When discussing the extent of the kinship group, we also touched on the fact that it includes the ancestors, the Maori using “I” about the kinship group even when mentioning his first ancestor’s landing on New Zealand. In the Maori’s mind the common first ancestor is what unites the kinship group, and he may express his disapproval of discord in the tribe by referring to this: “Although Ngatimaru, Ngatitamatea, and Ngatiwhanaunga are one tribe with a common first father, these three fought.”

The ancestors are called *tupuna* (more rarely *kahika*), but this word has a wider range, as it reaches the present time down to and including the grandparents; their generation and not death demarcates *tupuna*. In the other direction, backward, *tupuna* reach back to the creation of the world, even by name, i.e. if they are the *tupuna* of a high-born person.

Death thus is not capable of severing the thought that *tupuna* are those standing with the rich fullness of life behind them, whether they are still walking about with leisure and knowledge to guide the rising generation or they have been swallowed up by the underworld and there have joined the other, departed ancestors.

1. White 1888a: 148; 149; 127.
2. White 1888b: 90.
Tupuna are not only grandparents and ancestors proper, but everybody in the kinship group belonging to these generations,\(^4\) thus an enormous block of living and dead persons, the word as most other Maori designations for kinship being a “classificatory term.”

We have seen how important living together is for the reality of kinship and how true kinship is formed out of the biological relationship; but in the case of the ancestors we must go a step further, for there the “genealogical” relationship is at times created only from the experience of solidarity. An old Maori said to a missionary, “Rangi (Heaven) is my ancestor, the origin of the Maori people. Your ancestor is money...”\(^5\) “Our ancestor (tupuna), Captain Cook,”\(^6\) a Maori may say expressing his sympathy for the great explorer by including him among his ancestors. It is hardly probable that Cook should simply enter in the genealogical table; but on the other hand, experts on the great number of details of Maori history are sure that a good number of genealogical tables do not represent objective history.\(^7\) Kelly has shown that the deviations are not due to chance.\(^8\) It is no doubt an offshoot of old custom which has introduced the figures of the Old Testament into the genealogies.\(^9\) The word tupuna does not, however, require that the “ancestor” is found in the genealogy of the person in question, as it is a classificatory term and as such is more comprehensive. In the purely mythical parts of tradition we find flies, whales, birds, and trees as tupuna;\(^10\) but this may be one of the specific traits of the myth. On the other hand, in traditions of saga character concerning the time after the immigration we find the word tupuna being used about the canoe in which the immigration took place.\(^11\)

The relationship to tupuna is of course first of all determined by the fact that they belong to the kinship group, but furthermore special honor is due to them. Puhihuia begins a speech like this: “My tupuna, my fathers! What am I, an insignificant person, to say? You have the mana, it is for you to say the

---

\(^4\) E.g. White 1888a: 145
\(^5\) Best 1925b: 1032.
\(^6\) Tarakawa 1899a: 179; the text is due to Tarakawa, who is not particularly reliable; but this usage is probably correct enough.
\(^7\) Smith 1907: 187.
\(^8\) Kelly 1940: 235 ff., especially 241.
\(^9\) Tregear 1891: 667 (Noa); Rout 1926: 15 f. (this work is only of interest to illustrate such transitional phenomena; considered as a contribution to the old Maori traditions the book is a complete mistake).
\(^10\) E.g. Grey 1855: 82; White 1887b: 126; I, 87; 60.
words.”\textsuperscript{12} The latter statement applies to all elderly people, but \textit{tupuna} are mentioned apart and first. When \textit{Rata} in the myth fells a tree in an improper manner, i.e. without the proper rite, and he is reproached with this, this is done, characteristically enough, by his being reminded of the fact that the tree is his \textit{tupuna}: “Indeed, will you fell your \textit{tupuna} in profane wise?”\textsuperscript{13} In the myths—where on the whole there is more discord in the families than otherwise—it may happen that a \textit{tupuna} is insulted; but we also hear that Tawhaki’s mother was sad and wept as she feared that “her child should get into trouble (\textit{aitua}) because he had insulted these \textit{tupuna}.”\textsuperscript{14} Rupe, the pigeon, has got its hoarse voice by insulting its \textit{tupuna}’s holiness.\textsuperscript{15}

Death does not make any material change in the honor one shows one’s \textit{tupuna}. The ancestors are one’s pride;\textsuperscript{16} their names are honored in the genealogies, and their pictures are carved in the large, richly decorated houses, recognizable by the tattooing\textsuperscript{17} and particular insignia, such as Tutanekai with the flute, etc.\textsuperscript{18} The bones of the ancestors and their preserved heads are kept carefully protected and are finally deposited in remote rock caves and similar places,\textsuperscript{19} in order that strange tribes shall not find them and insult them by making fish-hooks out of them.

The relationship to the ancestors is a big chapter in the Maori’s life, but also a difficult one, because the ancestors are not only kinsmen, but dead as well. Therefore fear and familiarity mingle in a way which can only be unravelled by a close study of the situations in which the living and the dead have intercourse. How the ancestors give omens to the living and fortify them, how sacrifices are made to them, etc., must therefore on the whole be treated together with a study of gods and sacrifices. In the chapter on the “spirit,” however, we shall see just how decisive the situation is for the Maori’s experience of the departed.

We shall in this place restrict ourselves to a sphere independent of actual situations, viz. what may collectively be called the inheritance from the ancestors—what forms that “I” which is the kinship group through the ages. What is the share of the ancestors in this?

\begin{itemize}
  \item 12. White 1888a: 146.
  \item 13. White 1887a: 60; cf. 1, 80; 1887c: 4.
  \item 14. 1887a: 99.
  \item 15. 1887a: 76.
  \item 16. E.g. Grey 1855: 139.
  \item 17. E.g. Best 1926a: 30.
  \item 18. Cowan 1910: 170.
\end{itemize}
In a certain sense, there is no problem. The “I” which lives through the ages, the kinship “I,” is the fellowship in contrast to the individual life. Even if we did not know, we should be able to conclude that the ancestors’ legacy is *mana*. It is not mentioned very often in the texts, just because it is so obvious; but in a few places there are reasons for mentioning it, e.g. where the hereditary succession is unusual: “Marutuahu’s *mana* was not taken by his eldest children (or nephews of an older lineage, but by (one of) his middle children, viz. by Te Ngako.”

We are informed in great detail how a priest’s *mana* is taken on his deathbed by his pupil, the priest previously giving him this instruction: “When I am dying, you are to breathe (in) with your mouth at my left ear, in order that my *mana* can be taken by you, and in order that the knowledge of the incantations (*karakia*) I have taught you will always be remembered by you; and therefore you must (also) squeeze between my thighs in order that my *mana* can be taken by you.”

As long as a kinship group exists it is the same life, the same *mana* which is borne down through the ages by the changing generations, the *mana* being derived from the first ancestor. The Urewera, for instance, say, “We have the land after Toi and Potiki, the *mana* and nobility from Tuhoe.” We have previously mentioned how Te Ao saves her Arawa kinship group by virtue of her marriage into and relationships with the Ngapuhi tribe. This is expressed by stating that she displays Hoturoa’s *mana*. Hoturoa is one of Ngapuhi’s ancestors. The basis of the expression is thus that the ancestor’s *mana* still exists. By displaying this *mana* she shows how much she lives in the fellowship.

---

21. White 1888a: 90. We only hear of this kind of ritual in the case of sacral knowledge besides *mana*. In nearly all the rituals the pupil is to bite the dying (or dead) master. The part of the body which is to be bitten varies somewhat: the ear (Cowan 1920: 205; Cowan 1910), the forehead and *tawhito* (the perineum?) (Shortland 1882: 53), the left big toe (Best 1925b: 1099; cf. Tarakawa 1894c: 205). The bite seems to be a generally recognized method of acquiring *mana* (e.g. Best 1905: 212; Gudgeon 1906a: 30) but this is not conclusive. In the special case of *mana*, the text quoted is the only one that is altogether satisfactory, because Tarakawa 1894c: 205 must be left out as being composed by Tarakawa (see p. 273), and Shortland’s text, which is found in Williams 1932: *tawhito*, is somewhat obscure. It says that the bite is to be made “in order that the father’s *mana* may return (to the dead body?) to give him instruction.” One should expect *wairua* instead of *mana* here. At any rate is says nothing about the son getting the father’s *mana*. In the other passages nothing is said at all about *mana*.
23. See above, p.19.; Smith 1900a: 150 (Rangiwawahia); Ngata 1929: no. 200.
of the tribe and what authority she derives from it.

Even if “mana” answers the question of what associates the living with the ancestors, this answer is not sufficient. We need a more concrete determination; it is not enough to know that it is the fellowship which connects the living and the dead; we must ask about the concrete contents and form of this fellowship. The answer is not far to seek: what determines life and what is handed down from ancestors to descendants is tradition, history in the widest sense.

This answer, however, does not tell us much until we have seen what history means to the Maori.

The basis of our and his experience of history are fundamentally different. Our view of history is characterized by a constant fight to save a continuity out of such a multitude of small and chance events that there is a danger that the past is to become chaos if we do not get hold of the guiding lines. In this connection it is of minor importance whether the continuity of history is constituted by guiding ideas or social and economic forces or something else. It will be agreed at once that the Maori is not capable of that kind of history, but there is every reason to emphasize that it is the problem itself and thus the incentive that is missing.

The decisive distinction is in the view of the “event;” to us the event—apart from picturesque aspects—is of no value until it stands as an expression of the forces of history and their conflicts; to the Maori the event in itself is so significant that history obtains a full meaning simply by consisting of events. This is closely associated with the Maori’s whole experience of “action.”

It will be abundantly clear from the whole description of the Maori that he does not acknowledge chance. All that a man does is normally a perfectly valid expression of his intentions. If a matter goes wrong, this is not due to chance, but to the fact that extraneous life and extraneous will have stolen into him and his world. When a Maori acts, he inspires all that enters into or takes part in the action with his life; but in this way the action is potentially inwoven in things, so that the accomplished act becomes a realization of the potential act involved in the individual components of the action.

I have shown elsewhere that a purely linguistic investigation of the Maori language leads to this very view of action. Particularly significant in this connection is the form which I have termed “concretive” and which may stand for the action in its entirety and for a number of its individual constituents, viz. time, place, object, subject, means, cause, and manner. Even though these are grammatical concepts and are not straight away identical with what is otherwise understood by an action and its components, it is still a

question of a far-reaching agreement which thus is expressed in the fact that a study of the action, both the human and the grammatical action, leads to the same picture of it. The fact that the structure of the language seems to have been formed on the basis of this experience, indicates that we are faced with a deep-rooted feature of the Maori’s culture and mental structure.

Keeping this in mind we realize that the individual events of history obtain quite another depth than they do for us. The actions of the kinship group are not only significant as true expressions of life in the ancestors, but also of life in the living; for the same life, the same mana, is active through the history of the kinship group. The Maori therefore in the most pithy sense comes to own his history. This applies literally and is expressed also in the fact that a kinship group only tells its own history. It is pokanoa to tell other tribes’ history unless one is related to them.25 Pokanoa is a strong expression for disapproval, with a connotation of “shameless.” So also the history which roughly is common to all the tribes as well, the mythical history, is the possession of each tribe in that very version in which it is handed down in the tribe. About this history it says: “Let it be that on which your life is based, you, your elder and younger brothers, your children and children’s children, so that you are not led astray on other people’s plaza (i.e. by other versions). You are a descendant of your ancestors right from Nukutamaroro and Nukutemokotahou and down to me as well who am here telling you. I should not reveal the treasures of the mythological school (Wharewananga) if you had been a perfect stranger.”26

In the linguistic study of the action in the Maori language another thing of interest is brought out apart from the merely grammatical aspect. When we interpret the concretive it appears that the time of the action—whether considered as a unit or as extension—belongs to that which is characterized by the action. In verbal sentences, time also has an intimate relation to the action, having the same preposition (i) as the object. Finally, the tense system of the verbs is understood most naturally if time is considered as something belonging to the action more than as something absolute.27

Judging from this there is a fundamental difference between our experience of time and that of the Maori. Our time is first of all a quantitative phenomenon; as it proceeds it is measured accurately by days, hours, and minutes. The Maori’s time is first of all qualitative, its most important function is that of containing definite events. There is no word covering “time”

in our abstract sense; at most we may speak of a “period,” *wa*, *takiwa*, or *tau*, the last word, however, often being more concrete: “season” or “year.” Furthermore there are words for “month,” “day,” and “night,” and the times of the day (“morning,” “evening,” etc.).

There is then no technical word for “years.” They are not counted, and in Maori sagas there is no trace of chronology. We can still roughly date various events, but this is only done by counting backwards in the genealogies how many generations they date back and in this way we can calculate the approximate year. Within the single year, the Maori certainly keeps an account of the months by means of the moon—a natural thing for a farmer—but even here the qualitative aspect of time seems to be able to assert itself. Among the available lists of the months and their names, which for that matter vary somewhat from tribe to tribe—a sign of late origin—there is also a year with ten months only, the last two being left out as “negligible;” in another list two months are lumped together as “Te Ngahuru-tuhoahoa,” i.e. “the combined tenth (month).” This list is somewhat doubtful, but the same is found also in a third list, only that the months there are called “Te Ngahuru-tuhoehoe.” It is difficult to decide whether the two months which have been combined are identical with those omitted. We find in Yate a significant reason stated for giving up the chronology at the end of the year: “It is a time,” the natives say, “not worthy to be reckoned, as it is only spent in visiting, feasting, talking, playing, and sleeping.” It is intelligible enough if the Maori scamps chronology when nothing important happens; for even if time exists as pure quantity, the most essential thing is missing, viz. quality, the weighty contents of events.

Even if this question of the months and the calendar of the year involves so many problems that we must be very cautious in drawing conclusions, it is certain that the contents of events are of the greatest importance. Characteristically enough a short characterization of each month is appended to several of the lists of months handed down; see the following selection:

1. Pipiri. Everything on earth cowers with cold, man, too.

2. Hongonui. Man now feels very cold, makes fires, and warms himself.

---

28. See e.g. Best 1922b: 8 and 43 ff.
32. Yate 1835: 107.
33. Best 1922b: 15 ff.
Within each month chronology is satisfactory in so far as every single day of the month has its own name; only that it should be realized that this care does not apply to the quantity of time, chronology proper; on the contrary, it is just the quality of time which it is important to have in order. We need only to cast a glance at a “monthly calendar” to see this:

2. Tirea. The moon is seen very small.
4. Ouenuku. Get to work! A good night for eel-fishing.
5. Okoro. A pleasing day in the afternoon. Good for eel-fishing at night.
6. Tamata-ngana. Unpleasant weather. The sea is rough. etc.\(^{34}\)

Every day has its own character, its individual stamp. Many days stand in a particular relation to definite actions and are favourable or unfavourable for fishing, farming, births, etc.

The defective chronology is the negative aspect of the Maori’s experience of time; the positive aspect arises from the quality of time. As the most essential aspect of time is created by the action, the Maori by repeating the actions of the ancestors may call up the past. How this is to be

---

\(^{34}\) Best 1922b: 28. Here there are several other calendars of the same kind and there are some in Carrington 1945: 166. The special importance of the day for births, whether they will be easy or labour will be difficult, and for the character of the child, has been discussed by Best 1914a: 138.
understood is seen best in a concrete case. Here naturally one of the Maori’s most significant actions offers itself, the great theme in his life: vengeance.

The great avenger in history\(^{35}\) is named Whakatau. There are in the various tribes various versions of his vengeance. Certain main features, however, recur and these features are also found in the following version from Ngatiruanui:\(^{36}\)

> A living sacrifice is given to consecrate a building\(^{37}\) at its completion. The Uru-o-manono was the building, and Tuwhakararo was slain as an offering by the tribe who owned the building. When Tuwhakararo was taken as a sacrifice at the consecration of Uru-o-manono, Apakura\(^{38}\) went to the aged man Wairerewha (Kurutongia was another name). Then spoke Apakura, mother of Tuwhakararo, saying: ‘Let me have my nephews (a taua tamariki), that my wrongs may be avenged.’ Wairerewha replied, saying, ‘Not those, they are all tall.’ Hence the saying, ‘The tall family of Wairerewha.’ Thus spoke again Apakura, ‘Who then?’ Wairerewha replied, ‘Go select my very smallest one.’

Hence the saying—

> Here is the hero—a little hero—insignificantly small.
> He could disappear inside a finger-nail.
> Here am I. Oh, you demons!

So he, Whakatau, was chosen.

Wairerewha’s children were Pepemua, Peperoto, Pepetaha, Pepetemuimui, Te Tiratoro, Ngahuru, Maramamaiohotu, Takeke, Takoko, Tawhiroatu, Tawhiromai, Whirotenupua, Hua, Mana, Te Maramaiwhanake, Tioro, and Whakataupotiki. He was the youngest of them all. Now Whakatau proceeded to avenge the death of Tuwhakararo. On his arrival the bones were hanging in the building Tihiomanono. On his entering the place, the bones greeted him wailingly (tangi) and split. He then finished his incantation (tau\(^{39}\)). When he had got safely out of the house, he jumped on to its roof; he threw down a noose, which caught Tukitukipungawerere. Then he called to his men, ‘Pull.’ So they pulled

---

35. History here and in what follows, as in what precedes, denotes what is history to the Maori. In this connection it is of subordinate importance that the whole of the earliest history concerning the creation of the world is purely mythical to us.


37. This at most applies to particularly great and important houses.

38. The text has erroneously “Hapakura;” see the editor’s note.

39. *Tāo, a karakia*; cf. e.g. White 1888a: 22 and 27 with such passages as Grey 1855: 65 and White 1888b: 9.
this chief up through the smoke-hole (\textit{piha-nga}) of the house. Once more he threw down a noose and got hold of Poporokewa. When he had been pulled out, Whakatau put fire to the house, which was entirely consumed by the fire together with the people inside it, i.e. Te Atihapai.

Other versions deviate from this one on various points; still, two main points are established: Apakura’s lament and appeal to Whakatau, and the fact that he is the avenger, since he burns down Te Uruomanono (or Te Tihiomano). Among the variants there is reason to mention a few only. It is of less importance that Whakatau elsewhere is Tuwhakararo’s youngest brother or son; it is of interest, however, that the death of the latter in some versions is due to his love of Hakirimaurea, Maurea, or Mouriakura, a daughter of Popohorokewa (or Poporokewa).\footnote{Whakatau generally sails to Te Tihiomanono accompanied by a few followers in a canoe which is called “Te Hikutoto,” i.e. “The Vengeance” (“Expedition to avenge”).\footnote{Whakatau generally sails to Te Tihiomanono accompanied by a few followers in a canoe which is called “Te Hikutoto,” i.e. “The Vengeance” (“Expedition to avenge”).\footnote{Whakatau generally sails to Te Tihiomanono accompanied by a few followers in a canoe which is called “Te Hikutoto,” i.e. “The Vengeance” (“Expedition to avenge”).}}

Whakatau generally sails to Te Tihiomanono accompanied by a few followers in a canoe which is called “Te Hikutoto,” i.e. “The Vengeance” (“Expedition to avenge”).\footnote{Whakatau generally sails to Te Tihiomanono accompanied by a few followers in a canoe which is called “Te Hikutoto,” i.e. “The Vengeance” (“Expedition to avenge”).\footnote{Whakatau generally sails to Te Tihiomanono accompanied by a few followers in a canoe which is called “Te Hikutoto,” i.e. “The Vengeance” (“Expedition to avenge”).\footnote{Whakatau generally sails to Te Tihiomanono accompanied by a few followers in a canoe which is called “Te Hikutoto,” i.e. “The Vengeance” (“Expedition to avenge”).}} This canoe is the centre of some most peculiar incidents, in which Whakatau meets his enemies for the first time. This feature gives increased excitement to his entrance into the house, which takes place in the evening, and to which he manages to get access either disguised (viz. blackened) or by carrying a large load of firewood in which his spear is hidden. Often he himself provokes his recognition, but rushes out, locks up the enemy and sets the house on fire. The significance of the burning of the house is emphasized by the fact that Apakura sees the red glare in the sky and in this way learns that the vengeance is accomplished. The feature that an enemy chief is caught with a noose is elsewhere made a separate event taking place outside the house as rather an independent action.

This is the naked story as we may read it. In this alone we can only dimly see what the Maori experiences by hearing it. We see it the more closely in a lament for the dead in which these events are mentioned towards the end, and where the version clearly resembles the one which we, for this very reason, have selected for our starting-point. The whole lament is a splendid example of the kind of song in which the Maori plays on history as on a huge organ. The section adduced here is therefore quite representative.
Text:

72  Ku’ rongo ‘no koe i mate Tuwhakararo,  
    ki te hika a Mouriakura.  
    Tangihia e Apakura ki te whanau a Kurutongia.

75  ‘He roroa Wairerewa kau.’  
    Koia Pepemua, Peperoto, Pepetaha, Pepetemuimui,  
    Pepeterearea, Te ‘Tiratorongahuru,  
    Te Maramaiwhanake, ko Whakataupotiki katoa, e-i.  
    Nohoia e hapai-moumouta ki te whare-ahiahi.

80  ‘Patua ki te aruhe, runa ki te rama.’  
    Ka mate Te Kahuimounga,  
    hikitia Te Uruomanono, e,  
    ka mate te tini o Te Atihapai.

84  Ka tipu to mate ki reira, na-ai.43

Translation:

72  You have also heard that Tuwhakararo fell in love  
    With the young girl, Mouriakura.  
    Apakura appeals lamenting to Kurutongia’s family.

75  ‘Wairerewa has only tall sons,’  
    They are Pepemua, Peperoto, Pepetaha, Pepetemuimui,  
    Pepeterearea, Te ‘Tiratorongahuru,  
    Te Maramaiwhanake, and Whakataupotiki, too, e-i.  
    Those who are to be lifted to destruction are sitting  
    in the public meeting-house.

80  ‘Pound fern-root, bind torches.’  
    Te Kahuimounga dies.  
    The hikihi rite is performed with Te Uruomanono, e,  
    Te Atihapai’s multitudes die.

84  There thy death is avenged, na-ai.

Commentary:

72. The dead man is addressed.

75. The whole conversation between Apakura and Kuratonga—  
    Wairerewa (=Wairerewha) is represented by the proverb only.

43. Te Whetu 1896: 116.
77. According to Hongi (1898: 38) Te Tiratorongahuru is two names: Te Tiratoro and Ngahuru.

79. The translation is doubtful. Hare Hongi’s translation: “Quantities of food were stored in the council chamber” seems to me to be quite arbitrary. Moumou may mean “destroy” (Best 1925b: 224; Tuhoe... moumou tangata ki Te Po). I imagine that the reference is to the chiefs in Te Uruomanono, but probably only a closer knowledge of the local Whakatau myth can give the solution, and—it must be admitted—perhaps rehabilitate Hare Hongi’s translation.

80. The subject of a passive form may have prepositions as if the verb was in the active. A parallel is seen just in the Whakatau version translated (Hongi 1898: 38. Tikina atu i taku mea itiiti na: Go select my very smallest one—Katahi ha tikina ki tera: Then he was selected). Perhaps we should translate: “Fern-root is pounded, torches are bound,” which, however, makes little difference for the matter as a whole. I have interpreted the passage as Whakatau’s order to Apakura for the food necessary for the expedition of vengeance (cf. Grey 1855: 33). Fern-root was the traditional food of warriors. The torches are to be used to set the house on fire (cf. White 1887b: 146 and 148).

81. Te Kahuimounga? Is it a proper name at all?

82. Hare Hongi translates “The Uruomanono (was) stormed.” As hiki to my knowledge cannot mean “storm, attack,” and as there is not either any tradition that Te Uruomanono was stormed, but the whole point of the story is that it is burnt down, I cannot accept this rendering. I think there is a reference to a sacrificial rite in connection with blood vengeance (cf. Grey 1855: 33). Further reasons must, however, be adduced in connection with an account of this rite and its relation to the Whakatau myth.

84. ka tupu te mate; see p. 70.

It is clearly necessary to know the myth to understand this piece of poetry. The singer does not tell a connected story, he evokes familiar things in hasty glimpses. In these short glimpses we follow the broad undercurrent of the tale and in the main, in spite of a couple of difficult lines, understand what happens until we arrive at the last line—and give a start.

“There thy death is avenged.” We might as well translate: “was avenged” or “will be avenged;” the linguistic forms do not offer any guidance; but a dating would veil rather than define the Maori’s experience. It is true that the myth belongs to the past as the event has once taken place, but time does not disappear for that reason. Whenever vengeance is wreaked on somebody again, Whakatau again does his deed in the shape of the avenger. We hear accordingly about avengers who use Whakatau’s incantation, the one he
recited when Uruomanono (or Tihomanono) was burnt down.\textsuperscript{44} It is really the archetype of vengeance itself which unfolds itself in every act of vengeance; in the archetype of vengeance it takes place: “There thy death is avenged.”\textsuperscript{45}

If we realize this, a new light is thrown on the restoring force of the will to revenge. In the myth vengeance stands as a unity; he who wants to avenge himself, puts on Whakatau, so to speak, and so the accomplished vengeance is latently present, assured by the archetype of vengeance.

Just as vengeance is Whakatau’s, thus the lament of the mourning woman is Apakura’s. “She is looked upon by the Maoris of New Zealand as a kind of ‘parent’ or teacher of the art of mourning for the dead,” says Best.\textsuperscript{46} A lament for the dead begins:

\begin{quote}
Here am I, ever thinking, restlessly turning  
In the death-stricken house  
Of thy great ancestress Apakura.\textsuperscript{47}
\end{quote}

Apakura does not lament only in order to give vent to her feelings, she laments in order to incite to vengeance. We have a description from Ngaitahu of how to provide helpers for a vengeance by sending out people who in each village sing a song of words indicating the purpose. Characteristically enough the description suddenly passes into the myth, viz. with the words: “The following are the words in Apakura’s song to Whakatau sung in order to egg on the kinsmen to avenge Tuwhakararo’s death.” Then follow the song and a short summary of the myth.\textsuperscript{48}

We have a splendid description of the power of Apakura’s lament in a triumphal song sung by Whakatau after the house Tihomanono had been burnt down:\textsuperscript{49}

\begin{quote}
Rumbling crash thunder and heavens,\textsuperscript{50}  
It sounds like the sea that roars forth,\textsuperscript{51}  
As the sea that rises.
\end{quote}

\begin{center}
\textsuperscript{44} Whatahoro 1915: 262; cf. White 1888a: 80.  
\textsuperscript{45} In other tribes there are other “archetypical avengers” (a few tribes may have several), e.g. Tawhaki (Best 1925b: 958) and Rata (Taylor 1870: 192).  
\textsuperscript{46} Best 1905a: 182; apakura means “lament for the dead;” see Williams 1932; and Best 1905a: 175 and 182.  
\textsuperscript{47} Te Mamanga in Smith 1894b; Ngata 1929 no. 254.  
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\end{center}
The post is overturned.
Night listens and Day listens
To Apakura’s speech.
Shuddering she sings her fearsome lament,
Her sobbing lament to the brothers over her son,
That the death must be avenged, her son’s death,
Tuwhakararo’s indeed, Tuwhakararo.
The woman's lament, it is the foam of the wave,
The foam which washes the beach and returns to the sea,
Settles on the sacred shore.

In the roar of the sea Apakura’s lament is heard.53
The other great events in life are fundamentally identical with the events of history.
In the myth of creation, heaven is raised from the earth and put on poles by Tane; but this creation is not an event which ended long ago; it is constantly repeated. Therefore a father may sing to his son:54

It was he (viz. Tane) who put poles under heaven above us;
Then you were born to the world of light.

In the same way, the death of every human being is a direct offshoot of a primordial event, because Maui tried to conquer the mistress of the realm of the dead, Hinenuitepo, but was himself defeated and died. It is stated expressly in several of the versions of the myth, just as there are references to it elsewhere; but it is brought home to us very clearly in a lament over the dead. The myth is remembered here in the disconnected way which we already know, in order immediately to continue in the line:

There ill luck befell you (mou ra te he).56

Man dies in Maui’s primordial death, the individual causes of death are subordinate details.
Just as death enters the world with Hinenuitepo and is victorious in Maui’s death, so Tura is the archetype of old age with its infirmities. In a speech already quoted it says: “Tura’s weaknesses have

52. I.e. the chief.
54. Ngata 1929 no. 185.
55. Hardly Whakatau, as it is probably often understood.
touched you, the aitiau sits secretly in you.” The old age and death of the individual may belong in a causal chain; but in a way they are quite independent, each being a direct inheritance from the ancestors.

We cannot underline the literal meaning too much when we say that the Maori relives history. We are so apt to insert in thought a “like” and in this way make all of it very simple according to our presuppositions. We find it quite obvious that when an event has happened, it never returns; but this is exactly what happens. Taylor had a small experience which once again shows this with the greatest clarity:

I was preaching from the words, ‘Behold I saw Satan like lightning fall from heaven,’ and had no sooner concluded, than the chapel, a dark building of raupo, with only a door and a small aperture to admit the light, was suddenly illuminated; we all rushed out, and saw a splendid meteor, like a drawn sword; my congregation with almost one voice exclaimed: ‘There is Satan falling from heaven.’

The Maori possessed a large treasure of proverbs. Some of them are understood by us without further explanation, e.g. that one gives a small gift with the words: “It is quite small, but is given out of love.” The European can, however, find edification only in a few without any further explanation, and in many cases the directions must consist in a piece of tribal history.

We do not understand the meaning of “Hine’s plaza” to the Waikato tribes if we do not know the following episode from history. Hine was the daughter of Maniapoto and married to a chief in a neighboring tribe. Now it happened that a war broke out between the two tribes. The neighboring tribe got the worst of it and fled closely pursued into Maniapoto’s village. When he saw his own tribe pursuing his son-in-law’s people into the village, he cried:

Who are you?
Hallo! Do not mistake Hine’s plaza.

The pursuers then withdrew.

If subsequent to this a chief is invited to be an ally in a war, but will not, he may answer:

---
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Welcome, welcome!
Welcome to Hine’s plaza.

If a person who has been insulted is willing to forego his revenge and come to an agreement, he may say to the insulter:

Welcome to Hine’s plaza,
The plaza which is not ascended by warriors.

“Hine’s plaza” thus is a sacrosanct place, we should say straight away a symbol of peace and in so far we easily understand the phrase; but when we have seen what history involves to the Maori, we realize that these sayings have a literal meaning with which we have no direct contact. The chief who says, “Welcome to Hine’s plaza,” recalls the past time of history; he is actually standing on Hine’s plaza, as Maniapoto in olden time and proclaims the place sacred.

The ancestors appear in the living as history emerges and is actualized. “You have become Maui” may be used in the Matatua tribes as a greeting to a person who has been at death’s door and yet has saved his life. This is due to the fact that these tribes have a tradition that the mistress of the realm of the dead made an attempt at Maui’s life which failed. Later, however, Maui was to die there, too, as told among other tribes.

“Do not become Te Humu (kei whaka-Te-Humu),” runs a proverb. Te Humu was “an ancestor, who lived near a large village, who, whenever he heard that visitors had arrived there, and that a feast was about to take place, used to run as fast as he could, and intrude himself on the party, beginning to eat before anybody else, and devouring more than any of the others.”

This form of historical experience is the background of innumerable proverbs; but this is not all; the proverb tells us much more about the Maori.

History is the form of life, the elementary possibilities of life are realized in it, now in anonymous customs, now in great situations. The life which the ancestors lived forth in history is the same as that active in the living; therefore they find themselves in history. The proverbs are saturated with scenes from history in which an ancestor has concentrated a mental state in a short phrase. In Maori tradition, the discoverer of New Zealand is Kupe from Hawaiki. When another man from Hawaiki, viz. Turi, wanted to emigrate, he asked Kupe to go back to New Zealand with him. “Should Kupe return?” answered the latter, and this phrase became a proverb.

---
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self in Kupe when she has fled away with her lover and is requested to return home. “Should Kupe return?” she says. The proverb does not analyse, it does not unravel motives, on the contrary it not only condenses and concentrates Puhihua’s resolution, but also implies the whole situation as a metamorphosis of one of the archetypal situations of history. The proverb fits the Maori as the glove fits the hand just because he does not detach himself as an individual nor dissolves himself. The proverb is the speech of the whole human being, as he stands compact in his mental life and is united with his situation.

It may justly be said that the Maori finds himself in history; but we may with equal justice look at the matter from the opposite side and say that his nature and character are determined by the events of history. For that matter this applies not only to man, but to the whole universe and its furniture. Heaven and earth were given their places by a definite action, and so were the stars. The fact that trees are growing with the roots downwards and the crown upwards, that the sun proceeds at a suitable speed, that New Zealand is intersected by mountains and hills—all this is due to definite historical (we should say mythical) events. The harrier got the red tips of its wings from the fire when this was consuming the whole world with its flames. The pigeon became hoarse because it ate food which was too sacred.

Man was given his nature in the same way. Even the Christianized Maoris know this historical experience: “The customs of war are due to the angry mind, but at the same time to the sins of the ancestors. Only now (in our time) we realize that it is wrong to eat human beings; according to what the Maori says Maui and Hinenuitepo are the ancestors from whom the Maori got his bad nature.”

As seen through European virtuous indignation it looks like this: “On my enquiring of a native chief, who had been discovered in the act of theft, if the native deities would not punish the people for such bad conduct, he replied: “Oh no! On earth they were accustomed to do the same, and parents delight in children following their example.”

Fortunately, we have texts in which the same motif is played in purer tones. The fact that man and woman have intercourse is implanted in them through a primordial event in which both have their places. Every intercourse between the sexes consists in the reliving of the love of the first two human

---
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beings. The love of the primordial couple therefore is hardly an explanation of man’s and woman’s love, but rather a description of the actual state of things, as it obtained its nature by being created. In this way it also obtained its place in life and its recognition. When at length Puhihuia had been permitted by her family to marry the man with whom she had eloped, she made at the wedding festivities a kind of speech of defence, in which she referred to the first human couple, Tiki and Kauataata.70 “My grandparents! Welcome! Welcome! Here you see the person who ran away from you. Am I to blame? Was it I who said that Tiki was to be a man? Was it I who said that Kauataata was to be a woman? We should rather believe that it was the gods you have told about who did it. They are your fathers; and when your child, who is standing here, grew up, is it a fault that I followed the road taken by Kauataata? She, too, is the cause why you are sitting here, holy and divine. She married the man whom she loved, Tiki, and therefore you, too, were born. It is my fault, and it is your first mother’s fault. If she had lived apart and had not married Tiki, then you would not be seen in this world...” The nature of man is his history. This is the background of this speech; therefore history can be used as a defence of the love of the heart versus the marriage of convenience; for in the tale about the primordial event it is not stated that the family decides on marriage.

When the chief of her lover’s tribe receives Puhihuia just as she has run away from her home he is certainly at first somewhat anxious; but his thoughts, too, settle by probing reality to the bottom, i.e. by searching history. Reflecting on the danger he is running, he concludes by saying, “My grandchild of the older line! Girl! Welcome to these your grandparents. Death does not come from you; from olden times death has come to us. Certainly, also women among your ancestors lived without husbands, and did so in order that the tribe might choose husbands for them; but they themselves did choose their own husbands. The same applies to you; you choose your own husband.”71

Even if the “primeval time” has left particularly deep traces in man’s nature, creation is not yet over; later history also contributes to shaping man; only this is not a question of mankind (i.e. the Maori) in general; there every kinship group obtains its particular character.

Kerry-Nicholls noticed that in a certain region the natives spoke “with a much harsher accent than those further to the north, and that they clipped many of their words in a remarkable way.” His people then were given the explanation:

that their great ancestor, Ngatoroirangi, when he came over in the Arawa
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canoe was engaged in bailing out that craft during a storm, and that whilst
so doing he caught a severe cold, which caused him to speak in a sharp,
halting kind of way, which has been imitated ever since by many of the
Whanganui tribes, who claim descent from that celebrated chief.72

The kinship character is not of the organized form as among certain
peoples where each clan manages its part of the tribal ritual, its share in
the relationship to nature or the like, as in the case of totem clans. A few
accomplishments, it is true, are passed on within certain kinship groups, such
as the art of carving, the art of making stone implements and sorcery; but this
is not due to any special organization.73

The kinship characters are more subtle among the Maoris, but are dis-
tinct enough. We learn about them through a great number of proverbs which
each give a portrait in only a few strokes of the brush.74

In many cases a proverb is presented to us with the additional state-
ment that it applies to a tribe or hapu, others are immediately recognized as
such.

We cannot possibly bring out the expressive terseness of Maori pro-
verbs in the translation. “Ngatimaru rangi tahi,” “One day’s Ngatimaru” must
be extended to “Ngatimaru who can perform the incredible in one day.”75

However, even in the translations we perceive the picturesque power: “Pa-
heke’s descendants with the rolled-up mats,” i.e. always wandering.76

“Ngatipaoa with the vigilant ears.”77 “Ngatipoa with the big stomachs,”78 which
refers to a situation in which Paoa, the first ancestor, ate immoderately in
order to feign low-born. “Arawa which are big talking.”79 “Ngaiterangi with
one word,” i.e. “Ngaiterangi the upright.”80 “Deaf Ngaituwhaitara.” “Ngaiteau
with the willing women” as we—somewhat mitigatingly—may render the words
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of the original: “Ngateau tara makuku.”\textsuperscript{81} “Even though Tuhoe are few, the underworld laughs,” i.e. the few Tuhoes will be sure to send the enemy down there.\textsuperscript{82} “Tuhoe who squander food and possessions and destroy people (sending them) to the underworld.”\textsuperscript{83} The proverb says about Urewera, either another name for Tuhoe or a hapu in Tuhoe: “Urewera who travel by night,” viz. in contrast to the other Maoris, who were unwilling to undertake wanderings by night.\textsuperscript{84} Ngatiawa have had this curious saying associated with them: “Awa who relieve nature everywhere,” i.e. not only in the places set apart for that purpose.\textsuperscript{85} It also says about Ngatiawa (the same tribe?): “Rauru is the man who stands alone,” i.e. they shift for themselves.\textsuperscript{86} Besides these striking proverbs there are also some of a more universal content, cast in a stereotyped form; so we see them used about several tribes. “Ngatiawa with the hundred houses,”\textsuperscript{87} is said also about Ngatiapa.\textsuperscript{88} “Ngatimaru with the hundred hiding-places,”\textsuperscript{89} also about Ngapuhi\textsuperscript{90} and Ngatiwa.\textsuperscript{91} In the same way “Waikato with a hundred dragons (i.e. chiefs),”\textsuperscript{92} has a variant applied to Ngapuhi.\textsuperscript{93}

However, if we keep to those which are really characterizing, it is conspicuous that some proverbs seem simply to express the character and habits of a tribe, thus e.g. the two about Tuhoe, whether they bear a stamp of being the tribe’s own slogan or of being due to their neighbors’ sharper evaluation. Others evidently have a clear relation to a definite historical event, e.g. “Ngatipaoa with the big stomachs.” This does not make any great difference to the Maori; the peculiarities of the kinship group arise from those of the ancestors, and those of the ancestors are inherited by their descendants.

There is, however, a type of proverb which by its very form attributes the
character of the tribe to an ancestor. “The descendants of thoughtless Hape,”94 thus named because Hape and his people allowed themselves to be lured out of their good fortress in order to look at the besiegers’ dance, a piece of improvidence which cost them dear. “The descendants of Taketake with the long penis;”95 here, too, we know the origin. Taketake’s fortress was stormed, but he provided a breathing-space for his people which they understood how to utilize, as he distracted the enemy’s attention completely by standing stark naked on a platform immediately before their eyes and there—well, this may be guessed from the proverb.

In Shortland we find: “The motto of the descendants of the crew of Te Arawa is Nga uri a Te Matekapua (children of Te Matekapua); meaning that they inherit the thievish propensities of their ancestor Te Matekapua, who is celebrated for his many bad deeds, and among them for having plundered his neighbour’s store of kumara for a long time without being discovered, owing to his taking the precaution to walk there on stilts, which prevented his footsteps being tracked.”96

The actual form of the proverb does not guarantee that the reference is to a tribe in a literal sense. Te Paki of the use of proverbs amongst other things gives this explanation: “About a man who eats nicely, (it is said:) ‘A kaka-bird which eats nibblingly;’ if little is eaten, the words are these: ‘Descendants of Tahau-manawa-iti (i.e. Tahau-with-the-small-stomach) do not eat much.’”97 If we do not get further information, we may therefore be in doubt whether the reference is to a real tribe, or whether the saying is figurative. This applies e.g. to the proverb: “The descendants of Tuhourangi who ate their food cold.”98 In the case of certain proverbs with a moral point, we may surmise that the usage is not restricted to a definite tribe, e.g. “Well done, you descendants of Tane who lay sideways in front of the fire (so that others could not warm themselves).”99 But when the image of the tribe is used at all about definite peculiarities, it only throws further light on the Maori’s view of the tribe as having a character of its own; for if he did not see every kinship group before him with its peculiar traits, these proverbs would presumably be without their proper sense. This point of view is the more important as proverbs of this type are very common, most, however, in the form that
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descendants are not mentioned in the plural, but only one descendant is referred to. “A descendant of Te Paki with the unique legs” (Te Paki was an ancestor of Waikato, famed for his speed).

When the ancestor in the proverb is found back in the large stock of common history, the word “descendant” may be literal enough, but at the same time it is in the nature of things that the kinship stamp may be purely figurative. Otherwise a proverb like this cannot be understood: “A victorious descendant of Tumatauenga (i.e. the divine warrior),” or “The descendants of Whakataupotiki (the archetypical avenger).”

Some of these proverbs occur in two forms. We know both the form: “It is Kapu with the sudden mind,” i.e. Kapu who quickly decides on unexpected things, and “They are descendants of Kapu with the sudden mind;” to which we must finally add: “Follow the steps of Kapu (-with-the-sudden-mind).” Behind all the forms is the story that Kapu was surprised by a neighbouring chief who came as a guest without giving warning, moreover at a time of the year when the supply of food was poorest; Kapu revenged this insult by putting his neighbour into exactly the same painful situation a few days later. Later Kapu in a sophisticated manner convinced the same neighbour that water is more important than food; an assertion by Kapu which the neighbour had denied.

We have also “They are descendants of Mahanga who left both wife and food,” beside “Mahanga who left canoe and food.” Mahanga had bad luck with a canoe which was to be launched, and after this mate left both canoe and food to his helpers.

Although it might not beforehand be unimaginable that both forms might be used—indeed, we have previously seen how the ancestors may rise in the living—it is questionable whether both were actually used. The places
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where we find these two proverbs used is in the form extended with “descendants.” It is not unimaginable that the short form was used only about the ancestor himself and otherwise as an abbreviated representative of the full form when the proverb was mentioned only. We cannot of course decide on the matter on the basis of so few cases; but the fact that the two forms are not simply equivalent is evident from the proverb: “Are you Whakatauihu?” which is used ironically, whereas “The descendants of Whakataupotiki” is laudatory (Whakatauihu is identical with Whakataupotiki).

This whole group of proverbs of which we have here adduced a selection thus collectively gives evidence that it enters into the elementary experiences of the Maori that each kinship group has its own stamp, its own character as an inheritance from the ancestors with its root in history, often in a definite historical situation. We saw this very trait as greatly characteristic of the Maori, to whom it is the natural thing to see man as he lives in and with his world in such a way that the fixed points in life are not universal principles and laws, but situations and events which constantly are renewed through the ages, while at the same time they preserve an inner identity which is the fixed core in the continual vicissitudes of life.

Some of these proverbs show us the kinship groups from without, others from within. The latter thus also express the self-awareness and pride of the kinship group.

In his ancestors and history the Maori finds himself and his character. There he also finds the measure of the demands that may be made to existence. They are the unspoken background of the magnate’s greater jealousy of his honor; but we also find directly pronounced examples. The saga about Puhihuia, which altogether is a fruitful source of information about the Maori and history may also on this point give us an illustration.

The situation is that Puhihuia against the wishes of her family has eloped with her lover, Ponga. The canoes with the two and the others who with Ponga have been on a visit to Puhihuia’s family have reached their home and lie on the water immediately off Ponga’s village. Everything trembles in the balance. Will the chief and his kinship group accept Puhihuia and thus go in for the marriage with the consequences it may have? Will they risk war with her kinship group? This is how matters stand when Puhihuia with her brave resolution enforces a decision. She jumps into the water, swims towards the shore, takes her stand at some distance from the shore, and makes a speech to the effect that she will certainly herself decide whom she is to marry, and that Ponga and she are inseparable. If they may not go ashore the foam of the
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sea is to be their bed. She is a woman after the Maori’s own heart, and in the
end the chief welcomes both of them, making a long speech which ends like
this: “My girl! The bed of your high-born ancestors was not the waves of this
sea; they lie buried in a sacred place; therefore it is not either meet that you
should swim in vain near a coast where the monster, Kaiwhare, is swimming
about. Welcome, you my high-born grandchild! Now we two shall live
together.”112 There is nothing astonishing in this conclusion; others might also
find it improper to let a young girl end her days in the sea. The remarkable
thing is the premises. The chief’s thoughts of their own accord go back to
Puhihuia’s ancestors and to history to find their fixed starting-point there.

What the kinship group is, its character, what it gives and demands—all
this is a legacy from the ancestors, in this legacy the kinship group has its own
standard; the legacy is “the good thing” by virtue of history. Ngatimaru was a
powerful but small tribe; but their small number did not trouble them—al-
though there might be good grounds for it—for they said: “Even if the canoe
is stubby (i.e. the tribe is small), it is all right; it descends from the ancestors,
it is not from today.” “When the people heard that speech, their thoughts
became firm,” it is added significantly.

However an outsider may appraise the character of the kinship group—as
seen with the kinship group’s eyes it is their pride, inherited as it is from their
ancestors. Each kinship group thus has its humanity, its ideal. In each kinship
group true humanity therefore appears in its reliving the ancestors and history
in itself. Puhihuia was beautiful, brave, resolute, and victorious; she was “maia
from the heroes bearing arms and maia like the women among the
ancestors.”114 The proverb “She does not give up the bravery of her
ancestors”115 is justly applied to her.

Here we are at the focus of Maori ethics. To do the right thing is to
follow the ancestors; they are a model to the kinship group. In this very
respect, there is true continuity in the concept tupuna, for this word unites in
it all the generations which have set up and still set up the standards by which
the kinship group lives. We have set forth this view as regards the departed;
but the grandparents are the living representatives of custom and common
practice. Best writes: “A child’s grandparents had much to do with its training,
etc., while young, indeed it often occurred that the grandparents assumed the
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right to tend, train and educate the child.”  

We may momentarily be tempted to interpret this dependence on the ancestors and their actions as compulsion of the individual, an external and irrational relationship to ethics; but if we have only a little understanding of the Maori’s mind, this moment will be very brief, for—as we have seen—it is from within that the dependence comes; it is the inner identity, the life in common with the ancestors, which makes history come forth again. The picture of the elders of the kinship group as guiding must be supplemented by another in which the inspiring force of history stands out: “Maru rose and called upon the veteran warriors, the heroes of former battles, to recount the story of their deeds so as to inspire the tribe with courage.”  

It is also worth remembering what power the Maori could derive from the contemplation of the old treasures of the kinship group. He thinks history because he lives history.

There is no well-defined distinction between history and the customs of the ancestors as an expression of man’s nature on the one hand and history and the customs as a deliberate model on the other. In other words, ethics are after all an aspect of man’s nature; man’s love of woman, his claim for rehabilitation for insults, and his liberality are all the three of them parts of his humanity. It may be said in one word in Maori; they are tika; they belong to his tikanga.

Tika is a word which exactly covers this combination of nature and ethos; it simply means “natural,” i.e. from the Maori’s point of view.

We read somewhere that the gods provide that every thing keeps within its bounds: “Therefore everything is tika, both the small things of any form, the strong things, the weak and the crooked things,” i.e. every thing, of whatever kind, has its own nature. It is of course tika that kumara comes from a kumara field and not quite different plants. It is tika that a foot leaves footprints, that sun and moon proceed regularly through the heavens; and when a road is tika it means that it is straight, i.e. that it leads as fast and as easily to the goal as possible; correspondingly a man walks tika when he

---
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does not make any detours. In order to be *tika* one’s words must certainly be true, but this is not sufficient; they must also be reasonable, i.e. expressions of a natural thought. If myths especially are concerned, the accurate and correct rendering is of great importance; this is a condition of their being *tika*.

*Tikanga* is derived from *tika*, which would seem to determine its meaning. As, however, we have to do with a form which seems to live its own life as a vocable, it is safest to look at the word apart, although naturally it has the very closest connection with *tika*. *Tikanga* is the way in which something is *tika*, its natural form in the widest sense. In things it is nature and function, in actions procedure, etc. The close relationship between *tika* and its derivative appears from the fact that several of the above-mentioned uses of *tika* may be paralleled with a turn of phrase with *tikanga* which means very nearly the same. We heard that everything is *tika*, but it is also true that “everything possesses *tikanga*, even the most insignificant things, such as dust and gravel, whose lot it is to keep the sea or other water within its bounds.” *Tikanga* thus means “function, destiny.” Somewhere the *tikanga* of fish is mentioned in such a way that we understand that it means both how the fish generally behave and how they are to be treated, including ritual directions. The *tikanga* of the feet is the footprints, and a road which is straight (*tika*) also has a *tikanga*, i.e. a direction. The *tikanga* of words is their meaning or sense, not only in the strict, formal sense, but altogether their range and purpose. In the case of ritual words (*karakia*) *tikanga* seems to mean the correct form. All these are parallels to the applications of *tika*.

The *tikanga* of human beings is their nature, i.e. appearance, conduct, habits, etc. It says about Whakatau: “There is nobody like him; he has no man-*tikanga*.” The grey hairs originate from Tura; they belong to the
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tikanga of elderly people. Tikanga is also the way in which one acts, but still the natural way. Special standpoints are accepted as a matter of course like grey hairs and other unavoidable manifestations of human nature. When, during the fights between Europeans and Maoris, a chief took the side of the Europeans, this was acknowledged also by Maoris who neither belonged to his tribe nor were kindly disposed towards the Europeans. They said that “to protect the Pakeha was a law he had made for himself (tana tikanga). They referred to a remarkable occasion when he had stood up in defence of foreigners.” Similarly, it is told about Tamanuiarangi as a matter of course that it was his habit (tikanga) to wander about and rob people of women and treasures. He was an exception, for otherwise the proverb says: “A dog, an itinerant man, they have no tikanga, they have nothing.” Being without tikanga is the same as being at a loss. The chief Mahanga’s previous wife knew that if he lost his best men, then he would have no tikanga at all, i.e. would be at his wits’ end. Therefore it is so necessary to have this quality; tikanga is an inner form of life which manifests itself in a definite conduct. Te Rauparaha was the youngest son; but it was he and not his elder brothers who became chief: “The elder brothers possessed no tikanga; his tikanga alone was chieflike (rangatira).”

Referring to human matters tika, corresponding to all this, means the “natural” and hence the reasonable and correct. At the tu ora rite, a boy is given bravery and cleverness, all that is tika to him. When Tane felt a desire for a woman he first made some unsuccessful attempts, but only when he created woman, the natural functions could take place and “only then copulation became tika.” It is tika that an insulted man is gloomy.

Tika thus expresses that which is in accordance with human nature; but there is an even transition to that which is in accordance with custom and common practice, for the very good reason that to the Maori custom and common practice are the form of human nature. Thus there are definite seats for
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everybody in a canoe where it is tika to sit;\textsuperscript{144} on the other hand, it is not tika that the pupils in the sacral school should play with profane children,\textsuperscript{145} etc. Even though tika might well be translated by “is the custom,” it still has the same meaning, viz. “natural.” A custom as such is called “ritenga,” i.e. “which corresponds (rite) to something previous;” but thus it is tika. We have heard that it was a custom to make treasures pass to and fro between two closely related kinship groups; this is “tika according to the customs (ritenga) of the past.”\textsuperscript{146}

We find something corresponding in the case of tikanga. It is not synonymous with ritenga, as indeed it may be quite an individual procedure. Not only what an individual person generally does—as the man whose tikanga was that of robbing people of women and treasures—but also the plan followed in a special situation. A man may ponder on a tikanga, a plan, which may make a woman his,\textsuperscript{147} and when Tane the god had lifted up heaven, he was thinking of a tikanga, i.e. how to decorate heaven.\textsuperscript{148} Still the passages in which tikanga may be rendered by “custom, tradition” are probably the most frequent. When Rata as the first in history wanted to build a canoe, his people were doubtful and said: “There is no tikanga at all to build a canoe after.”\textsuperscript{149} The idea must be that there is no tradition by which to build a canoe.

Shortland has also noted this use of the word: “When war broke out between Heke and the colonists, the other tribes were very generally in a state of anxiety and uncertainty how they would be affected by it. They remarked that they had no tikanga to guide them in this case. In any quarrel among themselves, it could at once be determined by reference to ancient usage how it became any particular tribe to act.”\textsuperscript{150}

When the Maoris first settled in New Zealand there was one of them who prematurely threw a head ornament with red feathers into the sea when he caught sight of a splendidly red something on the coast; but when he discovered that it was red flowers which quickly faded, he repented and searched for his feathers. They had now been driven ashore and been found by another man, Mahia (or Mahina), who would not return them. “This has since then been a tikanga to the Maoris that what is found, even if it is of
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greenstone, is not returned to the original owner; and the saying is still in use ‘Mahina’s red feathers which went ashore.’”

It will not surprise us, either, that it may be said that a man has tikanga (a natural relationship, i.e. right, title) to some possessions, for here, too, we have a combination of the natural and the historically determined, which expresses the Maori’s experience of himself and the past. We might increase the number of examples ad libitum, but those adduced will presumably be sufficient to illustrate the principle fact, that tikanga may be used about custom, although in itself it means nothing but “a natural procedure,” just because the people who use the word find the natural procedure in custom and common practice.

It may be said that the Maori lacks ideality as his ethics are only one aspect of his nature. He has no ethical ideals that are so exalted that man must always strive to approach them, but never can reach them. Such a feeling as altruism without limits can never make sense in his culture; for he owes it to the highest in himself, viz. honor and kinship life, to avenge himself upon his enemies.

Nor has the Maori language any word for “the good.” Pai rather means “the pleasant,” thus is only according to circumstances equal to “the good.” Still there is a kind of “ideal,” only that it does not belong to the heaven of ideas, but walks about on two legs accepted in its individual development, viz. rangatira, the nobleman, the chief.

Rangatira may be used as an adjective meaning “noble;” but the actual meaning is probably “belonging to a nobleman.” As a substantive it means “nobleman” or especially “chief.”

The nobleman may be called an ideal with limited justification only. It is true that the ideal is admired by everybody; but there are definite limits for the possibility and will to realize it; for it is profoundly characteristic that the “ideal” is not only a plastic figure, but a human being determined by his kinship group; only the man who is of noble birth is a true nobleman. “All toa (famed warriors) are necessarily chiefs; bravery is not found among ware, i.e. persons of low birth,” said an Old-Time Maori to Best. This seems to a modern democrat rather a hazardous dogma, but it should be kept in mind that this is a simple consequence of a deep-rooted reality in the Maori; he lives in honor and in his kinship group; and therefore a noble man can only exist in a noble kinship group. “But what if a plebeian is actually brave?” it may be objected. This objection is refuted in the proverb: “My courage is
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noble courage (toku toa he toa rangatira);” it means that the courage of the plebeian is accidental, hollow, and inconstant. It may dazzle a European, but not the keen eye of the nobleman; for he knows that the man’s nature is determined by the kinship group, or, rather, is identical with that of the kinship group; therefore there can be no reality in the plebeian’s courage; it is not worth more than crocodile tears in an indurate rascal, a product of the moment and without constancy.

This view is deeply rooted in several words. For instance we find these translations:

\textit{ware:}

1. Ignorant.
2. Careless, thoughtless, off one’s guard.
3. Mean, low in social position.

\textit{tautauwhea:}

1. Plebeian, of low origin.
2. Cowardly, inactive.

Similarly in the adjectival applications of:

\textit{mokai:}

7. Foolish.
8. Provoking, vexatious.

The distinction is brought out very markedly in the translations of \textit{taureka:}

1. Captive taken in war, slave.
2. Scoundrel.

In so many words!

Nor is it so that one absolutely need be a Maori nobleman in order to see the difference. During his travels in New Zealand Dieffenbach came to a tribe which was very inhospitable and in spite of receiving gifts was
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very unwilling to supply victuals. Dieffenbach wondered; “but I afterwards heard that the tribe consisted chiefly of men who had formerly been slaves, and that they were noted for their churlishness and want of hospitality.”

The slave and the chief stand out as sharp contrasts because the slave is a kind of zero of humanity. Only free-born people are real human beings after all; for without relatives and without history there is no tikanga. Again, it is only the great chief who wholly and completely achieves the reality of man’s possibilities, those which are expressed by “the eight sources of the heart” (e waru nga pu manawa). This phrase refers to eight traditional qualities in the great chief:

1. Industrious in obtaining or cultivating food.
2. Able in settling disputes, etc.
4. Good leaders in war—an able general.
5. An expert at carving, tattooing and at ornamental weaving.
6. Hospitality.
7. Clever at building a house or pa, and in canoe-making.
8. A good knowledge of boundaries of tribal lands.

The plebeian is indeed a human being, but everything in him is on a smaller scale; his genealogy includes only insignificant people of younger lines or is lost in empty space, i.e. in slaves; his kinship group and its history is inferior. It is simply unreasonable to expect anything great from the plebeian; he is completely without any possibility of possessing “the eight sources of the heart,” but as a recognition of the fact that he, too, is a human being—although in a lesser degree—tradition, however, bestows four upon him, unfortunately without mentioning which.

From myths and sagas we may glean traits which may fill in the meagre contours of the portrait of the nobleman. It should first be noted that the word rangatira is very ill-defined in its downward limits. Any free man will call himself rangatira; but only those among the free-born who are of noble descent are mentioned by others as rangatira. When used about a chief the limits are ill-defined, too; for this concept includes all degrees from the chief of a large tribe to petty chiefs of small kinship groups. Behind all these
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applications of *rangatira* stands an image, “the nobleman,” to whom only the
great chief can give full reality, but which is still clearly perceptible in his close
kinship group and in subordinate chiefs. It is this image, which the Maori has
in view whenever he praises “the nobleman.” To this image we shall devote
the following lines.

“You are a noble descendant (*uri rangatira*), it is not necessary to teach
you to fight,”\(^{160}\) says Ponga’s companion to him. It is a matter of course that
this accomplishment in fighting must mean that the chief must also be *maia*,
i.e. possess “the gift of victory.” Indeed, it says: “It was hard to flee before the
enemy; it was a sign of plebeian descent (*uri tutua*).”\(^{161}\)

The core of the chief’s gift of victory is his firm and fearless mind. When
Puhihuia declared that she would hurl herself down from the rocks rather
than give up her lover, they said admiringly, “Look! This is proper for a noble
descendant (*uri ariki*); frivolity is unknown to her; she will hurl herself into the
underworld; her words are those of a noble woman (*ariki*).”\(^{162}\) A**riki** may in
this connection be briefly characterized as a superlative of *rangatira*. This
same contempt of death we find fully realized in Hauauru, who was invited
by his enemies to come and receive a canoe. When he put the chief’s distinc-
tive mark, the feathers, into his hair they portended his death. His tribe tried
to keep him from going; but he went and was murdered; for—as it proudly
says—“what does a nobleman care for death.”\(^{163}\) The nobleman’s contempt of
death is again a piece of his magnanimity. The Ngatirahiri are praised for
their nobility (*rangatira*), which made them spare the defeated from
Waikato.\(^{164}\) Best adduces a small feature from a war which shows us how the
chief himself makes it a point of honour to show magnanimity: “When Tuhoe
were advancing to attack Oputara pa, it was proposed to assault the fort under
cover of darkness, but Te Rangianiwaniwa, the chief, said: ‘Am I a slave that
I should attack an enemy in the dark? No! We will wait until the light of day
flashes upon Tawhiuau.’”\(^{165}\) Another example has been adduced by Percy
Smith. During a war *Te Rauparaha’s* guns made great slaughter amongst the
less well-equipped opponents. Their chief then requested him to fight with
Maori weapons only. Although Te Rauparaha was a man who was not always
particular about the methods he used, this appealed to the nobleman in him.
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“With the chivalry so often displayed by the old Maori, Te Rauparaha at once gave orders to cease firing, and the battle was continued with the native weapons alone.”

The magnanimity of the chief is connected with the fact that he lives the life of a whole tribe. His greatness allows him in all cases to take a wider view of things, but also makes it necessary that at any rate he stands in a certain relation to neighbouring tribes and kinship groups. It is the chief’s kinship group which arranges “political” marriages. It is he particularly who visits other tribes and himself invites guests. The list of Te Rauparaha’s accomplishments—he was skilled in war, in obtaining food, and in showing kindness to people—ends by stating expressly that he was also skilled in welcoming guests and travellers. But as the chief gathers the relationship to other tribes in his person, he must also—if anybody at all—have an ethos in relation to these. It is he who stands security for the keeping of promises and agreements; he does so because his life and honour are so great that they also include external obligations. We hear this in a speech in which a chief offers himself as a hostage: “I am a chief by birth, and my word is the word of a chief. If you are frightened I am prepared to stay with you as a hostage while your people go; then if any of them are killed you can kill me.” This reliability of honor is expected from the true nobleman. In Ngatimaru’s opinion, it was unjustifiable of Ngapuhi to keep the treasure Teuira which they had acquired by dodges: “If there were noblemen left among Ngapuhi they would understand that Teuira was with them unjustly.” On the whole it is improper for a nobleman to have recourse to underhand methods. Te Matorohanga dissuaded his listeners from practising sorcery: “It is the occupation of plebeians.”

Even though it is important that the nobleman is a victorious warrior, the importance that might be expected is not attached to warlike virtues. If anything, it is in the matters of peace that the great chief shines most brightly. This is expressed in a myth: “The only way in which man can prove himself a nobleman is by helping people, by providing food, by celebrating wedding ceremonies, etc., all that makes peace flourish.”

Diligence and skill in obtaining food is in several places mentioned as a
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criterion of nobility and makes the Maori exclaim admiringly: “Such is indeed your work, rangatira! Different from that of all others,” and he adds with a proverb: “One thing is the work of the hard heart-wood, another that of the soft sapwood—bravo, rangatira.” It is a woman, a noblewoman and a chiefess who is praised here, which is worth noting as it shows woman’s great social possibilities; but this is not why she is praised for good work; the same is said in the portrait drawn of a man, Ponga: “Now, Ponga was a handsome man, a man of few words, a man who cultivated the land, a man who was rangatira by virtue of his property, viz. the food he obtained by cultivating the land and which he meted out to his friends.” The last addition is significant; liberality is one of the very most important traits in the physiognomy for reasons which have already been mentioned in detail (p. 111 ff.). The Maori narrator has also put such a statement into Captain Cook’s mouth; for when he had asked Tatare for food and the latter had given abundantly, Cook according to Maori tradition exclaimed: “Tatare, the nobleman Tatare.”

This same Cook (or another European?) was at once by the Maoris viewed according to their own picture of the nobleman and chief. An old man tells how as a boy he was on the ship: “There was one who was the most important man on the ship; one realized that he was master (ariki) because he was a nobleman, with a fine carriage and was quiet; some of the other beings (tupua, i.e. the sailors) spoke incessantly; but this man did not utter many words.” If there was still a little doubt left in the narrator that Cook was a nobleman it was dispelled when he had a nail given to him by Cook: “Indeed, he was the great chief (rangatira) of the ship since he gave us presents and furthermore was kind to the children. The great man is not hidden among the many.”

As stated above, it is necessary that the chief understands how to manaaki people; and even if liberality is very important in this connection, kindness in general enters into the picture. “The woman showed her nobility by kindness to the people of the tribe; when the tribe saw her kindness, they spontaneously laid out victuals as gifts to her.”

The nobleman shows distinction in his behaviour. He is kind, but also a little reserved; he does not say very much, as indeed it was emphasized in the
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case of Ponga and Cook; but the weightier is his speech and he leaves it to the plebeian to jabber. The nobleman’s and the noblewoman’s kindness must not lose its delicacy by coarse exaggerations. When Puhihuia eloped with Ponga, the whole thing very innocently began by her accompanying the guests on the way; but her parents who were watching the guests leave felt a little unpleasantly affected when she continued accompanying them, and her father cried admonishingly, “Turn back, my girl, turn back! It is foolish to go far away like this; the guests must think that you are a plebeian!”

The same reserve characterizes a true nobleman at the meal. “A white heron which looks at the food before it eats,” says the proverb. The favourite image of the chief, the white heron, has here a special point, which is explained to us as follows: “The white heron examines its food before it eats it, applied to a chief, who, in a courteous manner, waits until others come, before he eats his food."

We see the nobleman’s manners with the negative sign in the scene in which Paoa feigns the plebeian: “Paoa looked at the fishes and pushed them away to his followers; then it was the turn of a small basket of fermented cockles, which he pulled up to him. Now he ate; he took only two handfuls of the mussels, then they were eaten up. When people saw how he was eating they said, ‘What a plebeian! He eats in an ugly manner.’” But however rudely Paoa behaves—it is not easy to hide the innate nobility, and so the story has the fine trait that some old experienced men say, “The man is a nobleman who is shamming.”

Although the essential thing is the Maori’s own view of the nobleman’s conduct, it is not without interest that the refinement in their conduct struck Europeans as well. The former Danish Prime Minister D. G. Monrad, who in 1865-69 lived in New Zealand, writes: “It has highly astonished me to find similarities between the manners of our and the French aristocracy on the one hand and that of the New Zealand Maoris on the other.”

The nobleman’s movements are suppler and steadier than those of common people. It is his or her particular pride to show this in dancing. When Kahurereremoa, the chief’s daughter, danced the haka before the strange tribe she was cheered with admiring exclamations; for wrists were so supple that it was as if her hands were falling off and her fingers touched the back of her hands. This was due to the massage falling to the share of the chief’s daughter.
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Furthermore, she was beautiful, a proper descendant of Tiki, the first human being. It is just as the proverb says about the noble person: “So fights the hard heart-wood, so the soft sapwood of the *tawa* tree.” This applies to the nobleman and noblewoman and when referring to the *haka* dance it means: one kind of *haka* is that of the nobleman, another is that of the plebeian, whose hands are clumsy.\(^{182}\)

Thus stands the ideal of nobility as a plastic figure, a noble mind in a noble body, \(καλὸς κἀγαθός\) only Maori-wise. The plastic aspect and the sterling integrity of the ideal is only emphasized by the fact that his nobility extends into his dress and ornaments.\(^{183}\) “Bone comb, *piki* hair-dress, and feathers of the white heron are the distinctive marks of the chief.”\(^{184}\) It is not only that the chief can actually dress better, he also owes it to his nature and his people to do so. Here, again, it is instructive to read about the chief Paoa, who feigned the plebeian and therefore also wore coarse and ugly clothes. His companions grew angry and told him to take them off; but he persisted. Then “the companions felt disgust and told him to dress beautifully.”\(^{185}\) They loathe him because a nobleman must be whole from his innermost core to his dress. When Paoa wants to dress poorly, it is because he has no *tikanga*, or in other words, it is a symptom of inner dissolution.