



Hapu of Te Āti Awa, North Taranaki. PETER ADDS, TE ĀTI AWA WAITANGI TRIBUNAL EVIDENCE, WAI 143, DI-D10, VOL 1, 1991



2

Mā Pango Mā Whero Ka Oti: Unities and Fragments in Māori History

| DANNY KEENAN

Māori historians are increasingly interested in depicting the Māori past in ways which recognise Māori customary forms of organising knowledge, including knowledge of the past. Such presentations of the past not only provide Māori histories with a customary infrastructure, but they also incorporate material from a wide array of sources: waiata, tauparapara (incantation), whaikōrero (marae oratory), whakairo (carving), oral testimony, and ancient stories. As well as providing narratives about past events, these sources particularly emphasise people, places and relationships.¹ A preference for Māori customary knowledge over more conventional forms of history writing poses challenges for Māori historians, especially in accessing those forms of knowledge.²

It should not be surprising that when writing about the past, Māori prefer to focus on the years prior to European arrival. Pre-contact histories are invariably affirming in nature; they open a window to Māori society before the changes wrought by contact with Pākehā, and they offer opportunities to work with customary forms of knowledge such as whakapapa.³ Given the interaction between Māori and Pākehā in this country, and the need to preserve Māori knowledge, Māori have good reason to present their histories in this way; iwi and hapū histories invoked on the marae, for example, are invariably framed by whakapapa. Most Māori working with customary forms of knowledge are aware of the ways in which their research should be conducted. They generally agree that research should comply with the conventions of the marae, such as properly approaching, and dealing with testimony from the old

people. These conventions are important and exert considerable influence over the processes of researching and writing Māori history.⁴

'Customary knowledge' may be described at any number of levels. Māori researchers have a strong sense of what constitutes customary knowledge, knowing it to be a complex and contested issue that is frequently debated on the marae.⁵ Māori will take issue with Pākehā historians who seek to define or qualify the nature of customary knowledge, adding further to the historiographical debate around it.⁶ As I argue in this essay, however, such types of knowledge and history writing for Māori substantially derive from local tribal or hapū contexts. E. T. Durie has suggested that a national description of Māori customary knowledge in a range of spheres is possible – how Māori social organisation affected issues of land tenure, for example. Yet as he notes, 'practice and process varied from place to place, over time and according to particular circumstances'. As a result, changes and variations meant that certain customary rules did not always become fixed despite the existence of underlying certainties. Various tenets of customary knowledge 'may not have acquired the status of a rule (though there was a consistency in the underlying ruling ideology, norms [and] values)'.⁷

Accordingly, there were always countless local stories from different areas and kinship groups that emphasised many different people, places, events and relationships. They were all important as independent – though seemingly fragmented – stories. When combined, they exceeded the sum of their disparate parts and constituted a greater historical unity and tradition. In some areas, Māori sought to maintain that greater unity in the face of ongoing and sometimes violent material and cultural disruption. The whakataūākī (proverb) I cite in the title of this essay reflects this view – *Mā pango mā whero ka oti*, the many important colours contribute to the finished tapestry.

Pre-contact histories of Māori people may draw heavily upon customary organising devices such as whakapapa, but such ways of representing the Māori past are seldom extended across the nineteenth century. Yet this needs to be done if the actions of Māori after 1800, as well as before then, are to be positioned within an ongoing context of 'customary knowledge'. As conveyed through devices like tauparapara, waiata and whaikōrero, customary knowledge offers vital insights into the activities of Māori right across the turbulent nineteenth century – and beyond.

Not all historians would agree with approaches which accord a primacy to customary knowledge across the spectrum of Māori history.⁸

There is a greater preference for histories framed by 'race relations' issues of contact between Māori and incoming settlers, which have long dominated the historiography of the nineteenth century. Contemporary interest in relations between Māori and Pākehā, and the process of resolving Crown breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi suggest that 'race relations' history will continue to dominate approaches to this country's nineteenth-century past for some time yet.⁹ Moreover, it is commonly held that the combined effects of colonisation and the work of agencies such as the Native Land Court served to muddy the waters of customary Māori recollection. Durie notes that our perceptions of Māori community activity may have been 'distorted by the opinions of settlers and colonial officials'.¹⁰ In these circumstances, the basis of the 'customary' nature of customary knowledge has been questioned.

In answering such challenges to the use of customary knowledge in writing Māori history, I suggest that when seeking to present the histories of Māori across the colonial era, it is the 'customary' forms of Māori knowledge that aid most in understanding the activities of Māori communities. This essay offers a range of issues and approaches that Māori – and non-Māori – historians, might consider when seeking to represent more broadly the histories of nineteenth-century Māori communities. My own tribal district of origin, North Taranaki, is my particular focus here. In using this area as a case study, I am conforming with the general convention that in researching and writing Māori history, scholars should write about their own home area and people, especially if they are using whakapapa.

Maintaining tribal unities

Common tribal stories of the past and a common geography centred on the imposing mountain provided the basis for a shared sense of Taranaki identity throughout the nineteenth century. Such shared tribal narratives were deposited within tribal memories, and they were kept alive in a variety of expressive forms, ranging from waiata to carvings. Elders often invoked these memories in formal testimony. In 1880, for example, Erueti Rangikopinga testified before the Native Affairs Committee and laid claim to the lands 'all the way from the Tukeho Stream to Taitairamaka'. This claim arose from earlier land confiscations, and Erueti was seeking the return of confiscated kinship lands in particular.¹¹ His claim seemed excessive to the Committee chairman, who asked 'Do

they claim all that land?' Erueti replied: 'These are the fixed boundaries of the Taranaki people. It includes Mount Egmont. These are the original boundaries and we claim within these . . . our ancestor was called Rua Taranaki and the tribe is called Taranaki.'¹² Erueti emphasised that his people were not actually claiming all of this land, but only 100 acres of Ngāti Tu, Te Kaingati and Ngāti Haumea land within it. The total landscape described in the petition was cited 'merely to show that we claim within these boundaries . . . I only claim the land of my grandmother who lived here and cultivated this land.'¹³ The whole, as well as the fragments in it, was significant.

Erueti's comments suggested a certain view of a common kinship throughout Taranaki. In order to emphasise this shared sense of kinship, Erueti cited a joint ancestor and pointed to a common land area. He stated this simply enough, but it would have had a profound resonance for Taranaki Māori and indeed for all Māori. As Durie has noted, the 'cultural, social and spiritual life of the community was built around land. The land was posited as a living being from which the community derived. Founding ancestors enhanced this organic identity.'¹⁴ Erueti spoke at a time when the entire Taranaki landscape was changing rapidly under the impact of European settlement. Relations between Māori and the new settlers were often fraught; according to historian Hazel Riseborough, 'Victorian notions of racial and cultural superiority meant that a partnership between Maori and European was an impossibility: it was domination or nothing.'¹⁵ By 1880, Pākehā colonisation had done much to erode the sense of unity that Erueti invoked.

Yet even before the arrival of European settlers in 1841, the unity asserted by Erueti had been under pressure from intensive and frequent attack from the north. Aggressive incursions from Waikato tribes in particular had commenced a half-century earlier, and had inflicted a deadly impact upon the Taranaki people and their land. The ravaged landscape, destroyed villages, disturbed landmarks and wāhi tapu, an horrific death-toll and a scattered populace testified to the heavy material effect of the attacks.¹⁶ Of course, the material and military impact affected the cultural life of Taranaki people. The incursions severely disrupted the ways the tribes organised and recorded themselves on the land long before the Pākehā settlers arrived.¹⁷

After 1827, when the first whalers established a shore base at Ngāmotu, the material and cultural impact of external contact upon Taranaki Māori continued unabated. Specifically, Taranaki Māori were progressively confronted with disruptions to the security of land

holdings. The Waikato attacks would continue for another decade, but at the same time, pressure was building from expanding European settlement and colonisation. The responses of the iwi and hapū to the Pākehā settlers especially can be seen in the many histories of interaction written about this period.¹⁸

Yet the tribal accounts of local Māori at this time tell of a people doing rather more than just reacting to waves of settlers. A recent Ngāti Te Whiti account of the mid-nineteenth century barely mentioned the arrival of European settlers. Instead, its primary focus was on the surviving families, the ways they regenerated themselves, and the land upon which this revival was achieved. This was history told through their whakapapa. The stories of contact and its impact were moved to the periphery; foremost in the narrative was the assertion of a shared sense of a history of mana that had survived, despite the frequent incursions from the north and the encroachment of European settlers.¹⁹

The impact of new settlers upon customary ways of dealing with Māori knowledge escalated following more organised Pākehā settlement. Moana Jackson has described such impacts as 'the unacknowledged and denied acts of colonisation'. They were all products, he states, of foreign ideas introduced into the Māori intellectual domain – 'a Christian God, a capitalist ethic, a common law, an imperial domain and an individuated manifest destiny'.²⁰ By the time that Erueti made his claim before the Native Affairs Committee, these 'denied acts' had radically impinged upon the continuing viability of Taranaki histories of mana. They had also seriously affected the ongoing and changing utility of customary knowledge, including the use of whakapapa across the nineteenth century. As Erueti was subtly pointing out, however, little had really changed beneath the surface. Māori communities of Taranaki were still asserting their histories of mana, as they had always done. They were citing revered forebears, who were still anchored into ancient landscapes, even though that same land might be slipping from the grasp of the people. Māori made such assertions irrespective of Pākehā settlers advancing their 'foreign ideas', including laws which sought to extinguish Māori legal title to the land upon which their histories were entrenched.²¹

Such customary responses, drawing into the pre-contact years for validation in the face of later Crown challenges, remained important through the nineteenth and into the twentieth centuries. Responses that incorporated a reliance upon customary knowledge and the land were uppermost when Māori conceptualised nineteenth-century issues,

and, where necessary, formulated responses to them. Associated with the land was a 'complex relationship between people, the natural environment, gods, ancestors and spirits'.²² Yet while this was so, many of the new issues – those 'denied acts of colonisation' – cut deeply into Māori thinking, and sharply intruded upon the underlying bases of tribal unity.

The unity of whakapapa

The device of whakapapa persisted as the primary organising device of iwi and hapū history throughout the nineteenth century. Whakapapa was also the central storehouse of tribal mana, and implicit in its gradations of names were the places – the land – where that mana and those histories were anchored.

In nineteenth-century whakapapa, deities remained as a focus of histories of mana. According to Durie, 'whakapapa linked the land's occupiers to the earliest occupying groups and even to the atua (gods) that formed it'.²³ The importance of organising extended narratives of the past into recognisable history was thus not diminished, even if the tendency persisted for speakers to be oral, selective or intuitive as the occasion warranted. Deities were the highest echelon of historical narrative within whakapapa. This could also incorporate the 'genealogy of the gods', or ancestors deemed to be of spiritual origin.²⁴ In nineteenth-century Taranaki, this initial component of whakapapa – including ancestors such as Rua Taranaki – persisted as a critical part of a tribe's recall and mediation of knowledge into history.

The Native Land Court in particular received a considerable amount of whakapapa filed as evidence alongside other documentary claims for land during major block disputes or investigations for new titles. Histories of mana heard in the courts constituted a record that had been established with frequent recourse to the customary tribal record. Accordingly, Māori 'demonstrated great care in defining their guardianship' of land and resources.²⁵ In Taranaki, as elsewhere, Māori accomplished this by continuing to deploy the device of whakapapa regardless of formal procedures that sought to undermine and deny its validity. Descent traditions were essentially histories 'anchored in locality'. They also incorporated other aspects of customary knowledge such as mana whenua which marked out the land over which tribes continued to exercise claim and authority.²⁶ It is evident, nevertheless, that much whakapapa may have been lost in that period, but also that its

value increased in intensity. This was especially the case when, Durie believes, Māori made strenuous efforts to 'whakapapa to both original occupiers and dominant migrants. The former had mana (right to the land or right to occupy the land), the latter, mana tangata (control over persons). By descent from both, one had all toes embedded in the soil.'²⁷

The nineteenth-century impact on whakapapa was probably not fully realised until the next century, although Māori voiced their concern about the loss of whakapapa in the context of the loss of all things Māori. Nonetheless, an examination of whakapapa, its contents, and its emphases, reveals that it remained a critical method of tribal recall and history telling, despite the 'denied acts of colonisation' penetrating into the underlying sources of customary knowledge, such as the land. Ultimately, however, the mana of the deities merged into the mana of mortal ancestors, those recalled ancestors who were seen to be more mortal than spiritual and whose lives were generally locked into the known landscape. Whakapapa was all about the lives of such ancestors, and especially their families and formation into kinship groups.²⁸

The nineteenth century was a time of great history telling in Taranaki, when spectacular hui generated significant whaikōrero. Faced with profound social and cultural change, tribes were compelled to act on new issues but sought solutions based on traditional ways of thinking. This was evident when Wiremu Kingi Rangitake wrote to Governor Gore Browne in 1859, saying that 'I will not agree to our bedroom being sold (I mean Waitara here), for this bed belongs to the whole of us . . . You may insist, but I will never agree to it.'²⁹ It was also apparent at Parihaka before 1881 when Te Whiti o Rongomai 'continued his show of autonomy long after any such challenge to European supremacy could hope to succeed'.³⁰ Whaikōrero may have continued to be oral and selective, but its underlying framework remained one of an ongoing expression of Taranaki unity, manifested in many unwritten forms. Local unity was inherent, and Māori endeavoured to emphasise it wherever possible. This was not easy for some hapū experiencing the impact of Pākehā settlers after the 1840s.

Unity and ambivalence

The unity of the Taranaki hapū and iwi, as frequently expressed in customary terms, was largely maintained across the nineteenth century. This occurred despite evidence of an increasing ambivalence; depictions

of the past were as likely to be fragmentary and incomplete, given that presentations of histories were often attuned to specific occasions, such as Native Land Court hearings.

Yet Māori speeches and pronouncements after the 1830s still frequently harked back to a perception of Taranaki identity. They also emphasised the enduring relevance of Māori customary forms of knowledge, expression and activity which underlay social and political change. The unity ultimately sprang from a common whakapapa, the customary framework that tied together the iwi of Taranaki. This strong sense of inherent unity endured to the 1927 Sim Commission, which was appointed to investigate land confiscations.³¹ Speaking before that Commission, Māori repeatedly invoked whakapapa which drew the people together. Thereafter, this sense of unity provided the basis for the establishment of the Taranaki Māori Trust Board in 1932.

But a subtle shift had occurred by this time. The whakapapa invoked before the Sim Commission wove the people together but it also pulled them into a common history of land confiscations. The Taranaki land confiscations after 1865 now competed with customary knowledge as a basic source of unity. This more recent and quite justified grievance over land issues gained in importance as a focus of unity alongside the longstanding, inherent sense of customary knowledge of ancestors, common land holdings, and whakapapa. Riseborough astutely captured this change when she suggested that Taranaki had long had the 'cohesion of a tribal district' but since the later nineteenth century another cohesion had stemmed from a single cause – 'a grievance: land confiscation'.³²

To be sure, much had happened in the nineteenth century to challenge the unity of the tribes. The Waikato raids had substantially united the people against a common aggressor. But Pākehā colonisation and the later conflicts were more complex. The Land Wars after 1860 had partly arisen from bitter inter-hapū feuding over land alienation, quite apart from the desire of Te Āti Awa to assert its ownership of land in the face of Crown resistance.³³ Despite this, much of the speech-making and activity of the time was underpinned by the desire of Taranaki Māori to achieve a distinct Taranaki consensus, as seen in speech, song, chant, carving styles and other unwritten sources such as language and dialect. These were the sources that compelled the search for unity and in their turn, generated a certain rhetoric of unity to be invoked on particular occasions. But this quest for unity could be an ambivalent aspiration especially in the face of later local contests for land between hapū and families before the Native Land Court. The rapid

fusion of unconventional situations and the intense ferment resulting from Pākehā colonisation only accentuated this further.

The fragmenting of Te Āti Awa

By moving the focus to individual Taranaki tribes – Te Āti Awa in particular – the various ways that these competing sources of unity played out against each other can be explored in greater detail. Issues of Te Āti Awa identity remained in a state of flux from the 1820s. The name itself had long competed with 'Ngāti Awa' as the appropriate descriptive. 'Te Āti Awa' was the more favoured name, but 'Ngāti Awa' was often used by Māori who occasionally asserted a traditional Taranaki connection to the Bay of Plenty. This connection was seen to have been of little practical effect when Pākehā settlers first arrived, although it was revived later in the century.

Throughout most of the later nineteenth century, Te Āti Awa hapū were well-populated and productive. By the 1860s, Te Āti Awa comprised a large number of active hapū, each with its own boundaries and living areas. This was a largely amicable and fluid arrangement that allowed for development and change according to well-defined and long-established kinship rules.³⁴

From around 1900, the three northern tribes of Te Āti Awa asserted their desire to be seen as independent; their assertion of difference was heard again during the land confiscation hearings of the Sim Commission. Records of that Commission and the Native Land Court display a clear enunciation of difference between hapū that did not challenge the customary sources of unity, but turned instead on land disputes.³⁵ A list of hapū of Te Āti Awa recorded earlier by the Compensation Court revealed the complexity of the picture, and showed how hapū configurations had altered considerably over time.

The large number of hapū within Te Āti Awa was, in one sense, an expression of the mana whenua that Te Āti Awa asserted over its lands as well as the intensive use that was made of it. According to Alex Watson, Te Āti Awa 'developed an intimate relationship with the land and its resources so that we shaped it and it shaped us'. Te Āti Awa made much of the fact that they lived within a defined territory, and that they were the first to settle in the area; they represented an uninterrupted descent continuum from the earliest settlers, as evident in their longstanding histories.³⁶

Te Āti Awa developed through interaction with the environment and with other iwi into a vibrant and dynamic political entity. This entity was firmly based on the hapū as the main unit of everyday life and expression of rangatiratanga. Whakapapa remained as the focus of knowledge and history, within a unified sense of deities, land and history. These were all assembled to serve the outworking of the mana of the tribe. Thus, Te Āti Awa were able to recall their histories and people of prominence. According to Native Land Court records, for example, Ngāti Rahiri recorded the following as their principal men who returned in the 1848 heke: Te Kahinga, Tu Tawa, Te Nirihanga, Ko Ongiongi, Arenō, Grey, Nikodemus and Te Kaokao.³⁷

The nineteenth century witnessed many changes to the nature of the customary land holdings, especially changes imposed by the Crown. Modifications also occurred in the nature of hapū relationships, especially where contests for land were common, although the reverence for and creation of common wāhi tapu persisted. The customary Māori attitude to land was complex, and the contest it generated in the new environment underlay much of the Taranaki Māori activity during the period. Some Māori found that precise hapū boundaries within Te Āti Awa were unclear during the later nineteenth century. This was often particularly so from the view of individual hapū. Given the widespread changes that were occurring after 1860, hapū and community boundaries were often difficult to locate. Te Āti Awa kaumātua conceded that the exact hapū boundaries were uncertain, especially after the Land Wars when the confiscations began to take effect. To a large degree, hapū and the land on which they lived were in a constant state of flux, despite the intimate nature of the family relationships within Te Āti Awa as a whole.³⁸

There may well be contemporary reasons for later-twentieth-century Māori delineating their hapū boundaries. As the Waitangi Tribunal's report on the Taranaki claim has pointed out, the later-nineteenth-century social situation became very dynamic. Boundaries as well as identities were seemingly subject to frequent alteration. Local Māori did not always perceive this fluidity as significant, however, as hapū were named and attendant land areas generally well known, given the closeness of inter-hapū relations. Intermarriage sometimes added a confusion when attempts were made to link land with individuals recorded as either having been born at, or at some stage having defended a particular area of land.³⁹

Crown Grant allocations compounded the problem of which Māori had entitlements to which specific lands. In 1884, the West Coast

Commissioner indiscriminately conferred Crown Land Grants on Māori. The Pukerangiora area, near Waitara, exemplifies this confusion. The Pukerangiora estate was deemed after 1840 to have been purchased by the New Zealand Company. Governor FitzRoy's later decision to overrule parts of that purchase effectively transferred title back to Pukerangiora or it should have done. The Land Wars after 1860 totally enveloped the area; a series of major conflicts was fought along the southern bank of the Waitara River, right up to the site of the old Pukerangiora Pā. When Crown Grants were later allocated for the Pukerangiora area, part of the land was found to be occupied by Te Amo and his people, apparently from Ngāti Maru, just across the river. The Commission deemed these people to be squatters – which they probably were – and set aside a large alternative reserve for them further inland within the heavily bushed Ngāti Maru rohe itself. Te Amo refused to move, claiming a right to remain through descent from his mother. The local people objected but Te Amo's claim was later upheld. The resulting exchange of land further clouded traditional claims as Te Amo continued to identify himself as belonging to Ngāti Maru, rather than Pukerangiora, on whose land he was – rightly or wrongly – dwelling.⁴⁰

Further south stood the old pā site of Manukorihi. By the early 1800s, this pā had become the central focus of the northern Taranaki district. In area, Manukorihi was once the largest fortification in Taranaki, covering almost 23 acres. The wood carving there was famous, and local schools of learning vied with Pukerangiora for acclaim. Manukorihi had exercised considerable military and political influence at this time. Traditions hold that its chiefs and fighting men were sought in military alliances and battles, such as those that occurred between Kāwhia and Waikato tribes around 1800. Defeated in battle, the Kāwhia tribes took sanctuary in Ngāti Mutunga territory, just north of Urenui, and inevitably married into the local hapū. By about 1840, some 200–300 people, primarily of Manukorihi and Ngāti Mutunga, lived around Waitara. Elements of Otaraua and Ngāti Maru lived in Mamaku Pā; Manukorihi and some Otaraua also lived in Titirangi Pā, Kainganui Pā and Mangaparua Pā. All of these diverse groups of people resided on lands of various hapū. This was the situation when European settlers drifted into the area.

On 20 September 1843, Reretawhangawhanga, the ariki of Manukorihi and the father of Wiremu Kingi, died. Alarmed at the arrival of large numbers of Pākehā settlers, he had earlier insisted that Wiremu Kingi promise never to permit the Pākehā to settle in Waitara. Wiremu

Kingi was to keep the oath as an inheritance for all Te Āti Awa. As such, it remained important because of its source of sustenance for local people. Much of the land around Waitara was swampy, and frequent rainfall rendered large areas seasonal in productivity. But the non-swampy land could grow kūmara, taro and later corn and two crops of potatoes a year. The climate was warm with few frosts. Ground was rested for two years between crops so that the fertility would not be exhausted. Apple and peach orchards were also planted, and use of timber was carefully controlled as most of the land was cleared for crops. This was especially so in the Waitara area, but further south to the Ngāti Te Whiti domain, extensive growing was also common.⁴¹

Later sales and confiscations made it difficult for Te Āti Awa to maintain their traditional activities of hui, marae and tangi. Manukorihi, for example, was included within the parcel of land confiscated by the Crown under the provisions of the New Zealand Settlements Act 1863 in punishment for Te Āti Awa being in 'rebellion'. A Crown Grant was issued for Manukorihi under the West Coast Settlement Act 1880 on 6 June 1883 to Enoka and others for an area totalling 25 acres. Enoka was one of the Manukorihi chiefs who commanded one of the waka on the return home from Waikanae. The Crown Grant included four other names. Whether these names were the same as those who crewed with him on the heke is unknown, as the names had not been recorded in 1848. A condition placed on the grant was that the 'Said Lands shall be inalienable by sale, gift or mortgage or in other way whatsoever.' The grant effectively placed the land into individual ownership. This meant that the customary land tenure system, long the material source of histories and traditions as well as communal use such as hui and tangi, was effectively extinguished. The site of the great pā was now subject to Crown land conditions, and placed in the hands of five people.⁴²

Issues of mana whenua were important to Māori where the establishing of histories of customary occupation was concerned. These histories were preserved over time to enhance the mana of the tribes of the north Taranaki area. Later claims by Māori to mana whenua reinforced for each tribe the sense of a history anchored within a specific locality. In the end, these substantiated a tribe's sense of mana, as experienced in the landscape, and as recorded in the wāhi tapu found across that landscape.

Whakapapa remained as the primary conduit through which relationships and unities were preserved, despite the tangible realities of

loss and dispossession facing Māori communities. Longstanding alliances through relationships could be cited to enhance the security and prosperity of the people. Noted orators, warriors and chiefs of the past could be recalled, and, importantly, located within the ancient landscape. Kinship linkages could be reaffirmed, and the mana of the people restated, even in the face of severe challenge and even as the land itself was slipping from the grasp, but not the comprehension, of the people.

Equally, the consequences of severe impacts upon the material and cultural resources of the people, especially upon the land, could be withstood. The predominant issue for the tribes of Taranaki and elsewhere was to sustain the unity of the people, and the continuing sense of unity through which Māori might view the past. This was achieved, in the context of fragmentation, through the unity of customary Māori knowledge.

It may be inevitable then that modern Māori scholars have begun to recognise the complex histories such as occurred in Taranaki. Nor should it be surprising that they have tried to weave into their histories the narratives from sources such as tauparapara, whaikōrero and waiata. In this way, those things that were important to Māori, in their past – people, places and relationships long concealed from history – can be accentuated, as well as offering new narratives about the past. The key to this is undoubtedly whakapapa, which provides Māori with firm imperatives to tell their history, including their histories throughout the entire nineteenth century. Whakapapa is now likely to be used increasingly as the controlling device and infrastructure of Māori history, especially during the colonial era, when much happened that seemingly unravelled and fragmented the very sources of that customary knowledge. Such an intricate weaving of commentary emphasises the strong place of a sense of history, of Māori people acting consistently within their own enduring histories.

1 Sidney Moko Mead, *Landmarks, Bridges and Visions: Aspects of Māori Culture*, Victoria University Press, Wellington, 1997.

2 Te Ahukaramū Charles Royal, *Te Haurapa: An Introduction to Researching Tribal Histories and Traditions*, Bridget Williams Books/Historical Branch, Department of Internal Affairs, Wellington, 1992.

- 3 Cleve Barlow, *Tikanga Whakaaro: Key Concepts in Maori Culture*, Oxford University Press, Auckland, 1991, pp. 171–4.
- 4 Monty Soutar, 'A Framework For Analysing Written Iwi Histories', *He Pūkenga Kōrero*, vol. 2, no. 1, 1996, pp. 43–57.
- 5 E.T. Durie, 'Maori Custom Law', unpublished paper, 1994.
- 6 Te Maire Tau, 'Mātauranga Māori as Epistemology', *Tē Pouhere Kōrero*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1999, pp. 10–23.
- 7 Durie, p. 1.
- 8 Historian Peter Munz is one prominent critic of these approaches; see Tau, p. 10.
- 9 Jock Phillips, 'Of Verandahs and Fish and Chips and Footie on Saturday Afternoon: Reflections on 100 years of New Zealand Historiography', *NZJH*, vol. 24, no. 2, 1990, pp. 118–34.
- 10 Durie, p. 1.
- 11 Hazel Riseborough, *Days Of Darkness: Taranaki 1878–1884*, Allen and Unwin/Port Nicholson Press, Wellington, 1989, pp. 31–51.
- 12 Rua Taranaki is one of the earliest tupuna of Taranaki. Joe Ritai, Submission of Te Āti Awa before the Waitangi Tribunal, Owae Marae, Waitara, 8 Apr 1991, Wai 143, D1, p. 17.
- 13 Petition of Erueti Rangikopinga and others, Petition no. 291, Le 1/1880/6, Legislative Department files, NA.
- 14 Durie, p. 61.
- 15 Riseborough, p. 214.
- 16 Ranginui Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tōnu Matou: Struggle Without End*, Penguin, Auckland, 1990, pp. 83–4.
- 17 James Bailey, Submission of Ngāti Rahiri before the Waitangi Tribunal, Owae Marae, 11 Apr 1991, Wai 143, D13, p. 84.
- 18 B. Wells, *The History of Taranaki*, Thomas Avery, New Plymouth, 1878, reprinted Capper Press, Christchurch, 1976. A more recent account of earliest European arrival at Ngāmotu is Sally Maclean, *A History of the Ngāmotu Mission and the Grey Institute Trust*, Grey Institute Trust, New Plymouth, 1992.
- 19 Darcy Keenan, Submission of Ngāti Te Whiti before the Waitangi Tribunal, Owae Marae, 11 Apr, 1991, Wai 143, D14, p. 3.
- 20 Moana Jackson, 'The Treaty and the Word: The Colonisation of Maori Philosophy', in Graham Oddie and Roy Perrett (ed.), *Justice, Ethics and New Zealand Society*, Oxford University Press, Auckland, 1992, p. 1.
- 21 Such legislation as the Native Lands Acts of 1862 and 1865, for example, which sought to extinguish Māori customary title in land. See David V. Williams, *'Te Kooti Tango Whenua': The Native Land Court 1864–1909*, Huia Publishers, Wellington, 1999.
- 22 Durie, p. 62.
- 23 Durie, p. 64.
- 24 'Genealogy of the Gods' or 'Te Whakapapa o te Taiao Whanui' are the terms used by Barlow, p. 174.
- 25 Judith Binney, 'The Native Land Court and the Māori Communities, 1865–1890', in Judith Binney, Judith Bassett and Erik Olssen, *The People and the Land: Te Tangata Me Te Whenua. An Illustrated History of New Zealand*, Allen and Unwin/Port Nicholson Press, Wellington, 1990, p. 144.
- 26 Peter Addis and Alex Watene, Submission of Te Āti Awa before the Waitangi Tribunal, Owae Marae, 8 Apr 1991, Wai 143, D3, pp. 24–33.
- 27 Durie, p. 65.
- 28 Barlow suggests two further categories – 'Genealogy of Mortal Man or Primal Genealogies' and 'Genealogy of the Canoes', p. 174.
- 29 Wiremu Kingi to the Governor, *AJHR*, 1860, E-3, p. 6.
- 30 Riseborough, p. 223.
- 31 *AJHR*, 1928, G-7.
- 32 Riseborough, p. ix.
- 33 'The Taranaki Wars – The First War', Waitangi Tribunal, *The Taranaki Report: Kaupapa Tuatahi*, Waitangi Tribunal, Wellington, 1996, pp. 83–7.
- 34 Alex Watson, Submission of Te Āti Awa before the Waitangi Tribunal, Owae Marae, 8 Apr 1991, Wai 143, D3, p. 34.
- 35 Greg White, Submission of Ngāti Tama before the Waitangi Tribunal, Urenui Marae, 17 Oct 1991, Wai 143, F19, p. 21.
- 36 Watson, Submission, Wai 143, D3, p. 34.
- 37 Peter Addis and others, Submission of Te Āti Awa before the Waitangi Tribunal, Owae Marae, 8 Apr 1991, Wai 143, D3, pp. 24–33.
- 38 Watson, Submission, Wai 143, D3, p. 34.
- 39 Ted Tamati, Submission of Te Āti Awa before the Waitangi Tribunal, Owae Marae, 9 Apr 1991, Wai 143, D17, p. 1.
- 40 Ted Tamati, Submission of Pukerangiora before the Waitangi Tribunal, Owae Marae, 12 Apr 1991, Wai 143, D17, p. 1.
- 41 Bailey, Submission, Wai 143, D13, p. 84.
- 42 The subsequent history of this area can be found in Wai 143, P118.