In the last chapter we have seen what life is to the Maori as it wells out in zest for life from within and extends into the surrounding world as honour and repute, and furthermore how the relation to the surrounding world reacts on life in human beings. We found that the word *tupu* could give us a key to the understanding of this whole interplay. Similarly we shall by a study of the meaning of the word *mana* to throw a significant and intimate light on the mutual relationship of the Maoris in the kinship group and on their relation to the surrounding world.

*Mana* has undoubtedly been debated so much that a fresh contribution might seem superfluous to some people. In this connexion we may call attention to two things.

In the first place, great parts of the previous investigations suffer from vagueness as to the starting-point; for the mana concept has been discussed in a number of peoples together. Even in Lehmann’s work, which is meritorious
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1. This term is convenient, but perhaps may be misunderstood. If we think of the meaning of a word as isolated from any context, it can presumably hardly throw light on any cultural trait; but this, indeed, implies a doubtful abstraction. More accurately, it is the passages in the texts in which the word occurs that are informative, but only because and when the meaning of the word is determined. This being the most difficult task, it will mean in practice to the philologist that the meaning of the word gives a clue to the understanding of the cultural traits it covers.
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on many points, *mana* is considered among the Melanesians and the Polynesians together. But who will guarantee that it is actually one thing that is being discussed? Can we be sure that there is not so great variations of the same idea that the determination necessarily becomes inexact, or worse, becomes false? What seems to me to be missing is the simple recognition of the view that the core of the investigations must be philological, thus the use of the word *mana* by a definite people. Only in this way may we be sure of speaking about something real and not a compromise between a scientific technical term, mana, and more or less corresponding notions of mana in various peoples.

Secondly, this lack of distinction in the investigations has been accompanied by lack of criticism of the sources. From a philological point of view, we must reject the idea that we should determine the meaning of *mana* from the Europeans' use of the word, even if they think that they use it in the same way as the natives. As e.g. Lehmann does not proceed philologically, he does not, either, hesitate to use to a great extent the stories of mana adduced by Gudgeon and others. Evidently, it does not occur to him that if only by this procedure, however correct Gudgeon may be in his usage, there will be a fundamental one-sidedness in his interpretation which completely disturbs the point of the word.

In the following investigations we shall therefore keep strictly to the texts; but even this is not sufficient. The word *mana* has evidently to a special extent changed character during the revolution which swept over the old Maori culture with the coming of the Europeans. It proves necessary to discard some texts as unreliable, particularly on this point. The Appendix will make clear the principle of this criticism of the texts, and its justification.

*Mana* has a meaning which has not a little in common with *tupu*, but on a significant point they are radically different. Both denote unfolding, activity and life; but whereas *tupu* is an expression of the nature of things and human beings as unfolded from within, *mana* expresses something participated, an active fellowship which according to its nature is never inextricably bound up with any single thing or any single human being. How this “fellowship” is to be understood will appear as we trace it in detail through a number of passages in which *mana* occurs, particularly looking on the *mana* of human beings and from there making digressions to other *manas*.

*Mana* is a kind of fellowship. This is evident from the texts when these are read quite straightforwardly. We may start with two reports on parallel events which throw light on one another fairly well. In a war between *Mango* and *Whatihua*, the latter advanced towards Mango’s fortress, but Mango’s
people made a sally and defeated Whatihua, many of whose men were killed. He was himself taken prisoner and taken before Mango, who forced his head down and made water upon it. As a consequence of this action, Whatihua’s *mana* had been taken by Mango (*ko te rironga tenei o te mana o Whatihua i a Mango*).  

Something similar happened in a conflict between two men, *Pahau* and *Tamure*, who belonged to the same tribe and lived in the same village, but who presumably were chiefs each of his *hapu*. Tamure felt himself to have been insulted by Pahua, got help from outside the *hapu*, and it came to a fight. The slaughter was hardly very great, as the two *hapus* must have been closely related, but Pahau succeeded in catching Tamure and making water upon his head. We can hardly doubt that Pahau, like Mango in the corresponding situation, by this action took Tamure’s *mana*. It does not say so, however, but we learn that now the *mana* of the tribe was with Pahau and that he was its chief (*ko Pehau te mea i a ia te mana o te iwi, a i kīa i ai ko Pahau te ariki o ratou*).  

By comparing these two stories we are led to the conclusion that the *mana* of the chief and the *mana* of the tribe must be almost identical. This conclusion is corroborated by a passage in which a man looks with envy upon his two cousins who are twins, because they belong to an older genealogical line; for he thinks of the fact that when they grow up, “the *mana* of these twins will become more extended than his, the *mana* of the whole of Poverty Bay will be taken by these two, both the *mana* of the land and the *mana* of the whole tribe.”  

*Mana* thus is something which is found both in chief, tribe, and land, in other words, something common to a group; but there is a difference in their relation to this *mana* in that the chief owns the *mana* of the others. It is this very thing that makes his *mana* so much greater than that of the others, as it “extends” into the land and the people.  

This fellowship, *mana*, has something impersonal about it, in the way that it may be taken from the chief and taken over by another man. The impersonal, however, is only one aspect of *mana*, the one due to the fact that it contains the *mana* of the tribe as well as the land, and we may perhaps add, that of the chief as well. On the other hand, there is something personal about *mana* in relation to tribe, chief, or land, by the fact that they each have their share in it. This becomes evident if we consider the relation to *tupu* in more detail.  

A man’s *tupu* and his *mana* are intimately connected. We may say that his *tupu* attaches his *mana* to it, or better that it extends into his *mana* so that they
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are in part identical. They both join in comprising a man’s repute. The presents which the kinship group give a man at his wedding, are at once distributed by him among his wife’s relatives; “Katiki araua kote mana, the mana is sufficient for the two, i.e. the married couple;” or in other words, the repute of the gifts is theirs.

Because of this fusion mana cannot either remain with a man if his tupu vanishes. The same insult which makes Tamure’s tupu vanish, causes Whatihua’s mana to be taken. In this connection we may also remind the reader of Hotunui, who feared that the disdain of the tribe “would make his tupu vanish and with it the mana of his speech (me te mana o tana kāhī).”

Outward mana and tupu co-operate. Ponga belonged to a younger line, “therefore his tupu was weakened by some of his friends’ tupu and mana.” Tupu and mana supplement each other, mana being the aspect of life which from the point of view of the individual turns outwards, “influence” we might say in this connection.

Just as the conjunction of tupu and mana shows that these two belong together, but are not identical, so we may from a number of other conjunctions with mana learn what accompanies mana without being identical with it:

It was Tane’s mana, strength and insight (te mana me te kāhā me te mōhio) which fixed Heaven above.

The mana and the strength of the divinity of the sacred place.

These heads (viz. those of the enemy) which were prepared as trophies, they were prepared in order to be a sign that the tribe had mana and the gift of victory (te maia me te mana).

His name (i.e. renown) and his mana were (both) very great.

It is hard to flee before the enemy…it is a sign that the mana and name (i.e. renown) of the tribe are destroyed by the blows of the weapons of the victorious tribe.

Therefore the fear of his name, the greatness of his mana and his nobil-
ity were greater than those of any other ancestor (koia te wehi o tona ingoa me te nui o tona mana, me tona rangatiratanga e nui ana i o etahi atu tipuna).\textsuperscript{15}

You possess the mana, you ought to say the words, i.e. you have the authority (na koutou te mana ma koutou te kupu).\textsuperscript{16}

Insight, the courage which bears victory in it (maia), strength, name (i.e. renown), and the awe which the great name bears with it, authority, all this is connected with mana as something intimately bound up with it. These things are not mana, but they accompany mana, and we see how mana extends the inner vitality of tupu into strength, its courage into victorious courage, its honour into name (renown) and authority.

It is not only that tupu extends itself into mana; the reverse is also the case: mana stretches into tupu and therefore obtains a character from the nature of the various things.

There is a legend about Hape, who was one of the ancestors of the Tuhoe tribe. It is told that he left the country of the Tuhoe, carrying the mana of the kumara with him and leaving behind only “cold.”\textsuperscript{17} The meaning of this is evident, “cold” means infertility, for when his descendants tried to grow kumara, it did not thrive (tupu). Mana extends into the kumara as its power of thriving and thus has a specific kumara character.

Sacral history must only be told in sacral houses, otherwise it has no mana, and this is concentrated in a request to be careful “in order that the understanding should not vanish and the stories be forgotten.”\textsuperscript{18} The mana of a story thus includes that it is remembered and understood.

The special character of mana stands out more positively in the tale about a man, Paihau, whose wife had run away to another man. Paihau only discovered this when she had got the start of him, but still he nearly overtook her. Nevertheless, he gave up his wife, but asked that their child, if a boy, should be named after “te mananga o aku waewae,” i.e. the efficacy, i.e. the speed manifested by his feet.\textsuperscript{19}

Just as the mana of the feet shows itself in speed, so the mana of the forest manifests itself by there being many birds, as the forest and its birds constitute a whole which descends from Tane. We learn this from a Maori,
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who explains why the number of birds is much smaller now than previously: "when boiled food has come into the wood, then it does not mana." 20

*Mana* is used as a verb here and may be interpreted as "to have (or get) mana." As the use as a verb generally involves that something happens not only with but in *mana*, the active contents of the word stand out particularly, so that we may often translate *mana* as: "have or get efficacy."

As *mana* is a kind of extension of *tupu* towards realization, it cannot be wondered at that these two words also as verbs express nearly the same idea. We have seen that an insult "unfolds its nature" (*tupu te mate*) by being revenged, but the same may be said by means of the word *mana*: "The hidden (i.e. unreverged) insults have no efficacy (*ko nga mate ngaro e kore e mana*)." 21

"Te Rauparaha considered in what way Te Pehi’s death should obtain efficacy (*ka mana ai te mate o Te Pehi*)." 22 *Mana* is also closely related to *tupu* in this sentence: "But the words which vanished like the drifting clouds can in no way get *mana* from me, i.e. I cannot say them (*engari e kore ano nga kupu i aoreretia ka mana i a au*)." 23 Even these instances, however, which show how closely related *mana* and *tupu* are also show the significant difference that *mana* may be given from outside, whereas *tupu* comes from within. Add to this that *mana* emphasizes the realization more than *tupu*. The last example is in no way typical. When a speaker during the discussions of Puhihuia’s fate said to somebody else, "Your words will not get *mana* from this girl," 24 the meaning is—as is evident from the context—that she will not obey them, thus will not give them a possibility of being effective. The fact that words get *mana* generally points towards their realization, not only as sound, but so that their contents are realized, i.e. they are obeyed.

*Mana* only refers to the urge towards realization; but this urge actually appears by the realization. "If *Maui* had not been killed by this god (viz. Hinenuitepo), Maui’s wish would have got *mana* (*kua mana te hiahia a Maui*) and man would live for ever;" 25 the realization of Maui’s wish thus would have followed as a consequence of its *mana*. Similarly, in the following passage: "Only now did they repeat a *karakia* (incantation) to Rangi in order that the bung of the springs of the water should be taken out and the water come forth. Then their wish really got *mana* (*ka mana
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hoki ta ratou tono), and the water rose.”

The dynamic element in mana, the unfolding, is brought out strongly when the word is used as a verb. The verbal character makes the aspect of mana as a communion or fellowship recede into the background, which is only justified if we do not forget that the dynamic element cannot be active except against this background. So far this aspect is only to be suggested by an example in order to be taken up for discussion below. We understand this fellowship best when the reference is to chief and people; but it was a fellowship of a similar kind which was utilized by those who forged Te Rauparaha’s signature on a letter, “in order that it could mana.” Here the idea is probably that it may be effective, but the presupposition is of course that those who read the letter stand in some relationship to Te Pauparaha.

Before we try to explain in more detail how this is to be understood, it will be expedient to amplify the description of the chief’s mana.

The mana common to the chief, the kinship group, and the land is owned by the chief; this causes his special position. It also means that his tupu extends over a wider field than that of other mortals. It may perhaps be translated into European languages by saying that his personality has a greater field of activity. We may say that he gets his field of activity with his mana, but the degree to which he can utilize it, will depend upon his personality. The chief who has a strong mind, strength, and courage, in short, a great tupu, can also be said to permeate the mana of the kinship group and the country with his being, his mana. It was said about Kupe, who was a chief from Hawaiki that “his mana penetrated into the population of the islands (i uru ai tona mana ki rota i nga iw).”

This mana, which permeates the kinship group, is the basis of the chief’s authority. It shows in practice by the fact that he can make others do what he wants. In a farewell letter to Governor Grey, some Maoris wrote: “It was your mana which put an end to the disturbances in this country.” The Maoris of course considered Grey as a kind of great chief and felt his mana in the authority by means of which he succeeded in making peace.

The same idea on a pure Maori basis is seen in the old proverb about a great man: “This is Karewa’s mana,” which is explained as follows: “His village did not feel alarmed; he could leave it unprotected.”
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The same confidence in the great chief’s *mana*, which permeates the whole country is brought out in another proverb: “Just let the treasures lie about. This is Taiwhanake’s *mana.*”

This *mana* which extends into country and people thus in the great chief is permeated by his being. It is not a mysterious substance, but a fellowship on which he may leave his mark and which he may dominate by his personality. Therefore there is no paradox, either, in the statement that the greater the chief’s *mana* is, the farther it extends itself, the more it is concentrated in his person. It can become so essential a part of him that the Maori briefly says, “The chief is *mana.*” “Farewell, thou, the *mana* of the country,” he will sing in the dirge on the deceased chief.

We have seen above that kinsfolk are to honour (*manaaki*) each other because in this way they are attached to each other and realize the kinship unity. *Manaaki* is a derivative of *mana*; but as the ending -aki is no more productive in Maori, this information interests us only because the Maori himself feels the connection: “By honouring (*manaaki*) people the *mana* endures (*ma te manaaki i te tangata e tu ai te mana*).” Thus *manaaki* means “to create *mana*, fellowship;” to *manaaki* is to give out of one’s own life.

Hence it is evident that the kinship group must honour (*manaaki*) its chief in order that his *mana* may endure. “In him the chief-*mana* goes with being honoured (*ka tau te manaakitanga me te mana rangatira ki a ia*),” it simply says.

It is, however, inherent in the nature of fellowship that the chief must also yield something from his own life, and we see in a new light why he must understand how to honour his people. By this means, he creates *mana* and by permeating the fellowship with his personality he attaches people to him. The greatest means to do so is by giving gifts. “This is Rehua’s *mana,*” says the Maori admiringly when seeing a chief being liberal, and as Rehua was of a divine nature it is understood that the chief provides a great *mana* for himself with his gifts.

From the intimate connection between *manaaki* and *mana* we also understand why it was impossible to decide whether a person honoured oth-
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ers most for his own sake or for the sake of the others. It is impossible because one honours for the sake of mana, the fellowship.

It is natural that the chief should put his stamp on the fellowship, but it is another question whether he can; for if not he will de facto be more dependent on the others, the more so, the less he himself contributes to the mana. This is brought out clearly in a tale about a man who had been defeated in a fight against his wife’s first husband, a chief named Mahanga. Afterwards he asked his wife, “What mana has Mahanga since it made him so strong?” His wife answered, “He has no mana himself; but in his heroes are the reason for his success (toa).” Then she described these heroes, adding, “If these men are killed, Mahanga does not know what to resort to.”

Mana gives a plastic picture of the Maori’s community because it denotes life in it. All free men have mana, i.e. they participate in the fellowship. Therefore everybody has a say in the matter according to his mana, i.e. his share in the fellowship. Therefore the chief is very far from being an absolute ruler, but the mana he contributes himself will always give him a corresponding influence. Add to this that he has a position as chief, which is expressed by the words that the mana of the kinship group is with him. This means that his personality is given the best possibility of asserting itself. The kinship group as a whole will not act without his being consulted.

Au, tupu, and mana are three different expressions for the same thing as viewed from different angles. Tupu is man’s natural unfolding, which, as we have seen, denotes strength, courage, and honour; but so, again, is life in the kinship I, au. Tupu is, however, closely attached to the individual lives in the kinship I. Mana, like tupu, is the contents of the kinship I, but is centred in the fellowship itself and is the communal life itself. The important point that mana is the communal life does not otherwise seem to have been realized; but Best must at any rate have seen that it expresses life since he writes: “When someone writes a treatise on the word mana, it will be seen that mana and ora (life) are almost synonymous terms, as applied to the old-time Maori.”

The secret of mana is that communal life, the “fellowship,” permeates all the people to their innermost hearts; we may say that they live mana. A single strong personality may colour the whole fellowship. This does not take place by outward compulsion, but by the fact that the fellowship itself is stamped in such a way that they all obtain their “being” or “nature” according to the dominant element of mana. This is illustrated in an amusing way by a legend.
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in which a tribe, Ngatiruanui, ate a dog that was rather out of the ordinary, for since that time a canine a-u, a-u entered their speech, which was due to the dog’s mana.\footnote{White 1888a: 105.}

The chief’s mana is not only the \textit{mana} of the kinship group but that of the country as well. “The great \textit{mana} of this tract is in him alone,”\footnote{White 1890: 33. It is incomprehensible to me what Best means when he writes (Best 1900a: 193): “Now land is said to have no \textit{mana},” unless he is thinking of the fact that its mana is owned by or is with a chief or kinship group.} it says somewhere about Te Rauparaha. So the \textit{mana} of the country is as a matter of course part of that of the kinship group as well, and as the latter stands in a similar determinative relationship to the country as the chief to the kinship group, the Maori may, of course, with equal right say that the \textit{mana} of the country is with the kinship group without being guilty of any inconsistency.

The \textit{mana} of the country was taken when they immigrated, and since then it has been the endeavour of every tribe and chief to cling to it.\footnote{White 1887c: 116.}

According to the sense of \textit{mana} this simply takes place by living with the soil: “This was a custom which originated from our ancestors, namely that we lived in some part of our country; later the tribe went to another part, lived there and cultivated the soil there, in order that our country’s \textit{mana} could be maintained by us, in order that our fires could always be burning on the extensive surface of our country so that the country was not taken by other tribes.”\footnote{White 1888b: 105.}

The Maori must of course also be able to maintain his right to the country with arms,\footnote{White 1888b: 113: “our country’s mana was maintained by our fortune in war (\textit{toa}).”} but a passage like the one quoted shows that if possession of land is in practice identical with possessing its \textit{mana}, then this is due to the fact that possession makes it possible to live with the country as one lives with the soil, inhabits it, cultivates it, and generally utilizes it.\footnote{There does not seem to be any certain evidence that one might posses the \textit{mana} of a region without living there. The most weighty piece of evidence occurs in a text which, however, only exists in a translated form (Shortland 1882: 82 f.); but it is necessary to be on one’s guard when investigating this question for \textit{mana} very soon acquired a legal sense, which not least asserted itself in the burning questions of possession of land. The usage of the immigrant cannot of course, be taken into consideration, but this it is that gives the reader of the literature about the Maoris the impression that \textit{mana} can be used about ownership without regard to dwelling.} The factor mentioned
last is not least in importance. The possession of the mana of the land must manifest itself in a true fellowship with the country, i.e. that one understands how to make the country yield. There is an instructive legend about two men, Whata and Tongowhiti, who were both interested in a lake. Both of them set eel-traps, but only Whata understood how to do it in the right way so that he had a catch. This proved that he had a true fellowship with the lake; “therefore the lake was taken by Whata, the mana of the lake had been taken by him for ever.”

As is natural, the fellowship appeared in both directions. When the Maori takes the mana of a country, it affects himself; his nature is stamped by this fact, and in practice it manifests itself in the fact that it comes natural for him to utilize the land. He becomes more of a fisherman in one tract, more of a tiller of the soil in another, etc. But the country also becomes different by changing its owner, or rather by its mana changing its owner; for the fellowship with man reacts on the country. When the original and tasty rat of New Zealand was exterminated, this was amongst other things due to the fact—so we learn—“that the Maori mana disappeared.”

It is acknowledged by the Maori that the fellowship reacts upon the land and in such a way that he sometimes finds it profitable to give its mana to a more inspiring owner. Having planted kumara in his field, he repeats some karakias (incantations) in order to make the kumara thrive, and the last of these incantations conveys the mana of the field to Rongomaraeroa alone. Rongomaraeroa is a god of the cultivation of kumara; therefore he can permeate the field with his mana of thriving; but he cannot do so until he enters into fellowship with the field, i.e. gets its mana.

The effect of fellowship upon the land sometimes appears in a particularly picturesque way. In Hauraki—as in many other places—there was a fabulous being, a monster or dragon, which was friendly (not quite so common!). It was a sign of the mana of the neighboring people, i.e. evidence of the fact that the human contribution to the fellowship could assert itself even into the dragons and monsters of the neighbourhood so that they became tame.

Having seen what it means to possess the mana of the country and having acknowledged that fellowship is a condition for the Maori to enjoy it, we also understand the Maori chief who during negotiations with the English about the right to dig gold said: “Let England get the gold of the soil, but the mana
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of the soil (must remain) with us.”

On the whole, *mana* is so necessary to the Maori because he cannot very well affect his surroundings without involving it in a fellowship, i.e. without possessing its *mana*, or—in other words—without permeating its *mana* with his own being. He must possess the *mana* of the *kumara* in order that it may thrive by his hand, and if its *mana* has been carried away, incorporated in a *mauri*, he must fetch it back.

*Mana*, fellowship, is so necessary that the Maori must have *mana* even with an enemy whom he meets in open fight. In this connection, it should also be mentioned that an enemy is called *hoa-riti*, or somewhat more rarely, *hoa-whawhai* and *hoa-ngangare*, the three words all with the literal sense of “fighting-comrade,” as *hoa* means “comrade, fellow,” whether referring to one’s wife or to a travelling companion. Thus it is not nonsense to talk about fellowship, although this, indeed, is of quite a different character from that within the kinship group. The fellowship consists in the fact that the Maoris cannot meet and fight in a merely outward sense; they must necessarily stand in an inner relationship to their enemy. The outward manifestations of the fight are really only a question of who has the greatest *mana*, i.e. who can conquer the other from within and thus bring the antagonist’s will and power to fight to its knees so that the weapons may reap the victory.

What is characteristic of the “fellowship” of the fight in contrast to that of peace, is the fact that in the fight each party will try to dominate the “fellowship” completely, which may be expressed as taking the enemy’s *mana* or as dominating it with one’s own *mana*. These are but two aspects of the same matter. As viewed from this angle there is but a difference of degree, but a very important difference, between the fellowship of peace and war.

The chief aspect of war thus is the fight of the *mana*. It is partly of a ritual character. In a passage we hear how a fortress was stormed. Previously, one of the enemies had been killed and a rite had been performed over his entrails, which were then thrown into the fortress “in order that the *mana* of the army by this means may attack the fortress so that the fortress may be captured by them.”

The opposite, that the *mana* is taken in the victory has been mentioned above.
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Thus there is a kind of enforced "fellowship," in which one party is dominated completely by the other. What happens is that the losers have a mana forced upon them which desires their defeat, indeed their death. Their own life is taken and instead they get a vital principle which subdues them from within and perhaps makes them the prey of death. There is a legend about an idol whose reputation was widespread because it and its tribe had such a mana that all strangers who came near died from it. This uncanny effect is a special and personal character of that very mana, since the effect is upon strangers only. It is due to the fact that the mana of the idol dominates completely, capturing everything foreign into its sphere, driving out its life and killing it from within. The impersonal aspect of mana, the fact that it is a fellowship is brought out by its character not being given once for all. The text informs us of this, as it says that the surrounding tribes wanted to kill the people of this idol "in order that the god could be taken from them to give mana to their own land." In other words, by taking this mana they may give it another personality; they may permeate it with their own life so that it becomes a blessing to them.

Against the background of these examples, which show how mana conquers and is conquered, we understand how it could be said about a tangata haere, a vagrant man, that he possesses mana. He could not like the chief possess his people's and his country's mana, but obviously this means that he was what we should term a powerful personality, who, wherever he went, forced people and things under his will, doing this—be it noted—from within by taking possession of their life, by creating a sphere which was his mana, but still a fellowship, as the point is that he included the others in it. The man in question actually became one of the great ancestors of one of the Waikato tribes, so that one of the tribes, the Ngatimahuta, was named after his son.

Similarly the great chief is surrounded by a sphere of life inspired by him. Although the investigations of mana should be restricted to what can be derived from the texts, we shall in this connection refer to a peculiar belief among the Maoris which seems to show how the chief's sphere does not only absorb human beings, but the tract as a whole; for it was a general conviction that when a great chief approached a village, it became impossible to catch birds, fish, etc. It is said that the mana of the guests drove them away.

56. Grey 1855: 147.
57. White 1888a: 160.
59. Best 1899a: 113; does this imply that the chief wants human flesh?
When discussing the use of *mana* as a verb we dwelt upon the dynamic aspect of the matter, but still mentioned that the basis of the word was a fellowship. We have now advanced the investigations to the point where it is possible to give an account of this also in cases in which it does not appear evident.

*Te Rauparaha* had decided that only an ambush could provide revenge for him for the murders which *Ngaitahu* had committed on his next of kin. As he lived on an island, it was necessary to go by sea in order to attack the enemy, but the difficulty consisted in approaching unseen. Then a European ship came to the island and this provided the means to carry out his revenge, as he could get down to Ngaitahu by hiding in the ship. At the moment when the arrival of the ship was reported, tradition makes *Te Rauparaha* think: “Today my purpose, which rankled in me (by not being carried out), has got much *mana* (kua mana rawa ano aku whakaaro).”[60] Here, too, *mana* has two aspects. First, his purpose has already been formed (tupu). That it *manaes* means that it extends itself, seizes and dominates the surrounding world. The purpose gets *mana* by getting “fellowship” with all that gives it a possibility of being realized. In light of what precedes, we must thus imagine that the captain of the ship already at this juncture (indeed without knowing it) is in the sphere in which *Te Rauparaha*’s will can take effect. The plan, indeed, was successful.

Furthermore, we have now obtained a basis for completely understanding how *mana* is sometimes personal, sometimes impersonal. The personal aspect is in the fact that he who has the greatest *mana*, i.e. he who lives most intensely in the fellowship, by this also stamps the fellowship throughout by his personality. The impersonal aspect is at the other pole: that *mana* is a fellowship and therefore can be taken by somebody else if he is capable of doing so. Therefore the fellowship gets the character of an impersonal power which can be utilized by the person who understands how to do so.

We have seen how far *mana* extends and thus given a much needed comment on its definition as “an active fellowship.” The comment is so necessary because we cannot briefly express what “fellowship” is and how it is to be understood. The difficulties are not only due to the fact that our language lacks a word which can render the meaning of *mana*, for this is only a symptom of the more deeply rooted and real obstacle to the rendering, viz. the fact that we are without the experience which is expressed by *mana*. Still, we have to a certain degree from our sphere of experience a possibility of intuitively knowing what *mana* is when referring to fellowship of human beings. Through the study of the kinship group we have furthermore sketched a background

which makes the understanding easier. It is more difficult to attain to a real understanding of the *mana* of things. Even if we have touched on this subject on the preceding pages and thus seen that the *mana* of things is not in principle different from the *mana* of human beings, it will be proper to make it the object of a more detailed consideration, which, in order to make it as concrete and vivid as possible, we shall connect with an investigation into the Maori’s whole relationship to things.