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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Be unproductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Hesitate and question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Improvise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Invite and participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Embrace the void</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Play!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Unite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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THE EXCHANGE OF GIFTS AND THE OBLIGATION TO RECIPROCATE (POLYNESIA)

Marcel Mauss

'TOTAL SERVICES', 'MATERNAL' GOODS' AGAINST 'MASCULINE GOODS'' (SAMOA)

During this research into the extension of contractual gifts, it seemed for a long time as if potlatch proper did not exist in Polynesia. Polynesian societies in which institutions were most comparable did not appear to go beyond the system of 'total services', permanent contracts between clans pooling their women, men, and children, and their rituals, etc. We then studied in Samoa the remarkable custom of exchanging emblazoned matting between chiefs on the occasion of a marriage, which did not appear to us to go beyond this level. The elements of rivalry, destruction, and combat appeared to be lacking, whereas this was not so in Melanesia. Finally, there were too few facts available. Now we would be less critical about the facts.

First, this system of contractual gifts in Samoa extends far beyond marriage. Such gifts accompany the following events: the birth of a child, circumcision, sickness, a daughter's arrival at puberty, funeral rites, trade. Next, two essential elements in potlatch proper can be clearly distinguished here: the honour, prestige, and mana conferred by wealth, and the absolute obligation to reciprocate these gifts under pain of losing that mana, that authority (the tālismān and source of wealth that is authority itself).

1 The French term, strictly speaking, relates to children of the same mother, but not necessarily of the same father. It is translated as 'maternal' and relates to the goods that are passed on to such children, i.e., 'maternal goods'.
2 Masculine goods (deus masculinus) relates to goods passed on to children through the father's side.
3 G. Davy (1922) 'Foi jurée', p. 140, has studied these exchanges in connection with marriage, and its relationship to contract. As we shall see, they have a different dimension.
4 Turner, Nineteen Years in Polynesia, p. 178; Samoa, p. 82 ff.; Stair, Old Samoa, p. 175.
5 Krämer, Samoa-Inseln, vol. 2, pp. 52-63.
6 Stair, Old Samoa, p. 180; Turner, Nineteen Years in Polynesia, p. 225; Samoa, p. 142.
7 Turner, Nineteen Years in Polynesia, p. 184; Samoa, p. 91.
9 Krämer, Samoa-Inseln, vol. 2, pp. 96, 363. The commercial expedition, the malaga (cf. walega in New Guinea) corresponds in fact very closely to the potlatch, which itself is characteristic of the expeditions carried out in the neighbouring Melanesian archipelago. Krämer uses the word Gegenschenk ('reciprocating present') for the exchange of the olua against the tanga, which we shall discuss. Moreover, although we must not fall into the exaggerations of British ethnographers of the Rivers and Elliot Smith school, nor into those of American ethnographers who, following Boas, see the whole of the American system of potlatch as a series of borrowings, we should, however, lay much weight on the fact that institutions, so to speak, travel around. This is especially true in this case, where a considerable amount of trade, from island to island and port to port, and over very great distances, from very early times must have served not only the passage of goods, but also the ways in which they were exchanged. Malinowski, in studies that we shall cite later, had a judicious appreciation of this fact. Cf. a study devoted to some of these institutions (Northwest Melanesia), in R. Lenoir (1904) 'Expéditions maritimes en Melanesie', Anthropologie, September.
10 In any case rivalry between Maori clans is mentioned fairly often, particularly in connection with festivities. Cf. S.P. Smith, 'Journal of the Polynesian Society' (henceforth, JPS), vol. 16, p. 87. (See also pp. 59, 4.)
11 The reason why, in this case, we do not assert that potlatch proper exists, is because the element of usury in the reciprocal service rendered is lacking. However, as we shall see in considering Maori law, the fact that nothing is given in return entails the loss of mana of 'face', as the Chinese say. In Samoa also, in order not to incur the same disadvantage, 'give and give in return' must be observed.

On the one hand, as Turner tells us:

After the festivities at a birth, after having received and reciprocated the oloa and the tonga—in other words, masculine and feminine goods—husband and wife did not emerge any richer than before. But they had the satisfaction of having witnessed what they considered to be a great honour: the masses of property that had been assembled on the occasion of the birth of their son.10

On the other hand, these gifts can be obligatory and permanent, with no total counter-service in return except the legal status that entails them. Thus the child whom the sister, and consequently the brother-in-law, who is the maternal uncle, receive from their brother and brother-in-law to bring up, is himself termed a tonga, a possession on the mother’s side.11

Now, he is:

the channel along which possessions that are internal in kind, the tonga, continue to flow from the family of the child to that family. Furthermore, the child is the means whereby his parents can obtain possessions of a foreign kind (oloa) from the parents who have adopted him, and this occurs throughout the child’s lifetime.

This sacrifice of the natural bonds:

facilitates an easy system of exchange of property internal and external to the two kinship sides.

In short, the child, belonging to the mother’s side, is the channel through which the goods of the maternal kin are exchanged against those of the paternal kin. It suffices to note that, living with his maternal uncle, the child has plainly the right to live there, and consequently possesses a general right over the latter’s possessions. This system of ‘fosterage’ appears very close to that of the generally acknowledged right of the maternal nephew in Melanesian areas over the possessions of his uncle.12 Only the theme of rivalry, combat, and destruction is lacking, for there to be potlatch.

Let us, however, note these two terms, oloa, and tonga, and let us consider particularly the tonga, that designates the permanent paraphernalia, particularly the mats given at marriage,14 inherited by the daughters of that marriage, and the decorations and talismans that through wife come into the newly founded family, with an obligation to return them.15 In short, they are kinds of fixed property—immovable because of their destination. The oloa16—designate objects, mainly tools, that belong specifically to the husband. These are essentially movable goods. Thus nowadays this term is applied to things passed on by Whites.17 This is clearly a recent extension of the meaning. We can leave on one side Turner’s translation:

oloa=foreign; tonga=native. It is incorrect and insufficient, but not without interest, since it demonstrates that certain goods that are termed tonga are more closely linked to the clan, the family, and the person than certain others that are termed oloa.

Yet, if we extend the field of our observation, the notion of tonga immediately takes on another dimension. In Maori, Tahitian, Tongan, and Mangarevan (Gambier), it connotes everything that may properly be termed possessions, everything that makes one rich, powerful, and influential, and everything that can be exchanged, and used as an object for compensating others.19 These are exclusively the precious articles, talismans, emblems, mats, and sacred idols, sometimes even the traditions, cults, and magic rituals. Here we link up with that notion of properties, talisman, which we are sure is general throughout the Malaysian and Polynesian world, and even throughout the Pacific as a whole.20

II

THE SPIRIT OF THE THING GIVEN (MAORI)

This observation leads us to a very important realization: the taonga [sic] are strongly linked to the person, the clan, and the earth, at least in the theory of Maori law and religion. They are the vehicle for its mana, its magical, religious, and spiritual force. In a proverb that has been recorded by Sir George Grey21 and C.O. Davis22 the taonga are implored to destroy the individual who has accepted them. Thus they contain within them that force, in cases where the law, particularly the obligation to reciprocate, may fail to be observed.

Our much regretted friend Hertz had perceived the importance of these facts. With his touching disinterestedness he had noted down ‘for Davy and Mauss’, on the card recording the following fact. Colenso says:23 ‘They had a kind of exchange system, or rather one of giving presents that must ultimately either be reciprocated or given back.’ For example, dried fish is exchanged for jellied birds or matting.24 All these are exchanged between tribes or ‘friendly families without any kind of stipulation.

But Hertz had also noted—and I have found it among his records—a text whose importance had escaped the notice of both of us, for I was equally aware of it:

Concerning the hau, the spirit of things, and especially that of the forest and wild fowl it contains, Tamati Ranaipiri, one of the best Maori informants of Eisdon Best, gives us, completely by chance, and entirely without prejudice, the key to the problem.25

I will speak to you about the hau. The hau is not the wind that blows—not at all. Let us suppose that you possess


24 Theoretically the tribes of New Zealand are divided, by Maori tradition itself, into fishermen, cultivators, and hunters, and we have learned that they exchange their products with one another constantly. Cf. E. Best, ‘Forest Lore’, Transactions of the New Zealand Institute, 42:435.


p. 165 describes the ie tonga (‘mats’) as follows:

They were the main wealth of the natives; formerly they were used as a form of money in exchange of property at marriages and on occasions demanding special courtesy. They are often kept in the families as heirlooms (substitute goods), and many of the old ie are known and valued very highly as having belonged to some famous family.

Cf. Turner, Maori text, p. 120: All these expressions have their equivalent in Melanesia and North America, and in our own folklore, as we shall see. 18 See Tregear, Samoan-inseil, vol. 2, pp. 90, 93.

19 See Tregear, Maori Comparative Dictionary; under taonga. Tahitian, tapoa, ‘to give property’, fastkaoa, ‘to compensate, to give property’. Marquesas Islands, see

a certain article (taonga) and that you give me this article. You give it to me without setting a price on it. 26 We strike no bargain about it. Now, I give this article to a third person who, after a certain lapse of time, decides to give me something as payment in return (utu). 27 He makes a present to me of something (taonga). Now, this taonga that he gives me is the spirit (hau) of the taonga that I had received from you and that I had given to him. The taonga that I received for these taonga (which came from you) must be returned to you. It would not be fair (tika) on my part to keep these taonga for myself, whether they were desirable (rawe) or undesirable (kino). I must give them to you because they are a hau 28 of the taonga that you gave me. If I kept this other taonga for myself, serious harm might befall me, even death. We are in the presence of the hau, the hau of personal property, the hau of the taonga, the hau of the forest. Kati ena (But enough on this subject).

This text, of capital importance, deserves a few comments. It is purely Maori, permeated by that, as yet, vague theological and juridical spirit of doctrines within the 'house of secrets', but at times astonishingly clear, and presenting only one obscure feature: the invasion of a third person. Yet, in order to understand fully this Maori juridical expert, one need only say:

The taonga and all goods termed strictly personal possess a hau, a spiritual power. You give me one of them, and I pass it on to a third party; he gives another to me in turn, because he is impelled to do so by the hau my present possesses. I, for my part, am obliged to give you that thing because I must return to you what is in reality the effect of the hau of your taonga.


When interpreted in this way the idea not only becomes clear, but emerges as one of the key ideas of Maori law. What imposes obligation in the present received and exchanged, is the fact that the thing received is me, even if it is inanimate. Even when a piece of the hau, the hau of personal property, has been abandoned by the giver, it still possesses something of him. Through it the giver has held over the beneficiary just as, being its owner, through it he has a hold over the thief. 29 This is because the taonga is animated by the hau of its forest, its native heath and soil. It is truly 'native' 30; the hau follows after anyone possessing the thing.

It not only follows after the first recipient, and even, if the occasion arises, a third person, but after any individual to whom the taonga is merely passed on. 31 In reality, it is the hau that wishes to return to its birthplace, to the sanctuary of the forest and the clan, and to the owner. The taonga or its hau—which itself moreover possesses a kind of individuality— 32 is attached to this chain of users until now these give back from their own property, their taonga, their goods, or from their labour or trading, by way of feasts, festivals and presents, the equivalent or something of even greater value. This in turn will give the donors authority and power over the first donor, who has become the last recipient. This is the key idea that in Samoa and New Zealand seems to dominate the obligatory circulation of wealth, tribute, and gifts.

Such a fact throws light upon two important systems of social phenomena in Polynesia and even outside that area. First, we can grasp the nature of the legal tie that arises through the passing on of a thing. We shall come back presently to this point, when we show how these facts can contribute to a general theory of obligation. For the time being, however, it is clear that in Maori law, the legal tie, a tie occurring through things, is one between souls, because the thing itself possesses a soul, is of the soul. Hence it follows that to make a gift of something to someone is to make a present of some part of oneself. Next, in this way we can better account for the very nature of exchange through gifts, of everything that we call 'total services', and among these, potlatch. In this system of ideas one clearly and logically realizes that one must give back to another person what is really part and parcel of his nature and substance, because to accept something from somebody is to accept some part of his spiritual essence, of his soul. To retain that thing would be dangerous and mortal, not only because it would be against law and morality, but also because that thing coming from the person not only morally, but physically and spiritually, that essence, that food, those goods, whether movable or immovable, those women or those descendants, those rituals or those acts of community—all exert a magical or religious hold over you. Finally, the thing given is not inactive. Invested with life, often possessing individuality, it seeks to return to what Hertz called its 'place of origin' or to produce, on behalf of the clan and the native soil from which it sprang, an equivalent to replace it.
III OTHER THEMES; THE OBLIGATION TO GIVE, THE OBLIGATION TO RECEIVE

To understand completely the institution of ‘total services’ and of potlatch, one has still to discover the explanation of the two other elements that are complementary to the former. The institution of ‘total services’ does not merely carry with it the obligation to reciprocate presents received.

It also supposes two other obligations just as important: the obligation, on the one hand, to give presents, and on the other, to receive them. The complete theory of these three obligations, of these three themes relating to the same complex, would yield a satisfactory basic explanation for this form of contract among Polynesian clans. For the time being it is only necessary to sketch out how the subject might be treated.

It is easy to find many facts concerning the obligation to receive. For a clan, a household, a group of people, a guest, have no option but to ask for hospitality, to receive presents, to enter into trading, to contract alliances, through wives or blood kinship. The Dayakans have even developed a whole system of law and morality based upon the duty one has not to fail to share in the meal at which one is present or that one has seen in preparation.

The obligation to give is no less important; a study of it might enable us to understand how people have become exchangeers of goods and services. We can only point out a few facts. To refuse to give, to fail to invite, just as to refuse to accept, is tantamount to declaring war; it is to reject the bond of alliance and commonality. Also, one gives because one is compelled to do so, because the recipient possesses some kind of right of property over anything that belongs to the donor for the time honored. This right may be conceived of as a spiritual bond. Thus in Australia the son-in-law who owes all the spoils of the hunt to his parent-in-law may not eat anything in their presence for fear that their mere breath will poison what he consumes. We have seen earlier the rights of this kind that the taonga nephew on the female side possesses in Samoa, which are exactly comparable to those of the nephew on the female side (vasu) in Fiji.

In all this there is a succession of rights and duties to consume and reciprocate, corresponding to rights and duties to offer and accept. Yet this intricate mingling of symmetrical and contrary rights and duties ceases to appear contradictory if, above all, one grasps that mixture of spiritual ties between things that to some degree appertain to the soul, and individuals, and groups that to some extent treat one another as things.

All these institutions express one fact alone, one social system, one precise state of mind: everything—food, women, children, property, tallismans, land, labour services, and the four sacred objects—is there for passing on, and for balancing accounts. Everything passes to and fro as if there were a constant exchange of a spiritual matter, including things and men, between clans and individuals, distributed between social ranks, the sexes, and the generations.

IV NOTE: THE PRESENT MADE TO HUMANS, AND THE PRESENT MADE TO THE GODS

A fourth theme plays a part in this system and moral code relating to presents: it is that of the gift made to men in the sight of the gods and nature. We have not undertaken the general study that would be necessary to bring out its importance. Moreover, the facts we have available do not all relate to those geographical areas to which we have confined ourselves. Finally, the mythological element that we scarcely yet understand is strong for us to leave it to a future account. We shall therefore confine ourselves to a few remarks.


We have (in) ‘Variations saisonnières dans les sociétés eskimo-selknam’ (in the Social Surveys, French and English) the festivities of the Alaskan Eskimos as a combination of Eskimo elements and of borrowings made from the Indian potlatches. The borrowing, which has already been explained, must be analyzed in the light of the potlatch, as well as the custom of presents, has been identified as existing among the Chukchee and the Yukaghir, as well as in Siberia, where we shall see. Consequently the borrowing could just as well have been made from these as from the American Indians. Moreover, we must take into account the fine and plausible hypotheses of Sauvageau (1924) (Journal des Américains) relating to the ethnocentric origin of the Eskimo languages. These hypotheses are confirmed by the very strong ideas of archeologists and anthropologists as to the origins of the Eskimos and their civilization. Finally, everything demonstrates that the Eskimos of the west, instead of being being depopulated, are growing, the east and the centre, are closer, linguistically and ethnologically to the south. This seems now to have been proved by Thalhoffer.

In these conditions one must be more definite and say that the potlatch, as it exists in Siberia and as it was established among them a very long time ago. However, there remain the totems and masks, which are somewhat peculiar to such festivals in the west, and a certain number of which are of Indian origin. Finally, the author should remain markedly conscious of the disappearance of the Eskimo potlatch from the east and centre of the American Arctic, unless it is explicable through the diminution in eastern Eskimo societies.
The relationships that exist between these contracts and exchanges among humans and those between men and the gods throw light on a whole aspect of the theory of sacrifice. First, they are perfectly understood, particularly in those societies in which, although contractual and economic rituals are practised between men, these men are the masked incar- 

54. Ibid., p. 90.
55. See p. 38, 'This for Thee'.
58. On the Tinglit potlatch, see, pp. 38 and 41. This characteristic is basic to all the potlatches in the American Northwest. It is, however, hardly apparent because the ritualism and the potlatch are bound together by custom and nature to be very marked, on top of its effect upon the spirits. A good banquet is particularly in the potlatch between the Chukchee and the Eskimos on St Lawrence Island, it is much more apparent.
59. See Chukchee Mythology, p. 21, for a potlatch myth. A dialogue is begun between two Shamans: 'What will you answer?' namely 'Give as required the present fines for this outstanding match. Then the two Shamans make a contract with each other. They exchange with each other their magic knife and their magic necklace, and their spirit (these attend upon magic), and finally their body (p. 15, line 2). But they are not perfectly successful in making their flights and landings. This is because they have forgotten to exchange their bracelets and their tassels, 'my guide in motion' (p. 16, line 10). In the end they succeed in performing their tricks. It can be seen that all these things have the same spiritual value as the spirit itself, and are spirits.
60. See 'Native Belief', Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. 6, p. 30, A Kwakiutl chant of the dance of the spirits (the Shaminism of the winter ceremonies). You send us everything from the other world, O spirits, you send us everything. O Kwakiutl. You have heard that we were hungry, O spirits. We shall receive much from you etc. See 'Kwakiutl Religion', Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. 6, p. 30, A Kwakiutl chant of the dance of the spirits (the Shaminism of the winter ceremonies). You send us everything from the other world, O spirits, you send us everything. O Kwakiutl. You have heard that we were hungry, O spirits. We shall receive much from you etc. See 'Kwakiutl Religion', Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. 6, p. 30, A Kwakiutl chant of the dance of the spirits (the Shaminism of the winter ceremonies). You send us everything from the other world, O spirits, you send us everything. O Kwakiutl. You have heard that we were hungry, O spirits. We shall receive much from you etc. See 'Kwakiutl Religion', Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. 6, p. 30, A Kwakiutl chant of the dance of the spirits (the Shaminism of the winter ceremonies). You send us everything from the other world, O spirits, you send us everything. O Kwakiutl. You have heard that we were hungry, O spirits. We shall receive much from you etc. See 'Kwakiutl Religion', Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. 6, p. 30, A Kwakiutl chant of the dance of the spirits (the Shaminism of the winter ceremonies). You send us everything from the other world, O spirits, you send us everything. O Kwakiutl. You have heard that we were hungry, O spirits. We shall receive much from you etc.

50. See also p. 37.
52. Ibid, pp. 3, 5 of the extract.
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55. See p. 38, 'This for Thee'.
58. On the Tinglit potlatch, see, pp. 38 and 41. This characteristic is basic to all the potlatches in the American Northwest. It is, however, hardly apparent because the ritualism and the potlatch are bound together by custom and nature to be very marked, on top of its effect upon the spirits. A good banquet is particularly in the potlatch between the Chukchee and the Eskimos on St Lawrence Island, it is much more apparent.
59. See Chukchee Mythology, p. 21, for a potlatch myth. A dialogue is begun between two Shamans: 'What will you answer?' namely 'Give as required the present fines for this outstanding match. Then the two Shamans make a contract with each other. They exchange with each other their magic knife and their magic necklace, and their spirit (these attend upon magic), and finally their body (p. 15, line 2). But they are not perfectly successful in making their flights and landings. This is because they have forgotten to exchange their bracelets and their tassels, 'my guide in motion' (p. 16, line 10). In the end they succeed in performing their tricks. It can be seen that all these things have the same spiritual value as the spirit itself, and are spirits.
60. See 'Native Belief', Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. 6, p. 30, A Kwakiutl chant of the dance of the spirits (the Shaminism of the winter ceremonies). You send us everything from the other world, O spirits, you send us everything. O Kwakiutl. You have heard that we were hungry, O spirits. We shall receive much from you etc. See 'Kwakiutl Religion', Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. 6, p. 30, A Kwakiutl chant of the dance of the spirits (the Shaminism of the winter ceremonies). You send us everything from the other world, O spirits, you send us everything. O Kwakiutl. You have heard that we were hungry, O spirits. We shall receive much from you etc. See 'Kwakiutl Religion', Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. 6, p. 30, A Kwakiutl chant of the dance of the spirits (the Shaminism of the winter ceremonies). You send us everything from the other world, O spirits, you send us everything. O Kwakiutl. You have heard that we were hungry, O spirits. We shall receive much from you etc. See 'Kwakiutl Religion', Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. 6, p. 30, A Kwakiutl chant of the dance of the spirits (the Shaminism of the winter ceremonies). You send us everything from the other world, O spirits, you send us everything. O Kwakiutl. You have heard that we were hungry, O spirits. We shall receive much from you etc.

50. See also p. 37.
52. Ibid, pp. 3, 5 of the extract.
NOTE ON ALMS

Later, however, in the evolution of laws and religions, men appear once more, having become again the representatives of the gods and the dead, if they have ever ceased to be. For example, among the Hausa in the Sudan, when the Guinea corn is ripe, fevers may spread. The only way to avoid this fever is to make presents of this grain to the poor.82 Also among the Hausa (but this time in Tripoli), at the time of the Great Prayer (Baban Salla), the children (these customs are Mediterranean and European) visit houses: ‘Should I enter?’ The reply is: ‘O long-eared hare, for a bone, one gets services.’ (A poor person is happy to work for the rich.) These gifts to children and the poor are pleasing to the dead.83 Among the Hausa these customs may be of Moslem origin,84 both Negro and European at the same time, and Berber also.

In any case here one can see how a theory of alms can develop. Alms are the fruits of a moral notion of the gift and of fortune59 on the one hand, and of a notion of sacrifice, on the other. Generosity is an obligation, because Nemesis avenges the poor and the gods for the superabundance of happiness and wealth of certain people who should rid themselves of it. This is the ancient morality of the gift, which has become a principle of justice. The gods and the spirits accept that the share of wealth and happiness that has been offered to them and had been hitherto destroyed in useless sacrifices should serve the poor and children.85 In recounting this we are recounting the history of the moral ideas of the Semites. The Arab sadaka originally meant exclusively justice, as did the Hebrew zedaqā;87 it has come to mean alms. We can even date from the Mischnaic era, from the victory of the ‘Poor’ in Jerusalem, the time when the doctrine of charity and alms was born, which, with Christianity and Islam, spread around the world. It was at this time that the word zedaqā changed in meaning, because in the Bible it did not mean justice.

However, let us return to our main subject: the gift, and the obligation to reciprocate. These documents and comments have not merely local ethnographic interest. A comparison can broaden the scope of these facts, deepening their meaning.

The basic elements of the potlatch78 can therefore be found in Polynesia, even if the institution in its entirety is not identical to that in the festivals of New Caledonia, Fiji, and New Guinea. Below is also a speech constituting an uma taenga (taonga oven), for a hikaro (food distribution) preserved in a song (given in Sir G. Grey (1855) Ko nga Motea: Mythology and Traditions in New Zealand, p. 132), in so far as I am able to translate it (second verse):

Give me on this side my taonga, Give me my taonga, so that I may heap them up, That I may place them in a heap pointing towards land, And in a heap pointing towards the sea, Etc...towards the east...

Give me my taonga.

The first verse double-references to stone taonga. We can see how the notion of the taonga is inherent in the ritual of the festival of food. See Percy Smith, ‘Wars of the Northern against the Southern Tribes’, JRSc 8:166 (the taonga of the Toko).
be found there. In any case 'exchange-through-gift' is the rule there. Yet, it would be merely pure scholasticism to dwell on this theme of the law if it were only Maori, or at the most, Polynesian. Let us shift the emphasis of the subject. We can show, at least as regards the obligation to reciprocate, that it has a completely different sphere of application. We shall likewise point out the extension of other obligations and prove that this interpretation is valid for several other groups of societies.


Marcel Mauss (1872-1950) was a French sociologist whose academic work traversed the boundaries between sociology and anthropology. Today, he is best known for his analyses of magic, sacrifice, and gift exchange in different cultures around the world, which he elaborated in his most famous book: The Gift from 1925.

Maori than in any other island, it is precisely because chieftainship had been reconstituted there, and isolated clans had become rivals. For the destruction of wealth on Melanesian or American lines in Samoa, see Krummbauer, Samoa-Inseln, vol. 1. p. 375. (See index, under 'fega') The Maori muni, the destructions of goods because of misdoing, may also be studied from this viewpoint. In Madagascar, the relations between the Mohamet, who should trade with one another, who may insult one another, and wreak havoc among themselves, are likewise vestiges of the ancient potlatches. See Grandier: Ethnographie de Madagascar, vol. 2. p. 131 and n.; pp. 132-3. See also p. 155.

TIME/BANK: A CONVERSATION WITH JULIETA ARANDA AND ANTON VIDOKLE

Julieta Aranda & Anton Vidokle

What was the impetus to resurrect Josiah Warren’s project/store? Is it the current financial crisis and belief that prevailing economic systems don’t work, in which case the project would be an eminently political action that uses the realm of artistic practice to come into being, or is it an essentially artistic project, strictly intended to address the realm of art (practice, audience, consumption)?

ANTON VIDOKLE:

Well, for me (and it may be something else for Julieta) there is something poetic in revisiting a project that existed briefly in 1827. It’s interesting how alternative and utopian proposals keep resurfacing in history again and again. Most of the time they have a short lifespan or remain unfinished or unrealized, but stubbornly keep coming back. I’d like to think that maybe someone else a hundred years from now will open yet another time store somewhere, and this time it will be so successful that it will really transform everything. Or maybe it will fail, but someone will try it again, and again… until it succeeds. What is reassuring is the continuity of a desire for things to be different.

The more practical side of this is that a time store is a very immediate visualization of an alternative economy. I find that one of the biggest problems in society in general is a certain difficulty to imagine things as being different. For example, while a lot of people are attracted to the idea of time-based currency or economy, most have a really hard time imagining what they can do with it. So it’s very helpful to have a store with all sorts of commodities that one can obtain in exchange for time—it makes a rather abstract concept visceral.

JULIETA ARANDA:

I agree with Anton, and would just want to add that I don’t see how we could think of a project such as Time/Bank as purely symbolic, even though I would actually say that Time/Bank is definitively an artist’s project. You see, the realm of art is not limited to practice/audience/consumption. That may be true about a market-driven contemporary art economy, but that economy— with all its visibility — represents only a part of the totality of art.

Recently, I was walking around a small occupation that sprouted in Mexico City, and it struck me that, in the same way as in Zucotti Park in NY, there was evidence of art everywhere—painting, theatrical situations, musical performances. While the manifestations of work that I witnessed