

12

**The past from the paepae-  
uses of the past in Māori Oral History**

**Danny Keenan  
2000/2001**



The purpose of this chapter is to comment on one aspect of the very complex Māori oral history process. The primary point of reference in this chapter is oral history, as you will hear it spoken on the marae, during formal speech making. The 'paepae' referred to in the title of this chapter is the place on the marae where kaumātua sit, during the ceremonial gatherings; and it is the place where they stand, when delivering their formal speeches.

The male elders who sit on the paepae do so because they are deemed to be expert in 'the art of oratory, genealogical discourse, tribal history, ritual incantation, and the songs of their people.' Normally, inexperienced speakers are discouraged from sitting on the paepae; and the most experienced or paramount elder speaks last. He does so because he is known to possess a high degree of knowledge and wisdom. He is therefore able to correct and summarize earlier speakers, admonishing or embellishing as he proceeds. Each paepae speaker is normally followed by a waiata (song) performed by the women of the marae. The purpose of the waiata is to add to the sentiments that have been expressed in the speeches.<sup>1</sup>

Literally speaking, then, the paepae is a clearly demarcated part of the marae, where elders stand to address visitors. Normally, it is a part of the front verandah of the whareniui (the main house). However, it can also be set aside, positioned further across the marae some distance away from the main house. Or, it can even be located inside the whareniui; in which case, ceremonial gatherings are held indoors.

When elders address visitors, from the paepae, they consciously arrange their whaikōrero (speech) in certain ways. The purpose of this chapter is to suggest how this intuitive arranging of knowledge, memory and history is achieved. To do this, we might employ the concept of 'paepae' as a metaphorical or figurative device; a device that provides some clues as to the various points of intuitive reference drawn upon by kaumātua when organizing their thoughts and whaikōrero.

Figuratively speaking, then, the concept of the 'paepae' can be used when recording and arranging Māori oral histories, wherever they may be presented or written. The idea of 'paepae' can be used to arrange Māori histories in certain ways as to ensure that they conform to the same whaikōrero conventions (and conventions of the marae) as would bear upon one who was actually standing on the paepae itself.

The question this chapter is addressing then is – how do Māori frame their oral histories, when they are delivered from the literal (or figurative) paepae?

In recent years, historical studies have undergone significant change, in New Zealand as elsewhere. Increasing emphasis (and acceptance) has been directed at subject areas and methodologies that were once thought to be peripheral to the conventional frameworks of history. Many such areas are now 'woven into the centrality of historical enquiry and historical research'.<sup>2</sup> Oral history is a good example.

Given this significant change, the value of oral testimony as historical method, and as source of history, has been much debated, if less so these days than perhaps a decade or so ago. Some historians still consider oral testimony to be an incomplete if not flawed source of history, especially Māori oral history. In 1994, Ian Campbell was certain that Māori Great Fleet traditions did not constitute 'good history'.<sup>3</sup> In so doing, Campbell was reviving a 1950s

debate amongst ethnologists as to the presumed inadequacies of Māori histories and traditions. And according to Alan Ward, whilst all evidence was of some value, no evidence, much less oral evidence, was 'privileged'. No form of evidence could be simply taken at face value. All forms of evidence, especially oral evidence, should therefore be placed under scrutiny and it should be tested against other forms of evidence 'for corroboration or substantiation,' he said.<sup>4</sup>

Other historians however, highlighted the inherent value of oral testimony and history. Elizabeth Tonkin described oral history as an exciting form of narrative that was readily located in context and time, with memory, cognition and history having many interconnections.<sup>5</sup> And oral histories provided a voice for peoples with little or no collective documentary record. Groups within societies who felt themselves and their histories marginalized fuelled a significant revival of interest in oral history in the 1960s. Oral history was perceived as a means to 'empower women, the working classes and ethnic minorities.'<sup>6</sup> Oral histories were seen to be the vehicles upon which important stories long submerged could be recovered.

This latter and more positive view was certainly the case for most Māori historians for whom the oral record provided both source of narrative and framework of interpretation. As the production of Māori oral histories increased, Māori approaches to such sources and methodologies of history became more differentiated from those of Pākehā historians working within the mainstream of New Zealand history. Some Pākehā historians working closely with Māori like Michael King and Judith Binney published some interesting analyses of these emerging differences, as perceived from the 'outside' of Māori history processes.<sup>7</sup> And differences there were, as Māori scholars like Tipene O'Regan and Joe Pere were increasingly pointing out.<sup>8</sup> But other Māori like Charles Royal and Monty Soutar were content to describe the Māori oral processes 'from within', without necessarily engaging with historians like King and Binney (as O'Regan had done).<sup>9</sup> Observing Māori oral processes from the 'outside' undoubtedly advanced our historiographical understanding of Māori and New Zealand history writing at large.<sup>10</sup> But for Māori, how were these same issues of oral history perceived 'from within'?

For Māori people, oral history at once provides both narratives of the past, and frameworks within which to interpret those narratives. This is because the past substantially converges with the present. Time, context and cognition easily connect within the active memory of kaumātua who, standing on the paepae, recall and mediate the past into important tribal and hapū histories.

Within such processes of historical construction, the value of oral history for Māori is not an issue of consequence. It simply does not feature in wider Māori considerations of 'what is an appropriate methodology' when Māori are seeking to tap into their past. This is because oral testimony, in its broadest sense, is accepted as an integral part of Māori knowledge transfer; and this has always been so. As a consequence, all important components of a tribal past, like the Great Fleet waka traditions for example, are readily acknowledged by Māori as perfectly valid history that is constantly maintained within vigorous oral forms like tauparapara (chants), whaikōrero and waiata.

Each of these components feature as an important and integral part of the total connected accounts of tribal histories and mana. Such accounts are mediated from vast storehouses of tribal knowledge, through the oral process, by kaumātua who are in command of tribal processes of historical construction. Such histories are ultimately presented to best serve the ends of the tribe or hapū (sub-tribe).

As a consequence, Māori purposes in history are not always well-served by arguments about methodology which preoccupy mainstream historians from time to time, arguments like validity of process, or 'reliability of tribal traditions as history'. Māori historians generally do not enter such scholarly debates, as 'how reliable or historical are tribal traditions'

because scholars advancing such debates often show little knowledge of, much less any empathy for, Māori conventions which Māori themselves apply when representing those same Māori histories.

Of most concern, in the end, is (and always was) the mana of the tribe or hapū. It is here that the significance of Māori oral history can best be appreciated; not in the veracity of tradition delivered, nor in the validity of a particular method utilised. The significance resides in the purposes for which the histories are being recalled, and by whom – and whose ends those histories will serve. It is important that we recognize that Māori purposes in history provide important frameworks, and frames of reference, for those histories. In other words, the reasons why a particular history is being told will often substantially determine *how* it is told. It is a process that is at once deliberate, pragmatic and intuitive, and the oral history process is flexible enough to incorporate a mix of all these approaches. To Māori, oral history then is more than just an aggregation of narratives. Oral history is also conceptual; it is about using a process for specific purposes. Such purposes can be detected when differing tribal uses of the 'Great Fleet' waka traditions are examined.

Most iwi of Aotearoa place special significance on their waka descent traditions. While the recorded narratives of Tainui, for example, date from the earliest occupation of Hawaiki, it is from the Tainui waka that primary descent histories are sourced. According to Kelly's published history of the Tainui confederation, "the people of Tainui, in common with other tribes, take great pride in tracing their ancestry from those who came hither in their tribal canoe ... they trace back to the most important personage on board – Hoturoa."<sup>11</sup>

The Te Arawa tribes around Rotorua claim primary descent from Tamatekapua, once a "lad of spirit who in time was regarded as a chief of no ordinary importance." Tamatekapua is said to have sparked "the last trouble of a long and bitter series which finally caused a group of Ngāti Ohomairangi to leave their homeland and travel to the land discovered by Kupe – Aotearoa."<sup>12</sup> This was a journey made on board the Te Arawa waka. Interestingly, the story is told by Maihi Te Kapua Te Hinaki of the two great ancestors, Hoturoa and Tamatekapua once coming to blows due to the "unwelcome attentions of Tamatekapua to Hoturoa's senior wife, Whakaotirangi." It is said that Tamatekapua was "worsted in the contest" before the people intervened and stopped the duel because they were all close relatives.<sup>13</sup>

Not all primary descent histories place such emphasis on the Great Fleet waka, however. The importance of the Great Fleet traditions can be overstated in scholarship which critiques Māori histories and traditions. The complex origin stories of Takitimu illustrate this. The Takitimu people claim their descent from the Takitimu waka but of course take their tribal name from Kahungunu, the son of Tamatea who sailed aboard the Takitimu.<sup>14</sup> Other theories as to the origins of Kahungunu have been advanced. William Greenwood's extensive survey of Ngāti Kahungunu whakapapa argued that Kahungunu was in fact a later ancestor, separated from Tamatea by some two hundred years. The issue turned on two ancestors named Tamatea: Tamatea – Uruhaea of the Takitimu waka and Tu Tamatea Kai ariki, supposedly Kahungunu's real father.<sup>15</sup>

While the source of the Taranaki whānui waka traditions attract less controversy, than perhaps do others, the origin accounts as perceived by the local iwi are nonetheless also utilised quite differently. The tribes of Taranaki draw their descent primarily from one of three waka – Kurahaupo, Aotea and Tokomaru. Descent from these three waka is frequently expressed in waiata, oratory, whakatauki and waiata of often-ancient origin. In reality however, Taranaki histories of origin are rather more complex. The Great Fleet traditions only tell part of the story. More often than not, these traditions are located somewhere within longer tribal narratives of descent which in fact go back well before the believed arrival dates of these Great Fleet canoes.

For example some Taranaki tribes like Nga Rauru and Taranaki tuturu place a greater store on pre-Great Fleet narratives when constructing their tribal histories.<sup>16</sup> One Nga Rauru

account which begins 'Matua te kore, te kore nui, te kore roa' (the absolute void, the great void, the long void) exceeds two hundred lines when written down. Only when concluding does it refer to Toi Te Huatahi who is believed to have arrived at the time of the Nga Rauru waka, Aotea.<sup>17</sup> In other words, it takes about two hundred lines to get to the waka traditions.

The traditions of Taranaki iwi, further north, also largely predate their waka, Kurahaupo. This is again achieved by an extended reaching back to ancient narratives from 'I noho a io roto i te aha o te aao (the development of life and knowledge through the interplay of past and present). These narratives in fact go back a long way; they predate the believed arrival date of the mountain in Taranaki. They contain references to Rua Tawhito, Rua Tipua and Rua Taranaki, ancient ancestors also claimed as tūpuna by some of the Taranaki tribes further to the north. Rua Taranaki is the believed ancestor from whom the mountain took its final name. By climbing the mountain and establishing an urupā (burial ground) high on its barren slopes, Rua Taranaki claimed the maunga as wāhi tapu for the people of Taranaki whānui.

Much later, in the Taranaki iwi descent traditions, reference is eventually made to the waka arrivals. "The Kurahaupo people arrived in the fourteenth century and lived among Kāhui Maunga ... in time, they defined themselves as the Taranaki tribe. The captain of the Kurahaupo was Te Hatauirā."<sup>18</sup>

The descent history of Ngai Tahu, further south, is more complex than most. It incorporates later large-scale migrations from the Takitimu area merging with various peoples occupying Te Waipounamu, the South Island.<sup>19</sup> Some strong local debate has attached to traditions of Ngai Tahu descent, as Tipene O'Regan has recently indicated:

*Ngai Tahu are the people who claim traditional mana whenua over the vast majority of Te Waipounamu ... there are 3 main streams of descent which flow together in our histories ... these streams are Waitaha, Mamoe and Tahu.*

That much said, O'Regan was straightforward. The traditional ways in which Māori have managed their histories over time have always had unique and identifiable characteristics, he said. These characteristics were markedly different from those "normally manipulated by the academic historian." Problems therefore could arise when Māori customary authentication and their perceptions of their ancient histories were "savaged by the professional historian."<sup>20</sup>

It is not uncommon of course for divisions to appear amongst members of iwi, over time. Divisions appear between component descent groups within iwi or confederations because of the pressures exerted by competing claims to mana whenua, and on the use of validating ancient narratives. Their consequent mediation into seemingly straightforward tribal histories and traditions can result in unexpected contests appearing between component kinship groups. This is a situation not confined of course to any one tribal area. It is especially prone to occur where "history and culture are seen no longer to constitute recreational or scholarly pursuits," said O'Regan. This is especially so of competing cross-claims that appear before the Waitangi Tribunal.

The Waitangi Tribunal, established in 1975, has provided a different forum within which oral testimonies might be heard. And, in that forum, the stakes are vastly different, says O'Regan. The Tribunal is a forum where the whakapapa of the Māori and the evidence of the conventional historian were presented for one purpose only; that of a "substantial result in terms of money, resources or property."<sup>21</sup>

O'Regan is not wrong in this view, that the focus of testimony is ultimately material compensation and redress. However, I have argued elsewhere that oral testimony from kaumātua before the Tribunal might be read differently. As a witness to the Taranaki claim in 1992, presenting the histories of my hapū, Ngāti Te Whiti (Te Atiawa), I was able to put the view that the material generated by the Tribunal process, whilst important when

emphasizing loss, was nonetheless interesting if used differently. Perhaps the stories of contact, interaction, conflict and material loss might be moved to the outer edges of the colonial story. If that were achieved, then the question arose – what, or whose, stories was one left trying to tell? If one was to get close to how nineteenth-century Māori themselves perceived the totality of change, and sought to relate to it in a way that affirmed their identities and sense of mana, then one should be looking beyond the context of contact conflict and deprivation. Oral testimony from Kaumātua then, even in the context of material loss (as deliberated over by the Tribunal) more often than not contained strong assertions of resilience and mana maintained.<sup>22</sup>

Thus the uses to which longstanding waka narratives were put over time then varied considerably, as tribes mediated their knowledge of the past into the present for different purposes. Such processes of mediation were important to Māori people when organizing knowledge of their past, and, as O'Regan has suggested, most recorded traditions should be seen as having been recorded within a particular frame, and for a particular purpose. "Very few things stand alone and unsullied without any direction or preceding shape... the mode of presentation of evidence is always driven by a purpose."<sup>23</sup>

In the end, such descent narratives were recalled by tribes within a context of mana Māori history - their histories of mana. Waka knowledge was therefore especially valued, not only for its own sake, but for its contribution to a total tribal account of past and present. The scholarship and debate on this subject is of course extensive. Much subsequent reference to waka histories by writers became transfixed on issues dealing with the supposed veracity and validity (or otherwise) of tribal traditions and processes. Such references often misread the complexity of such descent traditions, or they misinterpreted their importance as a source of mana to tribes. Frequent reference to the best-known waka has tended to elevate the importance of those Great Fleet narratives. They are often cited (and their 'accuracy' questioned) outside of their proper customary context, that of tribal descent narratives that frequently extend much further back, into the distant past. This said, waka narratives nonetheless remain important for Māori since they signify an integral part of the longstanding tribal narrative of origin and mana.

I.L.G. Sutherland once reflected on the importance of waka traditions to Māori when observing a hui held at Ngāruawahia to celebrate the believed six-hundredth anniversary of the Great Fleet migration to New Zealand;

*at the gathering, for hour after hour, night after night, kaumātuas from various tribes tried to agree on the whakapapa... tracing descent from those who came in the traditional canoes of the migration.*<sup>24</sup>

Peter Buck and Apirana Ngata, who assisted in arranging the anniversary, often discussed the 'necessity of getting standard whakapapa for the various canoes'- an interesting idea, perhaps suggesting a certain view of whakapapa as more or less fixed in time and function. In their correspondence, numerous possibilities and alternatives were mooted.<sup>25</sup>

Pei Te Hurinui was also involved in the hui's inception, having suggested to the late Princess Te Puea the idea of celebrating the believed anniversary of the distant arrival of the Fleet. As he later wrote, "in fixing the year 1950 for the celebration at Ngāruawahia, we first examined several lines of descent of King Koroki, back to Hoturoa and other leaders of the Fleet Migration.' Hurinui's study of whakapapa had extended, he wrote, over a period of more than forty years. Over that time, variations and mutations in tribal whakapapa had always been checked and rechecked with his elders of Tainui. "As a result of persistent questioning and careful study of our whakapapa, I [was] convinced that... our lines from the fleet [were] authentic," he wrote.<sup>26</sup>

Accordingly, the waka traditions, though perceived differently by different tribes, were important in that they featured as authoritative tribal narratives from which individual

histories could be drawn. Such narratives remained in the tribal memory over time, and were likely to be cited as constituting a basis for important knowledge of the tribal past. Pei Te Hurinui demonstrated this in searching Tainui whakapapa for verification of the waka celebrations.

Such verifications drew heavily on tribal processes of recall and organising knowledge. These processes encompassed more than detail of common and overlapping descent narratives, with lateral and vertical connections established across the centuries. It also incorporated *how* tribal histories were in fact to be recalled and constructed. This was a recall based primarily on a common oral process, as when Kaumātua speak on the paepae, with innumerable points of expression and reference. One such point of reference you might hear mentioned was the ancient landscape, where names on the land were "survey pegs of memory, marking the events that happened in a particular place, recording some aspect or feature of the traditions and history of a tribe."<sup>27</sup>

Other points of reference were more difficult to manifest, embedded within varying Māori cultural forms like whakapapa itself, as Ngāti Apa kaumātua Reuben Ashford has suggested:

*That is why oratory is established when you arrived at the marae, you didn't know who they were but the oratory would open up with the normal greeting, saying who you are and where you people land, where your ancestors traversed, where they now lie in death, deceased, they all make mana of you and your people.*<sup>28</sup>

Such whakapapa and whaikōrero, as seen on the paepae, incorporated aspects of intuitive oratory and delivery that implied an underlying and at times conflated sense of past and present. However, despite the essentially intuitive nature of Māori oral recall, selections of narrative were, on different levels, likely to be arranged carefully, where the specific recall of history and tradition was at issue. In this sense, whakapapa played a central role as an organizing device and intellectual infrastructure. Such common organising processes and methods of delivery were inherently Māori cultural process. The communication of oral traditions in part provided a primary conduit through which the mechanics of establishing collective representations of experience and reality, past and present, could be continued.<sup>29</sup>

It is important to understand that the value of such oral processes to Māori was two-fold. Firstly, such oral processes incorporated narrative representations of the past. They told stories, of people, places, events and great deeds. They also anchored families connected by these stories into historic landscapes. Secondly, such oral processes also incorporated the conceptual frameworks through which these narratives and stories were to be, at the very least, contextualised and rendered meaningful. And when aggregated, in their sum, as both narrative and framework, they represented the basis of the mana of the people.

Agathe Thornton considered the most important characteristic of such a process was its oral nature. It was extraordinary she observed that such a device as whakapapa was entirely oral, written down for the first time later only by those who wrote manuscripts. "From conception and learning to performance (they were) either chanted or recited. How this is possible is not easy for us to conceive."<sup>30</sup>

Much earlier, officials like Native Land Court Judges after 1865 in Taranaki were frequently similarly confounded. Chief Judge Francis Fenton transcribed numerous pages of notes from Māori depositions in 1866, at Compensation Court hearings in New Plymouth, attempting to decipher the intricacies of testimony and wakapapa being presented to him by kaumātua, standing before him.

To conclude, Māori oral depictions of the past as delivered from the paepae conform to the conventions of the marae. Whakapapa provides their primary structure and mana is the principle around which the whaikōrero is organised. Varying historical narratives, like the



Great Fleet stories or earlier traditions of origin, are drawn upon by Kaumātua if appropriate, for added emphasis and execution.

Such is the literal presentation of oral narratives from the paepae; and such also provides a figurative structure of important conventions around which Māori oral histories might be arranged and interpreted. This also pertains to Māori histories at large, even those dealing with the colonial era, with whakapapa again providing the organising structure and mana providing the organising principle.

To many historians, this process is seemingly fragmentary and incomplete; it is a process that does not sit easily within the conventions of mainstream western history. Yet such presentations from the paepae (literal or figurative) do not always take their 'fragmentary' form from an intuitive oral process however. They were equally likely to be selectively attuned to the occasion for which they were being presented. And, although some occasions within Māori protocols such as powhiri and poroporoaki provided constraints enough of their own, these seemingly fragmented presentations were in fact rigidly structured by practices like whaikōrero, as Buck had written:

*The fixed etiquette of welcoming visitors with oratorical speeches and discussions of affairs of tribal or family interest, connected with birth marriage and death, all led to the development of high standards of speech and oratory ... participants all learned to memorise the higher forms of speech which contained references to myth, tradition and genealogy ... enriched with figures of speech and appropriate chants and songs.<sup>31</sup>*

Such 'high standards of speech and oratory' still issue forth from the paepae, which continues to serve as controlling site for authoritative expositions of tribal whakapapa, traditions and history. Whilst these presentations might appear as wholly intuitive, astute listeners are aware, and are indeed appreciative, of the context and verbal contest unfolding; of the exchange, for the most part benevolent but within vigorous constructions, facts merging with feint, all within given frame works of historical construction, as tribal validity and mana are strongly asserted across the marae, from the paepae.

Figuratively speaking, the paepae can be said to be the controlling site of all Māori knowledge, including knowledge of the past. The paepae is the place for oral exposition, for argument, for assertions of histories of mana. Understanding how Māori organise and present those histories of mana, from the literal or figurative paepae, helps us to appreciate the uniqueness and potential Māori oral history, and all oral history.

Keywords: paepae, whaikōrero, formal speeches, oral testimony, insider/outsider, purpose, tribal histories, waka traditions,

- 1 Cleve Barlow, *Tikanga Whakaaro. Key Concepts in Māori Culture*, Auckland, 1991, p.85; see also Hiwi and Pat Turoa, *Te Marae. A Guide to Customs and Protocol*, Auckland, 1986.
- 2 Cleve Barlow, *Tikanga Whakaaro. Key Concepts in Māori Culture*, Auckland, 1991, p.85; see also Hiwi and Pat Turoa, *Te Marae. A Guide to Customs and Protocol*, Auckland, 1986.
- 3 I.C. Campbell, "1350 And All That: Why The Great Fleet Story Is Not History", *Historical News*, No.68 (May 1994), pp. 4-6.
- 4 Alan Ward, 'History and Historians before the Waitangi Tribunal' in *New Zealand Journal of History*, 24:2 (1990), pp.150-167.
- 5 Elizabeth Tonkin, *Narrating Our Pasts. The Social Construction of Oral History*, London, 1992, p.1.
- 6 Anna Green and Kathleen Troup, *The Houses of History. A Critical Reader of twentieth century history and theory*, Manchester University Press, 1999, p.231.
- 7 Michael King, 'New Zealand Oral History: Some Cultural and Methodological Considerations' in *New Zealand Journal of History*, 12:2, pp.104-23; Judith Binney, 'Māori Oral Narratives, Pākehā Written Texts: Two Forms of Telling History' in *New Zealand Journal of History*, 21:1, pp.16-28.
- 8 Tipene O'Regan, "Old Myths and New Politics. Some Contemporary Uses of Traditional History" in *New Zealand Journal of History*, 26:1, pp. 5-27; Joe Pere, 'Hitori Māori' in Colin Davis and Peter Lineham (eds), *The Future of the Past. Themes in New Zealand History*, Massey University, Palmerston North, 1991, pp. 29-48.

- 9 Te Ahukaramu Charles Royal, *Te Haurapa: An Introduction to Researching Tribal Histories and Traditions*, Wellington (1992); Monty Soutar, 'Towards an Acceptable Record: An Analysis of Tribal History', BA Hons essay, Massey University (1991).
- 10 Danny Keenan, 'Predicting the Past: Some Directions in Recent Māori Historiography' in *Te Pouhere Kōrero*, 1:1 (1999), pp.24-35.
- 11 Leslie Kelly, *Tainui. The Story of Hotoiroa and His Descendants*, Wellington, 1949, p.67.
- 12 D.M.Stafford, *Te Arawa. A History of the Arawa People*, Auckland, 1967, pp.1-2.
- 13 George Graham, "Tainui", in *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 60:1 (1951), p.60.
- 14 George Graham, "Tainui", in *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 60:1 (1951), p.60.
- 15 William Greenwood, 'Kahungunu and Tamatea' in *Journal of the Polynesian Society (JPS)*, 60:1 (1951), p.60. Greenwood was one of a large group of Pākehā scholars who in the 1950s made good use of the JPS to debate the 'veracity' and 'reliability' of tribal histories and traditions.
- 16 The name 'Taranaki' sometimes confuses readers of Taranaki iwi history. The name has three applications - firstly, it is the name of the whole district (which comprises eight tribes). Secondly, it is the name of one of those tribes, sometimes known as Taranaki tuturu. This name distinguishes the tribe from the whole district, which is sometimes known as Taranaki whānui. Finally, Taranaki refers to the mountain around which the tribes are positioned.
- 17 Vanessa Sturme, Submission of Nga Rauru, Waitangi Tribunal, Te Ihupuku Marae, Waitotara, 14 October 1991; Wai 143, F1, p.7.
- 18 Milton Hohaia, Submission of Taranaki iwi, Waitangi Tribunal, Parihaka, 16 October 1991, Wai 143, F12, p.2.
- 19 Tipene O'Regan, 'Ngai Tahu; ko wai te iwi?', Conference paper, New Zealand Historical Association conference, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, 11 May 1991.
- 20 O'Regan, 'Old Myths', p.5.
- 21 O'Regan, "Old Myths", p.5.
- 22 Danny Keenan, 'Bound to the Land. Māori Retention and Assertion of Land and Identity', in *Environmental Histories of New Zealand*, Auckland, 2001, pp.246-262.
- 23 O'Regan, "Old Myths", p.24.
- 24 I.L.G.Sutherland, 'Māori and European' in *JPS*, 61:1 (1952), p.153.
- 25 Apirana Ngata, 'letter to Peter Buck (Te Rangī Hiroa), 2 October 1929, in *Na to Hoa Aroha. From Your Dear Friend, Vol 1, 1925-1950*, (ed) M.P.K. Sorrenson, Auckland, 1986, p.245.
- 26 Pei Te Hurinui, 'Māori Genealogies', *JPS*, 62:2 (1956), p.162.
- 27 Te Aue Davis with Tipene O'Regan, *He Kōrero purākau mō ngā taunahanahatanga a ngā tūpuna. Place Names of the Ancestors*, Wellington, 1990, p.xiii.
- 28 Reuben Ashford, Ngāti Apa (Whanganui), personal communication, October 1992.
- 29 Jan Vansina, *Oral Tradition as History*, London, 1985, p.124.
- 30 Agathe Thornton, *Māori Tradition As History*, London, 1985, p.124.
- 31 Peter Buck, *The Coming of the Māori*, Wellington, 1925, p.360

Danny Keenan, 'The Past From the Paepae: Uses of the Past in Māori Oral History', in *Māori and Oral History: a collection*, by Rachael Selby and Atison Laurie (eds), Oral History Assn of NZ, 2005, pp. 54-61.