Tū alone was brave:
Notes on Maori cosmogony

Gregory Schrempp

One of the events of 1982 in the field of Maori studies was the publication, after it had remained in manuscript for a number of decades, of the second volume of Elsdon Best's *Maori Religion and Mythology*. Much of this long volume is a discussion of tales of the "second-class", this being one of the terms by which Best designated a body of colourful little vernacular stories. He regarded these as existing alongside of the grand monotheistic body of doctrine (confined to a select group of specialists) that he deals with more in Volume I of *Maori Religion and Mythology*.

Among the little tales appearing in this new volume is a repetition, with fuller context and more parallel examples, of a tale that had appeared earlier in Best's *Tuhoe*. It stands out as a probable instance of a type that has always been a favourite within the study of European folklore, namely a European tale that has come back after being transformed by a non-European culture. The European tale in question here is most commonly known in the form of an Aesop fable, though its scientific designation (according to the Stith Thompson motif index) is J711.1 "ant and the lazy cricket (grasshopper)".

Unfortunately, it is impossible to tell exactly what the Maori narrator told Best, for the text is a rather haphazard mixture of Maori, English within quotation marks, and English précis. The moralising part of the tale occurs in the English précis, and is perhaps for that reason to be regarded with some suspicion. The part presented in Maori consists of the words spoken by the ant and the cicada to each other. Biggs has translated a similar version as follows:

The Ant: Stick to digging
A pit against the rain from above
And the piercing cold of the night.
Gather seeds,
As food for the inner man,
And so prosper.

The Cicada: What is *my* pleasure? Just sitting about
Clinging to a tree branch,
Basking in the sun that shines,
And playing music on my wings.²

One cannot, of course, be certain that this is a case of cultural borrowing by the Maori, as opposed to an “independent invention”. The text that Biggs has translated occurs quite early in terms of large-scale Maori-European interchange, and this could possibly be taken in support of independent invention. But, is it possible to imagine a tale that more precisely and succinctly embodies the world-view of the Calvinistically-steeped early conduits of Western culture, the missionaries, than that of the industrious and frugal ant whose worldly affairs prosper (= sign of grace?) and the lazy and improvident grasshopper who comes to ruin?

An analysis could perhaps be made of the precise ways in which the European tale of the ant and the cicada has been transformed in the context of a different world-view. Though I shall not undertake such a specific analysis here, I am struck by the cultural logic evident in the mere fact that this particular European tale has been taken up by a Maori narrator. For there is, in fact, a whole class of indigenous Maori tales (with variants in other Polynesian societies) based on the plot of two different beings — often insects or animals, but ranging to such items as stones and bodies of water — contending with one another regarding some aspect of their mode of existence. While there is much variation within this genre, two basic plots stand out. In one, two beings both want to occupy the same geographical tract or “ecological niche”; they fight a battle, one taking possession of that tract and the other fleeing to a less desirable one. In the other type, to which the “Ant and the Cicada” is more similar, two beings argue with each other over the respective merits of two possible ways of life, and end up going off in mutual scorn, each to live his own way. A well-known example of the latter type is the story of the “Mosquito and the Sandfly”. The sandflies want to attack man by day in great numbers, and scoff at the prospect of heavy losses; the mosquitoes want to attack stealthily by night. Thus is occasioned the historic split in “custom” between the mosquito and sandfly tribes.³ Another tale, which occurs in Grey, Smith, and Best, has to do with the original separation of certain land and sea creatures, such as lizards and fish, with mutual exchange of insults. Each disparages the other’s choice of habitat, sometimes by way of suggesting that the other will end up serving as food for man.⁴ Thus, in at least some of their variants, these two examples, the origin of divergence between the mosquito and the sandfly, and between the land and sea creatures, are similar in the sense that in both instances the arguments revolve in part around the degree to which the respective ways of life under consideration will provide security from a common enemy, man. And, incidentally, this provides a further fortuitous parallel between the Maori and European Aesopian genre: for in both genres the target of scorn is specifically the vulnerability, the lack of security, that one being sees in the way of life advocated by the other.
Yet, despite these similarities between the European and Maori genres, which certainly must have something to do with the Maori adoption of the European tale, there is nevertheless a profound gulf between them. The Aesopian genre is one of moral edification and instruction; its purpose is to contrast different ways of living in such a way as to illustrate which ought to be accepted as a model by the audience in general — a point reaffirmed by the great motif index’s classification of the ant and cricket tale as a “J”, i.e., a tale of the “wise and unwise”. The Maori tales are in this respect directly contrary to the European ones, for they are distinctly non-didactic. They could perhaps be termed naturalistic, in that they seem to be fragments of an elaborate cosmogonic theory, the end of which is to account for the thousand divergent tāngata ‘men’ and iwi ‘tribes’ that make up the universe. Within this cosmogonic theory, biomorphological speciation (the “origin of species”) is accounted for through processes in which cultural choice and ecological imperatives are frequently intermixed. The ecological imperative is that of the food-chain, which is acknowledged, however, less through a logic that says it is “good to eat” than through a logic that says that it is “good not to be eaten”. That logic seems not to be contradicted even in the episode known widely from Grey (1855) in which Tū’s brothers become food for him; for it seems to be less the case that Tū conquers his brothers in order to eat them (Tū’s reasons for turning against his brothers are quite other than hunger), than that he eats them because they have been conquered, or have let themselves be conquered.

The allusion to Darwin is not wholly inapt. It is commonly thought characteristic of traditional or religiously-based cosmogonies to be teleological in orientation, an orientation sometimes considered to have been first systematically transcended by Darwin. And it is true that the genealogical versions of Maori cosmogony are most often teleological in orientation, resting on organic concepts or analogies such as those of gestation, birth, and growth. But in the prose versions, such as will be considered here, the motive force seems often to be located more atomistically, in individual species contending to locate a habitat and develop a suitable “ethos”. In this respect it is perhaps not out of keeping with the Maori prose cosmogony that incidents and plots which in some cases are integrated into long systematic recitations are, in other cases, found in fragmentary form as recounting one or a few cosmogonic events individually, and from the point of view of those particular entities.

THE LARGER FORMULATIONS

Yet the fact that cosmogonic events occur both in such fragmentary tales and woven together into larger major formulations, raises fundamental issues regarding how we should look at Maori cosmogonic narrative. Are the isolated tales that Best presents indeed intended as
such, or did Best fail to see the pattern — even though he did tend to group tales of this type together? Is the art of weaving together fragmentary tales into a coherent whole to be regarded as one of the skills of cosmogonic recital? Could cosmogony perhaps be viewed as a set of abstract principles immanent in a number of varying genres but not fully limited to any? Or, in line with some taxonomic framework of his own, was Best perhaps breaking down larger accounts into particular incidents? With regard to some issues it may be of use to attempt to specify the ways in which the smaller and larger formulations differ.

Among the most widely known cosmogonies is that which appears in Grey’s (1855) *Polynesian Mythology*. It originates in a manuscript written around 1850 by the Arawa chief Te Rangikaheke. In the Te Rangikaheke formulation, two particular features stand out beyond the series of individual incidents characteristic of Best’s tales of the second class. First, there is, set at the beginning of the account, an elaborately developed concern with the dramatic original separation of Sky and Earth, from which all of the other separations will follow. Second, there is, set near the end of the period of the original children of Sky and Earth, a concern to weave together the many events within an encompassing hierarchy. Between these two concerns, and held together by means of them, are specific little events like those recounted in Best’s tales.

I must be more specific about the kind of hierarchical relationship that is involved. Schwimmer (1978:207), following Smith (1974:34), has called attention to the incidents of creative “strife” in the Te Rangikaheke cosmogony, and has observed that through these various incidents both hierarchical and egalitarian relations obtain. Now, both of those types of relation are also to be found in the tales of the second class, aligning to some extent with the two types of plot that I characterised above. But what is specific to the larger Te Rangikaheke formulation is a particular, more embracing hierarchical relation that has as its most obvious feature a relating of the many to the one, as opposed to the ubiquitous one-versus-one of the smaller tales. Aside from this purely quantitative point, there are many specific characteristics of the hierarchical relation, which I shall return to below.

Te Rangikaheke wrote his account of the first origins of the universe (the story of Rangi and Papa and their sons) twice. These occur within the manuscripts designated as 43 and 81 in the Grey New Zealand Maori Manuscript Collection of the Auckland Public Library. There is a further body of material (manuscript 44) which Te Rangikaheke has entitled *Tūpuna ‘Ancestors’,* which carries forward the narratives contained in 43 into an account of the origin of the Arawa peoples. Curnow (1983:59 ff.) argues that 43 and 44 were originally one manuscript. All of these were published in transcription in Grey’s (1853) *Ko Nga Moteatea* while parts of each appear in Grey’s *Nga Mahi A Nga Tūpuna* and in translation in *Polynesian Mythology*. 
While it is beyond the scope of this paper to give a full account of
the contents of the Tūpuna manuscript, I should like to suggest some of
the relationships between the Te Rangikaheke accounts of the first
origins of the universe, on the one hand, and of the origin of the Arawa
peoples, as narrated in Tūpuna, on the other. I begin by summarising
the basic relationships that are set out in the account of the origin of the
universe. Because it is a summary of basic relationships, many details
of the originals are left out. I make no reference to the ways in which
the two accounts differ, and I do not claim to have captured the artistic
effect of the original. 9

Rangi (Sky) and Papa (Earth) at first cling together, enclosing their
children in darkness. The children multiply and seek for a way that they
might grow. Some argue that the parents should be killed, while others
argue that, rather, they should be separated, so that only one, the earth,
might remain a parent to them, while the other, the sky, would become dis­tant to them. They agree to separate the parents, with Tāwhiri (Wind)
dissenting. Each of the children, in turn, attempts to separate the parents:
Rongo (Kūmara), Tangaroa (Fish), Haumia (Fernroot), and Tū (Man).
Finally, Tāne (Trees), by putting his head down and feet up, is able to push
up the sky.

When the parents are indeed separated, then for the first time can be
seen the myriad of beings hiding inside the hollows of the bosoms of Rangi
and Papa. Tāwhiri, because he had not agreed to the separation, decides
that he will fight against all of the others; and so, when the sky is pushed
up, rather than remaining on the earth mother with the rest, he stays
within the hollows of the sky as it is pushed upwards. There, in consultation
with the Sky, he raises up a brood of descendants to send in attack against
his brothers — these descendants being various types of clouds and
meteorological phenomena.

When the children of Tāwhiri have become numerous, they are sent
out against the other sons of Sky and Earth. They attack Tāne (trees), and
snap them apart so that they fall to the ground to rot. They strike out
against Tangaroa, who runs off to the sea. The descendants of Tangaroa,
however, diverge, one group, the descendants of Ika-tere, going to the sea
and becoming fish, the other, the descendants of Tū-te-wēhiwēhi (lizards),
heading to the land. In parting they exchange insults, the former telling the
latter that they will be caught by fires in the fern, the latter telling the
former that they will be served in baskets of cooked food. The one group
cries "Us to the land", the other "Us to the sea"; and hence there is a saying
to that effect.

Tāwhiri and his brood turn to attack Rongo and Haumia, but the
Earth Mother protects these by hiding them in the folds of her body.

Then Tāwhiri turns against Tū, who is vexed as a result of the fact
that, in the gnawing of Tāwhiri and his brood, he alone has stood to fight.
Tāne was broken up; Tangaroa ran to the sea; Rongo and Haumia ran to
the land. Tū alone was brave in the face of Tāwhiri; they were equal to one
another in fighting.

When the anger of Tāwhiri is assuaged, Tū himself turns against his
brothers to seek vengeance against them for their failure to help him fight
Tāwhiri. He makes nets to catch the children of Tangaroa, and throws
them ashore. He goes after Rongo and Haumia; and even though the Earth
Mother has hidden them in the folds of her body, he sees their topknots sticking up and spears them with a digging stick, throwing them on the land to be dried by the sun. He fears that Tāne will be able to raise up a brood to send against him; and so he attacks the children of Tāne (the birds) with snares. So Tū's brothers are all eaten by him, and are thus made noa as a retribution for their sending him alone to fight Tāwhiri; all of them are killed and eaten, because Tū alone was brave enough to fight.

At this point, the karakia ‘traditional ritual incantations' are separated from one another, and also Tū's various names.

In manuscript 81, a kind of summary follows which skims over the last phases of origin, coming down to the generation of Toi and the fighting at Hawaiki that leads to the migration; manuscript 43, on the other hand, goes on to recount the Māui story.

DISCONTINUITY WITHIN COSMOGONY

As suggested earlier, the original separation of Sky and Earth constitutes only the first, though the most precipitating, of a whole series of separations that occur in the accounts of the origin of the cosmos. The same term, wehe 'to separate', appears in nearly all versions of the story of Rangi and Papa. Wehe appears to be a culturally important term in other contexts as well. It occurs frequently in karakia, and designates a certain category of karakia; it is also used to designate departures and dispersals, such as at the end of hui ‘gatherings'. The term occurs at least 10 times within each of the two Te Rangikaheke accounts of the story of Rangi and Papa, applying to the separation of all things of the cosmos — not just of the parents, but also, for instance, of the children, of the various names of Tū and of the karakia by which Tū will control his brothers. Michael Shirres (1979:23, 74), in the context of a concern with tapu, similarly notes the centrality in these accounts of the process of separation, commenting that it is “the key notion” in the early parts of the story.

It has been recognised for some time that Maori cosmogonies can take both prose narrative and genealogical form. In contrast with the prose cosmogonies which, though they may allude to prior epochs, tend to emphasise the separation of Rangi and Papa as the founding cosmogonic event, genealogical cosmogonies begin with sequences of cosmic elements, organised as names in genealogical recital, often starting with sequences of Pō ‘Night’ or Kore ‘Nothingness'. At some point the names of Rangi and Papa appear, and perhaps other allusions to the story of their separation.

Now, the first part of Tūpuna is in the form of a genealogy occasionally interrupted with short bits of prose. But then at the point of Toi, an ancestor of Hawaiki at the time of the migration, the account changes abruptly and fully to prose, though to return to genealogy again at a much later point. It seems to be a feature of Maori narration that long spans of time can be summarised genealogically,
serving among other things to indicate where in the long scheme of things a particular incident is situated. Because the genealogical part of Tūpuna covers the same period of cosmogony as is recounted in the two prose accounts of Rangi and Papa, and particularly because it is written by the same composer, it forms an important resource for studying the relationship of these two types of account, genealogical and prose.10

A more precise definition of the interrelationship between prose and genealogical cosmogonies will depend upon examination of many more examples. In this particular case, I am considering the hypothesis (not original to me, except perhaps in specific application) that the genealogical and prose cosmogonies bear the following complementary relation: they recount the same process, the former from the standpoint of demonstrating continuity, the latter from the perspective of recognising and emphasising discontinuity.11 As already suggested, the Te Rangikaiheke prose cosmogonies are both replete with incidents of separation, while the cosmogonic genealogy that initiates Tūpuna seems to cross over the same time span mainly by means of a series of cosmic elements, genealogically construed. It is as if in this genealogical ordering, disruption is subordinated to continuity. Yet, while the overall and most visible form in these constructions is that of a precisely ordered series of names, the names, taken individually, frequently denote change, growth, action. The names are typically nominalised verbs or nouns denoting actions (such as searching) states of will (such as longing), stages or conditions of growth or immanent growth (such as pregnancy), or organic entities directly associated with growth (such as roots). There are, in Tūpuna, moreover, brief prose interruptions. And as regards the above hypothesis of the interrelation of genealogical and prose accounts, the points that I should like to make here are, firstly, that those little prose interruptions often (though not necessarily always) seem to allude to disruptions and separations, and, secondly and more importantly, that precisely at the point where the Tūpuna account makes a definitive switch from genealogy to prose, to begin a long narrative account, it sounds the note of separation:

His [Toi's] sons were separated here [Ka wehea i konei āna tama]; some are at Hawaiki, and some of his descendants are in Aotea here . . . .

They were separated here — some of them were left in Hawaiki, and some came here in canoes. Tua-matua and Uenuku paddled in their canoes here to Aotea; again, at that time some of them were separated from each other, that is to say, Uenuku and Houmai-tawhiti.12

The late Hawaiki period and the notion of ancestral separation appear as linked in some other tribal traditions as well, though not in the same form. Regarding one of the pre-migration place-names, Best (1925:675), for instance, cites a Ngāti Awa authority:

"No Tane ma ka timata mai tenet ingoa a Mataora. No reira mai taua ingoa a Mataora, tae noa mai ki konei. No muri mai i a Mataora ka wehewehe nga iwi i raro i a Rangi" — (This name Mataora obtained from the time of Tane and his contemporaries. From that time the name of Mataora has
endured and is still known. After [the sojourn in] Mataora the peoples under Rangi separated.)

The same authority says:

"Te ingoa o te ao katoa, tae noa ki Hawaiki, ko Mataora" — (The name of the whole world, including Hawaiki, was Mataora.)

In Tūpuna, after the opening passages, the incidence of the term wehe declines; yet there does seem to be a distinct vocabulary and set of idioms in terms of which the settlement is depicted, some of them (e.g., the term marara 'scattered, separated') being common to both the account of the first elements and the post-migration settlement. The recurrent pattern presented in the account of the post-migration settlement is of a kind of radiation outward, above and below, from a particular centre.

Part of the artistic perfection of the Te Rangikaheke cosmogony seems to reside in the subtly depicted, often reciprocal relations that are constructed, and the poetic linking of these to relations experienced in the natural world. Compared with the account of these first elements, the accounts of the post-migration tribal settlements seem to exhibit less perfect symmetries and a less complete artistic closure — as if such qualities are displaced by "contingent event" and a "historical-particularist" attitude. Perhaps so; and yet the basic process of the creation of discontinuity — which begins, both in the story of Rangi and Papa, and in at least some of the accounts of migration hither, with the dispersal of a set of sons — continues on in the form of many memorable quarrels and agreements to part between founding ancestors. There is much more to be said regarding the processes through which the ancestors spread out from particular centres, and many of the particular motifs that occur within these accounts (e.g., that of finding a particular tract to be already occupied, and having to move on) also occur, as we might expect, in the accounts of the first "peopling" of the earth by the various natural species. To this pattern of dispersion we will return at a later point.

HIERARCHY WITHIN COSMOGONY

At the moment, however, I shall focus on a theme that the composer himself particularly emphasises. Tūpuna is an Arawa-centric formulation in which the composer attempts to enhance the stature of his particular group. This tribal-centric and tribal-aggrandising perspective would not seem to be inconsistent with much of what is otherwise known about traditional Maori society. The tribal-aggrandising perspective is evident particularly in a number of Ko te Arawa anake 'The Arawa alone' statements that are woven into the final part of Tūpuna. Of particular interest to the comparisons I am making here between different time periods in the cosmogony is that the first of these "Arawa alone" statements mirrors some statements
made about Tū in the story of Rangi and Papa. For one of the most central messages in the account of the origin of the universe, especially if we are allowed to count repetition as indicating centrality, has to do with the hierarchical relation of Tū (Man) to the other primary elements of the cosmos.

Then Tū sought for some plan by which to turn and subdue his brothers on account of their weakness in the face of Tāwhiri’s revenge over the parents, so that it had been he alone who had been brave enough to fight.14

This same statement is repeated at least five times, with slight variation, within the two manuscripts that recount the story of Rangi and Papa. Now the first of the several ‘Arawa alone’ statements of Tūpuna reads:

The Arawa alone was strong enough to return to Hawaiki to fight, to seek revenge for the expulsion hither. . . . [The statement is repeated again and amplified in the passage that follows.]15

Hierarchy is thus asserted in both cases — the origin of the elemental relations of the universe, and of the social relations among migrating peoples — not in the first instance through depiction of conquest by one of the others, but rather by reference to a differential ability among entities to redress a grievance that has been perpetrated equally against all of them. In this particular respect there is an analogy: the Arawa is to other canoes as Tū is to the other sons of Rangi and Papa. Perhaps it is not so much a deliberately constructed analogy, as one that merely shows up as a result of a singular “underlying” notion of what constitutes a hierarchical relation surfacing at two otherwise quite widely separated points within the narrative. It is notable that in each case (the story of Rangi and Papa, the origin of the Arawa peoples) the hierarchical relation is asserted towards the end of the episode, as if to provide a potential centre for accumulating divergent strands.

The particular underlying notion of the hierarchical relation that is suggested here accords well with a logic that Smith (1974:23) suggests as a fundamental Maori orientation: “For the Maori, a positive was most typically achieved through the negation of a negative.” Hierarchy based in differential ability to seek revenge (rapu utu) accords well with other aspects of the Te Rangikaheke cosmogony. For not only are many of the specific events based on retribution (beginning with Tāwhiri’s revenge, followed by Tū’s revenge against his brothers for failing to seek revenge against Tāwhiri), but additionally, at the point where Tūpuna switches from genealogy to prose, the theme of the separation of ancestors is followed immediately by a comment that gives historical depth to the causes of the migration by linking the troubles to a number of ancestors from previous times.16 Some of the particular ancestors mentioned here, including Tawhaki and Kae, are noteworthy because they stand at the centre of a set of famous tales that focus in particular on the principles and workings of utu, seeming to lay down essential cultural models of those principles.
The establishing of hierarchy in the story of Rangi and Papa is particularly pervasive, in that the process implicates a number of different cultural dimensions, some of which I shall comment on briefly.

The first of these is that of "proper names". Comparative sociolinguistics would probably confirm a human tendency to invest names and naming with forms of power beyond that of referring. For a first comparative example, we need only cite the Judaeo-Christian Genesis (2:19) myth, where human superordination over the rest of the animal kingdom is marked by the human becoming the namer. By contrast, the hierarchical relation in the Te Rangikaheke cosmogony is marked by the differentiation of the name of the superordinate entity.

When his [Tū's] brothers were defeated by him, then his names were separated [here follow a series of names of Tū followed by different epithets]; his names were made to be equal in number with his brothers. It could of course be argued that this difference of form between Maori and Judaeo-Christian cosmogonies is arbitrary and of no significance. But at least in the Maori case, the transformation in Tū's name that accompanies his superordination corresponds well with what is otherwise known about Polynesian notions of hierarchy. The form of the hierarchical relation in this Maori example is distinctly that of "encompassment". The subordinated elements become facets, dimensions, of the superordinate; the superordinate expands and differentiates, summarising the totality which it embraces. All of this has some relevance to basic principles of Maori social structure (e.g., the "eponymous ancestor" that draws together the many as one), and, more immediately, to certain patterns, which we will turn to again, by which Te Rangikaheke attempts to portray Arawa ancestors as centres of such inclusive totalities.

Secondly, karakia 'ritual incantations' arise simultaneously with hierarchy, as both a dimension and a means of it. There are, within Polynesian cosmogonies, a number of different temporal perspectives. In the present account, the origin of karakia marks one distinctive form of cyclical temporality, which might be related to or contrasted with incremental and linear themes that are also in this account. In this particular instance, cyclical temporality is intimately connected with hierarchy. For karakia arise just at the point of subordination by Tū of his brothers, "... so that his brothers could be caused to return as food for him. ..." Thus we have the origin of the various seasonal food cycles.

Thirdly, the relation of tapu and noa is implicated in the origin of hierarchy. This is a complex issue which will only be noted, and not analysed here; Shirres (1979, 1982) and Smith (1974:33 ff.) offer some comments on it.

There is one other important point regarding the origin of hierarchy as it occurs in this particular account. It is a characteristic of traditional mythologies, and probably of all systems of knowledge, that certain relations occur as problematic and in need of explanation, while others are taken as givens, and, if anything, used in the construc-
tion of solutions for those that are problematic. The point to be made here is that, implicated in the above account of the origin of assymetry and hierarchy among the main elements of the natural world, is another asymmetrical relation, that of younger and older brother (teina:tuakana). There are definite patterns, including patterns of transformation, in the teina:tuakana relationship as it appears in the Maori account not only of origins, but also of all of time; yet the assymetry of this relation seems not to require its own origin myth. It appears, rather, as part of the answer in relation to other asymmetries, such as those among the various beings of the natural world, that are posed as problematic. The way in which the teina:tuakana asymmetry is played out in the above account is put to the side in this analysis, though the basic point that the account really involves two fundamental asymmetries — one more as explanans, the other more as explanandum — should not be allowed to pass unnoticed.

OUTWARD EXPANSION

The largest body of data available in English translation and dealing with the later phases of the origin of Maori society, especially of specific hapū, is that of Best. As data, these ought to be replaced with purely indigenous texts; but that, as Braudel (1972:18) says of the proper working out of his Mediterranean hypothesis, "... would take not one lifetime but at least twenty, or the simultaneous dedication of twenty researchers." In the meantime it can be noted that Best's characterisations of the origin of the Tuhoe hapū fit very well the pattern depicted by Te Rangikaheke's account of the origin of the universe and migration hither. The origins of those Tuhoe hapū frequently involve partings of brothers in the context of "fratricidal fighting" (Best 1925:251), often the expulsion of one, and his wandering about, to marry or settle temporarily with women in areas outside of his initial settlement. Schwimmer (1978) offers a number of highly original insights into such hapū foundings, as recounted in a certain type of local tradition. Tūpuna offers only a sparse prose account of this late time period, for the prose account falls away after the splitting off of the great migrating ancestors such as Ngatoro-i-rangi and Tama-te-kapua, with their initial settlements around the Rotorua area. And at this point the account returns to genealogy, portraying the period mainly through hundreds of names and a few terse genealogical metaphors which, however, are in character with the processes depicted in the prose account as far as it goes, and with Best's prose summaries of the corresponding period within Tuhoe. As already suggested, organic metaphors such as gestation and roots are commonly embedded in cosmogonic genealogies dealing with the first phases of the universe; and in recounting this late period of time, Te Rangikaheke returns to organic metaphors. From his Arawa-centric perspective, he likens the descendants of the Arawa to seeds, planted in
one place and producing a plant that sends shoots out into other areas: “However, only the people aboard the Arawa were the seeds sown in the land, with the creepers and the branches of that creeper spreading above and below, as far as the South Island and the Ngāpuhi.” 21

In the accounts of this period we find, as the other side of the process of contention and separation among founding ancestors, the bases of intertribal and inter-hapū relations. One of those bases of interrelation consists in the ever-present possibility of two or more groups referring back to a common ancestor before a split. If there is any paradox in these points of partings between ancestors serving, retrospectively, as the points where unity between groups is affirmed, it is no larger than that embodied in the story of Rangi and Papa. For to read that account, one can only conclude that, as suggested earlier, it is about separation: that is what all the “action” of the story consists of. And yet it seems as if in the present day, Rangi and Papa, as the parents of all earthly beings, are evoked primarily as symbols of unity.

A second important base of tribal and hapū interrelation, accruing from this period, is that of intermarriage between groups — which once again is often set in motion initially by a parting between brothers, one setting off to live in a new area.

One may ask, however, what it is, in these situations of ancestors setting off to settle in new areas, that is specifically held to be the basis of the later tribal interrelation. A point that I think has not been adequately stressed in anthropological theory is that any particular group may have several different (either complementary or competing) formulations of its own principles; and so I wish to make clear that what I am going to say should not be taken as a hypothesis of the indigenous Maori formulation of a “socio-logic” of exogamy. What I suggest is that within certain formulations it appears that the “idea” in terms of which interrelation based on tribal intermarriage is constituted, consists not so much of prestation of spouses — much less ongoing systems of exchange of spouses — as of the notion of the growing up of descendants by an outsider within groups other than that of his most direct connection through descent. These other groups may be conceived of specifically as an indigenous population vis-à-vis immigrants from Hawaiki, as in many of the Mātaatua formulations, or simply as adjacent tribal areas. Among other things, this formulation is fully consistent with the much-discussed cognatic orientation of Polynesian societies.

Though Best’s English-language summaries are not to be ultimately depended upon, his phrasing of the relationship is suggestive, repeatedly asserting that “the descendants of” a particular ancestor “are among” or “are principally among” — and at this point frequently listing several tribal groups (e.g., Best 1925:213, 214, 217, 220, 237). There is a mythical precedent in Tāne, who, in some accounts (e.g., Best 1925:763 ff.), as the supreme male fertiliser, wanders about engendering tribes from all of the different uha (uwha) ‘female elements’ of the
Maori cosmogony

world. In one sense, the different tribes so engendered stem from and are differentiable in their specific characteristics by virtue of the different females that are involved; and yet from another perspective the descendants are all part of the expanding family of the great wandering ancestor Tāne. Te Rangikaheke also speaks a number of times over in Tūpuna of certain Arawa “great ancestors” who raised up people and groups in various districts over the land. Let us recall Te Rangikaheke’s metaphor of creepers spreading out over the whole land from the particular centre.

Now, if there is anything to the above suggestion regarding Maori “socio-logic” of exogamy, then one other point can be made, in this case a point regarding the comparability of Maori to other Polynesian societies. For even though in the Maori case the process of outward expansion often takes the form of a series of particular contentions, partings and expulsions (often eventuating in the younger brothers settling in adjacent areas), this process is still comparable in other important respects to processes noted in other, seemingly more politically centralised Polynesian societies. I have in mind particularly the recent characterisations by Bott (1982, esp. 56 ff) of political processes in the Kingdom of Tonga, where junior members of the royal family were sent to intermarry within the more peripheral districts as a distinct political strategy calculated to draw them under its hegemony. The difference between the Maori formulation and the Tongan would seem to have something to do with the differing temporal character of the two formulations — or should we say that other differences eventuate in varying temporal perspectives? For in the Maori case, with some few exceptions, this expansionistic pattern does not appear contemporaneously with the events that create it, e.g., the event of the expulsion of a brother, which eventuates in an intertribal marriage. This does not mean that any of these particular events, taken in itself, is without political strategy; but, rather, that the overall expansionist pattern in the Maori case, becomes visible mainly post facto. As in the case of the dispersal of the sons of Rangi and Papa, the motives and ideas under which the ancestors are portrayed as carrying out the work of initial settlement seem to be local and atomistic, and the immediate results of their actions to be frequently divisive — dominated at least in the initial phase by partings. “Society”, whether in the political sense of larger overarching, integrative structures of authority (as of major tribal areas), or in the moral sense of ideas, symbols and motives that specifically transcend atomistic impulses, is realised at a later time and retrospectively. For the retrospective detailed genealogical recouping and interrelating of these events allows them to reappear with a different meaning: as various moments in a larger unitary process of progressive ramification outward from a particular centre of power. In regard to the suggestion made earlier about the relation in cosmogony between genealogical recital and continuity on the one hand, and prose narrative and the origin of discontinuity on the other, it is specifically
in the context of a return to genealogical recital, towards the end of Tūpuna, that this vision of something like a larger, unitary process most clearly appears.

Centralised Tongan society, too, is pictured as a product of a series of historical events. What is different from the Maori case is that the overall expansionist pattern is presented as being contemporaneous with those events, or even as preceding them. The Tongan pattern appears in the form of an ongoing conscious model or strategy in which particular political actions are calculated and individual events precipitated. What is, in Tongan narrative, portrayed as achieved through the motives of the actors whose deeds are narrated, is achieved in Maori narrative through the narrator’s own predicking of a larger pattern of which the actors themselves are not generally represented as being conscious. There is thus a very different temporal character in the two types of narrative construction to which many other aspects of these two societies can be related. Temporality itself, in this respect, can be regarded as one axis of transformation within Polynesian cosmogony and indigenous history.

A RE-EMBEDDED COSMOS

Finally, it should be emphasised that fleeing and hiding in order to raise up one’s own brood, and in time avenge an injury, is itself an important Maori cosmogonic theme. The first instance is Tāwhiri, who hides in the hollow clefts of Rangi in order to raise up a brood to send out after his brothers. The theme is mentioned again in the case of Tū’s fear that Tāne will raise up a brood with which to attack his descendants, and this is the reason that Tū (Man) attacks the descendants of Tāne (the Birds). Needless to say, the same themes occur in the tribal histories; the whole theme of escaping remnants (of which the migration itself constitutes the most obvious example) and of the threat that is sometimes perceived to lie in the descendants of such remnants, ought to be examined in more detail specifically in the context of cosmogony. The frequency of themes like this, with built-in temporality (such as the waiting for a brood to arise), imparts to Maori cosmogony a particular flavour, consisting in part of a feeling of a world that demands at any time to be viewed not so much as a series of constant elements, as of so many immanent possibilities that may unfold in time.23

There is another challenge to analytic schemes inspired by the notion of systems of discrete units. While I have emphasised the fragmenting, ever-specialising nature of the universe as represented in cosmogony, that picture alone is ultimately not adequate. For part of the process of separation is a search for protection, which is often found within elements outside one’s most immediate kin. So there is a kind of re-embedding based partly on the fact that escaping is an escaping into.24
At the same time that things are becoming (relatively) discrete, they are also becoming interwoven in highly complex ways, some ending up inside others — inside not in the classificatory sense of a "subset" but physically living within, and, perhaps, morally under the protection of. Viewing Maori cosmogonic genealogies such as those presented by Best as classification, it might be objected that, from the standpoint of theory of classification, it makes no difference how the classified entities interact with one another. This can be accepted, provided that we then do not attempt to infer very much from "classification". However, in practice we are often led to try to read something of a world picture from it.

The story of Rangi and Papa contains a number of instances of the various elements providing refuge for one another; and refuge among more distant kin can be found in many of the little tales that Best presents. Tangaroa is at war not only with Tū and Tāwhiri but also with the sun; Hine-moana (Ocean Maid) protects the children of Tangaroa, and if ever they leave her protection the sun kills them (1925:776). Māui tries to gain complete control of fire by taking all 10 fingers of his ancestor Mahuika; Mahuika rages and threatens to envelop the whole land. Māui uses karakia to bring rain to control fire, for only water can overcome Mahuika; and when fire is threatened with total extinction, it escapes into hiding in certain trees and rocks, where it still resides today (1925:790 ff.; 1982:247 ff.). Even while Papa, the Earth Mother, is protecting her children in the folds of her body, and while the Ocean Maid protects the descendants of Tangaroa from the sun, the Ocean Maid is making war on the Earth Mother. Mirabile dictu, various beings — whose names are based on forms of rock, gravel and sand — protect Papa from the constant gnawing of the Ocean Maid (e.g., 1982:253). But while some of the stone family protect Papa, nevertheless they are at war among themselves; and one of their own, Greenstone, flees to the Swamp-Maid, who provides refuge (1982:327). A certain swarm of insects are under the sway of the Mist Maid, who comes down and feeds her folk at night, and leaves with the morning breeze (1982:268).

It is perfectly true, then, that the world-picture embodied in Maori cosmogony is one of "strife", as previous scholars have stressed. Moreover, it is from another manuscript by Te Rangikaheke that derives the striking line that refers to "... strife, the most important thing remaining in this mortal world" (Biggs 1960:87). Yet the picture is really made more complex by this constant theme of things giving refuge to others, hiding remnants, perhaps to grow and then in time be released again. Produced within the strife are complex lines of interpenetration and interdependence (in this respect the picture is not unlike that furnished by Western biology). This aspect of the general world-picture seems at least not inconsistent with the point made earlier about exogamy; for in the nonhuman tribes as well, the quest goes on for spheres of protection, which are occasionally provided by tribes other than those of one's closest kin.
Cosmogony and Unity

Perhaps I have concentrated too much on discontinuity; but the topic of unity in Maori society is a particularly complex issue, in relation to which I am prepared to offer little other than the observation that it probably cannot be fully understood apart from cosmogony.

Belief in common origin, whether of all the elements of the universe or, more specifically, of the members of a particular hapū from a particular eponymous ancestor, serves as one source of unity. The interwovenness of the various diverse elements, manifested in the later phases in intermarriages between areas, provides a focus for extensive political convergence on intertribal levels.

There is also a kind of temporary, though highly significant unity, ritually created (or perhaps recaptured?) around particular issues in ceremonial gatherings or hui. Now Lévi-Strauss has to a limited extent considered cosmogonic processes in a particular analysis of origin myths drawn from disparate parts of the world (Bororo, Ojibwa, Tikopia) with respect to “the problem of the changeover from continuous quantity to discrete quantity” (1966b:53). Whether due to the nature of these particular myths or to some property of Lêvi-Strauss' method, the transition in each instance is presented as occurring in a single jump: all the major distinctions relevant to the particular system in question are depicted as being introduced at once. In the Maori cosmogony, by way of contrast, each separation, each new discontinuity, has its own specific place and time, as well as particular memorable details. Reciprocally, discontinuity is overcome in the ritual process of hui one piece at a time. Each incoming group is acknowledged separately in building up the totality; and it was stressed to me by Maori people with whom I discussed principles of hui that a successful greeting requires not general sentiments, but specific references to particular points of interrelation between the two parties. While the ritual process of hui does not lead to complete “communitas” in Turner’s (1969) sense (i.e., to a state in which social distinctions are largely dissolved in favour of a more immediate and spontaneous oneness), there does appear to be some sense that a group, once incorporated, is then part of the totality which awaits subsequent groups. But, more importantly, it is precisely the proper recognition (not the dissolution) of all the particular linkages that makes possible the sense of a growing oneness. For each addition, there is a specific story or mythical allusion in the stock of tribal and intertribal lore. The incorporation in each case takes the general form of a ritual conjunction of “land” and “sea”. The most common chant by the tāngata whenua ‘land people’ is an invocation to haul the canoe of the incoming group, inversely to the separation “Us to the land, Us to the sea” of the cosmogony. Within the system of a number of relatively balanced and autonomous tribal entities characteristic of Maori society, the ritual categories of “land” and “sea” are reversible, so that the land people in one context can be the sea people in another, thus instancing what may
be a distinctive Maori transformation of a central symbolic categorial relation which is more often found in Polynesia (particularly in the context of indigenous histories) as constitutive of permanent, non-reversible hierarchical relations.27

* * *

One lesson that can be taken from this example of the ways in which the conjunctive and disjunctive processes of Maori cosmogony and ritual depart from the cosmogonic paradigm that Lévi-Strauss at one point develops (which is not necessarily to imply that it was inadequate for the particular data he was considering in that instance) is that if we want to apply some of the insights that have come our way through structuralism to societies possessing dynamic, highly developed, encompassing cosmogonic frameworks, then those insights will have to be rethought in alignment specifically with this property.28

There have been many different themes that at some point have fallen under the rubric of "structuralism", one of the more agreed-upon being the orientation towards "underlying" form — which, however, has often in practice translated only into a search for atemporal categorial relations. But if the above example illustrates anything, it is that an inherently temporal formulation, such as the coming-to-be of a cosmogony, can itself possess an underlying form. A genuine rethinking would imply more than a recognition of underlying forms, or even of repeating underlying forms within the span of the coming-to-be; it would mean learning to view the coming-to-be itself as form, and as potentially indistinguishable from "ongoing" social life.

NOTES

This is a first attempt to locate some points for integration within various sources of information on traditional Maori society that I have worked with over the past few years. The particular issues dealt with here were developed mainly during 1981, which I spent as a visiting Fulbright student at the University of Auckland. While at Auckland, I received a great deal of scholarly assistance and advice, as well as generous hospitality, from the members of the Maori Studies Section and the Department of Anthropology in general. During the following year, I was associated for eight months with the Centre for Maori Studies at the University of Waikato, during which time I was privileged to live in the historic Maori community at Wāhi Pā, Huntly. At Wāhi I came into contact with traditions both similar to and different from those which are considered here. In the years that follow I plan to write something of my experiences there, in a form that I hope will be of general interest, and make my comments available to the community. While I consider my experiences from that period insufficiently "digested" to write about now, I should nevertheless like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the warm hospitality that I received during my stay. I owe a very special debt of gratitude to Te Arikinui Te Atairangikāhū and the people of Wāhi Pā.

While it is impossible to list here all of the individuals to whom I am grateful for assistance, I should like to mention a few of those with whom I have worked particularly closely. First and foremost I should like to thank Antony Hooper, Judith Huntsman, Bruce Biggs, Robert Mahuta, Roger Green and Steve Webster, all of whom not only showed in-
terest in my work, but also contributed in various practical ways towards making my stay possible. Secondly I should like to acknowledge Pat Hohepa, Merimeri Penfold and Mira Simpson for help in the study of Maori language. Though I received a great deal of generous assistance from all of these people, my practice was mainly with texts other than the ones I discuss here; and thus all of these teachers have no part in any of the mistakes I have made. There are also many others who, though often of quite different theoretical persuasions, assisted me in various ways; I should particularly like to mention Michael Goldsmith, Isla Nottingham, Ralph Bulmer, Garth Rogers, Andrew Pawley, Ross Clark, Peter Ranby, Robin Hooper, Ann Carver, Jenifer Curnow, Jeff Sissons, Valerie Sallen, Margaret Mutu-Grigg, Jane McRae and Michael Shirres. I am also grateful for the help and interest of the various archives of New Zealand, especially to Pat French and the staff of the Auckland Public Library, Sharon Dell and the staff of the Turnbull Library and to the University of Auckland and Hocken Libraries.

I call attention to two works, both of which became available only after this paper was written, which are relevant to topics discussed here. Jenifer Curnow's (1983) Masters thesis deals extensively with the biography and key writings on cosmogony and history of Te Rangikaheke, and includes commentary and a complete transcription and translation of manuscript 44 (Tūpuna) as well as large sections of manuscript 43 (Ngā Tama a Rangi) and manuscript 81 (Maori Religious Ideas and Observances). Her study concurs with mine on two main points: first, in the general characterisation of the contents of manuscript 44 and of their interrelationship with the contents of manuscripts 43 and 81; second, in the emphasis on the "Arawa point of view" (to use Curnow's phrase) characteristic of Te Rangikaheke's account. Allan Hanson has recently published a number of articles on Maori ethnology and in one of these (1983) he treats the category of tales discussed above about the original separations of the different beings of the natural world, citing some of the same examples that I have. While there are points of overlap between Curnow's and Hanson's works and my own, their theoretical concerns are rather different from mine. Consequently, I have not reduced or altered my own presentation to any great extent in relation to them.

1. The classic paper in this genre is one by Frank Cushing (1901:411-22) describing a Zuni narrator's recounting of the Italian tale of "The Cock and the Mouse".
2. The translation by Biggs appears in Biggs, Lane and Cullen (1980:20); the corresponding Maori text appears in Biggs, Hohepa and Mead (1967:32), and originally in Davis (1855). Best's texts and discussion occur in Best (1925:990; 1982:576-7).
3. Texts and translations of this tale can be found in Biggs, Hohepa and Mead (1967:56-7); Biggs, Lane and Cullen (1980:38); Best (1925:991; 1982:578-80).
4. See Grey (1971:2-3; 1956:6), Smith (1913:48, 156), Best (1925:994; 1982:578-9, 270, 317, 568-9). While they do not form the focus of this analysis, principles of ethnobotany are embedded in all of these accounts, for instance, here, the point that lizards and fish have the same ancestor. Within the great "web of kinship" many of the assignations of parentage are similar to those of the Linnaean "tree"; that is, they conform to the basically morphological principle of categorisation characteristic of the Linnaean scheme. But there is clearly another principle evident, among other instances in the account of the story of Rangi and Papa, that will be considered here. It occurs in cases where great swarms of minuscule beings habitually climb around on large ones, fleeing to them for protection; in this case, irrespective of form, the minuscule ones are the "children" of the great ones. Many insects, for example, are descended from Haumia (Fern) or from specific plants they inhabit (e.g., Best 1925:778, 994); birds are the children of Tāne (Trees); and one could as easily say that it is by a consistent ethnobotanical principle, as by a poetic leap, that such elements as Kūmara, Fern and Man are the children of the earth.
5. I am aware that there is a need for more precision in defining the scope of generality of many of the points that follow. On the one hand, it is now commonly recognised that a defect of much previous scholarship on traditional Maori society is the too-facile generalisation from items encountered in a particular tribal area. Regarding this point I have attempted to restrict the term "Maori" to cases where I believe there is evidence of a generality beyond the particular tribal provenience of the data in question. It is interesting to note, however, that most of the comments I have re-
ceived on this point were to the effect that I have under- rather than over- generalised. Several specialists have brought to my attention parallels in other Polynesian societies, and Edmund Leach has suggested parallels with Greek mythology.


7. In itself, the motif of a cosmogonic separation of sky and earth (and of these elements as primal parents) is geographically widespread, including Middle-Eastern, Mediterranean, South Asian, and Pacific occurrences. More important than the particular motif, however, is the general form of the particular cosmogonies in which it is integrated. That general form constitutes the object of this particular analysis of Maori materials.

8. Some confusion was created at the Congress by my remarking that I had been considering a "third" manuscript by Te Rangikaheke, in response to which Bruce Biggs called attention to Curnow’s thesis of two manuscripts. At that time I was merely using the term "manuscript" in the way the Auckland Public Library for certain purposes does, namely, to designate a set of papers within a particular folder. My point was simply that previous scholarship had focused largely on the accounts contained in two of these (43, 81), while largely ignoring the other (44), towards which many of the present comments are directed. I do not mean to advance any particular theory about the original connection of the material in those different folders.

9. Transcriptions of the two accounts occur in Grey (1853) and, less accurately, in Grey (1971). Among the translations are those of Grey (1855) and Biggs (1970).

10. Moreover, in yet other writings, the same composer discusses elements from the cosmogony in relation to other verbal forms such as karakia. One point that should be examined in more detail is whether some of the references that occur in the prose narrative sections (especially in 81) might be allusions specifically to genealogy or to terms that occur within genealogy, reflecting perhaps a tendency of narrative to keep itself oriented in terms of genealogy. Some of these have passed into Grey’s translations where they are presented as though references to lines from “prayers”. The original lines say nothing about prayers, and the specific terms or sequences are often of the type that occur in cosmic genealogies such as the one that initiates Tūpuna. The same may be true in the case of the other well-known Maori cosmogonic account, that published by Percy Smith as The Lore of the Whare-Wānanga. The original manuscripts behind this published account often alternate prose and genealogical recital. Percy Smith has, like Grey, excerpted the narrative sections of several manuscripts. In the section of the Whare-Wānanga accounts that tells of the initial failure of the sons of Rangi and Papa to find the female element, the English translation sums up with, “Hence, is this episode known as: ‘Tē kitea’ (the not-seen), ‘Tē Rawea’ (the not-acquired), ‘Tē whiwhia’ (the not-possessed). And this is the origin of these words. . . .” (1913:138–9). Now these elements — the not-seen, etc., — are the typical units in the cosmogonic genealogies. In fact, in the Maori text these terms are linked to genealogy (1913:33), a point that is left untranslated in the English text, where instead occurs, as in Grey, a comment linking them to prayers (1913:138, n. 1).

11. The proximate source of this hypothesis in my own case is Valerio Valeri, who should not, however, be implicated either in the particular formulation or expression as it stands here, or in the application to Maori materials. It is also a hypothesis that I would apply to genealogy and narrative as they occur only within the more highly formalised cosmogonic accounts, and not to all instances of these verbal genres.

12. For the second passage I have basically followed Grey’s (1956:99) translation, which may be suspect, but for which I cannot now offer a more certain alternative. The punctuation in the original is particularly confusing to me in this passage, and the transcription here (as indeed in all of these cases) should not be regarded as final.

"Ka wehea i konei āna tama, kei Hawaiki ētahi kei Aotea nei ētahi āna uri. . . ."

and, slightly further on,

"Ka wehea hoki i konei, ki Hawaiki ētahi, i haere mai nei ētahi i runga i ngā
waka i hoe mai nei ki Aotea nei, ko Tuamātua, ko Uenuku, ka wehea hoki ētahi i konei, ko Uenuku, ko Houmaitawhiti” (Ms. 44:916).


14. “Kātahi ka rapu a Tū i tētahi whakaaro māna kia tahuri ia ki te patu i ōna tuākana, no te kaha kore ki te rapunga utu a Tāwhiri mo āna Mātua, ā koia anake i toa ki te whaunai” (Ms. 43:894).

15. “Ko te Arawa anake te waka i whaikoha [=whaikaha?] ki te hoki atu ki Hawaiki whaunhai ai, ki te rapu utu mo te pananga mai, ...”

The term that occurs in the above sentence is actually “whaikoha”, but from the context and the fact that the sentence is repeated again, almost identically, with “whaikaha”, suggests that this is what the author had in mind (Ms. 44:934).


17. “Ka mate ōna tēīna i a ia kātahi ka wehewehea ōna ingoa, ... i whakaritea tonutia ōna ingoa ki a rātou ko āna tuākana” (Ms. 81:55).

18. See Dumont 1970 (passim.).


20. “. . . kia whakahokia iho ōna tuākana hei kai māna . . .” (Ms. 43:896).

21. “Otirā ko ngā tāngata anake o runga i a te Arawa ngā kākano i ruia ai ki te whenua, ā toro ana ngā kiwe ki ngā pekanga o taua kāwai ki runga ki raro puta noa ki te Wai pou namu ki Ngāpuhi hoki” (Ms. 44:932).

22. For instance: “Ko tētahi tēnei o ngā tino tūpuna nāna i whakatupu atu he tānga ki hea, ki hea whenua. Ā ko Hei anō hoki tētahi tino tūpuna nāna i whakatupu atu ngā tāngata ki ngā tautīwhenua nei” (Ms. 44:931).

23. Cf. Schwimmer’s (1978) comments on the hapū as coming to fruition only a number of generations after the founding ancestor.

24. From a formalist point of view there is the kind of analogy to the problem that “embedding” presented to a certain type of strictly linear generative grammar (see Chomsky 1957:Ch. 3).

25. The Maori text can be found in Biggs (1960:93).


27. In some of the Mātaatua formulations of indigenous history, the relation does occur in this nonreversible form — a point which I hope to develop in future analyses. Belonging to different contexts, the two formulations are not contradictory.

28. Lévi-Strauss himself has suggested in several instances (e.g., 1966:233) that his totemic perspective may not provide a fully adequate framework for the analysis of Polynesian societies.
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