There is a word which by its applications can teach us a great deal of what life is to the Maori. It is the word *tupu*,1 “to unfold one’s nature.”

When the word is used about diseases,2 war and peace,3 thoughts and feelings,4 the meaning is evident, that these things arise and unfold their nature. A name unfolds its nature (*tupu*) by spreading,6 a grasp by being strong.7 Below we shall examine the meaning of the special idiom: “*ka tupu te mate*, the insult was revenged,” and see that actually *tupu* has the same meaning here. Apart from this expression the contexts are not of any particular interest. The peculiar play of the word is brought out much better in some places which we shall now adduce.

---

1. *Tupu* or *tipu*; the former form is used consistently here.
2. This kind of definition of course only gives an outline of the meaning, fullness and life is only brought out as the examples envelop the word. The reader is therefore requested to consider this and similar definitions only as to help to maintain the unity of the word during the further exposition.
5. White 1888a: 34; 97.
We learn that the world was created by some words which Io planted in it, and “ka tupu nei te ao ki te ao,” the world unfolded its nature as the world.”

What picture does the Maori see before him here? Are we to imagine the world arising from nothing, growing out of the words, or how? Another and more special myth of creation gives a hint: “Only now did the water unfold its nature (ka tupu te wai). It was Winding-stream, Dividing-stream, Overflowing-stream, Widespread-stream, etc.” A long series of mythical types with graphic names conjure up a picture in which the stress is not on the question whether the water arose on such an occasion, but on the fact that it showed a definite nature or character. This refers back to the former account of creation: to create (hangā, build, construct) is not the act of making things arise from nothing, but letting them obtain and unfold their nature, thus tupu. Tupu makes the difference between chaos and the world, every thing must necessarily tupu in its own way: “All things...unfold their nature (tupu), live (ora), have form (ahuā), whether trees, stones, birds, reptiles (ngarara), fish, quadrupeds, or human beings.” A stone will presumably tupu by being hard—the literature does not make any such statement, to be sure, but in support it may be stated that a pole does so by standing firm. In the case of the living beings it is not difficult to imagine the meaning.

This unfolding is the essence of creation and must constantly be renewed by karakia (incantations). There is e.g. a kind which must be spoken “over the fishes, birds, and (any) food, in order that their tupu may be good,” i.e. in order that their growth may be good; for referring to living beings tupu means that they live and thrive according to their kind. Sometimes tupu will naturally be translated by “live,” e.g. when it is said about some maggots that they tupu on the fat of a corpse. But behind it is, of course, the idea of growth, and the stress may easily be moved to the positive, the display of force. The priest repeats karakia over the sick person in order that “the blood may be good, in order that the breath may return, the sinews may be good, the flesh tupu, namely in order that power may be given to the sick person.” Here we should, if anything, translate tupu by “recover.”

11. Williams 1932, s v. tupu.
12. Whatahoro 1913: 12; the substantival meaning corresponds to the verbal one.
Both the power of unfolding and its peculiar character are brought out in a special way in the transformations reported in the legends. Firebrands from a fire were stuck into a river, “in order that these pieces of firewood might become (tupu) demons (kia tupu taniwha ai aua rakau).”

Referring to plants tupu of course means “grow” if tupu is verbal, as a substantive partly “growth and thriving” in general, partly the concrete result of growth, “sprout, shoot.” Here, too, we find that the word includes the unfolding as well as the character given by nature. If the kumara is not well looked after, ka heke te tupu, then its tupu vanishes, i.e. it does not thrive well. But tupu also includes the kind of the plant. In the legendary times, when the Maoris settled in New Zealand, there was a woman, Marama, who sinned by having intercourse with a slave. It affected her fields. Instead of the plants she had sown quite different ones grew up. This is expressed by the statement that their tupu failed (ka he te tupu), the stress being on the fact that tupu is thriving of a definite kind.

We have discussed tupu in these contexts in order with greater certainty to see what it involves when applied to human beings, by which on the one hand we find further corroboration of its meaning, and on the other hand gain some insight into what is meant by a man “unfolding his nature” and hence what is the characteristic and significant in man—what life is as a value and not only as existence.

It is true that tupu may be found in a context so much faded that we shall simply translate the word by “live”: “My parents lived (tupu) there;” but in this way they maintained their right to the country so that even here the positive aspect of tupu is brought out faintly. Mostly tupu is more pointedly positive.

There is a proverb that “The smallness of man will grow (tupu); but the smallness of the adze is always small.” Here tupu clearly means “growing,” not “living,” only.

That children tupu of course means that they grow, but particularly that they grow up.

---

16. E.g. Grey 1855: 64; White 1888a: 5; 190.
18. Best 1925d: 159.
Adults may *tupu* as well. Maui’s descendants “tupued and multiplied.”23 The Maori is thinking not only of the quantitative aspects that they multiplied, but of the qualitative aspect as well. This is evident from the following passage about some people who had been driven out of their own fortress, “and after the fugitive and surviving people had been assembled outside the fortress, only then the party *tupued,*” and they made a counterattack.24 Their *tupu* thus only began after they had assembled and therefore must consist in finding power and courage. This is described picturesquely in the case of a tribe which has been defeated but rises again. It says: “But we *tupued* and grew strong, courage returned to he hearts of men and we again held up our heads and determined to take vengeance for our dead.”25 *Tupu* probably denotes that they multiply, but particularly that they recover courage and strength.

Used substantivally *tupu* means the natural unfolding, that is, for man, his life. That people die is tantamount to meaning that their *tupu*, their life, vanishes.26 On the other hand, the reverse does not apply; for *tupu* is not only life as existence, but life as value as well. The gray hairs of old age, as *Tura* says, are “a sign that the *tupu* of man is dwindling, a sign of weakening.”27

It is told about the first Maoris in New Zealand that they waged wars against the previous inhabitants and carried off their women and male children in order to use them as slaves. “This was the way in which the invading Maoris’ *tupu* increased.”28 This does not only mean that they increased in number and strength—as indeed they only did indirectly—the context suggests that the narrator is particularly thinking of the fact that they won higher repute.

This aspect of *tupu* appears very clearly in the myth of Ruatapu, who was *Uenuku’s* (or *Ouenuku*)’s son by a prisoner of war. In spite of his low-birth, he was very haughty, so that one day his father, *Uenuku*, found it necessary to remind him of his position, saying: “My son it is not correct that you should go to your elder brother’s house; for you are not a prominent man.” He said this “in order to make Ruatapu’s *tupu* small (kia whakaitia te *tupu*_).”29 It is too little just to say that Ruatapu’s repute was to be reduced. It is life in him which is to be put down to the level where it belongs. It is not

---

24. White 1888b: 152.
27. White 1887b: 14; cf. White 1887a: 126: when the moon is on the wane, it is “the tupu that fades away as in an old woman.”
only the others’ valuation, but quite as much his own valuation of himself which is adapted. We cannot easily bring out this view in a better way than through the word “honour.”

Nor can we translate tupu differently in Heketewananga’s words to an old man whom he met with on a journey. The old man was sitting under a tree when Heketewananga caught sight of him. In his presumption he climbed the tree, made water on the old man’s head and said: “Ho! ho! You, down there, your chieflike honour (tupu rangatira) has vanished; my water has dripped on your head.”

On the other hand, honour can in no way be separated from repute. It is a weakening of one’s tupu to be refused at an offer of marriage. Repute and honour are one. Ponga indeed was a nobleman, but belonged to a lower line, “so his tupu was weakened by some of companions’ tupu and influence (mana).” His repute is overshadowed by that of the nobler men, but it is an inner concern as well. The whole saga is a long illustration of Ponga’s modest tupu. There is something dispirited and passive about him. It cannot be said that he carries his beloved, Puhiluaia, from her tribe; it is she who goes away with him. It is she who is the nobler of them and who—although it is not stated anywhere—has most tupu. She, not he, stands out with courage and strength and advances their claim throughout the saga. The lesser tupu means less repute as well as less courage and less vitality.

In the saga about Ponga this is brought out only indirectly, to be sure; but it is seen the more distinctly and dramatically in other accounts. During a fight, Pahau seized the head of Tamure, the enemy chief, forced it down, and made water upon it. There Tamure’s tupu vanished and with it his position as chief, and Pahau became chief of his tribe.

Life, strength, courage, honour, and repute thus are one in tupu. A fall in repute drags a man’s whole life down. When it came to light that Hotu had stolen something, he felt much ashamed and feared that by the scorn and derision of the tribe “his tupu would dwindle and thus the influence (mana) of his words.” His influence dwindles with his honour, and his shame penetrates into his soul until he collapses from within, gives up, and leaves his tribe, which had seen his theft. In this connection it should be remembered what it means for a Maori to give up his kinship group; accordingly, he leads

---

31. Firth 1929: 114 (from Graham).
33. White 1888a: 87.
34. White 1888a: 188.
a dispirited life a kind of small vassal under another tribe, which treats him with respect (he iwi whakaheke tupu tangata); only much later, when his son found him, did conditions change.

A defeat will invariably be an attack on the *tupu* of a tribe. Here, inversely, it is the fall in the strength of the kinship group revealed in the defeat that drags courage and esteem down with it. When Marutuaahu had defeated a tribe decisively, he allowed the survivors to live on their old land: “but their *tupu* was brought down (*i whakaheke iho te tupu*); it was only left for them to look after the land and be cooks (i.e. a dishonourable occupation) and this reduction of their *tupu* has lasted right down to our day.” Thus they were allowed to exist, but only in order to lead a poor and dishonourable life. With their *tupu* they lost strength, courage, and repute together, and never recovered any of these qualities. There is good agreement when it is stated about Hape that he “took land and reduced *tupus,*” for these things generally go together.

The difference between a free man and a slave very clearly illustrates what *tupu* involves. The slave is a prisoner of war, whose *tupu* has been lost irrecoverably. It means exactly that his life is without value. His master may take it at will. The reflections of a Maori on the differences between the good old times and the times introduced by colonization are characteristic. “In the old days,” he says, “if the kind of people...namely people whose *tupu* had vanished...if they did not obey their master’s commands, they were killed. But now you must not kill them because of the law (i.e. English law) although they still receive orders. In our day, they may go on being conceited and imprudent (*whakakake*).”

The grumpy old gentleman speaks the pure and unadulterated Maori truth. A slave is no real human being. He lacks that which is most important of all, life, i.e. the life which is of value, for he has no *tupu*. Law in its absurdity may protect his bit of life. But what is the good of that? It cannot restore his *tupu* to him. He is and remains a man without honour. The only thing the law can do to him is that it can make him *whakakake*, imprudent and conceited. This is because *tupu* develops from within and is maintained outwardly. As we shall see below, *mana* can be given and taken; but nobody can give or take *tupu* for it is life in man as it wells out from within exactly in man’s very nature, i.e. in vitality, courage, and honour, and asserts itself amongst other people as esteem.

---

35. Grey 1855: 118.
36. White 1888a: 36.
37. White 1888b: 73.
38. White 1888a: 44.
Even though one cannot give *tupu* to others, one may of course promote their *tupu*. The causative *whakatupu* thus means “bring up.” With a reflexive meaning it is nearly the same as *tupu*, but it indicates a more conscious effort. “*Katahi ka whakatupu kuri te tangata ra*: now this man transformed himself into a dog;” whereas “*ka tupu kuri*” means “he became a dog.” About Tawhaki, who had been nearly killed, it says that he “had not suffered so much that he could not restore his strength (*whakatuputupu*) by means of an incantation (*karakia*).”

*Tupu* for man is his natural and characteristic unfolding of life, as firmness is to the pole and thriving to the plant. In the myth man comes into existence, i.e. obtains his nature (*tupu*) by Tane creating him. Here the same word, *whaihanga*, is used as is used about the building of a canoe or the like. It means that man *tupu*es by taking form.

The distinctive character of man’s *tupu* pervades all. It does not appear in his form only, but in his honour as well. It is a deeply rooted peculiarity in the Maori that the high-born man will shun all that is connected with ordinary cooking. “The steam (from an oven) is something bad to a Maori; it reduces the human *tupu*.“ This expression indicates that it is something special to human beings that their *tupu* will not stand steam from the oven; other beings perhaps may thrive excellently by it.

Again, each human being has its characteristic *tupu* different from all others. There are those whose “*tupu* has taken an adult form (*kua ahua pakeke te tupu*)” in contrast to children. *Toarangatira* and brother were sons of a chief, but a little delicate. Therefore they were particularly well cared for by the tribe. Particularly Toarangatira was well fed because they saw that “he unfolded a brave nature (*i tupu maia a ia*).” The chief has a “chiefly nature” (*tupu rangatira*), i.e. courage, strength and esteem as suitable for a chief. In practice it appears by the fact that he can lead the kinship group or tribe by

---

39. E.g. Tiwhawhakia 1896:166 *ka whakatupu nei a Turereao i tana tamaiti...a ka tupu, a, ka tangatatia ...*
40. Williams 1932: s. v. *whakatupu*.
41. White 1887a: 86.
42. White 1887a: 135.
44. White 1888a: 114.
45. White 1888a: 93.
virtue of his personal qualities and his direct authority.\textsuperscript{47}

\textit{Tupu} is used adjectivally, too, but as a rule only in connection with a word which is the object of a genitive and only referring to something belonging to human beings. Within this narrow scope only the aspect of \textit{tupu} is brought out which indicates a definite nature, as \textit{tupu} (natural, characteristic) very closely connects the object of the genitive with the latter: \textit{Tana Tamaiti tupu “his own child.”}\textsuperscript{48} \textit{Ko Whakauekai-papa tana tane tupu, he tane tahae a Tuwharetoa, “Whakauekai-papa was her actual husband Tuwharetoa was a lover (a ‘thief-man’).”}\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Nga tangata e heke ana i o ratou whenua tupu “The people who emigrated from their native country.”}\textsuperscript{50} \textit{Ka mahue te kainga tupu ona i whanau ai “He left his own village where he was born.”}\textsuperscript{51}

Life in its essential meaning, life which is worth living, the strength and courage of life thus are identical with honour. Life and honour constitute an indissoluble whole: \textit{tupu}. As regards the word this may only be quite clear in the case of the northern tribes: the experience itself is common to all Maoris; their actions show that life and honour are one.

So it may seem strange that at the translation of the Bible it was necessary to introduce foreign words for honour: \textit{kororia, honoure} from “glo-

---

\textsuperscript{47} The substantival use of \textit{tupu} about human beings especially comprising honour is found with certainty only among the tribes in the northern half of the north island of New Zealand, viz. from Ngapuhi in the north down to and including the tribes Ngatihaua and Ngatitoa. In addition, there are some scattered examples. From Tuhoe we have the compound \textit{tupuheke “lose tupu, i. e. honour”} (Best 1903d: 65). From Ngatikahungunu a proverb is recorded: “\textit{He taina whakahoki-tipu, taina whakahirahira, he potikikihia-toa}.” (Whatahoro 1913: 41): “A younger brother who violates \textit{tupu}, who exalts himself at the expense of others; a crafty little brother.” (On \textit{kahiatoa} or \textit{kahia a toa} see ‘The Polynesian Society 1928: 373). Thus \textit{tupu} here includes honour but the strange thing is that it reads \textit{whakahoki tupu} instead of the usual \textit{whakaheke tupu}. It might be tempting to correct \textit{whakahoki} into \textit{whakaheke} if there were not in a Ngatitoa text a corresponding expression: “\textit{t. hokinga o te tupu}” (White 1890: 28) with the same meaning of “reducing \textit{tupu}.” As \textit{hoki} means “(to) return,” these expressions with \textit{whakahoki} must be interpreted in the way that \textit{tupu} is made to be the opposite of its natural movement, which is unfolding, thus to be reduced. The expression \textit{ka hoki tuku tipu} (Smith 1908: 171) is presumably to be interpreted in the same way: “then my \textit{tupu} decreases”; but the meaning of the passage is not quite certain. This interpretation is supported by a parallel use of \textit{hoki} in connection with \textit{ingoa} (name): \textit{kei hoki te ingoa “lest the name suffer”} (Ngata 1929 no 13 – Grey 1853: 117 from \textit{Te Arawa}).

\textsuperscript{48} Grey 1855: 100; 109.

\textsuperscript{49} Grey 1855: 106; cf. White 1888a: 185.

\textsuperscript{50} White 1888a: 131

ry” (or “Gloria”?) and “honour.” But the simple reason is that the Maori lacks a word for honour in itself. It only seems strange until we have seen that the weightiest words for the values of life, *tupu*, *mana*, and to a certain extent *tapu*, include *honour*. Honour is not isolated in language because it is not experienced at all as something which may be separated from the other values of life.

The weakening of life may be expressed by stating that *tupu* dwindles. The word *mate*, however, is used much more frequently; but this word by its scope refers back to exactly the same experience that vitality and honour are identical.

*Mate* is very nearly, if not exactly, the opposite of *tupu*. Starting from its use as a verb we may define *mate* as “to be insufficient,” which may be either “to be weakened” or “to lack.” As a substantive the word correspondingly means “weakening” or “lack.”

One may be in lack of food or drink;\(^52\) but it may also be a beloved one. If so, one may feel tempted to translate *mate* by “love” or “in love,” but then it should be kept in mind that this is a shifting of the contents of the word; for one cannot *mate* (miss) a woman or man whom one possesses; for through the union the want is satisfied: “Ponga searched for a way in which to have satisfied the desire in his heart, which longed for this girl (*e na ai te mate o tana ngakau aroha ki te kotiro ra*).”\(^53\) This, indeed, does not prevent us still from practicing reasons from often rendering *mate* by “in love”; but it is important to realize how the concept is changed thereby.

Just as *mate* to denote “lack, want” ranges from slight thirst to the intencst longing for a woman, so in the meaning of weakening it denotes everything from a slight indisposition to death.

Applied to things and animals *mate* everywhere has a meaning opposite to that of *tupu*. The *tupu* of the moon is waxing, its *mate* is waning.\(^54\) The *mate* of the sea is being calm,\(^55\) that of the fire is to die away, go out.\(^56\) The *mate* of a fish is to be caught, that of a tree to be felled, that of work to cease, to be finished,\(^57\) etc.

What is most interesting however, is the fact that *mate*, weakened, when referring to human beings is point by point the counterpart of *tupu*. *Tupu*

---

52. Williams 1932: s.v. *mate* on this and the following passages.
55. White 1887c: 97.
56. White 1887b: 67; 68.
57. Williams 1932,
may mean “arise, come into existence” and *mate* may mean “to be dead.” Just as *tupu* includes the meanings of “thriving” and “gathering strength,” so *mate* may denote all degree of “being weakened.” The context must decide how bad things are. “If this man, Kairangatira dies (*mate*), then this tribe is weakened (*mate*).” Thus *mate* is used about various kinds of weakness, e.g. birth pangs and the pain at being tattooed or more exactly that one is worn out by the pain. One is also exhausted (*mate*) by cold and rain. The word is further used about being paralyzed with fright and about being dejected with shame (*whakama*), a fact which we shall discuss in more detail below. Every defeat is a *matenga*, whether one is thrown in a wrestling match or is put in the wrong in a discussion. *Mate* thus is the opposite of the vitality and spirit contained in *tupu*.

*Mate*, however, is also the opposite of *tupu* when the reference is to honour and reputation. *Mate* is any insult and verbally means “insulted.” We saw above that the *tupu* vanished in the old man whose head was insulted by a younger man who made water upon it. Later this was described to the tribe as his *mate*.

It was an insult (*mate*) to Tamure that Pahau corrected a word in his incantation.

When Tuhourangi uninvited came on a visit in a period when food was scarce and thus forced Kapu to entertain him poorly this was a *matenga*. Should it be considered a defeat or an insult? After all a decision of this problem is not very important, for there is no great difference. Killing, defeat, and insult are one and the same thing, with a weakening of life; and this weakening is in itself a step towards perdition and therefore in itself a serious matter whether great or small.

As life and honour are one, the Maori must guard honour as his life, and his life in honour. It is not strange that he is jealous of his honour; it is only saying in other words that he is fond of life. Any insult is a *mate*, a direct

58. White 1888a: 42; 43.
60. Williams 1932, s.v.
61. White 1888b: 87; Grey 1855: 152.
63. White 1888a: 92.
64. White 1888b: 57.
66. White 1888a: 90; cf. 87.
attempt on his life, whether it is his brother who is killed or a word is changed in his incantation. He cannot calmly submit to an attempt on his life whatever the reason. Therefore a mate is a mate. This is not a question of great or small, for any insult, great or small, is aimed directly at his life.

The peculiar thing about the Maori’s experience of life is that it is complete, indeed perfect. So it is, and so it must be. There are no departments in his life; he cannot, as a European, be a great man at his office and be henpecked at home. Life is a whole, therefore the whole of life is affected by an insult or weakening. The Maori may also term the insult a “making small” (whakaiti), exactly because it makes the whole human being small.

A challenge is in itself an insult because it will leave a fall in esteem if it is not accepted. Therefore the chief acted very incautiously who said that “if Rauparaha ever dared to come upon his territory, he would rip his body open with a barracouta-tooth”; for no sooner had Te Rauparaha heard this than he at once set out from his island with a fleet and selected men and in practice disproved the incautious chief’s statement.

Life in honour is so precious that the Maori must necessarily be so jealous of his honour as to be nearly touchy. It is not necessary that anything depreciatory is said, the mere suggestion of it in a situation is enough. There was a woman who saved a boy’s life by pretending that he was a girl before her husband’s enemies; but this was also insult to the boy for which they came to suffer.

Presumably, Taupori must also be called touchy, who was most exasperated because two fugitives had passed his fortress and sought protection in his neighbor’s. He sent for them and said, “Did you not know that I was here for the express purpose of protecting Ngatata and his friends? Did you doubt my powers to protect your lives? I am in doubt now whether I shall not kill you both for the insult you have offered to me.” However, they succeeded in reassuring him. There were two chiefs who were partaking of a calabash with preserved birds. At last only one bird was left, which one of the chiefs took out, saying, “Here is a morsel for you and me, but as you have already seen it, I will do the eating.” But in matters of honour the Maori cannot take a joke, and this joke became the cause of a war. We might continue quoting these kinds of examples indefinitely, but had

68. White 1890: 68.
70. Tuwhawhakia 1896: 169.
better illustrate in more detail what on a more philological basis we have seen of the completeness of life, the fact that it includes courage, strength, and honour in one.

As a consequence a weakening (mate) affects life as a whole. This is by no means only a philological matter, but dead earnest. For the weakening has the effect that it may make the very will to live crumble away. Maning e.g. mentions that he knew a man “who, having been for two days plagued with toothache, cut his throat with a very blunt razor,” adding that this kind of thing was not unusual.\textsuperscript{73} It is not the pain in itself which is decisive, for in that respect the Maori is not inferior to others,\textsuperscript{74} and there are instances on record of fantastic hardiness. No, it is the feeling of the weakening as a disease of both soul and body which eats away the zest for life, because there is no visible enemy from which he may demand satisfaction.

This is illustrated still more distinctly when we see what shame may affect in the Maori.

Life and honour are one. The Maori cannot segregate honour; hence it follows that any defeat is also felt in his honour and affects it. This does not mean that he cannot distinguish between an attack of a corporal kind and one which is directed immediately at his honour and thus drags down life. Both, indeed, are mate and the difference is rather superficial, but it exists and is acknowledged by the fact that an attack on honour is felt as shame (whakama). Even here the boundary-line is not well-defined; we understand that grey hairs are a weakening; but when Tura is ashamed of his gray hairs, it is presumably because weakening of life drags honour with it.\textsuperscript{75} Otherwise the shame in nearly all cases is a direct consequence of an insult or a fall in esteem.

An open insult is not needed. Many a time shame rises in a man because the situation reveals that he is found wanting. If a man cannot serve food for his guests, and so is not equal to the situation, the “one is weakened by shame” (ka mate i te whakama), to use a set phrase.\textsuperscript{76} When Marama’s fields failed because of her sin with a slave she felt ashamed.\textsuperscript{77} Tama felt ashamed because he and his family at a dance were more poorly dressed than Tu-te-koro-punga and his family.\textsuperscript{78} Shame does not rise immediately from inferiority, but from

\textsuperscript{73} Maning 1906: 162.
\textsuperscript{74} E.g. Dieffenbach 1843, I, 101.
\textsuperscript{75} White 1887b: 12.
\textsuperscript{76} White 1888b: 55 and elsewhere.
\textsuperscript{77} White 1888a: 29.
\textsuperscript{78} White 1887b: 37.
its revelation. When his brothers laughed at Maui because he caught fish, he felt ashamed not because he was bad at catching fish, but because they laughed at him.\textsuperscript{79} It is the situation which immediately causes the shame. Ruawharo had long challenged his elder brother, Uenuku coming down to the shore when he landed his net and selecting the best fishes. One day Uenuku and his men turned Ruawharo over that he fell into the net and was smeared with fish slime. “Then Ruawharo was weakened, he felt ashamed and wept and wailed.”\textsuperscript{80}

Whether the reason is that others ignore one,\textsuperscript{81} or one’s own offence, e.g. a theft coming to light, it is the degrading situation itself which causes the shame. Therefore it is unimportant whether a charge of theft is true or not if it cannot at once be averted. The charge alone causes the shame and its consequences follow without regard to guilt or no guilt.\textsuperscript{82} The saga about Hotu will take quite the same course whether the narrator believes that Hotu has committed the theft with which he is charged.\textsuperscript{83}

Presumably we understand the importance of the situation best of all—without regard to guilt—in the case of the shame felt when one’s modesty is insulted,\textsuperscript{84} or when, like Hinetitama, one has committed incest without knowing it.\textsuperscript{85}

Shame is an inner attack on man, but this is not to say that one need succumb to it. When Maru, whose father had left his home even before his son had been born, heard the other boys shouting after him, “Bastard, bastard! Where is your father?” he felt ashamed; but he stood his ground and finally sought out his father.\textsuperscript{86} In the same way Tukutuku, who wooed Paoa, overcame her shame when he pushed her hand away, and even in the end got him as her husband.\textsuperscript{87}

Finally the shame may be so small that we should rather call it modesty, as the one which Paoa felt when he was invited into a house full of women
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only; but he overcame his modesty (whakama) and entered.\textsuperscript{88}

Even though the shame may be overcome, it is always a danger, always a weakening. The chief who dropped his revenge with the words, “I leave it to shame to beat them,” knew very well what he was doing.\textsuperscript{89}

\begin{quote}
Nothing is like my shame which makes me weak,  
It is like a burning heat;\textsuperscript{90}
\end{quote}

So runs a song, and using the same simile Ngarue puts the action of shame before us with terrible clearness. His brothers-in-law had dropped some remarks to the effect that he was an idler. So Ngarue said to his wife, “Shame in me is great, it is like a fire burning in me. My love of you pales before the strength of my shame.”\textsuperscript{91}

Shame thus is a fire which makes everything else fade and scorches it away. But this is only to expatiate on what is inherent in the common Maori saying, “\textit{Ka mate i te whakama}, he is weakened by shame;” for as we have seen, weakening seizes the whole of life if it is not checked. The fatal thing about shame is that it is often due either to the revelation of inner defects or to a kinsman’s words, and therefore cannot be remedied.

So we witness how shame burns like a fire and scorches everything else away—all that makes life worth living, strength, courage, and honour. With life also the love of one’s kinsfolk crumbles away, and thus shame has eaten the whole kinship \textit{I} in man. Perhaps the catastrophe stops here, and what we hear about the effects of shame is only the consequences of it. Perhaps the destruction is not quite so great, but at any rate it makes man smaller, and it may happen as it happened to a chief who could not carry a fortress which he tried to storm and for shame of his powerlessness gave up his wives.\textsuperscript{92}

But in a way this was a mild case as compared with the great number in which the whole of the kinship \textit{I} dies; for then the man, or rather his poor remnants, the individual \textit{I}, leaves family and home and goes away into strange parts.

So when we see what may be the cause of this sad spectacle, what was said above is again corroborated. Any insult is a weakening. It is the situation which can produce the shame and thus all its consequences. Hotu felt ashamed of the charge of theft and left family and home without regard to the
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question whether the charge was true or not. Things are not different in the more mythical parts of the traditions. Whiro, who with full knowledge had intercourse with his daughter-in-law, and Hinetitama, who discovered that her husband was not her own father, reacted exactly alike and fled in desperate shame.

We find that flight from the kinship group and the feeling of shame actually have common causes. There is Paoa, who could not serve good food for his guests, Kahurere, who was rebuked by his father, the woman who was charged with theft or was beaten by her husband, Tamaahua, who was mocked because he was circumcised, and in the myths the Tura mentioned above whose hairs turned grey to his shame, Whaitiri, who heard her husband say about her, “Her skin is like the wind, her skin is like the snow.” Rongoitua, who is mildly reproached—they all feel ashamed and fly away from their kinship group and kinship I, or at least from a spouse. Whaitiri (Thunder) fled to heaven. This is not done by everybody; but after the beginning of the colonization one might at least escape to America, as a Maori did out of shame because he could not pay for a canoe.

The flight in shame has also given rise to a saying: “Mahanga whaka-rere kai, whakarere waka, Mahanga who abandoned food and canoe.” Mahanga had drummed people together to drag his canoe to the water and provided food to feed them, but by ill luck the canoe was shattered. This was enough: “He could not even face his friends, or wait to partake in food, but started off at once.” He never returned.

All these instances corroborate what we have already seen: that a weakening is a weakening. If it is not checked it is unimportant whether the cause is great or small. When the fire of shame has been lit, it must be put out or life is laid waste.

Against this background we understand still better the meaning of
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manaaki and the politeness and gentleness towards the kinship group which it involves; for just as manaaki unites the kinship group, so a thoughtless insult may push akinsman out of the group.

Even towards strangers it may happen that the Maori shows the same delicacy, because he knows how serious an insult is. Once Te Popoki met with an unauthorized person, Whainu, who was setting bird snares in one of his trees. Te Popoki's son told Whainu to get down, but Te Popoki, who thought that Whainu was miserable with shame (kua mate a Whainu), shouted to him “Set your snares.” But—as it characteristically says—“Whainu had not strength enough for that, he was too much weakened (mate) because his encroachment had been seen and he had been told to get down; therefore he returned home.”

The Maori’s shame thus may destroy his relationship with whom he is living, mostly his kinship group, or in other words eat away the kinship I. This throws a certain light on the relationship between kinship I and individual I. The latter may, indeed, exist apart, but then certainly as a being with very little life, i.e. tupu. It shows how the glory of life, the value of life, courage, strength, and honour are inextricably bound up with the kinship I and found in this. As tupu for the most important part is thus invested in the kinship I, this also shows how fundamentally important it is to the Maori, as tupu is something developing from within in each individual. This intimate connection between kinship I and life is perhaps the most penetrating illustration that can be given of the significance and essence of the kinship I, when this is to be interpreted in a civilization which like the European is individualistic in its root.

Still the Maori—as we have seen—need not perish completely with the kinship I. As an individual he may maintain an existence among strangers, indeed, if he is of some prominence, he may attach people to him and obtain a kind of new I.

The family sagas bear witness to the great possibilities open to a prominent personality even when he was not backed by his kinship group. Several tribes might carry their origin back to such a lonely man, among them Ngati-Kahungunu, Ngati-Paoa, Ngai-Tahu, and, in a way, Ngati-Maru. Men in exile and illegitimate children play a statistically disproportionately great part in the traditions. They fascinated and interested the Maoris, who had a sense for the extraordinary effort necessary for the person with a poor or no kinship group to assert himself. A proverb says, “Ka mahi te moenga mokai, bravo, oh illegitimate child, (many of whom were considered anxious
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to distinguish themselves, and make a name).”

But the interest in the self-made man is of the kind shown in the extraordinary. Indeed, it is far from possible for everybody to found a new kinship group. We need only refer back (p. 24 ff.) to the inner and outer inhibitions which such a man has to fight, concentrated in the saying that he has no tikanga.

It is of course still more difficult for a slave to assert himself. Still, it might happen that a slave secured a position—evidence of how enormously plastic the Maori was in his social life (to the dismay of those who try to give a general description of this!). Earle tells about a slave who enjoyed no small reputation because of his rare skill in tattooing. It even happened that a slave was admitted to the tribe and obtained a position as chief. Waharoa also had an extraordinary fate. Having been a slave from his second to his twentieth year, he returned to his own tribe, was accepted by it against common practice and developed into one of the great chiefs of the nineteenth century. These cases are of interest because they throw light on the Maori’s respect for the great personality, but they are decidedly exceptions and should not blot out the picture of the slave or the exiled man as an unhonoured and irresolute nobody, who has half-way done being a human.

If only we adhere to the view that this is the normal, we understand that the Maori will many a time prefer death by his own hand to going into exile. Suicide in so far is on a level with flight, but it contains possibilities of a particular kind.

Whakamomori means being desperate, or doing a desperate deed. It may be that of leaving family and home, as has been mentioned above, but the word is used almost only about suicide.

Suicide thus is the extreme consequence of the fact that life is a whole and therefore stands as a whole or falls as a whole. Once again it is confirmed that there is no direct proportion between cause and consequences. Any weakening may without regard to magnitude hit home. Exactly the same causes may lead to suicide as to flight from the kinship group.
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Still, suicide holds a special position in the case of “weakenings” which do not immediately concern honour and where, therefore, the kinship I is not in the first place attacked. We have already heard about the man who cut his throat because he suffered from toothache. The typical suicide, however, is that of the widow. In the northernmost part of New Zealand, it was nearly an institution. The consequence was, of course, that every decent widow made an attempt at suicide. In elderly widows it was undoubtedly at the same time the consequence of their inner “weakening”; but in younger widows it must have been a more complicated matter. Presumably they often felt driven towards suicide while at the same time they felt that life might still offer possibilities for them. The fact that suicide was an institution then decided the matter. But still there was more to it; for it was a common thing that the family kept an eye on the young widows and took care to save them before death supervened. Perhaps we are allowed to believe that the same young widows did not either make this too difficult. Such a rescued widow might face the world, for one thing; but something also happened in herself on account of the violent event. We have a record from a widow who tried to drown herself, but who was saved. It was certainly grief that impelled her, but when she was lying under water and the want of air oppressed her chest and she felt pain in the ears, her grief ceased and she wanted to live after all. She succeeded in doing so when some people came to her assistance.

However, this is a sidetrack which does not concern the principle matter, that there is an inner weakening which eats life away from within, and that suicide is only a realization of this. Therefore it does not always help, however much the tribe watched her. It might, indeed, prevent the suicide, but then it might end as in the case of Hauraki’s sister, who simply died of grief at the loss of her brother. Sometimes the widower also did away with himself. Turi killed himself by throwing himself down from a tall rock when his eldest son had died. Best tells about a mother who shot herself when her son had died. Hongi tried to hang himself after his brother’s death—to mention only some cases of similar reasons for suicide.
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Love is also a mate, a weakening or a want—it comes to the same thing whatever we call it—and if this want is not allayed, there is a possibility that it may make life void, and make the unhappy lover do away with him- or herself.120

Shame also often drove the Maori to suicide. A chief, Terekau, who was visited by some people asked his wife to cook some food for the visitors. She told him to do so himself. Soon after Terekau was found in a tree, where he had hanged himself.121 The debtor who cannot pay,122 and the woman whose modesty is violated,123 and many others124 whom shame fills—guilty or innocent—are found among the suicides. But the greatest expression of the fact that shame carries death, is found in the myth about Hinetitama, the primal mother of man, who was first begotten by Tane and since became his wife and by him gave birth to man. For when she realized that she was married to her own father, she was seized with shame and whakamomori by fleeing to the underworld, where she later under the name of Hinenuitepo has drawn her descendants down into the land of the dead.125 This is the reason why people die, and thus we see the terrible power of shame in the fact that the shame of the primal mother puts death for man into the world order. But the myth also shows something else, viz. that by founding the land of the dead Hinenuitepo holds fast to her kin, which she draws down to her.

This is ultimately what divides suicide by flight. By flight the Maori gives up his kinship I, but by suicide there is a possibility of retaining the connection. It may perhaps be said that the Maori in suicide sacrifices his individual I in order to recover his kinship I. (In this connection it may be pointed out that suicides were actually common126). Unfortunately, one must express oneself with a certain cautiousness; for the sources are not sufficient to give real certainty in this question where so many threads are twisted into a difficult psychological knot.

It is, however, possible to approach a little nearer to the matter by looking in more detail on the ways chosen by the Maori when he takes his own life. It may happen that he quietly hangs himself; but not infrequently he kills himself in such a way that it is felt that he asserts himself by doing it.
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An instructive story is e.g. that about the young Te Aohuruhuru,\textsuperscript{127} whose modesty had been violated one night by her old husband’s guilty action. He, who was somewhat older than she, saw that in her sleep she had thrown off part of her blanket. He admired her beauty and put more wood on the fire in order that because of the heat she might get restless and uncover herself further. Then he awakened some other elderly men in the house in order that they might see her; but she awoke and felt ashamed. The next day her husband went fishing while she remained at home. In her shame she then decided to whakamomori, to take her own life, by throwing herself down from a tall rock at the coast. This is described as follows:

Now she began to adorn herself; she combed her hair, she adorned herself with a fine cloak with a border and put feathers in her hair—feathers and down from the huia bird, the heron, and the albatross. When this was done she rose, went to the steep rock, climbed it, and sat down up there. Then the young woman collected her thoughts on composing a song which she might sing.

The words of the song were finished. Her husband and his comrades were paddling towards the shore. His canoe was close to the foot of the rock on top of which the young woman was sitting, and her old husband’s heart warmed at the beauty of his young wife. Then they heard the woman singing her song. They heard the words of the woman’s song. Listen! They were borne over the ripples of the sea, and when the sound struck another rock it was returned to comfort her. Indeed, the sound of her song came distinctly to her ear. It was like this:

\begin{verbatim}
Half uncovered I slept
When the fire was made to blaze
In order that I should throw myself about in my sleep,
And I was made ridiculous.

When she had sung, she threw herself down from the rock in order to destroy herself. There the old man saw her falling from the rock. He watched her clothes which gleamed white as she fell.

Then their canoe headed towards the foot of the rock from where the woman had jumped; the men landed and when they had gone ashore they saw her as she lay there completely crushed.
\end{verbatim}

The whole account clearly shows that the woman made her death a point of honour. She adorned herself, she sang, she did that intentionally before her husband’s eyes. In this way, she recovers her honour and is remembered
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forever so that the rock is still called “Te Rerenga-o-Te-Aohuruhuru, the place where Te Aohuruhuru jumped.” This memorial is an outward sign that she still lives in the kinship I from which she was separated by her shame and with which she was reunited in honour.

If we ask how her honour can rise, the answer must probably be that it does so because she avenges herself on her husband.

This story pictures the situation to us more vividly than any other, but as regards the aspect of vengeance in suicide others are clearer.

Gudgeon tells how he once witnessed that a young Maori who had fallen out with his wife first wanted to throw himself down from a rock, but instead went openly into an English military camp and took two rifles. By doing so he fell into the hands of Gudgeon, who elicited the statement from him that he had counted on being shot, and his train of thought then was that this would force his tribe to seek revenge, which would not take place without also some of the tribesmen being killed; but through this he would be revenged himself.128

The question as to what suicide involves then leads on to another: What is revenge?

When—as we have seen—a mate which is not remedied is a menace to life a disease which in a short time can eat it away, then we understand that it is of vital importance for the Maori to seek healing of this disease. The remedy is revenge.

We are accustomed to consider revenge as a brutal manifestation of hatred, and I think we are right in so far as this is actually the nature of revenge with us. It is a different matter when we are faced with revenge in a foreign civilization, among people whose experiences are different from ours. Hence the customary ideas do not help, we must patiently try to find out what revenge is among the Maoris.

Merely seeing what mate involves is helpful. It may be expressed like this: mate is a void in man, whether it is most in the character of an absorbing desire or an undermining of the zest for life. Revenge fills in this void, satisfies it, as the Maori may say; “Hauraki’s mate was not yet satisfied (na),” for which reason they set out and killed another man.129

Revenge has a healing effect and makes the weakened person whole. How this is possible we may come to realize better by looking at the different variations of revenge found.

The normal revenge consists in killing one or more members of the kinship group that has offered the insult. It may be said with truth that revenge

has two aspects: partly that the avenger asserts himself, partly that the insulter is hit. This division is justifiable because the Maori himself makes it, if not in thought, at any rate in deed. For he may very well avenge himself by killing people who have nothing to do with the insult, i.e. are not related to the insulter at all. Thus it is recorded of a detachment of Ngatipaoa that they went to war far away from their home because they had been insulted by people who were related to them and against whom they could not, therefore, fight. But even if the insulter were not a kinsman, one might resort to similar expedients. Gudgeon maintains that if a tribe had been insulted by a stronger tribe against whom they could not do anything, they avenged themselves instead upon another and weaker tribe, although not in cases of assassination (kohuru).

If a chief died a natural death, this of course prevented seeking vengeance upon any guilty person; but as it was actually a case of in mate, a weakening, which could not be overlooked if the chief was of any rank, the southern Maoris resorted to the custom called Te Rakau-o-te-mate, “the staff of Death,” a custom which is described as “an ancient Maori custom, and one which was invariably carried out when a chief of any rank died. The rakau or stick was formerly retained for a year or longer, and was frequently taken to the pa of a former enemy against whom a grudge was felt. If any person was met by the bearer of the rakau he was instantly killed and a war ensued. If no one was met, then the rakau was left, and an armed party came to attack the pa.”

To us the point of revenge is that the avenger finds a vent for his hatred against the person who has injured him. In the great European novels of revenge the tension is produced by the widely ramified plans which must be made and carried out indefatigably in order to strike down just the right person. But the facts of Maori revenge adduced show that we must revise our notions if we shall understand the Maori. Undoubtedly a solid hatred often blazed in his heart, but that aspect of the matter must recede into the shade before the fact that a mate is a weakening. The weakening is the primary thing, therefore the primary element in revenge is that of asserting oneself by a deed. Of course he prefers to allay his hatred of the insulter at the same time, but the most important thing is the deed itself, which raises his repute, unfolds his life, restores his courage, in a word, renews the Maori’s tupu.

We may go even further and say that more important than the deed is the restoration of life, the recovery of honour and courage. An instructive
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feature in this connection is a custom which shows with clarity not only that hatred may be quite subordinate, but that everything turns on honour and its recovery, which, as we have seen, elevates the whole of life. This custom is described by Best as follows: “When a people have been defeated in battle, they can avenge themselves or equalize matters by building a special house and giving it the name of the battlefield where they fell. They send a messenger to the tribe who defeated them, and invite one of their chiefs to visit them. When he arrives he is conducted to the new house, and there treated as a guest of distinction. In a day or two he is returned to his home. The disaster is thus avenged.”

There can hardly be any doubt that such an event took place on the plane of honour; but one might, indeed, have wished for a comment informing us of what takes place in the Maori. We are, however, allowed to call attention to two aspects of this matter. In the first place, we know with certainty that it is a great point of honour for the Maori to be able to entertain his guests, not least we learn about it through the terrible shame that overcame him if he was unable to do so and the consequences of which we have seen above. Therefore there is no doubt that honour and hence life rises in him when he entertains the chief who previously defeated his tribe since—as we shall see below—greater honour is won by giving rather than by receiving. The defeated thus assert themselves before the victor. This is presumably the principal motive, but it is not inconceivable that a secondary motive is involved. By entertaining the chief and otherwise honouring him, they show him manaaki. It will be remembered how one attaches people to oneself in this way and thus creates a certain solidarity. Through this solidarity the enemy chief thus comes to participate in their defeat so that they can get an indirect revenge. Particularly the fact that the house was named after their defeat suggests that this thought was in their mind. Perhaps it will be found that too sophisticated a train of thought is attributed to the Maori here; but when we have seen the peculiar paths along which his thoughts move, not least if he has a demand for revenge on his kinship group, I hardly think the interpretation will be rejected for that reason.

Add to this that we find a train of thought related to that suggested above, in a proverb which runs: “Honoa te pito ora ki te pito mate, unite the living end with the weakened one.” For this proverb is commented on as follows by Grey: “Join an unconquered person to one who has been beaten; if you cannot revenge yourself on your conquerors, try, if you can, to marry a
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daughter of one of their chiefs; then your offspring cannot be insulted by any
allusion to your defeat.” Grey does not say so, but the reason why the
descendants do not drop offensive hints is, of course, that it is their own
kinship which has suffered the insult. Through the marriage it has thus been
transferred to the victor’s; in other words, here, too, there is a kind of subtle
retribution.

Retribution is not, however, the most important thing, and it may be
disregarded in such a way that we should not talk of “revenge” at all if the
Maori did not do so himself.

A popular entertainment was moari, “Giant’s stride,” a kind of
merry-go-round in which one swings round in ropes fastened to the top of a
tall pole, which often stands in such a way that one swings out above a river or
a precipice. One day, when Best was talking with some Maoris about two
moaris, which had previously been erected in the neighborhood, a Maori
happened to say, “They were erected in order to avenge the death of our
people slain at Manatepa.” The idea was simply that the play should make
them forget their grief. Fragments of a song sung during the game have been
handed down, but do not give much information. The most remarkable thing
is that the word “revenge” is used. It would certainly be interesting to know
which word the Maori used, (utu?). Fortunately, the Maori reasons about this
very point are that we learn with what justification the word “revenge” is used:
“of course it was not blood vengeance, or even a real equivalent for our loss,
it was simply to dispel our grief and end the brooding over the trouble, hence
it was looked upon as avenging or equalising matters.”

A song may also serve as revenge of an insult which cannot be blotted out
with arms; but here we at once approach more nearly to normal
revenge, because the song often mocked the enemy.

Revenge is actually a misleading word for what we have met here. A
more appropriate word is “redress” or “rehabilitation.” But the truth is that
none of our words completely go to the core of the matter, because the
Maori’s experience is on a different plane. It is especially worth underlining
the active element is the Maori’s rehabilitation which is connected with the
fact that what is at stake in his tupu, life as it unfolds itself from within.
Rehabilitation can be given only with difficulty, it must be taken. He must feel
his spirits grow into actions in order to have the weakening conquered.
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Revenge, therefore, in the case of more serious insults can only with difficulty be replaced by a gift received such was the *wergild* among the Teutons apart from the cases in which kinship as involved, and even there an active solution of the difficulty would often break through. Wilson gives an instructive report on a tribe who had hit a related tribe so hard that as "*wergild*" they gave them a fortress; for this rare event serves to show very clearly the powerlessness of the gift: the defeated tribe did not content itself with the gift, but still took blood vengeance.\textsuperscript{138}

Revenge is deeply rooted in the structure of the Maori's psyche and at bottom has nothing to do with the hatred against the enemy, which remains a secondary motive, even though it may often be important. Revenge is a necessity of life, because life is a whole and can only exist as a whole. Revenge is the fight for perfection and thus for life itself; it is the sign of the health of life.

Revenge is a strengthening of life, therefore the woman in her grief and her need for rehabilitation sings:

\begin{quote}
I wish my meal, Te Wera, could be caught for me.
I should like to eat Pareihe's brain raw at once,
So that it became a supporting staff for my heart
(*hei poupou ake mo roto i a au*).\textsuperscript{139}
\end{quote}

It is quite natural that the Maori rejoices in his rehabilitation. "The old woman, *Apakura*, rejoiced (\textit{manawareka}) in the fact that Tuwhakararo's death had been revenged,"\textsuperscript{140} it says in the legend which to the Maori contains the archetype of revenge. This Ngaitahu word, *manawareka*, is a compound easily understood: *manawa* is "breath" and feelings in connection with it, and *ureka* means "sweet, healthy."\textsuperscript{141} The word immediately paints the contrast between the constant pressure, the oppression of the chest, which is due to the insult and then the sweet health which is felt as a relief after the revenge. This joy is a necessary part of rehabilitation, immediately expressive of the fact that it has been successful. If joy does not appear, the rehabilitation is not sufficient, and if it were possible to think of a Maori who could not rejoice in revenge, this would be a sign of a disease of the mind. He would invariably be driven to perdition by the insult. Joy is so important that one may say that it is rehabilitation itself:
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“Tawhaki saw from heaven that all the people from these parts had fallen down, and now he rejoiced as a rehabilitation for their impudence against him (ka manawareka mai hei utu mo ta ratou mahi tutu ki a ia).” 142 We remember here how the Maori might find rehabilitation in his joy in playing.

So important is the inner resurgence, that it is in itself half of the revenge. This is suggested in the account of *tupu*, which we have already quoted: “But we *tupued* and grew strong, courage returned to the hearts of men and we again held up our heads and made up our minds to take vengeance for our dead.” 143 What we suspect here—that the will to vengeance in itself contains a rehabilitation—is brought out in a certainly most unusual way in the following event:

When Te Umuariki of the Tuhoe was slain by the East Coast people, Tuhoe and other tribes assembled at Te Waimana to make a great canoe in which to despatch a party to take revenge. The canoe was named Te Totaraohuiara and taken to Whakatane. Then Paora Kingi said: ‘As we have organized our expedition of vengeance, made a war canoe and brought it to the ocean, I am thinking that the death of Te Umuariki is avenged. We will now disperse, and return to our homes.’

And it happened in spite of protests from a few, and Paora Kingi made peace with Te Umuariki’s killers. 144

What is peculiar about this event is that the revenge is interrupted, but this also reveals to us how much the will to revenge itself otherwise sustains the Maori—if necessary for several generations—until an opportunity offers itself for its realization. Of course there were some people who protested against this interruption, which no doubt seemed somewhat unsatisfactory to all; for even if the will to revenge inhibits the weakening in its destructive work, it may easily be chafing in secret.

This is seen in the story about the young man Rautao, whose father, Kahu, was unrevenged. 145 He by no means took the matter with an easy mind, still there were those among his kinsfolk who found him to be too slow, and his cousin, who in the son saw the father’s proper revenger said to him, “You son of Kahu! Surely you must be bent up when sleeping, while I sleep
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straight.” In these words he very suggestively expressed the tension which to the Maori must be the consequence of the unrevenged insult. The son indeed felt this in himself, set out and revenged his father. But when he came home “his mind was healthy because his father’s death had been revenged,” and this simple expression (ka ora te ngakau) clearly indicates what revenge meant.

Even if retribution was not the most important element in revenge, it was not immaterial, either. When Papaki revenged himself on his mother’s brothers, who had killed his father and bullied himself as a boy, he remembered how they pushed him away from the much desired liver of the sting-ray, and every time when he cut down one of them, he said, “This is due to the liver of the sting-ray.” Characteristically, it is the personal insult that is adduced here, not the far worse one, that they have outraged his father’s bones. It was no doubt a concession to personal hatred, too, when the widow of a chief who had been killed had prisoners of war left to her, whom she might kill with her own hand, a custom which seemed to be rather common.

A custom emanating more than any from hatred of the enemy is cannibalism. “It was not for hunger that we ate human beings, no, we ate our enemies in order to satisfy our minds full of hatred (kia ngata ai te ngakau kino ki a ia).” This is plain speaking. It was the consummation of revenge to eat the enemies one had killed, “then the heart had peace,” as we may approximately translate the Maori phrase: “ka tatu te mauri.”

The question is also of interest because the Maori may have believed that at the eating he appropriated some of the enemy’s life; but this is uncertain and at any rate not the main thing. On the one hand, this appropriation took place prior to the meal proper and presumably was inherent in the victory itself, on the other, the passages quoted show that the main object was that of insulting the enemy, a motif which we even find in a pure form in a couple of cases in which a husband revenges himself upon his wife as well as her lover by forcing her to eat the lover’s genitals.

146. The same image is used in a proverb (Best 1942: 103) about the contrast between the man whose store of food is poor and the man whose store is plentiful. This undoubtedly explains why Rautao interpreted the remark not only as a hint at the fact that his father lay unavenged, but also at his efforts as a tiller of the soil.
147. White 1888a: 177.
149. Smith 1897: 4.
152. White 1887b: 22; Best 1925b: 394.
Innumerable satirical songs indeed suggest that the point of cannibalism is first of all that of profaning and insulting the hated antagonists.\footnote{153. See e.g. Best 1903c: 143 ff., where a selection has been translated by Best.}

Hatred is not the deepest source of revenge, but it enters into it, this much is certain. We can even graduate its importance rather closely by the extent to which revenge is not only rehabilitation but retribution as well.

According to circumstances retribution plays a greater or lesser part. Open homicide was far from arousing the same bitterness as assassination (kohuru). It was equally important that they should be revenged, but assassination should be paid back as well.\footnote{154. Gudgeon 1904a: 181.} The considerations made by Ō Te Rauparaha or attributed to him when Ō Te Pehi had been killed by treachery are typical. “How,” he thought, “is the death of Te Pehi and his associates to be avenged? It cannot be avenged by open fight, by a fortress being stormed; no, another assassination is needed to avenge it.”\footnote{155. White 1890: 31.}

Retribution can be regulated by a certain sense of reasonableness. To be sure, a Maori cannot very well take too much revenge, but if only the enemy is related to him, or for some other reason he wants to keep peace between himself and the insulter, a wish for adaptation of revenge will arise, so that an incessant sequence of acts of revenge should not be started. This may be done by making the revenge correspond to the insult. There was a chief, Tuhourangi, who insulted a neighbor, Kapu, by thoughtlessly paying a visit in the season when food is scarcest. It was a mate, an insult, to Kapu that he could not feed his guests very well, and this insult must be avenged. This he did by visiting Tuhourangi a few days later and thus putting him into exactly the same painful situation.\footnote{156. White 1888b: 53 ff.}

A similar reasonableness and moderation is seen in the record of an event during a barter with a European ship, undoubtedly Captain Cook’s. A Maori took himself off with some cloth without paying and on his way towards the shore was shot by the Whites. The Maoris then said, “He is himself the cause of his death, and it will not be correct to seek rehabilitation (utu) for him. In short, the cloth stolen by him is his rehabilitation (utu), and he may keep it as his shroud.”\footnote{157. White 1888b: 110.}

This sense of reasonableness of course to a great extent has its limitations. It may have a moderating effect on the rehabilitation, but it will very rarely prevent it. Indeed, in the case just mentioned, the thief kept the
cloth as rehabilitation.

If the rehabilitation should be completely dropped, we may safely say that this never happened with the kinship group’s consent, but only because the sense of reasonableness kept back the other groups so that the insulted hapu was isolated and therefore had to give up the revenge. Thus it happened that a hapu of the Tahoe, Ngatihuri, after the rest of the Tuhuoe had made peace with Te Arawa, still, in spite of it being warned, attacked Te Arawa, but with ill success. The Ngatihuri themselves wanted revenge, but the other hapus would not help them, because the Ngatihuri themselves had broken the peace, and their defeat was never revenged.\(^{158}\)

A Maori may discuss the question of how great a revenge he will demand, and conditions may force him to postpone, indeed, give up his demand for revenge; but if we disregard the special cases in which the insult was given by near relatives, it can hardly be disputed whether there ought to be revenge. There is rarely any vacillation on this point. It is recorded that soon after the immigration there was a tribe which for peace’s sake tried to give up revenge, but characteristically without success; for it still ended in fighting.\(^{159}\) Indeed, this is how it must be. From his presuppositions the Maori cannot act differently. This is easily understood if only it is kept in mind that to him there are actually two possibilities only: either that of allowing an insult to do its ghastly work and corrode life, or that of taking revenge, or if this cannot be done, at least maintaining the will to revenge.

Revenge therefore was a necessity to the old Maori. He could not live—the word being taken in an absolutely literal sense—without revenging his insults. An insult must normally lead to revenge. This was so much a matter of course that in a way we nearly falsified the picture of the Maori when we dwelt for so long on the problem of how the insult might drive man to death; for this remains the exception, which in practice occurs only in cases in which the insulter is a kinsman or in which revenge for some other reason is excluded. To the Maori, it is a settled thing that he cannot let himself be bullied in this way. The insult is a weakening which is real enough and an immediately menacing reality; but at the same time it is a challenge to life, a challenge which must be met. To the Maori, the view that an insult should normally lead to revenge is so firmly established that the phrase ka tupu te mate “the insult unfolds its nature” simply means: “the insult is revenged.”\(^{160}\) The same meaning is found in ka mana te mate, literally “the insult gets
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\(^{158}\) Best 1902c: 162.

\(^{159}\) Grey 1855: 70.

efficacy.” Whereas these turns of phrase are rare, there is a very common idiom which expresses a similar idea, viz. ngaki i te mate. Ngaki means “occupy oneself with, cultivate,” ‘to“cultivate” an insult’ thus means “to revenge it.” Furthermore, there is a related idea behind the expression: takitaki i te mate “revenge an insult,” takitaki means something like to “bring forth.” Finally, it corresponded to these turns of phrase that an unrevenged insult is termed mate ngaro, thus is “hidden” (ngaro).

Revenge is a necessity which the Maori always has much at heart. One of the ancestors of the Maoris, Turahui, and his associates had in the distant past when they ploughed through the waves of the Pacific, come to an island, where the people, little hospitably, demanded that they should leave, otherwise they would be killed. Opinions differed as to what to be done. Turahui then said, “I will not consent to return to sea, because I do not want to be caught and ripped up by the sharks. Let me stay here on land, then I can get a mat.” These words mean that he will not die unrevenged at sea; but wants a “mat,” i.e. he will kill an enemy, if he is to be killed himself. He succeeded in carrying his view, and when they were brought before the chief, he told his associates to manage to sit close to the chief in order that he might be their rehabilitation if they were killed, thus become “mat” to them.

The Maori can only with difficulty reconcile himself to the idea that a man should die unrevenged, and various customs reveal how they tried to revenge even a “natural” death. Such a custom, Te-Rakau-o-te-mate, was mentioned above; but exactly the same thing comes to light if a man is drowned at sea and the rest of the crew of the canoe are rescued. Then it is a recognized custom that the relatives of the dead man try to revenge themselves on the survivors. There is actually a proverb to that effect: “Those who escape the blows of Tangaroa will be killed by those on shore. (Tangaroa is the god of the sea.)” Revenge is a necessity, a downright duty. Even if one does not want to seek revenge for the sake of one’s own individual I, one must do so for the sake of the kinship I. There was one of Te Rauparaha’s prisoners of war who

162. Williams 1932: ngaki.
163. Williams 1932: takitaki.
164. Williams 1932: ngaro.
166. E.g. Shand 1892: 203 and Smith 1910d
167. White 1887c: Eng. 54. Inversely it might happen that those who had been wrecked avenged themselves on the tribe that owned the surf in which they had capsized; Smith 1909a: 14.
begged for his life, but Te Rauparaha answered, “If it was only a case of an insult to myself, it would be right, and I should let you live; but this is an insult to Ngatitoa (i.e. Te Rauparaha’s tribe), and I cannot do anything.”  

Thus speaks a chief, and thus he must speak if he wants to keep his people’s confidence and esteem. We have from the hand of Rev. J. W. Stack a description which sets off this truth:

Amongst the prisoners was the chief Te Rapaatekuri, who was brought by his captors to Maru, in order that he might have the satisfaction of putting him to death as utu (payment) for his father and sister. But contrary to their expectations, and to the annoyance and disgust of everyone, Maru spared the prisoner’s life. Waitai was so exasperated by his culpable leniency that he immediately withdrew with 300 followers, and sailed away to the south, settling for a time at Putekura. On taking his departure he warned those who remained against a leader who would encourage them to attack his enemies and then deprive them of their right to put their captive death. ‘I will never again join with Maru,’ he said.  

Stack obviously reported this with an ironical twinkle in the eye; but the Maori was in deadly earnest. A man, even a chief, who will not revenge himself, is on the brink of lunacy. He actually trifles with life in himself and his kinship group. Revenge simply is life’s struggle to maintain its highest values, all that is inherent in tupu: courage, power, and honour, and a man who does not seek vengeance, is without any greatness and makes himself and his kinship group despicable. Even the victims of revenge acknowledge that revenge ought to be done. When Pare in the legend had taken her own life because Hutu, whom she loved, did not dare to marry her, the tribe seized Hutu in order to revenge itself upon him. “It is right that I should be rehabilitation for the daughter of your chief,” he said. The only reason why he was not killed was that he fetched Pare back from the realm of the dead.  

Revenge is the noblest unfolding of life, its struggle for consummation. Therefore revenge is the great subject in Maori tradition. Where the moral of the story was to be found in certain European tales, the Maori said, “Thus that insult was revenged,” or “This was the end of their heroic deeds, for this insult was never revenged.” Thus the essential aspect of the matter was summed up, and the Maori always kept mental accounts of revenged and unrevenged insults. We have seen that honour is inherent in the kinship I. Therefore revenge is particularly an affair of the kinship I. So it is the same “I” which

168.  White 1890: 32.
169.  Stack 1877: 72.
171.  E.g. Shortland 1856: 17 ff.
through generations remembers the insults and knows exactly whether they have been revenged or not. After all, there is little difference between new and old. It has often been mentioned how ancient insults might suddenly, when occasion arose, become of immediate importance and break out in revenge. We shall here content ourselves with referring to the panic arising in Ponga’s tribe during their visit to that of Puhihuia, by the false report that the hosts were calling to mind insults generations old. Nobody thought of doubting so probable a piece of information. Everybody only thought of seeking safety.\textsuperscript{172}

When \textit{Turaungatao} and his kinsfolk had been driven away from their home, they asked, “How shall our defeat be revenged?” Turaungatao then answered, “We must grow as the fruit of the \textit{rengarenga} and come hard as those of the \textit{kawariki}.” These words, which later survived as a proverb, are interpreted to the effect that they were to breed men and multiply so that they might revenge their defeat.\textsuperscript{173} This tough will, which holds out until revenge can be taken, illustrates in a practical way what a “kinship I” actually means.

When we have seen what the actual will to revenge means we can also understand that the Maori clings to the insult by commemorating it in personal names. Indeed it is said to be done in order that the insult should not be forgotten,\textsuperscript{174} but this rationalistic explanation hardly covers more than a fraction of reality. The danger of forgetfulness on that point was hardly great. If the person in question seemed to the other kinsfolk a little negligent there were probably always some who could egg him on to revenge, not least among the women.\textsuperscript{175} We find in Best a small, but expressive scene in which a mother seizes her breasts and shakes them, saying, “I thought I had nourished you with my milk in order that your ‘father’s’ (i.e. mother’s brother’s), Tupakiaka’s death might be revenged.” This admonition was not lost; one of the sons rose at once saying, “It will be revenged by me.”\textsuperscript{176} A persistence in the will to revenge like the one expressed in a name, is frequently found in the laments for the dead (and still more clearly in the satirical songs, which indeed in themselves contain a certain revenge). In a lament, we e.g. find these lines:

\begin{quote}
There is no man in this world  
To revenge your death;  
There is only this kind of man: Ears-without-action,  
Who will not listen to the tale
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{172} White 1888a: 126.  
\textsuperscript{174} E.g. Best 1902c: 159.  
\textsuperscript{175} E.g. Grey 1855: 86. White 1888b: 61.  
\textsuperscript{176} Best 1925b: 274.
About your braveness in fight.\textsuperscript{177}

The fundamental importance of revenge naturally involves that the
normal revenge in its course has been crystallized in definite customs. The
beginning, that of providing helpers for a revenge, has an established form
within the various tribes.\textsuperscript{178} From the Ngaitahu, it is recorded that they sent
emissaries to the other kinship groups. When coming to the villages, they
would sing an old song, or perhaps a new one, dancing at the same time.\textsuperscript{179}
From the obscure hints it was understood what the purpose was. Among
the Tahoe it was customary to give a singed cloak, burnt food or the like
to the person whose help was sought for revenge. If the person in question
accepted the gift or ate the food it meant that he promised his assistance.\textsuperscript{180}
Such a “gift” amongst other things was called \textit{ngakau} “mind,” and by
accepting it one thus showed that one was of the same mind as the giver.\textsuperscript{181}

Next, when an army set out to seek blood vengeance, it was also
of a special character. The vital importance of blood vengeance made such
an army (\textit{tau\text{\textsuperscript{a}} to\text{\textsuperscript{t}}o}) more recklessly courageous than ordinary armies.\textsuperscript{182}
Therefore, the \textit{tau\text{\textsuperscript{a}} to\text{\textsuperscript{t}}o} must not weaken even slightly, in its aims. Somebody
\textit{must} be killed. It was simply a very ill omen to let the first person they met
pass by unhurt—so ill that such irresolution would nearly always cause the
whole undertaking to be given up.\textsuperscript{183} A person who happened to get in the way
of a \textit{tau\text{\textsuperscript{a}} to\text{\textsuperscript{t}}o} was cut down, even if he was a kinsman who by ill luck became
a “flying fish crossing the stem of the canoe,” as the Maori expressed it.\textsuperscript{184}

Finally there were special customs when the army returned after
vengeance had been accomplished. (Apart from rites which took place both
before and after the expedition, but which will not be discussed in this
connection.) The person who mourned for the killed person whose death had
now been revenged, received a kind of pledge of the vengeance (\textit{taia\text{\textsuperscript{aroa}}}).\textsuperscript{185}

The subject of revenge is actually as inexhaustible as the Maori’s
traditions, and indeed the description given here is not very adequate, as many
of its aspects have only been touched on rather than really investigated. Still, I

\textsuperscript{177.} Makere in Smith 1908: 171.  
\textsuperscript{178.} See especially: Best 1903a: 41 ff.  
\textsuperscript{179.} White 1887b: 145.  
\textsuperscript{180.} Best 1925b: 84; 329; Kelly 1940: 153; Best 1903a: 41ff.  
\textsuperscript{181.} Cf. p. 249.  
\textsuperscript{182.} Best 1925b: 379.  
\textsuperscript{183.} Best 1898a: 120.  
\textsuperscript{184.} E.g. Best 1925b: 364.  
\textsuperscript{185.} See Grey 1855: 36; Williams 1932: \textit{taia\text{\textsuperscript{aroa}}}.
hope that the main purpose has been achieved so that it will be understood why revenge is the highest unfolding of life and the avenger is man at his greatest.

Revenge is also the most striking expression of the importance of expansive activity for the Maori’s mental health. We shall meet this to feature fairly often, e.g. in the muru custom and in the relation between man and woman.

The contrast between the deadly depression which is the core of mate, and an expansive activity is fundamental to his character. Of course he spends the greater part of his life in the emotional middle register, but there is a great tendency towards reacting in one of these extreme ways to many decrees of fate. This liability is characteristic of his temperament. Most of those who have known the old-time Maori report on sudden attacks of fury. Polack summarizes this in the following characterization: “New Zealanders of either sex, if addressed somewhat sharply, either become infuriated with passion, or turn to a fit of sullenness, covering their heads within their garments, falling into a fit of tears and moaning as if the direst misfortunes had fallen on kith and kin . . .”186

We have seen how an insult within the kinship group will often result in the insulted person fleeing or doing away with himself. This being the ordinary course of events goes to show that even the revengeful Maori stayed his hand when faced with his kin. But however much truth there is in this, Maori life is so richly varied that revenge may break through in its own way even against one’s kin. The cases which may be adduced in this respect are so few that they must be said on the whole to be untypical, but in a way they become of special interest exactly for that reason, since they show us the Maori when moving on the outermost verge of his possibilities.

In so far as we may talk at all about normal revenge within the kinship group, it must be of a very indirect kind. A case of suicide which robs the kinship group of a member, perhaps always includes an element of revenge—this is difficult to decide. We can, of course, be sure in a case like the one mentioned above in which a man chose such a form of “suicide” that it necessarily would involve the kinship group in a war.

This man’s conduct is only a special case of a recognized custom which Shortland describes as follows:

There is a mode of retaliating authorized by the customs of the New Zealanders, called whakaha, which means, literally, putting your adversary in the wrong. It is adopted chiefly when the person who has done the first injustice is a near relation, or one of the same tribe, from whom the injured person could not or would not like to seek redress directly.

He will then commit some act of violence on a neighboring tribe, so as to involve his own tribe in a foreign quarrel, and thus punish the whole in order to get at that part of it who did him wrong.\footnote{Shortland 1856: 20.}

Shortland’s interpretation should probably be disregarded. He undermines it himself by writing: “Strange to say, this very dangerous principle of action, by whatever great evils it may be followed, obtains the respect and not the censure of the whole tribe for the person who adopts it.”\footnote{Shortland 1882: 101.}

This supplement is significant and shows that we must study the question in concrete cases, if we shall have hopes of understanding how the tribe can look on this peculiar custom with satisfaction.

Gudgeon tells the following story: “Among the Kahukoka people there were two chiefs (brothers) Tamakae and Tamakou, and for some reason the younger murdered the elder brother; here there was an altogether new and unique situation, but the hapu was equal to the occasion; the adherents of the dead man could not, it is true, take vengeance on their own chief; but they could and did murder a member of an adjacent tribe, with the deliberate intention of drawing down destruction on their own heads.”\footnote{Gudgeon 1904a: 185 f.}

The background of this action is to be sought in the discord which menaces the kinship group because some members side with the killed brother, others with his murderer; the chief motive is fairly certainly that of conquering this discord. If we want to follow the Maori’s thoughts, we must at the same time remember both that the side of the killed man had suffered an insult by the homicide, and what we have found out in the preceding pages about the proper nature of revenge, that it is not primarily a retribution but a rehabilitation. Therefore, there is hardly any doubt that the side insulted really obtains a rehabilitation by killing an unoffending person from another tribe. After this rehabilitation, it is again on an equal footing with the other side and thus in part has conquered the discord. Now it is, however, expressly stated that they do so in order to draw down a war on their own heads; but this aspect we can understand as well when considering that an attack on the part of strangers will always make a kinship group rally. In other words, they draw the war down upon them in order to conquer the discord definitively. Even if in this way we may find some sort of reason in the story, a European will presumably still find that his is a strange way in which to smooth away a conflict in the kinship group. It must, however, be kept in mind what a considerable part it plays when something—in this case the revenge—obtains the character...
of an institution. First of all, it means that it is a form corresponding exactly to the Maori’s experience and requirements, thus that the revenge is actually a rehabilitation for the insult. But next, the nature of revenge as an institution just involves that to the Maori it becomes the natural form of the restoration of a normal state of things, and thus will always appear to the mind as an obvious possibility. Revenge then becomes the starting-point of the line of thought rather than its result, so that he does not so much think, “How is the discord to be conquered?” as, “What revenge can conquer the discord?”

The application of revenge to the kinship group becomes perhaps of special interest to us exactly because it provides convincing evidence of how revenge by its enormous significance has entered the Maori’s mental structure and thus become a starting-point for his thoughts. Without this knowledge the—although special—cases in which one revenges oneself upon kinsfolk, will be insoluble riddles.

In this way, we have obtained a background showing the more general formation of this indirect revenge, in which it is not a case of sides, but of persons, as e.g. in the narrative about Huka, who felt himself to have been insulted by his kinsfolk and therefore, according to Wilson, said to himself, “I can’t kill all my relatives, but I can bring war upon them.” Which, sure enough, he did by murdering Waharoa’s cousin.\(^{190}\)

Huka’s method, however, appears quite clumsy as compared with that of Rautao’s.\(^{191}\) Rautao’s cousin had permitted himself discreetly to remind him that his father lay unrevenge. Discreetly or not, Rautao felt this as an insult, the more so as in his cousin’s remark he surmised the presence of a criticism of his work with the land.\(^{192}\) He had a house built with a partition across it which shut off the hindmost part of the house, in which an oven was dug and lit. Then the cousin and his attendants were by Rautao shown into the house, which apparently was like other houses. As soon as they had entered, the partition, however, was removed and the oven uncovered so that the steam from the hot food swirled around to Rautao and his guests. Since anything that has to do with the kitchen is the work of women and slaves, this steam was an insult to the nobleman, and as such it was understood. In this way, Rautao revenged the insult.

In this event various traits are particularly striking. It is evident how well considered the plan is, which makes it the more important to understand it. Furthermore we note that Rautao is himself the object of the insult which he
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\(^{190}\)  Wilson 1907: 83 f.

\(^{191}\)  White 1888b: 61 f.

\(^{192}\)  Cf. note 147 on p. 59.
prepares for the others, which reminds us that a similar thing also applies to
the other cases. It may be said that the personal insult is revenged by—as it
were—throwing it on all. The individual is in danger that the insult should
drive a wedge in between himself and his kinship group, which may separate
him from the group but through the revenge his insult is “satisfied” and he is
again one with the group; for this common insult does not separate them. The
curious thing is that even when the Maori asserts himself before the kinship
group, he cannot escape from his kinship I; actually he has to do so in a way
which confirms him as a man of the kin.\textsuperscript{193}

Actually the difference between Rautao and the suicide is not so great as
it might seem on an immediate consideration; for as we have seen suicide may
be committed as a self-assertion and a vengeance on the kinship group. The
assumption we made above, that the suicide in this asserts himself back to and
into the kinship group, is confirmed by these narratives, in which the insulted
person survives.

Although the Maori even in revenge on the kinship group is a kinship
man, there is of course something irregular about it, which he no doubt feels
in the fact that he actually injures himself. In spite of the deliberate planning,
there is in the action something which the Maori might be supposed to
characterize as onesidedness, if, indeed, he did occupy himself with such
reflections. There is a story about some brothers who fell out, the elder
brothers continuing to take fish from the younger brother, Hauiti. Finally
Hauiti went up to Marukakoa and asked, “How can killing (or discomfiture)
of a relation be affected?” Marukakoa answered, “Shut close the eyes and
when you open them to see, (he is) killed, prostrate (on the ground): another
plan (is by) fire.” One might think that the talk is about magic, but the con-
tinuation suggests that it is figurative speech, to which the Maori is much de-
voted; for Marukakoa lit a fire so that the house was filled with smoke which
made the eyes smart. Hauiti asked, “O, Marukakoa, what is this for?” and
Marukakoa answered, “This is the killing of a relation.” The idea of this ac-
tion is obviously that just as the smoke makes the eyes smart so one must
close the eyes if one wants to injure a relation. This is how Hauiti must have
interpreted it, for when his elder brothers returned in order to take his fish,
he took the offensive and chased them away, but before doing so he said to
his people, “Be courageous, be brave, and daring. Do not consider
relationship of the elder brother, or the younger, or of the father. Let the eyes

\textsuperscript{193} Other examples of this “indirect” vengeance: Stack 1877: 79; White 1887c: 38 f.; cf.
Whatahoro 1915: 168.
be firmly closed.”\(^{194}\)

Thus one cannot revenge oneself without closing the eyes, i.e. without being onesided in one’s relation to the kinship group. There is, indeed, good reason to close the eyes, for it is dangerous work to hurt one’s own kinship group; one must know very exactly how far, or rather how short a distance, one may go in order that the remedy should not be worse than the disease.

In the myth of *Ruatapu*, the Maori has a work of poetry which shows how a revenge within the kinship group becomes a disaster which pulls its originator into the abyss. Ruatapu’s father was a chief, but his mother was low-born. So he was of less honour than his brothers, though still very arrogant. When his father put him in his place he therefore felt much ashamed and desperate. He borrowed a canoe and secretly drilled a hole in the bottom of it which he then stopped again. Then he got all the best men of the kinship group, those of the early genealogical lines, into the canoe; but when they had lost sight of the land, he opened the hole in the bottom so that the canoe foundered and all except one perished. This revenge is morbid. It is horrifying that Ruatapu could direct so terrible a blow at his own kinship group and thus at himself. The morbid element now appears in the fact that Ruatapu himself loses connection not only with his kinship group but all humanity, and becomes a demonic figure, who in his insatiable revengefulness returns as a terrible wave, which washes over the land and sweeps everything with it except a few people who have managed to take refuge on a mountain. On this one point, it may be said that there is still something human left in Ruatapu as he lets the one survivor warn people against the inundation and enjoin them to seek safety on the mountain. This trait (which probably has a ritual meaning) cannot, however, obliterate the expression of demonic ghastliness enveloping the figure into whom the Maori has in poetry put his horror of the fact that shame may drive a human being not only out of his kinship group, but into insanity.\(^{195}\)

With revenge within the kinship group we have in a certain sense encircled and rounded off the question of honour, its insult and rehabilitation. At the same time, we have made observations of the contents of the kinship I and its relation to the individual I; but we have restricted ourselves to seeing the relation between individual and kinship group mainly from the
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\(^{194}\) Colenso 1880: 43 ff. The story is also found in Maori, but from another tribe, whose version does not illustrate the point (White 1887c: 89).

\(^{195}\) White 1887c: Chs. 1-2 contain a long series of versions, which, however, for the most part agree in the main features adduced here. Cf. a legend in which a man who feels ashamed kills his wife because she is cleverer than he at catching birds (Best 1942: 468).
point of view of the individual and left out of consideration a no less im-
portant question, viz. that of the individual as seen from the point of view of
the kinship group. The matter has certainly been touched upon during
the mention of the “kinship I” (p. 37 ff.), but it may be elaborated further in
the light of our recognition of the fact that the contents of the kinship I is
honour.

We have seen that even though honour and life are one whole, there are
different aspects of this whole. This is brought out in the fact that a weakening
can attack man either corporally or as an insult to his honour. Considering the
matter from the point of view of the individual, both in so far are equally
serious, because both can sweep the whole human being away. There is,
however, the difference that life’s aspect of honour exists especially in the
kinship I, therefore an insult of honour directly attacks kinship life in man.

We have particularly seen this in the possible effect of an unrehabilitated in-
sult of honour breeding a feeling of shame which eats away the kinship I in a
man after which he takes the consequences and flies away. Finally we have
found that there was a possibility of rehabilitation in suicide and in indirect
revenge. The whole question has, however, been considered from the point
of view of the individual Maori losing or saving his kinship I and thus his rela-
tion to the kinship group. But how does the kinship group regard an individ-
ual who is insulted in the cases where there is no rehabilitation? It is evident
that the difference between a corporal weakening and an insult of honour is
here more sharply defined because the insult of honour affects the kinship I
directly and thus strikes all members of the kinship group in a much more
direct way than if e.g. a member has a toothache. We get an inkling of this
difference by considering how the kinship group regularly tried to prevent the
suicide of young widows, whereas to my knowledge there are no instances of
the kinship group preventing a flight or an attempt at suicide due to shame.
Thus there is a fundamental difference in the attitude of the kinship group
towards suicides according as to whether honour is primarily involved or not.

This difference perhaps is not difficult to understand. Will the whole
kinship group not be exposed to danger if a dishonourable member walks
about among them every day? Will not his shame be their shame? Is there
anything which can prevent shame from leaping from mind to mind and
devouring honour and vitality in all?

There is hardly any doubt that such a fear that disgrace will spread like a
disease, particularly among the descendants, actually prevails in the kinship
group; for we see how the group may simply amputate a dishonourable
member. Thus it might happen that fathers killed their own sons if they
returned home after being slaves.\textsuperscript{196}

Rather more frequently we hear how the Maori prevents this disgrace. We have a very instructive report from a Maori, although unfortunately only in an English translation.

\textit{Tamaiharanui} and his people, among them \textit{Te Whakatuka}, were pursuing the enemy, in whose ranks there was also a cousin of Tamaiharanui named \textit{Upokohina} with some of his children. \textit{Te Whakatuka} had vengeance to wreak upon Upokohina, and cried out that they should hold him, but the latter begged for his life. Tamaiharanui overheard this and cried out, “Spare my cousin.” Upokohina sat down, and his pursuers stood round him. When Tamaiharanui came up he at once rubbed noses with his relative, and with each of the children; then without a moment’s warning, he buried his hatchet in the side of the old man’s head, who fell over with a groan; then withdrawing the hatchet, he struck each of the children on the head, cracking their skulls like birds’ eggs. Then, turning to \textit{Te Whakatuka}, he said, “But for your exclamation I should have spared my cousin and his children; but I could not permit you to boast hereafter that you had either slain or spared any of my family. The honour of our family demanded their death at my hands.”\textsuperscript{197}

Tamaiharanui’s heavy-handedness is not, as one might believe, due to the fact that his cousin was on the enemy’s side. The whole situation shows that he considers his cousin as a relative who has a claim upon him. The story is not unique; we know other cases in which the point is that it must be a relative who does the killing. Once an army set out, the leader of which had had a divine revelation according to which the first person they met was to be killed. The first person they met was a young woman, the sister of one of the warriors. The leader then entrusted the brother with cutting her down, and he did so without hesitation.\textsuperscript{198} The idea is no doubt the same: in this way honour and thus the kinship I suffer least. It is not always easy to see when the situation requires homicide and when leniency. It seems easiest to understand the killings in the case of Maoris killing their own children in order to prevent them from being taken captive.\textsuperscript{199}

It is only fair in this connection to remind the reader of the fact that the Maori is extremely willing to sacrifice his own life. Still, he does not derive his power over kinsfolks’ lives from his willingness to take his own; it is the kinship group and honour which are greater than the individual and his life.

\textsuperscript{196} Best 1903c: 163.
\textsuperscript{197} White 1887c: Eng. 277.
\textsuperscript{198} Best 1925b: 610; cf. Gudgeon 1904a: 188 f.
\textsuperscript{199} Best 1904a: 11; Te Kahu 1901: 91 or White 1890: 64.
Therefore situations may arise in which the life of the individual must be sacrificed, but the normal is of course the opposite, that the kinship group wants the individual to live.

We may suitably finish this chapter with two stories which illustrate these two possibilities with a certain, rather grim humor.

The first story has been told by Maning, who describes an old Maori nobleman, “who was utterly devoid of what weak mortals call ‘compassion.’” Indeed this is correct; this virtue was not popular with the Maori; but it was due to the fact that from his presuppositions he had not much use for it. Mankind always fell into two groups, those outside the kinship I, whom one did not owe anything, and those inside it to whom one stood in a much more intimate relationship than “compassion,” a fact which to a certain extent can be compared with one’s relation to one’s own limbs; in this way there was no room for a gap between one individual and another to be spanned by compassion. The comparison also in so far makes it intelligible that the Maori can look on himself and the kinship group so rationally—still to be understood from his lights. Maning now tells about this old-time Maori: “Should one of his family be dying or wounded, he merely felt it as the loss of one fighting man.... Indeed, I have seen him scolding severely a fine young man, his near relative, when actually expiring, for being such a fool as to blow himself up by accident, and deprive his family of a fighting man. The last words the dying man heard were these. ‘It serves you right. There you are, looking very like a burnt stick. It serves you right—a burnt stick! Serves you right.’”

On the other hand, it may be just as bad that a human life is spared, if in this way honour, i.e. the life of the kinship group suffers by it. This fact may be finally illustrated by the following story told by Gudgeon.

As mentioned above, an army which has set out to wreak blood vengeance is to kill the first person they meet, whoever it may be. Once it happened that such an army met one of their own chief’s sons who was just on his way home from a visit to a remoter kinsman. The leader was a good friend of his father’s and therefore contented himself with a “symbolic” killing of the young man, i.e. he gave him a smart blow on the head and declared him to be dead. When the young man came home to his father, the latter grew very angry, assembled an army and attacked the first army!

201. Gudgeon 1904a: 190.