytic and hypnotic effect of an extreme therapeutic nature (Māhina 1999b, 2003a; cf. Bott 1972; La Fontaine 1972).

Tā and Vā: Towards a General Time-Space Theory of Reality

THE CRITICAL INQUIRY INTO THE SUBJECT MATTER under investigation, Tongan art of humor, will be conducted in two distinct but related theoretical contexts. In the first instance, Tongan humor will be reflected upon within the general *tā-vā* theory of reality (Māhina 2002b, 2004b; cf. Harvey 1990; Ka'ili 2005, 2007), and, in the second place, I will examine it in the context of the general *tā-vā* theory of art (Māhina 2002b, 2004a), where the latter is a derivative of the former. Both the fundamentality and formality of the general *tā-vā* theory of reality enable it to enter all fields of study, within and across nature, mind, and society. Herein, reality is conveniently divided into nature, mind, and society, where both mind and society are themselves in nature. Based on conflict, the general *tā-vā* theory of reality advances a view that all things in nature, mind, and society stand in eternal relations of exchange.

This view of reality is evident in the general *tā-vā* theory of art, which recognizes the philosophical fact that conflict (or intersection) lies at the heart of all arts (Māhina 1999c; cf. Anderson 1962; Baker 1979; Helu 1999).

This can be seen in performance and material arts, where conflict exists in the form of *intersection* of lines and spaces of different subject matters, while, in the case of literature, conflict takes place by means of the *interface* of human meanings. Take the performance and material arts *faiva haka* (dance), and *tufunga langafale* (architecture) where conflict is manifested in terms of *intersecting bodily movements* and *interfacing lines and spaces* respectively. Within the context of literature, conflict occurs by way of the *intersection of human meanings*, as in the case of *faiva ta`anga* (poetry) and *faiva fananga* (mythology) both dealing with contradictions in the human situation in a unified, systematic manner. Aesthetically speaking, these conflicting tendencies, whether by means of *intersecting lines and spaces* or in terms of the *meeting point of human meanings*, are symmetrically transformed to produce harmony and beauty (Māhina 2002b, 2005b; cf. Helu 1999; Kaeppler 1993; Moyle 1987).

The general tā-vā theory of reality has, among many others, the following tenets (Māhina 2002a, 2002b, 2004c; cf. Ka`ili 2005; Adam 1990; Harvey 1990):

- that the general tā-vā theory of reality is philosophically-led, empirically-driven, and conflict-based in form and content;
- that reality is divided into nature, mind, and society, where mind and society are both in nature;
- that ontologically tā and vā are the common medium in which all things are, in a single level of reality, spatio-temporality or four-sided dimensionality;
- that epistemologically tā and vā are socially arranged differently in different cultures;
- that the relative coalition of tā and vā across cultures is conflicting in nature;
- that all things in nature, mind, and society stand in eternal relations of exchange to one another, giving rise to conflict or order;
- that conflict and order are permanent features of all things in nature, mind, and society;
- that conflict and order in the form and content of all things in nature, mind, and society are of the same logical status, in that order is itself an expression of conflict;
- that tā and vā are the abstract dimensions of the *fuo* (form) and *uho* (content), of all things, in nature, mind, and society;
- that the *fuo* and *uho* of all things in nature, mind, and society are the concrete dimensions of tā and vā;

- that while *tā* does not exclusively correspond to form and *vā* entirely to space, both entities combined give form and content to all things of the one and only order of being;
- that while *tā-vā* is universal, all things in nature, mind, and society, have nevertheless further myriad and infinitely complex forms in dialectical relation to other countless and multifaceted contents; and
- that *tā* and *vā*, like *fuō* and *uho* of all things in nature, mind, and society, are inseparable both in mind as in reality.

On the one hand, *tā* and *vā* are ontologically said to be “given” entities in nature and on the other hand, they are epistemologically considered to be “man-made” tendencies. Both their ontological and epistemological dimensions are present in all types of human activity, for example, art as a special form of social practice. Take, for instance, the natural entity of *ongo* (sound), which is, as a subject matter of artistic creation, transformed both symmetrically and rhythmically to *hiva* (music). By the same token, *hiva*, like all products of human creativity and activity, is both natural and social in nature. By virtue of this transformative capacity, the aims of all art forms are concerned with the production of order, a state of affairs that is consciously achieved through the mediation of conflicts. A building is, for example, in a condition of order when all of the equal and opposite forces meet at a common point of intersection. As a counterpoising of equal and opposite forces, this state of order is itself a form of conflict.

Tā and Vā: Towards a General Time-Space Theory of Art

Generally, art can be defined as a *tā-vā*, *fuō-uho* transformation taking place on both the abstract and concrete levels (Māhina 2002a, 2004b). On the general and specific levels, art involves the rhythmic intensification of *tā* and *fuō* and symmetrical reorganization of *vā* and *uho*, the principal aim of which is to produce harmony and beauty. This brings rhythm, symmetry, harmony, and above all beauty into a common aesthetic focus. Beauty is conditioned by or a function of rhythm, symmetry, and harmony, all of which are qualities internal to art. All these intrinsic qualities come to define art as a special form of social activity, temporally and spatially demarcating it from other forms of social activity.

On the other hand, the impact of art on people constitutes its external qualities. Examples of these in Tongan art are the “divine” feelings of *māfana*, “warmth,” *vela*, “burning fire,” and *tauēlangi*, literally “reaching-the-sky,” i.e., excitement (Māhina 1999c, 2005b, 2007; Māhina and Māhina-Tuai 2007;

cf. Helu 1999; Kaeppler 1993). These feelings are created by Tongan *faiva* (the composite arts of poetry, music, and dance or the fulfilling or uplifting emotions of amusement and laughter triggered by the Tongan art of the ludicrous). As an outcome, these external qualities, inter alia, give rise to what can be called the function of art (Hixon 2000; Kaeppler 1993; Layton 1991; Moyle 1987; Thomas 1995).² These external qualities are themselves the relations which art enters into, as in the case of the healing effect of laughter as an outcome of humor.

The effective rhythmic intensification of *tā* and *fuo* and symmetrical rearrangement of *vā* and *uho* generate a transfiguration from a situation of chaos to a condition of harmony, i.e., a sustained spatio-temporal, substantial-formal movement toward beauty. There are largely two types of *tā-vā* and *fuo-uho*, the one internal and the other external to art. The first type takes place within art and involves a reconstitution of *tā* and *vā* and *fuo-uho*, defining it as a unique way of life. The second type of transformation occurs outside of art, specifically in terms of the effects it has on people or simply its use. In these two distinct but related contexts, art can further be defined as formally a kind of inquiry and practically a means of communication. In aesthetic terms, art is a form of investigation of beauty, which, as a tool of communication, has the tendency to transform conflicts into order, creating a hypnotic nature. Thus, art has both *investigative* and *communicative* tendencies, both of which are commonly underscored by *transformative* capacities of a peculiar spatio-temporal order (Māhina 1999c, 2004a).

Fuo and Uho: Form and Content of Art

As far as art is concerned, the transformation of *tā* and *vā* is manifested in terms of *fuo* and *uho* or their concrete spatio-temporal manifestations (Māhina 2003a, 2005a, 2005b). In other words, *tā* and *vā* are the abstraction of the *fuo* and *uho* of things in reality. There has largely been a failure to make this logical connection between the concrete and abstract levels in aesthetics. Like *tā* and *vā*, either as a common medium of existence or their relative transcultural arrangement, the *fuo* and *uho* of things are inseparable in reality. Where there is *tā*, there is *vā*. By implication, art is four-dimensional; however, existing literature largely treats art as three-dimensional (Māhina 2003b, 2004a; cf. Anderson 1962; Baker 1979; Helu 1999). To say that all things exist in *tā* and *vā* and that they are essentially spatio-temporal is simply to say that all things are inseparably four-dimensional. Things in nature, mind, and society are either condensed or rarefied by means of form and content, giving rise to their temporal-spatial, formal-substantial variations (Māhina 2002b, 2004a; cf. Baker 1979).

Art forms are spatio-temporally differentiated from one another by means of the form and content of their respective subject matters, such as sound for music and bodily movements for dance. Such a mode of *tā-vā* and *fuo-uho* differentiation is made apparent throughout the whole artistic spectrum. Some instances of local and foreign art forms will be examined to demonstrate their common appeal to the universality of *tā* and *vā* as a basis of art. As visual arts, *faiva hele'uhila* and *tufunga faitā*, for example, deal with images as their common content, while the temporal variations between images themselves make up its form. Both arts are concerned with *moving* and *still* images, respectively. In both film and photography, *maama* (light) is the common medium. As for film or cinema, a distinction between *silent* and *talking* movies is made based on the basis of absence or presence of the added dimension of language. As a medium, light (which is temporally and spatially embodied in terms of lineal and spatial intersection) can be black and white or multiple colors.

The same applies to the art of tattooing, like dance, which is typically yet mistakenly taken to be *body-art*. In fact, the body is merely the medium for *tufunga tātatau*, the traditional Moana or Polynesian art of lineal-spatial (i.e., temporal-spatial, formal-substantial) intersection. Tattooing combines lines (i.e., time, form) and spaces (i.e., content), respectively manifested by way of black-colored ink and the reddish-brownish skin typical of the Moana or Polynesian peoples. In addition, the temporal variations of the associated *kupesi* (complex and elaborate geometric designs) provide its form, defining the rhythm that underlies it as an art form. The *uli* (black) and *kula* (red) colors are fundamental to Moana or Polynesian material arts, and taken to be symbolic not only of women and men but also of the natural qualities and social roles respectively associated with them in the productive and reproductive spheres (Māhina, Ka`ili, and Ka`ili 2006). Apart from tattooing, these two colors are commonly used in the production of *kupesi* in many if not all art forms, e.g., *tufunga lalava*, “*kafa*-cord-lashing” (connected with the material arts *tufunga langafale*, “house-building,” and *tufunga fo`uvaka*, “boat-building”), *koka`anga*, “bark-cloth-making,” and *lālanga*, “weaving,” among many others (Māhina 1999c, 2002b).³

Faiva and Tufunga: Performance and Material Arts

As we shall see, there is a clear universal *tā-vā* underpinning common to all art forms. Generally, Tongan art can be divided into performance and material arts (Māhina 2002b). There may be a third kind, referred to here as *nimamea`a* (fine arts), such as *koka`anga* (bark-cloth-making) and *lālanga*.

Performance and material arts were traditionally practiced by males while *ninamea`a* were practiced by females. Performance arts, or *faiva*, include a number of art forms such as *faiva ta'anga*, *faiva hiva* (music), *faiva haka*, and *faiva fakaoli*, amongst others. On the other hand, material arts (collectively called *tufunga*) include *tufunga langafale*, *tufunga tāmaka* (stone-cutting), *tufunga lalava*, and *tufunga tātatau*, amidst many other art forms. In all, the terms *faiva* and *tufunga* literally mean *beating space*, i.e., time-space, thus bringing both *tā* and *vā* into the whole aesthetic equation.

Aesthetically, these performance and material art forms vary in terms of form, content and medium, and they perform multiple functions with physical, psychological, and social values as means of human communication. These two major art forms, as well as the many subdivisions associated with them, have a clear substantial-formal, spatio-temporal basis. In fact, the terms *faiva* and *tufunga*, like the corresponding *faiva ta'anga* and *tufunga lalava*, basically mean *tā* and *vā*. All these arts, with their *investigative* and *communicative* tendencies, undergo a specific kind of *tā-vā*, *fuo-uho* transformation involving a reconstitution of their form, content, and function which takes place within and outside of them (Māhina 2003a).

***Oli* and *Kata*: Funny and Laughter**

There are problems, in the case of Tonga, regarding the distinction between “the ludicrous” and laughter which demands a settlement as to their respective characteristics. In general terms, the Tongan words *oli* and *kata* can be respectively translated as “funny” and “laughter.” Given their close affinity, it can be argued that the latter is a derivative of the former, as laughter results from being funny. But for there to be a *faiva fakakata*, the art of laughter, then the subject matter is laughter, which is a psychological phenomenon of a different order. As closely related phenomena, humor and laughter operate in such a way that they bring together a range of conflicting physical, psychological, and social tendencies into a common context (Chapman and Foot 1976; Hereniko 1995; Piddington 1963). Both humor and laughter can be considered as peculiar mental conditions, specifically originating in the conflicting relationships between nature, mind, and society.

Humor involves errors in human thinking about reality and is a specific condition of mind as a physically constituted, electro-chemical substance. This opens up a new exciting area for further critical investigation, of the physical operation of the brain and its responses to such emotional stimuli as anger and hunger. Other emotions that elicit physiological responses

are laughter and shame, the respective outcomes of comedy and tragedy. Thus, the brain can be critically examined as a neurological-magnetic, electrochemical, molecular-biological substance at the interface of nature and nurture (Māhina 2002b; cf. Māhina 2002a; 2003a).

However, the psychological process of thinking can create contradictions in the form of awareness, consciousness, or knowledge of reality which are largely brought about by human subjective interests, mental defects, or both. Following Nietzsche and Freud, John Anderson talks about the mind as having competing mental strivings (Anderson 1962; cf. Baker 1979; Māhina 2002b), where laughter, or shame in the case of tragedy, cause conflict. Other mental strivings may include anger, hunger, affection, and sadness. It is the nature of the mind to know or be aware of things in reality. Things in reality are, in turn, independently presented as images to the conscious mind. The presentation of these images is made via the psychological process of thinking, which transmits them as distinct entities in the form of knowledge. These distinct images can be conveyed via their innate qualities or in terms of human interests, which may amount to either objective knowledge or subjective understanding (Māhina 1999a, 2002a, 2002b, 2003a). As a source of conflicts, the latter largely provides a fertile ground for human absurdities, defining the content or subject matter of what is funny as an art form. Laughter is then triggered by the mind being self-conscious that misconception has occurred during the psychological process of thinking. This exemplifies the notion that as a realist opposed to an idealist would say, errors in thinking are a problem of mind but not of reality (Māhina 1999c, 2002a, 2004b; cf. Anderson 1962; Baker 1979; Helu 1999).

However, this paper does not attempt to examine the nature of humor and laughter. Rather, it examines formal, substantial, and functional relationships as physical, mental, and social entities, which define humor as an art form of some relevance to Tongans.⁴ Unequivocally, humor is at least understood as an art form in Tonga and specifically called *faiva fakaoli*, grouped under the generic classification referred to as *faiva*, i.e., performance art. There has not been consensus regarding a definition of humor as an art form, and this is reflected in varying degrees of ambivalence in both academic and popular attitudes toward humor as a conflicting human phenomenon. This is evidenced by the opposing arguments of classical writers, Renaissance thinkers, sixteenth- and seventeenth-century theorists, and modern scholars (Piddington 1963). Despite differences among these theories, they all regard laughter as a form of aggression (Chapman and Foot 1976; Piddington 1963; cf. Hereniko 1995). However, this view may be

more applicable to human conflicts that lead to anger as an expression of violence or aggression than those that give rise to laughter as a unifying mode of celebration.

Regardless of whether humor is taken across cultures as an art form or not, it transforms the spatio-temporal, substantial-temporal conflicts of human absurdities into self-knowledge of one's ignorance, then into some kind of order. This form of order, i.e., self-knowledge, results from the understanding that an error has been committed, and this knowledge becomes a source of celebration through laughter. Laughter is the best medicine because it heals both the body and mind and thus is physically and mentally therapeutic (Māhina 2002a, 2003a; cf. Piddington 1963). Of equal importance is the understanding which renders the art form of humor a form of interpreting the nature of human ignorance. In one sense, especially when humor is treated as a form of violence, the art of criticism can be readily, albeit problematically, regarded as a form of aggression. Criticism can particularly be viewed as aggressive when it involves seeing things as they really are, in a single level of reality, as opposed to observing them as we would like them to be. The opposition between these two states of mind becomes a source of conflict where human ignorance of reality (and of mind) is transformed to real understanding via criticism as a work of art, thereby also qualifying education as an art form (Māhina 1999c, 2008; Māhina, Māhina, and Māhina 2007; Māhina, Potauaine, et al. 2007; Māhina, Seve-Williams, et al. 2007).

While such ambivalence exists, in Tongan culture humor is treated as an art form. As an art form, humor can be defined as a work of the mind in, or a form of investigation of, human absurdities, involving a process of spatio-temporal, substantial-formal transformation from a condition of ignorance to a state of understanding. Quite simply, it is a *tā-vā*, *fu-uho* movement from conflict to harmony, i.e., from humor as a cause of laughter to laughter in itself as a human celebration, an effect, a form of self-knowledge.

By impacting the mind as a physical, electrochemical substance, this internal transformative process creates laughter in a celebratory mode. Like the emotional feeling or psychological state of warmth, "fieriness," or exuberance considered extrinsic to the performance arts of poetry, music, and dance, the act of laughter is merely a response to humor as a work of art.⁵ The effect or impact of laughter on both performer and viewer results in a form of transformation, but it is one that is external to humor as a work of art. In communicative terms, such an effect functions in ways that are psychoanalytic, hypnotic, or therapeutic to both performer and viewer. As

far as humor goes, human absurdities (i.e., contradictory human situations) define its content while the manner in which they are aesthetically revealed constitutes its form.

Faiva Fakaoli and *Faiva Fakamamahi*: Tongan Performance and Material Arts of Comedy and Tragedy

The conflicting formal, substantial, and functional relationships within and between *faiva fakaoli* and *faiva fakamamahi* require a reflection on both Tongan arts of comedy and tragedy. While the former is connected to “the art of funny things,” the latter is concerned with “the art of sad things.” *Fakamamahi* literally means “in-the-style-of-being-sad” and *mamahi* means being sad (or sadness). Both art forms have conflicting human emotions or thoughts as their common theme or subject matter for aesthetic treatment. In the case of *faiva fakaoli*, comedy deals with conflicts at the interface of *ngalipoto*, (normality) and *ngalivale* (absurdity) with *kata* as its effect. On the other hand, *faiva fakamamahi*, or tragedy, handles contradictions at the intersection of *anga`itangata* (sociality) and *anga`imanu* (animality) with *fakamā* (shame) as its outcome (Māhina, Ka`ili, and Ka`ili 2006; cf. Helu 1999; Māhina 2002b).

Both art forms, comedy and tragedy, thus have a sustained *tā-vā*, *fuo-uho* transformation in human thinking from a condition of self-ignorance to a state of self-knowledge (Māhina 2002a; cf. Veatch, 1999). That is, on both abstract and concrete levels, there is symmetrically a sustained albeit intensified spatio-temporal, substantial-formal shift from unconsciousness to consciousness. The experience is, thus, effectively psychoanalytic, hypnotic, or therapeutic (Māhina 2003a). In the case of comedy, however, laughter celebrates awareness of an error committed in the self's thinking about reality, whereas in the case of tragedy, shame is a realization that the self has failed to attain the prescribed and accepted norms of society, having succumbed to behavior typified as animalistic in its *modus operandi*.

Although comedy and tragedy are organized in different ways across cultures, both art forms commonly deal with spatio-temporal, formal-substantial contradictions in human thinking about reality, linking nature, mind, and society. What may be considered funny or sad in one culture may not be viewed either wholly or partially as such in another. Similarly, people in one culture may laugh at or feel ashamed of others following an incident considered funny or sad which may not be regarded as such by members of another cultural group. Undoubtedly, comedy and tragedy are distinct art forms, yet both comic and tragic elements are emphasized in both of them.

The anecdote of the comedian Selemā, recounted in the section, “Misi and Fakaoli: Dream and Humor,” illustrates my point. In this comedy, Selemā awakens to the realization that the events he dreamed were all tragic. His courting of a beautiful French girl, his partaking of a delicious meal, his discovering of gold and, worst still, his discovery that he wet his bed, were a series of tragic events. Yet, these tragedies all added up to something which members of the kava party found to be extremely funny and, therefore, caused great laughter (see, e.g., Veatch, 1999).

The spatio-temporal transition from the unconscious to the conscious runs parallel to that from ignorance to understanding. While ignorance and understanding are dialectical human conditions, order and conflict are opposite spatio-temporal, variously manifested within and across nature, mind, and society. In formal terms, conflict is variously taken to mean chaos, strife, and crisis. Similarly, order is thought to be synonymous with such conditions as harmony, unity, and stasis. Whereas the former takes place by way of intersecting times and spaces, the latter involves their mediating in the process. The attuning of mind and reality, which engages in a spatio-temporal, formal-substantial movement from ignorance to knowledge, leads to understanding things as they objectively are, as opposed to the subjective preference of human interest (see, e.g., Anderson, 1962; Helu, 1999; Māhina, 1999c, 2004b). In the case of art and literature, these abstract intersections of times and spaces manifest themselves concretely by means of lines and surfaces or human meanings (see, e.g., Māhina, 2002b, 2004a).

In more generalized, less formal situations (especially in matters relating to socialization, which primarily involves strict moral instructions, as in childrearing), parents make use of a mechanism similar to the artistic device used in tragedy as an art form. I refer here to the practice of shaming people, conducted at the conflicting, shifting interface of *anga`itangata* and *anga`imanu*. For instance, usually when children seriously misbehave (fighting, stealing, etc.), they are told off for behaving like dogs, pigs, or animals. Some familiar ones include: “*Oku mou kē `o hangē ha fanga kulī!*” (“You are fighting like dogs!”), “*Oku ke kai `o hangē ha puaka!*” (“You are eating like pigs!”) (cf. Māhina 2004c). Within this context, children are not equated with dogs or animals *per se*; rather, their behavior is compared to that of dogs or animals.

In Tonga, as in the Pacific, we witness the composite existence of a multiplicity of art forms where their individual rhythms are combined to yield a rhythmic level of an intense nature. This is evident in the case of *faiva ta`anga*, *faiva hiva*, and *faiva haka*, where their respective rhythms are merged, creating another rhythmic level of a more intensified order. There is, naturally, a

close affinity between them. For instance, when a poem is composed, it is then put to music and then choreographed into a dance. Similarly, both the arts of comedy and tragedy are present in the art forms of *faiva fananga* and *faiva lea heliaki*, “proverbs” (Māhina 1999c, 2003b, 2004c).

The Tongan myths of the Turtle Sangone and Canoe Lomipeau are metaphorical records of the individual historical, imperial links between Tonga and Samoa on the one hand and Tonga and `Uvea on the other where each of them is featured in the form of a tragedy and a comedy respectively (Māhina 1992, 1993, 1999b; Māhina and Alatini 2007; cf. Māhina, Ka`ili, and Ka`ili 2006). The same applies to the art of proverbs. A Tongan proverb such as *Lau matangi fai`i fale* (Talking about the wind from inside the house) is comic while one such as *`Oua `e lau kafo, ka e lau lava* (Mind not injury; rather, mind duty) is tragic (Māhina 2004c). While myths are prosaic, proverbs are poetic, and both are essentially rhythmic in relative degrees. Myths and proverbs, like comedy and tragedy, deal with conflicts in the human situation (Māhina 1999b, 2003b, 2004c). In effect, Tongan myths and proverbs can be generally divided into basically two types, the comic and the tragic. However, there have been cases where the comic and the tragic coexist in myth, proverb, or both.

Fananga and Misi: Myth and Dream

While myths and dreams share a lot in common as worlds of pure possibilities, where relations of cause and effect are absent, they are manifestations of the public and private subconscious minds respectively (Bott 1972; cf. Anderson 1962; Helu 1999; Māhina 2003a). As expressions of the human unconsciousness, myths and dreams take place on the collective and individual levels (Helu 1999). They not only relate to the specific humor of interest in this essay but are also directly connected with hypnotism, where both myth and dream are necessarily utilized as an investigative and communicative instrument. Whereas a myth is a collective dream, a dream is an individual myth (Māhina 2003a, 2003b). As psychological processes, myths and dreams represent an actual spatio-temporal transition from the conscious to the subconscious (Māhina 2003a; cf. Bott 1972; Helu 1999). Given the relative absence of logic or relations of cause and effect in them, both myths and dreams are considered worlds where anything is possible (cf. Anderson 1962; Baker 1979).

In these domains, the actual is, above spatio-temporality, mentally transformed into the potential, i.e., the impossible is transformed into the possible. While a myth is the deliberate creation of the conscious mind or

waking state, a dream is the accidental creation of the unconscious mind or sleeping state. Consciously, a myth is a mental creation that utilizes all the senses, where the collective mind transcends events over and above the single level of reality, to either a higher or lower level of existence. Opposite of a myth is a dream, an accidental creation of the unconscious mind occurring without the senses (Māhina 1999a). The senses are like doorways through which external images of reality freely present themselves to the mind where they are, in turn, mentally or electrochemically processed in terms of their individual qualities. This psychological process epistemologically organizes the ontological distinctions and relations of images or things, or states of affairs. Such complex interplay of mind and reality actively produces knowledge, either in subjective or objective terms, amounting at times to ignorance and confusion and at other times to real understanding (Māhina 2002a, 2003a; cf. Anderson 1962; Baker 1979).

Fananga, Misi, and *Faito'oloto*: Myth, Dream, and Hypnotism

Myths and dreams are transformative, investigative, and communicative in nature, deployed in hypnotism, and regarded as forms of psychoanalysis. Myths and dreams are combined in the context of hypnosis, which is a form of psychoanalysis. Hypnosis, like psychoanalysis, is the study of the mind. In a way, hypnosis initially parallels myth and finally parallels dream. In a similar manner to psychoanalysis, hypnosis operates within the context of the waking mind. As in the case of myth, the hypnotist consciously, though deliberately, engages in the design of a world relatively free of logic and external to the hypnotized. The hypnotized's waking mind is acted upon in conscious and intentional ways by the hypnotist, slowly transforming the conscious mode of the hypnotized to a state of unconsciousness by means of relations having no cause and effect.

During hypnosis, the senses (i.e., hearing, touch, taste, sight, and smell, which channel information about reality to the waking or conscious mind) are increasingly numbed by the creation of an environment of peace and harmony. When the senses of the hypnotized are consciously suppressed through complete silence, hypnotism unconsciously takes on the form of a myth, which is developed into a dream via total concentration. As a transformation process, hypnotism begins with a myth and ends with a dream. Total concentration and complete silence combine to produce an air of freedom, of no logical consequence or, for the same reasons, of no causal relations (Māhina 2003a). In effect, both a myth and a dream take the hypnotized through a *tā-vā*, *fuo-uho* of thoughts, transforming the world of

the here-and-now to the ethereal, yet real, realm of the so-called “divine” experience.

Misi and Fakaoli: Dream and Humor

Through the following story, which has some psychoanalytic implications, we experience the clever deployment of humor as a Tongan art form creatively produced in the context of a dream. The transformative capacities common to both the art form of humor and dream as a state of mind combine to tell us more about their shared investigative and communicative nature. At this point, I would like to retell a story that was told by an elderly man in a *faikava* (Collocott 1927; Feldman 1980; cf. Bott 1972), an informal *kava* drinking I attended many years ago in Tonga. This old man of Fijian descent was *Selemā*, the extremely witty, humorous, and gifted teller and original creator of funny anecdotes. He was known in *faikava* circles all over Tonga for his sense of humor and as an accomplished artist of *faiva fakaoli*. Clowning, usually the forte of older women, like satire (Hau’ofa 1983, 1995), may be considered a generic variation of comedy.

Selemā, gradually tilting up his head and raising his voice, begins to tell his tale. An abrupt change in mood occurs and everyone becomes noticeably quiet in great anticipation as the so-called “wicked-minded” *Selemā* is up, once again, to his usual tricks.

“After drinking a lot of *kava* last night, I staggered to my little coconut-thatched house. Intoxicated and half-awake, I collapsed senselessly onto my bed, a little plain mat on the floor. I had drunk too much of the muddy-colored stuff, you know. Strangely, however, I forgot to pass water or eat any food. Hardly had seconds gone by when I fell into a deep sleep.

Then, I had a dream. I dreamt and dreamt. In my dream, I saw many things; things I had never seen before. First, I saw myself in Paris. There, I was courting an exceedingly beautiful French girl. All of a sudden, however, as we were just about to kiss, I saw myself back in Tonga. I was at a feast sitting at the front table, busily feeding on yams and roasted suckling pigs.

In a blink of an eye, I saw myself walking on ice at the foot of a snowy mountain. Walking and walking, I looked down on the ice. ‘Hurrah! Gold!’ I exclaimed loudly. In my excitement, I started reaching down to pick up the nuggets. But I simply could not. Ah! So I thought, ‘I need something warm; something that would melt the ice. Ha! Ha! Warm water!’ But from where, when in the midst of

nowhere?' I asked myself. Suddenly, it clicked and I knew what to do. Hurriedly, I started lifting up my long skirt-like wraparound *tupenu*. In no time, I was urinating away on the ice, you see. It was the most refreshingly satisfying experience, with the exception, of course, of having sex. Anyway, the ice melted! With great elation, I quickly reached down."

But the very moment when *Selemā* touched the gold nuggets, he woke up, instead, holding his balls! By now, he was wide awake. The French beautiful girl was a lie; the great feast was a lie; even the gold was a lie. What was true, though, was that *Selemā* had simply wetted his *tupenu*!

Everyone's emotions were suspended while they awaited the climax of *Selemā*'s story. When he reached the humorous conclusion of his tale, we could no longer contain ourselves and burst into great laughter, making it a most fulfilling experience. Once again, there was another sudden change in the atmosphere, this time from dead silence to raucous laughter, creating an electrifying and tense feeling of exuberance. This kind of emotional fulfillment is common to most, if not all, kava drinking occasions for relating and debating issues of major cultural and historical significance (see, e.g., Feldman 1980; Collocott 1927). Kava drinking gatherings are also platforms for relaying oral traditions, for engaging in oratory and poetry of unique sophistry and rarity, for telling creative and original stories, jokes, and humor and recasting of old ones, and for singing traditional and contemporary songs of great artistry and beauty.

***Faito'o'atamai* and *Fakaoli*: Psychoanalysis and Humor**

In separate yet connected formal, substantial, and functional terms, psychoanalysis and humor (which involve a transformation from consciousness to unconsciousness and self-ignorance to self-knowledge respectively) are both investigative and communicative in nature (*Māhina* 2002a, 2003a, 2005a, 2005b; cf. Bott 1972; Helu 1999). As evident in the preceding story, two separate people or states of mind are featured in two distinct but interlaced domains. Engaged in conversation are *Selemā*'s conscious self and his unconscious mind, respectively situated in the waking domain and the dreaming world. The girl and food seen in his dream are probably images of sexual and hunger instincts deeply seated or suppressed in his subconscious mind. He undergoes a transformation from the waking world to the dream realm where all things were made possible, although not logically connected as they normally are in the waking world.

This breeds an atmosphere of liberation, a freeing up of Selemā's self or mind from the physical, social, and mental constraints of the waking world, which lasts nearly as long as his dream. It is not until Selemā awakes from his state of unconsciousness and deep sleep that he realizes all the things he saw in his dream were an illusion, i.e., they were simply untrue or false. These things all existed only in his mind, which was informed strictly by prior actual experience stored in his subconsciousness. However, he awoke to the unpleasant reality that he actually wetted his *tupenu*. Although his dream is the subject matter of Selemā's humor, which is a self-inquiry into how his own conscious and subconscious mind works, the two states of affairs, dreaming and laughing, nevertheless combine to yield a multiplicity of healing effects.

Conclusion: Issues and Implications

Dreams and humor are formally, substantially, and functionally related. Dreams, like myths, generate movement from consciousness to unconsciousness. The subject matter for psychoanalysis, or hypnotism for that matter, is inquiry into the workings of the mind (Māhina 2003a; cf. Bott 1972; Helu 1999). Using his dream as his subject matter, Selemā utilizes humor as a form of hypnosis and also psychoanalysis. Everyone, including Selemā, was temporally and spatially transformed through complete silence and total anticipation during the event, which concludes with a fulfilling sense of elation at the end. His dream contains a number of conflicting situations. Their climax reveals a disconnect between his dreaming and waking selves when he realizes that the visions in his dream are not the reality of his wakeful world. The absurdity of the situation causes laughter. Revelation of the contradictory character of the human situation, usually obscured by subjective interests, can be a source of objective knowledge. When a portion of this subjectivity is temporally and spatially, formally and substantially transformed into humor, the creation becomes an artistic celebration of the understanding of human absurdities through laughter. Aesthetically pleasing as a work of art, the experience derived from Tongan humor is both formally revealing and functionally healing.

GLOSSARY OF TONGAN AND OTHER WORDS

anga`imanu—animality

anga`itangata—sociality

faikava—*kava* drinking

- faitā, faiva*—photography, performance art of
faiva—performance art
faito`ò`atamai—psychoanalysis
faito`oloto—hypnosis
fakakata—laughter-like
fakamā—shame; shame-like
fakamamahi, faiva—sad things, performance art of; sadness-like; tragedy
fakaoli, faiva—funny things, performance art of; funny-like; comedy;
 humor
fale—house
fananga, faiva—legend(-telling), performance art of
fuo—form; shape; structure
fuo-uho—form-content
fò`uvaka—boat-building, material art of
haka, faiva—dance, performance art of
heliaki—epiphoric and metaphoric device
hele`uhila, faiva—cinema or film, performance art of
hiva, faiva—music, performance art of
kafo—injure; injury
kai—eat; eating
kata—laugh; laughter
kē—fight; fighting; quarrel; quarrelling
koka`anga, nimamea`a—bark-cloth-making, fine art of
kulī—dog
lālanga, nimamea`a—mat-weaving, fine art of
lalava, tufunga—*kafa*-sinnet lashing, material art of
langafale, tufunga—house-building, material art of
lava—possible; able; possibility; ability
lea heliaki, faiva—proverbs, performance art of
mā—shame
maama—light
māfana—warm; warmth
mamahi—sadness
matangi—winds
misi—dream
Moana—localized name of the Polynesians
ngalipoto—normality
ngalivale—absurdity
nimamea`a—fine art
oli—funny

puaka—pig

tā—time; tempo; beat; rhythm; rate; pace; form

ta`anga, faiva—poetry, performance art of

talatupu`a, faiva—myth(-telling), performance art of

tāmaka, tufunga—stone-cutting, material art of

tātatau, tufunga—tattooing, material art of

tā-vā—time-space

tauēlangi—lit. “reaching-the-sky”; excitement

tufunga—material art

tupenu—wrap-around garment

uho—content; substance; space

vā—space; relations; distance; surface

vela—burn; burning; fiery

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This original essay is dedicated to the late Ma`u-`i-Lalofonua (Fua Malungahu), a renowned artist of multiple arts, including *faiva fakaoli*, the late Selemā, whose great work of comedy is featured in this essay, and Sela Kāsinga, the greatest living Tongan artist of humor. A long-standing friend and great cultural teacher, Fua Malungahu, taught me many things about the intricacies and complexities of Tongan culture. He was a renowned *tufunga nimatapu* (literally “artist of the sacred hands,” i.e., undertaker) titled Ma`u-`i-Lalofonua (literally “Found-in-the-Underworld”). In Tonga, both death and the dead are regarded as more important than life and the living. The handling of death and the dead are taken to be *tapu*, sacred. By virtue of this worldview, man is, therefore, considered to be *`eiki* (divine) upon death. Apart from being an undertaker, orator, and musician, Fua was also an established artist of humor, a comedian.

A shorter version of a longer piece entitled “Psychoanalysis and Tongan Poetry: Their Aesthetic, Investigative and Therapeutic Value” was presented on a number of occasions: Lo`au Research Society (LRS) Conference, Sydney, Australia, 2002; Association of Social Anthropology in Oceania (ASAO) Conference, Auckland, New Zealand, 2002; Philosophy Weekly Seminar Series, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand, 2002. This shorter version was presented at the Sydney Society of Literature and Aesthetics Conference, 2003, Department of Anthropology Seminar Series, 2005; and Tongan Postgraduate Talanoa Seminar Series, Centre for Pacific Studies, University of Auckland, 2007. Much of the critical feedback in these conferences and seminars was invaluable in rethinking some of my original ideas on this specific subject.

In the production of this essay, I am greatly indebted to a number of institutions, groups, and individuals. On the institutional level, I must register my utmost gratitude to the University of Auckland Research Committee (UARC) and Pacific Arts Committee of Creative NZ for their financial assistance, which gave me the necessary time and space to conduct inquiry on and research into a range of topics of strict aesthetic significance. Equally, I must thank all the kava clubs in Tonga, Aotearoa New Zealand, Australia, Hawai`i and the U.S. for the long nights of tireless *talanoa* (talking-critically-yet-harmoniously), in this case, telling memorable stories of great humor and beautiful singing

and dancing. It was in these artistic contexts that I happened to come across a few individuals endowed with gifts of great wisdom and rare talents, such as Ma'u-'i-Lalofonua (Fua Malungahu), one of whom this essay is duly dedicated. Thank you all for the uplifting experiences from which I came to learn more about the beauty of many art forms, such as music and oratory, which provided me with the substance to reflect in new ways. I must thank members of the Lo'au Research Society (LRS) and Vava'u Academy for Critical Inquiry and Applied Research, Tāpinga'amaana Campus, Tefisi-Nga'akau, Vava'u, particularly Dr Max Rimoldi, Dr Wendy Pond, Dr Viliami Uasikē Lātū, Dr Robin Siale Havea, Dr Sifa Ika, Dr Fiona McCormack, Dr Tēvita Ka'ili, Dr 'Ōpeti Manisela Taliai, 'Inoke Fotu Hu'akau, 'Aisea Nau Matthew Māhina, Malia Talakai, Mele Ha'amoā Māhina 'Alatini and Failo Tāufa, for providing the intellectual platform on which we critically engaged in debating issues with a philosophical bearing on aesthetics. The two anonymous reviewers are duly acknowledged for their critical yet useful commentaries. Lastly, thanks go to my five children, Mele Ha'amoā, Kolokesa Uafā, 'Aisea Nau Matthew, Manuēsina 'Ofaki-Hautolo and Hikule'o Fe'ao-moe-Ako-'i-Kenipela Melaia, for their critical reading and commenting on an earlier draft.

NOTES

1. The subject matter of science deals with the form and content of things in nature, mind, and society, with their function as a different matter altogether. That is, science is primarily concerned with the independent working of things, as opposed to their treatment as we would like them to be.

2. Like the chief concerns of science with the form and content of things across nature, mind, and society, those of art and literature are with their tā and vā and fuo and uho underpinnings on both the abstract and concrete levels. Their functions are an issue for a separate consideration.

3. It must be pointed out that all the *kupesī* (elaborate and complex designs) used in such art forms as *tufunga tātatau* (tattooing), *tufunga ngaohikulo* (pottery-making), *lālanga* (weaving) and *koka'anga* (bark-cloth-making) are derivatives of the master art of *tufunga lalava*, *kafa-sinnet-lashing*, i.e., line-space intersection. This is in contrast to the common problematic assertion amongst Pacific archaeologists, notably Professor Roger Green, that *kupesī* such as those used in the production of bark-cloth, were derived from the ones associated with Lapita pottery.

4. Very little research has been done on Pacific humor (cf. Piddington 1963), let alone Tongan humor, except the works of a few Pacific scholars such as Epli Hau'ofa on Pacific satire in general (Hau'ofa 1983, 1995; cf. Hau'ofa 2000, 2005) and Vilisoni Hereniko on Rotuman clowning (1995), informed by a strict sense of idealism, structuralism, and determinism. Hereniko's recent short award-nominated film, *The Land Has Eyes* (2005) is of the same idealist, structuralist, and determinist type. While his two works can be considered an excellent piece of ethnography, they offer very little by way of theory. Moreover, both of his works dwell strictly on *what humor and myth do*, i.e., their extrinsic, social function, more so than *what humor and myth are*, i.e., their intrinsic, aesthetic nature.

5. In Tonga, *faiva fakaoli* is commonly yet mistakenly interchanged with what has also been alluded to as *faiva fakakata* to be Tongan art of humor. Given that *kata* (laughter) is an outcome of *oli* (being funny) as closely related psychological processes, it can be argued that *fakaoli* is a more appropriate term for humor than *fakakata*. But if there is to be a *faiva fakakata* (art of laughter), then *kata* (laughter) is unequivocally its subject matter, and not *oli* (being funny), which is the theme of *faiva fakaoli* (art of funny things).

REFERENCES

Adam, B.

1990 *Time and social theory*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Anderson, J.

1962 *Studies in empirical philosophy*. Sydney, Australia: Angus and Robertson.

Baker, A. J.

1979 *Anderson's social philosophy: The social thought & political life of Professor John Anderson*, ed. E. Benitez. Sydney, Australia: Angus & Robertson Publishers.

Benitez, E., ed.

2005 *Before Pangaea: New essays in transcultural aesthetics presented in honour of Professor Gracia Marchiano*. Sydney, Australia: The Journal of the Sydney Society of Literature and Aesthetics.

Bott, E.

1972 Psychoanalysis and ceremony. In *The interpretation of ritual: Essays in honor of A. I. Richards*, ed. J. S. La Fontaine, 203–37. London: Tavistock.

Chapman, T., and H. Foot, eds.

1976 *Humour and laughter: Theory, research and applications*. London: John Wiley & Sons.

Collocott, E.

1927 Kava ceremonial in Tonga. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 36 (141): 136–42.

Feldman, H.

1980 Informal Kava drinking in Tonga. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 89 (1): 101–03.

Harvey, D.

1990 Between space and time: Reflections on geographical imagination. *Annals, Association of American Geographers* 80: 418–34.

Hau'ofa, E.

1983 *Tales of the Tikongs*. Auckland, New Zealand: Longman Paul.

1995 *Kisses in the Nederends*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

2000 Epilogue: Pasts to remember. In *Remembrance of Pacific pasts: An invitation to remake history*, ed. R. Borofsky, 453–71. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

2005 Autonomy and creativity: A tribute to the founder of `Atenisi. In *Polynesian paradox: Essays in honour of Futa Helu*, ed. I. Campbell and E. Coxon, 17–24. Suva, Fiji: Inst. of Pacific Studies, Univ. of the South Pacific.

Helu, I. F.

1999 *Critical essays: Cultural perspectives from the South Seas*. Canberra, Australia: The Journal of Pacific History.

Hereniko, V.

1995 *Woven gods: Female clowns and power in Rotuma*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Hixon, M.

2000 *Sālotē: Queen of paradise*. Dunedin, New Zealand: Univ. of Otago Press.

Kaeppeler, R.

1993 *Poetry in motion: Study of Tongan dance*, Tonga: Vava'u Press; Honolulu: East-West Center's Pacific Islands Development Program.

Ka'ili, T. O.

2005 Tauhi vā: Nurturing Tongan sociospatial ties in Maui and beyond. *The Contemporary Pacific* 1 (17): 83–114.

2007 Tauhi vā: Creating beauty through the art of sociospatial relations. Unpublished PhD thesis. Univ. of Washington, Seattle.

La Fontaine, J. S., ed.

1972 *The interpretation of ritual: Essays in honor of A. I. Richards*. London: Tavistock.

Layton, R.

1991 *The anthropology of art*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Māhina, 'O.

1992 The Tongan traditional history Tala-ē-fonua: A vernacular ecology-centred, historico-cultural concept. Unpublished PhD thesis, Australian National Univ., Canberra.

1993 The poetics of Tongan traditional history, Tala-ē-fonua: An ecology-centred concept of culture and history. *Journal of Pacific History* 28: 109–21.

- 1999a Food Me'akai, and body sino in traditional Tongan society: their theoretical and practical implications for health policy. *Pacific Health Dialog: Journal of Community Health and Clinical Medicine for the Pacific*, 6: 276–87.
- 1999b Myth and history. In *Voyages and beaches: Pacific encounters, 1769–1840*, eds. A. Calder, J. Lamb, and B. Orr, 61–88. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.
- 1999c Theory and practice in anthropology: Pacific anthropology and Pacific Islanders. *Social Analysis: Journal of Social and Cultural Practice* 43 (2): 41–69.
- 2002a `Atamai, fakakaukau and vale: "Mind," "thinking" and "mental illness." *Pacific Health Dialog: Journal of Community Health and Clinical Medicine for the Pacific* 9 (2): 133–38.
- 2002b Tufunga lalava: the art of lineal and spatial intersection. In *Genealogy of lines: Hohoko e tohitohi*, ed. S. Rees, 5–9. New Plymouth: Govett-Brewster Art Gallery.
- 2003a Oceanic mythology. In *Myths, legends, & fantasies*, eds. Janet Parker and Julie Stanton, 373–81. Willoughby, Australia: Global Book Publishing.
- 2003b Psychoanalysis and Tongan poetry: Reflection on "the song of flowers," *The Journal of the Sydney Society of Literature and Aesthetics* 13 (1): 97–106.
- 2004a "Art as tā-vā," "time-space" transformation. In *Researching the Pacific and Indigenous peoples: Issues and perspectives*, ed. T. Baba, 'O. Māhina, N. Williams, and U. Nabobo-Baba, 86–93. Auckland, New Zealand: Centre for Pacific Studies, Univ. of Auckland.
- 2004b Issues and challenges in Pacific research: Some critical comments. In *Researching the Pacific and Indigenous peoples: Issues and perspectives*, ed. T. Baba, 'O. Māhina, N. Williams, and U. Nabobo-Baba, 186–98 Auckland, New Zealand: Centre for Pacific Studies, Univ. of Auckland.
- 2004c *Reed book of Tongan proverbs: Ko e Tohi 'a e Reedki he Lea Tonga Heliaki*. Auckland, New Zealand: Reed Publishing.
- 2005a The poetics of exile: Love and death in Tongan poetry. In *Before Pangaea: New essays in transcultural aesthetics presented in honour of Professor Grazia Marchiano*, ed. E. Benitez, *The Journal of the Sydney Society of Literature and Aesthetics*, special issue 15 (1): 136–47.
- 2005b *Tatau, potupotutatau and mālie*: A realist reflection on the symmetry, harmony and beauty of Queen Sālote's poetry. In *Polynesian Paradox: Essays in honour of Futa Helu*, ed. I. Campbell and E. Coxon, 168–83. Suva, Fiji: Inst. of Pacific Studies, USP.
- 2007 *Faiva ta'anga: Maau filifili 'a `Okusitino Māhina*. Auckland, New Zealand: LRS Publishing.
- 2008 Forthcoming. From vale ignorance to 'ilo knowledge to poto skill, the Tongan theory of ako education: Theorising old problems anew. *ALTER-NATIVE*.

Māhina, 'O., and M. H. M. `Alatini

- 2007 On the back of the sea turtle Sangone. In *Peace songs resounding in the Baisun Plain*, APCEU, 152–60. Seoul, Korea: APCEU.

Māhina, 'O., T. Baba, T. Williams, and U. Nabobo-Baba, eds.

- 2004 *Researching the Pacific and Indigenous peoples: Issues and perspectives*. Auckland, New Zealand, Centre for Pacific Studies: Univ. of Auckland.

- Māhina, 'O., T. O. Ka`ili, and `A. Ka`ili
 2006 *Ko e Ngaahi `Ata mei heHisitōlia mo e Kalatua `o Tonga: Ke Tufunga`i ha Lea Tonga Fakaako*. Auckland, New Zealand: Centre for Pacific Studies, Univ. of Auckland.
- Māhina, 'O., `A. N. M. Māhina, and M. O. Māhina
 2007 Tongans at the University of Auckland: A cause for celebrations. In *Ātea, Moana and Vanua: Voices from the Brown Edge*, ed. `O. Māhina, N. Seve-Williams, A. Faaiuso, and D. Hosking, 210–61. Auckland, New Zealand: Langiatea Moana Press, Univ. of Auckland.
- Māhina, 'O., and K. U. Māhina-Tuai
 2007 *Lea Tonga heliaki: Faiva moe tufunga lea heliaki*. Auckland, New Zealand: TVEDT Publishing.
- Māhina, 'O., and U. Nabobo-Baba
 2004 The issue of Pacific past and future: A challenge for Pacific students and academics in the present. In *Researching the Pacific and Indigenous peoples: Issues and perspectives*, ed. T. Baba, 'O. Māhina, N. Williams, and U. Nabobo-Baba, 202–06. Auckland, New Zealand: Centre for Pacific Studies, Univ. of Auckland.
- Māhina, 'O., S. P. M. T. Potauaine, M. H. M. `Alatini, `A. N. M. Māhina, and M. O. Māhina
 2007 *Veimau: Maau mo Potupotutatau kae Fepakitu`u mo Fihitu`u: Order and harmony yet conflicting and complex*, ed. `O. Māhina, N. Seve-Williams, A. Faaiuso, and D. Hosking. Auckland, New Zealand: TVEDT Publishing.
- Māhina, 'O., N. Seve-Williams, A. Faaiuso, and D. Hosking
 2007 *Ātea, Moana and Vanua: Voices from the Brown Edge*. Auckland: Langiatea Moana Press, Univ. of Auckland.
- Moyle, R.
 1987 *Tongan music*. Auckland, New Zealand: Univ. of Auckland Press.
- Piddington, R.
 1963 *The psychology of laughter: A study in social adaptation*. New York: Gamut Press, Inc.
- Rees, S., ed.
 2002 *Genealogy of lines: Hohoko e tohitohi*. New Plymouth: Govett-Brewster Art Gallery.
- Thomas, N.
 1995 *Oceanic Art*. London: James & Hudson.

Veatch, T. C.

- 1999 A theory of humour, *Humour, the International Journal of Humour Research*
<http://www.tomveatch.com/else/humour/paper/humour.html>.

Wood Ellem, E., ed.

- 2004 *Songs and poems of Queen Sālote*, trans. by M. Taumoeofolau, with essays by HRH Princess N. Tuku'aho, A. Kaepler, E. Wood Ellem, and M. Taumoeofolau.
Tonga: Vava'u Press.