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In the rural landscapes of New Zealand you will often pass a *whare hui* (meeting house) standing in a country paddock, or looking out to sea with the hills behind it. In Northland most of these houses are plain wooden halls, but in other districts they are often finely carved and decorated, in which case they are termed *whare whakairo* (carved house). Red-painted bargeboards reach towards the ground with a carved head at their apex, in some houses surmounted by a warrior figure who stands against the sky. The front wall of the house is set back, sheltered by a wide porch decorated with carved wall-posts and patterned rafters, the door and front window with their carved frames looking out towards the light. These houses provide a focal point for local Maori communities, linked together by kinship and descent, and it is here that the local people (*taangata whenua* or land people) farewell their dead, celebrate weddings and anniversaries, and welcome visitors to their gatherings. Every *whare hui* has a name, of a great ancestor or some event in the group’s history, and in the ceremonies of welcome visiting orators greet the house and the land it stands on:

*E tama raa, e Papa-tua-nuku, teenaa koe, teenaa koe, teenaa koe.*
Child, Earth mother, I greet you, I greet you, I greet you.

*Teenaa koe Papa-tua-nuku, hei tuanga moo ngaa uri whakatipu.*
I greet you, Earth mother, as a standing-place for the growing generations.

*E koro, te tipuna whare, e tuu, e tuu.*
Elder, house ancestor, stand there, stand.

In an ancient Polynesian image¹ the house is seen as the body of an ancestor, with its bargeboard arms stretched wide in welcome, the apical carved face as its head, the ridgepole its supporting spine, rafters as ribs and the interior the *poho* or belly of the ancestor. Inside the house each painted rafter rests upon a carved wall-post which also represents an ancestor, and those who sleep in the house at night like to lie at the feet of the ancestor from whom they most closely descend. Inside the house each painted rafter rests upon a carved wall-post which also represents an ancestor, and those who sleep in the house at night like to lie at the feet of the ancestor from whom they most closely descend. Inside the house each painted rafter rests upon a carved wall-post which also represents an ancestor, and those who sleep in the house at night like to lie at the feet of the ancestor from whom they most closely descend. On the walls hang photographs of the group’s more recent ancestors, and at *tangi* (funerals), photographs of the dead person’s dead kinsfolk are placed at the head or the foot of the body, while their living close kin lie beside them. At every ceremonial gathering the ancestors are present, summoned up by the high, echoing calls of the *karanga* (the call of recognition to another kin-group), hovering above the heads of their descendants, evoked in the formal speech-making and taking physical shape in the *whare tipuna* itself, its carvings and its photographs. Despite fundamental changes to the social landscape of New Zealand since European settlement, ancestors continue to have power and presence in contemporary Maori life.
Still, world theories as well as practical worlds have moved in the past two hundred years, and this paper explores some basic ideas about ancestry which can be traced in both early Maori cosmological accounts and the practical workings of cognatic descent groups in early Maori life. These include themes of male-female complementarity, senior-junior domination, the expression of mana as competitive success and the genealogical unity of all reality.

The word *tipuna* or *tupuna* 2 in Maori meant, and still means, grandparents, or relative of grandparent’s generation, or ancestor. Within this range neither particular generation nor gender is specified in the word itself.3 The ancestral house in many communities may carry a man’s or a woman’s name, and descent-groups of variable depth (perhaps 5-15 generations) are quite often named after women (although the frequency of this may vary regionally) and are described by terms which evoke the processes of pregnancy (*hapuu* lit. pregnant) and childbirth (*whaanau*, lit. birth). Women themselves are often referred to as *whare taangata* or ‘houses of people’, the necessary shelter for the rising generation, and it is often said *kaua nga taatatai e whati* – ‘do not break the descent lines’ – for if this happens the result will be the desolation of a ‘lost house’ or *whare ngaro*, where all the members of a family have died without issue (Best 1906:219).

Claude Lévi-Strauss has recently written of cognatic descent groups as ‘houses’ (Lévi-Strauss 1982:163-87) and Maori imagery gives this notion some support, yet the house is only one metaphor used in Maori discussions of descent. Another, more dominant idea is that of growth (*tipu* or *tupu*), from which indeed the terms *whakatipuranga* (generation) and *ngaa uri whakatipu* (descendants) are directly derived. An early missionary, Richard Taylor, observed that in Maori, descent lines were “compared to the *hue* (calabash), the main shoot or stem of which is called the *tahuhu* and the branches *kawae*” (Taylor 1855:155), and this image is also used in the early manuscript ‘Tuupuna’ (Ancestors) by the Te Arawa scribe Te Rangikaheke, when he describes the process of settlement from his ancestral canoe:

*Ko ngaa taangata anake o runga i a Te Arawa, ngaa kaakano i ruia ai ki te whenua, aa toro ana ngaa kiwe me nga pekanga o taua kaawai ki runga, ki raro . . .

Only the people on board Te Arawa were the seeds scattered on the land, and the runners and the branches of those runners stretched forth south and north (GNZMMSS44:932).

This also accounts for a saying which is commonly used to evoke ancestral descent from a distant homeland – *he kaakano i ruia mai i Rangiatea* (seeds sown from Rangiatea) – since only gourds, of all ancestral cultigens, were commonly grown from seed. Images of the sprawling tendrils of the gourd plant are also evoked in the curvilinear rafter paintings inside the house, and it was a useful metaphor (which may echo the ancient Samoan ‘vine of people’ (Dixon 1964:29)), for gourd plants creep and tangle across the land as they grow, striking subsidiary roots and flourishing, or sometimes unaccountably failing to thrive and withering away.

Plant growth and the growth of human beings are often held parallel in the semantic patterns of the Maori lexicon:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maori</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>tupu</em></td>
<td>generative force within an individual growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bud, shoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>inho</em></td>
<td>that wherein lies the strength of a thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>umbilical cord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hika</em></td>
<td>copulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hikahika</em></td>
<td>line of descent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kaawai</em></td>
<td>shoot, branch of gourd or other creeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>puu</em></td>
<td>origin, cause, source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>root of a tree or plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>heart, centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>main stock of a kin group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and some cosmogonic chants explicitly use a language of plant growth, as in this example from Hamiora Pio of Ngati Awa:

- **Te Pu**: origin, source, main stock of tribe, root
- **Te More**: cause, tap-root
- **Te Weu**: hair, rootlet
- **Te Aka**: long thin roots, stem of climbing plant
- **Te Rea**: growth
- **Te Wao-Nui**: primeval bush
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Te Kune: (conception, pregnancy, growth)
Te Whe: (noise, sound)
Te Kore: (creative void)
Te Po: (Night, the Unknown)
Rangi: Papa
(Sky Father) (Earth Mother)

(Best 1976:62).

The parallel between plants and people was part of a wider cosmic unity, in which all entities in the living world were held to share common fundamental characteristics. As Te Matorohanga, a nineteenth century Ngati Kahungunu priest, put it:

Nga mea katoa i tipu ai, i ora ai, i whati ahua ai, ahakoa rakau, kowhatu, manu, ngarara, ika, kararehe, tangata.
All things that tipu (grow), and live, have form, whether rocks, birds, reptiles, fish, animals or human beings (Smith 1913:13).

All entities in the world lived upon the Earth Mother, Papa-tua-nuku, and the universe was understood to be structured in layers (papa) both above and below the surface of the earth. The notion of layers was also fundamental to the language of descent, which was talked of as whakapaparanga tipuna, literally arranging ancestors in layers (Shortland 1851:103), and this was done from the source ancestor upwards, as Apirana Ngata, an early twentieth century tribal leader, made clear:

If you visualise the foundation ancestors as the first generation the next and succeeding generations are placed on them in ordered layers. The Pakeha equivalent, genealogical tree, gives you a corresponding picture. In setting out genealogies in writing or print the picture of the tree or the layers is turned upside down. This affects the mind of the modern students, because the foundation ancestors are placed at the top and the descending lines traced downwards (Ngata 1972:6).

The ultimate layer, or source, was Papatuanuku herself, and indeed it is impossible to understand Maori tribal notions of ancestry and kinship without turning to the various accounts of cosmic origins, recorded by Maori scribes and tribal experts in the mid to late nineteenth century.

ANCESTRY AND COSMOLOGY: A TRIBAL ACCOUNT

Myths sometimes set up a scheme of possibilities where empirically observable social groups . . . discover formulas for solving their problems of internal organization or enhancing their prestige vis-à-vis rivals. However, even in such cases, mythical thinking proves mysteriously prolific. It never seems satisfied with offering one single response to a problem . . . (Lévi-Strauss 1985:171-2).

Tribal accounts of cosmic origins survive in numerous versions in early Maori manuscripts. Some versions are more fragmentary than others, yet all, it would seem, derive the cosmos which gods and humans inhabit from a first, energetic impulse which generated a series of transformations involving Kore (the primal void which yet contained the possibility for all forms of life), Poo (darkness, night), and a triumphant emergence into Te Ao Maarama (the world of light). These transformations are described in a rhetoric of genealogy and growth, with each cosmological phase giving birth to the next, until the physical universe is set in place and peopled with sky, sun, moon and earth. The first talk of ‘tipuna’ in the texts with which I am most familiar is associated with Rangi-nui, the Sky Father, and Papa-tua-nuku, the Earth Mother; for example in the opening of Te Rangikaiheke’s beautiful account of the beginnings of human life in his manuscript Ngaa Tama a Rangi (The Children of Rangi), written in 1849:

E hoa, whakarongo mai! Kotahi ano te tupuna o te tangata Maaori, ko Rangi-nui e taa nei, ko Papa-tua-nuku e takoto nei . . . ki nga taangata Maaori, naa Rangi raaua ko Papa nga take o mua (GNZMMS43:893).
Friends, listen to me! There is but one ancestor of the Maori people, Rangi the great sky standing here, and Papa the earth who lies here. According to the Maori people, the take (roots, founding ancestors) of the past came from Rangi and Papa.

In this text Earth and Sky together are described as one, the male sky and female earth locked in each other’s arms making one entity which is the source of all successive ancestors. Gender is generative, and male and female together are foundational in this cosmic genealogical account.
While Rangi and Papa lay together the universe was dark, and the children they had produced were held between them in cramped, lightless conditions. The children thought they might kill their parents, but after a long debate decided to separate them instead. One son after another tried to push earth and sky apart without success, until Taane-mahuta the forest-god put his head on the earth and his feet against the sky and pushed them apart. Rangi and Papa wept bitterly, and one of their sons Taawhiri-matea, god of the winds, who had not agreed that they should be separated, went to his father the Sky, and attacked his brothers one by one. Taane-mahuta’s trees were snapped and broken; Tangaroa’s domain, the sea, became turbulent with storms and some of his children left to go on land; Rongo and Haumia, the gods of *kuumara* (sweet potato) and fern-root, hid in their mother’s body; and only Tuu-matauenga, the god of war, stood fast and resisted the hurricanes and gales. Tuu despised his elder brothers (*tuakana*) for their weakness and in his turn attacked them and ate them, capturing Tangaroa’s sea-children in a net; pulling *kuumara* and fern-root out of the ground by their hair, and capturing the forest-god’s children, the birds, in a noose. Only the wind-god remained unscathed, each of the other older brothers became noa (common, free of tapu) as they were eaten:


So Tuumatauenga caused his elder brothers to be completely eaten . . . Thus, he made his elder brothers ‘noa’. And he set apart his karakia (god chants) to return each of his senior brothers as food for him.

In this phase of the cosmological story the world was structured; light entered the world when Taane pushed his parents apart, and day and night were established. As the wind-god raged at his brothers they were destroyed and the *kuumara* and the fern-root gods hid in their mother’s body, while fish decided to stay in the sea and lizards deserted their parents’ domain to go ashore. As the children of each god separated and found their place in the world, the god of war attacked them, destroying the tapu of his older brothers (except the wind-god) and setting aside karakia (god-chants) to control them. In this account Tuu-matauenga is the ancestor of human beings, and they inherit his karakia and the command over birds, fish, fern-root and *kuumara* as their food. Right at the beginning of human life competitive striving differentiates the world, separates male from female, and overcomes primogeniture, placing senior brothers under control.

If one is to look for principles and possibilities for ordering social life in these cosmic accounts, then, at least four are very evident: the unity of all phenomenal life through genealogical connection; the complementarity of male and female; the principle of primogeniture; all of which can yet be overcome by a fourth principle of competitive striving, expressed in a language of war.

**ATU A AND TANGATA: GODS AND PEOPLE**

*He atua, he tangata*  
A god, a person

*He atua, he tangata, ho!*  
A god, a person!  
*(from the East Coast haka (war-chant) Ruamoko)*

It would be surprising if there were not close structural parallels between the activities of gods and people in Maori, because the line between ancestor-gods and their human descendants was finely drawn in the old tribal theories of the world. In an early anonymous Maori manuscript it is said that when a chiefly child was born, his or her ancestors were summoned by a priestly expert and gathered upon a *koromiko* branch that the priest held in one hand. These ancestors were then transferred to the head of the child as a source of mana (supernatural power) and bound there by karakia or godly chants. Such a child was the living ‘face’ of his or her ancestors, and as such was treated with reverence and respect by the people (GNZMMSS28). It is not possible to say from this manuscript whether either priest or child was male or female since in Maori, gender is not marked in pronouns, in the word *tamaiti* (used in this text for ‘child’) or indeed in many key words including *tipuna* itself. In an account of the *tohi* or ‘baptismal’ rite given to Best by a Ngaati Kahungunu expert it is in fact explicitly stated:

Now, this way of baptising (*tohi*) highborn children (*tamariki ariki*) described by me, whether they are male or female, this is the procedure written down here (Best 1929:267).

It seems clear from many early sources that priestly experts (*tohunga*) and the highest-born chiefs (*ariki*) could be either male or female; R.P. Lesson, an early French explorer, noted the ‘*wahine tohonga* or wise women’ as well as ‘*wahine ariki*’ in his visit to the Bay of Islands in 1824 (Sharp 1971:97,99), and Colenso among others is unequivocal that the highest-ranking person in a tribe could be either male or female:
The tribe or sub-tribe having sprung from one progenitor, the greatness of any one of it depended, partly, on his nearness to that progenitor, and partly on the rank, power, and influence of his own immediate parent or ancestor (male or female), who had married into the tribe. Thus, paradoxical as it may appear, the children were often of a higher rank then either of their parents. The children of a principal chief by wives of unequal rank would not all be of one rank, as their rank always depended on that of their mothers as well as on that of their fathers. The first-born of the eldest of the tribe, whether male or female, was called *ariki* (i.e. first-born, heir, high chief or ruler), and besides his high rank had great privileges. Of him, or her, great care was taken (Colenso 1875:21).

Shortland also clearly states that “the word Ariki, however, means no more than the heir male, or heir female of any family” (Shortland 1856:228), and he goes on to explain that such male or female children were venerated as living links between the ancestor-gods and their descendants, and as necessary mediators in all key ritual exchanges between them (Shortland 1856:104). Because of the closeness of this link they were *tapu* in a way which increased in intensity throughout their lives.

Furthermore, according to an early missionary, Turner:

They that have eaten Human Flesh are considered as Deities while they are alive, and by the name of *Atua* (god) they are often addressed; and even the Body itself when the Spirit is fled is called *Atua*; so that, according to their View, they are themselves deified, Body and Soul, dead and alive. When any are afflicted among them they say the *Atua* has got within and is eating them; and in this Way, according to their View, all their Afflictions and Death are brought about. When they die they tell us that their left Eye becomes a Star; the bright ones are those of their great Men, and the dim ones those of their Slaves (GBPP 1838:212; see also Marsden 1932:220).

Thomas Kendall, one of the first missionaries to work in New Zealand, elaborates this further:

As soon as Duaterra was dead the Natives called his Corpse *Atua* as they do all other dead people. Whenever we came near a place of Taboo'd ground and ask the reason why it is taboo'd: if a person has been buried in it, we always receive for an Answer “*Atua* lies there” (Kendall 1815:IV, footnote 24).

It is evident that such intense *tapu* could apply to women who had died as well as men, dependent in both cases on their rank, for many early European observers describe elaborate sepulchres marking the burial place of particular women (e.g. Marsden 1932:269, Wakefield II:91); and Joel Polack, an early trader, spelled out the implication of this to a House of Lords inquiry in 1838:

**Witness:** Even Women are allowed to be Chiefs.

**Question:** Do you know an Instance of that?

**Witness:** I was passing a Cemetery in my Boat; I asked whose it was; they said it was such a one’s, mentioning the Name of a Chiefess; that she was buried there; then they said, “Do not stay here, the *Atua* will come upon us.” That is, the God will lay hold of us (GBPP 1838:82).

Edward Shortland, the first Protector of Aborigines, explained in 1856 that while the gods who guarded various domains of nature were *atua* who had to be propitiated and commanded through *karakia* (godly chants), the *atua* with whom people communicated most closely were their own tribal and family ancestors who watched over their descendants, hovered over their heads in battle, and spoke to their living kin in dreams, visions, *tohu* (signs or omens) and the messages of mediums (Shortland 1856:81-3). War was therefore understood as a combat between gods as well as people, and victory was consummated by ritually eating the defeated chiefs, the living ‘face’ of their ancestors, and so conquering and incorporating the *tapu* of the defeated gods as well. In this most powerful of living moments, high-born men and women are reported to have played parallel and co-ordinate roles:

When they have got possession of a chief and his wife, after the woman is killed, their bodies are placed in order before the chiefs. The *areekee*, or high priest, then calls out to the chiefs to dress him the body of the man for his god. The priestess, who is also an *areekee*, then gives the command to the wives of the chiefs to dress the woman for her god. The bodies are then placed on the fires and roasted by the chiefs and their wives, none of the common people being allowed to touch them as they are *tabooed* (Marsden 1932:174).

How far this statement reflected actual practice in warfare it is impossible to say; nor is it possible to locate this claim in any precise region of the country. It is clear though that in some places at least in theory, high-born women and men acted symmetrically as mediators with their own gods, ritually conquering those of their
own gender from another group. At the critical interface between ancestor-gods and their descendants, the principle of complementarity between male and female – what one might call the ‘Rangi-Papa principle’ – appears to have been preserved in a number of key rituals (see also GNZMSS28), and gender does not appear to have been a major barrier to rank. Moreover women who played such ritual roles were subject to intense tapu restrictions, in flat contradiction of the common claim that Maori women were necessarily noa (unrestricted, free of tapu).

TUAKANA – TEINA: A QUESTION OF SENIORITY

In the cosmological story discussed above, Tuu-matauenga the god of war and ancestor of human beings attacked his older brothers (tuakana) and ate them in revenge for their weakness. Primogeniture enters human history with an immediate qualification, that only the forceful will survive and prosper, and that genealogical superiority will not necessarily fit one to lead the family group. Human beings from the beginning are established as teina (junior) to many other forms of life including birds, trees, fish, reptiles, fern-root and kuumara, but with an ancestral right to capture their senior relatives and use them for food.

In Maori kinship terminology tuakana within the nuclear family denotes an older same-sex sibling and teina a younger same-sex sibling, so that within the sibling group each gender has its own rank order. There is contradictory evidence, however, on the extensions of tuakana – teina to relatives within the extended family. On the one hand, Shortland reported that within this domain tuakana denoted an elder brother’s child (male or female) in relation to a younger brother’s child, or elder sister’s child in relation to a younger sister’s child; while teina denoted a younger brother’s child in relation to an older brother’s child; or a younger sister’s child in relation to an older sister’s child (Shortland 1882:106). Here a woman could be tuakana to a male of her own generation, but only by tracing through a senior member of a same-sex sibling set of the generation before.

On the other hand Elsdon Best, who derived most of his data from Tuuho people, carefully lists the denotations of tuakana in the extended family as same-sex (as ego) child of father’s or mother’s elder brother or sister, while teina denotes same-sex (as ego) child of father’s or mother’s younger brother or sister (Best 1904:25-8). In this way of reckoning a woman could only be tuakana to women of her own generation, or a man to men, but this could only be achieved by tracing through a cross-sex sibling tie the generation before.

One may capture this contrast by saying that in reckoning tuakana – teina status within the extended family, in the kinship terminology reported by Shortland male and female in the first ascending generation are kept apart and birth order is counted separately in each gender, but in ego’s generation gender is not important: thus a woman can be tuakana to a man. In the kinship terminology reported by Best however, only birth order counts in the first ascending generation, but in ego’s generation the genders are kept apart; thus a woman can only be tuakana to other women and a man to other men. What the two systems have in common is that in one or the other generation male and female are separated into parallel domains, within each of which seniority can be reckoned; and that in one or the other generation, women can be reckoned to be senior to men (and vice versa) by virtue of primogeniture alone. Thus both the principles of male-female complementarity and of primogeniture are expressed.

Further, in extending the calculation of tuakana – teina status to relationships of greater genealogical depth, the strategy appears to have been as follows: Individuals or group representatives traced back to a common ancestor, and then looked to that ancestor’s children and determined who among them traced from the senior siblings and who from the junior siblings. A line traced through successive first-born children was known as the aho maataamua (first-born line) (Best 1904:50), and such a line traced from a group’s founding ancestor was termed the aho ariki (ariki line). In the terminology reported by Shortland one would expect that only descendants who could trace through a same-sex ancestral sibling set could determine tuakana – teina status amongst themselves, but that this would include both male and female descendants. In the terminology reported by Best one can expect that in the ancestral sibling set only birth order (and not gender) would count, but that male descendants could claim to be tuakana only to other men on this basis, and women to other women. It is possible that Best’s and Shortland’s terminologies reflect different regional variants, and this may help to explain some of the bewildering inconsistencies in claims about the relative ranking of men and women in accounts by both Europeans and Maoris of traditional Maori practice. A further complication is that because of ancestral marriages there was often more than one way of reckoning the tuakana – teina relationship between given groups or individuals. This was called karanga rua (‘two callings’) and it was considered polite in receiving a visitor to trace to that person in a way that stressed their seniority to oneself, as a mark of particular honour (Buck and Aginsky 1940:201). Moreover, as chiefly marriages were often polygynous and wives could be of very different rank, primogeniture could be superseded if the eldest child was by a slave wife, for example, and not by the high ranking ‘head wife’ of a chief.
SENORITY, MALE–FEMALE COMPLEMENTARITY AND THE PRINCIPLE OF COMPETITIVE STRIVING

When Rangi and Papa's children tried to push them apart so that light could enter the world, it was not until Taane-mahuta put his head on the ground and his feet against the sky that female earth and male sky were separated, each into their own phenomenal domain. Taawhiri-maatea the wind-god then attacked his elder brothers (tuakana) for dividing their parents, with only Tuu-matauenga the god of war standing firm against him. In revenge for their weakness Tuu then attacked his elder brothers and defeated them, so that all but the god of wind lost their tapu or godliness. These gods competed with each other in mighty feats and in war, and in the process the unity of male and female was broken, and elder brothers were conquered by their juniors.

In human life competitive striving was also commonplace, in displays of mana or supernatural power to act. In war, in magic and in fasting, groups and individuals challenged each other and only the most courageous and determined could survive. War was pre-eminently a male activity, and although some women (particularly older women) did sometimes participate (Nicholas 1817 I:200), men gained a degree of dominance by protecting the group's interests in this way. The male principle expressed itself in stated preferences for a first-born male child in chiefly families and male leadership, and this often worked against the male-female balance otherwise expressed in many key rituals, the terminological reckoning of seniority and the claims of both men and women to aristocratic status. The extent to which male dominance was expressed in ideology and in practice clearly varied regionally, and very likely the contradiction between male-female complementarity and male domination worked out differently in different generations as well, depending on historical circumstances and the individuals involved.

On the East Coast of the North Island, for instance, at about the time of first missionary arrival, Hine Matioro was well known through the island as a great leader, a "woman possessing a large territory and numerous subjects" (Marsden 1932:175). During that period the region was evidently at peace most of the time, gaining its wealth from agriculture, carving, canoe-making and the production of fine mats. It is possible that during this era and perhaps for some time previously, war was not a major issue on the East Coast and women leaders were able to assert their aristocratic status in practical as well as ritual affairs. According to tribal accounts however, their status had been well recognised from earliest times, and many famous women are talked of in the tribal histories and numerous important descent-groups and carved houses carry women's names. Land claims are also often traced from women in both Ngaati Porou and Te Whaanaun-a-Apanui, the main tribal groupings of the area, and senior descent lines include many women as links. Arnold Reedy, an elder of Ngaati Porou, has said that many of the famous women of his tribe had authority over both land and people, and that younger chiefly sisters could by force of character and effective leadership supersede their seniors (tuakana) on occasion. "Remove the female genealogies" he said, "(and) our genealogies will be made common" (Mahuika 1973:268).

In the Bay of Islands, too, at the time of first missionary settlement, chiefly women described as 'queens' by the missionaries were treated with great respect by their people. Some of these women participated in warfare, others were described as making speeches which settled major group disputes (Nicholas II 1817:111), and in the centre of the fortified town of Okuratope in the inland Bay of Islands, the high chief Kaingaroa and his mother each had elevated carved seats six feet off the ground where they sat in state above their people. Kaingaroa's mother's seat also had a small store-house for her sacred provisions nearby (Nicholas I 1817:338-9).

Regional variations in the relative status of men and women are difficult to sort out retrospectively, because the records are very uneven in quality and quantity for different districts, but it does seem clear that women in all tribes had property rights, played co-ordinate roles in many rituals with men and often had great influence in practical affairs. Agnatic preferences were probably always stated, but the principle of balance between men and women both in theory and in practice was also very strong.

The contradiction between the principle of primogeniture and the recognition of mana as success in practical affairs also worked out variably in different regions and in different generations. Octavius Hadfield, a missionary, wrote:

"The chief of a tribe must be regarded as holding his position by a double title. His first title must arise from his undoubted descent through a long line of well-known ancestors from the original head of the tribe. His second title depends on a more democratic principle – that is, he must be the acknowledged and the elected head of the tribe. The chief is the representative of the territorial right of the tribe, not because he is descended from numerous ancestors of noble blood, but because he has been acknowledged as such on account of his personal qualifications and influence, and has, in fact, been recognised as the guardian as well as the mouthpiece of the rights of the tribe (AJHR 1890, G-1:10).

The senior descent lines were well known and provided a pool of potential leaders in any given generation. There were, however, various ways of tracing seniority and this gave flexibility for recognising and
legitimating the leadership of able people. The senior-born male (and in some regions female) in the senior line was always the preferred leader, but descent lines could wax and wane, and a line that produced a succession of leaders with evident mana could come to be regarded as senior over time. The reckoning of genealogy was therefore a pragmatic art which operated in a field where many possibilities existed, and few aho ariki (ariki lines) were based purely on primogeniture and disputes over seniority could readily occur.

TAKE: ‘ROOTS’, FOUNDING ANCESTORS

At the beginning of the cosmological story it is said ‘There was but one ancestor of the Maori people, Rangi standing here and Papa-tua-nuku lying here . . . The take (roots, founding ancestors) of the past came from Rangi and Papa.’ The notion of founding ancestors as ‘roots’ links people to the soil, and evokes again the image of the gourd plant, sprawling across the ground. The plant has one main root and stem (taahuhu ‘main line of descent, house ridgepole, main stem of creeper’), but as it grows it strikes secondary roots and puts out branches (kaawai ‘subsidiary line of descent, strand in plaiting, branch’).

Ancestral claims to land were often described in the early contact period by reference to particular founding ancestors or take who had exercised occupation rights founded on first cultivation, erection of dwellings, snaring birds or rats, gathering edible berries, digging fern-root, building eel weirs etc, and lands claimed in such a way were termed papatipu (lit. ‘growing ground’). Metaphorically such arguments also became described as take, but the source of the image is clear, in Shortland’s account of disputes over land for instance:

The Counsel for the plaintiff opens his case by naming in a loud voice some ancestor A, of his party, whom he calls the root of the land. “Ko Mea te taki (sic) o te Kaigna (sic). Na . . .” “So-and-so is the root of the estate. Now then . . .” is the form of words in which they invariably commence. He then endeavours to prove that this root exercised some right of ownership undisputed by anyone, and deduces, step by step, the descent of his clients from this ancestor or root (Shortland 1851:96).

This procedure could also be used to claim a living person as the ‘root’ of a particular group in land matters, as Wakefield described in 1845:

Rangi Tauwira, the old chief nearly bent double with age, arrogated, without exciting a murmur of dissent, the right to be called the take or ‘root’ of the tribes. “I am so old,” said he, “that you can all remember from tradition better than I can tell you, whether this is not true. This is my White man; – the land is for him!” (Wakefield 1845 I:285, see also Maunsell in AJHR 1890,G-1:6).

Primogeniture does not appear to have necessarily given privilege in land rights, although the eldest child may have inherited the better lands and resources claimed by a parent, and great chiefs were not always principal landowners (Taylor AJHR 1890 G-1:17, Clarke ibid:8). Commonly parents divided their lands and resources equally amongst their children (Polack GBPP 1838:82, Bishop of NZ AJHR 1890 G-1:3), although this was by no means always the case, for a disobedient child could be disinherited and a favoured child might be particularly well treated by a dying parent. Evidence on the land rights of women is somewhat contradictory; Shortland in 1882 stated that “Male children succeed to their father’s land, female children to their mother’s land” and in support quoted a proverb:

Nga tamariki tane ka whai ki te ure tu, nga tamariki wahine ka whai ki te u-kai-po.
Male children follow the erect penis, and female children follow the night-feeding breast.

This is probably a statement of ideology rather than invariable actual practice; Shortland also claimed on a similar basis that women who married a man of another tribe lost all rights to their mother’s land:

Haere atu te wahine, haere maro-kore.
The woman goes without a girdle (Shortland 1882:93).

and that only when the woman’s child was raised by her brothers was her land right maintained (see also Stack AJHR 1890 G-1:22, White ibid:12-13, Swainson ibid:10).

There are many other sources, however, which assert that women kept their land rights even after an exogamous marriage; for instance Polack cited two women who had brought large quantities of land and slaves with them on marriage (GBPP 1838:83), and McDonnell made it clear that such land-rights remained the wife’s, for transmission to her children:

If a chief, a landless one, took for a wife one who had extensive lands, he was made none the richer, and unless she chose to give him a piece he could not claim a square foot. The wife, however, as a rule, kept
her land for her children or for her tribal relations (AJHR 1890 G-1:7, see also Shortland 1856:141; Taylor 1855:164,5; Bishop of NZ AJHR G-1:3).

The land-rights might revert to the wife's people if she died without issue, if the marriage broke up or if her descendants did not occupy the land, and indeed the practice may have varied regionally and in different circumstances, but the great weight of early evidence indicates that women often inherited land and resource rights, and that on occasion they were principal landowners and the ancestral source of claims to land.

Claims to resources appear to have been exercised at different levels: particular cultivations, eel-weirs, rat-runs and birding-trees could be identified as the property of particular families and even individuals, and the resources controlled by the head of a family were usually scattered amongst those of other members of the wider descent-group and even those of other tribes. After generations of consistent use within the family such rights were regarded as indisputable, and the process of division among heirs could lead to minute sub-division of cultivable land in particular (AJHR 1890, G-1:3,4). There was always an overriding group interest in such resources, however, and they could not be given to another group as a marriage gift, in reparation for some offence etc. without general agreement, for as it was often argued:

A man's land is not like his cow or his pig; that he reared himself; but the land comes to all from one ancestor (Martin AJHR 1890 G-1:5).

Furthermore, where there was no particular pressure on resources rights were regarded as being held in common by the members of a descent group, and the group's leader notionally represented such group claims to land. The beauty of the *take* system was its tremendous flexibility, because by genealogical 'shunting' claims could be based on immediate, medium distance or ancient ancestral *take*, depending upon the degree of division of resources required, and the particular purpose for which the claim was being made. Ultimately it was always possible to go back to the first founding ancestor from whom the descent group traced its unity to justify the assertion of communal rights over resources; yet in different ecological environments and for different purposes corporate descent groups of varying scale could readily form and re-form.

**Cognatic Descent Groups in Maori**

This flexibility may help to explain the variable ways in which corporate descent groups were described in Maori. *Iwi*, which has often been taken to describe a large-scale corporate descent grouping (hence the usual translation 'tribe'), was rarely used prior to 1900 to refer to corporate descent groups (Sissons 1984:54). More commonly it referred to confederations of corporate descent groups which could be linked by descent from a common ancestor, by political alliance, by affinal ties or some combination of these, or to a broad category of people linked by descent, in a usage still common when people speak in English of their 'bones': 'So-and-so is a bone of mine'. *Iwi* does literally mean 'bone', and reference to the bones of ancestors could be used to rally an army for war, as Wakefield reported the great Tuwharetoa chief Te Heuheu doing in the early 1840's:

> Where is Tauteka? Where are all your parents and brothers? Their bones are at Waitotara. Will you not join us in gaining possession of the bones of our ancestors? Will you not release your sisters from being slaves? A fight for your fathers' bones! Be brave! be brave! be brave! There has been enough of talk (Wakefield 1845 I:465).

*Hapuu* (lit. 'pregnant', often translated as 'sub-tribe' or clan) might refer to descent groupings of very variable size, from several thousand members to quite small groups of several hundred members, with a depth of ancestral reckoning that might range from 5-20 generations or more; or it could refer to a descent category of all those who could trace descent from a particular apical ancestor. Most commonly however, *hapuu* referred to medium-scale groups which occupied and defended territory and resources, and which defined themselves by reference to common descent from a named ancestor or ancestral couple perhaps 5-10 generations before. Such medium-scale *hapuu* could co-exist with named higher order confederations tracing from more remote ancestors, but there was often no neat segmentary descent relationship between the higher and the medium order groups (cf. Sissons 1984:55-6, Ngata 1972, Lecture 3:7-8).

*Whaanau* (lit. 'bear, give birth') could refer to such confederations, and to medium-order descent-groups, as well as to the cognatic kin groups traced to ancestors four generations or less in the past to which the term is usually applied, while *whanaungatanga* or 'kinship' was an inclusive concept of almost infinite elasticity, which could include non-human forms of life as well as people, since all traced ancestry from the first *tipuna*, the Earth and the Sky. Most commonly though, *whaanau* referred to groups ranging from the nuclear family to descendants of an ancestor who lived two generations before contemporary elders (Sissons 1984:166).
Evidently, then, the terms describing descent groupings in Maori were applied without precise attention to the scale and ancestral depth of referent groups, and terms in English which refer to hierarchical segmentary descent systems (tribe, sub-tribe, extended family etc.) do not provide accurate translations. The semantic ‘slippage’ in these terms towards inclusive descent categories also points to one of the key practical problems in the formation of descent groups in Maori, that of closure, which was addressed in a number of ways: firstly, by choosing an apical (and often eponymous) ancestor for a group of a desired scale and composition at a genealogical location which would ensure an appropriate living membership; secondly by encouraging endogamous marriage within the corporate descent group to reduce external cross-cutting ties; and thirdly by limiting effective membership to those who kept their rights to land and resources ‘warm’ by continuous use and participation in group affairs (often referred to as ahi kaa or ‘burning fires’). Groups were named Ngati-X, Nga-X, Ngai-X, Ngare-X, Te Atl-X, Te Whanaau-a-X (X being an ancestral name) or a name derived from a historical circumstance (e.g. Te Wahine-Iii ‘small wife’ for a group descended from a second wife); they traced descent from a common ancestor or ancestral couple; they claimed and defended land and resources; they participated in the life crises of members and defended their group’s mana in hospitality and war. Smaller-scale descent groups could close ranks to defend themselves against outside attack, but there was no segmentary system such that particular whaanau or hapuu invariably allied together in cases of war, although hapuu within a particular confederation or iwi might tend to do so. Alliances depended on affinal ties, current local politics, the ability of group leaders to attract support by oratory and genealogical argument, and balances of debts and credits in the relevant group histories as well as on common descent.

The key structuring principles of Maori cognatic descent groups are precisely echoed in the cosmological account already discussed. The complementarity of male and female, expressed mythically in the unity and then the separation of Rangi and Papa, was expressed genealogically in the tracing of descent through both men and women. According to John White land claims were also grounded in the rights of grandparents and great-grandparents, the closest possible tipuna, rather than those of parents, so that resources were ambilaterally claimed by descent criteria, not filiation (AJHR 1890 G-1:13). Leadership ideally came from tuakana lines of descent from the founding ancestor of a group, but given ambilateral reckoning and endogamous marriages the taahuhu (or main line of descent for a group) could be arrived at in various ways. As in the cosmological story a courageous, energetic teina (junior relative) could control his seniors, and so leadership often followed ability rather than birth. The possibility of challenges from junior lines meant that descent group leadership was necessarily democratic rather than autocratic, because the loyalty of followers had to be earned and cultivated; and the possibility of activating dormant descent links when this was advantageous meant that descent groups could wax and wane quite rapidly as circumstances changed. Chiefly families practised strategies of endogamy and the marriage of close relatives to consolidate their aristocratic status, but they balanced this with exogamous marriages of alliance on occasion and by the cultivation of extensive genealogical, ritual and historical knowledge to attract allies, affirm their mana and defend it from attack. Above all, as in the mythical story of the family of brothers, contestation generated structure, because in war and ritual alike it was necessary to take sides, and individuals were forced to choose between their genealogical possibilities – as for instance the wind-god Taawhiri chose to join his father and attack his mother while Haumia and Rongo joined their mother, and the family of fish stayed with their parent Tangaroa while the reptiles went on land.

The lives of individuals in early Maori tribal existence were at least potentially a constant negotiation between an array of genealogical possibilities and the necessity of practical choice. The complementarity of mother’s and father’s (and grandparents’) descent groups was expressed in life crises; at the birth of a chiefly child, for instance, it is said that if the child was male his father’s genealogy was recited and if it was female the mother’s genealogy was spoken, and in the birth rituals reported by Elsdon Best, the grandparents of both sides played important and symmetrical roles (Best 1929:245, 248). According to Marsden, at the age of 5 or 6 a chiefly child was given a basket of kuumara to plant. A male child was given such kuumara by his father, and a female child by her mother, and these plants were grown and supplied the seed kuumara from which each child subsequently grew his or her crops (Marsden 1932:477). The families of both mother and father considered the child to be theirs, and sometimes relatives of one side or the other would claim the child to be reared by them. In the case of a chiefly exogamous marriage, the partner whose land rights might be weakened by a shift of residence would often send a child to be reared at the home village, thus keeping the land claim ‘warm’. This child was termed whaangaiai (led); alternatively this term could apply to a child of a chiefly exogamous marriage whose residential grandparents wished to secure him or her against possible claims from the in-marrying partner’s tribe. Such a child would be given an ancestral name by his grandfather or grandmother, binding the child to their own descent group, and land on which to live (Graham 1948:268). If a child was hurt, even in accident and one parent was held responsible, the other parent’s group could ritually plunder (mara) the family as a punishment for such negligence, and this practice was also followed in domestic disputes if a wife, say, was hit without good reason. Perhaps because of these safeguards domestic
life appears to have been remarkably free of violence in early contact times; men carried their children with
them as they worked and to their assemblies, and women and children were almost never physically abused
(see Marsden 1932:128, 193, 283; Taylor 1855:165; Colenso 1875:30). Women and children were the
guarantors of a descent line’s continuity and accordingly valued, although if a descent line was unimportant or
there were already numerous children this might not hold true and infanticide and wife-killing might occur.
Adultery was harshly sanctioned, and this could often result in an erring wife or lover being killed or
plundered, or sent into exile by the group.

Marriage was often endogamous, in part to consolidate the corporate descent group and in part to prevent
domestic disputes escalating in a way that involved other groups. *E moe koorua ko to tuahine, kia kai iho ano
koorua i a koorua* (Marry your ‘sister’, so you only ‘eat’ (i.e. control) each other) was the advice often given
to young men, although *tuahine* or ‘sisters’ within 3 generations from a common ancestor were strictly
forbidden as marriage partners lest there be a *tipu heke*, literally ‘loss of growth’, or deterioration in the line of
descent (Best 1904:30). Sometimes however, the political advantages to be gained from an alliance with
another descent-group outweighed the potential disadvantages, and an exogamous marriage was made. In
such cases the question of residence and land rights could become vexed, and depending on the balance of
advantage the marriage could be followed by either uxorilocal or patriilocal residence.

There is conflicting evidence on the land rights of outmarrying chiefly women; most sources however say
that such women retained their land rights, especially if the marriage was uxorilocal or one of her children
came to live on the land. The woman’s own land claims did not pass to her husband, but to her children,
although he might use the land for cultivation or other purposes during her life-time, and the children would
have to use the land if their rights by descent were to be maintained, or else their claims went ‘cold’ (*ahi
maataaetoa* ‘cold fire’). Land was sometimes gifted to another tribe as part of a marriage settlement, however,
and such land did become the property of the other group according to the saying: “Mau te wahine, maku te
whenua, kia ai koe i te tore tangata, kia au hoki ai i te tore whenua” – “The woman is for you, the land is for
me that you may breed from a human vagina, and I may breed from that of the earth (i.e. by planting)” (Best
1904:65). Exogamous marriages might be arranged many years in advance, as in *taumau* betrothals, or on
occasion they could be the result of forcible abduction, which accounts for the numerous early reports of
instances of ‘marriage by capture’. The children of such marriages were subject to conflicting loyalties and
were termed ‘*taharuata*’ (two sides) who might act as envoys in warfare or less desirably, as spies.

The evidence on the land rights of the offspring of exogamous marriages is also conflicting; Shortland has
already been reported as saying that the sons inherited their father’s land and the daughters their mother’s land,
and that daughters only received as much land from their father as their father and brothers were prepared to
give them (Shortland AJHR 1890, G-1:12); but since in such marriages the woman was (quite often) the
primary landowner, it seems more likely that land was allocated by both mother and father to both sons and
daughters more or less evenly, but that this could vary according to particular circumstances. There are
numerous reports from the period of early land sales in New Zealand of people who, having sold the land they
were occupying, moved to other places where they had land rights, and except in areas of dense settlement
there appears to have been considerable tolerance of such in-migrating kin. The period in which land rights
could lie dormant and yet still be activated must have varied greatly in different circumstances, according to
local pressures on resources and the desirability of acquiring new members for the group.

At the time of death all the descent groups to whom the deceased person was affiliated attended the
*tangi* (funeral) and vigorous claims were laid to have the person buried on their land. The evidence is probably the final
contestation (except possibly in early times when the bones were later exhumed and reburied) among descent
groups for the individual’s allegiance, and it is in this light that the violence of some such arguments can best
be understood. Land claims, too, could arise from an ancestor being buried in a particular place, and this may
well have been an additional source of heat in such funerary debates.

Only slaves were exempt from such contestations; it appears that the process of being conquered and
enslaved destroyed an individual’s descent group membership, and henceforth he or she was assumed to be
under the control of the owning group. Slaves were thus sometimes treated as property or killed for sacrifice
or food, but even slaves could by peculiar force of ability and will rise to become group leaders, and if they
married a free person their children inherited that person’s descent group membership and claimed *mana*
under those ancestral gods.

HISTORICAL CHANGE

The cosmological principles of male-female complementarity, *tuakana-teina* status and competitive striving
within a universe of genealogical kinship were differentially affected by the experience of contact with
Europeans. At the time of European settlement (from 1814 onwards) European gender relations were
controlled by an ideology of male dominance far more severe than the agnatic biases that existed in Maori
reckoning of descent group status. European women were legal minors who came under the guardianship of
men, and they had no independent rights to control property or to formal participation in political decision-making. Moreover the Protestant religious sects which missionised New Zealand practised male ritual dominance, and under such influences Maori women had much to lose. The traditional ritual recognition of male-female complementarity was eroded by conversion to Christianity, and the jural status of Maori women’s land rights and their participation in political activity was placed under severe pressure by contradictory European dogmas about the rights of women. There is a great deal of detailed research to be carried out in this area; but it is clear that Maori women retained their customary rights to land when the Native Land Court was established in 1862, and thus had legal property rights as individuals before these were enacted for European women in the Married Women’s Property Rights Act in 1884. This fact was used in the Parliamentary debates over this measure to urge that European married women should be granted property rights that Maori women already possessed. Maori women did not become enfranchised until European women also gained the vote in 1893, however, and they then sought the right to vote for Maori women members in the Maori Parliament as well, as the following translation from the records of the 1893 Maori Parliament attests:

Meri Mangakahia:
I will explain the reason that I really want Maori women to have the vote and for women Members to stand in the Maori Parliament:
1. There are many women in New Zealand whose husbands have died and who own land under grant or papatapu land.
2. There are many women in New Zealand whose parents have died and who have no brothers, and who own grants or papatapu land.
3. There are many intelligent women in New Zealand who marry men who do not know how to run their land.
4. There are many women whose parents have grown old, and who are intelligent women with grants and papatapu land of their own.
5. There are many male chiefs in this island who have appealed to the Queen over the problems affecting them, and we have never received any advantage from their appeals. For this reason I ask this House that women members be appointed.
In this way perhaps things will be put right, and it might be suitable for the female members to make appeal to the Queen over the problems which affect us and our lands. For perhaps the Queen will consent to the appeals of her Maori women advisers since she is also a woman (McRae 1985:119-20).

The role of primogeniture in reckoning aristocratic status was also greatly eroded by conversion to Christianity since the ariki was the pre-eminent mediator with the ancestor-gods. The world changes that came with a shift to belief in the Christian god shattered traditional theories of existence, as Te Matorohanga attests:

Because the mana of the conduct of the karakia (incantations), the tapu (pi.), and the atua (pi.) has declined, now there is no mana and everything has changed. The tapu (pi.) have ended, the ancient teachings (koorero tuuturu) are gone, the karakia are lost and they are no longer known. Because tapu is the first thing, if there is no tapu all the works of the gods have no mana, and if the gods are lost everything is useless – people, their actions and their thoughts are in a whirl, and the land itself is now confused.

In this transformation the ariki lost most of their ritual status and prestige. Slaves, on the other hand, had a great deal to gain and it is no accident that many of the first Maori converts to Christianity were slaves, who thus gained a new god, and became his prophets to their people.

The inclusive, flexible reckoning of ancestry allowed groups to adapt rapidly to changing economic and political conditions, and as inter-tribal war was abandoned and travel became easier, exogamous marriages increased and the web of kinship intensified until a basis for reckoning ‘Maori’ as a descent category in
distinction from ‘Pakeha’ or European was consolidated. This has also had its costs however, for the transference of inclusive, ambilineal tracing of land claims into European law without the practical constraints of residence and long-term use has led to a disastrous fractionation of Maori land titles. As Eric Schwimmer has pointed out, this combination of an inclusive kinship ideology with the abandonment of former strategies for group closure (endogamous marriages, the requirement for residence and practical participation in group affairs) will also make it very difficult to arrive at workable ‘twi authorities’ in the current process of devolution of decision-making to the ‘tribes’, if descent from a common ancestor should become a legal criterion for membership in such authorities without some of the old mechanisms for group closure being restored (Schwimmer 1988:23).

The other cosmological principle which has proved to be adaptive is that of competitive striving and leadership by ability, for with the erosion of primogeniture there was still a basis for leaders to emerge in response to changing conditions. This they have done in early trade with Europeans, in war with them and in faith-healing, prophetic movements, in Parliamentary democracy, in the revival of tribal mana in the cities, and in the resurgence of ancestral pride and protests against European domination. As the mythical in-fighting between brothers predicts, there are costs here too, but also a surge of hope and striving towards a new ‘world of light’, and the old ancestral vines are far from exhausted as they sprawl and tangle across the land.
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NOTES

1. See for example Valeri (1985:302-3).
2. tipuna is a Western dialect form, and tipuna is an Eastern dialect form (Harlow 1988:3).
3. Greater precision was achieved when necessary by adding an ordinal (e.g. tipuna tuara ‘great grandparent’) or a gender marker (tipuna taane ‘grandfather’ and tipuna wahine ‘grandmother’).
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THE CEREMONIAL SELF
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One of the achievements for which Ralph Bulmer will be remembered is that he showed a way of relating ethnoscience to the traditional holistic orientation of social anthropology. The ethnoscience of the early 1960's was an appropriate reaction against that holistic approach which had often erred by ignoring the informants' conceptual framework. Ethnoscience introduced methodological rigour in our fieldwork procedure but in the initial applications of the method the holistic perspective of the discipline of social anthropology was often lost.

Ralph Bulmer was one of the very first to show the way out of this dilemma, by a series of studies whose method was based partly on Lévi-Straussian structuralism but also, and largely, on British anthropological approaches to studying social process. He took from the former a definition of "species" permitting him to link biological with social and philosophical domains while he always relied on the latter for his basic fieldwork analysis (Bulmer 1967, 1968, 1970).

Both these approaches aimed at analysing society as a totality in which a number of levels of indigenous conceptualisation should be distinguished. In this sense, the present essay is intended as homage to Ralph Bulmer. In its own way, it seeks to present the Papua New Guinea kind of ritual process as a totality while relying for our understanding of each conceptual level on ideas derived directly from the members of the society studied.

INTRODUCTION

This paper summarises researches I have made into "the ceremonial self", especially as it is revealed in the ceremonial of the Orokaiva of Papua New Guinea. The term is quite evidently not Orokaiva: it is derived...