

ariki or chief was not in any instance disputed by his own people or adjoining tribes, when exercised for particular purposes. It was in his power as ariki to say when the prohibition for fishing for shark should be taken off. He was also allowed to decide when the rat-snaring season should commence. He had also power to decide when and where a corpse should be buried, when that corpse should be exhumed and exhibited to the people, previous to its final interment, and also where it should have its final resting place. As there is a great deal of labour connected with the ceremonies over the dead, such as providing food for those tribes invited to the Habunga, it may be supposed that the ariki is supreme ruler of the people, and his word is law for the ceremonies of the dead. As the gods are in more immediate connexion with the dead and the ceremonies over them it is supposed that if the superstitious rites of the Maori are not fully carried out according to ancient custom, the gods will curse the tribe, so that the ariki is not obeyed on account of his own influence. An ariki also may covet any article belonging to another person, and upon his calling it by the name of any part of his own body the owner is forced to make him a present of such thing; still, this is not done in honor of his own rank, but on account of his connexion with the gods, as the naming of that article after part of his body (his body being the abode of the gods) prevents the owner from keeping it for fear of them, since no one but the ariki thus naming it could by any possible means use or cause to be used the article without incurring the displeasure of the gods. Not that such an act ends as a gift; if the ariki does not repay to the owner, or his offspring after him, a twofold price, he is looked on with disgust by the people, and thereby loses any personal influence which he may have. This leads me to the next point, namely, to shew by what means a chief may lose his personal power. The foregoing will shew that covetousness will militate against him, so will neglect to entertain visitors or an over austere manner to his slaves, or a bad memory in respect of past history and mythology; but that which inevitably excludes an ariki from any power over his people is want of intellect. If a chief or ariki should be loquacious or bombastic, he is thought little of by his people; hence a studied silence is the rule of a chief. In no instance will a tribe be led or listen to the counsel of an ariki of the ablest mind if he takes that which is not his own; but still his mana on other points holds good against all these obstructions; for instance, in a case where war exists between two tribes with which such an ariki may be related by his intercession with each he can bring about a peace. Still it is not personal mana that does this, his being related to them is the introduction to pave the way for peace, and as an ariki he carries the influence of the gods with him. This, of course, is not the only ingredient in the matter; but as the Maori people do not delight in war (though when once in it they are so proud that they cannot think of wishing or offering terms of peace) an ariki related to each of the contending parties may offer terms of peace to each without insulting their Maori honour; thus, therefore, is the mana of an ariki admitted, but still not on personal power or influence.

It will appear, then, that any influence which may be exercised by an ariki or chief is allowed by the people and not assumed by right of birth; this I will illustrate by a few examples. I must, however, state that in times of peace an ariki does not appear to be anything more in the tribe than the minor chiefs, save that he eats alone and that the house in which he sleeps must not be polluted by food being taken into it nor the fire at which he sits be used for cooking, for fear of the gods. He cultivates with his people, if he is so inclined; but as a general rule he is merely the overseer of the work, receiving at the harvest a portion of the crop. This last remark must not lead any to suppose that the crops of a minor tribe or hapu are not common property, for the produce of a hapu is stored altogether, and the food cooked at a settlement is a common meal at which all the hapu partake; then as such, the ariki receives his portion when cooked. But in cases of dispute in the tribe, a minor chief may set at defiance the opinion of the ariki, and act as seems to him good. An instance of this occurred where a minor chief had a dispute with another member of the tribe, belonging to Waka Nene. The minor chief, Ngahu, having taken a horse from his opponent, Waka interfered, and sent a man to bring the horse back; but the messenger was insulted by being asked what Waka had to do in the matter. Waka knew he could not use force, and therefore as ariki he sent his own horse to Ngahu, saying that if it was really a desire on the part of Ngahu to have a horse and that he had merely taken the opportunity in that dispute to obtain one, he wished him to send the man's horse back, and take his. This could not be done by Ngahu, as the message implied insult: and Ngahu's pride being hurt, he sent the two horses back. In order to shew that the ariki or chief does not possess an imperative power over his tribe, I will illustrate it by an ancient custom. In olden times, in times of war, when an attack was expected by any section of a tribe and the aid of other portions of the tribe was needed, the ariki did not send a command, but conveyed his wish by a token called ngakau, which token varied according to the danger then impending; also, if a hapu or section of a tribe intended to take vengeance for an old insult, a token was sent to gain the assistance of other sections of the tribe. It was not a command. The token was sent without a message, and it was received without a question being put by the chief to whom it was sent: it was therefore optional on the part of the receiver to attend to the summons thus implied or not. An instance occurred about the year 1838 when a Maori war was raging in the Bay of Islands, in which Kawiti, ariki of the Ngatihine, took part; he sent a Ngakau to Mate, a Chief of the same tribe then residing in Kaipara, but the request was not complied with. If it had been (as some suppose) that a Chief is supreme in his tribe, such a custom as I have given could never have been practised for generations. The custom itself is a sufficient refutation of the assumption that the Chief has a manorial right over his tribe; but it may be said that this is an isolated case: I will, therefore, give another, where not only the hapus of a tribe were concerned, but where the whole tribe and all the Chiefs of the tribe were concerned in the refusal to accede to the request of the