

The Atoll of Niue: its settlement and people

The colonization of Niue ~~is~~ is of unique importance in the wider field of Pacific studies as it is not only the ^{only existing} ~~only~~ ^{Polynesian} outlier in Polynesia ~~today~~, but ~~Polynesian~~ ^{Polynesian} ~~one~~ ^{one} importantly it is the only outlier, past or present, in either region, ~~Polynesian or non-Polynesian~~, ⁱⁿ which we can follow the whole process of settlement from inception to the present day.

There are ~~many~~ several Polynesian outliers in Melanesia, such as Ostrea Tova, Sekiana and Tahopia, and in Micronesia, notably Kapuyarainagi and Nukeroro, and from oral tradition we know that most of them possess Micronesian components in their population mixture, but tradition is mute on the date and detail of the original settlement.

Only in one case of intra-regional migration - from the Marquesas to the Tuamotus - do we have documentary accounts of the ~~own~~ ^{and arrival} departure of the expedition, but even here ~~we have~~ ^{there is no} record of its subsequent fate.

For Niue alone among the known cases of intra-regional settlement in pre-European times ~~does~~ the historical record answers almost every question which we ~~should~~ could wish to have been able to put to the participants ~~and~~ ^{or} their descendants; and for this ~~reason~~ ^{reason} privilege we have to thank ~~our~~ ^{the} ~~Polynesian~~ ^{Polynesian} ~~historian~~ ^{historian} the late ^{rose} ~~Dr~~ ^{Dr} ~~Frederick~~ ^{Frederick} ~~W. G. Speiser~~, well-known in his time in ^{both} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~Pacific~~ ^{Pacific} ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~South~~ ^{South} ~~Sea~~ ^{Sea} ~~islands~~ ^{islands}.

and Tuvolu ~~was~~ ^{the} foremost authority on
the affairs of Niue, and ~~especially~~ especially its history.

the
NUI NTRO 2

There is another reason why the
settlement of Niue ~~is~~ ^{has} a special importance,
in this case to Gilbertese historical studies, for
it took place by Alesana and Beni High Chief
~~greatest~~ genealogical reckoning ~~is~~ ^{is} about ~~the~~ ¹² generations,
~~before~~ ^{and} by an ~~important~~ Niue reckoning 11
generations, before 1900. ^{fully}

The Niue genealogy is ~~likely~~ ^{likely} to be ~~important~~
because it is not that of a politically important descent
line and ~~contains~~ ^{contains} two women, ~~which~~
which is often so can sometimes be an indication of
breach of a ^{line} ~~line~~.

The migration to Niue and ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~settlement~~ ^{settlement},
~~however~~ ^{however} ~~took~~ ^{took} place, ~~however~~ ^{however},

From Anetipa's ~~own~~ ^{own} ~~evidence~~ ^{evidence},
however, it is clear that the migration to Niue took
place two generations after the conclusion of the wars
of Kaitia and Nakeia which ~~was~~ ^{was}, with the exception
of the coming from Samoa, the ~~last~~ ^{last} recorded event
in Gilbertese pre-European history.

Recognizing that we ^{are unable to} cannot get more than ~~very~~ approximate dates in chronological dates from genealogical tables, even though our lists of names may be absolutely correct as far as I believe it is in ~~some~~ the genealogies set out in Gen. 1, let us test them against our span of 332 years from AD 1568 to 1900.

Two generational spans ~~are~~ ^{have} been used in the past by Pacific Ethnohistorians:

(1) 25 years, as accepted by Percy Smith for Polynesia and Gribble for the Gilberts,¹ though Gribble considered 27 as more accurate for males and even ~~was~~ ^{has} accepted 25 only as being more convenient to use.

(2) 30 years, as usually accepted outside the Pacific, ^{area} and by Fernald for Polynesia.²

Gribble, ^{using} ~~provisional~~ an imperfect genealogical table giving 9 1/2 generations to the the war (from 1920) a line of ancestry AD 1920) gives an ~~approximate~~ ^{approximate} date of AD 1680 for the war. My own figures, based on 12 generations from AD 1900 three genealogies each ~~giving~~ ^{giving} 12 generations from AD 1900 give the date as AD 1600. at 27 years to a generation Gribble's date for the war must be AD 1663 and mine AD 1575.

But we know that the canoes did not ~~reach~~ ^{arrive} at Niue immediately after the war ~~but~~ but after

¹ Percy Smith
² Fernald

; Gribble 1989: 274-5.

~~reports~~ on Tahitians but when

it had spread from ~~Mount Tolitena~~ and ~~Sancti~~ to
~~Manila~~, ~~near~~ ~~Canara~~ ~~and~~ ~~Abra~~, where ^{Tatava} ~~one~~ of
the settlers on ~~San~~, was defeated and fled to ~~Sancti~~
~~Sancti~~ ~~Sancti~~ ~~Sancti~~ and ended up on Tolitena,
where he his ~~his~~ island of Tarawa, carried it and landed
on Tolitena. There he remained ~~some~~ for a 'long
time' (at least sufficient for his daughter to marry a
Tolitena $\frac{3}{2}$ and for Tertinti to inherit the chieftain of
South ~~North~~).

allowing 10 years for this period, from the
war on Tolitena to the arrival at ~~San~~, we cannot
do more than make an informed guess, the date of
the colonization of ~~San~~ ~~Sancti~~ ~~Sancti~~ would be:

- (1) on $\frac{3}{2}$ 25 years to a generation: A.D. ~~1610~~ 1610.
- (2) on 27 years to a generation: A.D. ~~1585~~ 1585.
- (3) on 30 years to a generation: A.D. 1550.

There is another reason why the settlement of Niue is of special importance, in this case to Gilbertese historical studies, for by Alexander, and ~~then~~ ~~the~~ ~~high~~ ~~chief~~ ~~geological~~ ~~researcher~~ ~~Ben~~ and Niue geologist reckoning it took place approximately 12 generations before 1900, other traditions is clear that it took place from our sources that it took place not long after the ward of Kaitu and Malesa. Tatorua, one of the colonists passengers in the first canoe, was actually fleeing from Alosiang when he lost his way and ~~defected~~ ~~at~~ ~~Alosiang~~ ~~when~~ ~~he~~ ~~lost~~ ~~his~~ ~~way~~ ~~and~~ ~~arrived~~ ~~at~~ ~~Talitevea~~. ^{to his line at a Tama}

This war was the most important event in Gilbertese history between the main migration from Samoa and the establishment of the British Protectorate in 1892 and may be ~~reliably~~ ~~dated~~, even a comparison of several genealogies, ~~the~~ ~~as~~ ~~being~~ ~~occurred~~ ~~very~~ ~~short~~ ~~12~~ ~~generations~~ ~~before~~ ~~1900~~.

¹⁹⁰⁰ ^{we obtain our chronological date} ^{from the fact that} Niue was the first island to be discovered sighted by Europeans in the ^{South} Tenua, and the first ~~island~~ ~~islands~~ ~~seen~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~South~~ ~~Tenua~~ ~~by~~ ~~Handerson~~ ~~on~~ ~~his~~ ~~first~~ ~~trans-Pacific~~ ~~expedition~~ ~~in~~ ~~1868~~, when he ^{with} ^{his} ^{company} called it the Island of Jesus. We therefore have ^{the} ^a ^{chronological} ^{span} ^{of} ^{no} ^{less} ^{than} ³³² ^{years} ^{to} ^{check} ^{the} ^{accuracy} ^{of} ^{our} ^{genealogical} ^{data} ^{from} ^{the} ^{islands} ^{the} ^{average} ^{length} ^{of} ^a ^{generation} ^{as} ^{used} ^{for} ^{other} ⁱⁿ ^{the} ^{calculation} ^{of} ^{an} ^{average} ^{generation} ^{date} ^{of} ^{genealogical} ^{data} ^{reckoning}.

1 see Gen. 1

from 1568 to 1900

Appendix 3

(1) The largest chronological span in Gillese history is 332 years: from 1900 to the date of Merdama's discovery of Ni in 1568.

(a) The ~~three~~ ^{two} generational spans hitherto used in dating Gillese history by genealogical lines are:

(a) 25 years, chosen by Perry Smith for Polynesia and by Gille for Kiribati.

(b) 27 years, considered to be usually more accurate by Gille but not so convenient to use.

(c) ~~set~~ 30 years, as accepted in other parts of the world and by Farnwell for the Pacific.

(c) The finest date ~~readily~~ established in Gillese of ~~the~~ genealogical reckoning in Gillese history is 12 generations from 1900 to the beginning of the war of Kaitu and Ukeia.²

(d) ~~Based~~ Dependent on the generational span used, this date has been put at:

(a) AD 1600 ~~AD~~ using a 25 year span ~~the~~
($25 \times 12 = 300$ years).

~~(b) AD 1975 using a 27 year span
($27 \times 12 = 324$ years).~~

(b) ~~AD~~ AD 1540 - using a 30 year span
($30 \times 12 = 360$ years).

GENSPAN

From the ~~antepio~~ ^{antepio} narrative the first settlement could not have taken place ~~any~~ ^{possibly} earlier than 10 years after the emergence of the War, i.e. in AD 1680, ~~1575~~ or 1550 according to the geological span used.

Yet in AD 1568 Mendana ~~antepio~~ ^{antepio} recorded that five canoes came out from the island and their occupants came ready with bows - shot before being driven away and returning to the atoll.³

This would only have been possible if we take a geological span as being 30 years as on the 25 year span hitherto used the redoubt would it would be over half a century before the Galathea colonised the island. ¹ Admittedly the occupants

of the ~~the~~ canoes might have been ^{transient} visitors ^{to the atoll} but this is less probable than ~~the~~ the hypothesis that our 25 year geological span is ^{in fact} too little. At least ^{our figures suggest} the desirability of examining ^{the hypothesis} further wherever the opportunity occurs in the course of our historical researches.

① only on a 30 year span would the atoll have been in occupation for 28 years, a period which affords ample time for ^{minor} geological errors in the tables used.

³ Maudslayi 1968: 55.

7

this is an unequal opportunity to check the largest chronological span in Gallathea lists against the next best established date obtained from ~~geological~~ geological research.

For the actual calculations and the assumptions

where a known chronological date coincides or comes close to a geologically calculable or calculable

The Atoll of Nui: its settlement and people

Introduction

The colonization of Nui is of unique importance in the wider field of Pacific studies not only because it is the sole existing Micronesian outlier in Polynesia but, more importantly, as being the only outlier, past or present, in either region where we can follow the whole process of settlement from its inception to the present day.

There are, of course, Polynesian outliers in both Melanesia and Micronesia, such as Ontong Java, Sikiana, Tikopia, Kapingamarangi and Nukuoro, and from oral tradition it seems that most of them possess Micronesian (usually Gilbertese) components in their population mixture, but tradition is mute on the time and detail of the original settlement or of later arrivals.

Only in one case of intra-regional migration - from the Marquesas to the Tuamotus - do we have ~~documentary~~ accounts of the departure and arrival of the would-be migrants, but even here there is no record of their subsequent fate.

From Nui alone among the known cases of inter-regional settlement in pre-European times the historical record answers almost every question which we could reasonably wish to have put to the participants or their descendants; and for this advantageous position we are indebted to the late Anetipa, well-known in his time in both Kiribati and Tuvalu as the foremost authority on the affairs of Nui, and especially its history.

There is another reason why the settlement of Nui has a special importance, in this case to Gilbertese historical studies, for it took place by Abemama and Beru High Chief genealogical reckoning about 12 generations, and by a Nui reckoning 11 generations, before 1900.

The Nui genealogy is probably imperfect because it is not that of a politically important descent line and includes two women, which can sometimes be a pointer to foreshortening.

From Anetipa's evidence, however, it is clear that the migration to Nui took place two generations after the commencement of the wars of Kaitu and Uakeia which is, with the exception of the Coming from Samoa, the best recorded event in Gilbertese pre-European history.

We obtain our chronological date from the fact that Nui was the first island to be seen by Europeans in Tuvalu, and the first where islanders were actually seen in either Kiribati or Tuvalu: this being by Mendana on his first trans-Pacific voyage in 1568, when he called it the Island of Jesus.

We therefore have a chronological span of no less than 332 years, from 1568 to 1900, to check the accuracy of the length of an average generation as used in the computation of dates based on genealogies.

Recognizing that we are unlikely to get more than approximate chronological dates from genealogical tables, this is a unique opportunity to check the longest chronological span in Gilbertese history against the most firmly established date obtained by genealogical reckoning.

Two generational spans have been used in the past by Pacific ethnohistorians:

- (1) 25 years, as accepted by Percy Smith for Polynesians and Grimble for the Gilbertese,¹ though Grimble considered 27 as more accurate for males and only accepted 25 as being more convenient to use.

¹Percy Smith

; Gulle 1989: 274-5.

- (2) 30 years, as usually accepted outside the Pacific area and by Fornander for Polynesia.

Grimble, using an imperfect genealogical table giving 9½ generations to the War (apparently from 1920) arrives at an approximate date of A.D.1680 for its commencement.. My own figures, based on the three important genealogies referred to, make the date to be A.D.1600, using Grimble's 25 year span.

But we know that the canoes did not arrive at Nui immediately after the War but when it had spread to Abaiang, where Tataua, one of the settlers on Nui, was defeated and fled to his home island of Tarawa, missed it and landed on Tabiteuea. There he remained for a 'long time' (at least sufficient for his daughter to marry a Tabiteuean and for Tentinti to inherit the chiefship of south Nonouti).

Allowing 10 years for this period (from the commencement of the War on Tabiteuea to the arrival of the colonists on Nui), for we cannot do more than make an informed guess, the date of the colonization of Nui would be:

- (1) on 25 years to a generation - A.D.1610.
- (2) On 27 years to a generation - A.D.1585.
- (3) On 30 years to a generation - A.D.1550.

Fornander