If one could picture to oneself a person like Kant among the old Maoris—which indeed is difficult—one should not be surprised if to the fundamental categories of knowledge, time and space, he had added: kinship.

The whole cosmos of the Maori unfolds itself as a gigantic “kin,” in which heaven and earth are first parents of all beings and things, such as the sea, the sand on the beach, the wood, the birds, and man. Apparently he does not feel quite comfortable if he cannot—preferably in much detail—give an account of his kinship whether to the fish of the sea or to a traveller who is invited to enter as a guest. With real passion the high-born Maori studies the genealogies, compares them with those of his guests, tries to find common ancestors, and unravels elder and younger lines. There are examples that he has kept in order genealogies including up to 1400 persons.¹

Before a young couple is allowed to marry, it is a real comfort for two fathers to discover a common ancestor, even if they must search back through 15 generations in order to find him among the first settlers of New Zealand.² “The Maoris carried relationship to even tenth or

¹ Best 1924b: 15.
² Tarakawa 1893: 228; see also Gudgeon 1893 and Tarakawa 1893: 242.
twelfth cousinship or further,” writes an expert like Percy Smith.³ There may be just the mere tradition of a relationship; still, Maori thought will take this course: “I don’t know exactly what the relationship is . . . but Walker and I are aware that we are related, and always come to each other’s help in war.”⁴

The genealogies show the relation of men to each other; whether the kinship is near or remote; whether my guest belongs to an early line, or the like. Only when this has been elucidated, I know whether I am talking to a papa, which denotes any male relative of my father’s generation including my father; or perhaps a tuakana, i.e. a male relative of my own generation belonging to an older line, including my own elder brothers. The Maori rarely uses other kinship terms than such classificatory terms.⁵ As these disregard any difference between near and remote relationship, they do not, of course, give any exhaustive information about the mutual relation of the persons in question. Still, they are precise on an important point. By grouping according to such views as generations, and particularly by distinguishing between older and younger lines, they denote differences in esteem, thus giving the basis of everything in the way of social etiquette.

Considering that the relationship is traced so far out, it is natural to ask the question: What does it mean? This question has been treated in a very stepmotherly fashion and is not easy to answer, either. The classificatory terms, which merge near and remote kinship, do not and cannot cover the facts, but correspond fairly well to the Maori’s thoughts of kinship. This indicates the problem which we shall now try to tackle. The fact is that kinship can mean everything from the nearest, warmest, and most genuine he knows to open enmity, but even in the last case kinship is in his mind.

Only when this is remembered it is possible to understand contrasts which apparently are almost incompatible.

If from the above-mentioned cases, in which Maoris dig their way many generations back into time in order to determine their relationship, one unpreparedly comes upon the story about Paoa and his sons, one involuntarily starts.

Paoa was a high-born Maori whom circumstances and his own character led to several wanderings and marriages. First, he had some children by a woman in Waikato and finally he settled down and lived with
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³ Makere in Smith 1908c: 171.
⁴ Maning 1906: 242. Walker was a Maori: Thomas Walker Nene.
⁵ A comprehensive list of terms of relationship is found in Best 1924b: 362 ff.
Tukutuku, who bore a number of sons to him. When he had grown very old, he took a fancy to seeing his first children once more. His sons by Tukutuku were not very pleased at that and they said to him that if their older half-brothers tried to keep him back, they would come for him. Paoa then set off and saw his elder children again. When the appointed time had passed, he had not yet returned and so the younger sons set out in order to fetch him. They nearly abducted their father, and it came to blows between the elder brothers and their people on the one hand and the younger brothers and their people on the other. During the fight two of the elder brothers were killed by one of their younger half-brothers. The peculiar thing is that in neither of the two versions in which Paoa’s saga has been handed down, the least comment on this bloodshed among relatives is offered.6

A conflict may arise between father and son as well. Peha had a son, Manutongatea, by a woman, whom, however, he left before she had given birth to the boy. During his adolescence he was teased by the other boys because he had no father. When he had grown up he therefore set out in order to find his father. He succeeds in doing so, but then he and his companions are assaulted by his father and his attendants, who do not know him. At night while he is lying bound and cold, he sings a song which reveals who he is. He is released, lives for some time in his father’s house, but then returns home, collects an army, returns and cuts down his father and his people. “Manutongatea’s insult was revenged.” ends the Maori. The insult partly was the one suffered by him by lying tied up in the cold, partly the killing of his companions.7

These two stories are of course exceptions, but they are characteristic of the Maori. There are circumstances under which kinship is not an urgent reality. In these two cases it is not difficult to see the reason why. The relatives who kill each other are, indeed, closely related, but they have grown up apart; they have never lived together. It would be wrong to conclude from this fact that the relationship was of no importance. It is like a latent picture which is first to be developed and fixed by their living together.

Such an unbaptized relationship, a relation which, however, is not a relation, may give rise to a strange play. Tamainupo was another youth who had never seen his father, Kokako. Chance would have it that he married the daughter of Kokako’s enemy. He lived at the house of his

father-in-law, joined his wife’s family, and took part in a war against Kokako. Before the battle he obtained information about the appearance of the latter, who was to be recognized by his cloak. He himself was the only person who knew that Kokako was his father. During the fight Tamainupo pursued his father and tore his cloak from him, but allowed him to escape. “He was his father. Therefore he did not pursue and kill him,” comments the Maori narrator. It is significant that he should feel at all induced to explain the matter.8 Later the son goes to see his father, but—be it noted—with his father-in-law’s permission.

The Maori is aware that there is a problem in the relation between brothers (and sisters) who have grown up in different places. It may give rise to a wish for securing peace between the parties beforehand. A woman, Ruaputahanga, had children in two villages. When she felt death approaching she told the sons with whom she was living to put her skull on a platform beside the village green. If their half-brothers came on a visit they would recognize them by the fact that the skull would fall down. Her sons did as they had been told, and everything really happened as foreseen. The half-brothers recognized each other and everything passed off in the best way.9

But not even this solicitude always avails. Another woman, Hiapoto, in the same situation had given the same instructions. The half-brothers came one day and the skull fell down; but unfortunately everybody had forgotten the meaning of the sign and it came to fighting and killing.10

Ngarue was a third person to make use of special means to keep the relationship alive. When forced to leave his pregnant wife he left a magic arrow behind. If the child turned out to be a son, the arrow would show him the way to his father (and so it actually happened). If a daughter, the wife was ordered to pronounce a formula over the child by a kind of “baptism” (tohi). These words tell us rather more than the magic arrow:11

A father in the house, and affection is at rest,
A parent abroad, and tears blind the eyes.
By questing feet may affectionate yearning be subdued and set at rest.
Charm thy footsteps as were those of Hine at Whitiananaunau,12
That you may reach the house porch of your father Ngarue.

10. White 1888a: 79.
11. Best 1925e: 312 (translated by Best).
12. Refers to the myth of Hinetitama, who fled from her father, Tane, across the plain of Whitiananaunau to the underworld.
Let your dreams at night, O Ngarue!
Bring to your ear the murmur of Hine-matangi on your plaza.

With these words an invincible longing for her father is to be instilled in Hinematangi, as the daughter is to be named,—and at the same time the power to seek him out: “By questing feet may affectionate yearning be subdued.”

To judge from the sagas the most frequent situation of this kind consists in a youth visiting an older near relative, father or uncle, whom he has never seen before.

Among high-born people there is an orthodox way in which to do that. In order completely to understand this, it must be borne in mind that the meeting of near relatives after separation for a prolonged time greatly moves the Maori. The characteristic thing is that this emotion is shown in a definite social form called tangi. At a tangi, one gives oneself up in an unrestrained manner to the weeping which naturally is produced by the internal emotion, and this is accompanied by moaning sounds. As tangi is a standing element in Maori culture, it is also of course used when there is no feeling in it, but this does not concern the main aspect of the matter. The custom of tangi gives us a feeling of the excitement accompanying the meeting of relatives, even when there are no complications; but if the two relatives have never seen one another, this excitement is thwarted by another factor, viz. the Maori’s intense aversion to telling his name. The youth who is approaching, say, the home of his hitherto unknown father, therefore is a whole knot of tensions. There is no bridge between being an unknown stranger whom anybody may kill—and most probably will kill—and being within the kinship group. There is no path, but a leap from open enmity to the intense emotion of recognition.

The orthodox method, at any rate if the father is high-born, is that of jumping into the situation. From the very beginning the son indicates his significant special position by creeping over the stockade, if it is a fortress, instead of going through the entrance. Next, he creeps into the house through the window instead of entering by the door, and as the culmination he sits down on his father’s most sacred couch, which otherwise nobody dares use. This is occupying one’s position as a son with a coup. If a stranger did so it would be certain death to him. In the fair number of cases handed down to us (perhaps in a slightly varied form), it generally gives rise to a passing panic. As a rule, the father (or uncle) himself real-
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izes who is before him. Otherwise the youth helps by singing a song which indirectly shows who he is. After the recognition they give vent to their feelings in a tangi. Later the relation is confirmed by a religious rite, tohi, the same as that performed for newborn children.¹⁵

Turning to ethnographical descriptions of the Maoris we find little information about the importance of living together for the force of the relationship. The only one to give some attention to the matter is Firth,¹⁶ who in his sociological descriptions starts from the village, kainga. Even if he does strike the theme, he mainly leaves it at that. Later he has returned to the problem and formulated the matter more clearly in a very instructive survey of kinship among the Polynesians.¹⁷ There he almost exclusively considers the importance of living together in the case of marriage. Indeed, the character of the section in itself prevents a more detailed description.

Besides, there are few and scattered remarks in Best and others, which throw light on the matter. Thus Maning remarks that a violation of tapu of the kumara field was a serious affair even to a near relative, provided that he did not live in the village.¹⁸

Partly on the basis of studies of the sagas (like those quoted above), partly with the support of Firth’s investigations, we shall briefly describe the structure of the kinship group. The kinship group is in a certain sense built on the family, i.e. father, mother, and children, so that the cohabitation of the man and the woman takes place within the framework of the family. The relation between parents and children is also, of course, warmer and more intimate than that between e.g. uncle and nephew. There is nothing strange in this. The peculiar thing is that the

---

¹⁵. The young person comes to
(a) father, uncle or grandfather: Tarakawa 1893: 226; Shortland 1882: 56 f.; Best 1925b: 103, 259, 294 (the text found in Best 1942: 479); White 1888a: 33, 169 f., 191; Taniwha 1941: 130. The young person is a woman: Grey 1855: 72; Best 1926a: 217; Whatahoro 1915: 164; Best 1924a: 254 (the two texts mentioned last are, however, very legendary).
(b) father’s mother: Best 1925b: 914 (mythical),
(c) sister’s husband: Tarakawa and Ropiha 1899: 123 (d) half-brother: White 1888a: 79 (this is a failure!).
Marutuahu’s meeting with his father (White 1888a: 33, 191) takes a slightly different course from the others, but the difference is merely external; see ix 202f.

¹⁶. Firth 1929: 75-127.
¹⁷. Firth 1936: 382 ff.
Maori has no word for “family,” but only for what may be called the “extended family,” whanau. This is consistent with the fact that extended family, generally including grandparents, their children with spouses and grandchildren, perhaps great-grandparents as well, on many important points forms a unit; for whanau is the part of the kinship group which lives intimately together, shares a house (or perhaps two neighbouring houses), owns and cultivates fields in common, shares the usufruct of small eel-weirs, fishing-grounds, owns a small canoe together, etc. Indeed, single persons may very well have such rights; but within the whanau the practical difference between private and joint ownership was hardly great, even though private ownership might give rise to conflicts.

The next unit is the hapu, which consists of descendants of a common ancestor several generations back, after whom it is generally named. A hapu includes a few hundred people who live together in a village or a quarter of the village.

The largest circle of relatives standing in a practical relation to each other is the tribe, iwi, which like the hapu has a common ancestor after which it is named, e.g. the tribe Ngati-Paoa named after Paoa.

It is evident that in these larger communities the solidarity was not of the same strength as in the whanau. The proverb according to which the rauhokowhitu, i.e. the 340, are victorious, is characteristic. We should not, however, attach too much importance to this figure, as it is a kind of standard figure. The idea is that if the army becomes too big, it will include men who are so loosely attached to the leading chief that its value is reduced.

The significance of the hapu in the Maori’s life is blurred somewhat by the fact that it need not be identical with the village community. A village may contain more than one hapu, and it is the village which e.g. owns the big canoes and the meeting house. The village is presumably the largest unit within which peace in principle prevails. On the other hand, Makereti states that in the case of greater events such as wedding parties only the hapu was invited, but matters are often idealized by her.

The importance of the hapu and the iwi is closely connected with the
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22. Best 1925b: 5.
ownership of land, fishing-grounds, etc.\textsuperscript{24} Each \textit{hapu} had its definite area, where it did not tolerate others except by agreement. At the same time, the tribe as a whole owned the whole area in the sense that the \textit{hapus} could not e.g. part with some area without the assent of the tribe.\textsuperscript{25}

In the case of questions about ownership and many other things small wars might arise between the \textit{hapus}. But these conflicts were suspended if the tribe was involved in war against another tribe. The following proverb originates from the tract around the river Whanganui: \textit{“He taura whiri, kotahi mai ano i te kopunga} (read: \textit{kopounga}) \textit{tae noa ki te puau}, a plaited rope, entire from source to mouth.”\textsuperscript{26} The various strands are the \textit{hapus} of the tribe; but when another tribe goes to the attack, they are plaited together into one firm rope which denotes the unity of the tribe.

As every tribe has developed from a single family, a constant dispersal over a larger area has taken place in the course of time.\textsuperscript{27} This dispersal has a disintegrating effect on the unity. Even though the disintegrating tendencies are the strongest in the long run, a twisting together constantly takes place by adoption and marriage.

Adoption mostly was due to reasons of kinship policy: it was always a relative who was adopted, and thus the kinship was strengthened.\textsuperscript{28}

In the case of marriage, many other factors of course were involved, but generally the effect was the same. At all events, the position of matrimony in the kinship group is so important a subject that it must be discussed in some detail.

The question naturally falls into two parts, viz. the relation of the children to the kinship groups of their father and mother, and the relation between husband and wife and their kinship groups.

The child’s relation to the kinship groups of its father and mother are determined by the extent of its living together with either group. The commonest and “most correct” thing is that the family lives with the husband’s extended family.\textsuperscript{29} This is in accordance with the fact that the Maori preferably reckons with male lines, and it is presumably the basis of the levirate as well.\textsuperscript{30} However, there is no established custom on this

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{24} Firth 1929: 367 ff.
\item \textsuperscript{25} E.g. Hutana cited in Graham 1948: 273.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Tuwhawhakia 1896: 170.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Hongi 1909: 85.
\item \textsuperscript{28} Firth 1929: 111 f.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Firth 1929: 367 ff.
\item \textsuperscript{30} Colenso 1868: 358; Best 1903d: 62 f.
\end{itemize}
point. If the mother’s kin is the nobler, one generally considered oneself as belonging to this. These are probably the cases in which the married couple chose to live with the wife’s extended family. If so, the child belonged there. About a boy living with his mother’s extended family and whose father had gone away, we hear that his mother’s brothers taught him ritual formulas. A Maori living alternately with his father’s and mother’s extended families, thus might keep both relationships alive and e.g. obtain a share in land and fishing rights in both places.

The existence of the child thus gave rise to possibilities of a new connection and perhaps a new relation between the two kinship groups. There are instances of peace being made between two hapus in this way, but according to what has been said about kinship and living together, it is easily understood that this was indeed only a possibility. If a conflict arose between the two kinship groups, the position of the child would be determined by which group he lived with. We do hear of a few cases in which the kinship alone is considered. “Turn back!” says an older man to a younger opponent, “lest you fall by the hand of your mother’s kinsman.”

But the following scene shows how weak the position of the children might be. Rehetaia had a vengeance at heart to wreak on the Ngatirahiri (a tribe). His elder brother had married a woman of this tribe and Rehetaia would kill her and her children, who, to be sure, were his brother’s as well. But the latter held the children up before his face and said, “Will you kill your seed and mine!” And this held him back. A boy’s position was particularly exposed because he represented a future revenger. Sometimes he was only saved because his mother ingeniously concealed his sex.

A child was both by parents, uncles, and aunts called tama or tama-hine, meaning respectively boy or girl. According to what is generally stated, iramutu denotes a nephew or niece whether in relation to his mother’s or his father’s brother. There are indications that the word was used about a nephew (niece) with whom one does not live together.

31. Smith 1908a: 58.
34. Stack 1877: 88.
35. Smith 1908b: 129.
36. White 1887c: eng. 118.
As the word was rarely used,\(^{39}\) and as the whole question of the importance of living together has been much neglected, it is possible that this shade of meaning has been overlooked. There is, however, a saying which is otherwise rather enigmatic: “He iramutu tu ke mai i tarawahi o te awa, an iramutu who stands far away on the other bank of the river.”\(^{40}\) It means that he does not assist, or perhaps that he does what is worse. The sense appears from a strange story in which the saying is used. Tamainupo had been insulted by his sister’s husband, but revenged himself by killing his brother-in-law. His two nephews (iramutu) fled, but were seized. One of them cried, “What have I done?” Tamainupo heard these words and said, “You cannot live, for where do you stand when the iramutu stands far away on the other bank of the river?”\(^{41}\) Then he stooped, put his nose against those of the boys (the Polynesian greeting), straightened himself, brandished his weapon, and killed the boys.

This strange scene clearly shows that the reality is the kinship group living together; but the complete matter-of-factness is accompanied by a strain of sensitivity which shows that in spite of separation and conflict kinship is not, however, a mere formality.

Even though the child with its double kinship is not respected in case of conflicts, the conflict in itself is of course exceptional. In general, the new relation which arises with the arrival of children will actually have a unifying effect. The whole question of the children’s position is however, linked up with the importance of matrimony in itself.

It is a matter of course that matrimony produces a new element in the relation between the two kinship groups to which the husband and wife belong. It is more difficult to determine its range. Apart from “political” marriages in the highest circles, it was to be desired that the two partners were related beforehand, although not too closely. The line is drawn approximately in the way that husband and wife must not have common grandparents and preferably not common greatgrandparents,\(^{42}\) which nearly amounts to saying that the whanau is exogamous, whereas endogamy approximately prevails in the hapu.

In the Maori’s relation to matrimony, there is a kind of inconsistency which must seem astonishing to those who meet it unprepared; for we see
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40. Tregear 1891: tarawahl.
42. Best 1903d: 20 f. Makereti 1938: 60 f.
him using matrimony to connect two kinship groups and thus practically acknowledging its importance, as he, so to say, looks past matrimony to fix his attention on the ruler of his thoughts—kinship. Matrimony among the Maoris therefore often provides new examples of the importance of living together for the reality of kinship, and of the same apparent neglect of other factors than kinship in spite of their tacit recognition in practice. Thus it is said that out of the classificatory terms for kinship those were preferred which were based on common descent—even though it dates far back—to those which showed the relation via a marriage (for instance brother-in-law, etc.). Thus one might ask a wife where her husband is in the words, “Where is your ‘brother’?”—of course the classificatory term “brother.”

We have seen, too, how even very remote kinship was considered to be essential in this connection (p. 3). During the attack of the Nga-Puhi tribe on Te Arawa, Te Ao’, who was married to one of the leading Nga-Puhi chiefs, but belonged to the Te Arawa, saved some of her relatives in this tribe through her influence on the Nga-Puhi. This is commemorated in a lament (tangi) sung over her; but the peculiar thing is that this was done with reference to a remote kinship with the Nga-Puhi, whereas the marriage to the Nga-Puhi chief was not mentioned. Of course her marriage was absolutely decisive of her influence on the Nga-Puhi, but here, again, we find the strange relation to kinship which enticed us to put it on a level with time and space.

On the one hand, matrimony is strengthened by being connected with kinship; on the other hand, matrimony serves to strengthen kinship not least through the children. This point of view is illustrated very well by what follows. Whaoroa had grown up at Moehau, but left home, settled somewhere else, married, and had many children. When he had grown very old, he wanted in their company to visit his native region in order, as he said, “that I may again taste of the foods of those forests, streams, and coast of my ancestors; that I may be wept over by my relatives there; that you may also become acquainted with those relatives, and take wives from your cousins at Moehau, and that our daughters here may marry with their brothers (cousins-male): lest it be said our genealogical descent has erred (kei he nga whakapapa).” The last significant addition shows that the tendency towards endogamy, is due to a wish for keeping the kinship

43. Makereti 1938: 51.
44. Makereti 1938: 62.
45. Tarakawa 1900c: 70
46. Ngahuripoko 1921:165.
group pure and united.

Reasons for endogamy may furthermore be adduced by a reference to the fact that if a conflict arises between husband and wife the trouble at least is kept within the family.\(^47\) This reasoning does not show a high opinion of the harmony of matrimony.

Still, endogamy is only a tendency. Love takes its own course and often was allowed to do so among the Maoris.\(^48\) Even people from different tribes married both for love and for other good reasons.

When the Maoris came to New Zealand, it might, according to tradition, happen that they took wives from among the aborigines in order to whakakotahi, lit. “make them into one.”\(^49\)

In order to obtain protection from the Tuhoe tribe, Ngatimanawa got Tuhoe wives. A characteristic episode shows that this really was effective.\(^50\) Kaura was a chief who wanted to take revenge for an insult on Ngatimanawa and Ngatiwhare, who both lived in a valley, Te Whaiti. So he visited the Tuhoe in order to apply for their assistance, saying, “Let us fetch and put out the fire burning in Te Whaiti.” To which the Tuhoe replied, “Your words would suit us, if a palm grove and field of flax had not grown up in Te Whaiti. I can vanquish a mountain of importance (tiketike), but not a man of importance.” This figurative speech refers to the Tuhoes married to the tribes in Te Whaiti. The metaphor especially carries weight by the fact that both the palm (\(\text{ti}\)) and the “flax” (i.e. Phormium tenax) were cultivated by the Maori. The last sentence is modelled on a proverb: “Sea greatness (tiketike moana) cannot be vanquished, but mountain greatness (tiketike maunga) can.”\(^51\) I have tried to bring out the special shade of meaning of tiketike by translating it by “of importance,” man being of importance by being a relative.

The fact that matrimony has an effect only in itself sometimes appears with dramatic distinctness. Once when some Whanganui people had been besieging a fortress for a long time in which there were some Ngatimaniapoto people, it happened that they were dancing a haka. When one of them, Turangapito, jumped forward and danced in front of the row, it made such an impression on those besieged that they came out

\(^{47}\) Best 1924b: 447.

\(^{48}\) This especially applied to ordinary people. The nobler the kinship group the more did kinship politics assert itself, e.g. at betrothals of children, taumau. Best 1903d: 42.


\(^{50}\) Best 1925b: 459 and 466 f.

\(^{51}\) Williams 1932 “tiketike.” Perhaps it would be better to use the term “a type of proverb”; cf. Best 1942: 268.
from the fortress and looked at it. Among them there was a young woman, *Hinemoa*, who at once fell in love with Turangapito. Somehow they managed to sleep together. More was not needed among Maoris for the two be considered to be married. This led to peace being made, and Turangapito went home with *Hinemoa* as his wife.\(^{52}\) In other, similar cases one chief offers his daughter to the chief of the opponents after which peace is made and marriage celebrated at the same time.\(^{53}\) It was more common that peace was made first and then sealed with a marriage.\(^{54}\) As these kinds of political marriages take place in the class of the chiefs, it may be said that in the case of this class the tendency towards endogamy is most frequently put aside by other considerations.

This custom testifies to a certain confidence in the unifying effect of matrimony. At the same time, it is here put to the severest test. The story about Turangapito and *Hinemoa* just told ends in a conflict arising between the brothers-in-law. In the literature it is possible to find a good number of conflicts between brothers-in-law, but after all conflicts are the main subject in the sagas, so nothing can be concluded as to their frequency. No doubt living together also here was of great importance; but when this was restricted to one family, old hatred might easily break out again all the same. Most characteristic perhaps is the story about *Manukaihongi*, who had carried off his wife during a war against the Ngatihuarere, with whom his tribe had been at enmity for a long time. His wife became pregnant. One day he saw her weeping. It was, he learnt, because she was longing for her parents. He then promised to fetch his parents-in-law that they might live in peace with him and her. This happened and gave rise to a saying: “*Manukaihongi’s* lasting peace.”\(^{55}\) In other words, this peace was not a matter of course. For further confirmation we have even another saying of similar origin.\(^{56}\)

Furthermore, matrimony is in itself feebler than kinship as it may be dissolved either by death or by wantonness. There is a proverb: “Let us bring up our little sister; she will mourn for us” (while the wife after our death perhaps will marry somebody else).\(^{57}\)

If it comes to a conflict between a man and his wife’s kin, the wife will have
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52. Tuwhawhakia 1896: 167; a somewhat different version is found in Kelly 1934: 102.
54. E. g. Smith 1910: 277; Mair 1895: 37.
56. “Hine’s plaza”; see p. 162.
no small influence on the outcome because she is herself inviolable—in general, at any rate. The story about Karewa and Taraao is instructive as to the possible course of such enmity. They were two brothers-in-law who after a violent dispute had parted enemies. Taraao at night went to Karewa’s village, where in the dead of night, while Karewa was asleep, he stole his weapon although it was fastened with a strap to his wrist, and put his own weapon there instead. The next morning when Karewa saw the exchange he flew into a rage; for it showed that his brother-in-law had held his life in his hand and given it to him, which was embarrassingly close to putting him on a level with a slave, who, indeed, was a prisoner of war whose life had been spared. So he gathered an army and set out against his brother-in-law. In the meantime Taraao and his people had dug a long tunnel from the middle of their fortress to the outside. Karewa now besieged the fortress and when they had been fighting for one day, Taraao and his people stole out through the tunnel immediately before dawn. The entrance to the tunnel was covered up and Taraao’s wife, who was the only one left behind sat down on this cover. She cleverly delayed the attackers as long as possible. Finally she heard her husband blow the conch as a sign that they were saved. Meanwhile her brother had taken the fort, which indeed was not defended, and she said to him, “Did you hear the conch? It is your brother-in-law’s conch. Now he has saved his life.” Her brother flew into a rage when he discovered what had happened, but, as it says in the story, “what did she care for her brother’s anger? Her husband had escaped and had saved his life.”

In this case, the woman stands between her husband and her brother; but her position cannot be given in an ordinary formula. We see her both taking the side of her kinship group against her husband and then again siding with her husband, indeed, even, in order to revenge his death, killing her own father.

We have now taken a survey of the range of kinship among the Maoris. To sum up we may say that even very remote relatives are considered as relatives, but that there is a distinction—although somewhat blurred—between relatives with whom one lives and in which the kinship carries its full value, and the others. The inner circle is formed by the whanau. Next comes the hapu. Furthermore, the relation between the families of husband and wife—in so far as it is determined by marriage—has
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not the same effect as kinship, and its importance is greatly determined by circumstances, but a great number of marriages takes place within the hapu so that matrimony only ties a new bond to the previous ones. If there are any children it may strengthen the relation more, as they are related to both sides, but here, too, living together is an important factor.\footnote{Since there really are two kinds of relatives, those living together and the others, it seems natural to ask whether the Maori language had no separate words for the two groups apart from the collective words whanau and hapu. I am inclined to think that whanaunga and huanga denoted relatives towards whom one had and had not any obligations respectively; huanga furthermore relatives through marriage, acquaintances, etc. (See especially the proverbs Grey 1857: 13; “\textit{He huanga ki Matiti, he tama ki Tokerau}” and Grey 1857: 80; “\textit{Piki-piki motumotu, ka hokia he whanaunga}”.) It is, however, difficult to come to any decision through textual studies alone, and it is now hardly possible by any other method.}

In order to find the extent of the kinship group, it has been necessary to follow the line denoting its limit or rather its limits towards other people. This line certainly was drawn in blood. This is to a certain extent due to the nature of things, but also to a great extent to the nature of the sources. It is necessary to keep this in mind when, in what follows, we shall try to look inward in order to see what kinship meant to the Maori. The foregoing pages have occasionally hinted at this, but indeed often in extraordinary situations. After all, war and extraordinary events are what are remembered from the past, by the Maori the more so as his weekday was the same as that of his ancestors and therefore not at all worth dwelling upon. Keeping this in mind, we shall now try to give an account of the importance of the kinship group to the Maori.

As the range of the kinship group as an actual reality depends on the situation, we shall not in what follows talk about whanau, hapu, and iwi, but only about kinship group or relationship, perhaps near or remote kin.

It is no exaggeration to say that the Maori must be surrounded by relatives in order to be a real human being. We shall get the most vivid impression of this by looking more closely at the position of the kinless man.

The typical example of the kinless man is the slave. We may know that he was hardly considered a real human being, amongst other things from the fact that his old kinship group would rarely have anything to do with him if he could return, and would not dream of revenging his death.\footnote{Gudgeon 1904c: 260; Tregear 1926: 156.} It is characteristic that we are referred to this kind of generality, for as a
consequence of the slave’s microscopical esteem there is no place for him in the family sagas. If we ask those Europeans who lived among the Maoris in former times, we do not get an unambiguous answer. The general view is that the slaves were treated fairly well but their behaviour is judged very differently. According to Yate they had frank manners, whereas Earle on the contrary writes, “The free Zealander is a joyous, good-humoured looking man full of laughter and vivacity, and is chattering incessantly; but the slaves have invariably a squalid dejected look; they are never seen to smile, and appear literally half starved.”

It is better to pay attention to the figures who interested the Maori more, viz. people who had a small family or lived apart from it. Such a man made a poor appearance and was exposed to mockery. A lonely old gentleman who was sitting eating a bird had to submit to this scornful remark, “Is this all that you have to eat? Have you no sons to catch birds for you?”

The lonely rover runs the risk of losing himself. “Have people who have become tramps a tapu?” somebody will ask scornfully, i.e. have they so great vital force that one needs to reckon with them? The question is really justifiable. We shall see that a Maori who abandons himself is nearly as ready to commit suicide as to fly from his kin and become a tramp. There is no great difference.

An expressive proverb gives good information about the matter. It says that a dog and an itinerant man have no tikanga; they have nothing. (He kuri, he tangata haere, kaore ona tikanga, ona aha). It means that he who is on the tramp is away from the kinship group; anybody may kick him as a dog. But the words cut deeper. That he is without tikanga means that he is lawless and irresolute, in a modern word: rootless.

We may find this proverb illustrated in the sagas. Thus it is recorded that Hutu could achieve a success and marry Pare, a woman of noble descent, but did not dare to do so, as he was away from his kin. “I am alone and your people is great; I am a stranger in your country,” is the reason given by him in his refusal. Another man was Hotu, who left his home
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with a few men and settled with a strange tribe, where he had to submit to the treatment they chose to give him. He had no tikanga, he could not assert himself before the strangers. Only when his son arrived, did conditions change.71

The most fascinating saga is that of Paoa. He was a particularly roving man (tangata haere72). Still, fortune finally smiled upon him and he became chief of a foreign people, indeed, the powerful Tukutuku, daughter of a chief and of very noble descent, who had refused so many suitors, heard about him and invited him. Paoa did come, but behaved in a curious way, dressed in coarse clothes, and ate in a boorish manner—in short, he did not behave like a chief, but like a plebeian.73 This had a repellent effect on his attendants, who tried to make him dress suitably, but he refused.74 When Tukutuku herself proposed to him, he withdrew, doubting that her relatives would give their consent and fearing that they should kill him.75 In short, he was uncertain and afraid. He misses his kin about him. Rootlessness has gnawed into him, therefore he has no tikanga, i.e. he does not carry himself as a chief ought to. The saga ends well only because Tukutuku has the earnestness of purpose which he is lacking and finally succeeds in soothing him.

The necessity of his kin to the Maori is also connected with the fact that kinship is the only relation between human beings which is completely true and genuine. “What relation is the Governor to Wanake that he should love him so much?” Taraia exclaims when the English Governor demands that a war between two tribes should be stopped.76 He does not understand that he is to stop before his revenge is accomplished. The Governor’s point of view that the relation between human beings can be determined by a government from general principles, such as the principle that there must be peace in the country, is incomprehensible to him. His amazement is precisely expressed in this question: “What relation is the Governor to Wanake?” If he were a relative, then his position would be obvious, and Taraia would understand everything.

The circle of people important to the Maori is certainly not great, but then there is no inflation in his human kindness. Within the kinship group
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the members stand close together against others. In one of the best told
sagas, we learn how some young people from one tribe visited a neigh-
bouring tribe. There a youth, Ponga, fell in love with the chief’s daughter
Puhihuia and she eloped to his home with him. This was a serious affair,
which might easily end in war. In the evening, Ponga’s tribe assembled in
the meeting-house to discuss the matter. A young son of a chief, who had
received a fine present from Puhihuia’s father as a pledge of peace between
the two tribes, considered Ponga a peace-breaker, and as he obviously
should not have minded marrying Puhihuia himself, he was the more un-
friendly towards Ponga, and asked why he should be exposed to danger for
Ponga’s sake. But another high-born young man rose and protested in a
speech which ended as follows: “Fate has touched Ponga and thus all of us,
young and old, men and women, who went together to Maungawhau (i.e.
Puhihuia’s home).”77 That is to say that whether one is cross with Ponga or
not—the fate which he has brought upon himself is common to all.

There is something compulsory in kinship which, in spite of dis-
agreement, causes relatives to stick together, as they actually do. This
strong bond between relatives was one of the worst obstacles to the work
of the missionaries. We hear that “no less than ten of the Rev. M.
Brown’s Native congregation at Tauranga left him, returning their books
to him, and saying, ‘We must fight to defend ourselves. Have they not
slaughtered our relatives? If we may not fight, we will no longer be
missionaries.”78

In a passage in the Lore of the Whare-wananga, the story is told of how
a woman left her home in anger, and when her children had grown up, she
incited them with rancorous words against their cousins. The narrator
expresses his profound disapproval of this, a moralizing trait which is rare
in Maori literature; but it is actually found in this text. Although moralizing
is hardly an old Maori trait, the moral is in itself completely Maori and a
fine expression of the unity of the kinship group. He says: “It is not right
that a whanau should behave like this against another or against others.
Do not hold fast to these kinds of thoughts. It is a bad sign when the door (in
the front gable) turns against the back gable and kills. If the house collapses,
where is then a shelter from wind and storm? The house keeps human
beings during the gale, the food keeps them alive behind the palisades of
the fortress. By solidarity (manaaki) between human beings their power
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(mana) is maintained—and people will fear you.”

This simile denotes that the kinship group like the house is something whole, but one especially feels the Maori’s trusting warm feelings when he is sitting in the midst of his kin. This warmth is also in the word manaaki, which denotes the solidarity of the kinship group.

Manaaki expresses exactly what one relative owes the other. As a small girl Makereti was admonished by her aunt: “You must always manaaki your brother, Te Waaka,” and she interprets this as follows: “Always do what you can for your brother Te Waaka,” and continues: “She impressed upon me that I was to uphold him in whatever he did, no matter what it was.” This is impressed upon the Maori of tender years that kinship is an unconditional claim.

For manaaki is not only to feel love, but first of all to display it, to give and help. “The manaaki to him was an eel weir,” as it says somewhere.

Manaaki is used about the strongest of all ties, the one which attaches parents to their children. It is such a matter of course that we only see it used in this connection when it is a question of step-parents; but the meaning is evident. There is a stepson who stays with his stepfather because the latter “loved (manaaki) this child so dearly as if it was his own,”—or translated more correctly: “so that it became his own.”

Manaaki thus is not only what one owes to the kinship group. It may be said to create the kinship group, as it denotes the importance of living together. It also denotes the natural relation between husband and wife. Puhihuia, who eloped with Ponga says that he is the one whom her heart loves and honours (manaaki) as her protector.

Manaaki may also be used about the host’s relation to guests whom he makes much of. Indeed the idea then is that he treats them as relatives. When Ngae (Kae) took leave of Tinirau, whose guest he has been, he gave a pledge which he promised to fulfil: “Because of you manaaki. Even a real relative would not have been like you.” This manaaki or love Tinirau showed by having him “fed, wrapped in clothes, and made always to sit in his sight.”

Actually manaaki denotes a reciprocity which leads us into the core

84. Ruatapu and Potae 1928: 268.
of the solidarity of the kinship group.

The tribe manaakis its chieftain, i.e. it honors him. Thus the chieftain becomes great and glorious. Therefore, woman’s heart beats like Rangiteruru’s when she saw “Nganateariki’s beauty, and how his people honoured (manaaki) him; and the woman, Rangiteruru, fell in love with Nganateariki and married him.” By this the people also becomes great. Such things cannot be kept separate; for chief and people are one. For to him it is necessary that he “should understand how to think great thoughts, to manaaki people and to lead the hapu or the tribe.” This does not only mean that he loves his people and is kind to them. The necessity particularly lies in the fact that he does it in such a way that his people are attached to him. Exactly this is the doublesidedness of manaaki: the word, indeed, denotes unconditional love of the kinship group, but at the same time it is necessary for each to love and honour the kinship group; for in this way one becomes solidary with the kinship group and gives kinship its complete reality.

This doublesidedness is inherent in the word, also when used about other relations than those between human beings. One must honour (manaaki) the opinions and customs of one’s ancestors, i.e. maintain them, both for the sake of the customs and for one’s own sake. The treasures of the kinship group are honoured (manaaki). This means that one cherishes them, does not waste them; but one also honours a thing by using it, for instance for a present, or by doing like Uenuku when he honoured (manaaki) a whalebone by making a comb for his hair out of it.

Actually it is impossible to tell whether one loves and honours (manaaki) something particularly for the sake of the thing or for one’s own sake. The word actually means both to give and to get. This double meaning is pleasantly seen in the story about Pawhero. He was with his people on the warpath and during a short rest they warmed themselves by the fire. Yet, they did not dare to stay very long by the fire in order that the enemy should not discover them, and so they soon prepared to start again. In spite of requests Pawhero, however, would not go with the others, but
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stayed at the dying fire, saying, “Kia manetakitia te renga o te ahi, let us honour the embers of the fire;” i.e. let us warm ourselves by them. 91

_Manaaki_ creates community. In the kinship group it both arises from the community and creates it and therefore is a double necessity, or rather a matter of course. But as mentioned above one also shows _manaaki_ towards guests and thus attaches them to oneself. 92 Exactly for that reason one must be careful whom one honours in this way. There was a chief’s daughter, Raumahora, who was kind to all guests alike. This troubled her father and he admonished her: “Towards the right people, hapus and tribes of noble descent one must show _manaaki_; but what purpose does it serve to _manaaki_ people, hapus and tribes descended from slaves?” 93 The course of events is a comment on these words; for these low-born people to whom Raumahora was kind returned later and overwhelmed them with presents. Her father then became gloomy at the multitude of presents, for if he could not give anything in return those low-born people had got the upper hand of him in prestige. “You must arrange this matter,” he said resignedly to his daughter. 94 Finally, she became their chieftainess, thus a practical illustration of the fact that _manaaki_ ties people together so that nobody knows who gives and who receives.

Actually this is just what the Maori briefly says in the words: “By _manaaki_’ing people the mana is maintained.” 95 Provisionally, this may be translated as follows: “By loving and honouring people a communal life is created and a community in strength.” 96

In the Old Testament in Maori the word “bless” was translated by _manaaki_. This does not teach us anything about the meaning of the word, but it is evidence that the first missionaries, too, felt the warmth and strength of this word.

_Manaaki_ shows us what kinship was in everyday life which is seen but dimly in the traditions of the Maori. Cook and other early travellers noticed the courtesy and gentleness shown by the Maoris towards one another. It was their _manaaki_ towards one another which appeared there as well as in the purely practical collaboration in the field, when the big fishing nets were to be used, etc.
In the Maori’s view there was something contemptible, or more exactly, something childish about a man who quarrelled with a relative. In such cases, they used the proverb:

“Ka mahi te tamariki wawahi taha: Well done, children, breaking your mother’s calabashes.”97

Of course conflicts might still arise in a kinship group. There was a man who got angry because his brother had interfered in the bird-catching in one of his trees, and he struck at his brother with the handle of the axe so that it touched his head. His brother then only said, “Now your tree may be a brother to you,” and went to another neighborhood.98 His answer indicates how absurd a conflict in the kinship group was considered to be.

In the great majority of cases, quarrels in the kinship group were settled without any actual rupture. Sometimes one of the parties took the step so difficult to a Maori, that of giving in.99 More frequently the conflict was allowed to spend itself in bloodless fight followed by reconciliation.100 Still, the fact remains that conflicts might end in the actual killing of relatives. The sources do not always permit us to decide whether it was a question of relatives living together, nor to probe the circumstances to the bottom at all; but in certain cases the matter is so plain that we can try to follow the strange ways chosen by the Maori when kinship and honour become entangled for him. We shall discuss this question below.101

At all events it is worth noting that there was not among the Maoris any special body to decide in legal conflicts, which of course was due to the fact that such a body was not needed within the kinship group, and outside the group there was hardly any relation to human beings.

The kinship solidarity is most in evidence to us as it appears during war—a consequence of the nature of the sources. It is hopeless to start on all the available cases in which the kinship group stands united for the purpose of revenging any insult. The pages of the sagas teem with instances. It is so obvious that the narrator rarely dwells on that point. We hear how a member of the kinship group is killed or hear about other insults. It must be revenged, and then the army is simply there; the account at once passes
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on to telling what course the fight takes.

More conspicuous are the strange situations which arise during the fights when there are relatives on both sides, a fact mostly due to marriages outside the kinship group and fairly common. Here we get an impression of what kinship without living together may mean. In order to get the correct background it must be kept in mind that the strategy of the Maori was well thought out, as amongst other things appears from their fortresses. A means frequently used was the element of surprise. Still, it is seen how the whole surprise attack is disturbed by somebody who has relatives on the other side deliberately giving away the plot. As many fortresses were extremely difficult to carry by storm and often had to be starved out, sieges of long duration were not uncommon. During such sieges relatives visited each other across the front, the attackers disclosed their secret plans, the defenders their weak points, whether they suffered from a shortage of water, or the like. Undercover of such visits some of the necessities of life are supplied to the fortress, etc. It is tried to obtain a safe-conduct for confined relatives if the situation proves to be hopeless. After the fight one helps relatives among the prisoners, if present, to escape.

There was a famous warrior, Kihi, who lived with a strange tribe in the fortress. Then it happened that the fortress was attacked by Kihi’s own tribe. He stayed in the fort for some time but when he saw that his own tribe was in a bad way, he left the fortress and joined them. Such an act is called *kaikai-waiu*, which probably means “being overwhelmed by the mother’s milk.”

Many of the things done during way by these doubly related persons, *taharu* (“two-sided”), seem to make the warfare completely parodic. It is more significant that the Maori accepts them as facts. They are what show how fundamental kinship is to him. It is obvious to him that a *taharua* cannot act differently, and so it must necessarily be respected.

Kinship across the front had a mitigating influence on Maori wars and
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furthermore was a channel for the making of peace:110 “Peace was then made by Tatua of the Ngatimutunga holding up his *hani* or *taiah*, as a sign to Mere-mere, who was a relation, and the latter recognizing the action as a desire for peace the fighting ceased.”111

Even rather remote kinship is effective here. During a fight between *Ngatiwhatua* and *Ngapuhi* a panic arose among the latter and they fled. But chiefs among the Ngatiwhatua because of kinship with the Ngapuhi desired that the defeat should not be too great and drew a line across which none of the Ngatiwhatua must pursue the Ngapuhi.112

In the incantation, (*karakia*) pronounced over weapons before the fight the words in which the enemy is consecrated to the realm of death are left out if one stands opposite to relatives. If a relative is hit by the weapon, an incantation (*karakia*) beginning with “Return to this world” is spoken over him.113 The same desire to remedy one’s action if one has hit a relative too hard, is found on a larger scale between two related tribes. One tribe had dealt so severely with the other that it repented and gave a piece of land as a penalty.114

With the enormous genealogies it was of course unavoidable that remote kinsmen were killed; but when we remember the fundamental importance of living together we understand that the Maori did not feel troubled on that account.

Quite a different thing is violation of the dead relative’s remains, e.g. by making fishhooks of his bones. Even if one is only related to a man by marriage, this is wrong and gives rise to new conflicts.115 A characteristic trait is Hotumáua’s reaction when he was surrounded by inimical brothers-in-law (the fact that they did not know his child’s sex shows early that he did not live with them). He was standing in a hole in the ground baling water and took the attack fairly easily; but when one of his brothers-in-law cried that his head was to be spared in order that it might be preserved, he flew into a rage and in a tremendous leap rid himself of the attackers and escaped.116

It was at least just as bad to eat a relative, even if the kinship was remote. It is true that offenses were committed in that respect, but fairly rare-
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ly, and indeed they gave rise to scandal.\footnote{White 1887c: eng. 272; cf. Maning 1906: 272.} As it often happens in such cases on which what ought not to take place does take place, there was (among the Ngatiawa) a tradition that originally such things ever happened before the purity of the ancestors was corrupted on a definite occasion.\footnote{Makere in Smith 1908: 172 and Smith 1908: 170.}

Curiously enough some cases may be mentioned in which the closest relatives ate each other without shame.\footnote{Best 1925b: 244; cf. Shortland 1856: 251. See also p. 207 f.} Were they local phenomena? At any rate they are strange, because we have evidence that the aversion to eating relatives is based not only on the view of what is proper, but rather on more profound feelings of what is natural or unnatural thus more sin than wrong.

Once there were some people who wished to trick a man into committing this sin by pretending that the meat was dog’s meat; but he refused and demanded true information as to what they were serving. When he learnt that he said, “I knew that it was a relative, for when the flesh was placed before me it quivered, as a sign that I should not eat.”\footnote{Downes 1914: 220.}

That the Maori reacts so strongly on this particular point is due to the fact that he could not eat a relative without at the same time making an attack upon the life and honour of the kinship group and thus upon himself. Uenuku came to feel it as intense pain in the stomach when he had been tricked into eating his own nephew.\footnote{Hongi 1893: 120.} A still clearer illustration is found in another passage: “Now \textit{Hou}, his \textit{whanau} and people indeed committed a great error when eating, for it was their \textit{tuakana} (relatives of the same generation and sex, but of an older line) themselves they were eating, namely descendants of Tamateakai-ariki. Therefore they were seized with cowardice...”\footnote{Grey 1855: 57.} In other words, Hou had really insulted himself and reaped the fruit of action as cowardice.

It was also believed that the dead man’s soul would turn against the person who had eaten his own relative.\footnote{Best 1900a: 180.}

These examples indicate that kinship is more than what to us is community and solidarity. The common will which conditions the solidarity is rooted in something deeper, an inner solidarity in the souls. In legendary traditions, thoughts are transmitted directly in the kinship group. When \textit{Tura}, who lived alone, had grown decrepit and helpless with age, he longed for his son. This
was revealed to the latter in that he heard his father calling him in his dreams. So he sought out his father and had him carried home on a stretcher.\footnote{White 1887b: 12.}

That kind of experience was not at all restricted to the legends. From the last century we learn e.g. about \textit{Te Rangihiaeata}, how once he felt certain twitchings in his muscles, from which the Maori drew omens. He understood at once that a misfortune had happened to the chief \textit{Te Rauparaha}. In fact, his attendants had been massacred and he had himself narrowly escaped death. When he reached \textit{Te Rangihiaeata}, the latter had already been informed and had made his preparations accordingly. “\textit{Te Rangihiaeata} was a very competent man in that kind of matter,” it says, “misfortunes of relatives were not concealed to him.”\footnote{Graham 1945: 72.} Indeed, it is said that this was not the only time that he felt that \textit{Te Rauparaha} was in danger.\footnote{Graham 1945: 77.}

Apparently \textit{Te Rangihiaeata} was particularly sensitive about the vicissitudes of his relatives. Others were less competent; but no doubt everybody had a possibility of immediately feeling what had happened to his kinsman.

The kinship group thus is not only a fellowship but a unit, and so we find it wherever revenge is taken. In insult and revenge it is not a question of person confronted with person, but of kinship group confronted with kinship group. The question whether the insulted person himself wreaks vengeance or whether the insulting person himself is killed, if not completely immaterial, is at least of subordinate importance. Anybody in one kinship group who gets the chance will kill the one in the other group whom he can get at.\footnote{Eg. White 1887c: Eng. 267.} Even in small matters and comical situations this unity is clearly brought out. There was a husband who felt a bad smell under the blanket of the bed. He thought it was due to his wife and scolded her, i.e. he abused her, her parents, and her brothers!\footnote{White 1887c: 56.}

This unity may be expressed by stating that the kinship group is one big “I.” Indeed, it was actually denoted like this by the Maori himself. Let us hear, e.g., what \textit{Te Ahukaramu} said to \textit{Te Rauparaha} when he wanted the permission of the latter for his tribe, the \textit{Ngatiraukawa} to come and live in \textit{Kapiti}: “(I) imagined that (we) might carry out (our) plans, so (I) did not listen to what you said when you came up to Maungatautari, to Opepe, but used to say: ‘Warriors! Heretaunga will be conquered by \textit{me}, by Ngatiraukawa.’” Now,
Te Rauparaha! there I, Natiraukawa, was quite mistaken, and you were quite right. (I) imagined that when (I) disregarded what you said, it would be correct of me, Ngatiraukawa; but it was injurious to be indifferent. It is so now, that if I, Ngatiraukawa, come to side with you, come to Kapiti, I shall always listen to what you say.\[129\]

“I, the tribe,” says the chief; but it is not he alone who says “I” about the kinship group.

Best writes that “it is well to ever bear in mind that a native so thoroughly identifies himself with his tribe that he is ever employing the first personal pronoun.”\[130\] Best does not restrict this usage to the chief. The texts confirm this statement, even though we most frequently hear a chief use “I” about the kinship group.

In a lament over a chief who has been killed, his sister sings:

I wish I could encircle the river at Ahuriri
And my food, Te Wera, be caught.\[131\]

This “I” is here used by a high-born woman and presumably denotes the kinship group.

The point is perhaps brought out best in the words spoken by Kairangatira when alone and surrounded by enemies he was killed: “Ma koutou, ko au; ma taku iwi, ko koutou, a maku te whenua: You will kill me, my tribe will kill you and the country will be mine.”\[132\] In this “mine” he is the tribe, not only now, but in future after his death.

Just as the kinship I prolongs itself into the future, so it reaches back in history.

A chief of part of the Ngatiwhatua tribe tells a piece of old tribal history as follows: “According to our knowledge the reason why the Ngatiwhatua tane to Kaipara was a murder committed by the Ngatikahumateika. This tribe murdered my ancestor, Taureka. The tribe lived in Hokianga. This country was theirs, this tribe’s. My home was Muriwhenua, it was my permanent residence because my ancestor lived there. Later I left Muriwhenua because of this murder. Then I tried to revenge myself and Hokianga’s people were defeated and I took possession of the old country. Because of this battle the whole of Hokianga was finally taken by me right to Maunganui, and I lived in the country because all the people had been
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killed.”

All the events described took place long before the narrator was born. Still it is “I” who underwent them, viz. as the kinship I which absorbs his own I.

“You were born in me,” says a Maori. “Yes, that is true,” admits the other, “I was born in you.”

Here there is an interplay between kinship I and individual I, and the same interplay—to us a little shimmering—is also seen in the passages quoted above. But this shimmering appears from the fact that in each case we shall attribute to au “I” either the meaning “I” (the individual) or “the tribe.” Actually the difference is not very great, the stress being laid on the qualitative, not on the quantitative element. “I” always means “kinship I,” sometimes as represented by the whole tribe, at other times coloured by the special personality of the individual; but the greater a man is, the stronger the kinship I is in him. There we particularly hear “I” with the whole fullness of the kinship group when spoken by the chief.

The kinship I reaches beyond the present, beyond the life of the individual. It reaches not only into the past, including all ancestors, but into the future as well. This range is a spontaneous experience in the Maori and shows the living reality of the kinship I in him; for the consequence of its very existence must of course be that it is born with the first ancestor and will live as long as the kinship group.

It is this kinship I which reveals itself in the rich traditions of the Maori: the history of the kinship group is his own. It is the kinship I which remembers old insults and old friendship; which sticks to its country and fights for it and which observes the customs of the ancestors, everything because it is the same unbroken I, which lives in all of it.

Its literal meaning and the tension which this “I” will bear, appears with dramatic force in a short scene in the history of Te Rauparaha’s eventful life. He was traveling with few men and more women and children. Then it happened that he met with an enemy army. He managed this dangerous situation by making the enemy believe that they confronted with warriors and not women and children; but this camouflage nearly failed because a small child began weeping. Te Rauparaha saw that this was a question of life or death and said to the child’s father, “My friend, you must strangle your child, for this child is I (ko au hoki tenei tamaiti).” The child was strangled and the others were saved.

The words used here by Te Rauparaha give cause for reflection. They
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carry a weight which requires that we must realize what they involve. “I” is both Te Rauparaha and the kinship group. His words “This child is I” have two aspects. They partly mean that the fate of the kinship group at the moment is concentrated in this child; but they also mean that even if the child is killed, or rather, exactly by its being killed, its kinship I will survive in the others.

The kinship I may require a sacrifice, but its very existence makes the sacrifice smaller because only part of man, viz. the individual, dies whereas the kinship I survives in the sacrifice.

Of course the Maori is not only a kinship man, but also an individual. The important problem is the relation between these two aspects of him. This relation is generally expressed in the word manaaki, which after all is that which the individual I in the Maori owes to the kinship I. In a way, it is thus an internal affair which is expressed in the fact that it is impossible for us to tell whether a Maori shows manaaki for his own sake or for that of others. He does so for the sake of the kinship I. Therefore the question after all does not make any real sense.

The relation between individual and kinship group is illustrated with a certain grim humor in the story of Turangatao, who was attacked in his village and had to fly with his people. He had a wife and many children, but ran away only to save his own life without trying to help the children. When his wife saw this, she cried, “You have left your children behind!” Her husband only continued running and cried back to his wife, “No, there are, indeed, children for us at the tip of my penis.”

Shortland tells that he often heard one of Turangatao’s descendants telling this story and whenever he repeated the answer to the wife, he laughed heartily.

There is hardly any doubt that in the eyes of the Maori Turangatao was a man with a clear understanding of the interests of his individual I (“he ran in order that he alone might live, ko ia anake kia ora”); but at the same time he looks after the interest of the kinship I with sober realism, indeed, a realism greater and soberer than usual in the Maori and the whole of the humour is due to this realism.

After all, the same thing is expressed in a less shocking way in the proverb: “Iti noa ana, he pito mata. Although it is only a morsel of sweet potatoe [sic], it has not been cooked; if, therefore, you plant it, it will produce abundantly; thus one chief escaping from a slaughter, may be

---
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the ancestor of a tribe," as Grey interprets the concise words to us.\footnote{Grey 1857: 34.}

If a kinship group has a restless and enterprising member, the kinship group will generally back him in his actions, accept the wars which are a consequence of his infringements and stand by him when he revenges the insults incurred by him. But however long-suffering the Maori might be in that respect, it might happen that he came to regard an individual as a menace to the kinship group if he overdid his recklessness. There is a story about a man, Te Atua, who was a reckless and unruly fellow whom nobody liked. He and his brother lived together and built a fort; but the brother only pretended to build his part of the stockade and dropped a hint to some neighboring people. They attacked the fort, easily forced their way through the false stockade and killed Te Atua, after which the fight ceased.\footnote{Parata 1911: 94 f. (Whakatara); cf. Downes 1915b: 81.}

Malicious sorcerers run the risk of being treated in the same way. We have on record a case where a sorcerer was shot by his own son with the full approval of the tribe.\footnote{Gudgeon 1907: 67.}

From these very special cases we again turn to the relation between individual and kinship group. We have seen that there are situations in which the kinship group claims everything, also that the individual is sacrificed; but what situations are they? It is hardly too bold an assumption that the individual I asserts itself more in everyday life, in small questions than in the great situations of vital importance, in which, in turn, it is subordinated to the kinship I. From this view we can understand sacrifices of the individual as those mentioned; but when we hear that an army which is setting out to wreak blood vengeance is to kill the first human being it comes across, even if it is the next of kin, or read about a father who strangles his own daughter in order that she should not be taken prisoner, then we must ask: Is this necessary for the life of the kinship group? We are therefore irresistibly led to the next question: What is life to the Maori?

\begin{verse}
\end{verse}