I myself regard the explanation of *mana* as a main point in my book, and fundamental to a further understanding of Maori religious beliefs. I have found it extremely difficult to define the implications of this word, since it is quite impossible to translate. In Danish, what I did was to coin a new word, a compound noun “fællesliv” which I then endeavoured to give the meaning possessed by *mana*. The term pointed in the direction where the meaning lay, and as a new word was not burdened from the outset by any misleading implications. Unfortunately, it did not lend itself to being rendered into English. My translator and I then seized upon the word “fellowship,” and I hoped that my discussion of *mana* would make it clear as to the very special significance attached to the word here. Naturally the difficulty lay in the word not being new, and it has also become apparent that in several instances its meaning has hindered comprehension of my exposition.

That this was a stumbling block was apparent to me when I read a paper by Aarne Koskinen. He quoted from my thesis that “*mana* is a kind of fellowship;” but declared thereafter: “This is not easily understood. Perhaps the expression used by the translator is somewhat far-fetched.” He furthermore added in a footnote: “In the Danish resumé of the book, the idea is expressed in the words *mana* means ‘fællesliv.’ I did not understand Dr. Johansen’s view at once. I rejected this definition when I first read the book, but later I have been persuad-
ed that there is much truth in his Danish expression” (Koskinen 1960: 125).

I do not feel we can lay any blame upon my translator. The problem lies with the impossibility of transferring the freer word formation in Danish to English. It might have been possible to facilitate comprehension by means of Levy-Bruhl’s participations. However, in 1954 I was afraid that it would encumber my presentation with the misconception that Maori thinking should be “pre-logical.” This unfortunate conception certainly bewildered him in his observations. As we know, he himself arrived at a better grasp of the matter (or at last abandoned the idea of pre-logical). Thus clarification has gradually come about, so that it is now usually recognized that the differences between our own and primitive thinking do not lie in the logic, but in the premises. It can be said in general that wherever possible our fundamental model of cognition is a mathematical one, or in any case as free as possible from the spontaneous and irrational features of living beings. The “model” of the primitive is alive. We feel he pushes it to extremes by regarding stones and posts as being animate (Koskinen 1960: 41).

However, the question indeed is whether we do not exaggerate things very much more by forcing cognition into lifeless and dead forms. Whatever the case may be, “participations” with the Maoris are an aspect of the living. They relate to fundamental experiences and are not merely concepts or notions they have.

It is important that these participations are mutual, and in the case of mana it thus means that the mutual participations of a dynamic character are centered in the person or object possessing the mana.

The Maori’s experience of the relationship between the chief and his tribe, for instance, namely that the chief possesses the mana of the tribe, is based on his participation in the life of every single member of his tribe. However, since mana is the dynamic centre, the chief is empowered to make his people obey his will through mana, but the mutuality in the participations is manifested in the opportunity given the individual to take part in shaping the chief’s will.

Returning to the exposition I presented in 1954, it was thus this mutual participation which I endeavoured to maintain through the expression “fellowship.” It had never been intended as an actual translation. However, since the traditional conception of mana had placed the main emphasis on the dynamic, I therefore found it important to present the other side, the mutual participation which is the medium through which the dynamic aspect manifests itself.

**Time**

On p.152, I wrote about the Maori’s relationship to historical sayings: “these sayings have a literal meaning with which we have no direct contact.” It was doubtless for linguistic considerations in par-
ticular that I was tempted to adopt this formulation which I now find misleading. What I can still defend are the statements on p.153, namely that the use of these sayings “also implies the whole situation of history.”

The literal recurrence of times long past is known of (familiar) in religious psychology in connection with occurrences and experiences of a mystical nature, such as those described by Marcel Proust for instance. There is much to indicate that a people like the Maoris have known this, particularly in ritualistic situations, though also possibly on other occasions when tensions run high, e.g. when mourning for the dead or when the sayings suggest themselves in crises. However, it is only for ritualistic situations that a concrete reason can be put forward for this presumption namely the peculiar merging of past and present, of myth and ritual, as we find it with the Maoris as well as with other primitive peoples.

**Tapu**

Jean Smith in her *Tapu removal in Maori religion* (Smith 1974: 39) has criticized the characterization I gave on p.185 of the Maori attitude to *tapu* in general. I feel she was right in so far as the Maori relations with *tapu* were generally not particularly pious. I have not myself seen the consequences of my later studies on *kumara* rituals, namely that a number of the most important rituals are concerned with ritualistic violations of *tapu, which* in the myths are expressed by combat and subjugation. In her book she has arrived at conclusions that are interesting and to a large extent convincing, through interpreting a number of myths from the viewpoint of *tapu* removal.

It is quite legitimate to write a book on tapu removal. Yet just because the book throws light on much in the myths, there is a danger that readers might forget the other aspects of the matter. *Mana* signifies the positive and harmonious in the relationships between people mutually, and with their surroundings. This is not apparent from the myths but is implied. *Tapu* indicates a disharmonious relationship and *tapu* violations thus become a main theme in dramatic mythology. Yet it is vital to remember that before any *tapu* can be violated, it must at least have existed and had been respected. I still think that this very fact bears witness to a deep-seated respect for the character and strength of the life which any *tapu* protects or is identified with, though this is undeniably a respect which is most often quite unsentimental. What I wrote on p. 190 about the chief problem being to protect *tapu* against the profane, does not of course apply to the ritualistic situations.
Since I penned the appendix dealing with the source value of the texts, information based on archival studies has been published in the two following articles on the origins of the texts.


It is greatly to be hoped that the publishing work now in progress, in particular by Margaret Orbell, may be expedited so that the large collections of texts still lying in the archives may become accessible to researchers. Until this is effected, they will still be very dependent upon John White’s *The Ancient History of the Maori*. This is regrettable, since all more recent studies have shown that he has taken several liberties with the texts (Orbell 1968: 107 f. and 113-116). Critical attitudes are necessary. For the time being one must doubtless manage with internal criteria.