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ABSTRACT

Throughout the nineteenth century probably the majority of Pakeha held the view that the East Polynesian ancestors of the Maori were the first people to settle in New Zealand. Over the same period there were always considerable numbers of Pakeha who held the alternative view that an earlier people were already living in New Zealand when the first East Polynesian immigrants arrived. Among Maori each hapu and iwi had their own origin traditions. Some held that their ancestors arrived to an empty land, while others believed there were other groups already here when their own ancestors arrived. The traditions of the Chatham Island Moriori indicated that they were also East Polynesian migrants, but some Pakeha speculated that the Moriori were a distinct people from the Maori.

By the early twentieth century one set of ideas on early settlement had become the orthodox view of the past among Pakeha. This view, which held sway from the 1910s until at least the 1960s, maintained that the original people of New Zealand were the ‘Moriori’, a people only distantly related, if at all, to the Maori. This primitive early people were supposed to have been displaced by the arrival of the more advanced East Polynesian Maori. Some of the more fortunate Moriori were absorbed into the Maori tribes, while the majority were either killed or driven into exile on the Chatham Islands. This idea of the past, sometimes called the ‘Moriori Myth’, has now been largely rejected by scholars, but still holds some currency in popular circles.

The current thesis examines the question of how the ‘Moriori Myth’ developed and eventually became the orthodox view of the past. This question is investigated in the contexts of British imperial expansion, of the development of scientific ideas on race and evolution, and of the study of language and folklore as a way to decipher racial history. The current thesis is largely based on the writings of Pakeha and Maori scholars of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Letters and manuscripts, in both English and Maori, have been used, along with published books and papers. The major focus of the work is the idea that the Moriori Myth largely developed out of the Pakeha study of Maori oral history. This study of oral history led to a considerable degree of interaction between Pakeha scholars and Maori experts.
A major focus in the early part of the work is on Pakeha attempts to determine the racial identity and history of the Chatham Island Moriori. In this part of the work considerable attention has been paid to the collaborative work of the Pakeha scholar Alexander Shand and the Moriori expert Hirawanu Tapu, who worked together to record the surviving Moriori traditions.

The focus of the latter part of this thesis is on the creation by Pakeha scholars of theoretical models of the early migrations to New Zealand, based on their understandings of Maori oral traditions. It will be argued that the ‘Moriori Myth’ was largely based on the writings of Stephenson Percy Smith, as promoted by himself and Elsdon Best, through the medium of the knowledge network formed by the Polynesian Society. Smith’s writings on the ‘Moriori Myth’ will be shown to have been largely based on his interpretations of the writings of the Ngati Kahungunu scholar Hoani Turei Whatahoro. It will be argued that the ‘Moriori Myth’ was in fact the creation of interactions between Pakeha scholars and Maori experts rather than the invention of any one person or group.
As a young boy, growing up in Nelson, New Zealand, in the 1960s, I do not recall having any formal education on the history of my country. I do, however, remember a story that was repeated by my parents and many other adults. This story was what I later came to know as the ‘Moriori Myth’. Basically, whenever there was mention of the idea that ‘the Maoris’ might have some justifiable complaint over Pakeha taking their land, the standard reply was, ‘But they took it off the Morioris first’. The ‘Morioris’ were generally portrayed as a much darker and more primitive group than ‘the Maoris’, who had been in occupation of New Zealand until the Maori came and ate them. The story as it was related to me was largely an apologetic, along the lines that, while Pakeha may have done some bad things in their take over of New Zealand, at least they had treated the Maori better than the Maori had treated the Moriori. Furthermore, the way some Pakeha told the story, the Maori should have no real cause for complaint about the actions of the Pakeha, as the Maori were not the ‘real’ natives of New Zealand anyway. The story as it was told to me by adults I found repeated in such ancient history books as Our Nation’s Story and A. H. Reed’s History of New Zealand. These books told me that some of the Moriori had survived the Maori invasion by escaping to the Chatham Islands, only to be wiped out by more Maori invaders in the nineteenth century. I am sure I also recall a Weetbix card series on the history of New Zealand, which gave the same account of the Moriori and Maori.

Later, as a secondary school student in the 1970s, I followed up my interest in history by purchasing the second edition of the New Zealand’s Heritage series. This publication appeared to be saying that the Maori were the first people in Aotearoa and that the Moriori of the Chathams were closely related to them. The lack of emphasis on New Zealand history within the school system of the 1970s meant I was largely left to work out the story of the Maori and the Moriori for myself. By the 1980s, through a combination of reading and some minor involvement in the political activism of the time, I had a reasonable idea of the sequence of events that had occurred during the early migration history of New Zealand. I had become aware that, while the Moriori Myth was still believed by many of the people I knew, it had in fact been rejected in anthropological circles in the 1950s and by the slower moving historians in the 1960s. I was particularly intrigued to learn that the Moriori, far from
being extinct, were alive and well on the Chathams and that some were even resident in New Zealand. Michael King’s book Moriori was a great help in informing me of the history of the Chatham Island Moriori people.

I was now curious as to why a story that appeared to have been so strongly rejected by academics had originally been so strongly adopted by scholars and by the general public. I became aware that there were some works that dealt with this subject, the principal one being M. P. K. Sorrenson’s, Origins and Migrations. As I did not consider this brief work to really answer my questions, I resolved to devote the long essay of my fourth year of history honours to the subject. I then had pointed out to me that Claudia Geiringer had several years earlier written just such a fourth year honours dissertation. Geiringer’s dissertation was an excellent piece of work, but as with all honours papers could not go into much depth due to the time restrictions involved. Being unable to take on this subject in my fourth year of honours I foolishly resolved to go into the topic in detail and thus, eight years ago began the project that led to the thesis you are now about to read. It has been a project that I conducted not just to gain a degree but very much to answer questions that puzzled me from my early years.

A Disclaimer and Note on Sources

Before thanking the many people who have assisted me greatly in this project I must first make a note on some of the sources I have used. A large part of the material I have used is primary source material produced by the writers who were, wittingly or unwittingly, the creators of the Moriori Myth. A central part of my thesis follows the idea presented by David Simmons and by M. P. K. Sorrenson that the initial source of the Moriori Myth was Stephenson Percy Smith’s book The Lore of the Whare Wananga, Volume 2, Te Kauwae Raro. This work contains both English and Maori texts. The Maori text of this book was claimed by Smith to be the writings of Hoani Turei Whatahoro. Te Kauwae Raro was published in 1915 and has provided the basis for information on the Moriori and early migrations in a large number of other works published since.

In order to determine how closely the Maori text of Te Kauwae raro followed Whatahoro’s writings it was necessary to look at the Whatahoro’s original manuscripts. This was also essential in order to gain some idea of how closely the English translation followed the original Maori. (I should mention at this point that I have a reading knowledge of te reo Maori, but am not skilled enough to make my own accurate translations.) The first point I
must make concerning the study of the text of Te Kauwae raro is that the work I have carried out would have been impossible without the prior work of two much greater scholars, neither of whom I have ever met. The great Sir Apirana Ngata left marginal notes in one of Whatahoro’s manuscripts that immediately indicated that this was the exact material from which the ‘tangata whenua’ and ‘Moriori’ sections of Te Kauwae raro were derived. Without this clue I probably would never have identified the material in question. The other scholar without whose work I could never have navigated my way through the ocean of material produced by Whatahoro, is David Simmons. Simmons’ work in identifying and categorising the material of Whatahoro and in working out how Whatahoro dealt with the teachings of the tohunga Matorohanga, was essential to my thesis. Without his work I could not even have begun to investigate this subject. In looking at the work of Matorohanga, Whatahoro, Percy Smith, Elsdon Best, Ngata, and Simmons I can only see myself as, ‘a dwarf standing on the shoulders of giants’, (I think I stole that quote from Isaac Newton).

The other issue in looking at Whatahoro’s material is that the vast bulk of his hefty manuscript collection is held in the Maori Purposes Fund Board collection, managed by the Alexander Turnbull Library. When I used this material, prior to 1999, it was available to the public on unrestricted access. Since that time, the Maori Purposes Fund Board has seen fit to restrict public access to all the material in this collection. Access, if it can be gained at all, can only be achieved by applying to the Maori Purposes Fund Board. It is also possible that the collection may be under one or more claims to the Waitangi Tribunal.

In my own use of Whatahoro’s writings I have restricted myself to those sections that relate to material already published and publicly disseminated through the Lore of the Whare Wananga volumes. I have not seen it as my role to comment in detail on material that applies specifically to the traditions or whakapapa of Ngati Kahungunu or any other iwi, other than where that material has specifically mentioned earlier ‘tangata whenua’ people. My interest has been in the interaction between Whatahoro and Pakeha ethnologists, and in the development of a national myth through the interaction of Pakeha and Maori scholars. I have not attempted to write a history of Ngati Kahungunu, Moriori, or any other iwi or hapu. The views reflected in what I have written are my own and do not express the opinions of any others. My intention has been to illustrate the creation by Pakeha and Maori, of a story that came to profoundly effect both groups. Whether I have succeeded or not the reader alone can tell.
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INTRODUCTION

The Moriori Myth at the End of the Twentieth Century

At the end of the twentieth century a confusing range of views could be detected in public debates concerning the first settlers of New Zealand. The diversity of opinions was reflected by the documentary *Who Was Here Before Us?*, shown on Television One on 11 September 2000. A variety of Maori experts, anthropologists, and archaeologists put forward view that the earliest population in New Zealand had been the East Polynesian ancestors of both the Maori and of the Chatham Island Moriori. The historian turned archaeologist Barry Brailsford put forward an alternative view, that the earliest inhabitants of New Zealand were in fact a non-East Polynesian people called the Waitaha. Basing his views on what he claimed were Waitaha oral traditions, Brailsford maintained that the Waitaha were a people of mixed ancestry who settled in New Zealand thousands of years before the East Polynesians. A group of Waitaha descendants, represented by spokesperson Ken McAnergney, agreed and also claimed their ancestors had arrived at least a thousand years before the first Maori. Another Waitaha descendant Te Maire Tau, disagreed, stating that Waitaha were a Maori iwi, not a separate ‘nation’ from other East Polynesians. A wide range of enthusiastic amateur scholars were also interviewed, who proposed a series of theories on the earliest New Zealand populations. Among the ideas presented were that the first settlers were pre-Celtic Britons who arrived around 3000 BC, that stone garden structures and unusual carvings in Northland were signs of an earlier ‘Waitahanui’ people, and that stone formations in the Kaimanawa area were walls built by an early civilisation.¹

The documentary *Who Was Here Before Us?* also briefly examined the idea that the first people to arrive in New Zealand had been a primitive, non-East Polynesian people, called the Moriori, who were driven out to the Chatham Islands after the arrival of the East Polynesian Maori on a ‘Great Fleet’ of canoes. The documentary dismissed both of these claims. The narrator of the documentary made the claim that the story of a refugee, non-Polynesian Moriori was the invention of the nineteenth century geologist Sir Julius von Haast. The anthropologist Janet Davidson explained that the Moriori were in fact East Polynesian migrants to the Chathams, who were migrants to the Chathams rather than refugees. The Maori Studies lecturer and Te Ati Awa academic Peter Addms made the claim that the story of the Great Fleet was the invention of the nineteenth century amateur ethnologist Stephenson Percy Smith.²

¹ *Who Was Here Before Us?*, Producer Tony Manson, Director Mark MacNeill, Greenstone/TV One/ NZ on Air, broadcast on Television One (New Zealand), 11/9/2000.
² *Ibid.* It can be seen that neither Haast nor Smith were responsible for these myths. Haast did not connect his theoretical earlier 'Moa-hunter' people with the Moriori of the Chatham Islands and believed that the earlier people became extinct before the Maori arrived. See J. Haast, 'Notes on an Ancient Native Burial
Barry Brailsford's ideas concerning the original inhabitants of New Zealand were set out in his 1994 work *Song of Waitaha*. Brailsford claimed this book contained Waitaha oral traditions that had been kept secret and intact for hundreds of years. According to *Song of Waitaha*, the Waitaha were descendants of the fair-skinned, blue-eyed, light-haired Urukehu; the tall, dark-skinned, dark-haired Maori people; and the short, fair-skinned, dark-haired Kiritea people. The book stated that these people arrived in New Zealand thousands of years before the East Polynesians. Their descendants became the Waitaha and Rapuwai people, who lived peacefully until invaded and swamped by the warlike Maori. Brailsford's writings on Waitaha and on the sacred stones of indigenous peoples have proved popular with 'New Age' Pakeha, but have been attacked by some Maori commentators as not accurately representing the history of indigenous people. His failure in *Song of Waitaha* to show the specific sources of 'traditions' makes it very difficult for the reader to work out which information came from Waitaha elders and which came from Brailsford himself.³

The confusion over the identity of the earliest inhabitants of New Zealand was also reflected in the public view of the identity of the Moriori people of the Chatham Islands or Rekohu. The year 2000 saw the release of the film *The Feathers of Peace*, specifically dedicated to telling the story of the Chatham Island Moriori. The film makers Barry Barclay and Don Selwyn acknowledged that it was based closely on Michael King's book *Moriori*, released in 1989. While the film did not go into detail about the origins of the Moriori, King's book clearly portrayed them as being East Polynesians sharing the same ancestors as the Maori.⁴ In an article in *Metro* on *The Feathers of Peace* and its representation of the fate of the Moriori, Bill Ralston wrote,
This century old hidden guilt is about to be exposed to the raw light of 21st century judgement... 5 The clear assumption from Ralston’s statement was that the general public did not know who the Moriori were or what had happened to them.

A series of letters to the Wellington newspaper The Dominion in November 2000 showed that some members of the public did have very definite, if conflicting, opinions on the identity and fate of the Moriori. The letters were part of a debate around the use of the word ‘holocaust’ to describe the land loss and cultural destruction suffered by Taranaki Maori in the nineteenth century. Three of these letters stated as fact the idea that a peaceful Moriori population had lived in New Zealand until either eaten or driven out by the invading Maori.6 As one letter writer put it, ‘The first fact is that Maori produced the only holocaust to appear in New Zealand when they exterminated the indigenous people of those times, the Moriori.’7 At least one letter in reply put forward the opposing view that no earlier population had existed in New Zealand before the Maori.8 Another letter writer asked, ‘Could people please make up their minds about whether the Moriori existed and what the Maori did to them...’9

This series of letters illustrated the fact that, in the year 2000, there was still a common view among some elements of the New Zealand public that the Moriori were the first people in New Zealand, and that Maori were not justified in complaining about Pakeha colonisation as they had done even worse things to an earlier population. At the same time the range of views expressed illustrate the confusion in the public mind over the existence or non-existence of a pre-Maori people. At the end of the twentieth century the orthodox view of contemporary scholars had not yet fully replaced the orthodoxy of the early twentieth century, the idea sometimes called the Moriori Myth.10

The Moriori Myth as Orthodoxy: 'The Great New Zealand Myth'

In the years before the 1970s no such confusion or mystery appeared to exist in the public mind over the identity and fate of the Moriori or over the early settlement history of New Zealand. For most of the twentieth century one particular set of ideas dominated the popular view of the earliest human arrivals in these islands. This version of events

5B. Ralston, 'The Feathers of Peace', Metro, July 2000, p. 82.
8N. Ellis to the editor, The Dominion, 22/11/2000.
10 Other places this researcher has encountered continued public acceptance of the Moriori Myth include pub conversations and toilet graffiti.
Harry McDonald, Harbour View Hotel, Ravensbourne, 6/2/1994, Perscomm.
can be set out as follows. The first person to discover and name Aotearoa was the East Polynesian Kupe, who found an unoccupied land around 950 AD. He explored various coastal regions, then returned to his home in Hawaiki. Many sites have been suggested for this original homeland of Kupe, with Ra'iatea, Rarotonga, and Tahiti being among the most commonly suggested. The exact location of Hawaiki has been a point of contention since Pakeha scholars first heard it spoken of as a leaving off point for migrations to New Zealand. Once Kupe had returned home, he told others of the uninhabited land he had visited and gave them sailing instructions on how to reach Aotearoa.

According to this set of ideas Kupe's visit to New Zealand was followed by the accidental arrival of a Melanesian or West Polynesian/Melanesian people known as the Moriori. These people were supposedly darker and more primitive than the East Polynesian Maori. They were described as being, 'A dark skinned people, tall and slim, with flat noses and restless eyes and upstanding hair; lazy, and little skilled in the arts of living'. The myth portrayed the Moriori as having no knowledge of agriculture and building only the most primitive of dwellings. Even those writers who believed that the Moriori were a Western Polynesian people, speaking a Polynesian language, still accepted that the Moriori were an inferior people to the East Polynesians.

Around 1150 AD a group of East Polynesian migrants led by Toi and his grandson Whatonga settled in Aotearoa. The arrival of Toi and Whatonga was supposedly the result of the accidental disappearance of Whatonga from Hawaiki. Whatonga was blown out to sea during a canoe race in the lagoon at Tahiti. When he did not return, his grandfather Toi set out to look for him. Having failed to find Whatonga on the islands of Samoa and of Rarotonga, Toi resolved to follow Kupe's sailing instructions and look for Toi on the islands of Kupe's Aotearoa. Toi did not find Whatonga there, but decided to abandon his search and settle among the tangata whenua people, the Moriori, who had settled there earlier. In the meantime Whatonga had made his way back to Tahiti, only to learn that his grandfather had set off across the ocean to look for him. Whatonga decided to go and look for his grandfather, following his trail until he too arrived in Aotearoa. The people of Toi and Whatonga intermarried with the local people. Eventually disputes arose between the mixed descendants of Toi and Whatonga, and those tangata whenua tribes who had not intermarried with the East Polynesians. As a result of these disputes warfare arose, which led to the Moriori eventually being forced to flee the islands of Aotearoa and settle out in the Chatham Islands.

The East Polynesian take-over of the country was completed in 1350 AD when a Great Fleet of seven waka arrived in Aotearoa. These waka are usually listed as Tainui, Te Arawa, Mataatua, Kurahaupo, Tokomaru, Aotea, Horouta, and Takitimu. The canoe migrants completed the conquest over any remaining tangata whenua peoples. According to this version of migration traditions most of the prominent tribes of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries traced their descent to the migrants of the Great Fleet.

The surviving Moriori were either absorbed into the Maori tribes or escaped to the Chatham Islands, where they continued to live a lazy and primitive life without agriculture. On the Chathams the Moriori also became pacifists. Their simple way of life continued until the invasion of the Chathams by Ngati Tama and Ngati Mutunga, in 1835. The conquest of the Chathams was assumed to be a mirror image of what had happened earlier in New Zealand. Those Moriori who were not killed following the invasion were unable to cope with the superior Maori and the even more superior Pakeha immigrants, and so quickly died out. According to this version of history, the Moriori became extinct in 1933, when Tommy Solomon, the last full-blooded Moriori, died.12

The version of the history of migration set out above was widely accepted from the 1910s until well into the late twentieth century. It has been described as having been the 'orthodox' version of pre-contact history.13 In the latter part of the twentieth century this account has lost its orthodox status. Most academic archaeologists and historians no longer accept these stories as factual; and the stories are no longer seen by most Maori and Moriori experts as having sanction of tradition. It has come to be described as the 'Moriori myth', or sometimes as the 'Maruiwi myth'.14 The orthodoxy was subject to criticism from the 1910s onwards, by such notable scholars as Alexander Shand, the most informed Pakeha ethnologist of Moriori oral culture; from the anthropologists H. D. Skinner and Peter Buck; and from H.W. Williams, the compiler of The Dictionary of the Maori Language. The archaeological work of Roger Duff and the migration theories of Andrew Sharp also helped discredit the orthodoxy. David Simmons textual work

12Simmons, Great NZ Myth, pp. 1-7.

13Simmons, Great NZ Myth, p. 15.

P. J. Gibbons, "Going Native": a case study of cultural appropriation in a settler society...", thesis, D. Phil, History, University of Waikato, 1992. Gibbons describes this version of the past as the 'Smith-Best orthodoxy', reflecting the roles of Stephenson Percy Smith and Elsdon Best in promoting the ideas, see ibid., p. 275.

14The story is sometimes called the 'Maruiwi Myth' from the name Maruiwi which Elsdon Best gave to the supposed pre-Maori tangata whenua, see E. Best, 'Maori and Maruiwi', TNZI, 48, 1916, pp. 435-47, and H. W. Williams, 'The Maruiwi Myth', JPS, 51, 1937, pp. 105-22.
showed that the sequence of migrations described in the myth was not representative of nineteenth century Maori traditions.\textsuperscript{15}

There is still a wide ranging debate over exactly when humans first settled in the islands of New Zealand and the Chathams.\textsuperscript{16} Certain points are, however, generally agreed upon by scholars. The early arrivals were Eastern Polynesians who were the ancestors of the Maori. A group of these same Eastern Polynesians left mainland New Zealand sometime around 500 years ago to settle on Rekohu or the Chatham Islands. These settlers were the ancestors of the Moriori, the tchakat henu or indigenous people of Rekohu. The close relationship between the Moriori and the Maori is clearly shown by examining archaeological evidence, comparative linguistics, and Moriori traditions. The so-called primitive nature of Moriori physical culture, appears to have been a result of the unique, isolated environment of Rekohu. Moriori only had access to products obtained by hunting and gathering, as crops such as kumara could not grow on the Chathams. With only a limited range of timbers and stone on the islands materials available for tool making and the building of houses and canoes were strictly limited. The development of pacifist forms of conflict resolution also seems to have been a response to the situation where a relatively large population lived on an isolated and geographically restricted archipelago.\textsuperscript{17} The idea of Moriori extinction has also been challenged. The descendants of the Rekohu Moriori have retained their cultural and political identity as Te Iwi Moriori, denying that they ceased to exist as a people with the death of Tommy Solomon.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{15}A. Shand to S. P. Smith, 30/3/1910, in A. Shand letterbook qMs-1789, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.


Simmons, \textit{Great NZ Myth}.

\textsuperscript{16}A paper that looks from an anthropological point of view at the changes in models of Polynesian settlement is J. Barber, 'Constructions of Change: A History of Early Maori Culture Sequences', \textit{JPS}, 104, 4, 1995, pp. 357-96.

\textsuperscript{17}Atholl Anderson suggests that the idea of Moriori pacifism may itself be a myth, given the presence of patu in the Moriori arsenal prior to European contact. A. Anderson pers comm, 17/5/2001.

\textsuperscript{18}A. Shand, \textit{The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands: Their History and Traditions}, New Plymouth, 1911, \textit{passim}.


D. Sutton, 'The Whence of the Moriori', \textit{NZJH}, 19, 1, 1985, pp. 3-13. Sutton noted, on p. 3 of this paper that the Moriori myth was still prevalent in 1985.


J. Davidson, \textit{The Prehistory of New Zealand}, Auckland, 1984, \textit{passim}. 6
The Aims of the Current Thesis in Relation to Previous Works

It is not the aim of this thesis to try and investigate the actual events surrounding the early human settlement of New Zealand. Nor is this work intended to be a history of the Moriori people of the Chatham Islands. Both of these subjects have been and continue to be covered at length by other papers and publications. The specific subject of this thesis is to examine the creation of the myth that New Zealand was originally populated by a Moriori people totally distinct from the Maori. In the April-May 2000 edition of Mana magazine, Peter Adds, a Te Ati Awa lecturer in Maori Studies at Victoria University, expressed the opinion that the Moriori Myth was the total invention of Stephenson Percy Smith.\(^1\) The current thesis will contest this idea, arguing instead that the myth was in fact the product of interaction between Pakeha and Maori ethnographers.

Aspects of the material covered in this thesis have been covered before in a number of works. M. P. K. Sorrenson outlined the various Pakeha myths concerning Polynesian migration in his Macmillan Brown lectures of 1978. In 1979, an expanded version of these lectures was published as Maori Origins and Migrations: The Genesis of Some Pakeha Myths and Legends. In this work Sorrenson discussed the work of Smith, Best and the Polynesian Society. Sorrenson, however, devoted a mere fourteen pages of his work to the entire development of the orthodox myth from the contact of Smith with Whatahoro, through to the debunking of the myth by the work of scholars such as H. W. Williams, Andrew Sharp and David Simmons. Sorrenson's work does not examine in any detail the interactions between Pakeha and Maori scholars which effectively created the orthodox myth. Nor does he make any detailed analysis of the way in which the Polynesian Society operated as a knowledge network to promote and give authority to this myth. Sorrenson's work provides a valuable introduction to examining the myths Pakeha created concerning Polynesian migration and the early inhabitants of New Zealand. It can, however, hardly be seen as a definitive history of the creation of the orthodox migration myth.\(^2\)

David Simmons' 1976 work, The Great New Zealand Myth, along with his 1970 paper, 'The Sources of The Lore of the Whare Wananga', written in collaboration with Bruce Biggs, provide detailed textual analyses of The Lore of the Whare Wananga. The Lore of the Whare Wananga was a two volume work, edited and translated by Stephenson Percy Smith. The first volume Te Kauwae runga or Things Celestial was published in 1913, the second, Te Kauwae raro or Things Terrestrial, was released in 1915. Te
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\(^1\) L. Ashton, 'Where Did We Come From?', Mana, 33, April-May 2000, p. 32.
**Kauwae raro** is the work which Simmons shows to have been the source of the orthodox myth. *Te Kauwae raro* referred to the deeds of the human ancestors of the Maori, while *Te Kauaie runga* dealt with stories of the gods. Percy Smith took this material from the writings of the Ngati Kahungunu expert, Hoani Turei Whatahoro. Whatahoro claimed that his writings were largely based on the teachings of the traditional school of learning, the Whare Wananga, as written down by him from the oral teachings of several Ngati Kahungunu tohunga, in particular Nepia Pohuhu and Te Matorohanga. Simmons has examined Whatahoro's work in his 1994 paper 'The Words of Matorohanga', in which he seeks to assess just how much of Whatahoro's writings can actually be traced back to Matorohanga.21

*Te Kauwae raro* was the first published work to set out the exact migration sequence used in the orthodox myth. It is also the first work to use the dates that became widely accepted as being historically accurate. *Te Kauwae raro* described Kupe's discovery of Aotearoa in 950; the Moriori arrival after this event, followed in turn by Toi and Whatonga in 1150; and the arrival of the Great Fleet in 1350.22

Simmons' work provides an essential guide to the writings of Whatahoro and to Smith's editing of, and commentaries on, these works. *The Great New Zealand Myth* also gives many examples of other migration traditions, providing an important comparative study. However the value of Simmons' works overall is mainly as textual analysis. Simmons' papers are of most value to scholars with access to the original primary manuscripts. Simmons' work does not provide an examination of the intellectual context that Pakeha scholars worked within in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It is only by examining this context that we can see what made Pakeha scholars so ready to accept Whatahoro's version of traditional history rather than any of the many other contradictory accounts of early migrations.

Peter Gibbons, examines many of the themes that will be covered in this current thesis. Gibbons gives a detailed account of the debates between Johannes Andersen and H. D. Skinner, in the 1930s, concerning the authenticity of the Whatahoro/Smith/Best account of the past. Gibbons looks at the interaction between Pakeha and Maori that helped
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21 Simmons, *Great NZ Myth*.  
Simmons, *Great NZ Myth*, pp. 16-7, 64-6, 112.
produce new ideas on the history of both groups. His thesis also examines in some detail the role of the Polynesian Society as a knowledge network and forum for debate. Gibbon's work does not, however, deal with the origins of the theories that were being debated.\textsuperscript{23}

The most comprehensive existing work on the creation of the Moriori myth is in fact a fourth year honours dissertation from the University of Otago, written by Claudia Geiringer in 1990, entitled ‘Ko te Heke ra o Maruiwi: Theories of Dual Settlement in New Zealand’. She traces the development of the idea of an earlier population from the early ideas of Crozet and Forster, through to Gudgeon, Smith and Best and their use of Maori oral traditions. Geiringer's work suffers from the standard problems associated with honours dissertations, in that time restrictions meant she could not research in detail many of the topics she raised. This is especially clear with regard to Smith's use of Whatahoro's manuscripts, and the interactions between Maori and Pakeha scholars that helped produce the orthodox version of the Moriori myth. Having not had the time to intensively study Smith's papers and Whatahoro's manuscripts, Geiringer is unable to give a detailed explanation of the processes by which Smith came to edit and promote the version of the past he had gleaned from Whatahoro's work. It is hoped that this thesis will be able to shed some light on these issues.\textsuperscript{24}

This thesis will begin by examining the intellectual context set up in the nineteenth century by the spread of progressive evolutionary ideas, by the emphasis on the study of language and folklore, and by the pervasiveness of race as a concept for defining and categorising peoples. The collection of oral traditions by scholars such as John White and Sir George Grey will be considered.

The theme of Pakeha collaboration with indigenous compilers of traditions will be examined in more detail through the writings of the Pakeha ethnologist Alexander Shand, who worked in partnership with the Moriori expert Hirawanu Tapu to produce the most extensive body of written work on the traditions of the Moriori. The work of Shand and Tapu will be examined in the context of looking at how Pakeha saw the Moriori of Rekohu or the Chatham Islands. Of particular importance in studying the origins of the Moriori myth will be the investigation of how different Pakeha perceived the genealogical relationship between the Moriori and the Maori. The Pakeha

\textsuperscript{23} Gibbons, 'Going Native', \textit{passim}, but especially pp. 275-355.
perceptions of the racial identity of Maori and Moriori will be examined in the light of contemporary Western thinking on race, migration and evolution.

This will be followed by an examination of the writings of two late nineteenth century Native Land Court judges, John Alexander Wilson and Walter Edward Gudgeon. The work of these two men will be used to illustrate the major theme of the use of Maori oral accounts as a source of ideas by Pakeha writers. The major influences on the ideas of Wilson and Gudgeon will be shown to be Western discourses on race, science, language and progress, while the building blocks they used to develop their ideas will be shown to be their interpretations of oral accounts given by Maori in the forum of the Native Land Court.

The latter part of this thesis will concentrate on the creation and dissemination of the ideas in *The Lore of the Whare Wananga*. Particular attention will be paid to the relationship between Stephenson Percy Smith and Hoani Turei Whatahoro, in the work they did together to produce the *Lore*. It is one of the main aims of this thesis to illustrate processes of information exchange between Pakeha and Maori scholars.

The theme of the engagement of Western scholars with the 'indigene', the 'other', or the 'Orient' has been examined in detail by writers such as Said, Clifford and Torgovnik. In the New Zealand context Terry Goldie has made a comparative study of the images of indigenous people as represented in the literature of the former white dominions of Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Peter Gibbons has used the example of the work of Johannes Andersen to illustrate the processes by which images taken from Pakeha views of Maori cultures were incorporated into the Pakeha self image in a process of 'indigenisation'.

The current thesis will look at similar processes to those examined by the authors mentioned above, but in the fields of ethnology and writing migration history. The processes described are not, however, simply a Pakeha invention of a 'Maori' history. The work of Sir George Grey, John White, W. E. Gudgeon, J. A. Wilson, Alexander Shand, Percy Smith and Elsdon Best, all of whom were competent speakers of te reo Maori, involved the extensive use of oral sources. Grey, White, Smith and Best all used
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Gibbons, "'Going Native"."
a large amount of Maori manuscript material which they discussed in some detail with
Maori scholars. In the use of both written and oral sources a great deal of interaction
was occurring between Pakeha scholars and Maori experts. Some of these Maori experts
were older men with a great deal of traditional knowledge. Others were younger men
who used their literacy skills to record the teachings of their elders. These Maori experts
were themselves taking ideas from Pakeha and using them to illuminate and develop the
traditions they were recording.

It will be argued that the Moriori myth was created through processes of the exchange of
information and cultural knowledge between peoples during the colonial take-over of
New Zealand. As Eric Wolf has pointed out, the 'people without history', the 'non-
Western' people of the world, were not simply passive groups to which colonising
powers did things. Once contacts were made these peoples were involved in constant
economic and cultural interchange with the 'West'. There were also constant interactions
with other peoples, involving economic and cultural interchange. The economic and
cultural products of these interchanges were seldom solely the product of one group's
input, despite the fact that one group may have claimed a greater control over or
ownership of these products.\(^{26}\)

This is not to argue that coloniser and colonised had equal power or agency in these
situations. Writers such as Frantz Fanon have shown the immense control over the
definition of culture held by those in positions of colonial power.\(^{27}\) In the case of an
idea such as the Moriori myth, once the idea had been accepted by influential colonial
scholars it was then adopted by the colonial media and education system. By the early
twentieth century these colonial Pakeha systems generally had more power to control
and disseminate their own version of the idea than did the communications systems of
the colonised.

An imperialist culture, or set of cultures, as Said and Goldie argue, has a discourse or
set of self-referential intellectual structures concerning indigenous people.\(^{28}\) It is the
argument of this thesis that, while such a discourse is self-referential, it is also open to
input from the very indigenous groups to which it is referring. Thus the ideas put
forward by Pakeha scholars concerning the early inhabitants of New Zealand were
influenced by the ideas of Maori. However, as I will argue, among a wide range of
Maori ideas it was the writings of Hoani Turei Whatahoro that were accepted as factual

\(^{27}\)F. Fanon, \textit{The Wretched of the Earth}, Harmondsworth, 1967.
\(^{28}\)Said, \textit{Orientalism}.
Said, \textit{Culture and Imperialism}.
by Pakeha scholars. The way Whatahoro presented the past fitted easily into Western discourses of power, race, folklore and migration history, thus explaining their easy acceptance by Pakeha.

The set of ideas used by Pakeha scholars in looking at things Maori, including Maori migration history, can be seen to have had many inputs from within Pakeha cultures. Works of fiction, interpretations of the Bible, attitudes to art and music, and the whole genre of travel literature, all helped shape Pakeha attitudes to indigenous people. While informed by some or all of these sets of ideas, it will be seen that most of the Pakeha scholars whose work will be examined, saw themselves as operating within the disciplines of science. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries scientific ideas concerning race and human migration were based strongly around ideas of biological evolution on the one hand and on the tracing of migration and racial identity through comparative philology and folklore on the other. While the two sets of ideas were in some ways radically different, both emphasised the idea of racial essence, whether based on biology or culture, and the idea of the triumph of stronger groups over the weaker.

This thesis will concentrate on those scholars who developed their ideas about the Maori through using Maori oral or written records as the raw material for their theories. We will therefore examine the period from the 1840s through to the early twentieth century, with the strongest focus on the period from the 1880s to around the 1920s. The period from the 1840s through to the 1880s saw both some Pakeha and some Maori develop sufficient knowledge of each other's languages and cultures to be influenced by the other when developing ideas about the past. By the 1880s a network of Pakeha scholars with a specific interest in things Maori and Polynesian had been built up. This network was formalised as the Polynesian Society in 1892. There was a certain amount of crossover between these Pakeha scholars and the network of indigenous scholars that had been building up over the same period. It will be seen that it was this crossover that led to the collaborative production of such works as Alexander Shand and Hirawanu Tapu's writings on the Moriori, and Percy Smith and Whatahoro's *The Lore of the Whare Wananga*. The 1920s has been taken as the cut off point for this thesis as it was in this period that the ideas on earlier inhabitants put forward in the *Lore* became largely accepted as the orthodoxy. The 1920s and 1930s was also the period when many of the principal figures involved in the creation of the orthodox Moriori myth died, including Whatahoro, Percy Smith and Elsdon Best.29

The ideas examined in this study will also contribute to the study of imperial history. The process whereby Pakeha scholars tried to build up a coherent and defined history of the earlier people was itself a part of the process of building what has been called the 'Imperial Archive'. The building up of knowledge about the natural features and peoples of areas being colonised was in itself part of the process whereby an enhanced knowledge of a place and its people enabled a greater degree of control to be established over both. At the same time the greater degree of knowledge allowed the colonisers to conduct a process of intellectual 'domestication'. The building up of knowledge about the new land and its people meant that both could be fitted more easily into Western intellectual constructs, allowing the coloniser to be both more comfortable with, and more in control of, things and people that had formerly appeared dangerously unfamiliar.

The build up of the Imperial Archive was itself a product of the growth political and commercial empires. Said has argued that the development of the nineteenth century novel was a product of the economic and social structures that built up as a result of the establishment of empires by the western European powers. This is also the case with western science. Expeditions of navigation and measurement such as those of Cook or the voyage of the Beagle, provided great opportunities for naturalists to collect and compare a wide range of material. The commercial and political spread of empire meant that missionaries, soldiers, traders and administrators were scattered around many parts of the world that would otherwise have been obscure to those at the metropolitan centres of empire. It was people on the frontiers who collected a great deal of the information and specimens that were then sent to back to the metropolitan centres of empire. Such information and material was used by metropolitan scholars as the raw material for the development of scientific theories. Later, when small scientific communities were established in colonies such as New Zealand, ideas were swapped back and forwards between the peripheries and centres of the empires. In examining the processes of developing the Moriori myth, the working of imperial scientific and scholarly networks will be illuminated.

**Language and Terminology**

Before concluding this introduction a few points must be made concerning the use of language and terminology. It must first be pointed out that many of the ideas examined in this thesis are now regarded by many, including this writer, as being both wrong and morally reprehensible. The aim of this thesis is, however, to examine and understand
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31 Said, *Culture and Imperialism*. 
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these ideas in their historical context, rather than to judge them. Such judgements are
left up to the reader.

In the late twentieth century the very concept of race has become a controversial one. As Bulmer and Solomos argue, 'It is no exaggeration to say that both race and racism remain essentially contested concepts, whether it be in academic or political spheres'.

The common usage of the term 'race' to divide humanity into discrete groups based on physical characteristics, and the mental attributes these physical features supposedly reflected, originated in the second half of the eighteenth century. By the mid nineteenth century the concept of race had become a dominant one in western European and North American thinking. The concept was, however, never an exact one and changed considerably in meaning over time.

In the late twentieth century, some scholars argued that the concept of race as a biologically determined division of the human species, was in fact a culturally defined fiction. This view, while not necessarily a widely held one, is shared by the author of this thesis. Despite this, in the text of the following work the term 'race' is used in the context of its varied nineteenth and early twentieth century applications. The word is therefore used without quotation marks, except in cases where it is specifically quoted. Terms such as 'savage', 'civilisation', 'white', 'primitive' and 'half-caste' also appear in this work in their nineteenth and early twentieth century contexts and, when not being specifically quoted, appear without quotation marks. In all of these cases the lack of quotation marks does not indicate the author's agreement with the meanings given to such words in their earlier intellectual contexts.

The early canoe migrant ancestors of the modern Maori have generally been referred to in this thesis as 'East Polynesians'. This term is used on the assumption that, by the time of their arrival in New Zealand, these people already possessed a culture which linked them closely with the inhabitants of areas such as Tahiti and the Society and Marquesas Islands, as well as with people who had migrated to the Hawaiian and Easter Islands. Where the term 'Macri' has been used to refer to these early migrants, it is used without the assumption that one homogenous group had arrived in New Zealand with a pre-existing distinct Maori culture and identity. It is instead assumed that Maori and
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33 The ambiguity of the nineteenth century term race can be illustrated by the fact that in his 1867 paper Our Race and its Origin Richard Taylor used the term race to apply to the 'New Zealand race', the 'Hamitic race', and the Human 'race'. See R. Taylor, Our Race and its Origin, London, 1867, pp. 6, 16, 24, 32.
34 For example, Collette Guillaumin examines the views of authors, such as the anthropologist Jean Hiernaux, who argue that race is strictly cultural. See C. Guillaumin, 'The Changing Face of Race', in M. Bulmer & J. Solomos, eds., Racism, pp. 355-62.
Moriori cultures were sets of East Polynesian cultures that evolved in the specific environments of New Zealand and Rekohu.

While the term Macri has been used to refer to the people living in New Zealand prior to 1769, this does not indicate that such a term was used by these people to refer to themselves before contact with Pakeha. Williams points out that the use of the term 'Maori' to refer to the indigenous people of New Zealand, was coined by the people themselves, probably in the 1850s. Dieffenbach writing in 1843 noted of the 'natives of New Zealand', that, 'They call themselves Maori, which means indigenous, aboriginal: or Tangata maori, indigenous men; in opposition to Pakea, which means a stranger, or Pakea mangomango, a very black stranger, a negro'. Before this time Maori were referred to by European writers as either 'natives' or 'New Zealanders'. Maori would either have adopted versions of these European titles or referred to themselves by their tribal identities. The concept of 'Maori' as such, only emerged once there were Pakeha to be compared with.

The term 'tangata whenua' is sometimes used in this thesis in the sense in which it is still used in te reo Maori, that is, to refer to the 'people of the land' of a particular area. In this context tangata whenua will be used without quotation marks. The phrase is also often used in the context that the Pakeha writers Stephenson Percy Smith and Elsdon Best used it, to refer to the supposed non-East Polynesian earlier people. When 'tangata whenua' is used in this context it has been placed in quotation marks to avoid confusion of meaning. The use of this term does not imply that the author of this thesis shares the belief held by Smith and Best that the Maori were not the original people of the land.

The term 'Moriori' when used in this thesis generally refers to the self-titled name of the tchakat henu or indigenous people of Rekohu or the Chatham Islands. On those occasions where the term is used by Pakeha authors to refer to a supposed early indigenous people of New Zealand, this will be indicated by quotation marks.

The term 'Pakeha' has generally been used to refer to European and North American immigrants and visitors to New Zealand. This term has been used in preference to 'European', in order to distinguish between those scholars based in Europe and those out in the New Zealand colony. The term Pakeha was current among Maori by the 1840s. Williams maintains that it usually referred to 'persons of predominantly European
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36H. W. Williams, *Dictionary of the Maori Language*, Wellington, 1971, p. 179. But Atholl Anderson has mentioned the idea that the term 'Maori' may have been used in pre-contact times to distinguish between ordinary 'corporal' people and atua or super natural beings. A. Anderson pers comm, 17/5/2001.
descent', though Dieffenbach noted in 1843 that 'Negroes' were referred to as 'Pakeha mangomango'.

The terms 'New Zealand' and 'Aotearoa' have been used interchangeably to describe the islands of New Zealand. It is, however, recognised by the author that the term Aotearoa was, until the late nineteenth century used specifically for the North Island or Te Ika a Maui, while the South Island was referred to as Te Wai Pounamu.

Throughout the thesis the phrase 'Maori cultures' has been used rather than 'Maori culture', to recognise that a range of beliefs, dialects, economies and cultural practices existed, and continue to exist among Maori. The small number of Maori and Moriori scholars, such as Hirawanu Tapu, Te Matorohanga, and Whatahoro, are not seen as representative of the entire 'Maori culture' or 'Moriori culture'. It is recognised that a wide range of knowledge, stories and expertise existed both within and across particular indigenous groups. The Pakeha scholars investigated in this thesis tended to see only a particular set of indigenous experts as retaining knowledge of the past. The male Pakeha scholars did not tend to regard most of the knowledge held by women as worthy of study or being recorded. Rather their interest was in what they saw as the specialist, elite knowledge of what were supposedly ancient traditions, held by men of some rank and training. In essence a specialist group of male Pakeha were interested in gaining knowledge from a specialist group of male Maori. Knowledge of the past held by women or by men without rank or traditional training did not hold much interest for these Pakeha specialists.

It should also be noted that neither macrons nor double vowels have been used to indicate the long vowel in Maori. While the author acknowledges the length of the vowel to indicate meaning, the majority of nineteenth and early twentieth century Maori texts used in this work give no indication of vowel length. I have therefore decided in the interests of consistency to omit the indication of vowel length throughout this work.

We will begin this exploration of the development of the Moriori Myth by examining the nineteenth century context in which ideas on race, evolution and progress developed. The pervasiveness of the idea that more primitive peoples, like more primitive plants and animals, must give way to more advanced races, will be
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investigated in the setting of the Pakeha colonisation of New Zealand and the seeming decline of the Maori. In a later chapter the same situation will be investigated with reference to the destruction of the Chatham Island Moriori by Maori and Pakeha colonisers. The major focus throughout will be on how Pakeha scholars attempted to construct theories on the early settlement of New Zealand through their understandings of Maori oral traditions.
CHAPTER ONE.

SCIENCE, EMPIRE AND EXTINCTION: THEORIES OF EVOLUTION AND DISPLACEMENT IN THE NEW ZEALAND CONTEXT

The first recorded interaction between Maori and Pakeha occurred in 1642, when the Dutch ships Heemskirk and Zeehaen, commanded by Abel Tasman, arrived at Taitapu, now called Golden Bay. Their interaction with the Ngati Tumatakokiri people of that area left little impact on Maori oral history. Our knowledge of this event therefore relies almost entirely on the Dutch account. The Dutch left only a brief description of the Maori and a record of the killing of several of Tasman’s crew. Tasman’s visit was for the purpose of investigating the possibilities of trade. The combination of Maori violence and a lack of evident trading possibilities meant that the Dutch decided to give New Zealand a wide berth in the future. This view was obviously adopted by other European powers as no visit to New Zealand was recorded again until that of Cook, 127 years later. Tasman himself did not make any guesses concerning the origins or identity of the Maori and did not record any interest in these subjects.

European thinkers began to speculate seriously about the origins of the Maori, and other ‘South Sea Islanders’, during the period of the British and French exploratory voyages of the Pacific in the eighteenth century. This was part of a general attempt by Europeans to understand the immense diversity of peoples they were encountering during journeys of exploration. This quest for knowledge was at the same time an essential tool in expanding European trade and European geo-political power. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries Britain and France were the two great imperial rivals in the Pacific. The speculation by European thinkers on the nature of humanity, and in particular on the nature of the peoples of these ‘new’ lands, was itself a product of interactions between imperial explorers and traders on the one hand and indigenous peoples on the other.

James Cook and Joseph Banks visited the Pacific, including New Zealand, on the Endeavour expedition of 1769. Their journals show that both men had a strong interest in tracing the origins of the Maori and in discovering how closely they were related to
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1 Salmond, Two Worlds, pp. 75n, 82-3, 83n. Salmond writes on p. 83, ‘Perhaps because of its near fictional quality, and because Ngaati Tumatakokiri ceased to exist as an effective unit before the period of European settlement, Maori records of this meeting are sparse’.
Salmond, Two Worlds, pp. 97-8.
other South Sea Islanders. The Tahitian Tupaia, who sailed with the *Endeavour* to New Zealand, was able to communicate fairly effectively with Maori using the Tahitian language. This indicated a strong connection between the Tahitians and Maori. Banks noted that some Maori claimed their ancestors had come originally from a place outside New Zealand, a place he recorded as being 'Heweaye'. Cook himself was certain the Maori were of the same origin as other South Sea Islanders but was not convinced that their place of origin would ever be found.

None of the stories collected by Tupaia and written down by his European travelling companions indicated any Maori belief that a people had lived in New Zealand before them. Nor did Cook or Banks appear to have believed that there was racial diversity among the Maori. Banks only noted that, 'In colour they vary a little, some being browner than others, but few are browner than a Spaniard a little sunburnt might be supposed to be.'

**Crozet and Forster: Early Ideas on a Pre-Maori Population.**

It was the disastrous 1772 French expedition of Marion du Fresne that provided the first speculation on a mixed racial origin for Maori and the possibility that an earlier people had lived in New Zealand. The French, like the British, were fascinated by questions of the origins of the South Sea Islanders. Marion du Fresne's expedition had been bringing home the Tahitian 'Maijaa', taken from Tahiti by Bougainville. Maijaa's death on the voyage to New Zealand meant that the French had no translator equivalent to the *Endeavour*'s Tupaia. The French were, however, able to observe the close similarity between the Maori and Tahitian languages through using a Tahitian vocabulary provided by Bougainville.

Julien Crozet, Marion du Fresne's second in command, made an original observation on the nature on the nature of Maori appearance. Crozet noted what he believed were three different categories of people. He referred to these divisions as 'yellowish-whites', 'yellow' people, and 'negroes'. Crozet believed the 'yellowish-whites' were the aboriginals of New Zealand, while the 'blacks' were from 'New Holland. The 'yellow'
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8Crozet, *Voyage*, p. 28.
people came from the union of the black and white groups. Looking at the similarity between Maori and Tahitian languages he speculated that in the past there had been contact between these islands. Crozet suggested that two waves of settlement had occurred in New Zealand, with the two peoples involved later inter-breeding to produce a third, mixed group of people, now living alongside the other two groups. Crozet's theory differed from most of those that were to follow it, in the sense that he suggested that the darker race were the later arrivals. Most later theories were to hold that the darker people were the more primitive and the earliest ones to arrive in New Zealand.

Johann Reinhold Forster (1729-1798) and his son George, (Johann George Adam, 1754-94), were naturalists on Cook's second Pacific voyage of 1772-5. Forster's idea of an earlier 'Papuan' people in the Pacific, a people who in some places were conquered by the more advanced 'Malays', was based in part on his observations during his travels in the Pacific. His ideas, however, owed far more to contemporary European ideas. In particular he drew heavily on contemporary ideas concerning human social progress and on the hierarchical scale of life forms described as the 'Great Chain of Being'. In the late eighteenth century many European thinkers, especially in France and in Scotland, were developing theories based around the idea of progressive social evolution. Forster constructed his own theory of a series of Pacific migrations and explained the nature of the 'Malay' Maori, who appeared to him to be degenerate when compared to their Tahitian relatives. He believed this to be the result of the Maori mixing with the darker and more primitive earlier 'Papuan' population. Forster's theories fitted with a view that was to remain a constant through most Western writing on Pacific migration. This was the idea that the darkness of colour of a people reflected both their inferiority and their antiquity. Forster held that the Papuans must be less advanced than the Malays and must therefore have arrived in the area earlier. He believed that the later a people left the Middle Eastern centres of culture the more advanced they tended to be and the less they had degenerated through isolation from such centres. Forster also maintained that those 'barbaric' customs of the Maori, such as cannibalism, that were not shared by their Tahitian relatives were a product of mixing with the Papuans.
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9 Ibid., pp. 66-7.
10 Ibid., p. 67.
M. Harris, Rites of Anthropological Theory: A History of Theories of Culture, New York, 1968, pp. 24-5.
"Some Dispersed Jews": 'Hamitic' and 'Semitic' Peoples in the Pacific?

In the early nineteenth century many of those writing accounts of their interaction with Maori were Anglican or Wesleyan missionaries or people with some connection with the missionary movement. Early nineteenth century British writing on the nature of 'savages', whether by clergy or lay writers, tended to emphasise the savage's fall from a previously more advanced position. This in turn was based on attempts to describe the history of humanity in the context of the events described in the Book of Genesis including the expulsion from Eden, the Flood, and the Tower of Babel. In early nineteenth century Britain established religion set the parameters for scientific thinking, particularly for ethnographic speculations. The same period witnessed a decline in Britain of progressive 'Enlightenment' ideas.

Both the Evangelical Movement and the heightened impact of the Bible on scientific thinking were part of a British reaction against what were seen as the excesses of the French Revolution. Any ideas of progressive human development which excluded the biblical account, especially those ideas from French thinkers, were regarded by the British establishment as dangerously atheistic and likely to lead to the breakdown of social and moral order. Fear of revolution and social breakdown increased in the 1830s as urban riots, Chartist agitation, industrial disputes and rural uprisings spread through Britain, while dissenters, atheists and political radicals spread their doctrines through public meetings and a generally illegal underground press.12

In contrast the religion of the established Churches of England and Scotland represented a bulwark of order against such threats. The idea of social and religious order was also reflected in the prevailing ideas on scientific inquiry and natural order.13 Nature was regarded as 'God's second book', along with the revealed word of the Bible, through which His Truth could be made known to humanity. The Natural Theology of Rev. William Paley maintained that the perfect adaptation of each life form was rational proof of God's existence and showed his concern for and ordering of Creation.14

J. B. Morrell and A. Thackry, Gentlemen of Science: Early years of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Oxford, 1981, pp. 7-10.
13In a sermon delivered in 1838 to 'colliers and rabble', the eminent clergyman and geologist Adam Sedgwick compared the natural order of geological stratification to the 'natural order' of society where each person had their appointed place. Ibid., p. 31.
14W. Paley, Natural Theology, London, 1802.
This religious emphasis restricted the theoretical framework within which ideas of human development and natural history could be constructed. Early nineteenth century religious thinkers of all shades of opinion accepted science, especially Newtonian astronomy, as the 'norm of truth'. An interest in natural history was considered to be part of the normal repertoire of the Anglican minister allowing him to read 'God's second book'. The Cambridge-based Liberal Anglicans, while critical of Paley's utilitarianism, agreed with him that the scientific search for Truth was a part of Christian duty.

In the early nineteenth century, established religion had a great deal of involvement in, and control over, scientific thought. The Anglican church controlled the great universities of Oxford and Cambridge which only Anglicans could attend. The majority of professors at these universities were also Anglican ministers, including such great scientists as the geologist the Reverend Adam Sedgewick, the botanist the Reverend John Stevens Henslow and the mathematician, geologist, historian and philosopher of science the Reverend William Whewell. On a more humble level a great deal of the geologising, botanising and studying of wildlife in the early part of the century was carried out by the ubiquitous parson-naturalist. Many non-clergymen scientists such as the ethnologist James Cowles Prichard and the geologist Charles Lyell were still strongly religious.

Many of the early Pakeha observers of the Maori were either missionaries or strongly religious laypeople. Of these some, notably Richard Taylor and William Colenso, were keen natural historians, collecting and recording specimens in New Zealand and keeping track of scientific developments in Europe. Taylor, Colenso and the Reverend James Stack were all actively involved in the debates over Moa extinction. Robert FitzRoy, captain of *HMS Beagle* and later Governor of New Zealand was strongly religious, but also keenly interested in meteorology and the magnetic aspects of navigation and mapping. In the early nineteenth century Britain, religious belief was not seen as being

---

16 *ibid.*, Chp I.
17 *ibid.*, Chps 1-2, pp. 249-50.
in conflict with scientific thinking, although religious beliefs did put some restrictions on scientific speculation.  

Ideas from the Bible led several early nineteenth century commentators to suggest that Maori were in fact the degenerated descendants of civilised ancient Semitic ancestors, perhaps even of one of the lost tribes of Israel. J. L. Nicholas accompanied the Reverend Samuel Marsden on his 1816 voyage to New Zealand. Nicholas later wrote that Maori tradition clearly showed some residual knowledge of Biblical teachings, left over from the times when their ancestors lived near the Holy Land.  

He believed all Polynesians were descended from a powerful Asian civilisation but 'degenerated into barbarism' as they migrated east. Nicholas believed the Maori were either of Jewish origin or had been in touch with Jewish religious knowledge when in Asia. Marsden also believed that the Maori had descended from 'some dispersed Jews, at some period or other...'. Like Nicholas he believed the Maori had degenerated through a process of migration.  

William Barrett Marshall, surgeon on HMS *Alligator*, was another writer who believed that Maori may have been descended from one of the 'lost tribes' of Israel. Robert FitzRoy thought the Maori were descended from a mixing of the offspring of the three sons of Noah; Shem, Ham and Japhet. Both naval men were staunch Christians. The Jewish trader J. S. Polack believed that Maori funeral customs indicated they were originally descended at least in part from 'the Chaldean ancestors of Abraham'. The missionary Thomas Kendall proposed an ancient Egyptian origin for the Maori on the basis of perceived religious similarities. Kendall differed from many writers in seeing

---

J. W. Stack, 'Some observations on the Annual Address of the President of the Philosophical Institute of Canterbury', *TNZI*, 4, 1871, pp. 107-10.  
21*Ibid.*, p. 286. The idea of a Jewish origin for Maori has made a profound impact on Maori religious thinking, with many Maori prophets strongly advocating such a connection, for example see Bronwyn Elsmore, *Mana from Heaven*, Tauranga, 1989.  
the Maori as descendants of Ham rather than Shem. None of these writers, however, spent much time discussing whether or not a pre-Maori people had existed.

It was not until the mid-nineteenth century that a missionary writer brought out a fully developed theory of dual racial origin for the Maori. The Reverend Richard Taylor in his 1855 book *Te Ika a Maui* set out his ideas on the Semitic origins of the Maori and on the existence of an earlier darker people in New Zealand. He developed these theories further in his 1867 pamphlet *Our Race and its Origin* and in the much expanded 1870 edition of *Te Ika a Maui*. The ideas of Richard Taylor shared some points of similarity with those of Forster. Taylor also set out a picture of an earlier darker skinned people, followed in migration by a lighter skinned more advanced people. Like Forster, Taylor had the idea that as a people moved further away from the centres of civilisation they were inclined to degenerate and lose those 'civilised' qualities of they had developed. Taylor's ideas were not based on Enlightenment ideas of the social evolution of humanity. Instead they were firmly grounded in the discourse of Judaeo-Christian ideas of Biblical origin.

Taylor had, in 1855, proposed that the Polynesians were in fact one of the lost tribes of Israel, but by 1870 he played this idea down, while continuing to emphasise his belief that the Polynesians were originally a Semitic, Middle Eastern people. Taylor envisaged that three different 'races' of people had migrated through the Pacific, the descendants of the three sons of Noah who had survived the Deluge. The first of these races, the dark children of Ham, had once been the builders of great civilisations but had degenerated as they migrated away from the Middle Eastern centre of civilisation. By the time they reached New Zealand they had sunk to a low level of culture. The Semites, children of Shem and ancestors of the Jews and Arabs, had followed the Hamites into the Pacific, where some of them became the lighter skinned Polynesians. The Semites had left the Middle East later than the Hamites and had retained a higher level of culture. Finally in the eighteenth and nineteenth century the Europeans, who were, according to Taylor, the lighter skinned descendants of Japheth, had moved into the Pacific, completing the cycles of migration and bringing with them the highest level of civilisation.

---

28Another missionary writer who held that there had been a pre-Maori settlement in New Zealand was William Colenso. However Colenso's theorising does not seem to have involved ideas of Semitic descent, degeneration, or other obviously scriptural references. See W. Colenso, 'On the Maori Races of New Zealand', *TNZI*, 1, 1868, p. 51.
30Taylor, *Our Race and its Origin*.
Taylor, *Te Ika a Maui*, 1870, Chps, 2 & 3.
In the 1855 edition of *Te Ika a Maui* Taylor had not speculated on the origins of the Chatham Island Moriori. In contrast, the 1870 edition portrayed the Moriori as a Melanesian people, descended from Ham, and probably originally resident in New Zealand. Taylor portrayed the Moriori as a 'degraded race' who went naked, and used primitive housing and technology. Taylor described how the Moriori had been conquered, enslaved, and their population decimated by the recent Maori invasion.31

While Taylor had a degree of familiarity with Maori oral traditions, his theories were drawn from biblical traditions and, to a lesser extent, from the scientific ideas current in the mid-nineteenth century. By the mid-nineteenth century, despite Taylor's familiarity with contemporary scientific texts, his theories were too strongly based on religious beliefs to be considered seriously by the majority of Pakeha scholars. Science had begun to take over from Christianity as the predominant western discourse for analysing the relationships of what were seen as different races.

**Science Changes the Nineteenth Century World View**

The nineteenth century was a period of radical changes in the Western world view, largely as a result of developments in science. Discoveries in geology indicated that the Earth was much more ancient than allowed for by a literal interpretation of the Book of Genesis. Fossils outlined the existence of long extinct ancient creatures. Archaeological findings indicated that the human race was far older than previously believed, and had in fact once shared the earth with vanished giant mammals. New theories on evolution, in particular those of Darwin, suggested that humans, rather than being the product of a special act of divine creation, were in fact just one more animal developed out of an ancient and ongoing process of struggle.

The nineteenth century was also an age of unprecedented imperial expansion by European countries and by the United States of America. This expansion included direct annexation of territories, sometimes accompanied by the establishment of settler colonies, as well as indirect control or influence through processes of trade and missionary activities. The development of science was intimately connected with this process of imperial expansion. Imperial travellers provided the observations and specimens which became the data for many of the great scientific theories of those times. At the same time knowledge gained through scientific endeavour was used to help control and exploit colonised areas. Britain, the nation that built up the largest empire in the nineteenth century, was also the nation that produced many of the most dramatic developments in geology, biology, anthropology and evolutionary theories.

31Ibid., pp. 7, 18.
In the process of establishing settler colonies in North America, Australia and New Zealand, imperial observers noted a continuing pattern. It appeared that the native plants, animals and people were unable to compete successfully with the encroaching plants, animals and people from Europe. This pattern seemed to be so constant that many thinkers elevated the idea of displacement to the status of a 'natural law'.

By the early nineteenth century, even clergymen scientists, such as Adam Sedgewick, had to accept that geology showed the world was millions of years old. The discovery of fossils made people aware that many strange creatures had existed on Earth and then mysteriously disappeared. The acceptance that species had become extinct challenged the idea in Natural Theology that nature's processes operated for the good of all creatures. Public imagination was captured by the idea that giant reptiles, christened dinosaurs by the British anatomist Richard Owen in 1841, had once roamed the land. A great debate ensued among geologists over whether the Earth's geological features had been created by a series of dramatic natural catastrophes or by a series of slow uniform processes. The one idea that was no longer taken seriously in geological debate was that the Earth had been created in seven days and was no more than 6000 years old, the literal interpretation of the Genesis account.32

The release of Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* in 1859 came to be seen as the central event in the mid-nineteenth change of Western world view, a change seen in both science and wider culture. Darwin argued that species had not come into existence through acts of special creation. Instead they had evolved from common ancestors through a process of natural selection that operated in the same way in the modern world as it had in the past. Thus in a sense Darwin extended Charles Lyell's uniformitarian approach to geology into the realms of biological origins. Darwin, along with Alfred Russell Wallace, who had developed similar theories, argued that changes resulting from the process of the natural selection of naturally occurring variations within species were enough over very long periods of time to produce new species.33 While many thinkers did not accept Darwin's hypothesis, his respected position and the

---


33 Darwin and Wallace were not the first to argue for a process of the evolution of species. Erasmus Darwin, Jean-Baptiste Lamarck, Geoffrey St. Hilaire, and Robert Chambers (author of *The Vestiges of Creation*), had all argued in favour of processes of change occurring through the passing on of acquired characteristics. These ideas had been accepted by many atheists and street radicals in Britain and by such scientific outsiders as the zoologist Richard F. Grant, but had been rejected by the scientific establishment. On pre-Darwinian evolutionary thinkers see Bowler, *Evolution*, pp. 81-8, 118, 141-8. A. Desmond and J. Moore, *Darwin*, London, 1991, pp. 33-41.
weight of evidence he presented meant that his ideas had to be taken seriously. Darwin's achievement, as Robert M. Young points out, was not so much to convince the scientific world of the truth of evolution by natural selection, as to firmly establish the scientific hypothesis of biological evolution at the centre of any future debate over the origins and development of life in general and human life in particular.34

Despite differences over aspects of Darwinian theory a group of scientists led by Thomas Henry Huxley, the botanist Joseph Hooker and the physicist John Tyndall enthusiastically embraced the central thesis of Darwin's ideas. They accepted that life had its origins in naturalistic processes and was not in itself a source of divine moral lessons. Huxley and his followers were able to use this new secular science as their major weapon in a campaign that aimed to drive the Anglican church out of its position of control over scientific funding and of religious influence over scientific ideas. The debate over the ancestry and special status of humanity was the central feature of wider debates over the control of science, over the relative social position of science and scientists, and over the political and social roles of religion and science.35

**Ancient Remains and Modern Savages: Changing Ideas on Human Antiquity and Development.**

In the mid-nineteenth century the question of human antiquity was opened up more by developments in archaeology than by the debates over evolution. In the 1840s and 1850s discoveries by the French archaeologist Boucher de Perthes in the Somme gravels and by British archaeologists at Brixham Cave, revealed human artefacts mixed in with the remains of extinct animals. Brixham was visited by such luminaries as Charles Lyell, who became convinced that humans were far older than was previously believed.36

---


35 The Huxley-Wilberforce debate of 1860 at Oxford was later seen as the classic battle in this campaign; a campaign which Huxley himself portrayed in exaggerated martial terms. In fact many clergymen and religiously minded scientists were able to accommodate a version of evolution with their religious beliefs. Huxley in contrast emphasised the differences between science and religion in a successful attempt to push religious influences out of the scientific world and hand over control to the rising group of young professional scientists. Huxley's wider goal was to enable science and scientists to take over much of the moral and political role held in society by the established church in Britain. See F. M. Turner, 'The Victorian Conflict Between Science and Religion: A Professional Dimension', *Isis*, 69, 1978, pp. 366-76. R. Barton, 'Evolution: The Whitworth Gun in Huxley's War for the Liberation of Science from Theology', in D. Oldroyd and I. Langham, eds, *The Wider Domain of Evolutionary Thought*, London, 1983, pp. 261-88.

By the 1850s Danish archaeologists had developed the idea of cultural stages, represented as a progressive sequence of stone age, bronze age, and iron age peoples. It was envisaged that each culture sequence was brought about by an influx of new arrivals rather than through the inventiveness of the people already living in an area. The English thinker John Lubbock further refined the system of defining cultural stages by comparing the types of tools found in particular strata. Lubbock divided the stone age into Palaeolithic (old stone age) and Neolithic (new stone age). In New Zealand these ideas were to be enthusiastically adopted by Julius Von Haast.37

Lubbock, along with Edward Burnett Tylor and John McLennan, was one of the early exponents of the ideas that George Stocking terms 'socio-cultural evolution'.38 As indicated by the long title of Lubbock's 1865 book *Prehistoric Times, as Illustrated by Ancient Remains, and the Manners and Customs of Modern Savages*, contemporary savages were seen as representing earlier stages of human development, stages that the ancestors of the Europeans had already been through. This idea assumed that humans were all of common ancestry and were so mentally similar as to go through the same developmental stages. Europeans, and in particular the Victorian British, were seen as having advanced farthest in these stages of developments. Such ideas can be seen to owe as much to the thinkers of the Scottish enlightenment as to Darwinism. It also led to 'savages' being studied by Europeans as living museum pieces, not for an understanding of indigenous societies but to enable the Europeans to understand their own past. It may well also be that observing non-Europeans seemingly stuck at earlier stages of development provided yet another justification for the late nineteenth century expansion of European Empires, on the grounds that such expansion would 'civilise the natives', with the colonial power giving the savages a helping hand, or a shove, up the socio-cultural evolutionary ladder.39

**The Hardening of British Racial Attitudes**

In contrast to the basically monogenist views of the Darwinians and socio-cultural evolutionists, the mid-nineteenth century witnessed the growth in Britain of a powerful school of extremely racist polygenist thought. Thinkers of this school rejected both the

---


38 Stocking, *Victorian Anthropology*, pp. 77-8, 82.

39 Stocking, *Victorian Anthropology*, passim.

Biblical and evolutionary ideas of the descent of all humans from common ancestors; but instead viewed different races as being in essence different species evolved from different ancestors. These ideas had been advanced by the Scottish anatomist Robert Knox. In his 1850 work, The Races of Man, Knox put forward the idea of human history as a struggle between different races. Knox's ideas were an important influence on Dr. James Hunt, who established the Anthropological Society in 1863. This learned society, which had broken away from the earlier Ethnological Society, emphasised the idea of polygeny, of white supremacy and of racial struggle as a basis for historical and political events.  

The Anthropological Society was a vocal advocate of polygenist ideas in the 1860s, but failed to attract the support of the rising new scientific establishment based around Darwin's followers. The Anthropological Society supported an extreme racist point of view that was strongly critical of philanthropists, missionaries and of the pro-monogenist Ethnological Society. The young Darwinians, while critical of Creationism and of any role for the church in science, were keen to portray an image of respectability as they manoeuvred to take over the scientific establishment. As such they tended to support the more moderate Ethnological Society, leaving the Anthropological Society to such culturally marginal figures as the poet Algernon Swinburne and the explorer and anti-hero, Richard Burton. The dispute between the Ethnological and Anthropological Societies was finally resolved when the two societies merged in 1871, to become the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland.  

Despite their support for the idea of the common ancestry of the human species, and despite their general rejection of the 'anthropologicals' support for slavery in America, the Darwinians and socio-cultural evolutionists did not uphold ideas of racial equality. Darwin sought to close the gap between the most primitive humans and the apes, by emphasising a hierarchy of races with the Englishman at the top and the natives of Tierra del Fuego at the bottom. Lubbock, in his Prehistoric Times, described Australian Aborigines as living fossils, relics of the past stuck in a very low condition. T. H.  

---

40 The Anthropological Society was also prominent in its support for such causes as the Confederacy in the American Civil War and the defence of Governor Eyre's bloody suppression of the Jamaican Rebellion. See G. W. Stocking, 'What's in a Name? The Origins of the Anthropological Institute (1837-71)', in Man, 6, 1971, pp. 370-90.  
41 Stocking, 'What's in a Name?', pp. 370-90.  
Young, Colonial Desire, pp. 14-6, 33-41.
Huxley maintained that discrimination against Negroes was unnecessary as they were incapable of competing on equal terms with whites.42

The views of all these commentators reflect a general hardening of racial attitudes in Britain during the mid-nineteenth century. The early nineteenth century had seen an influential evangelical and philanthropical movement reflected in such causes as the anti-slavery movement, the Aborigines Protection Society, and the missionary enterprises.43 By the mid-nineteenth century the political power of the missionaries and philanthropists had declined in both Britain and the colonies. The biblical idea of common human descent from divinely created ancestors was being replaced, to a large extent, by scientific ideas emphasising the differences between races. The classification of humans into separate groups was further pushed along first by phrenology and later by craniometry, based on the anatomical differences between races. The ideas of racial hierarchy implicit in Darwinian ideas of evolution, along with social evolutionary theories that emphasised the idea of Europeans, especially the Anglo-Saxons, as the pinnacle of human social achievement, encouraged the idea of white superiority.44

In addition to intellectual influences political events of the 1850s and 60s were a major factor in the hardening of British attitudes to the 'darker races'. The Indian Mutiny of 1857 profoundly shocked the British public, who read lurid accounts in the newspapers of massacres and the rape of white women, without the counterbalancing tales of British atrocities. The common representation of the 'Mutiny' in Britain was as an act of irrational barbarism and treachery by a superstitious and backward people. The carnage resulting from the American Civil War further damaged the image of both the Negro and the emancipists in the eyes of many Britons, who saw the anti-slavery movement as to blame for the war. Another major influence in hardening British public opinions over race was the impact of events surrounding the Jamaican Rebellion of 1865. Governor Eyre's brutal actions in crushing the rebellion sharply split public opinion in Britain. Those who supported Eyre tended to see the action of poor black Jamaicans in rebelling

42Stepan, The Idea of Race, pp. 53-5.
Stocking, Victorian Anthropology, pp. 152-3.
Desmond, Huxley, p. 334.
44Stocking, Victorian Anthropology, pp. 179-85.
Stepan, Idea of Race, Chp. 3.
against British authorities as an act of ingratitude against those who had freed them from slavery, and as proof that blacks were inherently savage and violent.\textsuperscript{45}

Lorimer points out that the acceptance of more racially-based ideas by the British public probably had more to do with political and social events than the propagation of racial ideas by scientifically minded scholars. Such ideas were no doubt important in influencing public opinions, yet it is debatable just how widely they were disseminated. Lorimer argues that many of the educated British middle classes accepted a hardening of racial attitudes which they saw as bolstering their own position. As Lorimer sees it, the new middle classes, including the new scientific elite, saw themselves as a type of natural aristocracy achieving their position by merit. The self-image of being the finest examples of an already superior race gave these classes a feeling of natural gentility. This image was important to the middle classes as they challenged the dominance of the old aristocracy and church establishment over areas such as the control of the scientific community. In addition the idea of natural racial superiority seemed to justify a world situation in which white people in general, and the Anglo-Saxons in particular, appeared to be on an inevitable path of increasing political, moral and intellectual dominance over the rest of the world.\textsuperscript{46}

**The 'Natural' Process of Displacement.**

A central tenet in nineteenth century debates on human races and on biological evolution was the idea that Ross Galbreath describes as 'displacement'. This idea held that the arrival of European species in a 'new' land led naturally and inevitably to the extirpation of the indigenous species and their replacement by the newcomers. In the same way indigenous 'races' of people would also be displaced by the arriving colonists. Such an idea could be interpreted as meaning that the displacement process was completely natural, meaning that colonisers need feel no sense of guilt over the decline of indigenous populations. The observation of such processes had a strong influence on the development of evolutionary ideas, including those of Darwin.\textsuperscript{47}

While such ideas of displacement appear to have become most widespread in the mid-nineteenth century, their origins go back to the European colonisation of America. The Spanish take-over of the Caribbean islands led to the extermination of many of the

\textsuperscript{45}The split in British public opinion over Eyre's actions is well illustrated by reactions within the Darwinian circle. Huxley, Lyell, Wallace and Darwin himself joined the campaign to prosecute Eyre, while Tyndall and Hooker joined the Eyre Defence Fund. This situation placed considerable strain on their friendships.
Desmond and Moore, *Darwin*, pp. 540-1.

\textsuperscript{46}Lorimer, *Colour, Class, and the Victorians*, pp. 156-61.

indigenous tribes by warfare and disease. This process led Europeans to theorise not only on the displacement of the indigenous Caribbean peoples by whites, but also to construct the idea that the pacific 'Arawaks' were already in the process of being displaced by the warlike and cannibalistic 'Caribs'.\(^\text{48}\) The impact of disease on the Indians of eastern North America led many colonists to speculate that a divine hand was at work.\(^\text{49}\) A particularly significant population decline occurred with the decimation by disease of the mound-building peoples of the Mississippi basin, a people who had existed in great numbers when attacked by the Spanish adventurer de Soto in the sixteenth century. French explorers in the eighteenth century found much smaller remnant populations, of which one Frenchman wrote, 'Touching these savages...it appears visibly that God wishes that they yield their place to new peoples.'\(^\text{50}\) It must be remembered that European observers watched the operations of disease with no knowledge of modern theories of viral or bacterial contagion or immunity. Thus the devastation caused to native peoples must have seemed miraculous or horrifying, depending on the point of view.

It was also recognised that displacement might occur through acts of violence. This idea was morally problematic even to the seventeenth century English colonists in North America. As Robert Gray asked in 1609, "By what right or warrant we can enter into the land of these Savages, take away their rightfull inheritance from them, and plant ourselves in their place, being unwronged or unprovoked by them."\(^\text{51}\) The common assumption in early colonial writings was that in any conflict the Indian would inevitably be defeated and driven out by the white settlers.\(^\text{52}\) Later writings came to refer to the Indian as voluntarily retreating, without any mention of the processes of

\(^{48}\)On the European construction of the groups 'Arawak' and 'Carib', and the idea of the Carib displacement of the Arawak see P. Hulme, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean*, London, 1986, Chp. 2.

\(^{49}\)John Winthrop, the first English Governor of the Massachusetts colony wrote, in 1634, 'For the natives, they are neere all dead of small Poxe, so as the Lord hathe cleared our tite to what we possess'. See J. Winthrop, *Winthrop Papers, 1631-1637*, quoted in A. W. Crosby, *Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900-1900*, Cambridge, 1986, p. 208. The writer Thomas Morton also suggested that Indian deaths from illness were a result of the circumstance that, 'The hand of God fell heavily upon them, with such a mortal stroke that they died on heaps as they lay in their houses', T. Morton, *New English Canaan*, 1634, quoted in M. Jehlin and M. Warner, eds, *The English Literatures of America, 1500-1800*, New York and London, 1997, p. 168.


\(^{52}\)The finding of a moral excuse for displacing the indigenous people appears to have been of some importance to the English settlers. Thus the writing of Edward Waterhouse, following the massacre of English settlers by the Algonquin of Virginia in 1622, carries a note of relief and hope for future triumph. In this circumstance the English saw themselves as having a legitimate excuse to unleash total violence upon the Indians and take over their traditional lands. See E. Waterhouse, 'A Declaration of the State of the Colony of Virginia, 1622', in Jehlin and Warner, eds, *English Literatures*. 
violence and physical eviction. The idea seems to have existed that such an action was morally positive as it led to the overall progress of humankind.53

Closely connected with, and influencing the idea of displacement was the notion of indigenous peoples as 'good savages' who were inevitably corrupted, sometimes to the point of destruction, by a European presence. Some eighteenth century writers, such as the Satirist Jonathan Swift condemned the whole process of colonisation as an unprovoked attack on others that gave 'civilised' people the opportunity to commit the most inhumane actions.54 The fear of the destruction that might be wrought by Europeans on indigenous peoples led the President of the Royal Society, James Douglas, the Earl of Morton, to advise James Cook and Joseph Banks to make all efforts to avoid conflict with 'natives'.55 Similar fears of the corruption and possible extinction of 'defenceless' indigenous peoples led a group of Evangelical and Quaker abolitionists to establish the Aborigines Protection Society in 1837.56

Galbreath points out that the idea of displacement became firmly established in British thinking in the nineteenth century and was applied to animal and plant species as well as to human 'races'. He suggests two important European ideas as being significant in the development of displacement theory. He believes that the idea of the 'Great Chain of Being' helped develop the idea that European peoples and species were superior to those of the areas of the world to which they were being introduced.57 The other idea of great importance in the development of displacement theory was that of extinction. Before the late eighteenth century this concept was not wholly accepted, with many thinkers maintaining that natural systems were complete and balanced. Therefore no species that had been created could disappear. By the early nineteenth century the work of scientists such as Cuvier with fossils showed that a vast range of creatures had once existed but had disappeared at some stage in the past. The rapid disappearance of native species

53 For examples of writers who followed the idea of progress justifying Indian displacement see Nathaniel Ames 'A Thought Upon the Past, Present, and Future of British America, 1758, in ibid., pp. 716-8, and Phillip Freneau, 'On the Emigration to America and Peopling the Western Country, 1784', in ibid., pp. 1104-6. Freneau was a particular advocate of the theme of the 'poetic and voluntarily receding Indian', ibid., p. 1104.
54 Swift wrote of colonisation,
They [the colonisers] see a harmless people, they are entertained with kindness, they give the country a new name, they take formal possession of it for their King,...Ships are sent with the first opportunity, the natives driven out or destroyed,...a free licence given to all acts of inhumanity and lust, the earth reeking with the blood of its inhabitants: and this execrable crew of butchers employed in so pious an expedition, is a modern colony sent to convert and civilize an idolatrous and barbarous people.
56 Stocking, 'What's in a Name?', pp. 369-70.
57 Galbreath, 'Colonisation', p. 55.
See also Lovejoy, The Great Chain of Being.
from areas of European settlement in Australia, New Zealand and North America seemed to confirm that extinction was a powerful and possibly unstoppable force in Nature.\textsuperscript{58}

In the late eighteenth century Louis Leclerc, the Comte de Buffon, developed a theory that as plants and animals had migrated away from Eurasia to distant areas such as the Americas and Australasia, they had 'degenerated' into local races as a response to environmental conditions. Buffon emphasised that American plants, animals and indigenous peoples were inferior to their European equivalents. The concept of American and Australasian plants, animals and people as being inferior due to degeneration may have helped build up the theory of the inevitability of their displacement by Old World imports.\textsuperscript{59} Many nineteenth century scientific thinkers such as Charles Darwin, Joseph D. Hooker, Charles Lyell and Alfred Russell Wallace adopted the concept of displacement in relation to animals, plants and peoples, often using events in Australia and New Zealand as proof of the validity of the idea.\textsuperscript{60}.

The example of the Tasmanian Aborigines made a great psychological impact on British thinkers looking at questions of displacement. By 1837 the Tasmanians had been driven out of their land and were presumed doomed to extinction. This entire process had occurred within less than thirty-five years of the first white settlement in Van Dieman's Land. To scientific thinkers this event represented the perfect example of the displacement of those unfit to compete with the more advanced. To philanthropists it was a tragedy which presented a grim warning of the potentially disastrous effects of largely uncontrolled European colonisation. As the Western observer looked at the European take-over of Tasmania, Eastern Australia, and North America, each case seemed to be a clear example of the massive displacement of native species and peoples. As Galbreath argues such events seemed to occur with such regularity that many commentators thought they reflected a 'natural law'.\textsuperscript{61}

The idea of displacement had a strong influence on the way European observers looked at the process of contact in New Zealand and also on observations of Maori and Pakeha impact on the Moriori of the Chathams. These observations in turn played a large role in

\textsuperscript{58}Galbreath, 'Colonisation', pp. 55-6.
\textsuperscript{59}Bowler, \textit{Evolution}, pp. 74-5.
\textsuperscript{60}Galbreath, 'Colonisation', pp. 56-7, 141-5.
\textsuperscript{61}Stocking, \textit{Victorian Anthropology}, pp. 275-83.
Galbreath, 'Colonisation', p. 97.
the formation of Pakeha ideas on the pre-contact history of Aotearoa. At the same time information from Pakeha observers in New Zealand provided a major source of primary material for theorists in Britain and Europe who were developing theories of displacement.

**Early Naturalists in New Zealand**

After the initial visits of naturalists such as Banks and Forster, few scientifically minded visitors came to New Zealand until the arrival of the early missionary naturalists, with their scripturally influenced views on Polynesian migratory history. From the 1820s onwards a series of naturalists visited New Zealand as different countries sent ships out on voyages of exploration and scientific investigation. These scientific observers tended to show a strong interest in the human populations of the lands they visited. Some thinkers tried to develop theories on the origins of indigenous peoples with particular attention to 'racial' identity. Of major interest to scientific observers was the impact of European newcomers on the people, and on the flora and fauna, of the 'new' lands.

Charles Darwin, acting as naturalist on the *Beagle's* voyage around the world, came to New Zealand in 1836. Writing in 1845, well before the publication of the *Origin*, Darwin believed he witnessed the process of displacement in New Zealand as he noted, 'there appears to be some... mysterious agency at work' of which he wrote,

> Wherever the European has trod, death seems to pursue the aboriginal... Nor is it the white man alone that thus acts as the destroyer; the Polynesian of Malay extraction has in parts of the East Indian archipelago, thus driven before him the dark-coloured native. The varieties of man seem to act on each other in the same way as different species of animals- the stronger always exterminating the weaker.62

Darwin, like many others of his time, believed that a process of displacement of peoples was occurring. He also noted that European plants such as the leek and the common dock were spreading in the Bay of Islands, and that the Norway rat seemed to be taking over from the Kiore or Polynesian rat.63 It is of particular interest that Darwin considered that the 'Polynesian' was driving out the 'dark-coloured native' from the East Indies, illustrating the idea that 'natives' of lighter skin colour were naturally superior and naturally drove out the darker races. However Darwin does not appear to have applied this idea to any imagined pre-contact history of New Zealand.64

---

63 Ibid., p. 412.
64 Ibid., pp. 418-9.
Ernst Dieffenbach, German born medical doctor and naturalist to the New Zealand Company expedition, travelled around much of New Zealand and the Chatham Islands, from 1839 to 1841. Dieffenbach also believed Maori were declining due to some mysterious cause resulting from contact with civilisation. He wrote,

> The number of the aborigines in New Zealand rapidly decreases- a strange and melancholy, but undeniable fact! It may be that it is one of Nature's eternal laws that some races of men, like the different kinds of organic beings, plants and animals, stand in opposition to each other...where one race begins to spread and increase, the other, which is perhaps less vigorous and less durable, dies off.65

Dieffenbach believed that, while the Maori were in great danger of becoming extinct, it was possible through wise policies of colonisation to prevent such an occurrence. In contrast he believed the Chatham Island Moriori were inevitably doomed to extinction. He was aware that disease was a major factor in such processes of decline, but having no knowledge of germ theory, he could only put the decline in indigenous health down to 'the design of Providence'.66

It was Dieffenbach's opinion that the Maori were a mixed race as shown by variations in skin colour from light through to very dark, combined with differences in hair, skull shape and facial features. The Moriori he believed were a pure Polynesian race, but only distantly related to Maori. Dieffenbach did not advocate the idea that the 'mixed race Maori' was the result of Polynesians supplanting an earlier, darker, and more primitive race in New Zealand. He pointed out that such variation in appearance was found throughout the Polynesian islands. He went on to point out that neither language nor oral tradition showed any evidence of the presence of an earlier people. Dieffenbach concluded that the variation in Maori appearance was either a result of racial mixing before the arrival in New Zealand or the product of the differences in social hierarchy within tribes.67

Dieffenbach assumed his readers might come to the conclusion which he had rejected; that is the idea that: 'Of two races in New Zealand...the darker were the original proprietors of the soil, anterior to the arrival of a stock of true Polynesian origin,- that they were conquered by the latter, and nearly exterminated'.68 This statement indicates

that Dieffenbach was aware of the presence of a common belief in the 1840s; the belief
that a darker skin indicated a people of older and more primitive stock, who would
naturally be overcome by the lighter skinned and more advanced newcomers.69

The Scottish military surgeon, Arthur Saunders Thomson, had a strong interest in
climate and health, and in the statistical analysis of the health of populations. While
stationed in New Zealand, from 1847 to 1858, he compared health statistics of British
soldiers, with health statistics he recorded from Maori in the northern half of the North
Island. Thomson concluded that British troops stationed in New Zealand were, in
general, healthier than those stationed in other parts of the Empire, including Britain
itself. In contrast he believed that the Maori population were undergoing a serious
decline in numbers.70

Thomson set out his views on the Maori past, present and future in his 1859 book The
Story of New Zealand: Past and Present-Savage and Civilised. He saw the Polynesians
as a branch of what he called 'the Malay family'. He believed they came to New Zealand
in a fleet of fourteen or fifteen canoes which set out from Hawaiki (which he identified
as 'Savaii' in Samoa), and travelled via Rarotonga to New Zealand.71 Thomson
mentioned that some traditions had Ngahue as the pre-fleet discoverer of Aotearoa
whereas others gave the same honour to Kupe. He gave some details of the stories of the
canoes 'Arawa, Tairui, Matatua, Takitumu, Kurahaupo, Tokomaru, Matawhaorua and
Aotea', pointing out that each canoe landed in a different place and each tribe had its
own distinctive origin story.72 In telling these stories Thomson emphasised his belief
that the ancestors of the Maori arrived in a land empty of any indigenous people and

69 Ibid., p. 2. Dieffenbach himself was sympathetic to Maori facing the problems of Pakeha colonisation and was involved with the philanthropical Aborigines Protection Society. Nevertheless, as Geiringer points out, Dieffenbach was of the view that 'Austral-negroes', (his own term for the indigenous people of Australia and Melanesia), occupied 'a low grade in the human family', and that those Maori of obviously darker stock tended to be of the 'lower grades' of Maori society. See Geiringer, 'Theories of Dual Settlement', p. 37.

Thomson believed inattention to the sick and infanticide were endemic problems of the Maori. He held that in addition to these processes, the post-contact factors of the adoption of new habits of life and the introduction of new diseases were having a serious impact on Maori mortality levels. Thomson also suggested that female sterility had become a major problem since contact. He appears to have been unsure as to the exact cause of sterility but blamed it to a large extent on inbreeding, which he saw as both producing sterility and making the population more susceptible to 'scrofula' and other diseases. See ibid., pp. 285, 289-90.

71 Thomson, Story of NZ, Vol. 1, pp. 52, 56, 58-60. Thomson writes of six or seven canoes whose names have been lost, in addition to the Arawa, Tairui, Matatua, Takitumu, Kurahaupo, Tokomaru, Matawhaorua, and Aotea. See Ibid., p. 60.

72 Ibid., pp. 59-63. The list of canoes is on p. 60.
explained what he believed was the origin of stories of an earlier people.\textsuperscript{73} He wrote that prior to these canoes,

There were no human inhabitants on the islands; conflicts which occurred several centuries ago have been magnified by tradition into combats between the first emigrants and the original inhabitants of New Zealand; but there is no truth in these accounts.\textsuperscript{74}

During 1859 the German geologist Ferdinand von Hochstetter travelled through much of the Auckland and Nelson provinces in the process of carrying out geological surveys with fellow German Julius von Haast. Hochstetter set out his views on the Maori and their past and future in a special chapter of his book \textit{New Zealand}, the English language version of which appeared in 1867. Hochstetter agreed with Thomson that New Zealand was uninhabited before the arrival of the ancestors of the Maori. Hochstetter did mention tales of 'Maeros' living in the wilds of the Tararua range who were supposedly 'savages with long hair, long fingers and nails, who eat their food raw', while the Southern Maori told similar tales of 'Ngatimamoes'. Hochstetter contended that both groups were 'degenerated Maori tribes' rather than the descendants of an earlier people, and included in his book a tale sent to him by Haast which purported to tell of one of the last of the 'Ngatimamoes'.\textsuperscript{75}

Hochstetter related that both Kupe and Ngahue were claimed as first discoverers of these islands and set out the names he had collected of voyaging canoes, explaining that each canoe had its own origin tradition. He went on to examine the debate over which of the Pacific islands was Hawaiki and at what date the great migration had occurred.\textsuperscript{76} Hochstetter made it plain that his own beliefs on the origin traditions were in agreement with the views expressed by C. Schirren in his 1856 work \textit{Die Wandersagen der Neu-Seelander und der Mauimythos}. Schirren's work had not been translated into English and Hochstetter remarked with regret that English writers on New Zealand seemed

\textsuperscript{73}Ibid., pp. 51, 61. Despite his belief that there had been only one pre-contact migration to New Zealand, Thomson believed Maori were 'a mixed race... divided into brown, reddish, and black', see ibid., p. 72. Thomson based this idea on his own observations, noting that brown skin appeared to be far more common than reddish or black, that chiefs were usually brown skinned but that 'every tribe... comprises all three varieties, all speak the same language, and all arrived in New Zealand at the same time.' Thomson disputed Crozet's notion of an earlier people and surmised that the variety of appearance was due to mixing of peoples during the migration through the Pacific. See ibid., pp. 72-3.

\textsuperscript{74}Ibid., p. 61.

\textsuperscript{75}F. von Hochstetter, \textit{New Zealand}, pp. 210-1, 222-4. Despite Hochstetter's apparent rejection of the idea of the existence of a pre-Maori people in his chapter on Maori, he admitted that there was some evidence which indicated an earlier people may have once existed. In a footnote he mentioned a find, in 1862, of unusual artefacts including sinkers and cutting tools, which differed from any found among contemporary Maori. Hochstetter mentioned that some saw this as evidence of a pre-Maori South Island tribe which had migrated northward. It appears likely that the above footnote's information became available to Hochstetter after he had written the original German text published in 1863. See ibid., p. 194n.

\textsuperscript{76}Hochstetter, \textit{New Zealand}, pp. 204-6.
totally unfamiliar with Schirren's work. Schirren held that Hawaiki, rather than being a historical island homeland, was in fact a mythical home of the spirits, from which the ancestors had come and to which the dead returned.77

Hochstetter considered that Maori had come from their own 'sphere of creation' and that 'science has as yet not been able to reduce the different spheres of creation to one common centre'.78 These statements suggest a strong element of polygeny in Hochstetter's thinking, although he did not appear to have completely discounted the possibility of a common origin for humanity. This matches Belich's description of Hochstetter's theories of race as including elements of monogenist, polygenist and evolutionary thinking.79

Hochstetter saw the primary cause of Maori extinction as a result of their being the weaker party in the "struggle for existence" with the Pakeha. Therefore even if, as Hochstetter believed, Pakeha had behaved in a humanitarian way towards Maori, in contrast to the brutality seen displayed towards the Aborigines of Australia, still Maori had no hope of survival.80 He saw this struggle for existence as occurring throughout the natural world; and on a human scale not just between races but also 'in the same manner...between states and states, between families and families, between individuals and individuals'. Hochstetter seems to have seen struggle as a process by which all change operated for moral progress and for the overall good of the world. Hochstetter wrote:

None but the weaker, the inferior perish; the stronger and nobler element remains victorious. Thus every progress in the world depends on this struggle for existence, and as far as man is concerned...we may above all be consoled by the fact, that it is not physical force, which decides the issue, but moral power and mental superiority!81

It should, however, be noted that not all early commentators agreed with the idea that the Maori population was in decline. Edward Shortland was a medical doctor and former Sub-Protector of Aborigines, who had learned te reo Maori and acted as an interpreter. In his 1851 book, *The Southern Districts of New Zealand*, Shortland argued that early Pakeha estimates of the pre-contact Maori population had been exaggerated and that the population had not been greatly reduced since Pakeha contact. Shortland

80 Hochstetter, *New Zealand*, p. 221.
believed that the seeming abandonment of some areas by Maori was a product of migration rather than the local extinction of particular Maori populations.\textsuperscript{82}

**The Establishment of a Scientific Community in New Zealand**

The works by Darwin, Dieffenbach, Thomson, and Hochstetter, examined above, were all published in Britain, or in Hochstetter's case Germany, for a European, rather than a colonial, audience. During the first half of the nineteenth century, young scientists would often try to make a name for themselves in the metropolitan centres through the collections they gathered and publications they produced as a result of time spent in the colonies or travelling as naturalists on exploring expeditions. Charles Darwin, Joseph Hooker and T. H. Huxley, all travelled as naturalists on naval surveying expeditions; while Alfred Russell Wallace, worked as a collector in South America and the Malay archipelago.

Once established in the metropolis, naturalists such as Darwin, Hooker and Huxley used the contacts they had made during their travels to build up networks of traders, missionaries, administrators, soldiers and settlers in the colonies, from whom they could obtain observations and specimens. Colonial collectors sent large amounts of material to renowned metropolitan scientists. As a result of such contacts Owen was able to provide the first scientific description of the moa, from a bone shown to him by Sydney doctor, John Rule. Darwin used information on the huia, obtained from Walter Buller, in his book *On the Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*. Both Darwin and Hochstetter were in correspondence with Haast for primary source information from New Zealand.\textsuperscript{83}

Despite the slowness of communications between Britain and New Zealand works such as those by Lyell, Chambers and Darwin were obtained and read as soon as possible. Such works provided a focus for debate on the latest scientific and scholarly issues. A. S. Atkinson wrote in 1861 that he had been given a copy of 'the much coveted Darwin *On the Origin of Species*', which on reading in early 1862 he found 'eminently reasonable, inducing a little order out of the wild turmoil of nature...'.\textsuperscript{84} In a related journal entry Atkinson mentioned that his wife, Jane Maria Atkinson, was reading the controversial *Essays and Reviews*, in which liberal theologians challenged traditional

interpretations of the Bible and argued in favour of evolutionary science. Richard Taylor in his 1867 pamphlets *Our Race and its Origin* and *The Age of New Zealand* cited the philologist Max Müller, the geologist Hugh Miller, the ethnologist John Crawfurd, Prichard's *Natural History of Man*, as well as Lyell, J. D. Hooker, Owen, the anonymously authored *Vestiges of Creation* (later revealed to have been written by Scottish publisher Robert Chambers), and Darwin's *Origin*. The level of public interest in science was also reflected in the high public turn out for lectures, as shown by the public lectures on evolution and religion held in Dunedin in 1876. The full coverage of these debates in the local press also gives some idea of the degree of public interest.

The establishment of 'Learned Societies', where groups of people interested in science and cultural subjects could meet and exchange ideas and information, began with the founding of the Literary and Scientific Institution of Nelson. This institution was established on board the immigrant ship *Whitby* in 1841, before the Wakefield settlers had even arrived in Nelson. In the 1850s and 60s similar Institutes and Philosophical Societies were established in Wellington, Auckland, Taranaki, Canterbury, and Otago. These Institutes provided fora for debate and the reading of papers, and established local museums and libraries. Enterprising local naturalists such as Walter Buller began to build up museum collections, by collecting local specimens and by arranging exchanges of material with overseas museums and collectors. In the early 1850s the development of scientific and cultural interests in the young colony was particularly encouraged by the interest in such matters shown by Governor George Grey, who had a strong interest in natural history and the study of Maori language and mythology.

In 1867 an Act of parliament established the New Zealand Institute, to which all the various local institutes eventually became incorporated. The Institute provided a forum for scientific debate and published an annual volume of *Transactions and Proceedings*. This consisted of the papers read to the various institutes, and the records of the proceedings of the meetings of the New Zealand Institute and its incorporated societies.

---

87 *Otago Daily Times*, 23/8/1876, 20/9/1876, 18/10/1876, 19/10/1876.
A. S. Atkinson, *Journal, 29/10/ 1856*, in G. H. Scholesfield, ed., *The Richmond-Atkinson Papers*, Vol. 1, Wellington, 1969, p. 238. It should be noted that the Philosophical Institutes tended to be dominated by educated, middle class, white males. In the early years of the Institutes, at least in the case of the New Zealand Institute and the Wellington Philosophical Society, it appears that women were allowed to attend the meetings, but there is no evidence that they took part in debates. Galbreath points out that we do not know of any Maori members of the Philosophical Societies until 1907 when Maui Pomare joined the Wellington Philosophical Society and Te Rangi Hiroa joined the Auckland Institute. Nevertheless the establishment of Museums and Libraries by the Institutes reflected a desire to be involved in public education in science and general culture. See Fleming, *Science, Settlers, Scholars*, pp. 18-9.
Galbreath, 'Colonisation', p. 73.
James Hector, one of New Zealand's few professional scientists, was appointed director of the Museum, Manager of the Institute, and editor of the Transactions and Proceedings. In 1861 Canterbury had employed the Austrian, Julius Haast as Provincial Geologist. Haast was instrumental in helping establish a scientific infrastructure, founding both the Philosophical Institute of Canterbury and the Canterbury Museum. A third major professional scientist in New Zealand was Frederick Wollaston Hutton who, after learning his skills as an amateur geologist in the army and later with the Geological Society, emigrated to New Zealand in 1863. In 1871 he was employed as Provincial Geologist in Otago, where he was also appointed as curator of the Otago Museum and Lecturer in geology and zoology at Otago University, reflecting his strong interest in biology and palaeontology. He went on in 1880 to the post of professor of biology at Canterbury College. Hutton was a firm supporter of the Darwinian theory of evolution and gained praise from Darwin himself for the extremely positive review of the Origin he wrote for the Geological Review in 1861. Hutton was also a devout Anglican who saw no conflict between evolution and his own Christian beliefs.

While the small number of professional scientists in New Zealand took a prominent role in the activities of the local learned Institutes, the majority of participants were amateurs. However, as was often the case with 'amateur' scientists in Britain, many of these people devoted a huge amount of time and effort to their scientific pursuits. W. T. L. Travers, a lawyer and politician, was also able to find time to explore the Nelson lakes region, make a large botanical collection and to write over 40 articles for the Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute. The articles he wrote covered the topics of botany, ornithology, geology and ethnology, as well as fully theoretical articles on evolutionary theories and the displacement of indigenous species by immigrant ones. Walter Lawry Buller was a Native Department official who used

89Fleming, Science, Settlers, Scholars, pp. 16-9. Hector was also Director of the Geological Survey and was in charge of the Meteorological Department, the Colonial Observatory, the Wellington Botanical Garden, and the Patent Office Library. The appointment of Hector illustrates the fact that the New Zealand colony was beginning to employ a small number of professional scientists. Hector had begun his New Zealand career in 1861, as Provincial Geologist for Otago. At the same time the power of imperial scientific patronage can be detected by the fact that Hector's appointment in Otago was largely as a result of the influence of Roderick Murchison, who had earlier secured a position for Hector as geologist on the Palliser expedition to western Canada. See R. K. Dell, 'James Hector' in Oliver, ed., Dictionary of NZ Biography, Vol.1, p. 183.


91H. N. Parton, 'Frederick Wollaston Hutton', C. Orange, ed., The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, Vol. 2, 1870-1900, Wellington, 1993, pp. 238-9. It should be noted that Desmond argues that men such as Hector, Haast and Hutton took jobs in the colonies partly as a result of the lack of opportunities in mid nineteenth century Europe, and particularly in Britain, for young scientists who were not from privileged backgrounds. See Desmond, Huxley, p. 168.

his skills in te reo Maori and Pakeha land laws to become a successful lawyer dealing with Maori land cases. He achieved greater fame, however, as the author of *A History of the Birds of New Zealand*. Buller also built up contacts with metropolitan naturalists by supplying them with information and specimens.93

From the 1860s onwards most of the scientific work carried out in New Zealand was conducted by locally based researchers, generally amateurs like Travers and Buller. Many researchers built up such levels of knowledge and expertise that they became regarded as authorities in their particular fields.94 The establishment of learned societies, and in particular of the New Zealand Institute with its own publication, provided a forum for the debate and propagation of scientific ideas and research within the colony, and helped build up a network of people with scientific interests.

Despite this build up of a local scientific community with its own institutions, science in New Zealand still fitted to an extent into what George Basalla describes as 'colonial science'. This is a stage where science in a particular place is dependent on and subsidiary to, the science of a metropolitan centre.95 Men such as Hector and Haast, with formal scientific training, had received it in metropolitan centres. Europe, and particularly Britain, was still the primary source of both material scientific equipment and of the theoretical tools which were applied to the observation of natural processes occurring in New Zealand. In the cases of the colonial debates over evolution and of Haast's application of the ideas of Palaeolithic and Neolithic cultures to the stone tools dug up in Canterbury, metropolitan theories were being applied to colonial situations.96

---

93Galbreath, *Walter Buller, passim*. Buller's *A History of New Zealand Birds* was published in two editions, in 1873 and 1888. Galbreath points out that these works were probably best known for their illustrations by the Dutch artist J. G. Keuleman, rather than for Buller's text. Keuleman's bird lithographs, in particular those from the 1880 edition, were to achieve almost iconographic status as the definitive images of New Zealand birds, see Galbreath, 'Colonisation', pp. 334-9. Buller was perhaps the only amateur scientist in New Zealand whose status matched those of professionals such as Hector and Haast. This was illustrated by his powerful role in the New Zealand Institute and by his gaining of such metropolitan honours as an honorary Doctorate from the University at Tubingen, the Fellowship of the Royal Society, and eventually a knighthood. Buller and other colonial scientists were not simply granted metropolitan honours as a recognition of their achievements. The process of receiving awards tended to be the result of a combination of recognition of scientific achievement and the cultivation of important scientific and political contacts in the metropolis. See Galbreath, *Buller*, pp. 97, 128-9, 151-8.

94The status of non-professional researchers as authorities on particular subjects can be illustrated with the cases of Buller with regard to New Zealand birds; the clergymen of the Williams family of Waiapu with regard to Maori language; and the surveyor Stephenson Percy Smith with regard to ethnology of the Maori.

95G. Basalla, 'The Spread of Western Science', in *Science*, 156, May 1967, pp. 611-22. Basalla suggests that as Western science spreads it goes through three phases. In the first phase the non-Western country operates solely as a source of material for metropolitan science. In the second 'colonial science' phase, where a local scientific community is becoming established but is still dependent on the metropolitan countries for training, equipment, ideas and recognition. In the third phase an independent scientific community is established in the non-Western country.

96J. Haast, 'Moas and Moa Hunters', in *TNZI*, 4, 1871, pp. 66-90. See in particular pp. 67-8 on the application of European theories of 'four ages' to New Zealand. W. T. L. Travers discusses these same theories in 'On the Changes Effected in the Natural Features of a New Country by the Introduction of Civilized Races', Pt 1, *TNZI*, 2, 1869, pp. 301-6. Travers also discusses the work and theories of the
Colonial naturalists also tended to be dependent on the metropolis for the identification and naming of new species of plants and animals, as the colonials did not have access to the extensive collections necessary for comparative taxonomic work, held in the museums of Europe. Buller's attempts to name new species were often rejected after investigations in the metropolitan museums showed his 'new' species had already been described and named. New Zealand scientists looked to Britain and Europe as sources of reward and recognition of their status. Scientific 'power brokers' such as Roderick Murchison and J. D. Hooker were often looked to recommend people for positions in the colony or to help colonial naturalists gain recognition in the metropolis. Publication in British journals was more highly regarded than an article in the Transactions and Proceedings. Haast, Hector and Buller competed to acquire as many British and European honours as possible, illustrating the desire of colonial scientists to gain status through metropolitan recognition.97

Although generally deprived of opportunities to train with the prominent figures of the European scientific establishment colonial scientists had the advantage of being able to observe first hand the natural features, flora, fauna and people of what to them was still an exotic and novel land.98 If New Zealand naturalists were largely cut off from the intellectual stimulation of the metropolitan centre, there was still a level of lively debate on current topics in the colonial Institutes. Such debate included efforts to apply the latest metropolitan theories to the colonial situation.

Colonial science was to a large extent involved with learning about the 'new' place in order to be able to control and exploit its resources including its indigenous people. Understanding of the features of the country made it easier for the colonisers to adjust intellectually to their new surroundings and try to fit these surroundings into the mental constructs the colonisers had brought with them from Europe. The surveying and mapping of land in order to make its feature, resources and people more accessible and controllable provides a prime example of this process. At the same time colonial science acted in a sort of symbiotic relationship with metropolitan science. Information and specimens were sent from the colonies to the centres to be used as source material in the formation of grand theories of how nature operated. The metropolitan centres sent out


97Galbreath, Buller, pp. 88-92, 128-9, 151-8.
98 It should be noted that even in Britain itself scientific education was not greatly advanced until well into the nineteenth century. This is illustrated by the fact that the first British BSc degrees were not introduced until 1858, when London University established the first Faculty of Science. See P. J. Bowler, The Fontana History of the Environmental Sciences, London, 1992, pp. 252-6. M. Sanderson, The Universities in the Nineteenth Century, London, 1975, pp. 2-9. A. Desmond, Huxley: The Devil's Disciple, London, 1994, p. 236.
people, equipment and ideas to carry out the work of science, and imperialism, on the colonial frontiers. As Galbreath describes it:

Science...was both an instrument of colonisation by which the colonists appropriated and assimilated native things into the European realm, and an arm of imperial domination under which colonists generally accepted a subordinate, peripheral role.  

New Zealand Debates on Displacement and Waves of Settlement: Shortland and Colenso

The newly established learned societies and in particular the *Transactions and Proceedings* provided a forum for opinion and debate on the topics that concerned the 'philosophically minded' settlers. Pakeha settlers were always fascinated by a set of questions regarding the Maori: the issues of who the Maori were, where they came from, whether they were the original inhabitants of New Zealand; and what was to be their ultimate fate. The degree of scholarly interest in matters concerning the Maori was reflected in the very first volume of the *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute*. This volume, covering the year 1868, contained two substantial articles on the Maori; each article written by a Pakeha author with a considerable reputation as an authority on matters Maori.

The author of the first of these articles was Edward Shortland. Shortland had a great deal of contact with Maori following his arrival in the colony in 1841, through his roles as Sub-Protector of aborigines, magistrate dealing with land disputes and interpreter at courts of inquiry into land disputes. He had travelled to many areas of the country and recorded a great deal of Maori lore, including information from Ngai Tahu. In his 1868 article, 'A Short Sketch of the Maori Races', Shortland set out stories of the migration from Hawaiki to New Zealand of the ancestral waka Tainui, Arawa, Mataatua, and Aotea; and related accounts of the internal migrations of some of the parties of canoe migrants. Shortland suggested that the arrival date of the ancestors of the Maori was probably not more than five hundred years before the time of writing. He based this conclusion on his reckoning of the genealogies of 'Chiefs', which he estimated as on average stretching back not more than eighteen generations to the first waka. Shortland argued that the supposed uniformity of the whakapapa of different tribes proved their accuracy. He further argued that the relatively small population of Maori at the time of contact with Cook and, in particular, the sparseness of the Maori

100 E. Shortland, 'A Short Sketch of the Maori Races', *TNZI*, 1, 1868, pp. 1-11.
W. Colenso, 'On the Maori Races of New Zealand', *TNZI*, 1, 1868, pp. 1-76.
population of the 'Middle and Southern Islands' indicated how recent human arrival in New Zealand had been.\textsuperscript{102}

Shortland went on to speculate on the location of Hawaiki, suggesting it was either Hawaii in the Sandwich (Hawaiian) Islands or Savaii in the Navigators' (Samoan) Islands. He noted that the peoples of Polynesia were obviously closely related to the Maori. Shortland suggested that the ancestors of the Polynesians were a 'brown race of Indians' who had originally migrated from Asia into the Pacific via the Indian Archipelago (the islands stretching from the Malay Peninsula to New Guinea). He believed that in some areas the 'Indians' had exterminated or absorbed the earlier, darker 'Papuan' population, whereas in others the Papuans remained dominant.\textsuperscript{103}

Shortland wrote that the Maori appeared to be 'a mixed race containing two elements, one...may be called the pure Indian, the other being the Papuan'.\textsuperscript{104} He went on to note that some speculated that the 'Papuan' strain represented an earlier population of New Zealand, which had been subjugated and absorbed by the later arriving 'Indians'. Shortland rejected this idea on the grounds that the 'Papuan element' was found throughout all social classes of Maori, including the rangatira, and that similar mixes of appearance occurred throughout the islands of Polynesia. He concluded that this mixing of races had in fact occurred during the period of migration through the Malay Peninsula and the Indian Archipelago. As further proof that the Maori were in fact the first inhabitants of New Zealand Shortland stated, 'The traditions of the New Zealanders speak of the country as being uninhabited on the arrival of their canoes from Hawaiki...'.\textsuperscript{105}

William Colenso had been in New Zealand since his arrival as a missionary printer in 1834. Colenso's missionary work along with his interests in exploration and science meant he had lived in predominantly Maori areas for years and had built up a considerable knowledge of various traditions and aspects of culture.\textsuperscript{106} In his article 'On the Maori Races of New Zealand', he examined the questions of the identity and origin point of the Maori, and the issue of whether they were the original inhabitants of New Zealand. In contrast to Shortland, Colenso rejected Maori tradition as any sort of reliable guide to their history, stating that, 'Very little can be gathered from their own

\textsuperscript{102}Shortland, 'Short Sketch', p. 7. In the first half of the nineteenth century it was common for Pakeha to refer to the South Island/Te Wai Pounamu as 'Middle Island' and Stewart Island/Rakiura as 'Southern Island'.

\textsuperscript{103}Ibid., pp. 9-10.

\textsuperscript{104}Ibid., p. 10.

\textsuperscript{105}Ibid., p. 11.

traditions worthy of any credit; save that, (a) some arrived hither in canoes; and (b) that these arrivals were successive.\(^{107}\)

Colenso rejected the case that there was any strong evidence that Hawaiki was either Hawaii or Savaii.\(^{108}\) He suggested that the whole story of the emigration from Hawaiki might be seen, 'more as a figurative or allegorical myth than anything really historical'. He proposed that Polynesian migration myths might be part of the fragmentary portions of a universal flood myth.\(^{109}\) Colenso also rejected whakapapa as any reliable means of deducing the time of Polynesian arrival, stating, again in contrast to Shortland, that genealogies, rather than being consistent, were often completely contradictory.\(^{110}\) He claimed that the Maori themselves never believed their traditions literally and went on to mock those Europeans who accepted the stories as historical truth.\(^{111}\)

Colenso set out the conclusions he believed it was possible to make regarding the origins of the Polynesians. He held that linguistic evidence showed that Polynesians were all of the same race; that linguistic and cultural evidence did not indicate a Malay origin for the Polynesians; and that it was possible that the Polynesians had in fact entered the Pacific from South America. He offered as evidence for this idea supposed similarities between South American and Polynesian carving and fire starting methods, and by the presence of the kumara, a South American native. Colenso also suggested the possibility that the Polynesian were a very ancient race and that, along with the animals and plants of the Pacific, their distribution may actually have reflected the submergence of a previously existing Pacific super continent. Colenso seems almost to have been hinting at a semi-polygenist idea of the Pacific basin as a specific centre of creation. Consistent with these ideas, he believed that the Maori had been in New Zealand far longer than the 500 years suggested by some scholars. Colenso even went to the extent of contradicting his statements on the value of tradition by suggesting that the Maui legends reflected ancient knowledge of geological changes.\(^{112}\) Despite all this speculation Colenso's final conclusion was that 'the origin of the Polynesian race is a problem that has yet to be solved'.\(^{113}\)

A major difference between Colenso and Shortland concerned the idea of whether or not there had been an earlier people in New Zealand prior to the arrival of the first

\(^{107}\) Colenso, 'Maori Races of NZ', p. 51.
\(^{108}\) Ibid., pp. 52-3.
\(^{109}\) Ibid., p. 53.
\(^{110}\) Ibid., pp. 53-4.
\(^{111}\) Ibid., p. 59.
\(^{112}\) Ibid., pp. 54-61.
\(^{113}\) Ibid., p. 62.
Polynesians. In contrast to Shortland, Colenso argued that it was 'very likely' that there had been a race of 'autochthones' in New Zealand, before the Maori. Colenso based his conclusion on the idea that all large land masses were inhabited and even the small islands of Polynesia tended to be populated. He believed that the Moriori of the Chatham islands were descended from these earlier people of New Zealand and that the Maori acknowledged them to be so. Colenso also referred to Maori traditions and fears of 'wild men' hidden in the forests and mountains. He mentioned traditions which spoke of earlier inhabitants in the Waitara and Rotorua. Colenso went on to write that while such people had probably existed, 'they have been destroyed, or become amalgamated with the present race'.

It can be seen that Shortland and Colenso, while both writing from the perspective of many years of contact with Maori, disagreed on many points. Significantly, the question of the presence or absence of a pre-Maori people was one of these points of difference. Such disagreement indicates the lack of consensus over this issue among the Pakeha scholarly community in the mid-nineteenth century.

**Haast, McKay and the Moa Debate**

From the late 1830s Pakeha naturalists had been fascinated by the questions raised from the finding of huge bones from giant birds. At the same time notes began to be taken of Maori accounts of the semi-mythical moa. Interest was further heightened after 1839 when the renowned London anatomist, Richard Owen, declared that the femoral bone brought to him from New Zealand by Sydney surgeon John Rule, belonged to a giant, flightless bird. As most scholars accepted that the moa was extinct, the question arose as to whether they had been killed off by people and, if so, who had been responsible.

Julius Haast, the Canterbury-based geologist and promoter of colonial science, was to become the major advocate of the idea that moa extinction was the work of a pre-Maori people. In 1871 Haast gave a series of addresses dedicated to the task of discerning the identity of the people who had killed off the moa. In the first of these papers Haast referred directly to the 1847 work of Boucher de Perthes in discovering giant extinct mammals which lived as contemporaries of Palaeolithic humans in Europe, and went on to explain the four age division of 'Palaeolithic', 'Neolithic', 'Bronze', and 'Iron' ages. Haast believed that, just as in Europe where giant, extinct mammals had disappeared during the time of Palaeolithic humans, so in New Zealand the moa hunters had been an
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115 I have relied for much of the background to this section on Atholl Anderson's comprehensive work *Prodigious Birds: Moas and Moa-hunting in New Zealand*, Cambridge, 1989, in particular Chapters 2 and 7.
earlier Palaeolithic people who had disappeared along with the various species of moa.\textsuperscript{116}

As evidence of the ancient extinction of the moa, Haast put forward a variety of arguments. These included the position of moa bones in the lower strata of excavations, the seeming lack of Maori traditional knowledge of the moa, and the claim by the German physiologist, C. G. Carus, that human skulls found with moa bones were of a Palaeolithic people, different from Maori.\textsuperscript{117}

Haast was at first convinced that the moa-hunters had only rough unpolished tools, such as had been identified in Europe as belonging to Palaeolithic culture, and that they did not possess greenstone. He originally believed that any polished tools found in moa-hunter sites were actually from later Maori camps on the same spots.\textsuperscript{118} Later Haast was to suggest that the rock paintings at Weka Pass were so ancient and so unlike contemporary Maori art as to indicate that they must have been painted by an earlier, different people.\textsuperscript{119} Atholl Anderson sees Haast's view as being an antipodean version of Lubbock's idea of separate Palaeolithic and Neolithic peoples, each associated with different animals and with different technologies.\textsuperscript{120}

Haast's views were immediately challenged by Hector and by W. D. Murison, who argued that moa extinction was recent, being the result of hunting by ancestors of the Maori.\textsuperscript{121} The biggest controversy over Haast's theories on moa extinction came when his ideas were attacked from an unexpected quarter. Haast had engaged two men to carry out an excavation of Moabone Point Cave in Sumner. Haast believed that the bones and artifacts found in the cave indicated that it had been visited or occupied by two separate peoples, an earlier Palaeolithic moa hunting people and the later Neolithic Maori.\textsuperscript{122}

\textsuperscript{116} J. Haast, 'Moas and Moa Hunters. First Paper', \textit{TNZI}, 4, 1871, pp. 67-68.
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid., pp. 70-9. As further proof of a pre-existing non-Maori race, Haast related stories from Alexander Mackay, the Native Commissioner, that 'the natives assert that in the interior of the North Island a race existed called Maero, which they described as wild men of the woods, and somewhat like Australians'. Haast later cited the ideas put forward by Richard Taylor in the 1870 edition of \textit{Te Ika a Maui} as support for his own views on earlier inhabitants. See \textit{ibid.}, p. 79, and J. Haast, 'Notes on an Ancient Native Burial Place near the Moa-bone Point, Sumner', \textit{TNZI}, 7, 1874, pp. 90-1.
\textsuperscript{118} J. Haast, 'Moas and Moa Hunters. First Paper', pp. 82-5.
\textsuperscript{119} J. Haast, 'Address', \textit{TNZI}, 10, 1877, pp. 44-8.
\textsuperscript{120} Anderson, \textit{Prodigious Birds}, pp. 100-1.
\textsuperscript{121} J. Hector, 'On Moa Remains in New Zealand', \textit{TNZI}, 4, 1871, pp. 110-20.
\textsuperscript{122} J. Haast, 'Researches and Excavations carried on in and near the Moa-bone Point Cave, Sumner Road, in the Year 1872', \textit{TNZI}, 7, 1874, pp. 54-85. On the modification of Haast's views on polished stone tools see \textit{ibid.}, p. 72.
J. Haast, 'Notes on the Moa-hunter Encampment at Shag Point, Otago', \textit{ibid.}, pp. 91-8.
In August 1874, a paper written by Alexander McKay was read to the Wellington Philosophical Society. McKay had been employed as a worker in Haast's excavation of Moa-bone Point Cave, and was later to be employed as a geologist by the Geological Survey. He argued that the excavations at Moa-bone Point Cave showed that the bones and artifacts found at the cave and elsewhere indicated a gradual extinction of the moa and its replacement in the local diet by shellfish. McKay further argued that it was quite possible the killers of the moa were in fact the same people as the Maori. He believed this was indicated by the presence of polished stone tools in the excavated 'moa-hunter' strata. McKay went on to argue that the Maori may have been in New Zealand a thousand years longer than previously believed, which he considered to be shown by the relatively large size of the Maori population. Haast was extremely annoyed over this article and portrayed McKay as being a mere workman who had betrayed the trust of his benefactor, Haast.

The disagreements between Haast and McKay indicate that, in the early 1870s, there was no scholarly agreement on whether or not there had been an earlier pre-Maori population in New Zealand. In Haast's depiction of the moa-hunters it is not clear as to whether he saw them as being driven out by later immigrants. It seems he believed they disappeared before Maori even arrived in Aotearoa, vanishing as a result of the extinction of the moa. Haast was nevertheless a strong believer in the idea of displacement and was convinced that the Maori would become extinct by the early twentieth century. While McKay appears to have disagreed with Haast on most other points he too believed that the contemporary Maori population was in numerical decline.

"Smoothing the Dying Pillow"-The Belief in Inevitable Maori Extinction.
The belief that Maori were dying out as a race was a very common one among Pakeha scholars in the second half of the nineteenth century. F. D. Fenton, who was later to be appointed as the Chief Judge of the Native Land Court, produced the official colonial

123 A. McKay, 'On the Identity of the Moa-hunters with the present Maori Race', ibid., pp. 98-105.
124 Haast was also angry with James Hector, who had sponsored McKay's paper and read it to the Wellington Philosophical Society. Haast accused Hector of being 'the abettor of such a perfidious transaction', and therefore 'as guilty as the perpetrator himself'. See 'Proceedings of the Philosophical Institute of Canterbury. 15 September, 1874', ibid., pp. 528-30. For further material relating to the dispute over this issue see 'Proc. of the Ph. Inst. of Cant. 1st October, 1874 and 5th January 1875', ibid., pp. 531-2, 534-5. Minutes and Correspondence relating to this dispute are published in ibid., pp. 535-8, including two letters of Alexander McKay defending his views and actions, ibid., pp. 537-8. The whole dispute and its ramifications are described in more detail in Anderson, Prodigious Birds, pp. 100-6.
government report *Observations on the State of the Aboriginal Inhabitants of New Zealand* in 1859. In this publication he argued that the Maori population was in decline, but argued this was only partially due to the impact of Pakeha arrival. Fenton maintained that the major reason for the fall in the Maori population was their own inbreeding. A.K. Newman was another who believed Maori were heading for extinction as a result of inbreeding and disease even before Pakeha arrived in New Zealand.

W.T.L. Travers used the work of renowned British scientists to back up his own theories on Maori extinction. Travers used the works of Lyell, Joseph Hooker, Lubbock and Darwin to illustrate the impact made by European plants, animals and people on the indigenous flora, fauna and people of New Zealand. Travers believed the take-over by European life forms was an unstoppable one, which would result in both positive and negative changes to the New Zealand environment. He expressed the hope that Maori might survive this, but seemed to regard their disappearance before the Pakeha intruders as a natural phenomena that probably could not be avoided. W.L. Buller agreed with the proposition that Maori were dying out. He maintained that the responsibility of Pakeha scholars was not to halt this decline, but to collect and publish as much ethnographic material on Maori as possible.

Not all commentators agreed with the idea of Maori decline to extinction. As mentioned earlier Edward Shortland had criticised the idea of Maori decline in population back in 1851. Buller's own father, the missionary James Buller, held that Maori would 'disappear', not through extinction but through a process of amalgamation with Pakeha and adoption of 'civilization'. The Maori Member of Parliament, James Carroll, totally rejected any idea of the certainty of Maori extinction, a view shared by John Thornton, the headmaster of Te Aute College, an influential figure on Apirana Ngata and Peter Buck.

It can be seen that, despite these dissenting views, the idea of the displacement and extinction of Maori and of the native flora and fauna of New Zealand was a common
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Galbreath, 'Colonisation', pp. 61-2, 82-3, 83n.
one. An examination of the ideas of the thinkers mentioned above shows that while all to some extent supported the idea that Maori were being displaced by Pakeha, only William Colenso clearly advocated the idea that Maori themselves had displaced an earlier population. The pattern that emerged by the late nineteenth century was one of general agreement over the issue of displacement of the Maori, but no consensus over the existence of a pre-Maori people.133

Darwinism in the Antipodes.

From the early 1860s Darwinian ideas of evolution began to be debated in the New Zealand colony. As pointed out above copies of the *Origin* were available in New Zealand by at least 1861, when A. S. Atkinson acquired a copy. Atkinson's brother-in-law, the Supreme Court judge C. W. Richmond, stirred up considerable debate on the issue, with his paper 'Man's Place in Creation'. This basically pro-Darwinian work, published in 1869, drew responses from such worthies as Archdeacon Harper, Bishop Suter and Sir William Martin.134

In 1876, the letter columns of the *Otago Daily Times* were the site of a vigorous debate between several prominent citizens over the compatibility, or otherwise, of Darwinian evolution and established religion. William Salmond, the new Professor of Divinity at Otago University, argued that evolution could not be reconciled with revealed religion and must therefore be rejected. Captain F. W. Hutton, a geologist and a devout Anglican, held that there was no real conflict between evolution and Christianity. On the other hand, Robert Stout, lawyer, politician and staunch freethinker, agreed with Salmond that Christianity and evolution were irreconcilable, but believed that Christianity should be rejected, rather than evolution. The leader writers of the *Otago Daily Times* consistently supported theistic evolution throughout this debate.135

Following on from this debate a series of lectures were organised by the Otago Institute. Otago Institute President, Robert Gillies, gave a lecture condemning the materialistic...

133 Newmann held that Maori were the original population, while the Chatham Island Moriori were their 'weakly offspring'. He saw no evidence confirming the existence a pre-Maori race and stated that, 'no faith can be placed in the vague tradition that these islands were inhabited by a dark race, the Ngati-Mamoe'. See Newman, 'Study of the Causes', pp. 459, 464. Travers had in 1868 commented that the Moa may have been killed off by an earlier, 'distinct race', but it appears he may have dropped this idea once he worked out his theories in more detail. In his 1869 paper Travers stated that Maori were the first settlers of New Zealand. See Travers, 'Changes Effected', p. 306.
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W. Martin to C. W. Richmond, 28/10/1869, in *ibid.*, pp. 297-8.

135 *Otago Daily Times*, 13/5/1876, 15/5/1876, 16/5/1876, 17/5/1876, 18/5/1876, 20/5/1876, 15/6/1876, 16/6/1876, 17/6/1876, 15/6/1876, 20/6/1876.
evolutionary philosophy expressed in German Darwinist Ernst Haeckel's 1868 book *The History of Creation* but supporting theistic evolution. Gillies' lecture was followed by one from Hutton supporting theistic evolution and a lecture by Anglican Bishop Nevill in favour of special creation. The *Otago Daily Times* declared Hutton the victor in this debate claiming that he demolished the Bishop's arguments in question time. Even former anti-evolutionist William Salmond announced his conversion to support for theistic evolution, as advocated by Hutton.

With the exception of the Otago Institute it seems that the issues raised by questions of evolution were not heavily debated in the Philosophical Institutes. Stenhouse points out that in New Zealand there was in fact only limited conflict between science and religion over evolution. Many theologians accepted theistic evolution, while scientists such as Hutton and Haast easily reconciled evolution with Christianity. Galbreath relates that the Philosophical Institutes themselves also tended to avoid controversial issues, seeing their role as that of observers of nature rather than metaphysical theorists. Thus debate in the Institutes over Darwinian evolution was played down during the 1870s and 80s. In the 1895 however, Buller presented the strongly pro-Darwinian article 'Illustrations of Darwinism' in response to criticisms of Darwinian evolution by Schaw and an anti-evolutionary article by Coleman Phillips.

Galbreath points out that, with the exception of the entomologist W. M. Maskell, virtually all the prominent New Zealand scientists accepted some form of evolution. Yet most scholars did not see the displacement of indigenous plants, animals and people as a reflection of Darwin's ideas. Buller, for example, though an admirer and defender of Darwin, did not accept natural selection as the mechanism behind the displacement process. Instead he saw displacement as evidence of a divine creative plan of inevitable progress.
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142 Buller saw natural selection as just one evolutionary factor, acting along with the Lamarckian acquisition of features. Buller viewed the whole evolutionary process as evidence of a Divine creative plan, seeing the process of displacement as the sign of a mysterious natural law reflecting the inevitability of progress. See Galbreath, *Buller*, pp. 104-6, 162-4. Buller's ideas were in some ways similar to those put forward by Dieffenbach in the 1840s, who wrote of displacement as 'a strange and melancholy, but undeniable, fact' reflecting 'Nature's eternal laws'. See Dieffenbach, *Travels in New Zealand*, Vol. 2, pp. 14-3. Hochstetter saw the process of displacement as the result of the 'struggle for existence' but, rather than seeing this in Darwinian terms, he regarded all change as for the better, being part of a providential scheme of physical, mental and moral progress. See Hochstetter, *New Zealand*, p. 197. Fenton and Newman both expressed versions of the idea that displacement of Maori reflected a
Galbreath argues against using the term 'Social Darwinism' to describe nineteenth century scholarly views on displacement. While Darwinian evolutionary views were well known and debated, and fitted in easily with commonly held views on displacement, they were not the principal basis for such beliefs. Displacement of Maori by Pakeha was often seen as the result of some mysterious and unstoppable principle of progress occurring in the Universe, rather than the result of the victory of the stronger over the weaker in a brutal struggle for access to resources. Pakeha colonisers were lucky enough to be the worthy but innocent beneficiaries of this process.

**Conclusion**

The nineteenth century saw immense changes in the Western scientific vision of the world, especially in the fields of geology, biology, and anthropology. It was also the period when science in New Zealand went from being a discipline carried out only by visiting naturalists to being mainly practised by local colonial naturalists (mainly amateur but including a small number of professionals), with their own networks, institutions, and publications. New Zealand science throughout the nineteenth century was part of the processes of imperialism. Information was gathered as part of a process of gaining knowledge of resources, geography, weather, flora, fauna, and people, in order to have more control over these things. At the same time this information was also used to develop grand theories, such as Darwin's evolutionary ideas or Lubbock's ideas on human cultural evolution.

The establishment of political and commercial empires also enabled an extremely productive two way scientific information exchange to operate. Imperial expansion, whether in the form of establishing settler colonies, taking control of non-Western territories, or setting up commercial trading systems, meant that naturalists, traders, missionaries, soldiers, sailors and explorers ventured into a wide range of new lands and sent back a huge amount of specimens and reports from these places. Metropolitan scientists were able to compare and order this information sent from the colonies and use it for the development of broad scientific theories. Naturalists venturing into or established and living in the colonies, were able to use the metropolitan training systems, technical knowledge, tools and theoretical constructs to help gain an understanding of 'new' and unfamiliar lands. This attempt to define and understand can be seen as part of a 'domestication' process. Colonisers tried to gain physical control
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over places and peoples, while at the same time trying to fit those places and peoples into Western world-views.

Once a substantial settler colony was set up in New Zealand, local naturalists began to establish a degree of independence. The setting up of local institutions was followed by a degree of co-ordination between such bodies on a colony-wide basis. Such co-ordination was particularly helped by the establishment of the Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute, which provided a colony wide forum for scientific discussion. Nevertheless naturalists in New Zealand remained in correspondence with metropolitan scientists, looking to them as leaders, and as sources of major innovative theories.

Despite the geographical isolation of the New Zealand colony, naturalists here were quick to read about, discuss and sometimes partially or completely adopt the latest metropolitan theories. The idea of colonies as backwaters where the colonists were unaware of the big issues and ideas being debated in the metropolitan centres does not hold up when the writings of New Zealand naturalists are examined. Thus Darwinian ideas were soon included among the variety of theoretical tools applied to the New Zealand situation by local thinkers. Yet not all metropolitan ideas automatically gained a following in the colony, as evidenced by the fact that no significant colonial thinker appears to have fully applied the idea of polygeny, to either the Maori or the Moriori. There does not appear to have been any challenge in New Zealand to the idea of monogeny, possibly as a result of the perceived similarities between Polynesians and Europeans.

It could be argued that the biggest change brought about by Darwinism, along with ideas such as those of Lyell on geology and Lubbock on human socio-cultural evolution, was the establishment of a newly recognised set of scientific hypotheses at the centre of debates over geological, biological, and human development. The protagonists of such debates did not necessarily agree on the truth or otherwise of these hypotheses but they did agree as to what they were arguing about. In line with these developments, after the 1860s, in New Zealand a significant change can be detected in the type of arguments used in debates about early migration through the Pacific. From the 1860s onwards whatever the religious views of participants in such debates their arguments were couched in avowedly scientific rather than religious terms. Taylor's 1870 edition of Te Ika a Maui appears to have been the last major work to seriously propose that biblical scholarship held the key to the story of waves of migrations in New Zealand and the Pacific.
A clear pattern emerges in looking at the work of the colonial scholarly community, showing that Pakeha had a fascination with collecting information on Maori and with trying to process that information in such a way as to understand the Maori on Pakeha terms. In particular Pakeha were fascinated with the question of how Maori came to New Zealand and what was the history of these migrations. Again this can be seen as part of a 'domestication' process whereby Pakeha tried to place the indigenous people and their past into a context which was more readily understandable, and therefore more under the control of, the coloniser.

The examination of the various theories put forward by Pakeha scholars shows clearly that by the late nineteenth century there was no consensus over whether Maori were the first people in New Zealand. It appears that the view that there had an earlier non-Maori population was a minority opinion. The majority of writers whose work was examined in the course of this chapter, believed that Maori were the first people in New Zealand.

The great majority of Pakeha scholars did share the idea of the inevitable displacement of more primitive peoples. Indigenous plants, animals, and people of New Zealand were widely believed to be in the process of being supplanted by superior European versions, although the reason for this was open to debate. Such an idea did not necessarily lead to the assumption that Maori had themselves been involved in a similar process of displacing an earlier people. But the idea did establish in Pakeha New Zealand a widely accepted intellectual model of displacement. Into this model the idea of Maori driving out an earlier, inferior people could be easily and comfortably fitted.

Along with developments in natural history the other great source of nineteenth century ideas on races and their historical migrations were the many studies of comparative philology, folklore and oral tradition. It was to be the Pakeha study of Maori oral traditions that provided the main source of the orthodox Moriori myth. In the next chapter we shall examine how the European and New Zealand contexts of these studies provided the background for the later works of Pakeha ethnologists.
CHAPTER TWO

PAKEHA COLLECTION OF MAORI ORAL TRADITION

The Nineteenth Century Western European Approach to Oral History, Folklore and Oral Tradition

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the collection of Maori oral traditions was to play a central role in the formation of Pakeha ideas on Polynesian migration to New Zealand, especially ideas concerning pre-Maori populations. To put Pakeha gathering of Maori traditions into context it is necessary first to examine the role of the collection of oral traditions in nineteenth century European, especially British, intellectual culture. The idea that racial migrations and major historical events could be traced through the study of comparative philology and oral traditions will be seen to be of particular significance in the development of ideas in New Zealand.

The collection of oral accounts in the writing of history is a practice that, in the West, goes back to the days of the ancient Greeks, Herodotus and Thucydides, and to such Roman writers as Julius Caesar and Tacitus. These authors based their accounts on a mixture of oral and written sources, giving at least as much weight to oral accounts as to written texts. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* and the books of the Old and New Testament were based to a large extent on oral narratives. These works were written and compiled in cultures that still used oral communication to pass on a large amount of their information and stories. The structure of the literary works of these cultures was still based on the structure of oral accounts. Written works were often largely known to people through being read aloud, and were probably written with this consideration in mind.¹

In western Europe during the early medieval times bards and poets were major producers of oral historical accounts. The composers of these accounts tended to be most concerned with justifying the position, power, and political claims of their own families or those of their aristocratic patrons rather than with strict historical accuracy. The written chronicles of early medieval times were often based on oral sources and were usually penned by monks with the skills and the time for writing. Bede's *History of the English Church and People* and *The Domesday Book*, the great landholding record of England in 1086, were both compiled largely from oral testimony. Charlemagne ordered his chroniclers to collect the oral accounts of the 'heathen' kings


of the past. For the ancient sections of his history of the Danes, Saxo Grammaticus used oral versions of the sagas told to him by visiting Icelanders.\(^2\)

From the sixteenth century, the spread of the printed word meant that a far larger amount of written material was in existence. As a result historians came to use more written material as a historical source, with less reliance on oral accounts. By the eighteenth century authors such as Voltaire and David Hume had become cynical about the value of oral testimony as a source for the historian.\(^3\)

The spread of print technology, and the resulting increase in literacy, was one of the most significant contributions to the raising of the status of the written and printed word as the ultimate repository of truth, with a subsequent downgrading of the oral account. Ong, in his *Orality and Literacy*, maintains that the development of literacy changes the entire way people think and the way they present information. It could be argued that the advent of the literate mind as the common way of thinking among European scholars, was a vital prerequisite to the idea that written accounts were the authority on past events. On the other hand, Ong points out that it took many centuries for even those in society who were literate to adopt what might be termed 'literate' rather than 'oral' ways of thinking. The increasing dominance of written over oral history probably reflected the slowly increasing dominance of patterns of thought and public discourse based on the written and printed word, rather than the spoken utterance.\(^4\)

In the nineteenth century many renowned Western historians continued to place a great deal of importance on the use of oral history. Jules Michelet used oral sources for his *History of the French Revolution* (1847-53) and *History of France* (1835-67), as did Macaulay for his *History of England* (1848-55). The interviews with workers carried out by Henry Mayhew for the *Morning Chronicle* in the 1840s, were an example of what was later to be called social history.\(^5\) Yet despite the importance attached to oral accounts by such authors, the nineteenth century was to see the rise of the idea that the written document was a far more respectable source of information for the historian than oral testimony. Paul Thompson argues that this change in emphasis was largely a result of the development of the position of the academic, professional historian.

\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 24-5.
\(^3\)Henige, *Oral Historiography*, pp. 8-11.
\(^4\)Thompson, *Voice of the Past*, pp. 24-6.
\(^7\)Reilly, 'John White', thesis, p. 32.
\(^8\)Thompson, *Voice of the Past*, pp. 19, 27-8, 35, 40-3.
Particularly influential in this process were the training systems and research methods devised in Germany by Leopold von Ranke. Ranke insisted that documents were the main material that the historian should use. This idea spread from Germany, as Ranke's disciples took his methodology to teaching establishments throughout the rest of Europe.\(^6\)

Thompson believes that this methodology was so widely adopted because it enabled history to become a more distinct, specialised, and professionalised discipline. The discipline of history was, in the first half of the nineteenth century, going through a process of internalisation of control, similar to that occurring in the sciences. The idea developed that historians themselves should have control over the writing of history through the process of peer review. This meant that historians judging other historians work by assessing the same documents. It was much more difficult to carry out a similar process with oral information. Peer review thus raised the status of the written document and lowered that of the oral account.\(^7\)

**Sagas, Folklore and Contested Identities.**

There were, in the nineteenth century, schools of historians in some European countries who strongly disagreed with the downgrading of the status of oral history. In Scandinavia a major group of historians studied the events of the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries, basing their researches on the saga literature of Iceland. Because the sagas were written down centuries after the early middle ages, these historians were forced to argue that the sagas had for generations been orally transmitted in a largely unchanged form. The historians maintained that people from oral cultures had much better memories and that they constructed their sagas in such a way as to make their memorisation easier. Such arguments were very similar to those used by many nineteenth century Pakeha ethnographers in New Zealand, referring to the reliability and historical value of Maori oral accounts. It was also argued that the Icelanders had retained the original Scandinavian traditions due to their isolation.\(^8\) Stephenson Percy Smith built on this idea in New Zealand, arguing that Maori had retained ancient
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Polynesian histories due to their isolation in a remote corner of the Pacific, just as the Icelanders had done in Europe.9

Scholars in Scandinavia were developing major interests in both the physical and oral signs of the past, at the same time as their great interest in saga literature. On the one hand, major developments in archaeology occurred in Denmark, which helped to establish the idea of stages of development based on physical culture such as the iron, bronze and stone ages. On the other hand, a large amount of folklore collecting began to take place in the Scandinavian countries. The use of orally-based saga literature, the collection of oral folklore, and the study of archaeological remains were all used by the intellectuals of different Scandinavian countries to ‘invent’ the pasts of their respective countries. This process was driven by what might be called contested nationalisms or contested identities. There were movements in Norway and Iceland struggling for independence from the dominance of other Scandinavian peoples, while within Denmark and Sweden there were groups who were trying to emphasise their country's rights to dominate other parts of Scandinavia.10

The scholars who studied the saga literature tried to construct from them suitably glorious pasts for their countries and peoples and emphasised the differences or similarities between the various Scandinavian peoples. For example, the Norwegian historians P. A. Munch (1810-63) and R. Keyser (1803-64) developed a theory of racial migrations based on their studies of the language of the Icelandic sagas. They held that the Norse were descended from a 'pure' Scandinavian northern wave of migrants, while a mixed 'Gotho-Germanic' people settled in the south and gave rise to the Danes. Their theory not only attacked Danish ideas of a greater Scandinavian unity, but also claimed the Icelandic sagas were 'old Norse' and therefore the cultural property of Norway.11

The German Romantics and Oral Records
Scandinavian scholarship emphasised oral traditions, connections with the land, and the identity of peoples. These features showed similarities with the Romantic movements of Germany. The German Romantics placed great importance on the study of languages and the recording of folktales and other aspects of the folkculture of ordinary people. A seminal influence was the thought of Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803), who emphasised the study of cultures in their own right, especially their language and folk-traditions. Herder broke away from French and Scottish Enlightenment ideas of the

9Smith, Lore: Kauwae runga, pp. iv-v.
Thompson, Voice of the Past, p. 56.
11Andersson, Icelandic Saga Origins, pp. 30-1.
universality of human culture and instead emphasised a pluralistic idea, with each human group having its own distinctive culture. He believed each culture was the product of people's attachment to their native lands. Interaction with the land produced popular traditions that could be studied to help understand the history and identity of peoples. Herder's ideas on one hand can be seen to emphasise a type of tolerant cultural relativism, yet can also be interpreted as encouraging a racially based nationalism.12

Herder believed that an imaginative Volkseele or folk-psyche of a people could be found within popular oral traditions. With regard to the Germans themselves, Herder believed the study of popular folklore, along with the recovery of medieval German literature, could form a basis for a modern national German literature. He encouraged scholars such as the Grimms to investigate the huge body of German oral and traditional lore. Such nationalistic romanticism was further boosted by a feeling of German cultural identity which developed within the German states as a reaction to the conflict with Napoleon. As in Scandinavia the German Romantics were operating in a situation of contested identity, in this case trying to construct a 'German' identity from a variety of peoples living in a large number of small states. Many scholars favoured German political unity based on this sense of identity, seeing their cultural work as part of a nationalistic unification process.13

The Grimm brothers were particularly prominent among the Romantic scholars. They produced a series of major works on philology, German language, mythology and folklore. Jacob Grimm (1785-1863) and his brother Wilhelm (1786-1859) were professors, first at the University of Gottingen and then at Berlin. They set out to collect German folklore driven by the common idea that such lore might be completely lost if not written down. While the Grimms used some literary sources, their main sources were oral, the stories told by ordinary people. While the brothers took care to acknowledge their sources, they often combined several versions of a story into what they considered to be the best version.14 Wilhelm Grimm in particular appeared to be more interested in presenting the stories in a way that reflected his vision of the 'true spirit' behind them, rather than publishing them in the same form as they had been written down.15 The Grimms were of great importance in the European study of folklore and language, providing an example of the systematic collection of folklore and the study of folklore's relationships with language and mythology. The brothers took an

14 Ibid., pp. 28-9.
15 Ibid., pp. 29-30.
active part in building up a European wide network of scholars working on folklore and language matters.16

**British Folklore Collection**

In Britain antiquarians began gathering folklore in the sixteenth century. These collectors were usually gentlemen and clergymen who collected the tales of rural commoners and took an interest in the physical remains of Britain’s past. By the early nineteenth century the collection of folklore was becoming a more organised and systematic activity, with the build-up of networks of scholars and a growing emphasis on the collection of oral accounts. William John Thoms (1803-1885) was inspired by the example of the Grimms to establish a publication in England for the collectors of folklore. He set up the journal *Notes & Queries* in 1849 which was a platform for correspondence from folklore collectors throughout Britain. Thoms’ many years of writing for and editing *Notes and Queries* resulted in the setting up of The Folklore Society in 1878. The establishment of such journals and societies helped change the collection of oral folklore from a hobby of scattered amateurs to a work carried out by a network of people who debated methods and theoretical issues.17

Many of the most significant nineteenth century British collections of folklore came from the so-called ‘Celtic fringe’. Sir Walter Scott was a major collector of Scottish and border folklore around the turn of the century, having been inspired by tales he heard as a youth in the Highlands, from veterans of the 1745 uprising. Scott produced two major collections *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border* (1802-3) and *The Border Antiquities of England and Scotland* (1814-7). He also used the material he collected as a basis for much of the fiction in his novels, as in the *Waverley* series.18

Two collectors, Thomas Crofton Croker and Thomas Keightley, produced major works on Irish folklore, based in part on oral material. The networking between folklorists was illustrated by the early collaboration of Croker with Keightley as well as by Croker’s

---

16 The Grimms inspired the work of the great Russian folklorist Alexander Nicolaevich Afanasev (1826-71), and corresponded with the Scottish novelist and folklorist Sir Walter Scott (1771-1832). The brothers also corresponded with the Irish folklorist Thomas Crofton Croker (1798-1854) who had made substantial collections of southern Irish folklore, published in three volumes as *Fairy Legends of the South of Ireland* (1825-28). The Grimms translated the first volume of Croker’s work into German, while Croker in turn translated a lengthy ‘Essay on the Fairies’ by the Grimms, and published it with the third volume of *Fairy Legends*. See R. M. Dorson, *The British Folklorists*, London, 1968, pp. 45-8, 109. The British folklorist Thomas Keightley developed ideas on the diffusion of stories through invasions by different races. These ideas were strongly based on the work of the Grimms on language and folklore. The anthropologist Edward Burnett Tylor acknowledged the debt owed to the Grimms for collecting folklore thus enabling students to try and find the mental history concealed in such stories. See ibid., pp. 54, 188.


18 Ibid., pp. 107-9.

correspondence with the Grimms and Scott. Keightley acknowledged his own debt to the Grimms in an expanded 1850 edition of *The Fairy Mythology*, a work in which he developed his ideas on comparative mythology and attempted to use folklore to trace the paths of migration of the supposed ancestral European peoples.\(^{19}\)

The collection of folklore in the 'Celtic fringe' of Britain became linked with the issues of cultural nationalism and the invention of identities and traditions. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the features that had distinguished rural Welsh culture were in many cases disappearing. Welsh intellectuals were, over the same period becoming fascinated by what they saw as the Welsh past. Middle class scholars began to construct a version of the Welsh past and culture from fragments of folklore and history.\(^{20}\) This vision they set up in opposition to the hegemony of English culture.

A similar process was occurring in Scotland where a group of mainly lowland Scots intellectuals constructed a version of Highland dress and culture which bore little resemblance to the genuine way of life of the dwindling Highland population. This image, with elements such as the bagpipes and clan tartans, was expanded to become adopted as a Scottish identity; adopted even by Lowlanders, who in the past had generally regarded the Highlanders as dangerous, illiterate, thieves.\(^{21}\)

A major influence on this creation of a supposedly Highland Scottish identity were the writings of James Macpherson. Macpherson was a middle-class, Gaelic speaking Highlander, who had been educated at the University of Aberdeen and then lived in Edinburgh. He was therefore familiar with both Highland Gaelic and Lowland Scots cultures. In 1765 Macpherson brought out *The Works of Ossian*, claimed to be the works of the blind third century Highland poet obtained from Highland oral traditions, collected before they disappeared. Many romantic nationalist Scots, along with many other European scholars, accepted Macpherson's claims. Others, including Dr. Johnson, regarded Macpherson as a fraud who had made up the poems himself.\(^{22}\)

Many twentieth century scholars agreed with Dr. Johnson. Hugh Trevor-Roper believes Macpherson deliberately took Irish stories and repackaged them as being of Scottish

---

\(^{19}\)Dorson, *British Folklorists*, pp. 44-8, 52-5. Croker produced three volumes entitled *Fairy Legends and Traditions of the South of Ireland* (1825-8) which also included Welsh and Scottish material. Keightley, who had originally worked with Croker but then fell out with him, brought out two collections, *The Fairy Mythology* (1828, revised in 1850) and *Tales and Popular Fictions* (1834).


origin, in an attempt to show that Highland culture in particular, and Scottish culture in general, were distinct from both the Irish and the English. More recently Fiona Stafford has argued that Macpherson's work was not a forgery as such. Rather she sees it as a fictionalised repackaging of Highland Gaelic traditions by a man familiar with that culture. She argues that Macpherson was trying to preserve something he saw as disappearing, by representing the material in a way that was understandable to an English-speaking audience who were unfamiliar with it. Thus, according to Stafford, Macpherson was a mediator between cultures rather than a fraudster. Whatever the truth about Macpherson's motives, his Ossian was very widely read and very influential in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, including in New Zealand as will be seen in the case of John White.

In Scotland and Wales scholars were not generally seeking any sort of political independence but were seeking to emphasise their cultural autonomy from the English. The Welsh and Scots placed particular importance on the glorious history of struggle against the now dominant English. In the process greater emphasis came to be placed on the racial groups people were assumed to be descended from such as the 'Celts'. The oral culture of the ordinary peoples was a product of local histories and ongoing ways of life rather than being the stuff of great national or racial identities. In the hands of scholars this oral culture became the raw material for a great series of inventions of tradition, often based around cultural or political nationalism.

The collectors of folklore can be seen to have been the middle class and aristocratic gentlemen who had benefited economically and culturally from the spread of literacy and the growth of industry, the very processes that appeared to be threatening the old oral culture. Collectors often emphasised the need to record 'disappearing' oral traditions. The comparison can be made with the European collectors of colonised peoples traditions. These collectors also lamented the 'passing' of indigenous traditions while simultaneously implementing the processes of colonisation that placed those traditions under threat. Deeper social and political motives than mere entertainment can be detected in such collecting processes. The Romantic movements had a profound influence on the collection of folklore through their rejection of Enlightenment ideas of a universal human nature and their increased emphasis on cultural, racial and national identities. Romantic influence shows up strongly when middle and upper-class scholars

25 A similar process of cultural 'revival' or invention of tradition was to occur in Ireland nearer to the end of the nineteenth century. The earlier work of Croker and Keightley does not appear to have been connected to any specifically political or identity-based projects. Later writers such as Yeats and Hyde linked an interest in Irish folklore and language with nationalist ideas. See R. Kee, The Bold Fenian Men, London, 1976, pp. 130-141.
were involved in processes of trying to establish national cultural identities for what they regarded as their own people. The use of oral tradition and folklore to reconstruct history was given much more prominence when scholars were studying cultures with little or no written literature. A similar process was to be seen in the outposts of empire as European scholars tried to reconstruct the past of indigenous peoples in a way that Europeans could understand. In the empires this process was further complicated by the wider cultural gaps between indigenous peoples and European recorders of traditions.

The Fear of the Disappearance of Oral Culture

By the nineteenth century the fear of the disappearance of stories and customs had become a major factor encouraging collectors to record material. From very early times of folklore studies there were those who believed such stories and customs were being lost and must be written down. Thus the antiquarian John Aubrey (1626-97) observed that the spread of print and the increase of literacy among ordinary people of his native Wiltshire, was leading to a decline in their oral traditions, especially when combined with the chaos resulting from the English Civil War. Aubrey's seventeenth century observations make an interesting comparison with Ong's twentieth century ideas that the type and nature of stories, and the way memory is used, change dramatically once oral-based cultures develop a considerable degree of literacy.26

In eighteenth century Britain a considerable spread of literacy was combined with the beginnings of the industrial revolution and the subsequent depopulation of the countryside. These factors encouraged a decline in the knowledge of folktales and customs. Occasionally there were also deliberate attempts by metropolitan authorities to destroy aspects of oral-based cultures, such as the repressive laws instituted in highland Scotland after the 1745 rebellion. Scholars commonly believed that the folk customs and tales of rural England and the Celtic fringe would disappear, and therefore must be recorded before they were lost or were hopelessly corrupted. This exercise might be termed 'salvage ethnography'. In a similar process, with the expansion of Empires, the British and other Europeans encountered cultures based around the oral record. The imperialists initiated changes to these cultures that seemed destined to destroy these traditions. European collectors tried to write down the oral accounts that they believed would soon disappear, in a series of international exercises of salvage ethnology.27

26 Dorson, British Folklore, pp. 4-7.
Ong, Orality & Literacy pp. 78-9, 93-116.
27 Stocking, Victorian Anthropology, p. 55.
Torgovnick writes of an examples in the 1980s of filmmakers seeking to record examples of 'untouched peoples' only to realise that the supposedly 'uncontacted' Asmat of New Guinea had actually had generations of contact with outside groups. See Torgovnick, Gone Primitive, pp. 177-82, 180n.
The authority of the collectors of oral traditions was enhanced by the fact that their books were supposedly the last repositories of otherwise vanished ancient knowledge. To hear oral traditions one had to find an expert who knew the stories and then persuade them to tell these stories. Many traditions might be in a dialect or language incomprehensible to most westerners. Thus for most readers of the written accounts of oral traditions, the written versions were much more accessible than any surviving oral account. Oral accounts also tended to change with changing social contexts and to vary according to which person from which group was telling them. To the person from outside these social contexts these variations might have been interpreted as being unreliable or as a corruption of the oral version. A written version might well have seemed solid and reliable in contrast. In addition, the privileged position of writing as a form of communication in a literate society, meant that the written text often came to be more highly regarded by the literate public than any surviving oral version. Binney mentions a similar process in New Zealand, where even the descendants of those who produced oral narratives come to give preference to extant written versions. It could well be argued that, even within European cultures, the recording and appropriation of folklore was a type of colonialism, involving the take-over of stories by outsiders. These stories then came to serve different purposes from their original roles in the social groups that had produced them.28

Authority over Narratives: Appropriation through Collecting.

The action of collecting and of turning oral narratives into written texts can be seen as an essentially political process. Oral narratives only exist in performance; that is when they are being told. They form part of a social relationship between the teller and the listener. Folktales and oral narratives are generally associated with the relatives, neighbours and environment of the community from which the tale emerges. Thus even though the plot or theme of the story may be one found in many different parts of the world, they are told in a localised setting specific to the narrator’s people and place. Oral narratives may be combative, used by particular people or communities to prove their specific political or resource control claims in argument. Specific people in a community are always seen as having the authority to tell specific stories. All such qualities place the folktale or oral tradition firmly within the context of the society from which it originates. But once the oral narrative becomes a written text the notions of the nature of the story, its meanings, and the idea of who has authority over it change completely.29

Ong, Orality & Literacy, pp. 130-5.
Ong, Orality & Literacy, Chp. 3.
Folklore collectors and their readers saw authority over traditional stories as passing from the people who originally told the stories to the middle and upper class Western 'experts' who recorded them. The collectors tended to see themselves as having authoritative knowledge of the stories and the right to construct more 'correct' versions from the originals. An example of this was the Grimms combining regional variations of stories to produce new synthetic versions. Wilhelm Grimm tended also to change the style of the stories to fit what he saw as correct 'tone' for folktales. James Macpherson constructed an entire version of Highland Gaelic history out of fragments of oral culture. In Wales scholars such as Iolo Morganwg constructed a romantic nationalistic image of the Welsh past by major extrapolations from the surviving fragments of Welsh rural people's culture.

The view of who had authority over tradition was further complicated by factors such as language and culture. English-speaking readers, with little access to the Gaelic or Welsh languages and cultures, saw writers such as Macpherson and Morganwg as authorities because they could transmit their stories in forms the English-speaking reader could understand. A similar situation will later be examined in this thesis, when we investigate Pakeha acceptance of Stephenson Percy Smith's English language versions of Te Whatahoro's writings in Maori. Stafford argues that people such as Morganwg and Macpherson (like Smith and Whatahoro) act as mediators between cultures due to their bicultural knowledge. In contrast it could be argued the lack of knowledge of Welsh and Gaelic among the English meant that they were easily fooled by fraudsters such as Macpherson and Morganwg. Morgan argues that among Welsh and Gaelic speakers there was a lack of access to any large bodies of ancient literature, combined with a lack of major networks of scholars operating in these languages. This meant there could be no systematic criticism of Macpherson and Morganwg's respective views of the past.

Those scholars who collected and rewrote traditions as part of a process of constructing national traditions were among those attempting to find 'a genuine core of ancient history' hidden within oral traditions. Such quests were often carried out in conjunction with the examination of physical antiquities. Dorson gives the example, from the

Binney writes of the use of two different versions of the story of Te Kooti's diamond, being used by two different Tuhoe hapu. Each hapu was trying to prove their respective claims to have received the mana of Te Kooti. See Binney, 'Maori Oral Narratives', pp. 23-4.
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sixteenth century, of William Camden locating a site visited by Julius Caesar by comparing Kentish folk tales, ancient burial mounds, and Roman writings. The search for history behind the oral traditions was particularly important for those collectors who were trying to reconstruct what they believed were the great racial migrations of the ancestors of the European peoples. Migration theories had initially been based around the biblical account of the Deluge and of speculations on the migrations of the descendants Noah's sons afterwards, as seen with Richard Taylor's ideas on Polynesian migration. With the challenges to biblical authority in the nineteenth century other forms of scholarship came to be used more frequently to work out the past migrations of humanity. The study of oral traditions was one of these branches of study, closely interlinked with another form of oral-based scholarship, that of comparative philology.

**Philology and Comparative Mythology**

The disciplines of comparative philology and comparative mythology had a strong influence on nineteenth century theories concerning racial migrations. Comparative philology had its origins in the eighteenth century work of the Englishman, Sir William Jones, who first recognised the links between Sanskrit and the classically-based European languages. His work on comparative philology based around Sanskrit was adopted and further developed in Germany by such scholars as Franz Bopp, Friedrich and August-Wilhelm Schlegel, Wilhelm von Humboldt, and Jacob Grimm. Thus German Romanticism and an interest in oral traditions were intimately linked with the study of comparative philology. From this developed the idea that through the study of language and folklore the history of different races and their relationships with each other could be traced.

William Jones' discovery of the connections between Sanskrit and the Indo-European languages was developed by Friedrich Schlegel into the idea that the movements of languages traced the historical movements of races. In the early nineteenth century the Schlegel brothers advocated the idea that a noble North Indian race, who they called the 'Aryans', had populated much of northern Europe. Many German scholars approved of the idea that north Europeans, particularly the Germans, were of noble Indian descent. These ideas became particularly popular among the early nineteenth century romantic nationalist German movements. Thinkers such as Franz Bopp, Friedrich Hegel, and Jacob Grimm all showed interest in ideas of racial migration from central Asia. The

---

33Ibid., pp. 160-1.
idea that the great waves of racial migration could be traced through language was taken up by Jacob Grimm, who held that a series of races had swept across Europe, with the Germans following the sequence of the Greeks, the Romans and the Celts.\textsuperscript{35}

The idea that waves of racial migration could be traced by language was also popular in early nineteenth century Britain. Thomas Keightley developed theories regarding the development of stories, arranging them according to 'racial geography'. He saw folklore as moving from Scandinavian and German areas into the Celtic fringe, a development on the ideas of the Grimms. Keightley regarded the similarities between stories as the result of diffusion of culture through invasions. He also thought that sometimes parallel stories arose that were geographically unconnected, resulting from similarities in the way people's minds worked.\textsuperscript{36}

British historical scholars began to emphasise the idea of waves of invaders, an emphasis which tended to support the superiority of the 'Anglo-Saxon' over the earlier 'Celtic' peoples. As the nineteenth century unfolded these linguistic groupings came to be seen more in racial terms. Supporters of the ideas of Anglo-Saxon racialism often saw the Celts as 'impulsive, imaginative, violent and somewhat childish' while the Anglo-Saxons were 'enterprising, liberty-loving... self-reliant and self-controlled...'.\textsuperscript{37}

The idea of waves of racial migration was supported by the philological studies of Benjamin Thorpe and John Kemble, and the teaching of Thomas Arnold at Oxford, all of whom emphasised the Germanic nature of the Anglo-Saxons. The extreme of pro-Anglo-Saxon and anti-Celtic sentiment was reached in the racial writings of the polygenist Robert Knox.\textsuperscript{38}

Thomas Arnold belonged to a group of thinkers known as the 'liberal Anglicans' who held to a cyclic view of history, seeing nations and races as going through cycles of rise and decline. These thinkers were heavily influenced by the German romantics and by historians such as Barthold Niebuhr. Just as the Romantics had emphasised the descent of the German people from the Teutonic tribes that had defeated the Romans, so the liberal Anglicans placed great emphasis on the Anglo-Saxon descent of the English people. Particular races were supposed to have introduced particular aspects into the 'English character'. Writers such as Sharon Turner, Charles Kingsley, John Mitchell
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Kemble, and William Stubbs emphasised the belief that the English love of liberty was inherited from their Saxon forebears. Matthew Arnold, son of Thomas, believed that the creativity and imagination of the English was in part a product of their Celtic ancestors, but saw the strength of the Saxons cancelling out what he saw as the sentimental, dreamy defeatism of the Celts. Edward A. Freeman emphasised that the Normans too were a Germanic, Scandinavian people and that their input further improved the English. Such beliefs were used to justify imperialism. Writers such as James Anthony Froude saw English strength of will giving them the right to dominate not just the darker races but also the Celts, who he saw as brave but undisciplined. It is interesting to compare these ideas with the writings of New Zealand scholars such as W. E. Gudgeon, who also emphasised ideas of waves of racial migration, along with the importance of distinct racial characteristics, and the power of will and character.39

The German philologist Max Müller (1823-1900), was the scholar most responsible for the prominence of comparative philology and comparative mythology in mid-nineteenth century Britain. Müller came to England in 1846 with the aim of studying Sanskrit and translating the ancient Vedas into English. Müller was assisted in his introduction to British intellectual life by his patron Baron Bunsen, the Prussian ambassador, who shared Müller's passion for philology and had strong links with the Liberal Anglican movement. Müller eventually was made Professor of Comparative Philology at Christ Church College at Oxford.40 Müller followed the idea that 'Indo-European' were all descended from north Indian Aryans, with Sanskrit as the closest language to the original Aryan. He believed the migratory history and the relationships of peoples could traced through comparative philology.41

Müller's work involved looking at ancient texts rather than using oral accounts. Nevertheless the emphasis that comparative philology placed on languages was an added encouragement to missionaries and other colonisers to learn the languages of exotic peoples and to send information on this back to the metropolis. Müller was

39Ibid., pp. 62-3.
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Stocking, Victorian Anthropology, pp. 59-60. It is important to note that Müller regarded the Aryans as a
language group rather than a physical 'race'. However his references to this group were ambiguous
enough to be able to interpreted as racial categorisation by his readers and listeners. Müller himself
emphasised that Europeans shared the same ancestors as Persians and Indians, thus discouraging more
extreme white supremacist views. Nevertheless some interpreters of his work saw it as showing the
deeply interested in the ethnological research of E. B. Tylor and believed the British should take advantage of their Imperial activities to establish 'an archive on "Ethnological Records of the English Colonies"'. He familiarised himself with collections such as Horatio Hale's work on American Indian languages and Reverend W. Wyatt Gill's collection of mythological traditions from Mangaia. Müller was also familiar with Maori mythology, probably through the work of Grey. Müller's work illustrates the extent to which imperial networks exchanging information on language and oral tradition, had become an important part of the nineteenth century western intellectual world. He was in turn to have a profound influence on New Zealand scholars such as Edward Tregear and Stephenson Percy Smith in their work on Maori and Polynesian origins and migrations.¹⁴²

**Pakeha Collection of Maori Oral Traditions: A Source of 'Authentic History'?**

From the time of the late eighteenth century, with the voyages of Cook and the French explorers, Europeans were interested in the oral traditions of the Maori and other Polynesians. Europeans were fascinated by the mysteries of the location of the original Polynesian homeland, of how the Polynesians migrated through the Pacific, and of whether their journeys were accidental or navigated. It was hoped that the study of oral traditions and the comparative studies of language might answer some of these questions. As Pakeha became more familiar with Polynesian languages and traditions, they began to formulate theories on the history of South Pacific migrations. The variety of origin traditions in New Zealand raised the further question of whether or not the Polynesians had found another people already resident in New Zealand.

Before investigating the processes and the ideas developed by Pakeha collectors of Maori oral tradition, it is necessary to outline several important issues. We will first examine the question of the authenticity of the traditions collected by Pakeha. The anthropologist David Simmons sets out a series of criteria which he believes indicate traditions can be considered to be 'authentic'. Simmons considers authentic those elements in Maori tradition that have their origins in the lore existing before Pakeha arrival. He gives the example of the extremely widespread stories of Maui. Simmons holds that authentic tradition should not be the invention of only one person, which is how he describes the teachings of prophets such as Te Ua or Rua Kenana. Nor should tradition be an amalgam of several stories. Simmons considers only stories belonging to the tribal group of the story teller as being authentic, and therefore counts out any


traditions 'borrowed' from other tribes. Simmons believes that we must know the identity of the teller of the traditions in question, along with their tribal affiliations and whether they were considered to have the authority to know and pass on the story. Simmons considers that such an informant would have to be a person of rank in the particular hapu and have a wide knowledge of traditions, rather than just knowing one story. The value of written material, according to Simmons, can also be determined by working out who wrote down the material and what their level of competence in the Maori language was. The purpose for which the tradition was being related must also be considered in judging its authenticity. The biases and loyalties of both informants and recorders of traditions should also be taken into account and the context in which the traditions were related, especially in adversarial situations such as the Native Land Court.43

Michael Reilly, in the light of Simmons' approach to 'authenticity', considers that a series of factors should be examined when considering the writing up of Maori material by Pakeha collectors. The collector's attitude to the material they have recorded must be ascertained; for example, did the recorder regard the material as pure fable or as historical data. The collector's own biographical details should be known as much as possible, above all their experience of, and attitudes towards, Maori. The level of skill in te reo Maori is of primary importance in considering how accurate a record a Pakeha collector may have made of oral traditions. Finally the working techniques of the collector must be considered, including such factors as how they collected and recorded their material; how they organised the traditions when presenting this material; and whether they were writing up the material with publication in mind.44

Wiremu Parker and Tamati Kruger gave Reilly some Maori views on authenticity. Among the points they made was that for a tradition to be regarded as 'authentic' by Maori its social usefulness to the ongoing life of contemporary hapu was a major consideration. In the past this factor, combined with geographical distance, often meant that versions of stories varied considerably between hapu. In contrast several factors operated to inhibit changes to traditions. Traditions were seen to contain a mauri or "life force" of their own and were often only passed on to selected people in specific circumstance. When they were recited it was often at meetings of experts who were familiar with traditional material. Parker and Kruger both acknowledged that changes brought about by colonisation had led to greater changes in accepted traditions. Some

43 Simmons, Great NZ Myth, pp. 8-12.
changes were so substantial that some older versions of stories were no longer ones accepted as the 'authentic' versions by the hapu they concern.⁴⁵

James Clifford, in examining the work of Marcel Griaule among the Dogon of West Africa, challenges the concepts of writers who suggest that the 'authentic' traditions of any people are those recorded from knowledgeable, generally male authority figures, such as chiefs and priests. Clifford maintains that such 'elite' traditions are simply the view of the particular indigenous society taken by that society's intellectuals. Clifford argues that equally authentic views of an indigenous society and its past could be gained by talking to people from different social groups within it, especially women. It is notable that nearly all the nineteenth and early twentieth century Pakeha ethnographers seem to have talked exclusively to Maori males, regarding them as the sole repositories of their people's traditions. Clifford's idea is also interesting given that in the late twentieth century Western historiography put greater emphasis on oral history as a way to obtain the stories of those 'ordinary' people who were generally ignored in written histories.⁴⁶

Among nineteenth century Pakeha collectors of Maori traditions, there was considerable debate over the reliability of Maori oral traditions as a guide to historical events. This debate bore some resemblance to the Scandinavian debate over the reliability of the Icelandic sagas as a source of history. Edward Shortland noted the level of agreement between Maori stories, collected independently at different times and from different parts of New Zealand. He believed this indicated that traditions had been passed down largely unchanged from generation to generation. He believed that despite regional differences the traditions were historically reliable, 'after omitting the fanciful and supernatural embellishments by which they are frequently disguised'.⁴⁷ A. S. Thomson echoed Shortland's contention that the similarities between different tribal stories lent them credibility, but believed that, 'the traditions of the New Zealanders about most things are so vague that it is often difficult to separate truth and error'.⁴⁸ He believed that the migration traditions were essentially factual once they were 'denuded' of 'their traditional absurdities'.⁴⁹ Sir George Grey described Maori traditions as 'puerile' but gave no indication that he did not believe that the waka migration stories were based on fact.⁵⁰
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W. T. L. Travers, in his analysis of the traditions collected by Grey, voiced the dissenting opinion that the migration stories were of little historical value. He held that they were largely works of the imagination, 'the whole of the tales...are in the nature of historical novels, in which a few real and comparatively recent events are made the ground work of a large amount of fiction...'.\(^{51}\) William Colenso was also sceptical about the historical value of the migration stories, maintaining that the Maori themselves did not believe they were factual. He wrote, 'In all this mythical rhapsody there is scarcely a grain of truth; and yet some educated Europeans have wholly believed it! The New Zealanders themselves, however, never did so.' In particular Colenso believed that the miraculous events described in the migration accounts, 'excelling those of Munchausen or Gulliver...', proved that the stories were fables rather than history.\(^{52}\) Yet, despite the opinions of sceptics such as Colenso and Travers, it appears that a large number of the nineteenth century Pakeha collectors of oral tradition believed that Maori traditions were accurate guides to the historical past.

While many of the themes found in the processes of collecting oral tradition in Europe will be seen to have occurred in New Zealand, there were also some fundamental differences which must be considered. In the early days of contact, Pakeha were complete outsiders approaching peoples who spoke a strange language and participated in cultures with which Pakeha were almost totally unfamiliar. A major reason for early Pakeha collection of Maori traditions was the simple desire to gain more understanding of Maori and thus make interaction with them easier. This was particularly important for missionaries who often saw an understanding of Maori character as being a great help to evangelism. Thomas Kendall, for example, maintained that he was learning about Nga Puhi religion from his lover Tungaroa, as part of a project to learn about Maori culture in order to more easily convert Maori to Christianity.\(^{53}\)

It was only after Pakeha had built up a considerable knowledge of te reo Maori that they were able to learn more details of Maori traditions. This in turn occurred only after an extended period of contact between Maori and Pakeha. Once again missionaries were at an advantage, having been in contact with Maori long enough to develop language skills, while at the same time having the intellectual interest and the religious motivation to learn about Maori ways. Missionaries were aware that knowledge of language and traditions gave them a greater ability to operate in and have influence on

\(^{51}\)W. T. L. Travers, 'Notes upon the Historical Value of the "Traditions of the New Zealanders" as collected by Sir George Grey...'; TNZI, 4, 1871, p. 62.
\(^{52}\)W. Colenso, 'On the Maori Races of New Zealand...'; TNZI, 1, 1868, p. 59.

Stocking writes of the missionary Thomas Williams learning about Fijian customs for very similar reasons (but not presumably by the same methods as Kendall). See Stocking, Victorian Anthropology, pp. 87-92.
Maori society. Missionaries also often had enough scholarly interest to record these matters and pass them on to scholars in the metropolis. Along with the missionaries some secular writers such as Polack took an interest in recording Maori customs. Visiting naturalists such as Dieffenbach in 1839 and the naturalists of the American Horatio Hale expedition of the 1830s also took an interest in oral tradition. In these cases the visiting naturalists were able to take advantage of the presence of Pakeha in New Zealand who were reasonably fluent in Maori. By the 1830s there were also, no doubt, some Maori who were fairly skilled in English. The length of time needed by Pakeha to decipher details of Maori custom is illustrated by Ballara's point that even by 1840 the missionaries were only just becoming aware of the degree to which whakapapa links were the basis of tribal structure. Detailed historical and religious questions could only be asked once a certain level of sophistication was reached in Pakeha knowledge of Maori language and culture. This level of sophistication was also important for interpreting the answers Maori gave to these questions.54

Pakeha understanding of Maori traditions was made more difficult by the fact that Maori oral narratives were not based around a European-style linear narrative structure. The central feature in Maori traditional narrative was, and still remains, whakapapa connections. When traditions were being recited the orator often focused on the connections, whether positive or negative, between the narrator and their particular audience. When writing up these oral accounts, Pakeha collectors often tried to arrange them into a European-style linear narrative structure. Many scholars tried to write all-encompassing histories of New Zealand from Maori traditions. These writers often went to great lengths to reconcile conflicting Maori stories and place them in some type of chronological order. Most Pakeha scholars also went to great lengths to find definite geographical locations for places mentioned in Maori traditions with few scholars accepting the idea that places such as Hawaiki might be of more mythical significance, rather than literal geographical and historical descriptions. Overall it will be seen that the ideas on race, history and migrations developing out of the European studies on folklore, mythology and comparative philology were to have a major influence on the way the Pakeha studied and recorded Maori oral traditions.55

Early Pakeha Collectors of Maori Oral Traditions

James Hamlin (1803-65) was a lay teacher with the CMS mission, who had been a flax dresser and weaver in England. He came out to New Zealand in 1826, with the missionary William Williams, and was stationed at Waimate, Kerikeri and later at Manukau. Hamlin took an interest in the traditional stories of the northern Maori and wrote one of the earliest detailed accounts of Maori mythology. This was published in 1842 as a paper in two parts in *The Tasmanian Journal of Natural Science*.

Hamlin's article briefly mentioned Rangi and Papa. He then went on to write of Maui, concentrating on the story of Maui catching his great fish, Te Ika a Maui. Hamlin believed that Maui and his brothers grounded their canoe at 'Apuriri' near East Cape and then disappeared. Hamlin then records that Kupe arrived in Aotearoa with his grandfather 'Marutawiti' and his brother-in-law, 'Hoturapa'. Kupe returned home without settling in New Zealand. Hamlin knew no details of Kupe's homeland. Hamlin's version of the 'Great Fleet' had four canoes: 'Tainui', 'Arawa', 'Matatua', and 'Kuraawhaupo', which brought the ancestors of all the Maori to New Zealand. The people from Tainui settled on the West Coast, those from the other three settled on the East. He noted that no one seemed to know how many generations back the migration was but that it was comparatively recent compared to the time of Maui.

Hamlin believed that Maui had left no descendants on his fish and that therefore the four canoes brought the first settlers to an empty land. He believed the original tribes were 'Ngateawa' and 'Ngateariari' but that new iwi split away on the death of powerful individuals, taking the name of the dead chief for the new tribal entity. Hamlin's account, therefore, put forward his own ideas about tribal structures and hierarchies. He made no mention of an earlier people and therefore seems to have believed that the 'New Zealanders', as he called the Maori, were the first inhabitants.

Agnes Sullivan points out that, while Hamlin's material was all collected from the Auckland-Manukau-Lower Waikato region, it was in fact compiled from information given by several speakers, who appear to have been from different hapu and iwi. Hamlin appears to have carried out a process, similar to that used by the Grimms and others in Europe, of combining a variety of stories to produce a synthetic account that
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57 J. Hamlin, 'On the Mythology of the New Zealanders', Pt. 1, in *The Tasmanian Journal of Natural Science*, 1, 4, 1842, pp. 254-64. The names of the canoes are given on p. 261. It should be noted that in Hamlin's articles the name 'Maui' is consistently misspelt as 'Mani', probably a printer's error.
had not existed in that form before. Hamlin did point out places where the accounts disagreed, noting, for example, that some tribes attribute the actions of Maui to 'Mauitikitikiotaranga' whereas others attribute them to 'Mauipotiki'. Nevertheless, to the Western reader the impression presented by Hamlin's paper was that of an overall Maori history, rather than of a compilation of different people's stories. This impression was emphasised by the fact that Hamlin did not name any of his informants or co-authors. As Hamlin did not name these people it is not possible to work out whether they fit Simmons' criteria for authenticity.60

Hamlin did note that no one was able to give him a general history of events from the period of Maori arrival to the period of Pakeha contact. He wrote that accounts tended only to cover more recent events.61 As Sullivan again notes, this gives some clue to the approach which Hamlin had taken with his informants. It appears that he was asking questions with the idea of constructing an account of events along the lines of Western historical narratives; that is a series of connected events situated in a definite chronological sequence and taking place in fixed geographical locations. Hamlin was able to work out a sequence of events, but he was not able to place them within a Western system of chronological dates. Hamlin's exercise involved repackaging a series of disparate Maori accounts into an organised chronological sequence in which events were to some extent linked. Such exercises were to became a common feature of the Pakeha recording of Maori oral traditions.62

There were several other very early Pakeha accounts of Maori migration taken from Maori oral tradition. Dieffenbach, in 1843, wrote of the ancestors of the Maori arriving in New Zealand in three canoes, the 'Arawa', the 'Kotahi nui'(Ko Tainui?), and the 'Matatua'. Unlike Hamlin, who did not know where the Maori were from, Dieffenbach mentioned their original homeland as being called 'Hawaiki' and located it somewhere to the east. Significantly Dieffenbach wrote, 'Before the arrival of the present inhabitants there were no men in the land and it was covered in forest.'63

Horatio Hale, of the United States Exploring Expedition, also wrote about the migration traditions he had recorded during the expedition's visit to Bay of Islands, in 1840. He too noted that Maori claimed to come from Hawaiki in the east. The canoes were called 'Tahi-nui (or Tainui)', 'Tearawa', 'Horouta', and 'Takitimu'. Hale also noted that a later canoe was supposed to have arrived from Hawaiki, bringing the kumara with it. Hale

60Hamlin, 'Mythology of New Zealanders', Pt. 1, passim, but see in particular pp. 255-6.
61Ibid., Pt. 2, pp. 342-3.
pointed out that the various Maori accounts he recorded were conflicting. This indicates yet again the process of drawing together an account from a variety of sources. Hale gave the impression that he believed the canoes came together in a fleet. Like Hamlin and Dieffenbach, Hale made no mention of any other people living in the country before the arrival of the canoe voyagers.64

The accounts of Hamlin, Dieffenbach, and Hale only vaguely match the orthodox early twentieth century myth of a sequence of arrivals of Kupe, followed by the Moriori, then Toi and Whatonga, and finally the Great Fleet. Hamlin made mention of Kupe, but neither Dieffenbach nor Hale appear to have heard of him. None of the writers made any mention of Toi or Whatonga. All appear to have gained the idea that the ancestors of the Maori arrived in New Zealand in a fleet of varying numbers of canoes. None appear to have picked up any ideas of an earlier people living in New Zealand. From this it can be seen that the orthodox 'Moriori Myth' was unknown to Pakeha scholars in the 1840s. In particular there does not appear to have been a common belief among Pakeha collecting Maori oral traditions, that there had been an earlier people living in New Zealand before Maori.

Grey's Nga Mahi a Nga Tupuna.
Sir George Grey (1812-98) gathered together a collection of Maori traditions that is still regarded as one of the most important. Part of this collection was published in Maori as Nga Mahinga a Nga Tupuna in 1854, closely followed by Grey's English translation of the work as Polynesian Mythology in 1855.65 While Grey had a degree of fluency in Maori, there is some debate over the accuracy of his translation. Simmons describes Polynesian Mythology as a 'fairly reliable translation' whereas Timoti Karetu refers to it as a 'vague' translation.66 Michael Reilly suggests that Grey's translation might be called a 'loose' translation in the sense that it conveyed the general meaning of the Maori text, but contained much additional information. Reilly notes that Grey made some critical mistranslations that made the Maori stories seem more in accord with European thinking then they actually were.67

65 The editions I have used for this study are the 1928 edition published as Nga Mahi a Nga Tupuna, edited by H. W. Williams and the 1956 edition of Polynesian Mythology. The 1928 edition of Nga Mahi contains nine added accounts from Grey's manuscripts but otherwise only differs from the original 1854 edition in the standardising of Maori spelling. The 1956 Polynesian Mythology is also substantially the same as the 1855 edition, with standardisation of Maori spelling.
The introduction that Grey wrote for the English version is a very good illustration of the imperial motives behind the collection of indigenous peoples' traditions. Grey wrote that once he had arrived in New Zealand to take up his appointment as Governor, he did not feel he could deal effectively with Maori through interpreters. Instead he believed he had to learn te reo Maori himself. He saw this as 'necessary to enable me to perform properly every duty to my country and to the people I was appointed to govern.\(^6^8\) Once he had gained some skill in te reo, Grey became aware of a new difficulty in dealing with 'ancient and influential chiefs'. As he explained it:

These chiefs, either in their speeches to me or in their letters, frequently quoted, in explanation of their views and intentions, fragments of ancient poems or proverbs, or made allusions which rested on an ancient system of mythology...\(^6^9\)

Grey went on to describe how his interpreters, who were often young Christian Maori, were unable to explain to his satisfaction the meaning of these allusions. The governor therefore decided that the only course open to him to deal effectively with the rangatira was, 'to acquaint myself with the ancient language of the country, to collect its traditional poems and legends, to induce their priests to impart to me their mythology, and to study their proverbs.'\(^7^0\) He claimed that he wrote down the material he had collected to make it easier for those Pakeha who came after him to deal with the Maori. The missionaries, soldiers, surveyors, traders and administrators who operated in the vanguard of the imperial process often followed Grey's example, learning indigenous languages and traditions to help them understand, influence and ultimately have some control over indigenous peoples.\(^7^1\)

Grey was tutored in te reo Maori by a very knowledgeable young man, Wiremu Maihi Te Rangikaheke (1810s?-1896) of the Ngati Kereru hapu of Ngati Rangiwhewhi, based in the Rotorua area. From some time around 1846 Te Rangikaheke lived with Grey in order to teach him Maori and help him learn traditions. The two men worked together until 1853 and were on very close, friendly terms. Over this time Te Rangikaheke supplied Grey with a great deal of traditional information from the iwi of the Arawa waka. They collaborated not only in learning te reo but also in co-writing Maori manuscripts.\(^7^2\) Te Rangikaheke's manuscripts formed the basis of about one quarter of the text of Nga Mahi a Nga Tupuna. This included Nga Tama a Rangi, the story of children of Rangi and Papa, the bulk of the Maui stories, along with many of the stories
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\(^6^8\)G. Grey, Polynesian Mythology, Auckland, 1956, p. iii.
\(^6^9\)Ibid., pp. iii-iv.
\(^7^0\)Ibid., p. iv.
\(^7^1\)Ibid., pp. v-vi.
of the Arawa waka and of those descended from its crew. It also seems likely that Te Rangikaihake helped in the editing of some of the material which Grey collected from other experts.  

Grey's material was largely collected in the form of manuscripts produced by Maori authors, though these in turn were written down from oral accounts. All of these texts were examples of the early writings of an oral culture that had only recently adopted literacy. Grey was in a privileged collecting position as Governor. Maori experts acknowledged Grey as being a Pakeha of very high status and therefore someone worthy of passing information on to. Very high ranking chiefs such as Te Wherowhero were prepared to give information to Grey that they may not have given to a Pakeha of lesser rank. Maori who took political grievances to the Governor used traditional stories, songs and proverbs to argue their cases. This meant that Grey was able to hear or read a great many traditional accounts. His developing skill in te reo Maori and his collaboration with Te Rangikaihake would have been a great help in this process, and enabled Grey to actively solicit material from Maori experts. Grey personally believed that some of the material he had been given would not have been passed on to any other Pakeha.  

Grey's collection does have a story of Kupe, but does not have Kupe as the first to visit Aotearoa. The account in Nga Mahi, which is found in the section Te Maunutanga mai o Turi i Hawaiki, is based on a manuscript by Piri Kawau of Ati Awa, and on another unknown, probably Ngati Ruanui, source. The account has Kupe killing Hoturapa in order to run off with his wahine (wife) Kura maro tini. Kupe and Kura maro tini fled in the waka, Matahorua, and came to New Zealand where Kupe killed the giant 'cuttlefish' Te Whekea Muturangi. Kupe then returned to Hawaiki having found no inhabitants in New Zealand. In this story Kupe is presented as a contemporary of Turi, who came to New Zealand on the Aotea waka using Kupe's navigation instructions.  

Grey, in the section Te Haerenga mai o Ngahue has Ngahue rather than Kupe as the first from Hawaiki to reach Aotearoa, and return bringing news of a land with moa and pounamu (greenstone). This story is from accounts by Te Rangikaihake and Matene Te Whiwhi, a young Ngati Toa chief. Matene Te Whiwhi had obtained most of his
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73 Ibd., pp. 102-3. Simmons, 'Sources of Nga Mahi', pp. 364-5. Simmons' paper shows the origins of each section of Nga Mahi, tracing each part back to the original Maori source.
74 Grey, Polynesian Mythology, pp. iii-v.
information from the very knowledgeable rangatira Te Rangihaeata, the nephew of Te Rauparaha and co-leader of Ngati Toa.76

Grey's *Nga Mahi* contains a narrative entitled *Te Korero mo Nga Waka* which refers to the waka 'Tainui', 'Matatua', 'Takitimu', 'Kura-hau-po', 'Toko-maru', and 'Matawhaorua' all being built at the same time in Hawaiki, thus reinforcing the idea of the 'fleet'. The various migrants began building the waka after hearing from Ngahue about New Zealand. This account is a compilation of the writings of Te Rangikaheke and Te Whiwhi. Simmons points out that among early nineteenth century Maori manuscripts, a few mention waka travelling as a fleet, but the majority of recorded traditions refer to waka travelling independently.77

Significantly for the present study Grey's published work has only one reference to an earlier people being in Aotearoa. This reference is found in the section *Te Haeranga mai o Manaia i Hawaiki*, and describes Manaia of the *Tokomaru* waka arriving in the Taranaki area,

> Ka tae ki te Rōhutu, ki te kongutu awa o Waitara, ka noho ratou i reira. Na he tangata ano i reira, ko nga tangata whenua ake ano o tenei motu; o tira ka patua ratou e Manaia ma, ka mate, ka riro te kainga i a Manaia ratou ko ana tama, me tonc iwi. Ko aua tangata i patua ai e Manaia ma kia riro ai te kainga i a ratou.78

They...travelled on until they reached Raho-tu(sic), at the mouth of the Waitara river, and they dwelt there, and there found people living, the native inhabitants of these islands; but Manaia and his party slew them, and destroyed them, so that the country was left for him and his descendants, and Manaia and his followers destroyed the original occupants of the country, in order to obtain possession of it.79

This account gives no details of the origin or nature of the 'tangata whenua'. Therefore we have no indication whether they were regarded as a completely alien people or alternatively seen as quite similar to the newcomers in language, customs and
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Simmons, 'Sources of Nga Mahi', pp. 365-6, 369.
Simmons, *Great NZ Myth, passim*, but see especially, pp. 111-3, 164.
appearance. The story of Manaia has its origin in an unknown Ati Awa source. No other story recorded in Grey’s published collection mentioned tangata whenua.\(^80\)

It is noteworthy that, in the books published from his collection, Grey did not acknowledge the names of any co-authors in either the Maori or the English versions of the published collections. Yet Grey’s work would have been impossible without the language tutoring and written contribution of Te Rangikaheke. Other unacknowledged contributors included some of the great Maori experts of the 1840s, such as Te Rangihaeata and Te Wherowhero. Grey himself acknowledged that he had collected fragments of stories from all around the country until he believed he had the definitive versions. This provides an example of a Pakeha collector considering they had the authority to construct the ‘correct’ version of a story. As Simmons has pointed out, Grey’s books were heavily edited compilations in which a variety of versions of a story from different authors and even from different iwi might be combined. Yet the fact that Grey had combined these sources together in his narrative left the European reader with the impression that they were reading the one definitive version of ‘Maori’ traditions; unaware that such a compilation would not have occurred until the spread of literacy among Maori.\(^81\)

Grey was following the common practice among Pakeha ethnographers of trying to construct a linear narrative. He traced Maori tradition from the origins of the gods or atua; through the creation of people; the adventures of superhuman ancestral figures such as Maui; down to dissensions in Hawaiki and the migration to New Zealand; and finally to stories in New Zealand often connected with the origins of particular iwi. The original stories may to some extent have followed a similar sequence. However, it is unlikely that stories from different iwi would have been combined together and arranged in the way that Grey did. Maori speakers tended to only recite the traditions which related to their own whanau, hapu and iwi and therefore their own tupuna. Wiremu Parker emphasised that the traditions of one hapu could vary even from those of closely related hapu from the same waka. While aware of the wide range of stories, a person would normally consider the stories from their own hapu to be most important. Therefore they would usually not attempt to synthesise their stories with those of other hapu.\(^82\) Te Aue Davis illustrates this by quoting Maori elders describing the diversity of
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\(^80\) Simmons, ‘Sources of Nga Mahi’, p. 369. See also Simmons, *Great NZ Myth*, pp. 182-8.

\(^81\) Simmons, ‘Sources of Nga Mahi’, pp. 365, 368-70.


See also Binney, *Maori Oral Narratives, Pakeha Written Texts*, pp. 20-1.
Kupe stories and relating who has authority over which story, "Moku te kupu, ko ahau e mohio!", "If the word is about me, I know best!".83

Simmons considers that the source material of *Nga Mahi* generally fits his own criteria for authentic tradition. Yet the way the stories are presented in *Nga Mahi* does not represent the way these stories would have been presented by their Maori narrators. Nevertheless the narrators and authors of the source manuscripts are generally acknowledged to have been men who were traditional authorities. Thus the sections which make up the text of *Nga Mahi* can be regarded as representing authentic traditions of the 1840s, albeit ones edited and revised by Grey.84

How does the sequence of events set out in *Nga Mahi* compare to the sequence in the later orthodox Moriori myth? Grey mentions Kupe in his account, but as a contemporary of Turi, commander of the waka *Aotea*, rather than as discoverer of Aotearoa. The *Aotea* itself was supposedly part of the Great Fleet. Grey has the discoverer of New Zealand as Ngahue who also appears to be a contemporary of the fleet. The only Toi mentioned in Grey is Toi-te-huatahi, a native of Hawaiki who never sets foot in Aotearoa, while Whatonga is not mentioned at all. Grey describes the waka being all constructed together and has some of them sailing together as a fleet. This is his only major point of agreement with the early twentieth century orthodox migration story. In some of the stories in Grey's collection the waka migrants arrive to an empty land. In contrast only one story, that of the emigration of Manaia, has a specific mention of an earlier people. No details concerning the tangata whenua are given in this story. Grey's collection therefore provided few clues on the existence or the nature of any pre-Maori people in New Zealand.

**John White's *Ancient History of the Maori***

John White arrived with his family in New Zealand in 1835, when he was nine years old. He grew up in the Hokianga where he learned te reo Maori and developed a strong interest in Maori custom and traditions. White was largely self-educated and was particularly influenced by his study of Macpherson's *Poems of Ossian*. White worked at a variety of different occupations that used his Maori language skills, including Government translator, Resident Magistrate, land purchase commissioner, Native Land Court interpreter, and editor of the Maori newspaper *Te Wananga*. Throughout this time White collected Maori songs, poetry, and stories. In 1879 White was appointed to compile and write an official history of the Maori. He worked on this for over ten years,

84Simmons, 'Sources of Nga Mahi', pp. 368-9.
producing six volumes of *The Ancient History of the Maori* by 1890. This project came to a halt when the Government withdrew its funding from the project in 1890, despite the fact that there were still volumes of material to be written up. White died soon afterwards in 1891.85

In his youth, White's major incentives for writing were mainly literary, a desire to be an author. While his desire to be a writer no doubt remained, it seems that in later life White's financial insecurity became a major incentive to collect and rewrite Maori narratives. White had been recording Maori narratives, poems and waiata since the late 1840s. The *Ancient History* received its Government funding right at the end of the Grey administration in 1879. White had worked for Grey in 1851 as a secretary and translator. Grey and John Sheehan, his Native Minister, were both competent speakers of te reo, and were supportive of the idea of a Maori history. They believed it would be helpful in Native Land Court cases and in Pakeha educational institutions. These two motives could be seen to be part of the idea of ethnography as an exercise to help the coloniser understand and control the colonised people and land.86

By the 1870s, as the Maori population appeared to be going into a steep decline and possibly heading for extinction, the need to record material before those who held it died, had become the major driving force behind the collection of traditional Maori material. The idea of salvage ethnology became the major incentive for collecting and recording material for the *Ancient History*. Grey and Sheehan expressed the fear that if the knowledge of the 'old natives' was not recorded it would be lost forever.87

White used a wide variety of sources to gather information. In his early days in the Hokianga White had simply written down from memory stories told to him by Maori he had met by chance. Often he wrote down material in English and then reworked it into Maori. As he became more systematic in his collecting White began to ask Maori themselves to write down material such as waiata. As far back as 1848 he had sent a manuscript book to Aperahama Taonui asking him to record material. In the *Ancient History* project, White sent out a large number of manuscript books to Maori he considered to be knowledgeable or to have access to others with knowledge. Among those he sent such books to was Te Whatahoro, later Percy Smith's major co-author and informant for *The Lore of the Whare Wananga*. White also used a range of written sources, often in the form of small snippets or excerpts. White used letters written to

86Ibid., pp. 587-8.
87Grey, *Nga Mahi*, p. xv
him by Maori, as well as Maori letters to Government officials, to other Maori, and to Maori newspapers. White used manuscripts that had been compiled for Native Land Court sittings. He also used material from the works of Richard Taylor, Rev. J. F. H. Wohlers, Sir George Grey, and C. O. B. Davis. The value of the material in the final work is considerably reduced by the fact that White seldom gave the names of the original authors or tellers of the stories he included. Unlike Grey, White did generally keep the stories from different iwi separate, acknowledging the tribal source for each one. He tended to avoid the temptation to try and amalgamate stories from different sources.88

White encountered a series of difficulties with many of the Maori who were providing him with information. Some objected to the idea of providing White with information on topics such as makutu, believing such material was dangerous. Aperahama Taonui was worried that if Maori got to read the old material it would turn them against Christianity. Others wrote to White telling of opposition from local prophets, Maori Komiti (committee), and Rangatira, towards the recording of information. Henare Paraone wrote that his manuscript had been hidden by locals opposed to his work. Henare Hau and Piripi Maki complained that the kaumatau were all dead. Napeoho of Whangarei wrote that the kaumatau did not believe they should give away information unless they were paid for it. Hoani Meihana Te Rangiotu of Rangitane mentioned that there had been major arguments at hui over the correct form of the material.89

White also had major problems organising material once he had collected it. On the one hand, he appears to have been disorganised in his systems of numbering and indexing the material he had collected. This brought difficulties once a large amount of material needed to be sorted and compiled. Reilly suggests that White was unfamiliar with how to organise an overall structure for such large work, especially given his lack of formal education. White appears to have had only limited contact with the work of contemporary writers on ethnology, philology and oral tradition. Instead his major inspirations and models for writing seem to have been from Charles Kingsley's historical novels and from James Macpherson's Poems of Ossian. 90 On the other hand, Reilly also emphasises that nobody had tried to carry out such an ambitious project.

before White's attempt and that any scholar may have had trouble organising such a large and wide ranging body of material. Reilly states that, given White's lack of formal training in writing and editing, his achievements were in fact impressive.\textsuperscript{91}

White's abilities and the value of the work he produced remain the subject of conflicting opinions. At the time he was writing, White was criticised by some Maori for not being skilled in writing Maori. However Ruka Broughton declared that some of White's later letters in Maori suggest that near the end of his life White's written Maori was almost at the level of a native speaker. Reilly suggests that White's ability in Maori improved throughout his life, despite the fact that his lack of education gave him major problems with writing in English.\textsuperscript{92}

W. E. Gudgeon, who was a friend and correspondent of White, criticised him for getting information off young Maori who did not have the level of knowledge of their elders.\textsuperscript{93} Elsdon Best criticised White for failing to acknowledge material taken from other authors such as Grey; for mixing together material from a variety of traditions; and for standardising the various dialects that material had originally been recorded in. He also questioned White's competence in Maori believing his sentence construction was poor and his translations of word meanings were often fanciful.\textsuperscript{94} H.W. Williams, editor of the Dictionary of the Maori Language, was very critical of White's writings, seeing the Maori text of The Ancient History as one which 'bristles with misprints'; questioning the accuracy of White's translations; and criticising his failure to acknowledge his sources and his changing of material from the original texts.\textsuperscript{95}

In contrast many of White's contemporaries held him in high regard. George Davies, the Government Interpreter, regularly got White to translate material for him. Grey considered White someone he could consult for information on Maori language and custom. A. S. Atkinson, a renowned scholar of Maori, had worked with White and considered him an authority on Maori matters. Stephenson Percy Smith had some disagreements with White over the accuracy of his translations but considered him a 'great' scholar of Maori in the sense of being a great collector of Maori material. Smith based much of his own Peopling of the North on material collected by White, and used The Ancient History extensively for information. His biggest criticism of White was that White did not organise his large body of material into the historical sequences that Smith believed had occurred in pre-contact New Zealand. Perhaps suprisingly White

\textsuperscript{91}M. P. J. Reilly, personal communication, 28/1/2001.
\textsuperscript{93}W. E. Gudgeon, 'Maori Tribes of the East Coast', Pt 4, JPS, 5,17, 1896,p.3.
\textsuperscript{95}Williams, Dictionary of the Maori Language, pp. xxx-xxxi.
appears to have had little contact with Smith, despite Smith's growing reputation as an ethnographer in the latter half of the nineteenth century. The range of contemporary reactions to White and his works show that he was always a controversial figure in the world of Maori scholarship. What cannot be denied is that ethnographers took his work seriously enough to carefully examine it, and use it extensively.  

Kendrick Smithyman points out some of the processes that White went through to rearrange material to present 'historical' narratives in the way he thought things should have happened. Smithyman illustrates this by looking at White's account of an early nineteenth century war expedition of northern Maori down to Taranaki and Kapiti Coast area. He shows that White began his account from material written down in English from memory of earlier conversations in Maori with informants. White then rewrote this material into Maori. Finally he rewrote this text several times changing certain words and adding in some material from other informants. This illustrates the fact that while White's writings contain valuable primary source material they must be approached with caution by scholars, due to the extent to which he altered material.

White's preface and introduction to *The Ancient History* give the impression he believed there was one overall history of Maori that progressed in a linear pattern from the creation of the world, through migrations, wars, marriages, and disputes up to modern times. At the same time White was fully aware that the various tribal accounts were extremely contradictory. He believed it was necessary to present as many different versions as possible in print. White held that one of the reasons the contemporary versions of Maori history were so contradictory was that much of the information that would have explained these contradictions was no longer available. His view was that in the early days of contact the tohunga had refused to give out all the 'sacred history' of their tribes to Pakeha or to Maori of insufficient standing, due to fear of the spiritual consequences. He believed that later experts of high rank, such as Wiremu Te Rangikāheke and Aperahama Taonui, had a wide range of knowledge while their adoption of Christian beliefs removed their fear of revealing tapu information. However by the time they had begun learning traditions the level of learning in the schools of

---

S. P. Smith, 'The Peopling of the North', Supplement to *JPS*, Vols 5-6, 1896-7, pp. 1, 3, 12-3, 16n, 28n, 43-6, 55.
97 K. Smithyman, 'Making History: John White and S. Percy Smith at Work', *JPS*, 88, 4, 1979, *passim*, but see in particular pp. 389-90, 399-400. Smithyman points out that S. Percy Smith substantially rewrote White's account to fit into the sequence of historical events which he, Smith, believed had occurred. Smith appears to have taken little notice of any ideas White put forward on Maori language, custom, or history. He regarded White's material as simply a supply of source material for developing his own theories on the Maori past.
tradition, the Whare kura, had declined. This meant that they only received a partial knowledge of ancient lore.98

Reilly maintains that White's belief in a 'real' unitary Maori history meant that White was open to some reworking of texts to fit his own vision of Maori history, trying to find common threads in the contradictory stories. He also, in the later stages of the project, made some efforts to introduce a European-style chronology to various accounts. White viewed Maori tradition overall as being a static set of stories which had existed largely unchanged until Pakeha arrival in Aotearoa. His belief that stories had been transmitted intact meant he was prepared to publish material of widely varying quality. White's view that Maori material was disappearing meant that he saw his job of recording this matter as being extremely important. White did not believe that contemporary Maori should have the right of reviewing and editing material which he had collected from their tribes. He was afraid that if modern rangatira and tohunga checked and reviewed whakapapa and stories they would only dispute material and 'corrupt' it with modern ideas. White seems to have believed that, by the second half of the nineteenth century, only the 'objective' European scholar had the right to study and produce the 'real' Maori history. He saw the modern Maori as too degraded by contact with civilisation to be able to be left in charge of their own past. White was fascinated by his own imagined 'noble' Maori of the pre-contact days, rather than by their troublesome living descendants.99

To what extent did the material White collected support or contradict the idea of a separate 'pre-Maori' population? White definitely believed there had been an earlier population. He wrote that many East Coast iwi, 'called these people "Toi" and they were, they say, very numerous'. The Tainui peoples supposedly referred to them as '"Upoko-toea"'. 'These people lived on fern-root, fish and birds, but did not possess the kumara'. White also wrote that the Moriori on arrival in the Chathams in the days of Rangimata found the "Hiti" people already in occupation.100

In the introduction to the Ancient History White wrote that he planned to give an account of the people the Maori found here.101 Yet the wide range of accounts in the Ancient History are contradictory regarding the presence or absence of a pre-Maori people. Many of the migration stories recorded by White make no mention of an

98 J. White, The Ancient History of the Maori: His Mythology and Traditions, Vol. 1, Wellington, 1887, pp. iii-vi, 3. Each volume of the Ancient History is divided into two sections, an English version called The Ancient History and a Maori section called Nga Tatai Korero Whakapapa a Te Maori, both individually paginated. References to the Maori section will be to Tatai Korero.
100 J. White, 'Legendary History of the Maoris', AJHR, 1880, 8-8, p. 2.
101 White, Ancient History, Vol. 1, p. 3.
original people. Two stories from Ngati Awa and from Ngati Hau have Ngahue as the first to visit New Zealand. In each case it is specifically mentioned that he found an entirely empty land. According to the Ngati Hau story Ngahue then advised the people of the Tainui and Arawa waka to sail out to New Zealand.\textsuperscript{102} A Ngati Apa story has Rakataura and Kupe as the first and second visitors respectively, both finding no earlier inhabitants. Both Rakataura and Kupe advised canoe voyagers to make their way to Aotearoa.\textsuperscript{103}

White also recounts a considerable number of stories that have an earlier population present. A story from Hatario of Waitotara has Kupe finding two people already in Aotearoa.\textsuperscript{104} A Ngati Hau story told of how the Pangatoru canoe was prevented from landing in Aotearoa by the original inhabitants.\textsuperscript{105} A Ngati Porou story told of Kahukura finding Toi and his people already resident in Aotearoa. The story goes on to relate how Kahukura returned in Toi's waka Horouta to Hawaiki in order to bring the kumara to Aotearoa.\textsuperscript{106} White sets out the Ngati Maru story of Hotunui, from the Tainui waka, who married a woman from a people who came on an earlier unnamed waka. Hotunui was later exiled and had to live among the Uri o Pou people who appear to have been a tangata whenua group. Hotunui's son, Maru tuahu, killed many of the Uri o Pou people in revenge for the insults they had given to his father. White goes on to describe how the descendants of Hotunui destroyed the original inhabitants of the land.\textsuperscript{107} White also set out a Ngati Tipa account of conflict between the Tainui people and the earlier peoples already occupying the Waikato area. None of these stories make it clear whether these earlier people were considered to be simply different iwi or whether they were regarded as a completely alien people.\textsuperscript{108}

Some of the stories concerning earlier people set out in the Ancient History clearly describe people considered to be quite different from Maori. Stories from Ngai Tahu refer to Kahui-tipua who were the original inhabitants of Te Wai Pounamu, the South Island.\textsuperscript{109} Te Kahui-tipua, 'were giants who could stride from mountain-range to mountain-range, and transform themselves into anything, animate or inanimate.'\textsuperscript{110} The Ngai Tahu story represents the next people to arrive, Te Rapuwai, as being ordinary humans. They were in turn displaced by the next wave of people the Waitaha. Ngai

\textsuperscript{104}White, Ancient History, Vol. 4, p.20, Tatai Korero, Vol. 4, p. 15.
Tahu experts debated over whether Te Rapuwai were close relatives of the Waitaha or a completely separate iwi. Ngai Tahu generally believed that Waitaha were descended from people who came from Hawaiki on the Arawa waka. This in turn would seem to indicate that they saw both Te Rapuwai and Waitaha as being fairly similar people to themselves.\textsuperscript{111} In contrast, Ngati Kahungunu had a story where 'Maori' were descended from Tane nui a rangi and his wife Hine ti tama, whereas Te Rapuwai were descended from Tane and his senior wife Hine ahu one. This people were quite different from Maori as evidenced by the fact that, 'when the Europeans were first seen by the Maori in New Zealand they were said by the old priests to be the descendants of Te-rapu-wai.'\textsuperscript{112}

How does the \textit{Ancient History} compare to the orthodox account of pre-contact history? As seen above John White's collection presents a contradictory series of stories. Some stories show Kupe as the first person to arrive in Aotearoa, other stories have Ngahue as the discoverer. Toi is presented not as a migrant but as one of the tangata whenua. Some tales have the ancestors of the Maori arriving in an empty land. Others have earlier peoples present who appear to be little different from Polynesians. Other stories again have earlier peoples present who appear to have been completely different from the ancestors of the Maori. Overall the \textit{Ancient History} gives no coherent sequence of stories which can easily fit in with the early twentieth century orthodox migration account.

**Conclusion: Early Ethnologists and the Idea of a pre-Maori People.**

Hamlin, Grey and White can be seen as representing three different stages in the Pakeha study of Maori tradition, stages which in turn reflect aspects of the ongoing process of Pakeha colonisation of New Zealand. Hamlin's writings came from a time when, after almost thirty years of intimate contact with Maori, many Pakeha missionaries had achieved a level of fluency in te reo Maori that enabled them to engage in serious enquiry into many aspects of Maori society. Nevertheless, missionaries were only beginning to work out the nature of key concepts of Maori society, including issues such as the way chiefly authority operated within tribes, the nature of hapu and iwi structures, and the way that whakapapa relationships determined so many facets of Maori life.\textsuperscript{113}

Hamlin's writing was part of the early ethnological process where some Pakeha based in New Zealand were trying to learn as much as possible about the cultures of the

\textsuperscript{111}Ibid., pp. 125-6.
\textsuperscript{112}Ibid., p. 123.
\textsuperscript{113}On the changes of Pakeha understanding of such subjects as iwi structure see Ballara, \textit{Iwi}. For the 1830s-40s period in particular see \textit{ibid.}, pp. 55-68.
dominant group they were living amongst. The greater the knowledge they could acquire of Maori language, social structures, customs, and traditions the easier it was for Pakeha to operate in this society. Such knowledge was of particular importance for groups such as the missionaries who were trying to gain a powerful influence over Maori in order to get them to change of their way of life. This early stage of ethnology involved first developing enough knowledge of Maori language to be able to ask in-depth questions and, in the process, developing enough knowledge of the culture to able to gain some degree of understanding of the answers received.

At the time Hamlin was writing, Pakeha had become quite familiar with a few specific hapu. Most of these hapu were those living in areas important as trading stations with Pakeha, including the Bay of Islands, Hokianga, the Cook Strait area, and southern Te Wai Pounamu (South Island). By 1840, Pakeha had only had very limited contact with many of the inland peoples. Nevertheless Hamlin collected stories from a variety of Northern hapu and was therefore aware of the great differences between the stories told by different groups. Hamlin did not attempt to hide the differences between accounts, but it appears he succumbed to the temptation of trying to construct a unitary linear narrative, attempting to create an overall story of Maori arrival in New Zealand. Such a process could be seen as part of a general imperial collecting and organising process carried out by Pakeha scholars in New Zealand; similar to that carried out by colonisers throughout the expanding political and trade empires of Europe and North America. In this exercise the colonisers collected and recorded information on both the natural history and the ways of life of the people of 'new' lands. This enabled them to mentally organise or 'domesticate' new knowledge thus making the information easier to deal with and control. The colonisers were also able to more easily classify the colonised peoples and place them into an imagined hierarchy of races.

Grey's ethnographic work was a reflection of a more advanced stage of colonisation where the colonisers were trying to achieve a much greater degree of control and influence over the indigenous people. In the period when Grey was collecting material from Maori experts, Maori were still in a position of power and control in large parts of the country, forming a strong obstacle to Pakeha control. Colonisers such as Grey were directly involved in negotiating with Maori, and with mediating between Pakeha and Maori. To succeed in such activities and to eventually establish power over Maori they had to take Maori ways very seriously and learn as much about them as possible. However, even at this early stage, Grey was expressing fears that Maori traditions were disappearing.
Grey maintained that he wrote up this material in order to help Pakeha who had to deal with Maori. Yet, despite his claims that his translations were 'close and faithful', Grey followed what was to become a standard practice of Pakeha ethnographers and rearranged the material in order to establish more of a linear narrative. He also failed to acknowledge his Maori sources and show which stories came from which people. Instead he presented his work as though it were a standard body of material common to all Maori tribes.

John White's *Ancient History* project is representative of a later stage of the colonial situation where most Pakeha no longer regarded Maori as any major obstacle to colonisation. Many Pakeha were by this point convinced that Maori were doomed to physical extinction. It was a widespread Pakeha belief that Maori culture would completely disappear. White was carrying out a major exercise in salvage ethnology, collecting as much material as possible before it was too late. It was assumed that the written record would end up being the last repository of this material. It was assumed that the Maori experts, who knew the oral traditions, would die without having passed the stories on to their degenerating offspring. Thus even if Maori did not become extinct in the future the final experts and arbiters of information on ancient Maori history and tradition would be Pakeha authors. In an act of intellectual colonialism the power of definition of these aspects of Maori culture would pass from Maori experts in oral tradition, to those Pakeha familiar with the literary world. In line with this idea White believed he had the authority to rearrange and rewrite Maori material. He did not want to allow Maori experts to check over his material and rewrite it, believing they would add modern 'corruptions' to old stories. The Pakeha expert did not want Maori retaking control over the material he had appropriated.

The great interest that developed in Europe in the early nineteenth century in the collection of oral tradition no doubt provided a setting which encouraged the collection of traditions in the periphery of Empire. The studies of philology and comparative religion that were associated with these folklore studies further encouraged the idea of using language and traditions as a way of tracing the past of non-literate peoples. Certainly many European scholars were interested in reading accounts of Maori traditions such as the works of Grey. Collectors in Europe shared the fears of colleagues in New Zealand that oral traditions were rapidly disappearing and must be recorded urgently. Collectors in Europe and New Zealand also shared the idea that they had the right through superior knowledge to rearrange and rewrite material as they saw fit. This can be seen as a type of colonial appropriation of the rights to a story.
With regard to the idea of a pre-Maori population most nineteenth century collections of tradition did not give a great deal of clear evidence. Some accounts, such as that of Hamlin, made no mention of an earlier population at all. Grey's large collection only made one brief reference to an earlier population in the Waitara area, without giving any clues as to the nature or history of these people. White's material included a variety of stories of earlier peoples, from the traditions of several different iwi. In some of these accounts the earlier peoples appear to have been little different from the waka migrants, the 'Maori'. In other stories the earlier people are portrayed as supernatural beings or giants. In one Ngai Tahu account there is a description of a sequence of arrivals of peoples in Te Wai Pounamu. Other than this the point that distinguishes all of these early accounts of pre-Maori groups is the lack of any systematic account of who the earlier people were, where they came from, and what their relationship was to the Maori waka migrants. For all the efforts of early ethnographers to organise traditional material into linear narratives, the question of earlier people was largely passed over.

As discussed above, one of the major ideas to develop out of the Romantic movements of the early nineteenth century and their attendant studies of oral tradition and comparative philology, was an interest in tracing the supposed sweeping migrations of races in the pre-literate past. It was believed these migrations could be reconstructed from the study of languages and folklore. The Pakeha writers we have examined in this chapter did not appear to have applied such racial ideas in any significant way to their attempts to make order of the Maori past as reflected in oral traditions. However, in the late nineteenth century many Pakeha writers were to use ideas of race and language very similar to those being used in Europe, in order to reconstruct what they believed was the history of the various pre-European migrations to New Zealand.

We will now examine the Pakeha reactions to their encounter with the Moriori of Rekohu or the Chatham Islands. The ideas on racial classification, migration and extinction being developed in the fields of science were applied by scholars to the Moriori, as were the studies of philology, folklore and oral tradition. The Pakeha views on the history of the Moriori and on the Moriori racial relationship to the East Polynesian Maori were to be a major factor in the development of the Moriori Myth. A major study of Moriori oral tradition and history was carried out by Alexander Shand, in collaboration with the Moriori expert Hirawanu Tapu. These events and ideas will be the subject of the next chapter.
CHAPTER THREE

THE MORIORI OF REKOHU: EAST POLYNESIAN MIGRANTS OR PRIMITIVE REFUGEES?

The Rekohu Moriori

Pakeha encounters with the Moriori of Rekohu, or the Chatham Islands, had a significant impact on the development of ideas concerning a pre-Maori population in New Zealand; the ideas that became the 'Moriori myth'. Pakeha observers spent a lot of time trying to determine whether or not Moriori were closely related to the East Polynesian Maori, or whether they were in fact descended from different people from other parts of the Pacific. Pakeha studies of the Moriori culminated in the work of Alexander Shand who worked with the Moriori expert Hirawanu Tapu to produce the definitive texts on Moriori culture and traditions. In this chapter we will examine how the work of Shand and Tapu influenced Pakeha theorists in their attempts to construct models of the history of human migration to New Zealand and the Chathams.

Rekohu, or the Chatham Islands, (known to Maori as Wharekauri), are located 870 kilometres to the east of New Zealand, around the latitude of 44 degrees South. The two main islands are Rekohu or Chatham; and Rangiauria or Pitt. The Moriori are the 'tchakat henu' (tangata whenua) or indigenous people of these islands. According to the early twentieth century 'Moriori myth', or 'Maruiwi myth', the Moriori were a primitive, dark people of Melanesian or Melanesian/West Polynesian descent, occupying a low position in the hierarchy of races. They originally inhabited New Zealand before the invasion of the more advanced and warlike East Polynesians, from whom they were a completely distinct race. Those who were not killed by the Maori were either absorbed into the conquering tribes or driven out to the Chatham Islands. There they remained in primitive isolation until the Maori invasion of 1835, which inevitably brought about their extinction.

While the last 'full blooded' Moriori, Tommy Solomon, died in 1933, people of Moriori descent have not accepted their supposed 'extinction'. In the 1990s they reclaimed their identity as the indigenous people of Rekohu. There are several extant Moriori

1Moriori is a word from the indigenous language of Rekohu meaning 'normal'. Hence 'tchakat Moriori' means 'ordinary people', which may be compared to 'tangata Maori'. King writes that Moriori has been variously spelt as 'Mooriori, Maoriori, Maioriori, Mouriuri and Mori-ori', see King, Moriori, p. 18n. Dieffenbach in 1840 did not come across the use of the term Moriori but recorded that the Chatham Islanders referred to themselves as 'Tuiti', see Dieffenbach, 'An Account of the Chathams', p. 208. Selwyn, writing in 1848, noted that the Islanders referred to themselves as 'Maoriori', see G. A. Selwyn, New Zealand, Pt 5, London, 1851, p. 100.


3King, Moriori, p. 16.
traditions giving the tchakat henu origin stories, none of which agree with the 'Moriori myth' version. One set of stories concerns Kahu, the first recorded visitor to the islands. Kahu did not remain on the Chathams but returned to his homeland. He found the Chathams already inhabited by autochthonous tribes, that is people 'sprung from the soil'. These tribes were said to be descendants of the ancestors Te Aomarama and Rongomai-whenua. Later arrivals on the islands were the Rangimata and Rangihoua canoes bringing the Wheteina people; and the Oropuke canoe bringing the Rauru people. Conflict resulted between these two groups, a conflict that was finally resolved by Nunuku-whenua, an elder of one of the indigenous tribes. He instituted the laws banning deadly warfare and replacing it with ritual combat, which remained effective until the nineteenth century Maori invasion.4

Modern anthropologists see the Moriori as a Polynesian people who settled in the Chathams at some time between the ninth and the sixteenth centuries. Linguistic and material evidence indicates the ancestors of the Moriori came from New Zealand and were the same people as the ancestors of the modern Maori. The hunter-gatherer society developed by Moriori is seen as being a response to the environmental conditions of Rekohu where standard Polynesian crops such as the kumara could not grow. The Moriori based their economy on (in declining order of importance) seals, sea birds, fish, land birds and terrestrial plants. The pre-contact population of Rekohu is estimated at around 2000 people, as opposed to the approximately 700 people living on the Chathams in the 1990s. Moriori religious beliefs concerning atua and tapu were similar to other Eastern Polynesian societies. The simplicity of Moriori technology is regarded by anthropologists as an adaptation for a semi-nomadic, hunter-gatherer lifestyle. The relatively egalitarian and pacifist society developed by Moriori appears to have been unique in Eastern Polynesia and may have been a response to coping with a large population in a small, isolated place.5

4 A. Shand, 'The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands: Their Traditions and History'. Chp. 8a, JPS, 5, 17, 1896, pp. 13-30. The ethnographers Alexander Shand and Hirawanu Tapu could find no stories of the origins of the autochthonous tribes, but, according to Ewing, the Moriori sailor Koche told a story that the original inhabitants of Rekohu came from Rangiauria. See C. Ewing, 'Koche, King of Pitt', Catholic World, July, 1873, pp. 546-7. It should be pointed out that, of the remaining knowledge we have of Moriori tradition, an estimated ninety percent is the product of the collecting efforts of Hirawanu Tapu. He was a Moriori who recorded a great deal of tradition told him by surviving elders in the late nineteenth century. Much of this material was written down by Alexander Shand, in collaboration with Tapu, and later published by the Polynesian Society. See King, Moriori, pp. 124-5, and A. Shand, The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands, New Plymouth, 1911.

The first known outside contact with the Moriori was that by the crew of the Royal Naval brig *Chatham*, under the command of Lieutenant Broughton, who accidentally rediscovered Rekohu and renamed it Chatham Island, in November of 1791. A cutter was sent ashore at Kaingaroa on the North coast with Lt. Broughton, and eight crew members on board. They were approached by a crowd of about forty Moriori men. After about an hour of friendly interaction between British and Moriori a dispute broke out which led to the British reluctantly firing upon the Moriori, killing one of them. Following this incident the British left the Chathams, by their own account deeply regretting the lethal result of their encounter. The impression the British account gave was of a people brave enough to approach, and even attack, a totally alien intruder. The same people were also described as cheerful and curious. This description strongly contrasts with the comments of later observers, such as B. Weiss who wrote of a 'secluded and timid people'.

Moriori oral accounts from the nineteenth century gave several different versions of the above incident. One account held that the Moriori, being unused to European style clothing, mistook the British sailors for women and tried to capture them. Another version held that a Moriori had tried to take Broughton's coat, while yet another version maintained that fighting broke out when one of the sailors tried to take a Moriori fishing net. The slain Moriori was named Tamakaroro. A council was held after the skirmish at which it was decided that the intruders had not been to blame and that any future visitors would be welcomed in peace.

From the early nineteenth century the Chathams began to be regularly visited by British (including Australian), American, and French sealing vessels. Whaling vessels, on the other hand, only became regular visitors in the 1830s. While relations were generally

---


Broughton's description of this encounter, in ibid., pp. 386-7, is worth quoting to give some idea of how the tchakat henu appeared at first contact,

> The men were of middling size, some stoutly made, well limbed and fleshy; their Hair both of the Head and Beard, and by some it was worn long.... Some had their beards plucked out: the complexion and general colour was dark brown.... Their skins were destitute of any marks, and they had the appearance of being cleanly about their persons.... Some were naked, excepting a well woven mat of fine texture, which...made a sort of decent garment. We noticed two or three old men, but they did not appear to have any authority over the others. They seemed a cheerful race, our conversation frequently excited bursts of laughter amongst them. On our first landing their surprise(sic) and exclamations can hardly be imagined; they pointed to the sun, and then to us, as if to ask, whether we had come from thence.


8Ewing, 'Koche, King of Pitt', p. 549.


amicable between the tehukat henu and the outsiders, in the long run these visits were to have disastrous results. By the 1830s the seal colonies were decimated, removing a central element of the Moriori economy and of their religious beliefs. Illnesses such as measles, influenza, and sexually transmitted diseases were also introduced, creating epidemics in the non-resistant Moriori population. It is estimated that more than 400 Moriori died from these plagues reducing the population to around 1,600 by 1835.9

These early visitors left few records giving their impressions of the indigenous people. John (Jacky) Marmon, in 1881, recalled his voyage as a ten year old cabin boy on the Commerce, during the years 1807 and 1808.10 Of the Chathams he said, 'We found a considerable number of the natives, called in their own tongue Moriori, who seemed in dialect, colour and customs to resemble the Maori...'.11 Dr. Hocken, in 1879, recorded the memories of former sealer Edwin Palmer who had visited the Chathams aboard the Sally in 1825. Palmer also commented on similarities in appearance and language between the Maori and the Moriori.12

Broughton, Marmon and Palmer all give no indication that they regarded the Moriori as in any way inferior to the Maori. Furthermore the Moriori were portrayed by these commentators as a confident and cheerful people in contrast to the post-invasion picture of abject and timid savages.

Maori Invasion of the Chathams

The most disastrous result of contact for the Moriori was undoubtedly the Maori invasion of 1835. A number of Maori had visited the Chathams while crewing on sealing and whaling vessels. It was from such visits that Wharekauri, originally the name of a specific northern coastal settlement, came to be applied by Maori to the whole island of Rekohu. Among the Maori visitors who returned to New Zealand with news of what they had seen, were members of Ngati Tama and Ngati Mutunga, two iwi from Taranaki.13

In the early 1830s, pressured by attacks from the Waikato tribes, the majority of Ngati Tama and Ngati Mutunga had left Taranaki, heading south in a great series of heke

9Ibid., pp. 46-50.
11Ibid., p. 22.
13King, Moriori, pp. 54-5.
A. Shand, 'The Occupation of the Chatham Islands by the Maoris in 1835. Pt. 2.', in JPS, 1, 2, 1892, p. 154.
towards Te Upoko o Te Ika a Maui, the southern end of the North Island. Ngati Tama and Ngati Mutunga began these heke as allies of Te Rauparaha and Te Rangihaeata's Ngati Toa iwi, but once in the south tension and conflict developed between the former comrades in arms. This tension may have been a major factor pressuring Ngati Tama and Ngati Mutunga to move on. According to the old men of Ngati Tama, it was the description of the Chathams by Paki Whara, one of the returned sailors, that convinced them to go. He had described the islands as 'He Whenua Kai', a land of abundant food, inhabited by a people who did not know how to fight.\(^\text{14}\)

In November 1835 Ngati Tama and Ngati Mutunga forcibly 'hired' the brig *Rodney* in order to proceed to the Chathams. In reaction to the arrival of the invaders the Moriori tribes held a major meeting at Te Awapatiki on the east coast. Despite the advice of some prominent young men that the Moriori should fight, Moriori elders decided this was against their customs. The Moriori refused to fight and were easily conquered and enslaved by Ngati Mutunga and Ngati Tama. According to King, the various Maori leaders walked across the land and killed a sufficient number of Moriori to establish their own claims to the land in accordance with Maori tikanga. In some cases this killing degenerated into wholesale massacres followed by cannibal feasts. Moriori later reported that over 250 of their number were murdered in the first few years of Maori occupation.\(^\text{15}\)

The Maori attitude to the Moriori was generally one of contempt. In an extreme case the hapu Ngati Wai massacred over sixty Moriori on the beach at Waitangi. In contrast some chiefs such as Apitea acted as protectors of the Moriori after the conquest.\(^\text{16}\) Maori gave Moriori the insulting name of paraiwhara, which according to Hunt meant 'blackfellows - not from their complexion, they having no darker tinge than a Maori - but in their [Maori] eyes the term is synonymous with slavery'.\(^\text{17}\) King believes that in the Musket War period of the 1820s and 30s, few Maori understood or respected the concept of refusing to put up armed resistance to attack. Therefore it is perhaps not
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surprising that the warrior Ngati Tama and Ngati Mutunga, who had spent most of the previous ten years in combat, should look down on the pacifist Moriori.  

In the years following the invasion a drastic fall in Moriori population numbers occurred. Moriori were enslaved and their families were broken up. Marriages were prohibited, people removed from their homelands, and forced to break their own sacred laws of tchap (tapu). Baucke and Shand both believed many deaths came about from Moriori reactions to breaches of tchap, 'for the Morioris were an exceedingly tapu race'. Resistance often had lethal consequences. Refusal to work sometimes resulted in the killing of the slave. Those who escaped to the bush were usually recaptured and often killed. It was Shand's belief, however, that disease was the primary cause of Moriori death. The Moriori population has been estimated as having been around 1,600 in 1835. Selwyn, who carried out a census in 1848, recorded only 268 Moriori still alive.

None of the resident Pakeha made any attempt to intervene during the Ngati Tama/Ngati Mutunga invasion; although, as King points out, this may have been due to fear of retaliation. Efforts, in the 1840s and 1850s, by Bishop Selwyn and Resident Magistrate Archibald Shand to improve the lot of the Moriori were largely ineffectual. In general the colonial administration of New Zealand appears to have regarded the Chathams as a backwater, not worth spending much money or effort on. Official reports by William Seed, in 1862, and Halse, in 1867, expressed sympathy for the plight of the Moriori, but made few practical suggestions of any sort of Government actions to alleviate the situation.

Partly as a result of Halse's report a Native Land Court sitting to consider land rights was held, in 1870, at Waitangi, the main settlement on the Chathams. Evidence was presented by Moriori and Maori claimants. Moriori claimed the islands on the grounds that they were the tchakat henu and had held to their tikanga of non-resistance. Ngati

---

18 King, Moriori, p. 76. (his attitude is ironic given the prominent role later played by Ngati Tama and Ngati Mutunga, including people from the Chatham Islands, in the non-violent resistance movement based at Parahaka.  
20 Ibid., pp. 160-1.  
Baucke, 'Life and Customs', p. 32.  
King, Moriori, pp. 66-8.  
Ewing, 'Koche: King of Pitt', pp. 550-1.  
Selwyn, New Zealand, Pt. 5, p. 100.  
22 King Moriori, p. 66, p. 122.  
Tama and Ngati Mutunga claimed the Chathams were theirs on the grounds that they had invaded and occupied them in line with accepted Maori tikanga. The Court's decision was that Maori tikanga overrode that of the Moriori. Maori were awarded 97 per cent of the land under claim on the Chathams, the remainder set aside as reserves for the Moriori. A variety of suggestions have been proposed to explain why the Court decided so strongly in favour of the Maori claimants. Hirawanu Tapu, the main Moriori witness, lacked Court experience and was ill during the case. Many Ngati Tama and Ngati Mutunga had already had experience as witnesses in Taranaki land cases. A Government desire to keep the Taranaki Maori on the Chathams, rather than have them join the resistance then building up around Parihaka, may have strongly influenced the decision. It seems likely that another strong reason Pakeha favoured Maori arose from a common Pakeha belief in the superiority of the Maori to the Moriori, who were supposedly doomed to extinction.23

The great majority of Pakeha observers only saw Moriori after invasion and slavery had shattered their culture and self confidence. The notion emerged among Pakeha writers that the fate of the Moriori, while unfortunate, was an inevitable 'natural' process that could not be interfered with. The German naturalist Ernst Dieffenbach, visited the Chathams in 1840, while on the New Zealand Company survey ship Cuba. He later wrote describing the inexplicable but undeniable decline in population of indigenous peoples. He saw this process as occurring New Zealand and the Chatham Islands, just as it was in Australia, the South Sea Islands and the Americas.24 While supporting colonisation Dieffenbach wanted to prevent the destruction of indigenous peoples. He therefore set out his own ideas on how New Zealand could be settled by Europeans without having detrimental effects on Maori.25

Writing in 1841, Dieffenbach expressed sympathy for the Moriori plight, but saw them as doomed to extinction, writing, 'A few years of slavery and degradation have reduced their numbers, and in a short time every trace of them will be lost, as even the New Zealanders have disdained to intermarrry with them'.26 For all Dieffenbach's concern he

23 King, Moriori, Chp. 7 passim. For discussion of reasons for the Court's decisions see in particular p. 125.
25 Ibid., Chp. 9.
Despite his humanitarian suggestions Dieffenbach believed that the decline of native peoples might be part of 'the design of Providence' and therefore prove unstoppable. He suggested in Ibid., pp. 14-5, 'It may be... one of Nature's eternal laws that some races of men, like some kinds of organic beings, plants and animals, stand in opposition to each other; ...where one race begins to spread and increase, the other, which is perhaps less vigorous and less durable dies off.'
saw Moriori as weaker than either Maori or Pakeha, and seems to have regarded them as beyond help.

Frederick Hunt was one of the earliest Pakeha settlers on the Chathams, settling on Pitt Island in 1843. Writing in 1866 on the future of the Chathams, Hunt described the 'decadence' of the Maori and speculated that they were declining due to some form of divine providence clearing a path for 'civilisation'. He went on to reject this idea believing that Maori would survive to become 'civilised'. He made no mention of Moriori in the statement on survival, indicating he believed they would become extinct. Hunt appears to have viewed this extinction as a perfectly natural phenomena, seeing the Maori invasion as a natural event in which no one could interfere. He believed Moriori had been incapable of coping, due to their pacifism and their sensitivity to disease.27

Alexander Shand, the principal Pakeha ethnographer of the Moriori, was another believer in the ideas of 'Providence' and extinction. Writing of the Maori in New Zealand, Shand suggested that a 'dispensation of providence' had through the instruments of disease and the musket wars, brought about, 'the devolution of the [Maori] race in favour of ours, a better one (although none too clean in many respects).28 Given this belief concerning Maori it is hardly surprising that Shand shared other observer's opinions that the Moriori were doomed to extinction.29

William Baucke, the child of German missionaries to the Chathams, grew up among Maori and Moriori, and later wrote a highly critical account of Moriori life. Like Shand he saw the Moriori 'race' as only existing as long as it had 'pure-blooded' members. Their extinction he saw not as a result of the Maori invasion but as a result of inbreeding and the laws against warfare imposed by the 'pacifist tyrant' Nunuku.30 Baucke held a type of Darwinian belief, 'that the law of Nature... demands the extinction of the weak by tests which we call "war", so that the more healthy, active and valiant can perpetuate their kind.' Thus as the Moriori no longer carried out the natural selection process of lethal combat they were doomed to degeneration and extinction.31

27Hunt, *Twenty five Years Experience*, pp. 29, 38, 62-4. This book was edited by John Amery and the first edition of it was published with Amery's name mentioned to the exclusion of Hunt. This explains why some writers, such as W. T. L. Travers, mistook Amery for the book's author.
28A. Shand to S. P. Smith, 16/9/1909, A. Shand letterbook, qMS-1789, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
31Baucke, 'An Extinct Race', *New Zealand Herald*, 29/7/1922.
All the writers mentioned viewed the Moriori demise as the result of the operations of 'Providence'. Dieffenbach's writings show that the idea of displacement of native species and peoples by fitter outsiders was being expounded in the 1840s, well before the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species*. The invocation of the idea of 'Providence' gives the impression of a divine power operating beyond human control. Thus any Pakeha intervention to try and prevent Moriori extinction could be viewed as pointless in the face of such an unstoppable natural process. Furthermore Pakeha needed to feel no guilt over their own 'inevitable' take-over of New Zealand and the Chathams, and over the demise of the Maori. Moriori were displaced by the stronger Maori, just as Maori would in turn be displaced by the Pakeha. It appeared that indigenous peoples were displaced by Europeans, just as native plant and animal species were being displaced by 'superior' European species.

The Place of the Moriori in the Human Family Tree

Nineteenth and early twentieth century Western ethnologists were fascinated by the exercise of categorising humanity into various races and then ranking these races in an ordered hierarchy. An example of this socio-evolutionary thinking is found in the introduction to W.T. L. Travers' 1876 paper on Moriori. In this introduction Travers clearly set out his own views on the Moriori place in racial hierarchies; the roles of environment versus heredity in their cultural development; and the importance of studying such peoples. Travers described the Moriori as one of the 'lower races of men'. He believed the study of such groups was vital to the understanding of 'the origin and progress of civilisation'. As he believed the Moriori were descended from some of the same ancestors as the more advanced Maori, Travers saw an opportunity to study the relative progress of the two groups. He believed this comparison would enable the ethnologist to decipher the effects of environment compared to those of heredity in the development of each race.
Travers' writings illustrate the interest Western scholars took in peoples who were seen as extremely primitive and inevitably doomed, such as the Tasmanians and the Moriori. Scholars designated the position each race was seen as occupying in the Western defined racial hierarchy. In the process Pakeha scholars defined how the various races were supposedly related to each other. The major questions appear to have been were Moriori Polynesian, and if so how closely were they related to the Maori? How closely the Moriori were defined as being related to the Maori determined the positioning of the Moriori on the ladder of racial hierarchy.

**Moriori as a Separate Race From Maori**

The naturalist Dieffenbach's 1841 paper on the Chathams seems to have been the first attempt to categorise the Moriori in European ethnological terms. He was of the opinion that the Moriori were 'Polynesians, and not Papuans'. Despite this he believed the Moriori were only distantly related to Maori and were not descended from them. He used as evidence his belief that the Moriori language, while resembling Maori, was more closely related to Tahitian. He held that the Moriori language was far enough removed from Te Reo Maori that at initial contact the two groups could not understand each other. He did acknowledge that the two languages were similar enough that a dialect intermediate between the two had come into existence.

Dieffenbach set out a variety of other aspects of culture that he believed showed the distance of the connection between Moriori and Maori. He saw the absence of warfare among the Moriori as significant. Unlike Maori it appeared that Moriori had originally no domestic animals or cultivated plants. He noted a major difference between Moriori and Maori song styles as well as in canoe building and in death customs.

Dieffenbach made no mention of any idea that the Moriori had been in New Zealand prior to the Chathams, nor of Moriori being driven out by the Maori. The only origin tradition Dieffenbach collected was one speaking of a Moriori origin on Pitt (Rangiauria) Island. It would appear that he believed the Moriori had come to the Chathams without going to New Zealand. He held that the differences between Moriori
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34 Some early Pakeha visitors made comments on how closely they believed Moriori resembled Maori. As mentioned above the Sealers Palmer and Marmon saw Moriori as being very similar to Maori. Captain Copping, writing in 1839 noted that the Moriori, unlike their warlike Maori conquerors were, 'A most inoffensive, harmless race of a more dusky hue than the New Zealanders'. See Richards, *Whaling and Sealing: Sealing*, p. 16.

35 While Dieffenbach noted that Moriori were generally of darker skin colour than Maori, he attributed this to the environmental factors of 'greater exposure and still greater uncleanness stemming from their condition of slavery'. See Dieffenbach, 'Account of the Chathams', p. 208.


and Maori could only be explained by a migratory history where the ancestors of the
two groups separated in the very distant past.\textsuperscript{39}

William Baucke was another who shared the idea that Moriori were Polynesian but not
descended from the Maori. His writings date from the early twentieth century, but they
are based on observations made in the 1850s, 60s and 70s. Baucke was born on the
Chathams in 1848, the son of German Moravian missionaries. He grew up among
Maori and Moriori and while still a child learned the Moriori, Maori, German and
English languages. He learned Moriori fishing and birding lore through accompanying
such expeditions. Despite his close youthful contact with Moriori, by the time Baucke
wrote his articles he had developed strong pro-Maori and anti-Moriori prejudices,
perhaps due to being with Moriori when they were devastated physically and culturally
by the after-effects of invasion and disease. As King has suggested, Baucke's attitudes
call into question the reliability of his writings, despite their unique value as a record of
Moriori hunting and fishing lore.\textsuperscript{40}

Baucke believed his account of the Moriori was the most reliable in existence, as he
alone had an accurate knowledge of the language. He was extremely critical of the other
major written source of information on things Moriori, the collaborative work of the
Moriori elder Hirawanu Tapu and Alexander Shand. Baucke claimed that Tapu's
Moriori language was faulty, 'tainted with Maori idioms', due to Tapu having been a
slave of the Maori from ages eleven to thirty-six; and due to the fact that Moriori
adopted Maori into their every-day speech. Baucke further maintained that Shand, who
had been on the island since 1855, had never heard the 'pure Moriori' to which Baucke
had been exposed as a child. However, as Ross Clark points out, Baucke was only seven
years old in 1855, so the Moriori language he heard as a child may have been as 'tainted'
as that Tapu and Shand were exposed to. Furthermore, Baucke's writings date from
sixty years after the events they describe and were written from memory after a lifetime
of speaking Maori.\textsuperscript{41} Therefore Baucke's version of the Moriori language may have
been as 'contaminated' with Maori idioms as that of Tapu and Shand.\textsuperscript{42}
Baucke entirely rejected all Moriori migration stories, considering them to be simply adaptations of Maori waka stories. He believed such Moriori tales were post-invasion fabrications, invented to enhance their dignity by establishing links between them and the Maori. He recorded that Maori in turn regarded these tales with scorn. Baucke constantly emphasised his belief in the innate inferiority of the Moriori to both Pakeha and Maori. He believed they were of 'stone dull intellect', described their religious teaching as 'lies', and their historical traditions as 'foolishness'. Rather than seeing Moriori as a Polynesian people closely related to Maori, Baucke wrote,

'It is my firm judgement that the Moriori was a distinct branch of the great Polynesian family tree...The abject, decadent Moriori was too prone to agree with any plausible suggestions that connected his ancestry with that lordly and commandingly superior human being, the Maori, at once his overlord and incomparable master.'

Baucke's writings on the origins of the Moriori are confusing and at times appear contradictory. He regarded the Moriori as a Polynesian group that had split away from the main Polynesian family at some very distant time. He cited what he regarded as the crudeness of Moriori carving and the absence of tattooing in their culture as evidence of the ancient separation of the Moriori from the rest of Polynesian culture. Baucke did not believe Moriori were the descendants of a pre-Maori, 'Maruiwi', population from New Zealand. He did believe they had been in the Chathams since ancient times but didn't believe they originated there.

Baucke was unclear as to how he believed the migrations to the Chathams had occurred. Some of his writings suggest he believed there had been canoe migrations in very distant times, while at another point he appears to suggest that Moriori were left on the Chathams as the result of the break-up of a Southern supercontinent. He was definite on one point, his belief that the Moriori had not come from New Zealand and had no contact with Maori prior to the nineteenth century.
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Baucke, 'Life and Customs', p. 43. Baucke did believe there had been two prehistoric influxes of people into the Chathams. As a consequence of this he thought there had been two distinct physical types on the Chathams; a Northern and a Southern type. Of these two types Baucke believed the Northern were older, lazier, weaker, and more inbred. Ibid., pp. 17, 43.

A few visitors to the Chathams went even further than Dieffenbach and Baucke in portraying Moriori as a totally separate, inferior race to the Maori. One such writer was the French doctor, Louis Thiercelin, who visited the Chathams in the early 1860s. He maintained that the Moriori were considerably darker.
Moriori as Close Relatives of Maori

H. H. (Henry Hammersley) Travers was a naturalist and professional collector who made a series of visits to the Chathams through the second half of the nineteenth century. His father W. T. L. (William Thomas Locke) Travers was a prominent figure in the Philosophical Institutes of Canterbury and later Wellington. As mentioned previously, W. T. L. Travers wrote many papers on natural history, including evolutionary theory. H. H. Travers made his first journey to the Chathams in the summer of 1863-4, sending a detailed letter to his father recording his observations. In the report he made of his expedition, H. H. Travers was unsure of the origins of the Moriori or of their ethnic relationship to the Maori.

Travers noted the pacifism of the Moriori and their unique death customs. He also noticed that Moriori appeared to have no hereditary chiefs and that he could find little evidence of ideas of gods. Travers mentioned that he was unable to find out how long the Moriori had been in the Chathams as 'their chronology...is very defective'. He was able to gather a story that the Moriori came to the Chathams in two canoes, but could not work out where these canoes set out from. He believed that the physical appearance of the Moriori indicated that they might have the same origin as the 'Mangaia Kanakas', presumably Polynesians from Mangaia, in the Cook group.

H. H. Travers made another trip to the Chathams in 1871 during which he talked to Moriori elders. He believed that 'with the exception of four or five old men, they were utterly ignorant on the subject of their origin'. Nevertheless Travers was able to gain enough information to conclude that the Moriori were 'a mixed race, descended from
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48 It appears that in 1865 W. T. L. Travers sent a copy of this letter to the Ethnological Society in London, which was published as W. Travers, 'On the Destruction of the Aborigines of Chatham Island', in Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London, 4, 1866, pp. 352-60. The same letter was reprinted, with spelling corrections as H. H. Travers, 'On the Chatham Islands', in TNZI, 1, 1868, pp. 173-80. For information on the confusing dating of Travers' various trips to the Chathams I have relied on information supplied by personal communication from Alan Tennyson, Museum of New Zealand, December, 1996.

49 It appears that at this time H. H. Travers thought the Moriori were somewhat different physically from Maori as he wrote: 'They [the Moriori] are much shorter, but stouter built, than the New Zealanders, and have darker skins, but the same straight coarse hair... Their noses are Roman in shape, resembling those of the Jews', H. H. Travers, 'On Chatham Islands', p. 175.

50 Ibid., p. 175.

51 Ibid., pp. 175-6.
the union of Maoris, who reached the islands many generations ago from New Zealand, with an aboriginal race by whom they were then occupied.\textsuperscript{52}

In 1876 W. T. L. Travers presented a paper to the Wellington Philosophical Society, in which he set out his own ideas on Moriori origins and traditions, based on the information provided by his son. He believed that the earliest people on the Chathams were supposedly larger and darker than modern Polynesians and had emigrated from 'Hawaiki' to escape from conflict there. Thirty generations later, the 'Rangimata' and 'Rangihoaana' canoes arrived at the Chathams from Hawaiki. These canoes were in turn followed by the 'Oropuke' from 'Arapawa' or 'Aotea', which W. T. L. Travers, in agreement with Alexander Shand, believed referred to New Zealand.\textsuperscript{53} The occupants of all three of these canoes were described by W. T. L. Travers as 'Maori'.\textsuperscript{54}

H. H. Travers also had learned that the Moriori had creation myths involving Rangi and Papa, similar to Macri and other East Polynesians, contradicting his earlier thinking that Moriori had no ideas of gods. It appears Travers now rejected his earlier view that the Moriori had little reliable knowledge of their own past.\textsuperscript{55}

W. T. L. Travers continued to believe that the Moriori were extremely primitive, writing of them, 'Like all savage people they were gluttonous and improvident...', thus portraying the Moriori as incapable of planning ahead in life.\textsuperscript{56} Moriori beliefs regarding ghosts or 'kiko kiko' were portrayed in W. T. L. Travers writing as being laughable and childish, 'the effect of an excited imagination on a weak, untutored mind'.\textsuperscript{57} The simple nature of Moriori housing and clothing were mentioned as examples of the lack of sophistication of their culture. Travers also compared Moriori carving unfavourably with Maori carving styles.\textsuperscript{58}

As stated above W. T. L. Travers saw the study of Maori and Moriori as a chance to gain understanding into the development of civilisation and the comparison of heredity and environment as influences on different races development. Travers clearly believed the New Zealand Maori were at a much higher state of development than the Moriori

\textsuperscript{52}W. T. L. Travers, 'Notes on the Chatham Islands', \textit{TNZI}, 4, 1871, p. 64.
\textsuperscript{53}W. T. L. Travers, 'Notes of the Traditions and Customs of the Morioris', in \textit{TNZI}, 9, 1876, pp. 17-9.
\textsuperscript{54}Ibid., p. 15. As further proof of the New Zealand connection H. H. Travers mentioned the finding of ancient greenstone tools on the Chathams and Shand's recording of references to totara and pohutukawa (neither of which grow on the Chathams), in what in what he believed to be ancient Moriori songs. \textit{Ibid.}, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{55}Ibid., pp. 25-6. It seems likely that H. H. Travers acquaintance with Shand may have helped him to meet Moriori who gave him the information on which these later papers were based.
\textsuperscript{56}Ibid., p. 20.
\textsuperscript{57}Ibid., pp. 26-7.
\textsuperscript{58}Ibid., pp. 20-1.
and saw this as a result of the 'degrading' environment of the Chathams on its people.\footnote{59} 

It is clear that both of the Travers had developed a more complex view of Moriori identity by the 1870s. Rather than seeing Moriori as being only distantly related to Maori, W. T. L. Travers now described one of the Moriori ancestral lines as 'Maori'. Yet despite seeing Moriori as closely related to Maori, both the Travers still believed there were considerable differences in appearance and language between the two groups. Their belief that Moriori were descended from larger darker aboriginals may have acted as an explanation for these differences. It remains clear that the Travers continued to believe that the Moriori were an inferior, doomed race.\footnote{60} 

The idea that the Moriori were descended from the same New Zealand-based ancestors as the Maori seems to have been a common view among nineteenth century commentators on the Chathams. Bishop Selwyn, for example, appears to have believed the two peoples were very closely related. He described the Moriori as very similar in appearance to the Maori and was of the impression that at the time of the invasion the Moriori language 'was perfectly intelligible to the Ngatiawa'.\footnote{61} 

Frederick Hunt settled with his family on Pitt Island, or Rangiauria, in 1843. In his first years on the island Hunt had considerable contact with Moriori who had fled there to escape the Maori on Rekohu. He was unsure of the origins of the Moriori but considered them to be, 'Somewhat akin to the Maoris in manners, customs and language, but totally devoid of their energy, intelligence and ferocity', a 'wild, solitary and timid race'.\footnote{62} Again we have the image presented of an obviously Polynesian people, but portrayed as distinctly inferior to Maori. Hunt described them as having in appearance 'the most remarkable resemblance to the Jewish race' and as being no darker than the Maori; the term paraíwhara, 'blackfellow' being an insult rather than a description.\footnote{63} 

Hunt believed the Moriori may have come from New Zealand. He wrote of an oral tradition of the ancestors of the Moriori being blown to the Chathams by a storm when out on a fishing expedition. He speculated that they may have originated from the deep south as 'They bear a striking resemblance to the natives of Stewart's Island'. This presumably meant he saw the Moriori as ethnically very similar to Maori. However

\footnote{59}{Ibid., pp. 15-6.} \footnote{60}{Ibid., pp. 15, 17-9.} \footnote{61}{Selwyn, New Zealand, Pt. 5, p. 100.} \footnote{62}{Hunt, Twenty Five Years Experience, pp. 28, 34.} \footnote{63}{Ibid., pp. 29, 34.}
there is the possibility that he believed the southern Maori were somehow distinct from those of the north.\textsuperscript{64}

Hunt expressed sympathy for the 'gentle and inoffensive' Moriori, especially in their relations with 'thei' cruel taskmasters' the Maori. Nevertheless, he regarded many Moriori customs as primitive and appalling; as can be seen by the occasion when he and his wife forced Moriori to change their funeral customs. In some ways he saw Moriori as simple figures of fun as witnessed by the time he dressed as a ghost to terrify Moriori who were ritually exorcising a 'kikokiko' or spirit.\textsuperscript{65}

The ethnologist and public servant Edward Tregear visited the Chathams in 1889. He was interested to discover as much as possible of what remained of Moriori migration traditions. Tregear went to Hirawanu Tapu, the recognised living authority on Moriori traditions. The gaps in Tapu's genealogical knowledge Tregear filled in with information from Alexander Shand who had obtained it from the Moriori elder Minarapa Tamahiwaka. Tregear ascertained that the Moriori were Polynesians who traced their ancestry back to Rangi and Papa. He went on to outline the stories of the arrival of the \textit{Rangimata}, \textit{Rangihoua} and \textit{Oropuke} canoes and the story of Kahu's visit.\textsuperscript{66}

Tregear related that one tradition spoke of an indigenous Chathams people called the Hiti who were driven out of the islands by the Moriori. Hirawanu Tapu however was insistent that the Moriori were the original tchakat henu and that the later canoes brought newcomers from Hawaiki. Tregear, in contrast, thought it unlikely that the Moriori were autochthonous as he believed their appearance, language, songs and genealogy all indicated their Polynesian ancestry. He saw their origin as being from 'the same far off Hawaiki' as the Maori, but did not indicate whether he believed they came to the Chathams via New Zealand.\textsuperscript{67} Tregear also carried out a census of Moriori numbers; counting twenty seven 'pure bloods' and five of mixed descent. Like most commentators he repeated the funeral dirge of inevitable Moriori extinction.\textsuperscript{68}

In his 1904 book, \textit{The Maori Race}, Tregear again mentioned the Polynesian physical features of the Moriori, and the similarity of the names of their gods to those of other Polynesians.\textsuperscript{69} He now ventured to suggest that there was a strong chance that the

\textsuperscript{64}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{65}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 35.
\textsuperscript{67}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 76-7.
\textsuperscript{68}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 78-9.
\textsuperscript{69}E. Tregear, \textit{The Maori Race}, Wanganui, 1904, pp. 576, 579.
Moriori had either lived in or at some point visited New Zealand, but was unsure how closely they were related to the Maori. Nevertheless, he was by this time convinced that the Moriori were 'an offshoot of the same Polynesian race as the Maori'.

Shand and Tapu write 'The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands'

Of all the Pakeha writers on the Moriori, the one who produced, or in reality co-produced, the greatest body of work was Alexander Shand (1840-1910). Shand's family came to the Chathams in 1855, when his father Archibald was appointed the first Resident Magistrate. Alexander, who was fifteen when his family arrived, was to live on the Chathams for the rest of his life. He took up farming, but also became a skilled speaker of te reo Maori, acting as a licensed interpreter in Native Land Court cases for Maori and Moriori. He developed a keen interest in Maori and Moriori cultures and it was largely at his instigation that the largest written body of Moriori material was preserved. He was acknowledged as an expert on Taranaki Maori history and traditions as well as those of the Moriori.

Shand's co-author in this project was the Moriori expert Hirawanu Tapu (?-1900). Tapu had been a boy at the time of the Ngati Tama/Ngati Mutunga invasion and had been enslaved until 1860. After gaining his freedom he became a scribe and political leader for the Moriori people, representing them in the 1870 Native Land Court case. From 1868 onwards Tapu interviewed many of the surviving male Moriori elders. He recorded mythology, genealogy, stories of Hawaiki, and the stories of the migration canoes. It is significant that neither Shand nor Tapu made any attempt to record information from female Moriori; a pattern generally repeated by male ethnologists in New Zealand. It may have been that given the tapu laws of Moriori society a male would not have been able to gain access to female knowledge. Despite this major omission the conclusions Shand drew on the nature of Moriori history, origins and ethnicity were based on considerable familiarity with Tapu's interviews, which were the most comprehensive body of Moriori lore available.

Hirawanu Tapu was fluent in spoken and written Maori, but he was only a competent speaker of Moriori. This was a consequence of being forced to speak Maori during his time as a slave. The Moriori as slaves had been forbidden by Ngati Tama and Ngati Mutunga to speak Moriori and had begun to commonly converse in what was in fact an amalgam of the two languages. This created a difficulty in deciphering what aspects of the Moriori language pre-dated the 1835 invasion. Moriori itself had never been
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developed as a written language. The written forms of most Polynesian languages were originally developed by missionaries for the translation of the scriptures. On the Chathams the missionaries, who arrived after the Maori invasion, never bothered to develop a written form of Moriori. They used Maori written texts and taught local people to read and write in Maori. Therefore Hirawanu Tapu may have been able to understand what the tchohuk (tohunga), or experts, said to him regardless of whether it was in Maori or Moriori; but he could only record it in Maori. He and Shand then tried to rewrite these scripts phonetically to resemble as closely as possible the spoken Moriori. A further complication was the fact that many Moriori religious and traditional concepts could only be expressed in the Moriori language.\(^73\)

Shand, largely through his work with Tapu, appears to have gained a considerable knowledge of the Moriori language. He considered it to have been a dialect of Maori, writing of it to Percy Smith: 'The language I have no doubt is Maori only with the difference noticeable between one tribe and another, but villainously pronounced thereby disguising the proper sound or pronunciation of the words'.\(^74\)

In a much later letter Shand acknowledged more of the differences between Moriori and Maori languages. He suggested that this might in part be the result of long isolation. He believed that Moriori resembled some of the 'South Sea Island dialects', due to retaining some words which Maori had lost. He also explained the differences in Moriori language as being a product of the influence of the earlier east Polynesian population he believed had settled in the Chathams before the main canoe migration to New Zealand. While Shand felt confident enough to theorise on the Moriori language and its relationship to te reo Maori, he was well aware of the problems involved in such language studies. He would have known that the language he heard through Tapu and other speakers was heavily influenced by the Taranaki dialect of Ngati Tama and Ngati Mutunga, as that was the dialect he had himself learned.\(^75\)

In the first chapter of 'The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands: Their History and Traditions', Shand set out what he described as a 'popular' rather than 'scientific' description of the Moriori 'habits and customs' specifically to encourage comparison
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\(^73\) Shand, 'The Moriori People'. Chp. 1, JPS, 3, 10, 1894, pp. 76, 91.

\(^74\) A. Shand to S. P. Smith, 27/7/1870, A. Shand letterbook, qMS-1789, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.

\(^75\) A. Shand to S. P. Smith, 28/3/1890, A. Shand letterbook, qMS-1789, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ. Shand's ideas on the retention of words in Moriori which have been lost in Maori can be compared with Ross Clark's recent work, which points out such retentions. Clark suggests Moriori's relationship to Maori might be seen as either that of a 'highly divergent dialect' or of a 'closely related language'. See Clark, 'Moriori and Maori: The Linguistic Evidence', pp. 131-2.
with 'their relatives of other branches of the Polynesian Race.' Shand pointed out the features which made Moriori different from Maori including their pacifism, the simplicity of their housing, their unique raft-canoes, their lack of agriculture, and the absence of slavery from their society. Despite making these points Shand's work emphasized his total conviction that the Moriori were Polynesian and very closely related to the Maori. He wrote: 'It will be understood that they are very similar to the Maoris in their physical aspect, as well as in their language, customs and many other particulars, as will be seen by their traditions...'. He went on to write, 'The Moriori race is closely allied to, in fact is one with the Maori...'.

Shand's physical description of the Moriori emphasized their resemblance to the Maori in features; although he believed that the hooked noses of many Moriori gave a 'Jewish cast' to their faces. He held that the Moriori were in colour very similar to Maori but often slightly darker. Shand believed two distinct physical types existed among the Moriori: 'The straight haired fairer people and the curly haired darker people... approaching the Melanesian type'. This division was identical to that which many Pakeha observers believed they had detected within Maori populations. Shand explained these differences as the product of several different waves of culturally similar East Polynesians having settled in the Chathams, one wave in very ancient times, the other arriving some time around the fourteenth century.

Shand illustrated the East Polynesian nature of the Moriori by describing a range of social customs that had strong counterparts in other Polynesian societies. Moriori were divided into tribes, with the Moriori term 'Etchi' being the equivalent of the Maori 'Ati' or 'Ngati'. As in many other Polynesian societies leaders were referred to as Ariki. Certain resource rights were held by particular families through hereditary rights, while of paramount importance in the operation of Moriori society were the standard Polynesian concepts of tapu and noa.

Shand's descriptions of Moriori gods and heroes, from the information collected by Tapu, showed many parallels to other Eastern Polynesian societies. Rangi, the sky father, and Papa, the Earth Mother, were the original beings. Tu was god of war and
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also represented humans. As in Maori belief, Tane was god of the forest and Tangaroa god of the sea. Rongo, rather than being the god of cultivated plants was, in Moriori belief, in charge of the pilot whales, or Rongomoana, which when stranded were an important item of food. Moriori told stories of Maui, including the tales of his stealing fire and of slowing down the sun. In the Moriori version of the slowing down of the sun, the hero was Maui-mua, the oldest brother, rather than the youngest, Maui-tikitiki-o-Taranga who was the hero in the Maori version. Moriori also told the common Polynesian tale of the hero Tawhaki and his ascent into the heavens. Shand saw these shared beliefs as proof of the Polynesian nature of the Moriori.83

Shand and Tapu's work provided readers with what is still the fullest extant account of Moriori migration stories. Two versions were set out of Kahu's visit to the Chathams; both of which describe him sailing to various parts of the island, attempting and failing to plant and grow kumara, then departing for Hawaikí. Various accounts were given of the conflicts in Hawaikí that precipitated the canoe migrations to Rekohu. These stories were followed by the tale of the arrival of the Rangimata and Rangihoua waka, bringing with them the Wheteina tribe. On Rekohu the Wheteina found an already resident tchakat henu or tangata whenua people, who spoke the same language and were very culturally similar to the Wheteina. According to the Shand/Tapu account the final waka to arrive from Hawaikí was the Oropuke under Moe, bringing with it the Rauru tribe, traditional rivals of the Wheteina. Fighting broke out between the two groups until a lasting peace and law of non-violence was established by Nunuku, a leader of the tangata whenua.84

Shand was convinced that the 'Hawaikí' in the Moriori stories actually referred to New Zealand. He believed the names 'Aotea' and 'Aropawa' used in Moriori stories referred to the North and South Islands of New Zealand, especially as Aotearoa and Arapaoa were Maori names for the North and South Islands respectively. Shand also believed the places described in the account of the battle at Whanga-patiki, which led to the departure of the Wheteina to Rekohu, were in fact areas around Tauranga harbour. Shand believed that Moriori familiarity with the names of trees such as Kauri, Puriri, and Pohutukawa, none of which were found on the Chathams; along with their stories of attempts at kumara growing, were further proof of a New Zealand origin.85
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points out that many place names such as Aotea are found throughout Polynesia. Furthermore by the time these stories were written down years of contact with Maori had familiarised Moriori with many of the New Zealand placenames. The same could possibly be true for accounts of trees and crops. Yet King, like most other scholars, agrees with Shand that New Zealand was the most likely leaving off point for the migration to Rekohu. 86

While Shand believed the Moriori came from a 'Hawaiki' in New Zealand, he did not believe this confirmed that they were driven out by the invading Maori. According to Shand and Tapu, the Rangimata and Rangihoua waka left Hawaiki due to conflict between the Wheteina and the Rauru peoples. From the stories set down these two groups appear to have both been Polynesian iwi, speaking the same language and intermarrying. There is no hint in these stories of a distinctly different group invading 'Hawaiki' from outside and driving out an older people. 87

On the arrival of the Wheteina in Rekohu they found the place already inhabited by a variety of tribes of people who according to Moriori story tellers were 'no te whenua ake'; a people who had sprung from the land itself. 88 The stories portray these earlier people as similar to the new arrivals and as speaking the same language. Nunuku, who instituted the laws of non-violence, was one of the tangata whenua, and yet was also said to be a tipuna of Moe, commander of the Oropuke waka. The Moriori of Shand's time claimed descent from both the tchakat henu (tangata whenua) and the people of the three waka. Both groups of tipuna seem to have been held in equal regard by their descendants. 89 Shand appears to have believed that the existence of two ancestral groups on the island may have helped explain such oddities as the unusual features of the Moriori language. 90

Shand was convinced that a Western-style chronology for Moriori history could be worked out by examining whakapapa. Despite this belief, he confessed himself at a loss to work out the exact timing of Moriori departure from New Zealand. Shand believed the ancestors of the Maori had arrived in New Zealand in a great fleet of canoes, which
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Despite the ethnological 'commodification' of the Moriori in Shand's writings, his work remains one of the few accounts to present the Moriori in a generally positive light, as a people with complex mythological and historical traditions. Perhaps the greatest value of this work is that it is almost the only account in which Moriori themselves have something of a voice of their own, through the presence of substantial transcripts of the teachings of elders recorded by Tapu. There is, of course, still the historical problem that the reader can never be sure how accurately Tapu recorded the teachings of the elders. Nevertheless the writings of Tapu are the only ones we have recorded by a Moriori author. The characters within these myths and historical traditions are actors in their own dramas with degrees of power and control in the events of the stories portrayed. This contrasts strongly with the portrayal of Moriori in most early Pakeha accounts as marginalised, apathetic victims or simple, irrational primitives.95

It must, however, be emphasised that it is now impossible to know how much Shand altered Tapu's material, or for that matter how much Tapu altered the sayings of his collaborators, as all the original material has been lost. Thus it is not possible to carry out a study on the works of Shand along the lines of that carried out by Simmons and Biggs on Percy Smith's editing of The Lore of the Whare Wananga. Shand's writing up of Moriori traditions involved a similar process to that which occurred in the Pakeha collection of Maori traditions. He fitted the Moriori traditions into the Pakeha discourse of scholarly writing concerning Polynesian matters. The processes of translating and writing down material for publication in scholarly journals could substantially change the meanings of stories that previously existed solely as orally transmitted accounts specific to particular cultures. If it were possible to gain an idea of how much Shand changed the material he worked with, we would gain a clearer idea of how much respect he had for his 'informants' (or co-authors) and their material.

Shand, like most Pakeha commentators, held some negative opinions of the Moriori and regarded them as inferior to Pakeha. He considered them deficient in 'energy or vivacity' when compared to the Maori and described the group of Moriori he tried to recruit to work on his flax mill as "cursedly" lazy.96 Yet despite these criticisms there is no

95A notable exception to the negative presentation is the story 'Koche: King of Pitt', a tale reputedly told by the Moriori Koche to the American doctor C. Ewing, when the two were shipmates on an American whaler. While the tale is told in Ewing's words rather than Koche's, Koche is presented as a hero struggling for his freedom. This image does fit in to the Western stereotype of 'the Noble Savage', (and for once in Koche's case that term is appropriate as he strongly resembles the 'hard savage' image of the North American Indian characters to whom this term was originally applied: see O. H. K. Spate, Paradise Found and Lost, Canberra, 1988, p. 246.), but it is nevertheless a more positive image than that presented of Moriori in any texts outside those recorded by Tapu. Furthermore, Koche is presented as an individual with a character of his own, rather than just as a representative Moriori. See Ewing, 'Koche: King of Pitt', pp. 545-57.
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indication from Shand's writings that he regarded the Moriori as less intelligent than the Maori. The fact that Shand's commentaries on the Moriori texts tend to be minimal and generally avoid the degree of condescension and crude racism displayed by writers such as Baucke, indicates a degree of respect for the Moriori view of their own history and myth. Shand's descriptions of Moriori 'habits and customs', emphasised the links with the broader Polynesian culture, rather than the supposedly primitive nature of Moriori culture. Shand's respect for individual Moriori is expressed in his acceptance of the accuracy of whakapapa and historical information given by Moriori elders and in his trust in Tapu as an informant. This attitude again contrasted with Baucke's view that most of this information was fabricated.

Shand's work was clearly a product of its time. He regarded Moriori as an inferior, doomed race whose traditions he was collecting to be part of a Western scientific archive, for the use and enlightenment of an educated Western audience. Shand regarded Maori, whose traditions he also collected, as racially inferior to Pakeha. He saw the massacres and atrocities of the musket wars and the Chathams invasion as signs of 'innate savagery'. Yet he was well aware of the idea of Polynesians as a superior class of 'savage' and expressed great admiration himself for their skill in navigation and in their intimate knowledge of their own oral history. Shand's insistence on the close relationship between Moriori and Maori may have been largely due to what he saw as the overwhelming evidence in favour of this proposition. There is also a strong probability that, as Shand had a degree of respect for Moriori as a people, he was able to see them as part of the wider east Polynesian race, rather than as members of a race regarded by Pakeha as even lower in the racial hierarchy.

**Wider Fields of Science: Craniometrical Speculations on Moriori.**

The largest body of speculative work on categorising Moriori and Maori occurred in the fields of osteology and craniometry. Craniometry, the measuring of skull size and shape, was a particularly popular method among scientists attempting to classify 'race'. In the late eighteenth century Peter Camper's index of facial angles was one of the

97 King writes that Shand described the Moriori as "totally devoid of their [the Maori's] energy, intelligence and ferocity", see King, *Moriori*, p. 137. This is, however, a misquote as these words were in fact written by Frederick Hunt. See Hunt, *Twenty Five Years Experience*, p. 28.
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seminal influences on the growth of craniometry. In the nineteenth century the work of the American Samuel G. Morton and the Frenchman Paul Broca helped develop a complicated set of measuring systems which supposedly enabled the craniometrist to identify the 'racial' origin of a skull and place this race within a hierarchy. Skulls and other bones were measured in order to assign racial categories and were therefore in big demand by anatomists. Scientists were particularly interested in small, 'primitive' and disappearing groups such as the Moriori.101 Thus collectors such as H. H. Travers were able to make money collecting and selling Moriori and Maori skulls to colonial and metropolitan Museums and private collectors.102

The most exhaustive study carried out on Moriori skeletal remains was the work of Otago University anatomist Professor J. H. Scott, published in 1893. Scott measured eighty three Maori skulls, of which forty five were from the southern South Island and therefore assumed by Scott to be Kai Tahu/Kati Mamoe. Scott compared these measurements with the measurements of forty six Moriori skulls. Scott measured these skulls according to the guidelines set out by Paul Broca, with the result that the paper he produced contained a baffling array of technical craniometrical terms.103 Scott was convinced that Maori were of mixed Polynesian/Melanesian background. He maintained that the Maori skulls he measured included some displaying Melanesian features, being long, narrow, and prognathous (that is having a protruding jaw) and some displaying distinctly Polynesian features, being short, broad and orthognathous (with a non-protruding jaw). Scott's measurements of Moriori skulls revealed to him a very similar mixed background of Polynesian and Melanesian ancestry, which he believed was also revealed by the origin traditions collected by Shand.104

Contrary to King's interpretation of his paper, Scott did not suggest that the Moriori skulls indicated a 'stronger Melanesian element' than those of the Maori.105 He rather commented on the features of the Moriori skull which distinguished it from the Maori, such as its having a 'depressed and retreating forehead', being 'slightly broader relative to its length' and having a more protruding jaw. He also noted that according to his measurements of the Moriori skull 'the cranial capacity is also slightly less'. Despite

S. J. Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man*, London, 1981, pp. 50-69, Chp. 3. Gould points out that the work of scientists such as Broca was as meticulous as of any other science of the time, but the results indicating a racial hierarchy were in effect skewed beforehand by the assumptions made at the beginning of the studies. See pp. 57-60, 65-9, 89-105.
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noting these differences the major emphasis of Scott's article was on how similar Maori and Moriori skulls were and how difficult it was to distinguish between them.\textsuperscript{106} He wrote:

There can be little doubt that both Maori and Moriori are the result of a mingling of the same races... . There is... a tradition of the early introduction of a pure Maori strain direct from New Zealand... it is difficult to believe that this occurred only once in the long period that elapsed between the settlement and the arrival of Europeans.\textsuperscript{107}

\textit{Conclusion}

In examining Pakeha writing on the Moriori a pattern emerges. In the earliest writings Moriori are peripheral, just one of the topics mentioned, in travel accounts which centre on describing the geography, resources and natural history of the Chathams. This way of writing is described by Mary Louise Pratt as the 'face of the country' style of writing and is well illustrated by Dieffenbach's account and by H. H. Travers 1860s papers.\textsuperscript{108} Later writing is more ethnographically-centred, concentrating on the Moriori themselves, as shown by the writings of Shand and Baucke. It appears that as the Moriori edged closer to 'extinction' they became of greater interest to the Pakeha writer, desperate to record the 'last' information in an action of 'salvage anthropology'.

The writings of Pakeha observers from the early nineteenth century onwards show two recurring themes. From the time of the 1835 invasion onwards Pakeha were convinced Moriori were doomed to extinction. As explained above, this belief tended to be tied in to ideas of Providence and the belief that weaker races must inevitably decline before the onslaught of stronger ones. Such a belief was both useful and comforting to a people, such as the British, involved in economic expansion and colonisation at the expense of indigenous peoples. The destruction of indigenous people could be seen as the result of natural processes thus freeing the coloniser from any feelings of guilt. The activities of the Maori 'savages' against the Moriori could be represented as acts of nature for which Pakeha need take little responsibility; much the same as the effects of diseases or introduced animals and plants on native wildlife. Pakeha saw themselves as able, and obliged, to do no more than sadly watch Moriori decline from the sidelines; while at the same time being prepared to colonise the Chathams for the British Empire.

\textsuperscript{106}Scott, 'Osteology', pp. 62-4. King misquotes Scott on cranial capacity claiming he wrote the 'cranial capacity is somewhat less', see King, \textit{Moriori}, p. 171. Duckworth made exactly the same misquote, see Duckworth, 'Collection of Crania', p.148. Scott actually used the less dramatic phrase the 'cranial capacity is also \textit{slightly} less' (my italics), see Scott, 'Osteology', p. 63.

\textsuperscript{107}Ibid., p. 26.

Many Pakeha believed Maori on the Chathams, and in New Zealand, were going through a process of inevitable decline similar to that affecting Moriori.

Implicit in the idea of extinction was a belief in purity of 'race'. In Pakeha belief 'Moriori' only existed as long as they were 'pure blooded'. Anyone of Moriori descent who was a 'half-caste', that is anyone with non-Moriori ancestors, ceased in Pakeha eyes to be a Moriori. Thus for Moriori to 'disappear' all they had to do was to interbreed with Maori and Pakeha, thus ceasing to be 'full blooded'. Such an idea was also applied by some Pakha to Maori, but not in the same way to groups such as 'the French' or 'the English'. Powerful ideas of control come into this thought process as it becomes the colonising peoples who make the authoritative decisions on the identity of the colonised. A similar process was applied to the Tasmanian Aborigines who were considered extinct by the whites once all the 'pure bloods' were dead. As with Moriori many Tasmanian Aborigines of mixed descent survive today, but are faced with a political struggle even to assert their own identity.109

The other major preoccupation of Pakeha observers of the Moriori was to ascertain Moriori racial affinities; in particular, how closely they might be related to Maori. An understanding of this relationship would, it was believed, illustrate the migratory history of the Moriori. This would, in turn, reveal at what point, if at all, Moriori ancestors had separated from those of the Maori, and by what route Moriori had come to the Chathams. It was this examination of the relationship between Moriori and Maori which was of particular significance for the development of the 'Maruiwi myth'. Pakeha opinion was divided over whether Moriori were a Western Polynesian or Melanesian people with little relationship to Maori or an Eastern Polynesian people closely related to them. There was also a division of opinion over whether Moriori ancestors had been driven from New Zealand by the ancestors of the Maori.

It is clear that at the end of the nineteenth century the majority of writers on Moriori matters were of the view that the Moriori were an Eastern Polynesian people whose ancestors were very closely related to, if not directly descended from, the ancestors of the Maori.110 While there was not full agreement on how the Moriori got to the Chathams, most writers followed the version stated in the Moriori traditions recorded
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by Hirawanu Tapu. This version had an early indigenous Polynesian people who were later joined by closely related peoples who left 'Hawaiki' to escape from intertribal fighting, rather than being driven out by invaders. The main proponent of these ideas was Alexander Shand, who was widely acknowledged as the Pakeha expert on Moriori matters. Shand was particularly insistent that the Moriori Hawaiki was in fact New Zealand. Even William Baucke, who strongly disagreed with most of Shand's views, agreed that the Moriori were not a people who had been driven out of New Zealand by the Maori.

What does become clear in examining debates over Moriori history and identity is how important ideas on Moriori history and identity were considered to be by those formulating ideas on the early human history of New Zealand. It was seen that an understanding of the Moriori relationship to New Zealand would in turn help identify who were the earliest 'tangata whenua' of New Zealand and what their relationship was to Maori.

By the 1920s, the orthodox scholarly view of the history and identity of the Moriori had shifted away from a general belief in ideas similar to those of Shand. The orthodoxy had become the idea that the Moriori were an inferior people of mixed West Polynesian/Melanesian ancestry who had been forced out of New Zealand by the Maori, first by the followers of Toi and Whatonga, and later by the canoe travellers of the Great Fleet. The major proponent of this view was Stephenson Percy Smith, with support from fellow ethnologist Elsdon Best. It was their work which was largely responsible for creating and promoting to scholars and the public at large what became the standard 'Maruiwi myth'. Yet, until the early twentieth century, Smith had followed ideas on Moriori history and identity very similar to those of Shand. Smith's shift of views arose from his reading and discussion of the work of the Ngati Kahungunu scholar Te Whatahoro. The following chapters will discuss how various Pakeha scholars developed ideas about the migratory past of the Maori and Moriori, through their own collection of Maori oral texts. This will lead on to an examination of the collaborative work of Smith and Whatahoro that led to the creation of the orthodox Moriori myth.
Native Land Court Judges and Theories of Racial Migration

From the early days of contact with Maori interested Pakeha had tried to collect information from Maori oral traditions. Pakeha collectors developed their own images of the Maori past from these traditions. Among those Pakeha who involved in this exercise were the Native Land Court Judges John Alexander Wilson and Walter Edward Gudgeon, the subjects of the current chapter. They used traditional information in attempts to construct consistent stories of the Polynesian migrations to New Zealand. Maori oral traditions were specific to particular hapu and iwi, varying greatly between different groups. For Pakeha scholars the difficulty of constructing a consistent story from these varying narratives was compounded by the physical problem of gathering together information from geographically scattered peoples. A further problem was that of convincing Maori to share knowledge that they might consider sacred or to be the exclusive property of a particular group.

The Native Land Court was established by legislation in 1862 and began to function in 1866. The role of the Court was to give legally recognised titles to lands that had formerly been held under traditional custom. In order to claim rights to the title of an area of land claimants had to be able to trace their descent back to an ancestor who had obtained rights to that land and whose descendants had occupied it continuously. This meant a wide variety of traditional evidence had to be presented and recorded at Native Land Court sessions. Whakapapa were presented to show ancestral connections; ancient battles described to prove rights of conquest; sites of urupa, villages and cultivations pointed out to indicate continuous occupation. Maori came to the Court from many different areas to argue their cases, thus facilitating the recording of traditions from many regions of the country. In order to prove connections to areas of land information that might previously have been hidden from Pakeha was brought out before the Native Land Court. The Native Land Court therefore acted as a unique site for recording an unprecedented range of Maori oral traditions.1

Despite the importance of the Native Land Court as a site for the recording of traditions, the versions of the Maori past recorded in this forum cannot be regarded as definitive. The nature of the Court's operations severely distorted both the type of traditional information brought forward by claimants and the degree of emphasis informants placed on different aspects of such traditions. The adversarial nature of the Court processes meant that strongly contradictory versions of traditions were often presented to the Court. The accusation was often made that stories had been made up simply to gain title to land. Those hapu who for some reason did not present evidence to the Court often came to have their versions of the past ignored by later historians.  

The Court used a system of Pakeha Judges assisted by Maori Assessors. Only a few of these Judges had legal training, the majority being Pakeha who had worked in jobs that brought them into close contact with Maori and who were therefore assumed to be knowledgeable in Maori lore. Their former occupations included such jobs as surveyors, land purchase commissioners, resident magistrates, and officers with the Native Contingent. The Assessors were rangatira or men of great traditional knowledge, such as Te Whatahoro of Ngati Kahungunu, whose job was to advise the Judge on matters of Maori language and custom.

John Alexander Wilson and Walter Edward Gudgeon were two scholars who both served as Native Land Court Judges in the East Coast/Bay of Plenty region. Both independently developed systematic migration theories that attempted to describe a metanarrative or overarching account of the entire process of Polynesian migration to New Zealand. An important part of their respective theories was the belief in the existence of a pre-fleet 'tangata whenua', that is a distinct population in New Zealand before the arrival of the supposed Great Fleet from Hawaiki. Both men based their theories largely on the wide range of Maori oral material they had collected while serving as Native Land Court Judges. Both were able give their ideas a degree of authority with Pakeha audiences by presenting themselves as experts as a result of their work with the Native Land Court.

---

Gudgeon and Wilson stand out as two of the earliest thinkers to develop detailed systematic theories of migration that relied on Maori oral traditions as their major source of information. While Sir George Grey and John White were both more significant as collectors of Maori oral traditions, neither Grey nor White used the wide range of information they gathered to develop any systematic, overarching theory on the waves of migration to New Zealand. Gudgeon and Wilson on the other hand both sought to make some order out of the mass of traditional information they had recorded while serving as Native Land Court Judges. Both men as Judges had made decisions on which oral evidence they would accepted as genuine and which material they would reject. In a similar process, when developing their migration theories, the two men made decisions on which stories to accept as possessing historical truths and which to discard. In the process of organising this information both men independently came to the conclusion that several major waves of settlement had occurred in the years before Pakeha contact.4

Johann Rheinhold Forster, Richard Taylor, and Julius von Haast had all developed systematic theories describing waves of migration of different peoples to New Zealand. Each theory proposed the existence of a pre-Maori people in New Zealand, but, in contrast to Wilson and Gudgeon, each of these scholars based their theories principally on evidence from European intellectual discourses. Forster based his ideas of waves of Papuan and Malay immigrants on ideas of progressive social development and the Great Chain of Being, informed by the thinkers of the Scottish and French enlightenments. Taylor, despite having some knowledge of Maori oral traditions, developed his theory of three waves of migration through the Pacific from the biblical story of the three sons of Noah Ham, Shem, and Japheth. Haast’s idea of the existence of an earlier Moa-hunting people in New Zealand, came from applying contemporary theories on Palaeolithic and Neolithic cultures to the evidence provided by stone tools and Moa remains unearthed in archaeological digs. None of these three thinkers developed their grand theories of migration history from the migration stories in Maori oral tradition.

The works of Wilson and Gudgeon were not to become the basis of the orthodox Moriori Myth. Their speculations are worth analysis though, as they represent precursors to the work of Smith and Best, who developed the Moriori Myth from the oral traditions recorded by Hoani Turei Whatahoro. The works of Gudgeon and Wilson were to form part of a general discourse of debate in the 1890s and early 1900s concerning the existence of a pre-Fleet 'tangata whenua'. This debate, in which Smith

4Sissons makes a similar comparison concerning the role of Elsdon Best, who decided on the 'accuracy' of information he recorded for the Urewera Commission from 1897 to 1903, while also deciding which Tuhoe traditions he regarded as 'genuine' for inclusion in his book Tuhoe. See J. Sissons, Te Waimana: The Spring of Mana: Tuhoe History and the Colonial Encounter, Dunedin, 1991, pp. 20-1.
and Best were major participants, centred around the scholarly networks of the Polynesian Society. While Wilson was not a member of this group his work was read with interest by Smith and Best as they attempted to answer the questions surrounding the identity of the 'tangata whenua'. Gudgeon was prominent in Polynesian Society circles and was regarded by Smith as one of the only people, other than Best and himself, who had the knowledge and skill to tackle the questions surrounding the identity and story of the pre-Fleet 'tangata whenua' and of such ancient figures as Toite-hua-tahi. It is with these considerations in mind that this chapter will examine the respective works of Wilson and Gudgeon on 'tangata whenua' populations in New Zealand.

### J. A. Wilson and the Idea of the 'Maui Maori Nation'.

John Alexander Wilson (1829-1909) arrived in New Zealand with his missionary parents in 1833. He became a speaker of te reo Maori during his early life in Northland and Tauranga. Wilson spent some time farming in the 1850s and served in the wars of the 1860s. He acted as special commissioner for confiscated land in the Eastern Bay of Plenty following the Government invasion of the area in 1866. He then became a land purchase officer for the East Coast and Bay of Plenty. All of these activities involved considerable interaction with Maori. In 1878 Wilson was appointed a Judge of the Native Land Court, based in Tauranga. He lost this position due to conflict with the Chief Judge F. D. Fenton, in 1880, but was reappointed in 1886. Wilson served as a Land Court Judge from 1886 until 1891, and again from 1895 to 1901. It was during this time that he acquired much of the information on which he based his *Sketches of Ancient Maori Life and History*. In this work he set out his views on the early tangata whenua population and on the waka migrations. Wilson claimed that all of his information was from Maori sources, except for material he had obtained from his father, who had collected material from Maori in the 1830s and 40s. It is significant that J. A. Wilson did not name any of his Maori sources.

Wilson believed there had been several different peoples in New Zealand before Pakeha arrival. The most recently arrived of these peoples were what he called the 'Hawaiki Maori', coming on the waka 'Matawhaorua (which returned to Hawaiki), Arawa, Tainui, Mataatua, Takitumu, Kurahaupo, Aotea, Tokomaru, Mahuhu, Pungarangi,
Rangimatoru, and Whatu Ranganuku. He was convinced that before the Hawaiki Maori, two other peoples had lived in New Zealand. One of these peoples was the 'Urukehu, or white New Zealanders with red hair'. Apart from asserting that these people had been driven out of the country by the Hawaiki Maori, Wilson had little more to say about them.9

According to Wilson's theories another earlier people had lived in Aotearoa, a people he referred to as the 'Maui Maori nation'. Wilson wrote that Maui and his three sons had fished up 'Te Ika a Maui (Maui's fish), or Ehinomaui (fished up by Maui)'. Maui's canoe was grounded on top of Hikurangi Mountain, where it was turned to stone. Maui himself returned to his homeland, but his sons remained behind and their descendants populated the country. Wilson did not explain where the women came from to help Maui's sons in their populating mission. Wilson believed that when the fourteenth century Hawaiki waka arrived, they found the Maui nation had occupied most of Te Ika a Maui.10

Wilson saw the Maui people as having been hunter-gatherers with no agriculture other than growing the hue gourd for the making of calabashes. He believed they lived by gathering berries and fern root; by hunting moa, kakapo, kaka, and kereru (pigeons); and by fishing in rivers, swamps and at sea. According to Wilson, the Hawaiki Maori had introduced the aue (tapa cloth tree), taro, kumara, karaka berries, and kiore (rats) all of which were unknown to the Maui people.11

Wilson clearly saw this early people as Polynesian, referring to them as 'Maui Maori' and stating that they spoke the Maori language.12 He described some of the Maui tribes as warlike: 'In war the aboriginal Maori was courageous. He is described as tall, spare and active, and with a good reach in the delivery of his weapon...'.13 According to Wilson, the fortified pa was an invention of the Maui Maori and appeared to predate the arrival of the Hawaiki Maori. He suggested that the various hapu of the Maui people fought amongst themselves before the arrival of the Hawaiki waka. While Wilson saw the Maui people as warriors, he believed that both cannibalism and human sacrifices were introduced by the Hawaiki immigrants.14

---

8 Ibid., p. 171.
9 Ibid., p. ix. It is interesting to note that in the Otago University library copy of this book a note can be found on p. ix, in a hand resembling that of T. M. Hocken, saying, 'Bosh. never was an Urukehu people in NZ'.
10 Ibid., pp. 126-7.
11 Ibid., pp. 127-8.
12 Ibid, p. 128.
13 Ibid, p. 129.
14 Ibid, p. 130.
Wilson thought that many modern tribes traced ancestry back to the Maui nation. He maintained that these tribes had preserved whakapapa which traced their tupuna back for over one thousand years, containing twice the number of generations as recorded on the whakapapa of the Hawaiki immigrants. Wilson was of the opinion that some of the Maui tribes remained intact after the arrival of the Hawaiki people, while others were absorbed into the tribes of the newcomers. He believed that the Maui people had adopted agriculture from the Hawaiki people, while the immigrants learned the uses of flax from the aborigines. 

Wilson saw the waka migration as a result of strife in Hawaiki, due to population increase putting too much pressure on land. The migrants left on a fleet of twelve canoes which came to Aotearoa on a navigated voyage. Wilson believed that when the Hawaiki immigrants first arrived they were welcomed by the Maui people and intermarried with them. Then after about two hundred years the new arrivals had become strong enough to attack the aborigines. In some places the Maui people were destroyed or forced out, but in other areas peace was maintained and the two peoples became completely intermixed. Wilson held that, 'There is no doubt that the manners, customs, religion, polity, and the arts of the two peoples have been fused by time and habit into the civilisation belonging to one nation now...'.

Wilson believed that as the Hawaiki Maori had developed agriculture and such 'personal qualities such as tact and address, skill at sea, and a knowledge of war on shore', they were therefore superior to the Maui Maori. Despite this belief he portrayed the Maui people as brave warriors, who showed intelligence and innovation in their inventing of the fortified pa. He did not believe that the Hawaiki people were always victorious in their struggles with the Maui Maori. Wilson related that Ngai te rangi (which he wrote as 'Ngaeterangi'), largely descended, he believed, from a Maui nation originally known as Te Rangihouhiri, defeated Hawaiki Maori from Te Arawa, Takitimu, and Tainui, and took control of the Maketu and Tauranga areas. He also held that despite their inferiority in most fields the religious ideas of the Maui people were far more sophisticated than those of the Hawaikians. Wilson considered that the Maui people believed in 'a Divine Incarnation' which manifested its power in the world, whereas the Hawaiki people he saw as mere idolaters.

---

16Ibid., pp. 159-60.
17Ibid, p. 131.
18Ibid., p. 148.
19Ibid., pp. 129-30, 139-40.
20Ibid, pp. 130-1.
Despite acknowledging what he saw as the finer qualities of the Maui peoples, Wilson held that modern Maori tended to be more proud of and place greater emphasis on their descent from the Hawaiki migrants. As a result he believed that much of the history of the Maui peoples had been lost due to being held in lower regard by those people of mixed Maui and Hawaiki descent. Wilson wrote, 'Not that I ever found a native ashamed of an aboriginal connection; far from it, but his other side seems always to be more present to him, more engrained... in his being and memory.'

Wilson wrote that only once did he find an iwi who were prepared to emphasise and take great pride in their connections with the ancient peoples and use this as a basis for land claims. These people were the Uepohatu or Iwi Pohatu a Maui, whose chief, Wi Tahata, claimed that he and his people were descended from Maui himself through 38 generations. Wi Tahata based all of Uepohatu's land claims on this and offered to take Wilson up to the top of Hikurangi to show him the petrified waka of Maui.

Wilson did not give any definite idea of where he believed the Maui nation came from. He saw it as obvious from philological and traditional evidence that the Maui and Hawaiki peoples had a common origin, but did not appear to believe the Maui people had come on canoes from Hawaiki. Wilson argued that if that had been the case they should have had knowledge of agriculture. He suggested that it was possible that both peoples had originated in New Zealand itself. The Hawaiki people had then voyaged in the distant past northward into the eastern Pacific. Wilson believed that the Hawaiki voyagers had prior knowledge of the location of New Zealand, which therefore explained how they were able to find the islands with such accuracy.

Wilson outlined stories of Kupe and Toi, to illustrate the fact that traditions told of exploratory voyages to New Zealand before the major Hawaiki migration. Wilson's account of Kupe was very similar to that later presented in the orthodox early twentieth century Moriori Myth. He set out what he said was a Ngāti Awa version of Kupe's voyage. In this version Kupe visited New Zealand from Hawaiki, in his waka Matawhaorua and travelled around Te Ika a Maui. He then returned to Hawaiki and reported on what he had seen. Wilson's version of the Toi story had little in common with the version in the later orthodox Myth. In Wilson's version Toi was one of the tangata whenua. Three men from Hawaiki, Tautaka, Hoaki, and Maku, were shipwrecked near the Whakatane river. There they were found by the daughter of Toi. The three men introduced Toi's people to the use of a new food the kumara. A waka was

---

21Ibid., p. 148.
23Ibid., pp. 159-62.
built in which Tautaka and Maku went back to Hawaiki along with some of Toi's people, promising to return with kumara. Hoaki was left behind as a hostage, but as the waka never returned he was killed. Toi left his pa at Kapu and settled at Ohiwa, where he was living when the Mataatua waka landed at Whakatane.24

Wilson contradicted this story when, in a different part of his book, he stated that Toi lived 200 years before the Hawaiki migration. He noted that there were two different men by the name cf Toi. One was a resident of Hawaiki about 400 years before the migration; the other a member of the Maui nation, the ancestor of a group of tribes near Whakatane.25 Wilson calculated dates by counting the number of generations mentioned in whakapapa, a common technique among Pakeha ethnologists. He used a standard system of thirty years for a generation, but admitted that this was an arbitrary figure. From this system Wilson calculated that the 'fleet' arrived in New Zealand around 1290 A.D.26

Wilson's attempts to define specific dates for events illustrate his broader attempts to systematise Maori history. He appears to have believed that by comparing a wide range of contradictory traditional stories it was possible to work out the exact events of the past. According to Wilson, those iwi or hapu with more comprehensive oral traditions were able to give reliable histories of other iwi or hapu with less comprehensive traditions. In some cases Wilson would accept a story one people told about another peoples' history, despite the fact that the people concerned had never before heard of the story told about them. For example, Wilson maintained that the Ngaitai, of the Bay of Plenty, had no idea of how they were connected to the Hawaiki waka migrants. He was prepared to believe a story from non-Ngaitai, Tainui sources, that stated that Ngaitai were of mixed Maui and Hawaiki descent; partly through Torere, a woman from the Tainui waka. This was a story Ngaitai themselves were unfamiliar with. Wilson was prepared to believe that Tainui experts knew more about Ngaitai than Ngaitai knew about themselves.27

Wilson based his model of the Maori past entirely on his own interpretation of Maori tradition. He appears to have taken no account of any archaeological or physical evidence. Wilson seems to have regarded the waka migration accounts as historically

24 Ibid., pp. 162-4, 178.
25 Ibid., pp. 142-3. Wilson's idea of the two different Tois compares well with Simmons' conclusion that tradition shows two different Tois. Traditions among the Bay of Plenty tribes, such as Ngati Awa and Tuhoe, describe an ancestor known as Toi kai rakau or Toi te huatahi who was born in Aotearoa. Arawa traditions speak of a Toi te huatahi born in Hawaiki, who was a contemporary of the Arawa canoe, but who never came out to New Zealand. See Simmons, Great NZ Myth, pp. 63-100.
27 Ibid., pp. 146-9.
accurate, once they had been stripped of their more magical elements. He went as far as to believe it was possible to work out from the waka stories the exact time of year in which the migration took place.\textsuperscript{28} Wilson maintained that all tribes who could trace descent back to a waka, other than that of Maui, had ancestors who had been part of the fleet migration from Hawaiki. He also recognised that some tribes could not trace descent to a Hawaiki waka, or could only trace very obscure connections to them. There were also some tribes who traced descent to obviously mythical waka such as that of Maui. Wilson held that all such peoples were descended from the Maui nation. He had thereby effectively created a model of Maori descent into which he could conveniently and arbitrarily fit any hapu or iwi. As Wilson did not give the names of his informants it is not possible to decipher why he accepted the idea of a fleet as opposed to individual voyaging. Nor can we tell why he believed that the twelve waka he named were the ones that made up the fleet.\textsuperscript{29}

Wilson's idea was that the Maui Maori were essentially of a very similar culture, language and appearance to the Hawaiki Maori. He gave no clear idea as to how he believed the Maui people came to New Zealand, repeating the Uepohatu story of Maui's waka, but not indicating whether he saw it as semi-historical or completely mythical.\textsuperscript{30} He may even have thought that the Maui people came from New Zealand originally. He believed that the Hawaiki people came from the same origins as the Maui people and may have spread into the Pacific from New Zealand originally. In the process the Hawaiki Maori acquired a more sophisticated culture that included agriculture. Many generations later some of the Hawaiki people, under pressure from population growth and strife over land, made a navigated migration to Aotearoa in a fleet of waka. Wilson believed that several exploratory voyages had been made before this, but he suggested that the likelihood that the Hawaiki people originated in New Zealand explained how they were able to navigate there.\textsuperscript{31}

Wilson believed that the Hawaiki people at first settled in the less populated areas of New Zealand and generally avoided conflict with the aboriginal Maui people. He held that at first the two groups often intermarried and learned skills from each other, which lead to the Maui people adopting agriculture from the Hawaikians.\textsuperscript{32} Wilson was convinced that as the Hawaiki people grew in strength they had begun to make attacks on the Maui nations. He believed that Hawaiki people were generally superior in war to the Maui people. Therefore the Hawaiki people usually destroyed, absorbed, or drove

\textsuperscript{28}\textit{Ibid}, pp. 166-7.
\textsuperscript{29}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 133-57, 171.
\textsuperscript{30}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 125-7.
\textsuperscript{31}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 159-162.
away the Maui nations. In some areas there was little or no conflict and the two groups intermixed. In a few cases such as that of Uepohatu, the Maui people held their lands intact. In an even rarer case the Maui people, Ngati Rangihouhiri, who became the Ngai Te Rangi, defeated the Hawaiki peoples and took land from them. Wilson believed the events of the past resulted in a variety of descent patterns around the country, with some areas having Maori of pure Hawaiki descent, some areas having a mixed population, and in a few areas people who were of pure Maui descent.  

According to Wilson, Maori nearly always emphasised their descent from the Hawaiki migrants rather than from the aboriginal peoples. Wilson does not appear to have considered that this emphasis may have been a result of speakers framing their information in order to achieve success in Native Land Court hearings. Wilson, like many Native Land Court Judges, tended to give much greater credence to claims made through lines of descent traced to the well known waka such as Tainui, Te Arawa, and Mataatua. Land claimants, being aware of this often emphasised such ancestry. Furthermore, Judges such as Wilson tended to believe that later arriving groups were in general superior to earlier groups and would therefore tend to defeat them. Wilson seems to have followed a model of hapu and iwi structure that portrayed smaller, older hapu being generally either exterminated or absorbed by newer, conquering groups. As a Judge he therefore dismissed the claims of the Whatumamoa to rights to inland Patea, as they, a group he believed were 'Maui Maori', claimed to have defeated the 'Hawaiki Maori' Ngati Tamakopiri. Wilson could not believe that 'a considerable body of the Maori race could be conquered and permanently displaced by autochthones'.

Wilson did not accept the views of writers such as Colenso, who held that traditions were largely allegorical and not believed literally by Maori themselves. Instead Wilson gave a great deal of authority to much of the oral material he collected, especially that recorded from the Native Land Court. Yet, according to Elsdon Best,  

33Ibid., pp. 138-142, 147-9, 150-5. Wilson believed that 'Ehinomaui', a name for the North Island which referred to it as the thing fished up by Maui, was an old Maui nation term. 'Aotearoa', on the other hand, was, he believed, a name from the Hawaiki immigrants. He interpreted this as meaning 'Long White World', a title given from sailing down the east coast and observing the coastline with the summer sun on it. Wilson maintained that the tribes at Tokomaru, who told Cook of the name 'Ehinomaui', must have been of Maui nation descent, see ibid., pp. 153-4.  

34Ballara, Iwi, p. 92. Another illustration of how Wilson's views on conquest and extinction distorted his views of reality is the case of Ngai Te Rangi and Pirirakau. Wilson believed that Pirirakau were a remnant group who survived Ngai Te Rangi conquest only by hiding in the bush. He therefore saw them as vassals of Ngai Te Rangi, a view shared by such Government officials as H. T. Clarke, Civil Commissioner at Tauranga in the 1860s. That Pirirakau did not see themselves as vassals is illustrated by their armed resistance to Government efforts to confiscate Pirirakau land. This attempt at confiscation resulted from an agreement the colonial Government made with rangatira of Ngai Te Rangi, following the 1864 fighting near Tauranga. Pirirakau clearly did not accept the authority of the Ngai Te Rangi chiefs to make such an agreement. See E. Stokes, 'Pai Marire and Raupatu at Tauranga, 1864-7', NZH, 31, 1, 1997, pp. 58-83.  

35W. Colenso, 'On the Maori Races of New Zealand... ', TNZI, 1, 1869, p. 59.
many Maori regarded his writings as based on totally unreliable information. Best wrote to Stephenson Percy Smith from the Urewera country, 'Many thanks for Wilson's book which... is the very thing I want, though these people condemn many of his notes and say that they were only Land Court items- i.e. made up for the occasion'.

It appears that Wilson's model of pre-contract history was largely a product of the way he interpreted the oral tradition he had collected. Much of that material was in turn the product of Land Court hearings, where stories were often tailored for that particular forum, rather than being an accurate reflection of older traditions. Once Wilson had accepted the idea of a fleet of canoes from Hawaiki, he saw any hapu or iwi claiming descent from those waka as being of superior Hawaiki stock. Any group not claiming such ancestry, or any group unable to effectively demonstrate such descent, were supposedly part of the more primitive Maui nation. As Wilson did not name his sources it is difficult to work out on whose accounts he based his ideas of the fleet migration and his descriptions of the earlier people. It is clear that his model was a product of the process of trying to work out one coherent linear historical narrative with clear historical dates. Wilson was trying to compile this from a variety of disparate stories that did not fit into a clear linear sequence.

Wilson's accounts of Kupe and of the fleet were very similar to those in 'The Great New Zealand Myth' as set out by Simmons. In contrast, Wilson's account of two separate Tois, one in Hawaiki and one in the Bay of Plenty, was totally different from the account in the Myth. Wilson's version of early history totally accepted the idea of an earlier, more primitive people. But Wilson saw the earlier people, the 'Maui nation', as being a people of a similar race to the Hawaiki immigrants. He believed the two peoples were of a common origin, sharing language and many other cultural features. This view differed from an essential aspect of the early twentieth century Moriori Myth, which was to hold that the earlier people were a distinct race from the later East Polynesian immigrants.

Walter Edward Gudgeon: Racial Hierarchies and Waves of Migration.
Walter Edward Gudgeon (1841-1920) was born in London, and came out to New Zealand with his family in 1850. The Gudgeon family settled in New Plymouth, where Gudgeon left school at the age of eleven to begin work on the family farm. He spent the rest of his life educating himself through reading. In 1865, after managing a farm in the Wanganui area, Gudgeon joined the Wanganui bushrangers and was then made second in command of the Wanganui Native Contingent, under Thomas MacDonnell. He was

37E. Best to S. P. Smith, undated 1890s, E. Best Papers, MS-Papers- 0072-08, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
involved in campaigns at Opotiki and southern Taranaki, followed by a stint with the Armed Constabulary in the campaigns against Titokowaru and Te Kooti. Gudgeon's service in the Native Contingent would have encouraged his interest in Maori language and culture. In the 1870s Gudgeon was mostly stationed in the Poverty Bay area, road building with the Armed Constabulary and later acting as a Resident Magistrate. It was during this time that he met and married Edith Maria Best, the sister of the ethnologist Elsdon Best. Edith unfortunately died of tuberculosis in 1879, leaving three surviving children. Gudgeon maintained a friendship and correspondence with Elsdon Best from the 1870s onwards.  

Gudgeon went on to serve in the invasion of Parihaka in 1880 and was then made commissioner of the Police. In 1890 Gudgeon, who was a competent speaker of te reo Maori, was appointed a Judge of the Native Land Court. This enabled him to collect a great deal of information on Maori traditions. Gudgeon went on to be involved in the New Zealand annexation of the Cook Islands, in 1901. Gudgeon ended up as the de facto ruler of the New Zealand colony. He administered the Cook’s with the aim of establishing a settler-controlled society, with the Cook Island Maori reduced to the position of plantation labourers. Believing that the Cook Island Maori were inevitably dying out, Gudgeon took little action to guarantee their welfare or improve their situation. He had to be forcibly retired by Joseph Ward in 1909.  

In 1892, Gudgeon was a founding member of the Polynesian Society. It was mainly in the pages of the Journal of the Polynesian Society that Gudgeon aired his views on the history of Maori migration to New Zealand. Although his writings were sometimes contradictory, a theory of early settlement patterns can be deciphered from them. Like Wilson, and many other Pakeha writers, Gudgeon was convinced that Maori had arrived in New Zealand from Hawaiki in a fleet of canoes. Gudgeon referred to this as 'the Arawa migration'. He acknowledged that many Pakeha with knowledge of Maori matters believed that New Zealand had been empty of inhabitants when the Hawaiki migrants arrived. He also accepted that Maori authorities themselves often denied the existence of any earlier peoples. Despite this he believed Maori had sometimes denied or ignored the existence of earlier peoples, because ancestry was always traced to the 'superior' Hawaiki immigrants. Mana was inherited from the immigrants rather than from the lowly tangata whenua. Gudgeon illustrated this with a Tuhoe whakatauki,

39Ibid., pp. 182-3.
"No Toi raua ko Potiki te whenua; no Tuhoe te mana te rangatiratanga". "Our right to the land is derived from Toi and Potiki; our power and prestige from Tuhoe". Gudgeon believed that Toi and Potiki were both of earlier tangata whenua peoples, while Tuhoe was the great grandson of Toroa, rangatira of the Mataatua 'fleets' canoe.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 208-9. In examining Gudgeon's ideas on pre-Maori populations I was greatly assisted by consulting the sections on Gudgeon in Chapter 4 of Geiringer, 'Ko te Heke ra o Maruiwi: Theories of Dual Settlement in New Zealand'.}

Gudgeon had to explain the failure of Pakeha scholars to detect signs of an earlier people. He contended that Pakeha only ever knew fragments of Maori tradition. Gudgeon maintained that the 'real' history of the Maori was held in the karakia of the old priesthood, which in turn could only be learned in the sacred confines of the Wharekura or school of learning, where they had been passed on unchanged for generations. Then during the period of 'missionary dominance', from 1840 to 1860, much of the ritual and knowledge of history was suppressed and lost. Gudgeon was convinced that now even Maori experts did not have complete knowledge of their own traditions and often made up material to suit Pakeha audiences.\footnote{W. E. Gudgeon, 'Nga Tangata Maori', Pt. 11, MR, 2, 9, 1890, pp. 532-3.}

Gudgeon also believed that most Pakeha did not have an extensive enough knowledge of the Maori language to properly study Maori history. He felt that Maori were generally reluctant to give much information to Pakeha, as a result of the touchy pride and fear of ridicule he believed to be common to all Polynesians. Gudgeon specifically criticised A. S. Thomson's book, The Story of New Zealand, as being, 'valueless as a history of the Maori', especially as Thomson dismissed the idea of a pre-Maori population.\footnote{W. E. Gudgeon, 'The Whence of the Maori', Pt. 1, JPS, 11, 43, 1902, p. 188.} Gudgeon was also critical of most of the material collected by John White. Gudgeon believed that much of this information had been obtained from ignorant young men who had written down material they claimed was from the elders, but that in fact was not authentic. He did not believe these young men had the authority to persuade the old experts to allow their words to be written down.\footnote{W. E. Gudgeon, 'The Whence of the Maori', Pt. 2, JPS, 11, 44, 1902, p. 247.}

Gudgeon admitted that there was little reliable evidence proving the existence of the earlier 'tangata whenua', but believed that the evidence that did exist was incontrovertible.\footnote{W. E. Gudgeon, 'The Maori Tribes of the East Coast', Pt. 4, JPS, 5, 17, 1896, pp. 3-4.} Gudgeon based his ideas mainly on information he had gathered among the Bay of Plenty and East Coast tribes. He believed these tribes had a larger proportion of 'tangata whenua' ancestry than that found in any other area. Gudgeon developed his ideas largely from the evidence of selected oral traditions but also had

\footnote{W. E. Gudgeon, 'The Whence of the Maori', Pt. 4, JPS, 12, 47, 1903, p. 175-6.}
some arguments based on physical evidence. He mentioned how Maori had huge respect for the physical remains of their own tupuna and regarded them as highly tapu objects. Yet many tribes also knew of burial caves full of the bones of people from tribes which had formerly inhabited their districts. These remains were not treated as in any way tapu. Gudgeon believed that these bones did not simply belong to people from other tribes, but to people of a totally different race. He claimed that Taneti, a rangatira of Kawhia, had told Alfred Preece of bones that were from an earlier, non-Maori people. He also believed that the bones were larger than the average Maori skeleton.47

Gudgeon suggested that the unique Maori styles of carving and moko had originated in New Zealand. He did not believe the people of the Hawaiki migration had been here long enough to develop these styles. Therefore he argued that they must have been developed by an earlier people and adopted by the Hawaiki immigrants.48 Gudgeon also mentioned cases where Maori attributed traces of previous cultivations and artefacts of unknown origin to earlier peoples such as the tribes connected with Toi.49 He believed that Haast's 'moa-hunters' were in fact these earlier people. Gudgeon maintained that Maori tradition did not contain enough information on the moa to indicate any contact between Maori and moa. Instead he believed it was probably the earlier people who had killed off the moa before the arrival of the fleet. Any surviving moa traditions had been passed down to the Maori from the earlier people.50 In one of his later writings Gudgeon also argued that New Zealand, like any large land mass, had an indigenous population from the beginning. Gudgeon expressed, however, a contradictory and sometimes confusing range of views on who he believed the indigenous people to be and on how they came to be in New Zealand.51

Gudgeon set out to create a coherent vision of the Maori past from a variety of traditions. He was aware that there were many contradictory stories regarding earlier peoples. He argued that the earlier people were often not acknowledged because they were inferior people, not worth citing in whakapapa. Gudgeon referred to the story, recorded by Grey, concerning Manaia from the Tokomaru waka, who killed the indigenous people of Waitara. Gudgeon maintained that the Tokomaru was part of the fleet of waka from Hawaiki and that the Waitara 'tangata whenua' were, 'autochthones, or at any rate a very ancient migration of the Polynesians, of whom the Tokomaru canoe had no knowledge or record'. Gudgeon held that the Maori term describing the

48Gudgeon, 'Nga Tangata Maori', Pt. 11, MR, 2, 9, 1890, p. 525.
Gudgeon, 'Whence of the Maori', Pt 4, p. 178.
49Gudgeon, 'Nga Tangata Maori', Pt. 11, MR, 2, 8, 1890, p. 481.
Gudgeon, 'Nga Tangata Maori', Pt. 11, MR, 2, 9, 1890, p. 525.
50Gudgeon, 'Whence of the Maori', Pt 4, pp. 175-6.
51Ibid., pp. 176-7.
indigenous people, 'ko nga tangata whenua ake o tenei motu...' (translated by Grey as 'The Native inhabitants of these islands...'), definitely indicated that the Maori saw the earlier people as being different from themselves.\(^\text{52}\)

Gudgeon offered further proof of the existence of earlier people from the stories of Tamatea and his son Kahungunu travelling around the central and eastern North Island. The two men constantly encountering established tribes. He argued that Tamatea had arrived on the Takitimu (which Gudgeon usually wrote as 'Takitumu'), and that all the other Hawaiki Maori arrived at about the same time on a fleet of six canoes. Therefore he argued that the already established tribes must have been of a different people. Gudgeon backed up this idea by pointing out that Kahungunu was reported in tradition to have watched the behaviour of the Mahia Peninsula people with interest, 'thus plainly showing that by him they were regarded as a strange and alien people'.\(^\text{53}\) Gudgeon made particular mention of the Whatumamoa and Ngaitai peoples, who Wilson had also regarded as tangata whenua groups.\(^\text{54}\)

Gudgeon saw Toi as being a rangatira of the tangata whenua on the East Coast and mentioned that he appeared in the traditions of all the Bay of Plenty tribes.\(^\text{55}\) He related two different stories of Toi and the introduction of the kumara. In a version that Gudgeon said was from a branch of Ngati Awa, Hoake and Taukata arrived at Whakatane on a piece of pumice and showed kumara to Toi's people who only knew of uncultivated plant food. Taukata built a canoe, *Te Aratawhao*, which returned to Hawaiki under the command of Tama ki Hikurangi, in order to bring the kumara to Aotearoa. On their return Taukata was killed, as a sacrifice to ensure that the kumara would grow. Gudgeon stated that Ngati Awa believed that the *Aratawhao* brought back a fleet of ten canoes; 'Mata-atua, Takitumu, Nukutere, Te Arawa, Rangi-matoru, Turereao, Tokomaru, Kura-haupo, Tainui, and Tauira...'.\(^\text{56}\) In the version Gudgeon claimed came from Ngati Porou, it was Kahukura, who was supposedly a god, and Rongoiame who showed the kumara to Toi. Toi's canoe, the *Horouta*, was taken by Tama ki Hikurangi to Hawaiki to bring back the kumara. In a later version of this same

---


\(^{55}\) Gudgeon names the 'Te Tururu-mauku, Te Ma-rangaranga, Te Raupo-ngaoheoehe, Te Tini-o-te-tuoi, Te Tini-o-te-Makahua, and Te Kokomuka-tutara-whare' as tribes acknowledging the authority of Toi, see Gudgeon, 'The Whence of the Maori', Pt. 4, p. 170.

\(^{56}\) *ibid.*, pp. 169-70.
story, Gudgeon said that Kahukura and Rongoiamo came to New Zealand on a rainbow.\textsuperscript{57}

**Gudgeon's ideas of the Nature of the Earlier Peoples**

Having established that Gudgeon believed that both tradition and physical evidence indicated the existence of earlier peoples, we must now consider Gudgeon's ideas on who the earlier peoples were and on how they came to be in New Zealand. This is not necessarily a simple task. Gudgeon's writings cover a fourteen year period and contain contradictory statements, along with confusing terminology. He appears to have believed that the very first inhabitants of New Zealand were quite different from the Maori. In 1890 he mentioned a Nga Puhi tradition that the original inhabitants of the country were the 'Turehu'. They were displaced by a people whom Gudgeon referred to as 'Moriori'. The Moriori were in turn replaced by the Maori.\textsuperscript{58} Gudgeon mentioned that southern tribes had stories of the Turehu as fairies and described them as Urukehu, having red hair.\textsuperscript{59} In 1903 Gudgeon developed this story further saying that the Nga Puhi held that the 'Kui' were in fact the first people of Te Ika a Maui, the North Island. They were displaced by the 'Tutu-maiao', then came the 'Turehu', who were finally displaced by the Maori.\textsuperscript{60}

Gudgeon wrote that Tamatea, ancestor of the Ngai Tamatea of Mangonui, was descended from the Turehu on his mother's side. He also related the Hokianga legend of the Parau, a Turehu mountain people from whom the Maori were supposed to have learned the art of making fishing nets.\textsuperscript{61} He mentioned South Island traditions that the original inhabitants were the 'Kahui Tipua (herd of demons) who were giants and man eaters'. These were displaced by the 'Rapuwai', who were in turn exterminated by the 'Waitaha'. He maintained that the ancient Waitaha no longer existed and were unconnected with the 'Wai-taha' of the Bay of Plenty, who were from the Arawa migration. Gudgeon wrote:

> It seems probable that the tradition to which I referred, relates to the former existence of a race of men distinct from the Maori, and hence the tales about the Waero or Mohoao (bush people) whom the Maoris believe to have existed almost to the time of the Pakeha.\textsuperscript{62}

Gudgeon, 'Maori Tradition as to the *Kumara* (*Convolvulus batatus*)', *JPS*, 2, 1893, pp. 100-2.
Gudgeon, 'Whence of the Maori', Pt. 4, pp. 170-1.

\textsuperscript{58}Gudgeon, 'Nga Tangata Maori', Pt. 11, *MR*, 2, 9, 1890, p. 517-8.

\textsuperscript{59}Ibid., *Whence of the Maori*, Pt 4, p. 177.

\textsuperscript{60}Ibid., pp. 176-7.

\textsuperscript{61}Gudgeon, 'Nga Tangata Maori', Pt. 11, *MR*, 2, 9, 1890, p. 518.
Gudgeon, 'Whence of the Maori', Pt 4, p. 177-8.

\textsuperscript{62}Ibid., p. 178.
Gudgeon thus believed that stories referring to supernatural beings were in fact describing the existence of an earlier people, who were racially distinct from Maori. He seems to have been somewhat ambiguous in his attitude to this earlier Turehu people. On several different occasions he stated that the pale, red-haired Maori known as Urukehu, were descended from the Turehu, being, 'not a freak of nature, but a reversion to some ancestral type...'.\(^{63}\) He believed that those Maori descended from these pale types were usually found among the 'highest type' of Maori, and were supposedly possessed of great physical courage and martial ability, qualities admired both by the Maori in general and by Gudgeon in particular. Gudgeon's attitudes to warfare and racial superiority come through in one of his statement's concerning the Urukehu: 'It was supposed that the Urukehu was superior as a fighting man to all other types, and if this be so, his superiority in all things can be assumed...'.\(^{64}\) It seems quite possible that Gudgeon, having decided that one branch of the ancestors of the Maori closely resembled the European, therefore regarded that branch as the repository of all the best qualities in the Maori. It is interesting to compare his attitudes to the ideas of scholars such as Blumenbach, who held that whites, especially white males, represented the ideal, original human type. The closer a group resembled the whites, the higher that group would be on the scale of things.\(^{65}\)

Gudgeon asserted that superiority in warfare indicated superiority in all things and suggested that the warrior Urukehu were a superior people, due to their skills as warriors. At the same time he described the Turehu, the supposed ancestors of the Urukehu, as an inferior group. In Gudgeon's view the Turehu were inferior to their conquerors, as each conquering wave of people was superior to the last. He thought that each group of new arrivals defeated and either absorbed or destroyed the previous inhabitants, sure proof of the racial superiority of the immigrants. The people who displaced the Turehu were a people of Polynesian language and culture. Gudgeon referred to them variously as 'Moirori', or 'Maioiri'. These Maiiori were the 'tangata whenua' that the Arawa migrants encountered when they arrived in New Zealand. Gudgeon seems to have thought that the Maiiori, while superior to the Turehu, were inferior to the Maori of the fleet.\(^{66}\)

\(^{63}\)Gudgeon, 'Maori Tribes of the East Coast', Pt. 1, p. 209. See also, Gudgeon, 'Whence of the Maori', Pt. 4, p. 177.

\(^{64}\)Ibid. It should be noted that Gudgeon gives no names of Maori informants who actually believed that the Turehu were a race of people rather than supernatural beings. Nor does he give the source of a story demonstrating the superiority of the Urukehu, where a chief of the Ngati Rereahu led a force of 150 Urukehu armed with spears to victory over a party of Nga Puhi armed with muskets. See Ibid. and Gudgeon, 'Maori Tribes of the East Coast', Pt. 1, p. 209-10.

\(^{65}\)Young, *Colonial Desire*, pp. 64-5.


\(^{66}\)Gudgeon, 'Maori Tribes of the East Coast', Pt. 1, p. 209.

'Moriori' and 'Maori': Waves of Polynesian Settlement

Gudgeon believed the Polynesians could be divided into three groupings: the 'Mahori', the 'Moriori', and the 'Maori'. He had no more to say on the Mahori, but believed that both the 'Moriori' and the Maori ended up in New Zealand. Gudgeon's views on why the 'Moriori' were inferior to the Maori illustrate his views on miscegenation, racial hierarchy, and on martial ability as an indicator of racial superiority. He considered that the Polynesians were naturally warlike, but that the Moriori had mixed with the earlier, inferior Turehu. This interbreeding had in turn led to the degeneration of the Moriori. Gudgeon wrote: 'One can hardly suppose that these early migrations from Polynesia could have lost their ancient vigour, except by inter-marriage with some alien and inferior race they probably found in occupation of the country...'. The Moriori thus became 'half-caste Polynesians', inferior to their 'pure bred relatives'. Gudgeon believed a sure sign of the inferiority of the 'tangata whenua' was their lack of 'natural manliness', illustrated by their failure to offer 'natural resistance' to the Maori invaders.

Gudgeon believed that racial mixing had made the 'tangata whenua' more placid and less politically astute than the Arawa invaders. This made it easy for the newcomers to either destroy or dominate them. He gave the example of the Hawaiki immigrant tribe Ngati Maru, who supposedly defeated three 'tangata whenua' tribes (Te Uriopou, Tuhukea, and Ngati Hako), with only 140 of their own warriors. While this story did not prove that the defeated people were non-Polynesian it did show they 'had long been degraded and enervated by peaceful pursuits to such an extent that...they were no match for the warlike Maoris'.

Gudgeon showed his belief in 'tangata whenua' weakness by writing, 'the ancient tribes were men of a milder type than their Polynesian cousins,... there is not one instance on record of them producing a truly great man.' He believed that following defeat those 'tangata whenua' who had impressed the Maori with their warrior abilities would be adopted into the tribe, 'but certainly not as equals', while those without sufficient force of character were enslaved. Gudgeon maintained that lowly victims were often killed as a result of a quarrel between rangatira. Those killed were often slaves who came
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67 Gudgeon, 'Nga Tangata Maori', Pt. 11, MR, 2, 8, 1890, p. 473. It should be noted that when in this section on Gudgeon the term 'Moriori' is used in parentheses it refers to Gudgeon's theoretical 'Moriori', rather than to the Moriori as the indigenous people of the Chathams, unless otherwise indicated.
68 Gudgeon, 'Whence of the Maori', Pt 4, p. 174.
69 Ibid.
70 Gudgeon, 'Tangata Maori'. Pt 11, MR, 2, 9, p. 517.
71 Ibid., p. 525. Gudgeon got this story from John White's writings plus some additional information on the Tahukea from the chief Taipari (whose iwi connections he did not name.)
72 Gudgeon, 'The Maori Tribes of the East Coast', Pt 1, p. 209.
73 Gudgeon, 'Whence of the Maori', Pt. 4, p. 174.
from the defeated 'tangata whenua'. On the other hand the 'fine' women of the conquered people were taken as wives by the victors and their children became members of the dominant tribe. Gudgeon had seen the mixing of 'Moriori' Polynesians with earlier peoples as producing degeneration. In contrast he thought those 'Moriori' who mixed with the Hawaiki migrants produced offspring with the essential courage and cruelty to be great warriors. The earlier people were thus either killed or absorbed into the conqueror's tribes.\textsuperscript{74}

Gudgeon's description of the fate of the 'tangata whenua' people 'Ngaiwi' further illustrated his views on racial hierarchy and conquest. This people, which he claimed included the 'sub-tribes' of 'Ngariki, Ngaoho, and Te Waiohua', were said to have occupied the area from Kaipara down to Hamilton; and from the Waikato River to the East Coast. While people of Arawa and Tainui descent claimed ancestral connections with Ngaiwi, Gudgeon denied the claim that Ngaiwi were from the \textit{Tainui} canoe.\textsuperscript{75} He believed they were an earlier Polynesian group who were 'intellectually and, perhaps, physically inferior...' to the Hawaiki Maori.\textsuperscript{76} As the earlier people lacked mana, courage, character, and knowledge of their ancestors they were easily taken over by the brothers Paoa and Mahuta, from the Arawa migration, who appointed themselves as their leaders.\textsuperscript{77}

Supposedly the Ngaiwi adopted the names and ways of their rulers and disappeared from history. Gudgeon claimed that the Waikato and Ngati Paoa were largely descended from the Ngaiwi, but that all their hapu took their names from descendants of Paoa, Mahuta, or crew members of \textit{Tainui}. His views on race and aristocracy can be seen in his description of Paoa and Mahuta as, 'like our Norman ancestors...true leaders of men'.\textsuperscript{78} The Ngaiwi who did not become absorbed into Arawa or Tainui identities were destroyed in battle. It appears that Gudgeon had also adopted contemporary evolutionary ideas on the struggle for survival and applied them to races of people. His statement on the Ngaiwi illustrates this: 'They were not fitted to cope with the true Maoris, and not being the fittest have not survived'.\textsuperscript{79}

\textsuperscript{74}Ibid., pp. 174-5.
\textsuperscript{76}Ibid., p. 586.
\textsuperscript{77}Gudgeon describes Mahuta and Paoa as 'the two famous \textit{Arawa} brothers...', see \textit{ibid.}, p. 586, but they could as legitimately be described as being of \textit{Tainui}. They were descended from the crew of the \textit{Arawa} waka through their grand father Pikiao, but from the crew of the \textit{Tainui} through their grandmother Rereiao. See L. G. \textit{Kelly}, \textit{Tainui}, Wellington, 1949, pp. 186-7.
\textsuperscript{78}Gudgeon, 'Tangata Maori', Pt. 13, pp. 586-7. The 'leaders of men' quote is from \textit{ibid.}, p. 587.
\textsuperscript{79}Ibid., p. 589.
In contrast, Gudgeon acknowledged that some of the earlier people had survived. He believed that some had survived in name only, while some no longer survived as tribal groups although their whakapapa was still known. Some other early tribal groups continued to exist. Gudgeon mentioned the Pirirakau of Tauranga who he claimed were descended from the 'tangata whenua' Ngamarama; the Ngati Hako of Hauraki who survived despite their defeat by Ngati Paoa, and the Uepohatu of Hikurangi, who traced their ancestry back to Maui Potiki. Gudgeon also mentioned that certain larger tribes acknowledged a very large number of descent lines to 'tangata whenua' tribes. Rongowhakaata, Te Aitanga a Mahaki, Ngai Taï, Ngati Porou, Ngati Awa, and Urewera (Tuhoe) were all able to trace descent lines back to 'tangata whenua' peoples, including Maui potiki himself. Gudgeon believed that Maui potiki was in fact the Polynesian discoverer of New Zealand.80

Gudgeon's description of these peoples contradicts his earlier statements about the weakness of the 'tangata whenua' peoples. He mentioned that the Ngati Hako were described by their enemies the Ngati Maru as 'very strong willed'. The Pirirakau were described as fierce warriors who had defeated the Ngati Haua and had taken part in the Gate Pa battle. Gudgeon argued that this was due to the environments these groups lived in. He suggested that Pirirakau's struggle to survive in the mountainous forests, while harassed by many enemies, had turned them into fierce warriors. Gudgeon believed that the Urewera or Tuhoe, had one of the largest inputs of 'tangata whenua' ancestry, yet also acknowledged their reputation as fierce warriors. This also, he claimed, was the result of life in a harsh environment surrounded by enemies.81

None of this fits in with Gudgeon's arguments that the earlier people were of a milder nature. Gudgeon appears to have often been inconsistent in his arguments. He made many exceptions to his own rules in order to explain things that did not fit into his general arguments. He argued that the fact that Toi did not attack Toroa and the crew of Mataatua proved the general mild nature of the 'tangata whenua'. Yet the fact that Toroa and the Mataatua people did not attack Toi's people was not seen as proof of the mild nature of the Maori in general. Gudgeon had set views on the nature of each of the two groups. Any contradiction to this was simply to be ignored or explained away.82

Gudgeon's various writings present a confusing mass of detail, yet from them a pattern emerges illustrating his views on the early settlement of New Zealand. He appears to

81 Gudgeon, 'Tangata Maori', Pt. 11, MR, 2, 9, 1890, pp. 520, 526-8.  
82 Ibid. Pt. 11, MR, 2, 8, 1890, p. 479.
have believed that the references in traditions to supernatural beings, such as Turehu and Mohoao, were in fact referring to earlier peoples. He believed these people were destroyed by the first Polynesians who arrived in New Zealand, a people whom Gudgeon described as 'Moriori'. Gudgeon also believed that the two peoples intermarried and produced a race of 'half-caste' Polynesians, who were inferior both to their pure Polynesian ancestors, and to the next wave of Polynesian invaders, the Maori. Yet Gudgeon did not consider that racial mixing was intrinsically bad. He believed that mixing with 'inferior' races was detrimental to the 'superior'. Therefore the intermixing of the early Polynesians with the Turehu weakened them as a warrior race. On the other hand the mixing of the Polynesian tangata whenua ancestors of the Urewera and the Ngati Haua iwi with Hawaiki migrants produced strong warlike peoples. Gudgeon believed that characteristics such as courage were inherited biologically. Thus he believed that Ngati Haua, descended in part from the 'tangata whenua' Ngati Ruatipua, must have received their courage and mana from their other ancestors, Turi and Paoa of the Hawaiki migration. To Gudgeon racial mixing might improve or degrade a people, depending on who they mixed with.83

Gudgeon believed in a clear racial hierarchy, expressed above all by skill and success at war. As Geiringer points out, Gudgeon had a circular argument, that victory and conquest showed the victors were a superior race; while superior races were bound to win in combat with inferiors. Both courage and cruelty led to victory and thus were indicators of superiority. On the other hand Gudgeon saw peaceful pursuits as weakening the character of a people as illustrated by the 'Moriori' people in New Zealand.84

Force of character was the factor Gudgeon saw as essential in the domination of one race by another. Thus 'natural leaders of men' such as Paoa and Mahutu were able to impose their will over the weaker Ngaiwi people. The conquered supposedly recognised their own inferiority and 'shrank into an obscurity from which they never emerged.' Those who survived came to identify with their superiors and discard their old ways and identities. This view was very much akin to the idea that 'natives' would become 'civilised' once they recognised the superiority of the coloniser.85

Gudgeon believed that before the main Hawaiki migration various canoes had visited New Zealand and left individuals behind. These individuals came to dominate the

Gudgeon, 'Whence of the Maori', Pt. 4, p. 174.
84 Geiringer, 'Theories of Dual Settlement', p. 93.
85 Gudgeon, 'Tangata Maori', Pt. 11, MR, 2, 10, 1890, p. 587.
'barbarous or simple tribes' they lived amongst, due to having 'perhaps a superior religion or polity'. They therefore became rulers of the inferior groups and came to be identified as the founding ancestors of groups who were mostly descended from 'tangata whenua'. This idea of Gudgeon's reads like the classic colonialist fantasy of the castaway becoming king over the simple savages.86

Gudgeon appears to have seen his vision of waves of increasingly superior conquerors in the same light as he saw the waves of conquering people who were assumed to have swept through Britain. He compared the rangatira families with those in England whose ancestors 'came over with the conqueror'.87 Paoa and Mahuta, 'like our Norman ancestors, were true leaders of men'.88 As with the ideas of the Celtic, Anglo-Saxon, and Norman invasions the theme running through this was that each conquering people was of a superior caste to those before them. The mixing of peoples, in Britain and in New Zealand, sometimes led to the development of even stronger races, as indicated by their abilities in warfare. Those peoples who had been conquered and displaced were proved to be inferior by their lack of warrior qualities. The obvious development out of Gudgeon's ideas was the idea that Pakeha colonisation was in itself the victory of a superior race and the natural way of things. Such ideas fitted well with the Romantic ideas of the sweeping migrations of racial groups, traceable through folklore and language. Gudgeon put a biological evolutionary angle on his ideas by stating that the disappearance of earlier peoples was a natural result of their inability to survive competition with superior groups.89

**Gudgeon and the 'Great New Zealand Myth'**

How did Gudgeon's ideas compare with what was later to be the orthodox version of Maori migration, what Simmons described as the 'Great New Zealand Myth'? In contrast to the Myth, Gudgeon did not believe that Kupe was the discoverer of New Zealand. He acknowledged that some tribes, such as Nga Puhi, maintained that Kupe was the first to come to New Zealand, and mentioned that some tribes held that Kupe had come to an empty land. Gudgeon believed Kupe was in fact contemporary with the Arawa migration and therefore could not have been thediscoverer of Aotearoa. Gudgeon also wrote that the waka *Aratauwhaiti*, and several others had been to New Zealand before Kupe and that Kupe appeared to already know where Aotearoa was. Gudgeon believed Kupe probably came to look for his wife Kura marotini, who had been abducted by his brother Hotu rapa. Gudgeon also wrote that Kupe left some people

86 Gudgeon, 'Maori Migrations to New Zealand', *JPS*, 1, 1892, p. 220.
behind, as the Mua Upoko iwi traced descent from one of his daughters. He believed Kupe may have got the reputation as discoverer due to being the first visitor from his particular island group, which Gudgeon believed was Ra'iatea. Gudgeon also mentioned that some tribes had Ngahue as discoverer, but again he rejected this on the grounds that Ngahue too seemed to know where New Zealand was.  

Gudgeon believed that Maui potiki was in fact the discoverer of New Zealand and that the legend of him fishing up Te Ika a Maui in fact referred to his discovery. He pointed out that Ngati Porou, Ngati Kahungunu, Ngai Tai, Rongowhakaata, Ngati Awa and Tuhoe all could claim descent from Maui Potiki. In most cases this was through Toi kai rakau, although Gudgeon described Ngati Uepohatu as being almost pure descendants from Maui. Gudgeon believed that all these people were Polynesians, as one of the earlier peoples had been Moriori Polynesians. He did not make it clear how the Turehu people were supposed to fit into this scheme of things. It is not obvious whether Gudgeon saw them as autochthonous, 'sprung from the soil', or whether he believed they came in a migration.  

Gudgeon's view of Toi was completely different from the picture of Toi in the orthodox Myth. He saw Toi kai rakau as being a Polynesian of the 'Moriori' wave of settlement who was tangata whenua of the Whakatane area. Gudgeon believed he was a descendant of Maui Potiki and was ancestor of a great many eastern tribes including Ngai te Rangi, Ngati Awa, Ngati Pukeko, Tuhoe, Ngai Tai, Whanau a Apanui, Whakatohea, Ngati Porou, and Rongowhakaata. In one account Gudgeon wrote of Toi's people arriving with Maui Potiki himself. In a contradictory account he mentioned that Tuhoe and Ngati Awa believed that one of Toi's ancestors, Maku, arrived in Aotearoa from Hawaiki, while another, Tiwakawaka, came to Aotearoa from an island called Mataora. Gudgeon repeated stories of Toi acquiring the kumara from Maori visitors from Hawaiki. He maintained that while Toi's people were Polynesians, they were smaller in stature and of a milder nature than the Polynesians of the Hawaiki migration. None of these ideas fitted with the view that Toi was himself one of the Hawaiki migrants, as described in the orthodox early twentieth century myth.
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Gudgeon appears to have fully accepted the idea of a fleet of canoes coming to Aotearoa. However he was well aware that there had in fact been far more canoes than the supposed six of the fleet. In fact he saw the 'fleet' as simply being the migration of the last and most aristocratic group of Polynesians to arrive in New Zealand, the group he referred to as the 'Arawa migration' or the 'true Maori'. It also appears that he was aware that only some traditions referred to a fleet, whereas others had the canoes coming separately. Gudgeon admitted, 'We also know that the Maoris did not all come from the same place, nor at one and the same time'.

Nevertheless Gudgeon admitted to making a rather arbitrary division of Polynesians into pre-fleet 'Moriori' and fleet 'Maori'. As he wrote, 'It will, however, suit my purpose to assume that all the ancestors of the Maoris came at one time...'. In fact Gudgeon appears to have changed his definition of such terms as 'Maori' and 'Polynesian' from article to article. Gudgeon did accept that it was impossible to trace the original Hawaiki to a specific geographical spot. He wrote that each leaving-off place was named Hawaiki, probably after an ancient home in the west.

While Gudgeon used the terms 'Maoriori' and 'Moriori' to describe the first wave of Polynesians in New Zealand, he also acknowledged that the Moriori were the early inhabitants of the Chatham Islands or Rekohu. Gudgeon based his view of the Moriori on information supplied by Alexander Shand. Thus he saw the Rekohu Moriori as a Polynesian people, as was shown by their language, religious ideas and their approach to oral history, tradition and whakapapa. Gudgeon agreed with Shand that the Moriori had migrated to the Chathams from the North Island of New Zealand, and that on arrival at Rekohu they found an indigenous people, probably also Polynesian, already in residence. Gudgeon believed the Moriori were from the first wave of Polynesian settlement of New Zealand, but believed they migrated to the Chathams about 150 years before the arrival of the 'fleet' in New Zealand. He argued that most of the differences between Maori and Rekohu Moriori were the result of the long period of isolation on the Chathams.

Gudgeon did not claim that the Moriori were driven out of New Zealand by the Hawaiki Maori. Despite this, by linking the Rekohu Moriori with the earlier people of Aotearoa, Gudgeon reinforced the idea that both the 'Moriori' of New Zealand and the Moriori of the Chathams were inferior peoples. As Geiringer has pointed out, Gudgeon's use of
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94 Gudgeon, 'Whence of the Maori'. Pt 2, p. 248.
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terminology and descriptions of the earliest peoples was often confusing and sometimes contradictory.\footnote{Geiringer, 'Theories of Dual Settlement', pp. 94-5.} There were times he referred to the first inhabitants as being Polynesians, whereas at other times he said they were non-Polynesian Turehu. He further confused matters by suggesting that some of the people of supposedly ancient lineage such as Ngati Hako and Tuhoe had an 'admixture of Mongol blood', which he thought was obvious from their appearance. He referred to the earlier Polynesians as being milder than the Hawaiki migrants. He then went on to argue that special circumstances explained why iwi with substantial 'tangata whenua' descent lines, such as Pirirakau, Tuhoe and Ngati Haau, were fierce warriors. Gudgeon appears to have worked out a model of the Polynesian migrations to New Zealand, but to have been confused by the mass of information he had collected.\footnote{Gudgeon, 'Whence of the Maori', Pt 4, p. 173. For the reference to Tuhoe and Ngati Hako being of 'Mongol blood' see Gudgeon, 'Whence of the Maori', Pt. 1, p. 183.}

**Native Land Court Evidence and the 'Tangata whenua'**

The question must be asked as to what factors led both Wilson and Gudgeon to conclude that there had been an earlier population in New Zealand before the arrival of the fleet. Gudgeon himself stated that most of the Native Land Court Judges believed that there had been a tangata whenua population in New Zealand when the fleet arrived.\footnote{Gudgeon, 'Nga Tangata Maori', Pt 11, MR, 2, 8, 1890, p. 473.} Such beliefs were encouraged by traditions from the Bay of Plenty/East Coast area, where both Gudgeon and Wilson collected much of their material. Many hapu and iwi from this area traced descent to ancestors who did not appear to have arrived on any of the more famous waka. In particular, a great many hapu and iwi traced lines of descent back to the renowned Bay of Plenty ancestor Toi-te-hua-tahi, who, according to most East Coast accounts, was tangata whenua of that area. According to these stories Toi was in the Bay of Plenty area before the introduction of kumara and before the arrival of any of the waka that were supposed to be part of the fleet.

Several factors involved in the mechanisms of the Native Land Court's operations encouraged belief in the idea that several waves of settlement had occurred, with the later, more advanced Hawaiki Maori conquering and often subsuming the earlier 'tangata whenua'. While some Judges had a very good understanding of Maori oral evidence, some were confused by the sheer scale and complexity of the whakapapa and tribal history presented to them. These complexities encouraged some Judges to make decisions based on their own views of Maori custom and on contemporary racial theories, rather than on the evidence presented. Many Pakeha had formed their ideas on
such issues as hapu and iwi identity, the emergence and disappearance of tribal groups, and the role of conquest in land ownership, from their knowledge of the period immediately prior to large scale Pakeha settlement. This period, the 1820s and 1830s, witnessed large scale Maori migrations, warfare and disruption as a result of the adoption from Pakeha of new weapons, technologies and ideas. Ballara argues that these events helped produce the idea prevalent among the Native Land Court Judges that the large iwi rather than the smaller hapu was the kinship group of real importance in land claims. Another result of the violent events surrounding migrations was that the Judges tended to emphasise the roles of warfare and conquest in deciding rights to land. Maori history was seen as a process where larger, more powerful groups took over the land of the smaller or more peaceful hapu.101

The attitude of the Judges is typified by what the Chief Judge of the Native Land Court, Francis Dart Fenton, wrote in 1866:

The great rule which governed Maori rights to land was force-i.e., that a tribe...held possession of a certain tract of country until expelled from it by a superior power, and that on such expulsion, if the invaders settled upon the evacuated territory, it remained theirs until they in turn had to yield it to others.102

While warfare and conquest definitely played an important role in the establishment of rights to land, other factors were of equal or greater importance. Traditional systems of resource rights and hapu affiliation were very complicated. People could have affiliations with several different hapu through ancestry, while hapu might even affiliate to more than one iwi. Each different affiliation gave individuals or groups different rights to land or to resources on a particular piece of land. Several hapu might in turn have different specific resource rights to the same area. Judges understandably had difficulty in unravelling the complexities of these systems of rights. Instead they tended to hold the view that one iwi, descended from one particular eponymous ancestor, held the exclusive rights to an area. Any other groups with 'rights' to the same area were generally viewed by the Judges as vassals to the iwi holding mana over the area. Furthermore Judges tended to give priority to iwi or hapu who gained mana over land by conquest, rather than to those who gained it by gifting, by marriage or by peacemaking alliances. The view of war and conquest being the over-riding factors

Parsonson, 'He Whenua te Utu', pp. 69-70, and Chps 4 and 5.
102F. D. Fenton, Important Judgements delivered in the Compensation Court and the Native Land Court, 1866-1879, Wellington, 1879, p. 9.
encouraged the idea that several powerful iwi arriving in a fleet of waka, then
conquering and dominating any earlier peoples.103

As Maori witnesses became familiar with the biases of the Native Land Court they
began to tailor the evidence they presented in order to strengthen their claims. The
Native Land Court judges often gave greater credence to claims made through descent
from ancestors from the famous waka which were supposedly part of the fleet from
Hawaiki. Judges tended to uphold the rights of those who could prove occupation and
cultivation of a site over those who had only hunting and gathering rights. Maori
witnesses therefore often emphasised descent from waka voyagers, while playing down
rights which had come through earlier tangata whenua hapu. In response to Judge's
biases, witnesses emphasised claims by conquest, and often claimed to have exterminated or exiled earlier hapu. These sorts of claims helped groups gain exclusive
rights to an area. The more complicated realities of changing hapu identities and
multiple rights to areas were often either glossed over or else strongly contended by the
different claimants.104

Maori themselves were well aware that information presented to the Land Court was
not necessarily an accurate picture of past events, but was instead tailored to that forum.
Writers such as Elsdon Best recorded examples of Maori scepticism over the evidence
presented to the Native Land Court, seeing it as a source of stories invented for the
occasion.105

Native Land Court judges often viewed the history of different areas as consisting of
waves of superior conquering peoples destroying or enslaving inferior earlier peoples.
Such a view gave an easier pattern of history to follow than the more complicated
stories of combat, intermarriage and gifting of land expressed in whakapapa based
Maori narratives. The view of history as a series of sweeping migrations also fitted well
with the contemporary romantic European ideas, such as Aryanism, which held that
history was a process of the movements of races that could be traced through language
and folklore. The idea of the weak naturally succumbing to the strong fitted in with
prevailing scientific notions and could be used as a justification for Pakeha colonialism.

103 Ballara, Iwi, pp. 89-91.
Parsonson, 'He Whenua te Utu', pp. 63-7, also Chps. 4 & 5, passim.
Parsonson, 'He Whenua te Utu', Chps. 4 & 5.
105 E. Best to S. P. Smith, undated 1890s, E. Best Papers, MS-Papers-0072-08, Alexander Turnbull
Library, NLNZ.
Conclusion
Gudgeon and Wilson had both followed the examples of predecessors such as Sir George Grey, Edward Shortland, Richard Taylor and John White, in collecting large bodies of Maori oral tradition. Like these collectors (and in contrast to such scholars as William Colenso and W. T. L. Travers), Gudgeon and Wilson both considered oral tradition to be a reasonably accurate guide to events in the Maori past. Both Gudgeon and Wilson seemed to follow the idea, common among Pakeha scholars of Maori, that once the magical elements were removed from Maori stories, actual historical events could be deciphered. Thus Gudgeon maintained that the story of Tura, who supposedly floated to Aotearoa on a piece of pumice, actually referred to a people who had arrived at a time so distant that the name of their waka had been lost.106

There was one major difference between Gudgeon and Wilson, on the one hand, and the earlier collectors of traditions on the other. This was the fact that, with the exception of Richard Taylor, the earlier collectors had not built up a systematic historical picture of how they believed the waves of settlement in New Zealand had occurred. Both Gudgeon and Wilson set out distinct models of how they believed the various peoples had settled in New Zealand. Wilson had his model of the Maui Maori nation, with its mysterious origin, followed by the partial take-over by the related but superior Hawaiki Maori. Gudgeon saw an indigenous Turehu people, again of mysterious origin, being invaded by the 'Moriori' Polynesians. This invasion resulted in an intermixing of the peoples, which supposedly lowered the racial qualities of the 'Moriori'. The Hawaiki Maori invaded in the next wave and destroyed or absorbed most of the earlier people.

Both Wilson and Gudgeon used the Land Court as their major source of information. Neither man took into account how this particular forum might distort the nature of the information being presented. Those presenting information to the Court tended to emphasise the acquisition of land through processes of conquest and occupation while playing down the roles of such factors as intermarriage and multiple resource rights. Thus much of the evidence presented tended to fit into Wilson and Gudgeon's models of war, conquest and extermination.

In building up their models Wilson and Gudgeon were both aware that only some traditions fitted in with their ideas. They realised that not all Maori even agreed that earlier peoples existed. However, both argued that certain peoples had a better knowledge of the past than others. They tended to believe that those hapu and iwi with more comprehensive stories of migration and settlement were the experts on historical

events. Thus Wilson believed that Tainui experts were right when they claimed to know of ancestors of the Ngaitai hapu who were unknown to the Ngaitai themselves. Gudgeon believed that Arawa were the best informed people on general Maori history, as they had the most detailed migration traditions and could trace many chiefly lines back to their waka.107 Neither Judge considered that such stories might have more to do with ancient and recent politics than with knowledge of historical migrations. Furthermore, the Judges' views on history tended to favour the stories of the larger interconnected iwi groups over those of smaller, more independent hapu.

Once Wilson and Gudgeon had both established patterns of how they considered Polynesian settlement had occurred they were able to fit any hapu or iwi into the schemes they had devised. Thus any Maori group which could trace ancestry to one of the fleet canoes was obviously one of the later, superior groups. Any Maori group that could not was of the earlier wave of Polynesians. The racial superiority of the Hawaiki immigrants was seen as proven by their conquest of the earlier peoples. Yet some earlier peoples did survive and sometimes even defeated the invaders. This was explained away by such factors as the hardening effects of living in harsh environments or by the improving effects of interbreeding with the superior newcomers.

The development of these theories of Maori history can be seen as an example of Pakeha scholars involving themselves in acts of intellectual colonialism. Both Wilson and Gudgeon believed they had constructed a better model of Maori history than that put forward by any Maori hapu or iwi. They were able to proclaim that they, rather than any Maori expert, had been able to decipher what had really gone on in the Maori past. Thus they were able to present the argument that they knew the Maori past better than most Maori. Gudgeon especially maintained that young Maori no longer had the level of specialised knowledge possessed by the old tohunga, as the Wharekura, that had taught such knowledge, no longer existed. Once the old experts died, only Pakeha experts like himself would have the deep knowledge of the Maori past.

The views of Wilson and Gudgeon are of particular interest as they fit so well with the common nineteenth century ideas of waves of settlement, with each new superior race displacing the earlier ones. Such views had become common in Europe with thinking on Aryanism, and the philological and folklore work carried out by scholars such as Herder, Grimm and Müller. In Britain the popular idea of the past portrayed waves of Celts, Saxons, Vikings and Normans, each bringing their own particular racial

107Wilson, Story of Te Waharoa, pp. 146-9.
characteristics. At the same time the ideas on migration presented by Wilson and Gudgeon seemed to fit well with the progressive ideas on biological evolution, as advocated by Darwin, Huxley and Spencer. Gudgeon in particular maintained that those tribes who were not fit enough to cope with the new arrivals died out.

Wilson and Gudgeon's theories of the early settlement of New Zealand both came out in the 1890s, over twenty years before the publication of the second volume of *The Lore of the Whare Wananga* which generated the orthodox Moriori Myth. Both authors had a considerable degree of standing with other Pakeha scholars as a result of their experience as Native Land Court Judges. We know, for example, that Smith and Best both read Wilson's book as part of their process of trying to ascertain the history and identity of the earlier peoples of New Zealand. We also know that both Smith and Best were aware of a degree of Maori scepticism over the veracity of Wilson's work.108 Wilson did not join the Polynesian Society, nor does he appear to have taken part in the ongoing debates in the 1890s and early 1900s over the existence and identity of the earliest New Zealand peoples. Nevertheless, his book did contribute to these debates. Its publication provides evidence that, while Percy Smith and Elsdon Best were trying to reconstruct the big picture of Polynesian migration history, other attempts were being made to construct grand narratives of the waves of settlement of New Zealand from Maori migration traditions.

Unlike Wilson, Gudgeon was fully involved in the Polynesian Society's debates concerning the 'tangata whenua'. He was intimately connected with the leading lights of the Society, as Percy Smith was an old schoolmate of his, while Best was his brother-in-law. Gudgeon was a founding member of the Polynesian Society and its *Journal* was the major medium through which Gudgeon disseminated his ideas. He also maintained correspondence with Smith and Best over the mysteries of the 'tangata whenua'. Smith regarded Gudgeon as the only person, other than Best and himself, with 'the knowledge or sufficient enthusiasm to take up the question'.109 While Gudgeon's ideas may not have been adopted by Smith and Best, the ideas he put forward built up a body of knowledge on the subject and encouraged Smith and Best to try and resolve these mysteries for themselves.

The theories of Wilson and Gudgeon were not in the long run adopted by other scholars or by the general public as the popular explanation of the early migration history of New Zealand. They are nevertheless of importance as the earliest published examples of

108E. Best to S. P. Smith, undated 1890s, E. Best Papers, MS-Papers-0072-08, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
109S. P. Smith to E. Best, 20/10/1906, Polynesian Society Records, MS-Papers-1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
scholars developing metanarratives of migration history by compiling information from a wide range of Maori migration traditions. Of particular significance to this study is the fact that in both cases the theories accepted the existence of a Great Fleet, but emphasised that a 'tangata whenua' people had lived in New Zealand before its arrival.

Wilson and Gudgeon's ideas were not widely adopted, but they were read with interest by Smith and Best as they attempted to construct their own metanarratives of migration history and unravel the mysteries surrounding the existence of the tangata whenua. Wilson and Gudgeon's theories, along with the work of Shand on the Rekohu Moriori, all helped create a field of discourse where scholars saw oral tradition as holding the answer to the questions surrounding the early migration history of New Zealand. It was, however, the work of Smith and Best, based on the manuscripts written by Hoani Turei Whatahoro, that was to be adopted by scholars and the general Pakeha public as the definitive story of Polynesian migration. The development of this story, the orthodox Moriori Myth, will be the subject of the next two chapters.
CHAPTER FIVE

SMITH AND BEST SEARCH FOR THE 'TANGATA WHENUA'

In the previous chapters we have examined a variety of Pakeha theories that assumed the existence of pre-Maori 'tangata whenua' population in New Zealand. Some of these ideas were based on the physical evidence of Maori appearance and anatomy, some on archaeology, some on theoretical constructs drawn from the Bible, and some on Maori oral traditions. Scholars such as Julien Crozet, Johann Rheinhold Forster, William Colenso, Richard Taylor, Julius von Haast, Joshua Rutland, J. A. Wilson and W. E. Gudgeon all presented their arguments as to why a 'tangata whenua' people must have existed.

Despite the arguments of these scholars, the idea of a pre-Maori 'tangata whenua' was not accepted by a large number of Pakeha scholars during the nineteenth century. It seems clear that no consensus existed at that time on the subject of an earlier population. One common Pakeha view was that the East Polynesian ancestors of the Maori were the original inhabitants of New Zealand. Edward Shortland and Alexander Mckay, A. K Newman, Ernst Dieffenbach, A. S. Thomson and Ferdinand von Hochstetter were among those who maintained that the Maori were the original inhabitants. In 1894, Colonel W. E. Gudgeon, a supporter of the idea of an earlier race, wrote: 'There are Europeans, who although conversant with Maori history and language, yet hold firmly to the belief that New Zealand was without inhabitants up to the date of the first Hawaiki migration.'

By the mid-twentieth century a consensus on the story of the early human migrations to New Zealand seemed to have been achieved. A version of New Zealand's pre-history had been adopted as orthodoxy, being taught in schools and repeated in numerous popular history books and travel guides. This orthodox version of the past was based around what David Simmons has called 'The Great New Zealand Myth'. This set out a sequence of arrivals in New Zealand, beginning with Kupe's visit in 950 AD, the accidental migration of the primitive West Polynesian/Melanesian Moriori at some later date, the arrival of Toi and Whatonga in 1150 and the expulsion of the Moriori to the Chatham Islands, combined with the arrival of the Great Fleet in 1350.

---

2 Simmons, The Great NZ Myth, pp. 1-7.
This orthodox version of Polynesian migration history was largely the work of three men: the ethnologists Stephenson Percy Smith and Elsdon Best, and the Maori expert Hoani Turei Whatahoro. As Simmons and Biggs have shown, the work of Stephenson Percy Smith was the immediate public source of the orthodox version.\(^3\) Smith's writings were a product of his attempts to construct a comprehensive history of Polynesian migrations in the Pacific and to trace the sequence of migrations to New Zealand. Smith saw himself as one of those Pakeha historians 'who have studied it [Polynesian history] with a view of eliminating errors in the Native histories and bringing the discordant data into a semblance of real history'.\(^4\) By comparing the traditions and genealogies he had collected from indigenous experts throughout the Pacific, Smith hoped to trace the migrations of the Polynesians and reconstruct the deeds of the early Polynesian heroes. Smith went as far as to believe he was the only person with a wide enough knowledge of traditions to be able to develop a broad history of Polynesian migrations.\(^5\)

Smith's principal collaborator in this project was his protege, the ethnologist Elsdon Best. Best worked with Smith for almost forty years to reconstruct what they considered to be an accurate version of Polynesian history. Both men believed that for a history to have value for European scholars it had to be arranged with a precise chronology, exact identification of historical locations and with events reconciled to occur in a linear sequence. The most complete version of history developed by Smith was that set out in the second volume of \textit{The Lore of the Whare Wananga}. This work was in turn edited by Smith from the writings of Hoani Turei Whatahoro of the Ngati Kahungunu. \textit{The Lore} set out the version of history related in the Great New Zealand Myth and described the appearance and behaviour of the pre-Maori 'tangata-whenua'. It told of their arrival and subsequent history in New Zealand and their exile to the Chathams where they supposedly became the Chatham Island Moriori. The Maori language versions of these accounts are almost exact versions of Whatahoro's writings. Smith's English language translations of these stories in turn can be shown to be the sources of the orthodox story.

In the following two chapters the work of Whatahoro, Smith and Best will be examined. An attempt will be made to determine why the version of history developed by Whatahoro was accepted by Smith and Best. Their repackaging and promotion of this story to the general Pakeha populace will also be examined. In the present chapter we will investigate the attempts by Smith and Best to determine the identity of the earliest

\(^3\)Simmons and Biggs, 'The Sources of the "Lore of the Whare Wananga"', pp. 22-42.

\(^4\)Simmons, \textit{Great NZ Myth}, passim.


\(\text{Smith refers to his belief in his unique abilities to write such a history in the letters S. P. Smith to E. Best, 10/5/1911, Polynesian Society Records, MS-Papers 1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ and S. P. Smith to A. Hamilton, 25/5/1911, Copy in author's personal collection.}\)
The inhabitants of New Zealand, the 'tangata whenua'. The build-up of a network of scholars based around the Polynesian Society will also be described, explaining how such a group could exchange and disseminate information, while enhancing their own public standing as a peer group of experts.

**Stephenson Percy Smith: Surveyors, Ethnology and the building of Scholarly Networks.**

Stephenson Percy Smith (1840-1922) arrived in New Zealand with his family in 1849. The Smiths settled in Taranaki, where from an early age Percy Smith showed a strong interest in the native plants, animals and landscape. Of even greater interest to Smith were the indigenous Maori. In the 1850s, the majority of land in Taranaki was still under Maori control. Maori made up a large proportion of the population, with considerable interaction between them and Pakeha. Smith's opportunities for contact with Maori increased from 1855, when, at the age of fourteen, he became a surveyor cadet with the Taranaki provincial survey department. This career was to lead him to make many expeditions into remote bush areas and to spend a great deal of time with a wide variety of Maori. Smith wrote that it was on these expeditions that he started learning te reo, beginning with the Maori names for the trees. Smith also admitted that it was from the Maori that he learned how to survive in the bush, 'From these natives... I learned so much bush-lore and woodcraft, which in the end made us as accomplished bushmen as, I suppose were to be found anywhere'.

Colonial Surveyors were the advance guard of larger bodies of Pakeha settlers. They operated in areas where there were often very few, if any, other Pakeha present. Surveyors provide a classic example of a job that was essential to the colonising process, but that operated at the geographical and cultural margins of the white colony. They were often dependent on the navigational skills and bushcraft of Maori assistants. Even in the South Island surveyors such as Brunner, Rochfort and Dobson preferred employing Maori guides, both male and female. Byrnes points out that for the guides these were not exploratory expeditions. Instead they were being paid to show Pakeha

---

6 The term 'tangata whenua' in this chapter will be used in the same context as that used by Smith and Best, referring to the supposed 'pre-fleet' inhabitants of New Zealand, rather than in reference to the native people and rightful owners of a particular area.

7 Over the period from 1855 to 1859 Smith was involved in the survey of the Waiwhakaino Block. The survey involved spending a fortnight at a time in the bush with his boss W. Carrington and seven or eight Maori (including Te Whiti who was later to be the prophet of Parihaka). See S. P. Smith, 'Reminiscences of a Pioneer Surveyor, from 1840-1916', qMS-1835, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ, p. 26.


8Smith, 'Reminiscences', p. 27.
areas that Maori were already familiar with. Effective communication with these guides made it essential for surveyors to learn te reo Maori to at least a basic level.9

Maori guides performed the crucial role of acting as intermediaries between surveyors and other Maori encountered in the course of their work. It was necessary to negotiate access to areas with the hapu who controlled them. Surveyors were often welcomed into kainga and freely given food and shelter. During these visits some surveyors also had sexual relations with some of their Maori hosts. Yet even when members of local hapu had asked surveyors in to particular areas other hapu members often resisted any attempts at surveying. In the course of their work, Pakeha measured, mapped and quantified Maori land in order to control the land, allowing Pakeha to gain access to its resources and eventually acquire it. Maori tended to be well aware of this and saw survey pegs and the theodolite, commonly referred to as ‘te taipo’, as symbols of the Pakeha making claims to their land. Many cases were recorded of the obstruction of surveys through pulling up survey pegs, the destruction of surveyor’s huts, and threats of violence. In some extreme examples, such as the Wairau affray, violent opposition occurred. Negotiations with Maori over wages and prices for such items as food and canoes, could become heated. Interactions between surveyors and Maori, whether friendly, antagonistic, or ambivalent provided the surveyor with the opportunity to learn more of Maori language and custom. At the same time, those Maori interacting with the surveyors would have been using these circumstances to improve their knowledge of Pakeha language and ways.10

Surveyors can be seen to have spent much of their time working in situations where Maori had greater knowledge of the land and of the means to survive in it. Thus surveyors often ended up using Maori expertise and Maori technology such as waka or canoes, mokihi or flax rafts, flax sandals, and rope ladders to travel. They also relied on Maori hunting techniques to provide them with food in the bush. Surveyors had to use Maori knowledge to survive and the Maori language to gain access to this knowledge. For those, like W. H. Skinner, Edward Tregear, and S. Percy Smith, who had an


10 Bymes, 'Surveying', pp. 85-98. Bymes refers the use of the term 'taipo’, which may or may not have meant ‘demon’ or ‘goblin’, to describe the theodolite in ibid., pp. 91, 91n.
Smith, 'Reminiscences', pp. 25-6, 36-9, 67-70.
inquisitive (and acquisitive) interest in Maori tradition, surveying provided the perfect opportunity to gather such information. Long periods of time in predominantly Maori situations, the building up of a degree of trust through the sharing of difficult working conditions, and the lack of other distractions all meant that surveyors with a fluency in te reo Maori had ample opportunities to ask questions about tradition.\textsuperscript{11}

Surveyors were approaching the land with the idea of measuring it scientifically, in a systematic and mathematical way. The process of mapping, the recording of the details of the land's surface, was carried out to gain a degree of understanding and control over the land and its resources. It appears that some of the surveyor/ethnologists were influenced by this approach. Smith and Best advocated a systematic approach to measuring and recording the cultural and physical details of indigenous peoples. Best was not actually a surveyor himself, but was involved for years with the Urewera road building project and was no doubt totally familiar with the surveyors' systematic approach. Comparison can be made between recording the measurements of the land in order to bring it under control, and recording information on indigenous people, allowing increased imperial control over them, once they had been fitted into Western concepts of knowledge.\textsuperscript{12}

Those Pakeha who became competent speakers of Maori, and took up an interest in Maori cultures and traditions, usually had occupations, like surveying, that necessitated a great deal of contact with Maori. Missionaries had to acquire a degree of fluency in Maori in order to communicate and debate with the people they lived among and hoped to convert. Early traders and shore whalers, such as Joel Polack and Dicky Barrett, were operating in situations where they had to develop language skills in order both to trade and survive in a Maori dominated situation. These Pakeha were later able to use their skills in order to act as interpreters and negotiators for new arrivals who did not have their cultural skills.\textsuperscript{13}

Pakeha farmers settling in areas with few Pakeha and many Maori inhabitants often had to acquire a level of fluency in Maori. Alexander Shand on the Chatham Islands provides a good example of a Pakeha who learned te reo Maori in order to communicate

Smith, \textit{Reminiscences}, \textit{passim}.
with his Maori and Moriori neighbours. He was further motivated by personal interest to learn as much as he could of the Moriori language and culture. Sir George Grey, as a colonial administrator, could have relied on interpreters. Instead he believed the only way he could effectively govern Maori, was to gain as much knowledge as possible of their language and culture. It is noteworthy that Grey developed his skills during his first term as Governor, during a time when the British control over the colony was still limited and Maori power could not be ignored.  

While the aims of a surveyor, missionary, trader, or colonial administrator might vary widely, each was in some way helping to establish a new, Western economic and cultural hegemony in areas formerly under Maori control. Those in the vanguard of colonisation may be seen as having been part of a process of introducing a new system of power and culture to a specific geographical space, over which they, for a period of time, had only limited control. In this process they had to spend a great deal of time operating within indigenous cultures; cultures substantially different from their own.

The success of their various enterprises was strongly dependent on how successfully they negotiated, and to an extent played roles within, Maori societies. It should of course be noted that the situation for each 'vanguard Pakeha' was different in each place as Maori cultures varied from hapu to hapu, while the economic and political situation varied according to geography and recent history. For Pakeha such as missionaries and isolated traders and farmers, living in areas where Maori formed the powerful majority, economic and physical survival could well depend on the Pakeha's skills in adapting to the majority culture. Such Pakeha, along with the Maori who interacted with them, often occupied what Giselle Byrnes has described as 'the spaces in-between cultures'.

---

Grey, Polynesian Mythology, Auckland, 1956, pp. iii-v.
For an examination of a range of British people who became involved in interaction with, and the gathering of information on, indigenous cultures see Stocking, Victorian Anthropology, Chap. 3. From the middle of the nineteenth century many of those Pakeha in occupations involving a great deal of contact with Maori were like Elsdon Best and Percy Smith in that the were either born in New Zealand or had come out there at a very early age. They had thus often been through a sort of apprenticeship in te reo and in aspects of Maori culture, which helped them to go on into occupations involving interactions with Maori. Examples of this use of knowledge include: Elizabeth Colenso (1821-1904), born Elizabeth Fairburn in Kerikeri, who, in 1843, went through an arranged marriage with William Colenso, in order to assist his missionary work through her acknowledged skills in Maori language. See J. E. Murray, 'Elizabeth Colenso', Oliver, ed., Dictionary of NZ Biography, Vol. 1, pp. 86-7. Gilbert Mair (1843-1923), born in Whangarei into a family of merchant traders, grew up speaking Maori and went on to work as a surveyor, an officer of the Te Arawa Native Contingent, a land purchase commissioner, a Resident Magistrate and as an interpreter to the House of Representatives. See P. Savage, 'Gilbert Mair', in ibid., pp. 260-1. Walter Lawry Buller (1838-1906), was born into a missionary family in Hokianga and grew up in the Kaipara region. He used the Maori language skills he gained from this to work as a Resident Magistrate and land purchasing agent for the Native Department, and later specialised as a barrister in the Native Land Court, using this position to acquire Maori land for himself and his business associates. See Galbreath, Walter Buller.

15 Byrnes, 'Surveying', p 85.
Smith's Early Career-The Travels of a Surveyor in Maoriland.

Smith's 1855 appointment as a surveying cadet in Taranaki was the beginning of a career that spanned 42 years and enabled him to visit much of New Zealand, as well as the Chatham Islands. Smith's first four years of work were based in Taranaki, involving a great deal of bush surveying in the company of Maori. It was during this time that Smith seriously began to learn te reo Maori and Maori customs and traditions. In the late 1850s, while working as Assistant Surveyor in Taranaki, Smith observed the inter-hapu conflict developing in the Waitara over land selling. For all his interest in Maori tradition Smith was unsympathetic to those trying to resist land selling. This was reflected in his dual roles of acting as a surveyor mapping the areas of Maori land to be bought, while also enrolling as a member of the New Plymouth militia. He bought land for the Government in the Kaipara and surveying confiscated land.\(^{16}\)

In the late 1850s Smith began to venture further afield and meet a wide variety of Maori. In 1858, with four companions, he carried out a two month exploring expedition into the centre of Te Ika a Maui (the North Island). Travelling by foot and canoe, they journeyed from New Plymouth, via Lake Taupo through to Tarawera, then returned to Taranaki by way of Tongariro and Whanganui. During this time they met and stayed with many local Maori in areas that few Pakeha had visited.\(^{17}\)

In 1859 the Land Purchase Department appointed Smith to survey land in the Kaipara area. Smith's skills in negotiating with Maori were called on in the following year, when the Government sent him back to the Kaipara to gain the support of the Ngati Whatua for the Pakeha settlers. He was to carry out a series of surveys and land purchasing trips to the Kaipara region between 1859 and 1864. During these visits Smith gathered much of the information he was later to use in his articles entitled 'The Peopling of the North', an account of traditions of Maori settlement in the area north of Auckland.\(^{18}\)

Smith did not fight in the wars of the 1860s but contributed to the Pakeha war effort by activities such as his mission to Ngati Whatua and surveying confiscated land for military settlements in Waiuku. From 1865 to 1867 Smith was again living and working in Taranaki where he was involved in surveying areas of land confiscated after fighting. During these expeditions Smith and his surveyors were armed, as well as being

\(^{17}\)Smith was later to return to Tarawera in 1886, to survey the area in the aftermath of the volcanic eruption. See ibid., pp. 27-27a, 168-75.
\(^{18}\)S. P. Smith, 'The Peopling of the North', a supplement to JPS, Vols. 5-6, 1896-1897.
accompanied by an armed escort, often Maori. Smith was close to the fighting on many of these surveys and came under fire when ambushed while surveying near Hawera. During this time he accompanied the colonial army on several expeditions, witnessing fighting near Waingongoro. In 1868 Smith went to the Chatham Islands to carry out surveys in preparation for the Land Court sittings to be held there in 1870. He surveyed Chatham Island or Rekohu (known to Maori as Wharekauri), and Pitt Island or Rangiauria. Smith spent over a year working on the Chathams, although the isolation was probably made easier by the presence of his wife, Mary Ann. While on the Chathams Smith interviewed Ngati Tama and Ngati Mutunga Maori and indigenous Moriori, including the expert Hirawatu Tapu. Smith recorded accounts of the Moriori migration to the Chathams and of Broughton's visit in 1791. Smith also met Alexander Shand while on the Chathams. Shand was to become very knowledgeable on the traditions of Taranaki Maori and would be recognised as the foremost Pakeha expert on Moriori culture and traditions. Smith and Shand began a friendship that continued until Shand's death in 1910. The two corresponded throughout this period and Shand came to visit Smith in New Zealand on several occasions.22

In the 1870s Smith was based in Auckland Province and carried out surveys in Auckland, Thames, Taupo, Maketu, Hokianga, Hawkes Bay and Rotorua. He was promoted to Chief Surveyor of Auckland Province in 1877, as well as being appointed Inspector of State Forests in 1886 and Commissioner for Crown Lands for the Auckland District in 1888. Much of Smith's survey work involved surveying Maori land for Native Land Court cases and road building. In 1879 Smith was put in charge of Native Surveys all over the country. Smith moved to Wellington in 1889 to take up his new appointment as Surveyor General and Secretary for Crown Lands and Mines, a position he held until his retirement in 1900.23

In addition to his surveying work Smith was appointed to several Government Commissions whose operations gave him further opportunities to acquire knowledge of

19Smith, 'Reminiscences', pp. 67-81. Smith's surveyors were guarded at different times by parties of armed Maori, by the Native Contingent (while surveying near Hawera), and by the British 18th Regiment (when in the Patea district).
20Ibid., pp. 72-5.
21Smith had married Mary Ann Crompton, who came from a prominent Taranaki settler family, in 1862.
22S. P. Smith, Diary 1868, MS-1967, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ, passim.
23Smith, 'Reminiscences', pp. 86-102. Smith makes mention in both accounts of the fact that he was on the Chathams at the time when Te Kooti and his followers made their escape from their exile.
Maori subjects. Smith was chairman of the Urewera Commission, a Government body set up to determine the owners of blocks of land in the Urewera following the official declaration of the Urewera District Native Reserve. This Commission heard evidence from representatives of the various Tuhoe hapu. Smith was also able to get a great deal of information from the five Maori members of the Commission, all knowledgeable elders, including Numia Kereru and Tutakangahau (a major contributor to Best's *Tuhoe*). The secretary of the Commission was Smith's friend and fellow ethnologist Elsdon Best, at this time based in the Urewera.24 In 1904 Smith was appointed to the Scenery Preservation Commission which, as part of its investigations, held meetings on marae throughout the country. The Maori representative on the Commission was Major Tunuiarangi, an expert on Ngati Kahungunu tradition. He and Smith spent much time discussing aspects of Maori lore.25

It can be seen that the combination of positions Smith held throughout his career enabled him to travel around the country and gave him the opportunity to meet Maori experts and Pakeha scholars of Maori subjects. Smith was appointed to a range of official positions connected to Maori and Polynesian issues. In addition to his appointments to the Scenery Preservation Commission and the Urewera Commission Smith was also, along with Judge Alexander Mackay, part of a two man investigative team into the conditions of the Maori of Te Wai Pounamu, the 'South Island Landless Natives'.26 Smith went to Niue, or 'Savage Island', in 1901, for three months to help draw up plans for the colonial administration of the island by New Zealand.27 In 1902 he and Augustus Hamilton, the director of the Dominion Museum, drew up the regulations for a proposed ethnological Museum.28 These official roles illustrate the fact that Smith was seen by powerful people within the New Zealand Government as a Pakeha with authoritative knowledge on Polynesian matters.

---


26Smith and Mackay appear to have looked mainly at written rather than oral evidence in their investigations. After eight years of working on the issue in meetings they held in their own spare time they decided the southern Maori had indeed suffered injustices. They recommended that Reserves be set aside for the southern Maori. However the reserves established as a result were pathetically small and located in remote, rough country. See S. P. Smith, 'Reminiscences', p. 198. H. Evison, *Te Wai Pounamu: The Greenstone Island*, Christchurch, 1993, pp. 472-3.


Building a Network of Scholars: The Formation of the Polynesian Society

Throughout his time working as a surveyor, Smith built up a network of connections with Pakeha scholars of Maori subjects, as well as with Maori experts themselves. As his own reputation grew other scholars began to seek out his opinions on Polynesian subjects. Smith's Taranaki surveying connections were a useful beginning for constructing the network. Edward Tregear and W. H. Skinner were two surveyors who shared his interests and had a degree of knowledge of te reo. An important contact from Taranaki was Smith's old schoolmate W. E. Gudgeon, who had been a commander of the Native Contingent and was later a Judge of the Native Land Court. Gilbert Mair, another former surveyor and officer in the Native Contingent, was a contact of Smith's from the 1860s. Smith maintained a correspondence with Alexander Shand for 40 years, after the two scholars met on the Chathams. Smith also maintained contacts with his relation by marriage, A. S. Atkinson, a scholar of Maori who had accompanied Smith on one of his Kaipara expeditions in 1861.29

In the early 1880s Smith met Elsdon Best, who was to become his most important and valued co-worker in ethnology. Best was serving in the Armed Constabulary concentrated against the followers of the prophets Te Whiti and Tohu at Parihaka. His commanding officer was his brother-in-law and fellow scholar of Maori, W. E. Gudgeon. Best's interest in Maori matters led him into contact with Tregear and Smith. Smith, who was not prone to false modesty, came to see Best as one of the few Pakeha he considered to be in his own league as a scholar of Maori.30

Best was born at Tawa Flat, near Wellington, in 1856, and in his early years spent much time in the company of local Maori, learning te reo in the process. In 1874 Best rejected the civil service career his father had planned for him and went to work as a farm labourer in Poverty Bay, a predominantly Maori area. Here Best renewed his interest in recording Maori customs and traditions. Economic depression in the late 1870s led to Best joining the Armed Constabulary. He was posted to Taranaki, where he took part in

29S. P. Smith, Diary, 1890, MS-1989, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ, 3/10/1890.
S. P. Smith, Diary, 1898, MS-1997, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ, 28/1/1898.
A. S. Atkinson, Journal, Richmond-Atkinson collection, MSX 3045, WGA Vol. 32, Richmond-Atkinson collection, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ, 18-31 December 1860. Other contacts included Joshua Rutland, the Marlborough based amateur archaeologist; Dr. T. M. Hocken, the Dunedin scholar and bibliophile; and Bishop W. L. Williams and Archdeacon H. W. Williams of Waiapu, compilers of several editions of the most authoritative dictionary of the Maori language. Smith also made links with Polynesian scholars outside New Zealand. He corresponded with Dr. Alan Carroll, the Australian anthropologist, and the Rev. Dr. William Wyatt Gill, the missionary ethnographer of Mangaia, both of whom he met in Sydney in 1888 at the inaugural meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science. See Smith, 'Reminiscences', pp. 86-91, 181, 190, 225-6, 235.
30This was illustrated when Smith wrote to Best, in 1906, regarding the unravelling of the mystery of the identity of Toi. Smith declared, 'Unless some one of us three (Gudgeon, yourself or myself), do it it never will be done, for no others have either the knowledge or sufficient enthusiasm to take up the question'. See S. P. Smith to E. Best, 20/10/1906, Polynesian Society Records, MS-Papers-1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
the 1881 raid on Parihaka. With Gudgeon's help Best transferred to the Native Contingent, which consisted mostly of Arawa warriors. Best was thus able to learn about Arawa customs and traditions. Best resigned from the Constabulary, disgusted with military discipline and forced inactivity. Best travelled through the United States of America from 1883 to 1886, then returned to New Zealand and set up a saw milling business with his brother, Walter. With the collapse of timber prices in 1891 the saw milling business failed. Best had by this time built up a large collection of Maori material. He moved to Wellington, working at first as an assistant at a general store, but hoping somehow to pursue his interest in ethnology.31

Best's arrival in Wellington coincided with Smith's launching of his most ambitious project to formalise the network of scholars that he had helped to build up. Smith had always been motivated in his collecting activities by the fear of the physical dying out of the Polynesians and their traditional knowledge. He wrote in 1898 how he had seen the situation in the early 1890s:

Time was pressing - the old men of the Polynesian race from whom their history could be obtained were fast passing away - civilisation was fast extinguishing what little remained of ancient lore - the people themselves were dying out before the incoming white man and, to all appearances, there would soon be nothing left but regrets over lost opportunities.32

Smith believed it was the duty of Pakeha scholars to record as much as possible of this 'vanishing' information. He was interested in collecting and comparing traditions from around the South Pacific. He hoped, by comparing traditions, to trace the origins and migrations of the ancestors of the Polynesian history. Smith had been involved for some time with scientific and scholarly societies such as the Auckland Institute, the New Zealand Institute, and the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science. He was aware of the value of such organisations both as forums for discussion and publication and as bodies to give greater recognition and status to their particular branches of scholarship. Smith hoped that the establishment of a society devoted exclusively to Polynesian ethnology would raise the status of the discipline, encouraging it to be more widely recognised as a science, rather than as the hobby of amateur collectors.33 In 1891 Smith therefore sent out a circular, proposing to establish a Polynesian Society for,

33It is interesting to note that, according to Smith, the head of the New Zealand Institute, Sir James Hector, was initially opposed to the establishment of the Polynesian Society as he saw it as interfering with the work of the Institute, which had up to that time published many articles of an ethnological
Communication, co-operation and mutual criticism between those interested in, or studying Polynesian anthropology, ethnology, philology, history, manners and customs of the Oceanic races, and the preservation of all that relates to such subjects in a permanent form.

Despite positive responses to Smith's circular the inaugural meeting of the Polynesian Society, on 8th January 1892, consisted of only ten men. The low turnout was almost certainly due to the popularity of a conflicting event on the same evening, a lecture by the visiting journalist-explorer Henry Morton Stanley, describing his adventures in 'darkest Africa'. Among the ten present, in addition to Smith himself, were Elsdon Best, W. E. Gudgeon and Edward Tregear. Smith had sent out circulars to those he considered might be interested in Pacific ethnology, mostly within New Zealand but also to scholars around the Pacific and further afield.

At the time of the inaugural meeting the Society had just over one hundred subscribing members. At this meeting the category of corresponding members was established. These were members who did not have to pay a subscription fee but were instead encouraged to contribute material. One reason for establishing this type of membership was to encourage Maori and other Polynesians to join the Society. The Society was also eager to recruit distinguished overseas members. Best, who had some knowledge of Spanish, was able to persuade some scholars from the Philippines and Latin America to join.

For the purpose of recording and sharing ethnological information the Journal of the Polynesian Society was established. It was intended to send the Journal to libraries and to members of the Society. At the first meeting Tregear and Smith were appointed joint-editors of the Journal, as well as joint-Secretaries and Treasurers of the Society. Both men had important Civil Service jobs: Tregear was Secretary of the Department of

---

34 S. P. Smith, Circular, Polynesian Society Records, MS-Papers-1187-125, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
35 S. P. Smith, Diary 1892, 8/1/1891, MS-1990, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
36 Among significant early Maori members were Tukino Te Heu Heu of Ngati Tuwharetoa, Hone Mohi Tawhai of Nga Puhi, Major Keapa Te Rangihiwini from Wanganui, and Rev. Mohi Turei and Major Ropata Wahawaha from Waiapu, along with the Rarotongan chief, Te Aia. By 1895 James Carroll and Apirana Ngata had joined the Society as ordinary members, to be followed by Maui Pomare in 1901 and Peter Buck, (Te Rangihiroa), in 1907. Among those overseas scholars who were made Honorary members were Horatio Hale of Ontario, who had been on Wilkes's U.S. Exploring Expedition which visited New Zealand in the 1840s, and Max Muller, the renowned Oxford University philologist. See M. P. K. Sorrenson, Manifest Duty: The Polynesian Society over 100 years, Auckland, 1992, pp. 25-6, 31-32 and Howe, Singer in a Songless Land, pp. 96-8. The annual report of 1894 recorded sixty four members from New Zealand, including Alexander Shand from the Chathams, twenty two members based in Hawaii, two from the New Hebrides and Tahiti, five from Australia, one each from Norfolk Island, Tonga, New Guinea and the U.S.A. See JPS, 3, 1894, p. ix.
Labour, while Smith was Surveyor-General. Despite this both men put in a great deal of work, dealing with the Society's correspondence, organising the growing Polynesian Society library, managing finance and membership, and editing the Journal which appeared four times a year. In the early years of the Journal the emphasis was on oral traditions, oral history, genealogy and philology. Most articles related to Maori matters, but much valuable material from other parts of the Pacific was published.37

Many of these early articles included considerable sections of text in indigenous languages. Some articles were written down by indigenous authors and passed on to the Society. The openness of the Journal to articles written in Maori text encouraged a certain level of Maori participation in the work of the Society.38 Sorrenson points out that in its early years the Society probably had a higher proportion of Maori members than at any other stage of its history and the Journal included many articles written by Maori in te Reo.39 It is also probable that during those years the Society had a higher proportion of competent Maori-speaking Pakeha than at any other time. Smith, Best, Tregear and Skinner all made a point of replying in te reo to letters written in Maori to the Society.40

Despite a degree of Maori input, the Society was still largely a club for Pakeha scholars to exchange, compare and interpret information on cultures they believed were dying.

---

37 A major example of Polynesian material from outside New Zealand was Alexander Shand's series of writings on the Moriori taken from his collaboration with Hirawatu Tapu. See A. Shand, 'The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands: Their Traditions and History', JPS, 3, 2, 1894, pp. 76-92; JPS, 3, 3, 1894, pp. 121-33; JPS, 3, 4, 1894, pp. 187-98; JPS, 4, 1, 1895, pp. 33-46; JPS, 4, 2, 1895, pp. 89-98; JPS, 4, 3, 1895, pp. 161-76; JPS, 4, 4, 1895, pp. 209-25; JPS, 5, 17, 1896, pp. 13-32; JPS, 5, 18, 1896, 73-91; JPS, 5, 19, 1896, pp. 131-41; JPS, 5, 20, 1896, pp. 195-211; JPS, 6, 21, 1897, pp. 11-8; JPS, 6, 23, 1897, pp. 145-51; JPS, 6, 24, 1897, pp. 161-68; JPS, 7, 26, 1898, pp. 73-88. These articles were later published in 1911, as the second of the Polynesian Society's Memoirs; A. Shand, The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands: Their History and Traditions. For more early examples of articles from other parts of the Pacific see J. M. Orsmond, 'Genealogy of the Pomare Family of Tahiti', JPS, 2, 1893, pp. 25-42 and W. D. Alexander, trans., 'Ancient Tahitian Poetry', JPS, 2, 1893, pp. 55-9. Both articles were from material supplied by Orsmond's daughter Mrs. Teuria Henry. See also C. J. Lyons, trans., 'Song of Kuiali of Hawaii, Sandwich Islands', JPS, 2, 1893, pp. 160-78; and J. Fraser, 'The Samoan story of Creation-A Tala', JPS, 1, 1892, pp. 164-89. This article contained a Samoan text supplied by the Rev. Powell, which had been translated by the Rev. G. Pratt. Fraser based his English text on this Samoan text.

38 This is illustrated by the debate sparked by A. S. Atkinson's English language article, 'What is a Tangata Maori?', which discussed the origins of the word 'Maori'. In reply to Atkinson a series of Maori authors wrote in te reo Maori to the Journal, debating the origins and use of the word Maori. See A. S. Atkinson, 'What is a Tangata Maori?', JPS, 1, 1892, pp. 133-6. Tuta Tamati, 'A Reply to Mr. A. S.. Atkinson's Paper "What is a Tangata Maori?'", JPS, 2, 1893, pp. 60-62, Hauraki Paora, 'Notes on Mr. A. S. Atkinson's Paper "What is a Tangata Maori?'", JPS, 2, 1893, pp. 116-8, Hoani Nahe, 'A Reply to A. S. Atkinson's "What is a Tangata Whenua?"', JPS, 3, 1894, pp. 27-35.

39 Sorrenson, Manifest Duty, p. 32.

40 An example of official Polynesian Society correspondence in Maori is provided by the letter W. H. Skinner and W. L. Newman to H. T. Whatahoro, 16/2/1907, Polynesian Society further records, 80-115-02a/08, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ. In 1895 the Pakeha members of the Polynesian Society who possessed a degree of fluency in Maori that enabled them to read articles in te reo included Honorary members Sir G. Grey and F. D. Fenton, corresponding member T. G. Hammond, and ordinary members S. Percy Smith, Eldson Best, Edward Tregear, W. L. Buller, C. E. Nelson, J. W. Stack, Alexander Shand, W. H. Skinner, W. L. Williams, H. W. Williams, A. S. Atkinson, and W. E. Gudgeon. See JPS, 4, 1895, membership list.
Pakeha scholars, or those Maori who could write in the Pakeha style, tended to be seen as more authoritative on questions under debate. The belief that indigenous peoples or their cultures were dying out, meant that Pakeha scholars saw the stories and traditions of these peoples as now being the property of the scholarly community; in other words of those Pakeha who had recorded them. Pakeha scholars believed they had both the level of knowledge and the moral right to decipher from the mass of often contradictory stories what the 'true' story of the Polynesian past had been. From the formation of the Society its members were involved in debating the origins and migrations of the Polynesians and the question of the identity of the first inhabitants of New Zealand.  

The use of the *Journal* as a site for debate by Pakeha helped establish what Byrnes describes as a 'community of discourse'. She writes: 'This discourse was predominantly communicated through print, among correspondents who were aware of each others views, and who shared common perceptions of the Maori'.  

It should, however, be noted that, in addition to the public medium of scholarly journals, much of the development of this discourse continued to be carried out by private correspondence, such as the long exchange of letters between Smith and Alexander Shand debating the nature of the Chatham Island Moriori.

Percy Smith was co-editor of the *Journal* from 1892 to 1903 and sole editor from 1905 to 1922. Throughout this period he dominated the *Journal*, deciding what should and should not be published. It does not appear that Smith rejected a large amount of material, but he was always prepared to make sometimes extensive footnotes, correcting points he disagreed with in other author's articles. In one case Smith set out his objections to Joshua Rutland's theories concerning the Melanesian nature of the Moriori. Other examples included Smith's footnoting of his disagreement with Best on the arrival of Melanesians in the Bay of Plenty and Smith's questioning of Gudgeon's ideas on the early presence of non-Polynesian races in eastern Polynesia.

---

42 Byrnes, 'Savages and Scholars', p. 2.  
43 Shand letterbook, A, Shand letterbook, qMS-1789, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ, passim.  
44 Rutland, 'Ancient Pit Dwellings of Pelorus', pp. 81-2n.  
E. Best, 'Notes on the Art of War, as conducted by the Maori of New Zealand', Pt 4, *JPS*, 11, 44, 1902, p. 240n.  
Gudgeon, 'The Whence of the Maori', Pt 1, p. 189n.
The establishment of the Polynesian Society meant that it became recognised by Pakeha scholars in New Zealand as the authoritative body on the study of Maori and other Polynesian cultures. This reputation also spread to some extent internationally. From the 1890s any Pakeha studying Polynesian material had to take note of the material gathered by the Polynesian Society members. Membership of the Society gave the scholar access to this material and enabled them to be part of a wider scholarly community. The Society's *Journal* and its publication of various Memoirs provided a forum for scholars to publish the information they had gathered and the ideas they had developed.

The involvement of a small number of Maori members probably helped give the impression, to a Pakeha audience, of a more general Maori involvement and approval of the Society than actually existed. Among those Maori members of the Society James Carroll, Apirana Ngata, Maui Pomare and Peter Buck were at various times Members of Parliament, which gave the Society some access to the ear of Parliament. Smith and Tregear's positions as important Civil Servants further increased the Society's influence with Government. The standing of the Polynesian Society was further enhanced by the fact that prominent members such as Smith and Best became well known to the general public through the publication of their popular articles on Polynesian subjects in both English and Maori language newspapers.

**Smith and Best Search for Toi and the 'Tangata Whenua'.**

During the early years of the Polynesian Society, Elsdon Best based himself in Wellington. Craig relates that Best spent a great deal of time travelling on foot through the Kapiti Coast area, meeting kaumatua and discussing and recording traditions. He travelled further afield to the Wairarapa and up the Wanganui River. Over this period he

45While Polynesian Society officials such as Smith, Tregear and Best hoped to use Maori members to provide information and increase the authoritative status of the Society, it is clear that Maori had their own reasons for joining the Society. Maori members obviously saw the Society and its *Journal* as sites for gaining more access to information on Maori tradition, as well as being an outlet for publishing their own material. Such publication could also sometimes help to give a stamp of wider authority, especially in Pakeha circles, to a particular hapu or iwi's contested version of history. For example Major Tunuiarangi, in 1904, used the authority of Smith and the *Journal* to promote his claim that Ngati Kahungunu were the only iwi holding mana over the Wairarapa district. See S. Crisp, 'The Maori Occupation of Wairarapa: Orthodox and Nonorthodox Versions', *JPS*, 102, 1, 1993, pp. 39-70. A later example is provided by Ngata using the resources of the Polynesian Society to help collect and publish *Nga Moteatea*, his collection of traditional songs, see Gibbons, 'Going Native', Chp. 6.

46It appears, however that those at the highest levels of New Zealand Government were not so open to influence. Smith records that during his years as Surveyor-General he did not get on well with Seddon, see S. P. Smith 'Reminiscences', p. 233. Massey was probably even less sympathetic to the cause of funding Polynesian research. W. H. Skinner wrote, 'Massey is the stumbling block re financial help to associations such as ours, the Institute etc. says if he had his way he would burn the whole d___ lot of those useless publications', W. H. Skinner to E. Best, 1/4/1923, E. Best Papers, MS-Papers-0072-05, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.

collected a considerable amount of material, translated some of this for the *Journal of the Polynesian Society* and also wrote a series of his own articles, some dealing with early migrations to New Zealand. Yet it was from his later work in the Urewera region that Best was to make his name as an ethnologist. The discussions between Best and Smith growing out of this work were to provide a major stimulus to the development of their respective ideas concerning the sequences of Polynesian migration and the existence of a pre-Maori people in New Zealand.

In early 1895 Smith, in his role as Surveyor-General, had been part of an expedition into the Urewera country to try to persuade the Tuhoe to allow surveying and gold prospecting on their land. Smith was unsuccessful, as the Tuhoe correctly saw this as an attempt to destroy what remained of their independence and allow the coloniser access to the resources of their rohe (home region). Tuhoe therefore forcibly prevented the first attempts to survey their land. The Government reacted by sending in a force of police and artillermen equipped with small arms. Open conflict was avoided, after several days of negotiations between Tuhoe leaders and James Carroll, acting on behalf of the Government. Tuhoe eventually agreed to allow the building of a road from Fort Galatea to Lake Waikaremoana. Deep Tuhoe suspicion of Pakeha motives remained. Bearing this in mind Smith believed that the road building crew would need to be accompanied by someone capable of carrying out the delicate negotiations necessary to push the road through the lands of the many local hapu.

Smith was actively involved in the process of destroying Tuhoe independence, but was at the same time fascinated by the Tuhoe people. Smith knew that Tuhoe had had a degree of contact with Pakeha for over fifty years and that many now followed the Ringatu faith, started by Te Kooti in the 1860s, rather than traditional beliefs. Yet he still believed that Tuhoe were the people who were closest to the 'Maori as he was', retaining much of their ancient culture as a product of their relative isolation and independence. Smith was convinced that the encroachment of road-building Pakeha would lead to the destruction of the traditional elements remaining in Tuhoe society. Therefore those traditions needed to be recorded before they disappeared. Smith's idea reflected a view common among imperial collectors. They held that civilisation would

---

49 Ibid., pp. 54-5.
Craig, *Man of the Mist*, pp. 54.
naturally destroy the inferior culture of the indigenous people, but that the coloniser had a duty to record for posterity as much as possible of the disappearing knowledge.\(^{51}\)

Smith proposed to create a position combining the roles of both negotiator and ethnologist; a person who could help the progress of road building while recording Tuhoe traditions. He saw Elsdon Best as the ideal man for both jobs. He was fluent in Maori, experienced in the recording of traditions, skilled as a bushman, and enjoyed life away from Pakeha towns. Smith arranged to have Best appointed to the road building crew, with the official position of paymaster-storeman. Best set off, in April 1895, for what was to prove to be a fifteen year stint in the Urewera country. In addition to his duties as ethnologist, negotiator and storeman, Best was appointed secretary to the Urewera Commission. This was the body established by the Government to determine who they would recognise as owners of blocks of land within the newly designated Urewera District Native Reserve. Best's secretarial work involved the collection of whakapapa and local traditions, adding to his own research material.\(^{52}\)

In 1904, after his work for both the road building team and the Urewera Commission had ceased, Best was appointed as Maori Health Officer attached to the Mataatua District Maori Council. This work kept him in the Urewera country for another five years, based at Ruatoki, where he lived with his wife Adelaide. It was also over this time that he wrote most of what was to become his classic work, *Tuhoe: The Children of the Mist*, completing the draft of his book in 1907.\(^{53}\)

Best agreed with Smith's idea that the Tuhoe represented the 'Maori as he was', and that their vanishing ancient knowledge had to be recorded. He therefore sought out those he believed to be knowledgeable elders, or ruanuku. Best's informants, or co-authors, included Paitini Wi Tapeka of Ngati Maru, Hamiora Pio of Ngati Awa, and the man Best held to be the most learned of all, Tutakangahau of Nga Potiki.\(^{54}\) Best followed the common practise of Pakeha ethnologists and generally only talked to males. When Best


\(^{52}\) Craig, *Man of the Mist*, pp. 90-91. Sissons, *Te Waimana*, pp. 3-4. The establishment of the Urewera Commission and the Native Reserve probably increased the level of dispute over areas of land as each family and hapu tried to have their claims to areas officially recognised. See also Smith, Diaries January to March 1899 and February to March 1900, and Smith 'Reminiscences' pp. 216-9. The story of the establishment of the Urewera District Native Reserve and its subsequent demise as a result of Government efforts to undermine it is told in Binney, *Te Mana Tuatoru*, pp. 117-131.

\(^{53}\) Craig, *Man of the Mist*, pp. 116-22. In 1903 Best married Adelaide Wylie, a Pakeha who was a competent speaker of Maori and had taught at the Native School at Te Houhi. See ibid. p. 102.

\(^{54}\) E. Best, *Tuhoe: The Children of the Mist*, Vol. 1, Auckland, 1996, p. xii. Best mentioned these three experts in 'He mihi tenei' at the beginning of Tuhoe. Other informants Best specifically mentioned in this mihi were Tamarau Waiariof Ngati Koura, Rewi Rangiamio of Ngati Manawa, and Himiona Tikitu of Nga Maihi.
lived for a period with Makurata and her husband Paitini Wi Tapeka, he only acknowledged Paitini as an informant. Best appears to have largely ignored the perspective that the female half of Tuhoe might have given on their traditions. It may be, however, that there was some sort of cultural barrier preventing Tuhoe women from passing information on to men, making it difficult for Best to acquire knowledge from women, even if he had wanted to.55

The attitude of Smith and Best to oral tradition conflicts with ideas held by twentieth century writers such as Binney, Vansina and Sissons. These modern writers maintain that oral tradition performs social and political functions within the societies that produce it. Oral traditions relate directly to the people telling and listening to them. As such, while many oral traditions refer to ancestors in a mythic past, the majority will centre around the most immediate ancestors of those telling the stories. Often a story will remain in oral tradition but will be built around a more recent ancestor than the hero of the same story as it was told a few generations before. Other stories may simply drop out of the record, while new ones are added in.56

In contrast to this approach, Elsdon Best and Percy Smith both considered Maori traditions to be a solid, unchanging body of knowledge, handed down from the past. Any change to this body they regarded as a corruption of the original. They regarded the passing of any story out of the general body of knowledge as the extinction of something which had existed for hundreds or thousands of years.57

Sissons points out that the organisation of Tuhoe reflects Best’s approach to the material he collected in the Urewera country. The Tuhoe narrators arranged their material according to political and social relations based around whakapapa (genealogy). Sissons suggests that the ancestral stories of the various hapu make sense as political statements. They signpost the relationships between groups and between people and

55Ibid.
Michael Reilly suggests that the complementary but separate roles for men and women in Polynesian societies make it difficult for information to pass from women to men. He remarks that it was unfortunate that Elsdon Best did not work together with his wife Adelaide, to collect women’s traditions. M. P. J. Reilly, personal communication, 29/1/2001.
Sissons, *Te Waimana*, passim.
57There are many instances where Smith and Best expressed their views on oral tradition and its supposed disappearance. See for example,
E. Best to S. P. Smith, 17/5/1907, Polynesian Society Records, Ms-Papers- 1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
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their land. In contrast Best arranged the material he recorded into sections based on how historically accurate he considered it to be. He therefore separated out 'history' from 'traditions' and 'myths', categories that were alien to the Tuhoé narrator. Best judged some origin traditions to be accurate, in particular those involving the more well known migration canoes. Some other tales of origin he dismissed as 'myths'. Sissons believes the historical sequence Best devised did not make sense in a Tuhoé context. Best's scheme divided up and rearranged stories in a way that removed their political and social meanings. 58

Best and Smith carried out a debate through correspondence over the questions surrounding the existence and identity of an early 'tangata-whenua' people. They were particularly intrigued by the identity of the prominent early ancestor Toi te Huatahi. Best saw one of the central events of Tuhoé history as being the arrival of the Mataatua canoe. The migrants from the Mataatua intermarried with the tangata whenua hapu. According to Best this led to the establishment of the Tuhoé iwi. Best designated all the pre-Mataatua peoples as 'aborigines' or 'tangata whenua'. 59

The name Toi te huatahi was found in the stories and whakapapa of many different hapu and iwi. Most stories from East Coast and Bay of Plenty tribes referred to Toi te huatahi, otherwise known as Toi kai rakau, as one of the tangata whenua people of the Bay of Plenty. In some whakapapa, especially those from the East Coast, Toi was clearly represented as living in Aotearoa. In contrast some Whanganui, Taranaki, Arawa and Tainui stories and whakapapa showed Toi te huatahi as an ancestor of the waka migrants, who lived in Hawaiki and never came to New Zealand. Smith and Best became convinced that there were distinct East Coast and West Coast Tois. They wanted to determine whether the two were the same person or two separate people. 60

Best did some background research on Toi and the East Coast 'tangata whenua' by acquiring and reading Gudgeon and Wilson's works. Best noted that these writings were regarded with suspicion by Tuhoé experts, who regarded any information gathered at Native Land Court sittings as unreliable. 61 Best believed that there had been tangata whenua peoples in the Urewera country, but noted that this idea was questioned even

58 Sissons, Te Waimana, pp. 6-8, 16-21.
60 S. P. Smith, History and Traditions, Chp. 4.
E. Best to S. P. Smith, 23/6/1895, E. Best Papers, MS-Papers-0072-08, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
For a detailed comparative examination of Toi traditions and whakapapa and an account of Smith's manipulation of these see Simmons, Great NZ Myth, pp. 66-100.
61 E. Best to S. P. Smith, 27/7/1895, E. Best Papers, MS-Papers-0072-08, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
among the Tuhoe themselves. He wrote to Smith, 'The old men not only admit [tangata whenua] as a pre-Maori or pre-Mataatua people but are rather proud of it. The younger men mostly deny that any [tangata whenua] ever existed'.

Best spent much time trying to unravel the histories of the various peoples he identified as tangata whenua, believing he could compare traditions to work out the 'true' history of an area or a people. He tried to trace the story of early peoples such as Nga Potiki, who were clearly seen as ancestors by Tuhoe, and of other ancient peoples such as Maruiwi, who appeared to have totally disappeared. In particular Best tried to work out how the various hapu were related to the ancestor Toi te huatahi. He eventually came to the conclusion that most of the 'tangata whenua' lines of Tuhoe ancestry could be traced back to Toi, with the exception of Nga Potiki and probably Te Hapu oneone.

Best collected a wide variety of stories concerning Toi and the 'tangata whenua'. He wrote to Smith that information he had received from Parakiri of Ngati Manawa and Hamiora Pio of Ngati Awa, indicated that there were in fact two different men called Toi. These were Toi te huatahi or Toi kai rakau, who was an 'aboriginal' and a Hawaikian Toi, who Parakiri referred to as 'Toi-te-atua-rere-tahi'. The Toi from Hawaiki apparently never came out to New Zealand. Best did not accept that this was definitive answer to the question of Toi's identity, as he wrote in the same letter to Smith, 'The great Toi controversy progresses apace'. As will be seen below, Smith also considered that Toi's identity remained an open question. Best continued collecting information on Toi, recording many contradictory whakapapa and stories. Most of these accounts had the common factor of identifying Toi as being tangata whenua from Aotearoa rather than Hawaiki.

In 1906 Smith asked Best for his comments and corrections concerning the draft chapter on Toi that Smith was writing for his *History and Traditions of the Maoris of the West Coast*. Smith speculated that the Toi te huatahi or Toi kai rakau of the various New

---

62 Best used a shorthand symbol for tangata whenua in this letter. The shorthand was devised by Smith for recording Maori information and was commonly used by him and Best. See Smith, *Reminiscences*, p. 217, for Smith's claim to have invented the shorthand. For more information on details of the shorthand see 'Te Ringapoto o Te Peeti' in *He Muka*, 6, Raumati 1993. I must thank Tipene Crisp for passing on to me this publication of the Maori Language Commission.

63 E. Best to S. P. Smith, 3/7/1895, E. Best Papers, MS-Papers-0072-08, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
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66 Smith noted that for his chapter on Toi in *The History and Traditions of the Maoris of the West Coast*, that many of the thirty nine whakapapa tables he had drawn up for Toi had been given to him by Best, as had the notes on which much of the chapter was based. See Smith, *History and Traditions*, p. 63n.
Zealand stories was the same as the Toi te huatahi of Rarotongan stories. He mentioned that there were stories of the New Zealand Toi going to Hawaiki. Smith further suggested that there may have been more than one Toi in New Zealand. Best's reply shows he had very clear views by this time. He stated that he had always heard that the New Zealand Toi was a completely distinct character from the Toi of Hawaiki. He had never heard it said that the New Zealand Toi had been to Hawaiki. Best wrote that most Tuhoe stories held that Toi was tangata whenua. However Best had heard a few stories that had Toi coming from Hawaiki, a version that he personally could not believe. Best considered the most accurate stories to be those he had collected from Ngati Awa, portraying Toi as tangata whenua. He also believed that the New Zealand Toi te huatahi was the same character as Toi kai rakau and Toi te huru manu. Smith, however, remained unconvinced by Best's arguments.

The book *Tuhoe*, which was largely written in 1906 and 1907, provides a summary of the views Best held on the tangata whenua, before he came in contact with the writings of Whatahoro. Best believed the tangata whenua were a Polynesian people who had settled in New Zealand thirty three to thirty five generations before the early twentieth century. Of these people one of the most important ancestral figures was Toi te huatahi, so named for being an only child (huatahi). He was named Toi kai rakau (Toi the wood eater) by a later wave of Polynesian settlers to mark the fact that his people lived by hunting and gathering, having no agriculture. Most of the hapu in the East Coast/Bay of Plenty area were in some way connected with Toi.

Best believed a second migration of Polynesians arrived in Aotearoa around the year 1350, a date worked out by estimating twenty five years per generation. (Best's use of this system of dating and his adoption of the idea of a fleet of canoes will be examined below in the section on Smith's writings.) The principal waka to arrive in the Bay of Plenty area was the *Mataatua*. Best believed the people from this migration were, 'A more energetic and masterful people than the old-time people of Toi, Potiki and Hape'. This meant they triumphed in battle over the original inhabitants. Best believed, however, that the new arrivals intermixed so much with the older peoples that their Tuhoe descendants were, 'far more aboriginal in blood than they are Hawaikian'.

---

67 S. P. Smith to E. Best, 20/10/1906, Polynesian Society Records, MS-Papers-1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
68 S. P. Smith to E. Best, 7/10/1906, Polynesian Society Records, MS-Papers-1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
Nevertheless the modern Tuhoe hapu tended to emphasise their Mataatua ancestry as reflected in the whakatauki quoted by Best, "Na Toi raua ko Potiki te whenua, na Tuhoe te mana me te rangatiratanga". (The land is from Toi and Potiki, the prestige and rank is from Tuhoe [an ancestor of Mataatua descent]).

Best believed that the tangata whenua had a strong Melanesian element in their ancestry, as indicated by the large number of individuals within the Tuhoe people who showed what he described as 'Melanesian characteristics, both in features and in their hair'. In an 1896 pamphlet In Ancient Maoriland, Best wrote that, 'Since I have been in contact with the descendants of the original people...I have come to the conclusion that the primary ancestors of the Tangata whenua...came from a totally different part of the Pacific to that which sent forth the fleet of canoes'. Best became convinced that the tangata whenua were at least partly descended from Melanesians, which distinguished them from the East Polynesians of the 'fleet' migration. He speculated that the Polynesians and Melanesians may have intermarried further north in the Pacific or that the mixing may have occurred as a result of the arrival of Melanesians in Aotearoa on canoes such as the Horouta.

In 1902 Best wrote an article for the Journal of the Polynesian Society on 'The Art of War', in which he stated, in commenting on the finding of an ancient bow at Mangapai in Northland,

It is fairly proved by traditionary evidence that the bow-using Melanesians visited and settled in New Zealand in the long ago. Traces of the admixture of the Melanesian and Polynesian races are most noticeable in various divisions of the Tuhoe tribes.

Smith, at this time, disagreed with Best's views on the Melanesian ancestry of the 'tangata whenua'. He wrote to Best saying that he could not prove that Melanesians had come to New Zealand. Best replied saying that the Melanesians were black people.

---

71 Ibid., p. 13.
72 Best described as 'coarse' the physical characteristics that he believed were 'Melanesian', such as thick lips, dark skin, and bushy hair. The 'purer' Polynesians had 'good features', such as thin lips, straight noses, and straight or wavy hair. It is clear that Best's idea of physical beauty was highly Eurocentric, the closer a person's physical features were to a European stereotype the better. See, Best, Tuhoe, Vol. 1, p. 14.
74 Best, Tuhoe, Vol. 1, pp. 14-5. Tuhoe, which was not published until 1925, also included a later insertion based on material not available to Best in 1907. In the insertion Best set out an account of the original tangata whenua of the North Island as 'a dark skinned, bushy-haired folk the Mouriuripeople, sometimes referred to as the Maruiwi'. These people were later driven out by the mixed race descendants of later East Polynesian migrants who intermarried with some local peoples. Best speculated that the Melanesian features of the Tuhoe might be traced back to this earliest people. This version of the past, which Best had only become aware of in 1909, was derived from Te Whatahoro of the Ngati Kahungunu, whose work will be discussed below. Ibid., p. 14.
75 Best, 'Notes on the Art of War', Pt 4, p. 240.
speaking a strange tongue who had arrived at the Whakatane area on the Horouta canoe. Best had obtained stories concerning these people from Hamiora Pio, Matutaera Hatua, Hoani Poururu and Waata Te Rangikotuha, all from Ngati Awa. In a letter to Smith, Best conceded that the Melanesians were not the original people of New Zealand. Instead he put forward the idea that they had arrived in New Zealand, only to have the men eaten by the Polynesians and the women kept. He later suggested that the Melanesians had come on Horouta as slaves of the Polynesian navigators. Both ideas reflect Best's racist views on Polynesian cannibalism and on racial hierarchies. He considered that darker Melanesians must be inferior to the lighter Polynesians.76

Smith published Best's article keeping intact the statement on the Melanesian presence, but adding the following footnote, 'This statement does not of course imply that there was a Melanesian race here before the Maoris- a theory lately promulgated, but without any authority in our opinion-Ed.'77 Smith was to remain for many years unconvinced of the Melanesian element among the 'tangata whenua'. In contrast Best began to lean more and more towards supporting the idea, as evidenced by several passages from the book Tuhoe, repeating the account of the Horouta canoe and its black crew. This emphasis on a Melanesian element in the 'tangata whenua' was later to be a major factor in the popular concept of the 'Moriori'.78

An article Best wrote in 1901, entitled 'Te Whanga-nui-a-Tara', set out the state of his thinking, at that time, on the 'tangata whenua'. Best believed a considerable aboriginal population had lived in New Zealand well before the arrival of the fleet. With the arrival of the fleet the 'tangata whenua' tribes were pushed south by the new immigrants. Best regarded early southern tribes such as the Waitaha and Ngati Mamoe as having been 'aboriginals', but recognised that the Ngati Mamoe at least had become mixed in with the East Polynesian immigrants. In 1901, Best believed the 'tangata whenua' were Polynesians, but had no idea where they came from. He speculated that the earlier peoples may have been closely related to the Chatham Island Moriori, but did not appear to have been very sure of this. He saw the early 'tangata whenua' as having disappeared completely, following the arrival of the more advanced East Polynesians.79

Best suggested that the decline of peoples before more advanced races, 'is surely

---

76 E. Best to S. P. Smith, 20/11/1902, Polynesian Society Records, MS-Papers-1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
77 Best, 'Notes on the Art of War', Pt. 4, p. 240n.
fulfilling a great law of Nature, and is a necessary link in the endless chain of human progress.

The attempts by Best and Smith to decipher the identity of Toi and the tangata whenua provide an example of their historical approach. On the one hand they believed that the oral traditions of the hapu connected with Tuhoe contained within them accounts of actual historical events. Best and Smith believed that they as ethnologists and historians had the ability, and the right, to determine which parts of the stories described 'real' events and which parts were purely 'mythical'. They also believed it was possible to compare a variety of hapu accounts concerning particular events and decide which accounts were true. They thought it legitimate to make a composite 'true' story out of the various accounts. Sissons compares their sitting in judgement on the accuracy of different stories with the role of the Urewera Commissioners deciding which land claims were legitimate.

Best and Smith do not appear to have attached much importance to what these stories meant to those who originally told them. Sissons describes Best as ignoring the fact that a story might be an assertion of a political or spiritual relationship to another people or area of land or water. Best and Smith took these stories out of their original contexts and rearranged them as building blocks in overarching histories they were devising. Their work might be compared to an archaeologist trying to piece together a story from fragments of material culture, without being aware of the original uses of these objects. Smith and Best used this information to build up something which had not previously existed in Maori oral histories, a scheme which Ballara refers to as "the grand design". Within this scheme they tried to create all embracing histories of Tuhoe as an iwi, of the waves of arrival of people in New Zealand; and of the entire pattern of Polynesian migration in the Pacific.

Smith Tries to Write a Comprehensive Account of Polynesian Migration

It is clear from the correspondence between Smith and Best that by the mid-1890s both men accepted the existence of a pre-Maori tangata whenua people but that neither of them were sure of the history, origin or exact identity of these people. Smith's interest in the whole question of the tangata whenua and the identity of characters such as Toi was in turn part of his larger project of constructing a history of the entire process of Polynesian migration throughout the Pacific. During the 1890s and 1900s Smith

80Ibid., p. 121.
81Sissons, Te Waimana, pp. 18-21. See also Ballara, Iwi, Chp. 8, especially pp. 99-100.
82Sissons, Te Waimana, pp. 6-12, 54-57.
brought out a series of writings on these questions. These publications reveal the
development of Smith's ideas on the pre-fleet tangata whenua, and on early Polynesian
migration, up to the time of his contact with Whatahoro. From this it can be seen how
Smith's ideas were changed by Whatahoro's writings and how the story Simmons
described as 'the Great New Zealand Myth' was developed by Smith and Whatahoro
into its public form.

It is important before looking at these developments to address the question of
chronological dating, an issue which was regarded by both Smith and Best as vital to
their work. Smith acknowledged that traditional Polynesian societies had not followed
Western concepts of linear time, for dating events in their traditions. Yet he believed, 'If
Polynesian traditions cannot be reduced to the proper periods to which they have
reference, they will never serve the purposes of history."

Smith believed the only way to calculate the dates of events in Maori tradition was by
using whakapapa or genealogies. He believed an average of twenty-five years could be
applied to each generation on a genealogical table, a figure that appears to have been
agreed on by several different Pakeha ethnologists after a period of debate. Ancestral
figures often appeared on a wide variety of different genealogical tables, each of
different length. Smith simply used the technique of averaging these out, or
alternatively selecting as accurate the tables that best fitted his overall theories. Simmons
has written at length on the inaccuracies of this technique as a way of working out
historical dates for such events as the 950 AD arrival of Kupe, the 1120 AD
settlement by Toi and Whatonga, and the 1350 AD arrival of the 'fleet'. Simmons sees
Smith's methods of dating as completely arbitrary and dismisses them as nothing more
valuable than 'an exercise in arithmetic'.

Smith's arithmetic was particularly dubious when he came to calculate the dates of the
'Great Fleet' or heke (migration). This was a group of canoes that were supposed to have
set off together from Hawaiki, transporting the East Polynesian ancestors of the major
nineteenth century tribes to New Zealand. Simmons points out that in the nineteenth
century a few iwi such as Ngati Kahungunu, had some versions of their migration
stories that spoke of a fleet of canoes. Some Tainui stories spoke of Tainui, Arawa,
Kurahaupo and Mataatua all leaving Hawaiki around the same time, but all Tainui

---

85Smith, 'Hawaiki, Pt 2', p. 201. For debate over the number of years to be assigned to a Maori
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86Simmons, Great NZ Myth, pp. 36-40, 71-73, 107-8.
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accounts held that the Tainui and Arawa canoes were contemporaries. Arawa accounts told of the Tainui and Arawa waka arriving in Aotearoa at around the same time. Apart from these few examples the great majority of migration stories had the various canoes sailing separately.88 Nevertheless for some reason the idea of a fleet was popular among Pakeha scholars of Maori subjects, being supported by writers such as Dieffenbach, Horatio Hale, Wilson and Gudgeon.89

Smith was a firm believer in the idea of a fleet, as was Elsdon Best. Smith calculated the date of the fleet as 1350 by averaging out the number of generations from a wide variety of whakapapa of ancestors from the various canoes. In an extreme case, Smith and Best admitted that there were only around sixteen generations from 1900 AD back to the ancestors of the Mataatua canoe, a canoe which had no tradition of being part of a fleet. Despite this fact both men held that Mataatua was part of the fleet that had supposedly sailed in 1350, about twenty-two generations before 1900.90

'The Peopling of the North'

Smith examined the questions relating to the tangata whenua, in his 'The Peopling of the North', a two-part supplement to the 1896 and 1897 volumes of the Journal of the Polynesian Society. Several themes, which were developed more fully in Smith's later writings, emerge from this early work. 'The Peopling of the North' was an attempt to write a history of the tribes living between North Cape and Auckland. Smith admitted that the traditions concerning these peoples were fragmentary. He based his work on the collections of John White, along with his own notes written down from his time spent among the Ngati Whatua of Kaipara in the early 1860s.91

'The Peopling of the North' clearly shows that by 1896 Smith firmly believed that a great heke or migration had occurred in 1350 AD. Smith claimed that it was a general belief among Maori that such a fleet had brought migrants to the areas south of Auckland.92 He believed that Northland was inhabited well before the Fleet waka arrived and maintained that there had been many other canoes landing in New Zealand

88 Ibid., pp. 111-25, 158-81. Judith Binney points out that among contemporary Tuhoe there are now some traditions that the Mataatua was accompanied. J. Binney, pers comm, 9/7/2001.
89 Dieffenbach, Travels in New Zealand, Vol. 2, p. 85
Wilson, Story of Te Waharoa, pp. 166-71.
90 Smith, History and Traditions, p. 66.
91 S. P. Smith, 'The Peopling of the North', JPS, supplement Vols 5-6, 1896-7, pp. i-ii.
92 Smith, 'Peopling of the North', pp. 1-2, 17, 18, 20, 32.
before those of the 'Fleet' and that it was from some of these canoes that the Northland tribes traced descent. The canoe migrants found an even earlier tangata whenua people resident in Northland. Smith admitted he had no information on the names of these tangata whenua tribes nor about what canoes they had arrived on. He believed there had been a strong tangata whenua presence in Northland, giving the northern tribes a high proportion of tangata whenua ancestors.

In 'Peopling of the North' Smith was rather vague about the identity of the tangata whenua and how closely they were related to the migrants of the supposed fleet. He did not say whether he believed the migrants in the 'pre-fleet' canoes such as the Mahuhu, were of the same race as the tangata whenua people who were already in Northland. Nor did he say whether he believed either of these pre-fleet groups were related to the fleet migrants. One quote does indicate that Smith may have seen the tangata whenua as an entirely different race from the Maori, when he mentioned Maori tribes of 'a purely Polynesian descent, entirely unconnected with the tangata-whenua or aborigines'.

Smith gave some vague descriptions of the earlier peoples in two separate items, both taken from the collection of John White. The story, told originally by Hehi, of the arrival of the Aupouri people in New Zealand mentioned that their ancestors settled disputes by argument rather than by combat. Smith believed this indicated a connection with the pacifist Moriori of the Chatham Islands, especially as he believed that the Moriori whakapapa indicated that their ancestors would still have been in New Zealand when Hehi's ancestors settled at Te Aupouri. Smith also mentioned a tradition of the Ngati Kahukokopake people, which told of a people descended from the Mahuhu waka who in ancient times settled around the heads of the Kaipara Harbour. According to the tradition these people, who were later destroyed by Arawa peoples, lived by hunting and gathering and dwelt in caves. Smith again believed this was similar to the way of life of the Chatham island Moriori and contrasted it to the 'fleet' Maori, who he believed had introduced agriculture and the building of substantial houses to New Zealand.

---

93 Among the canoes he mentioned were the unnamed waka on which the ancestors of the Aupouri (North Cape) people came; the Mahuhu, claimed by Ngati Whatua (as well as the Nga Puhi and Te Rarawa); and Kupe's waka 'Mata-hourua', from which various local people claimed descent. See Ibid., pp. 2-8, 13-5. Smith's account of Kupe was based on material collected by John White. The story of the Aupouri people's migration was told by an Aupouri man called Patiki, who claimed that it originated with a tohunga called Hehi who passed it on in the late 1830s. It was collected by White, see Ibid., pp. 3-8. Smith also mentioned that various northern tribes also traced descent to 'Fleet' waka. Te Rarawa claimed descent to the Kurahoukopa through their ancestor Po and to Mataatua through Miru pokai, while Nga Puhi claimed descent from the Mataatua waka through their ancestor Puhi. See Ibid., pp. 15-18.
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Smith wrote, 'There are strong reasons for believing that the pre-heke inhabitants of this country were of the same race as the Moriori'.

In 1896 Smith believed that the tangata whenua were probably closely related to the Moriori. At this time Smith still held to the view he had formed during his year on the Chathams, in 1868, that the Moriori were purely Polynesians. He wrote in an editorial comment in 1897: 'They [the Moriori] are in outward appearance almost identical with the Maoris, though...there are some differences, but not so great as to be noticed by the casual observer'. In the same commentary Smith noted that the craniological work of the Otago University College anatomist Professor J. H. Scott, 'seems to indicate an origin for the Moriori from the two great Polynesian stocks'. All these comments indicate that Smith, in 1896, believed that the tangata whenua were Polynesians rather than a separate race from Maori.

The view Smith had of Kupe in 1896 was also very different from his later ideas. In 'The Peopling of the North' Smith held that Kupe did not come to Aotearoa in 920 AD but instead visited some time between 1325 and 1350. Smith cited as proof of this date the story of Kupe's meeting Turi of the Aotea canoe, a canoe which he believed was part of the fleet. At this time Smith dismissed as incorrect the Nga Puhi story that Kupe was the first man to come to New Zealand. Smith also maintained that the whakapapa which connected Kupe to the Nga Puhi was completely incorrect and unreliable. Smith believed that he, as a Pakeha historian, had the authority to work out which oral traditions were accurate, and which were fictional. His approach to oral tradition, like that of Best with the Tuhoe, involved a refusal to take account of the meanings traditions held for those who developed them.

Smith made only two brief references to Toi in 'Peopling of the North'. In both references he was writing of 'Toi-kai-rakau', the ancestor of the Bay of Plenty tribes. In 1896 Smith saw Toi as one of the tangata whenua. Smith printed a whakapapa chart, obtained from Hone Mohi Tawhai of Nga Puhi, which showed Toi as being twenty-nine generations back from Tawhai. Smith wrote that by comparing a number of whakapapa tracing back to Toi, all of different lengths, he could work out an average of the number generations back to Toi. From this he calculated Toi flourished in the period from around 1150 to 1200.
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Smith accepted that there were conflicting versions of stories, as shown when he outlined three entirely different versions of the story of the arrival of the Northland ancestors Tiki and Po. Rather than accepting that each version had a specific meaning for the hapu from which it originated, he believed that some were more accurate versions of history than others. Smith believed that he was enough of an expert to determine which stories and whakapapa could be regarded as 'accurate' and which were partly or completely wrong. Therefore he rejected the Nga Puhí stories and whakapapa connected with Kupe as being 'incorrect'.

Smith saw himself as having complete authority of interpretation over the stories he collected. In one example Smith explained the Te Rarawa stories of descent from the 'god-man' Tawhaki, by saying they referred to Te Rarawa's descent from more recent Polynesian immigrants of 'a more advanced civilization'. In another example Smith maintained that claims of descent from Patupaiarehe, 'fairies', were in fact references to tangata whenua who had been in New Zealand before the fleet Maori. Smith's interpretation of the Tawhaki story illustrates his idea that migration was a progressive process, with each newly arriving group being superior to those who preceded them.

Smith's historically literalist approach is illustrated by his attempts to specifically identify geographical locations mentioned in migration stories. He rejected any idea that the places mentioned in traditions might be purely mythical or symbolic constructs. Thus he tried to specifically locate the island of 'Wae-rota' mentioned the account of the history of the Mahuhu waka related by Hehi of Aupouri. Smith used Hehi's description of dark skinned, bushy haired people, along with the plants and animals described in the account to place Waerota in Melanesia. Smith did not consider that the quite detailed descriptions of people, flora and fauna supposedly found in Waerota might date from journeys by Maori to Melanesia on whaling and merchant ships after European contact. Smith was convinced that these stories had been handed down for generations relatively intact and held the key to tracing the ancient history of Polynesian migrations.

103Smith, 'Peopling the North', pp. 9-10. Smith held that one of the accounts of Tiki and Po, based around a whakapapa obtained by the missionary Rev. Matthews, confirmed the account by Hehi of the arrival of the Mahuhu canoe at a time much earlier than the 'fleet'. The third account, collected by Edward Shortland, described Tiki and Po as coming on the Kurahaupo canoe. Smith argued that Shortland's account was inaccurate as to the name of the canoe, even though it may have been accurate on other counts. Smith would not accept the Kurahaupo story, not only because it contradicted the other two versions, but also because it contradicted other accounts, some of which held that the Kurahaupo didn't get to New Zealand, while others held that it did come, but during the period of the fleet.


105Ibid., pp. 21, 50-1.

106On the Pakeha quest for a geographical location for Hawaiki see M. Orbell, Hawaiki: A New Approach to Maori Tradition, Christchurch, 1985, in which Orbell argues that Hawaiki and the migration stories are largely religious constructs. Also on the quest for Hawaiki see Sorrenson, Maori Origins and Migrations.
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'The Peopling of the North' shows that by 1897 Smith was beginning to try to construct an integrated history of the migration of the ancestors of the Maori to New Zealand. He was convinced that the central event in the history of these migrations was the arrival of a 'Great Fleet', or heke (migration), which he had calculated to have landed in New Zealand around 1350. Before the fleet's arrival a 'tangata whenua' people inhabited New Zealand, a people he believed to be related to the Moriori of the Chatham Islands. However at this time he clearly considered the Moriori to be Polynesians and it is therefore probable that he considered the 'tangata whenua' to be at least distantly related to the fleet Maori. This idea is however further complicated by a quote in which Smith indicated he saw the 'tangata whenua' as entirely separate racially from the Polynesians.

In 1897 Smith believed that Kupe was a contemporary of the Great Fleet and was not the first man to visit New Zealand. Smith also at this time believed that Toi kai rakau was one of the tangata whenua from the Bay of Plenty. These views of Kupe and Toi were different from what Smith was later to believe in the orthodox version of Polynesian migration, where he saw Kupe was the discoverer of Aotearoa and Toi as an immigrant from Hawaiki.

Smith's ideas show that he considered that as a Pakeha scholar he had the right to compare, integrate or reject different accounts and whakapapa list. He attempted to show the history of actual events in their correct chronological order and geographical setting, with all accounts being created out of a synthesis of disparate traditions. Smith admitted that he found the Northern accounts very frustrating as the stories were complicated and fragmentary, with many traditions having been lost. He summed this up in the opening line of this work: 'In reference to the Maori inhabitants of the extreme north of New Zealand there is great difficulty in evolving out of the various traditions that have been preserved anything like order or sequence'.

A Polynesian or Melanesian 'Tangata Whenua'- Smith's Debate with Rutland

In the 1890s Smith believed an earlier people had lived in New Zealand before the arrival of the fleet. Smith knew little about this people, but believed they resembled the Moriori of the Chathams. At this time Smith believed the Moriori were Polynesian and very similar to Maori. He did not agree with Best that the tangata whenua had a strong
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Melanesian aspect. The views Smith held in the late 1890s are well illustrated by his comments on the work of the Marlborough amateur archaeologist, Joshua Rutland.

Over a period of several years Rutland excavated a series of pits in Pelorus Sound, convinced they were the remains of hut dwellings. The seeming antiquity of charcoal and shells associated with the pits, combined with the fact that some pits were covered by the roots of large trees indicated to Rutland that these 'dwellings' were very old. Stone implements were also found embedded under the roots of large, old trees. Rutland became convinced that the Sounds had been inhabited from a much earlier date than previously assumed.112

Rutland collected information from local Maori as to the nature of the supposed earlier inhabitants. The earlier people were described to him as, 'A small, dark complexioned Maori speaking people, who were very numerous, peaceable and industrious'.113 Rutland compared this pacifism to the peaceable habits of the Moriori as described by Shand.114 The early people were supposedly contemporary with the moa; they were skilled at agriculture and working greenstone, but built very simplistic canoes. They were conquered and largely destroyed or enslaved by 'the ancestors of the modern Maoris'. Some Maori families in Pelorus were said to be descended from these people. Rutland's failure to name his informants or give their hapu and iwi affiliations makes it impossible to test the reliability of this information as contemporary oral tradition.115

In a later article Rutland had settled on an identity for the early population, writing, 'There can be little doubt that in the now nearly extinct Moriori we have a remnant of the people by whom New Zealand was first colonised'.116 Rutland offered a variety of evidence to back up his claims. The Pelorus Sound pits were he believed evidence of 'V huts' similar to those used on the Chathams. Rutland quoted a letter from Tregear which confirmed the pit dwelling habit of the Moriori. Tools found in the Pelorus area were claimed to be very similar to those collected on the Chathams.117 Rutland went on to assert that Moriori were more closely related to the Melanesians than the Polynesians. He wrote of this:

The Moriori resembling the Melanesian rather than the peoples of Eastern Polynesia, it is in the Western Pacific we must seek the origin of whatever
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was peculiar in their arts, habits, and customs, when compared with the modern Maori.\textsuperscript{118}

He suggested this was shown by their supposedly darker appearance, by the type of agriculture which he believed had occurred in the Sounds, and by the poor quality of their canoes. Rutland also suggested that the quantity of Moa bones around dwelling areas might be evidence that Moa had been semi-domesticated, similar to cassowaries in some Melanesian villages. He went on to explain Moriori loss of the art of cultivation as a product of the destructive effects of the Maori invasion of New Zealand.\textsuperscript{119}

Rutland's arguments as presented in his 1897 \textit{Journal of the Polynesian Society} article, were strongly criticised by Smith in editorial footnotes. Smith began by questioning whether Chatham Island Moriori had been pit dwellers. He went on to suggest that physical evidence indicated a predominantly Polynesian identity for the Moriori. Smith cited Scott's osteological paper as proving that Moriori, like Maori, were a people of mixed Polynesian and Melanesian ancestry but with the Polynesian predominating. Smith also added his own observations from the Chathams,

\begin{quotation}
The author [Rutland] appears to insist...on the Melanesian rather than the Polynesian affinities of the Moriori. They are in outward appearance almost identical with the Maoris, though...there are some differences, but not so great as to be noticed by the casual observer. Such is the opinion formed by one of us after spending twelve months on the Chatham Islands, in constant communication with the Morioris...From personal observation we can state that their hair is exactly the same as that of the Maoris, sometimes long and straight, at others curly, but never crisp like that of the Melanesians.\textsuperscript{120}
\end{quotation}

\textsuperscript{118}Ibid., p. 81.
\textsuperscript{119}Ibid., pp. 81-83. It should be noted that Rutland's use of the term Polynesian is at times ambiguous. It appears he sometimes used the term in reference to Pacific people, sometimes as a description of South Pacific islands in general. Thus at one point he makes the statement, that, 'The Moriori were undoubtedly an offshoot of some Polynesian nation', (see Ibid. p. 84), which appears to contradict his main argument.
\textsuperscript{120}Ibid., pp. 81-2n. Despite Percy Smith's criticisms, Rutland's ideas on the 'pit dwellers' had some influence. Professor Macmillan Brown accepted Rutland's idea of a darker, aboriginal people in the Marlborough Sounds from whom the Moriori were descended. However Macmillan Brown believed these people were neither Polynesian nor Melanesian but a separate group again with connections to Western Polynesian and South America. See J. Macmillan Brown 'An Extinct Race', \textit{The Weekly Press}, 24 August, 1910. Macmillan Brown was regarded by the Polynesian Society scholars such as Percy Smith and Best as an eccentric whose views on Pacific migration were to be given little credence, see for example, E. Best to S. P. Smith, 20/4/1908 and 12/1/1909, Polynesian Society Records, MS-Papers-1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.

As an interesting sequel to Rutland's ideas on the 'pit dwellers' it should be noted that some contemporary, (1990's), dwellers in the Marlborough Sounds have folklore tales of the 'pit people' who were supposedly Moriori. J. M. Clayworth, pers comm, 19/3/ 1994.
Smith's insistence in the 1890s on the similarities between the Maori and the Moriori provides an interesting contrast to the views he was to later hold once he gained access to the works of Whatahoro in 1909.

'Hawaiki- The Whence of the Maori'

In July 1897 Percy Smith took a six month holiday from his job as Surveyor General. He used this time to undertake two sea voyages which took him to many of the islands of Polynesia. Smith's goal was to talk to the old men of the various Polynesian peoples and record the oral traditions that he believed would otherwise soon be lost. From this information Smith hoped to construct an integrated history of the Polynesian migrations through the Pacific and in particular trace the wanderings of the ancestors of the New Zealand Maori. He collected a wide variety of material during his Pacific voyages but considered his most important acquisition to be a manuscript on Rarotongan history lent to him by the Rev. J. J. K. Hutchin of Rarotonga. This manuscript was said to have been written in the 1860s by the Rarotongan priest Te Ariki taraare.\(^\text{121}\)

Smith wrote up the material he had collected in a series of articles for the *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, entitled 'Hawaiki: The Whence of the Maori: Being an introduction to Rarotongan History', published in 1898 and 1899. The work was largely based on Rarotongan material, especially the Te Ariki taraare document. This material was also released as a book in 1898. Smith rewrote the material in an attempt to construct a general history of Polynesian migrations. This work was published in 1904 as *Hawaiki- The Original Home of the Maori*. Two more editions of *Hawaiki* were released, in 1910 and 1921, of which the fourth edition contained major additions of new material taken from the work of Te Whatahoro. The first three editions of *Hawaiki* will be examined, in order to illustrate the development of Smith's thoughts on Polynesian migration up to the time he came in contact with Whatahoro's work.\(^\text{122}\)

One of Smith's main goals was to locate the islands which had been the departure points for the various stages of the Polynesian migrations, especially those that had been named in traditions he had recorded in New Zealand. He knew that a wide variety of


places might have the same name for different reasons, such as descriptive purposes, memorials for some person or event, or being named after places in former homelands. Bearing this in mind Smith still believed that it was possible to find many of the exact geographical locations named in the New Zealand traditions. Therefore he held that the Maori 'Rangiatea' was Ra'iatea in the Society Islands, 'Ma-mangaia-tua' was Mangaia in the Cooks, and that the Rarotonga mentioned in Maori stories was Rarotonga of the Cooks.

It was information regarding the fleet or heke which convinced Smith that Rarotonga was the final departure point on the journey to New Zealand. During his visit to Rarotonga Smith consulted Tamarua-Orometua, a knowledgeable Rarotongan elder of the Ngati Tangiia tribe from the eastern side of the island. Tamarua-Orometua told Smith that many years ago a fleet of six canoes had left Rarotonga for New Zealand, which Tamarua referred to as Aotearoa. The canoes were named 'Te Arava, Kura-aupo, Mata-atua, Toko-maru, Tainui, and Taki-tumu'. Smith appears to have asked Tamarua if he had heard the names of various famous traditional canoe ancestors such as Tama te kapua, Toroa and Ngatoro i rangi. Tamarua had only heard the name of the captain of the Tainui, who was known in Rarotonga as Oturoa. (In Tainui Maori tradition the captain of the Tainui was Hoturoa.) Tamarua stated that he had not heard of Kupe, nor of the Aotea canoe, which Smith believed to have arrived in New Zealand around the time of the supposed fleet.

Smith was told several other stories by Tamarua that appeared to match stories from New Zealand. Tamarua spoke of a man called Ngaue who went to New Zealand, then returned with a stone called 'toka-matie' and with the preserved flesh of a Moa he had killed there. Ngaue's tales of New Zealand were what inspired the fleet to migrate there. This story matched the New Zealand tale of Ngahue who visited New Zealand and went back to Hawaiki taking pounamu (greenstone) and the flesh of a Moa. Tamarua also mentioned the Mamari canoe, which sailed separately from the fleet. Smith identified this waka with the Mamari canoe of Northland tradition. The one major difference Smith saw between the Rarotongan and New Zealand stories was that in Tamarua's version the Takitumu returned from Aotearoa to Rarotonga and stayed there. Tamarua did not say that Rarotonga was the Hawaiki of Maori tradition but rather that the fleet
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came to Rarotonga from Hawaiki and finding it fully populated headed on to New Zealand.\textsuperscript{128}

Smith recorded that he was so excited on receiving this information that he forgot to ask Tamarua where the fleet had come from prior to its landing at Rarotonga. He completely accepted Tamarua's stories as authentic, rejecting any thoughts that the stories may have originated from earlier nineteenth century New Zealand Maori visitors to Rarotonga. Nor does he appear to have thought that his questioning of Tamarua would have prompted any of the answers he received. Tamarua told Smith that he was about twenty two years old in 1822 when the first missionaries arrived in Rarotonga. Smith believed this meant that Tamarua would have been able to acquire the ancient knowledge without the corruption from Christian influences.\textsuperscript{129}

Smith was even more impressed with the document he received in Rarotonga from the Rev. J. J. K. Hutchin, said to have been written down by Te Ariki tara are in the 1860s. This document, if genuine, indicated that the Rarotongans had a detailed traditional record of the stages of Polynesian migration through the Pacific. After comparing this document with his own knowledge of Pacific migration traditions, Smith concluded it was fairly accurate, especially as he believed it had been recorded by an important priest in Rarotonga. Before he had met H. T. Whatahoro, Smith believed that Maori had no similar documents nor any detailed record of their Pacific migratory history. At the time of his visit to Rarotonga, he maintained that there was a huge gap in Maori history between the stories of the creator gods and the adventures of legendary heroes such as Tawhaki.\textsuperscript{130}

The information Smith acquired in Rarotonga reinforced his idea that by comparing traditions and whakapapa throughout Polynesia he could write a comprehensive history of Polynesian migrations. He believed that the Polynesians had existed as a race or 'type' from before the time they ventured into the Pacific.\textsuperscript{131} One of the major aims of Smith's Pacific journeys was to determine the location of Hawaiki. He realised that Hawaiki was a general Polynesian name for a homeland or place left in migration, but thought it was in fact the name of the original homeland, probably in Indonesia or further West, from which the Polynesians had commenced their Pacific migrations. Smith noted that the Polynesians had applied the name 'Hawaiki' to many other

\textsuperscript{128}Ibid., pp. 195-8.
\textsuperscript{129}Ibid., pp. 197-8.
\textsuperscript{130}Ibid., pp. 211-2. Smith saw this gap in Maori history as being due either to the failure of early missionaries to properly record Maori oral traditions, or perhaps to the fact that the original Polynesian migrants to New Zealand may not have been accompanied by any priests with enough knowledge to retain the early traditions of Pacific migration. Ibid.
\textsuperscript{131}Ibid. Pt. 3, p. 46.
homelands that had been sites of departure throughout the Pacific. Thus they had named Savai'i in Samoa; Havai'i, an old name for Ra'iatea in the Society Islands; Havaiki, an old name for Fakarava in the Tuamotu Islands (which Smith referred to as the Paumotu group); and Hawai'i, in the Hawaiian Islands.  

Smith believed that for Maori Tahiti and the Society islands had been the most recent Hawaiki. He suggested that Tahiti was the Tawhiti nui mentioned in East Coast Maori stories. He also maintained that Turi, captain of the Aotea canoe and ancestor of many West Coast tribes, was the same Turi mentioned in Tahitian legend, who set sail into the unknown from Ra'iatea. Looking out from a hill on Ra'iatea, Smith set out an imaginary account of Turi's departure which illustrated his romantic approach to the issue of Polynesian migration:

> Imagination pictured a large double canoe with its daring commander, its stalwart crew, its priests, its living freight of women and children...parting forever from their ancestral home, with tears and farewells, bound on a voyage across what was for them an unknown ocean, in search of a home wherein peace might be found...  

Smith stated in a section on Polynesian navigation that:

> It is now well known that this country [New Zealand] had a considerable population before the arrival of the fleet in 1350, who were divided into tribes, the names alone of which are retained, the people having been absorbed to a large extent by the newcomers.

Smith bewailed the lack of genealogical knowledge of these people that made it very difficult to accurately date their arrival in New Zealand. He believed a comparison of genealogical tables showed that Toi kai rakau had lived about 28 generations before 1850, which Smith calculated was around 1150 AD. He believed that what he considered to be the most reliable genealogical table showed that the earliest known 'tangata whenua' ancestor was 'Ti-wakawaka', who was visited by a Polynesian voyager called Maku, around 850 AD. It appears Smith at this point believed the 'tangata
When writing this earliest version of 'Hawaiki', Smith clearly believed that the Chatham Island Moriori were part of a single Polynesian race, being largely indistinguishable in physical appearance from Maori, Tongans, Hawaiians, or Easter Islands and speaking a dialect of the Eastern Polynesian language. Smith also believed that the Moriori were the 'tangata whenua' of New Zealand. This reinforced the idea Smith held at this time, that the first people in New Zealand were very closely related to the Maori. Smith believed that Moriori genealogies indicated they had left New Zealand for the Chathams around the time of Toi. Toi, his son Rauru, and grandson Whatonga were all on Moriori genealogical tables, but as ancestral 'gods' rather than as ordinary human beings. Smith believed he understood Polynesian genealogies enough to declare that Toi and his descendants had been 'misplaced' in their positions on Moriori whakapapa.

In 1898, Smith did not believe that Kupe was the discoverer of New Zealand, as he was not mentioned in Rarotongan history. Smith simply held that the Taranaki tribes placed Kupe as a contemporary of Turi and that Kupe had visited New Zealand about a generation before the arrival of the fleet. Smith believed that there had been a series of solo canoe visits to New Zealand by navigators such as Kupe, Tu moana, Paoa, and Ngahue, during the hundred years or so before 1350, the arrival date he had calculated for the fleet.

At the end of his account Smith set out some of the issues that remained unresolved despite the information gained from the Rarotongan traditions. Smith speculated as to the origin of the Polynesians. He put forward the theory that they had lived originally in India, but were neither Aryan nor Semitic. He believed they had been pushed out of India by Aryan invaders from whom they had learned many Aryan words. Smith also...
suggested that the Polynesians had been neighbours to a Semitic people living in 'Beloochistan', from whom they had adopted various Semitic customs. During their Pacific voyages Smith believed the Polynesians had visited South America from whence they had acquired the kumara.  

In 1904 Smith released a new edition of 'Hawaiiki' entitled *Hawaiiki: the Original Home of the Maori*, which he described as 'rearranged... to form a sketch of the History of the Polynesian Race...'. Again the work was largely based on Rarotongan traditions, in particular, the document claimed to be written by Te Ariki tara are. Smith reiterated his belief in the value of indigenous traditions as a source of historical information stating, 'It is an axiom that all tradition is based on fact- whilst the details may be wrong, the main stem is generally right'.  

In 1904 Smith repeated the idea he had put forward in 1898, that the Polynesian 'race' was essentially homogenous, although varying around an essential 'type'. Smith fleshed out this idea of an original or essential Polynesian 'type', the 'true Polynesian'. While acknowledging that it was impossible to know exactly what this type was he believed:

> It is probable that the handsome, tall, oval faced, high browed, lithe, active, light brown, black straight haired, black or very brown eyed, cheerful, dignified individual so frequently met with is the nearest to the original Polynesian.

Smith's description was highly Eurocentric, describing features he considered as handsome, but which also came very close to features which were considered to be that of 'Europeans'. It appears from the descriptions and photos in the 1904 edition of *Hawaiiki*, that the ideal type referred to is male rather than generic.

Smith believed that the variations around this type were the result of mixing with other peoples, in particular the Melanesians, during the long migrations of the Polynesians. Smith stated that this meant the race was 'not pure', suggesting a negative attitude to the idea of the mixing of peoples. Given his rather glowing description of the ideal Polynesian and his rather contemptuous attitude towards Melanesians this attitude is not
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surprising. Hence Smith dismissed the Fijians as 'half-castes', a mixture of Polynesians and Melanesians. Smith hoped that future craniological studies might help to unravel the mysteries of the origins of the Polynesians and the history of their mixing with other peoples.

The information in the 1904 *Hawaiki* contained on Toi kai rakau was unchanged from the 1898 edition, as was the idea that Kupe was not the discoverer of New Zealand, but had come to New Zealand just before the fleet. Smith had now developed the additional idea that there were possibly two Kupes, with the man who gave Turi the directions to New Zealand being a different person to the explorer of the West Coast.

Smith also further developed his ideas on the nature of the 'tangata whenua' of New Zealand. He believed that the modern Maori were descended from both the original 'tangata whenua' and the fleet migrants of 1350. He believed that the Maori tended to play down their tangata whenua ancestry, setting greater store by their fleet ancestry. Smith stated that there were considerable differences in behaviour between the 'tangata whenua' and the fleet migrants. Basing his ideas on the information in the manuscript written by Hamiora Pio of Ngati Awa, Smith stated that the 'tangata whenua' were a peaceful people, while the fleet migrants were 'ferocious cannibals'. Smith believed the fleet migrants were more advanced intellectually and were better warriors than the 'tangata whenua'. Therefore the Maori conquered, absorbed, or enslaved the original inhabitants. Smith believed that the Urewera tribes and the Moriori of the Chathams were both descended largely from the earlier population.

Smith was insistent, however, that this earlier 'tangata whenua' population, and their Moriori descendants, were Polynesians of the same race as the fleet migrants. He did not believe that New Zealand or any other part of Polynesia had been originally inhabited by Melanesians. He wrote: 'The few slight indications that some writers have fancied indicated a previous race are all referable to contact of the Polynesians with Papuans or Melanesians in their migrations...'

The account of migrations to New Zealand contained in the 1910 edition of *Hawaiki* was substantially unchanged from the 1904 edition. However in the 1910 edition Smith added one newly acquired Maori tradition concerning the adventures of an ancestor called 'Hui-te-rangiora' who left a place called Irihia or Hawaiki nui, to venture into the
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Pacific, finally reaching Hawaiki, which was Tahiti. Smith saw this Maori story as being basically the same as the Rarotongan story of 'Ui-te-rangiora'. The story which Smith had added into the text of the 1910 Hawaiki was part of the writings of Whatahoro, which Whatahoro in turn claimed to have recorded from the oral teachings of the tohunga, Matorohanga. Smith had only come into contact with the writings of Whatahoro in late 1909. These writings were to profoundly influence Smith's ideas on the early Polynesian migrations to New Zealand, as will be seen in the following chapter.

'The History and Traditions of the Taranaki Coast'
In 1910, Percy Smith's *The History and Traditions of the Maoris of the West Coast*, was published. This major work brought together a wide range of the material on the Maori of the Taranaki area. Smith had spent years compiling this material and had been publishing it as articles in the *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, since 1907, under the title of 'The History and Traditions of the Taranaki Coast'. This work represents the last development by Smith of ideas on Kupe, Toi and the tangata whenua before late 1909, when he gained access to the writings of Whatahoro.

In the *History and Traditions* Percy Smith clearly set out what he hoped to achieve by reconstructing Maori traditions. He indicated that he was quite aware of the great variety of accounts of particular incidents, with many contradictions between the traditions and genealogies of different tribes. Smith did not accept that these differences might be the result of the varying political, religious and social meanings of these traditions for each tribe concerned. Instead he believed that these stories were the echoes of events that had actually occurred. Some accounts were supposedly more accurate in their description of these events than others. Smith believed that the task of the Pakeha historian was to collect and compare these various accounts and
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The writings of Whatahoro from which the story of Hui te rangiora and the departure from Irihiacan be found in Smith, *Lore: Te Kauwae Raro.*, pp. 3-14, 16-19, 37-8. See also Simmons and Biggs, 'The Sources of "The Lore of the Whare Wananga"', pp. 38-9.

155 The articles published in the *JPS* were as follows,


genealogies, with a view to removing 'errors' from them. Smith saw the historian's job as to set exact locations and dates to the events described, using the calculation of generations from whakapapa lines as the tool for estimating dates. He knew that different tribes had widely varying traditions describing many different events. Smith regarded the task of arranging these events into a continuous sequence as one of the ethnologists most important jobs. This would reproduce the type of linear progressive chronological histories commonly seen in western historical writing. Smith himself described what he was trying to do: 'It remains to gather up the various threads of the story as they have been preserved by the tribes, and endeavour to weave them into something like a continuous history'.

In the History and Traditions Smith set out the nearest approximation possible to a continuous history of the Taranaki tribes. Smith either ignored the mythological elements of stories, or tried to give them rational, historical explanations. He speculated, for example, that a story of a group of people travelling on a floating piece of land from Taranaki to the Marlborough Sounds, actually referred to the destruction of a Taranaki village by a landslip after its former inhabitants had migrated south by canoe.

Smith saw such mythical tales as reflecting the "culture-plane" of the pre-Christian Maori. He believed that some of these stories could be traced back to ancient Asia, but had been relocated to local places and ascribed to famous ancestors. Smith played down such mythical stories, instead concentrating on stories of events that he believed had actually happened. He combined the realistic stories together into his version of a correct chronological order of events. This process removed much of the political, social and religious meaning that the stories would have held in their original settings.

The ideas Smith held just prior to 1910 concerning the 'tangata whenua', Kupe and Toi te huatahi, were set out in History and Traditions. At the time of writing the History
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and Traditions, around 1907, Smith believed the fullest information on the tangata whenua was contained in Ngati Awa traditions recorded by Elsdon Best. These traditions told of a large tangata whenua presence in the Bay of Plenty around twenty generations before the fleet of 1350, a date which Smith calculated as being around 850 AD. He admitted that in Taranaki traditions, information on the earlier people was fragmentary and any references to them were usually indirect.161

Smith believed the arrival of 'a more masterful people' in 1350 had led to the absorption of the earlier population and the loss of their traditions. The cultural dominance of the fleet migrants was reflected in the fact that the fleet traditions also came to be accepted by the descendants of the tangata whenua. A description Smith wrote of this assumed attitude displays both Smith's romantic approach to the history of migration and the comparisons he made between the waves of migration and conquest which he imagined had taken place in the Pacific and those which had occurred in Europe. Smith wrote:

It has always been the pride and glory of chiefs to trace their descent from these old Vikings who guided the fleet here. In this they are like our English Aristocracy who delight to trace a descent from the Norman Conquerors of England in 1066.162

Smith held that tribes tended to trace their descent back to an eponymous ancestor connected with the heke or fleet migration, while ignoring 'tangata whenua' ancestors. Eventually it came to be thought by many that the fleet migrants had been the first arrivals in New Zealand and that no earlier peoples had existed.163

Smith believed the stories of supernatural forest dwelling beings such as the Maero or 'wild men', and Turehu or Patupaiarehe, sometimes called 'fairies', actually referred to remnants of the 'tangata whenua'.164 Smith also used a series of brief mentions of the tangata whenua, from a variety of sources, as evidence that such a people had existed. He quoted a variety of Maori and Pakeha sources including the reference in Grey's Nga Mahinga to Manaia's destruction of the 'tangata whenua' of the Waitara area.165 Smith also maintained that the whakapapa of many of the Taranaki tribes showed their descent in part from tangata whenua peoples. He believed, for example, that Te Awa nui a rangi, the eponymous ancestor of Te Ati Awa, was one of the tangata whenua. While Ati Awa

---

161 Smith, History and Traditions, pp. 16-17, 23, 33-34.
162 Ibid., p. 73.
163 Ibid. pp. 16-17, 37, 73.
164 Ibid., pp. 33-34.
165 Ibid., pp. 34-37. As well as Grey, Smith quoted from Rev. T. G. Hammond of Patea, Hone Mohi Tawhai of Nga Puhi, John White, Hamiora Pio of Ngati Awa, and from anonymous Taranaki and Ngati Ruanui sources.
claimed descent from the *Tokomaru* canoe, Smith argued that the fact they could show few genealogical connections with this waka indicated that Ati Awa were principally of 'tangata whenua' descent. He speculated that many of the canoes that were known by name only may have been those of the 'tangata whenua' migration.\(^{166}\)

Smith mentioned that the Whanganui tribes, as well as tracing descent to the *Aotea* and *Kurahaupo* canoes, had many 'tangata whenua' ancestors. Smith believed that Paerangi, the eponymous ancestor of the Nga Paerangi, was a 'tangata whenua', despite the fact that some of his descendants claimed he came to New Zealand with the fleet. Smith, quoting from a note by Best, noted that the Whanganui people all said that Kupe found only the birds tiwaiwaka (fantail), tiako (saddleback) and kokako, living in the Whanganui river area. Smith approvingly repeated Elsdon Best's assertion that the 'birds' were in fact 'tangata whenua' people descended from Paerangi. Paerangi was supposed transported to New Zealand by atua (divine beings) without the benefit of a canoe. Smith gave a rationalised explanation for this story, seeing it as proof that the original 'tangata whenua' traditions of Paerangi's arrival had been lost through the dominance of the fleet traditions. However the existence of the Nga Paerangi hapu, named for a 'tangata whenua' ancestor, told against Smith's theory that people would trace their descent to a fleet ancestor whenever possible.\(^{167}\)

Smith re-emphasised his idea that the 'tangata whenua' were Polynesians and he again rejected the idea that the pre-fleet people had been Melanesians. Smith conceded that Melanesians may have visited New Zealand, but was only prepared to believe they came as slaves on board Polynesian canoes, reconfirming his idea that the darker Melanesians must be inferior to the paler Polynesians.\(^{168}\) He believed that the 'tangata whenua' were from West Polynesia, but admitted that he had very little evidence to back this up. He placed the Hawaiki of the 'tangata whenua' as somewhere near Savai‘i in Samoa, while that of the 1350 AD heke was around Tahiti. Smith believed that the tangata whenua settled in the Bay of Plenty some time before 850 AD and then spread through the rest of the country. Smith can be seen to have still been trying to build up a

\(^{166}\) *Ibid.*, pp. 23-4. Smith also believed that the Ngati Tama who claimed descent from Tama ihu toroa of the *Arawa* waka had many 'tangata whenua' ancestors. He maintained that Uenga puanake, father of Ruanui, ancestor of the Ngati Ruanui, was a tangata whenua, although he acknowledged that it was also claimed that Uenga puanake had come on the *Tekituim* waka. He noted that the Nga Rauru claimed that their eponymous ancestor Rauru was the grandson of Toi. Nga Rauru claimed that Toi and Rauru both lived in Hawaiki, and that it was one of their descendants, Turi, captain of the *Aotea* canoe, who came out to Aotearoa. Smith believed that the Toi and Rauru referred to were identical to Toi te hua tahi and his son Rauru, referred to as tangata whenua in the East Coast genealogies. We will see below how Smith resolved these apparent contradictions. The obscurity of the stories surrounding some of the other ancestral canoes of the Nga Rauru led Smith to speculate that they may have been waka of the 'tangata whenua'. See *ibid.*, pp. 75, 97, 112, 119, 130, 132, 141-3..


theory that traced the movements of the ancestors of the Polynesians throughout the Pacific.169

While admitting that he knew little about the 'tangata whenua', Smith had reached a few conclusions about them. He believed that they had killed off the Moa, which explained its minimal role in Maori tradition. Smith thought that the 'tangata whenua' had knowledge of pounamu (greenstone) and knew how to work it.170 Smith accepted the view of the tangata whenua put forward in a manuscript by the Ngati Awa chief Hamiora Pio. Pio believed that the tangata whenua were a peaceful people and that fighting was mainly the result of the arrival of the fleet. Smith held that initially the small population and general abundance of resources would have encouraged a generally more peaceful situation. Smith did point out, in opposition to this idea of Pio's, that many of the fortified pa built around New Zealand appeared to date from the period of the 'tangata whenua'.171

An examination of Smith's ideas on the Chatham Island Moriori, as expressed in the History and Traditions, illustrates how much Smith accepted that the early people were pacifists. Smith believed the Moriori were descended from the original West Polynesian 'tangata whenua'. In 1907 Smith did not believe that the Moriori had been driven out by the 'fleet Maori'. Instead he was of the opinion that internal conflicts had driven the Moriori to migrate to Rekohu (Chatham Island), a few generations before the fleet arrived in Aotearoa. This view indicates that Smith did not believe the 'tangata whenua' were completely peaceful. Nevertheless Smith claimed that the case with which the Moriori on the Chathams adopted the idea of complete pacifism was the result of attitudes brought from living in a relatively peaceful society in New Zealand. Smith emphasised the similarities in language, traditions and appearance between the West Polynesian 'tangata whenua', among whom he included the Moriori, and the East Polynesian immigrants. He therefore argued against the suggestion by Gilbert Mair that the Maori and Moriori were two distinct races, suggesting instead that differences between the two groups were largely a result of the years of isolation from each other.172

169 Ibid., pp. 16-17, 35-35,
170 Ibid., pp. 19, 28.
171 Ibid., p. 22.
172 Ibid., pp. 22, 22n.

Smith was also convinced that the fact that the Maori and Chatham Island Moriori retained a more detailed account of the Creation myth of the separation of Rangi and Papa than any other Polynesian people, indicated that this story came from the tangata whenua. Smith was of the opinion that this was a very ancient story that had been partially lost in other parts of Polynesia, but that due to isolation the 'tangata whenua' retained this story in New Zealand and the Chathams in greater detail than anywhere else. See Ibid., pp. 21-22.
The History and Traditions had a chapter devoted to Kupe and another to Toi. By 1907 Smith's views on Kupe were not far removed from those he was to adopt from Whatahoro. Smith compared the various accounts of Kupe. In some Kupe was a contemporary of Turi, who came out in the Aotea, around the time of the fleet. To Smith this idea was contradicted by whakapapa supplied by the Ngā Puhi experts Hone Mohi Tawhai and Hare Hongi. These whakapapa put Kupe between 41 and 43 generations before 1900, visiting Aotearoa before the arrival of the 'tangata whenua'. This in turn fitted with the idea expressed in many of the accounts that Kupe had visited an empty land. Smith came to the conclusion that there had been two Kupe's. One had visited Aotearoa just before 1350 and gave sailing instructions to Turi of the Aotea. The other Kupe, the one for whom many places had been named in New Zealand, was in fact the first person to visit these islands at some time before 900 AD.

Smith acknowledged in the History and Traditions that a mystery surrounded the identity of Toi te hua tahi, as it appeared there were two different men by this name. One was also known as Toi kai rakau, and was a 'tangata whenua' ancestor from the Bay of Plenty area. The other was an ancestor from Hawaiiki, who apparently never came out to New Zealand. Smith believed the Hawaiiki Toi had lived around the same time as the New Zealand Toi. He tried to fit Toi into his Pacific-wide scheme of the history of migrations and was therefore delighted to find him mentioned in Rarotongan and Mangaian traditions and genealogies. In the New Zealand Toi traditions there was a confusing mass of detail. Smith stated that he possessed thirty-nine different genealogical tables which traced back to Toi, but that there were many differences between the tables. Some of the genealogies from Tuhoe and Ngati Awa, of the Bay of Plenty region, tended to locate Toi as a 'tangata whenua' ancestor in the Whakatane region. Other genealogies from Ngati Awa, Te Arawa, and from the West Coast tribes identified Toi as an ancestor of such famous canoe navigators as Tama te kapua and Nga toro i rangi of the Arawa, Toroa of the Mataatua, and Turi of the Aotea. This would indicated that the Toi in question was a resident of Hawaiiki.

Smith set out to reconcile the various accounts and to work out what was the 'real' genealogical table of the descendants of Toi, hoping to place Toi in time and

---

173 Ibid., pp. 44-8. Smith mentioned accounts by Karipa Te Whetu, of Ati Awa and by Turaukawa of Ngati Ruiaui, which describing Kupe as a contemporary of Turi. Grey recorded a similar account largely based on information from Piri Kawai of Ati Awa, see Grey, Polynesian Mythology, pp. 158-172, Grey, Ngā Mahi a Nga Tupuna, pp. 90-98, Simmons, Great NZ Myth, p. 367.

174 Smith, History and Traditions, pp. 47-55. Among those who maintained that Kupe came to an empty land were Karipa Te Whetu and Turaukawa, both of whom held that Kupe was a contemporary of Turi. See Ibid., 46-48.

175 Ibid., pp. 55-56. Simmons rejects Smith's reasoning in postulating two Kupe's and analyses Smith's ideas on Kupe in Great NZ Myth, Chp. 3.

176 History and Traditions, pp. 59, 64-71.
geographical space as an historical figure. He calculated that both the New Zealand and Hawaiki Toi had lived around eight or nine generations before the supposed 1350 date of the fleet. He also noted that many of the East Coast whakapapa tended to show Rauru as the son of Toi, whereas the West Coast whakapapa tended to have Rauru as the son of Ruarangi, who was in turn the son of Toi. Smith reconciled this by arguing that Ruarangi was actually Rauru's half brother, rather than his father. Smith took particular note of the fact that one of the genealogical tables he had obtained from Rarotonga also showed Toi having a son called Ruarangi and a grandson called Rauru. He also calculated that the Rarotongan Toi was extant thirty-two generations before 1900, the East Coast Toi thirty generations from 1900, and the West Coast Toi thirty-one generations back. This, along with a similar genealogical table from the Chatham Island Moriori, convinced Smith that the Hawaiki Toi and the Bay of Plenty Toi were one and the same man.177

Smith was still left with the task of reconciling two widely divergent accounts, with no seeming connections between the story of the Bay of Plenty Toi and the account of the Hawaiki Toi. Smith mentioned a series of confused stories which indicated that travels had occurred quite commonly between Hawaiki and Aotearoa. Basing his theory on these pieces of knowledge Smith constructed a story for which he had no authority from Maori traditions. He decided that Toi had been born and had lived for years in New Zealand. Toi then went with his son Rauru to Hawaiki where he lived for many years before returning to New Zealand and settling in the Bay of Plenty. Rauru later followed his father back out to New Zealand bringing his own son Whatonga with him. This version, which Smith constructed around 1907, was markedly different from the 'orthodox version' of the Toi and Whatonga story Smith was later to adopt from Whatahoro's writings.178 The prominent role played by Whatonga in the account of Toi given by Whatahoro was, in 1907, completely unknown to Smith. Smith stated in the History and Traditions, 'Rauru's son was Whatonga, and of him little is mentioned in Maori tradition, beyond the fact that he was an ancestor of many of the tangata whenua tribes...'.179

Conclusion
It can be seen from the above that both Percy Smith and Elsdon Best had, by 1909, developed quite definite ideas about the 'tangata whenua' or earliest inhabitants of New Zealand. Both men firmly believed that a fleet of canoes had arrived in New Zealand around 1350, bringing the ancestors for whom most of the important contemporary

177Ibid., pp. 59-60, 64-67, 71-2.
178Ibid., pp. 68-72.
179Ibid., p. 71.
tribes were named. Both also believed that many of the modern Maori were descended, in part, from an earlier 'tangata whenua' people, who had been in residence in New Zealand when the Polynesians of the fleet had arrived. The 'tangata whenua' were assumed to be more primitive than the fleet Maori as they supposedly lacked agriculture. Smith and Best both claimed the 'tangata whenua' were more peaceful and less skilled in warfare than the fleet immigrants. On the arrival of the fleet from Hawaiki the new immigrants either destroyed or came to dominate the original inhabitants.

Elsdon Best had collected a great deal of information in the Urewera country on tribes supposedly of 'tangata whenua' ancestry. Of central importance in the Bay of Plenty area was the 'tangata whenua' ancestor Toi te huatahi. Best noted that some people identified Toi as being from Hawaiki but that most saw him as being born and having lived all his life in the Whakatane area. In 1907, at the time of writing his work Tuhoe, Best was not convinced by Smith's suggestions that Toi had visited Hawaiki or that the Toi of Hawaiki was the same character as Toi in New Zealand. The other area where Best disagreed with Smith was over the matter of the racial makeup of the 'tangata whenua'. Best believed the 'tangata whenua' were of mixed Polynesian and Melanesian descent. He believed that Melanesian features could be seen in the modern Tuhoe, who he believed had a much higher amount of 'tangata whenua' descent than most other tribes. Smith, in contrast, tended to play down any Melanesian element in the 'tangata whenua' or in the Chatham Island Moriori, as evidenced by his disagreements with Rutland.

Smith's views in 1909 can be gleaned from looking at his work The History and Traditions of the Maoris of the West Coast. He had gone from believing that Kupe was a contemporary of the Great Fleet to concluding that there were in fact two Kupes, one of whom was the contemporary of the fleet, the other being the discoverer of Aotearoa many generations earlier. Smith believed the 'tangata whenua' had settled in New Zealand some time after Kupe. He believed they were a West Polynesian people who were fairly closely related to the East Polynesian fleet Maori. He also believed that the Moriori of the Chatham Islands were descended from this people, but he did not believe they had been driven out by the fleet Maori. Instead he agreed with the ideas of Shand and Hirawatu Tapu that the Moriori had left New Zealand due to intertribal conflict not long before the arrival of the fleet. Smith had come to the conclusion that the Toi te huatahi of New Zealand and the Toi of Hawaiki were the same character, explaining this by suggesting that Toi had been born in New Zealand, travelled to Hawaiki and then later returned to his birthplace.
Smith was trying to build up a comprehensive history of Polynesian migrations in the Pacific. He was particularly keen to understand the sequence of migrations to New Zealand. He and Best had carried out a process of compiling Western-style linear histories from completely disparate tribal accounts and genealogical tables. Smith was especially pleased when he acquired the Rarotongan account which seemed to answer many of his questions regarding the voyages through the Pacific. He was, however, disappointed that no similar account appeared to exist in New Zealand, especially as he was aware that many of his questions on aspects of the settlement history of New Zealand had not been adequately answered.

The preface to the History and Traditions Smith announced that he had gained access to just such a Maori account. This newly discovered text contained the answers to many of Smith's questions regarding the 'tangata whenua' and Polynesian migrations to New Zealand. It set out a version of the past that can be recognised as the orthodox Moriori or Maruiwi myth. In the following chapter we will examine how Smith gained access to this text, which was to become the essential basis of the Moriori myth. The question of how accurately the text reflects the oral histories of the various tribes of the nineteenth century will be discussed along with the reasons as to why Pakeha scholars were generally so eager to accept the text as genuine.
CHAPTER SIX

THE LORE OF THE WHARE WANANGA

In the previous chapter we examined the attempts by Stephenson Percy Smith and Elsdon Best to construct a comprehensive history of Polynesian migrations to New Zealand and throughout the Pacific. Smith and Best were particularly intrigued by the question of the identity of the people they called the 'tangata whenua', who they believed were a distinct population living in New Zealand prior to the arrival of the main body of East Polynesian migrants. By 1909 both men firmly believed in the existence of an earlier people, but were unsure of any details of their history or identity. Smith tended to assert the Polynesian nature of the tangata whenua while Best was more open to the idea of a Melanesian aspect to their background. Both men believed that a Great Fleet or heke had brought the ancestors of the major tribes to New Zealand, but confessed to know very little about the earlier voyages. In particular they had yet to work out the details of the history of Toi te huatahi, a man who was claimed by some to be a great tangata whenua ancestor in the Bay of Plenty, and by others to be a native of Hawaiki who never came to New Zealand.

In 1910 Smith made the public announcement of an important discovery, in the preface to The History and Traditions of the Maoris of the West Coast. He wrote of the acquisition of a Maori text which appeared to answer nearly all of his questions regarding the history of ancient migrations:

Reference is made in Chapter II hereof to the paucity of information relative to the tangata whenua, or original inhabitants of this coast. Since that was published, some documents, written at the end of the fifties of last century to the dictation of one of the last of the learned men of the Whare-wananga, or House-of-learning, have turned up...¹

Smith went on to give a brief summary of the information these documents contained on a pre-Maori tangata whenua. The documents described Kupe's discovery of uninhabited islands, followed by the arrival of a 'tangata whenua' people of mixed West Polynesian/Melanesian ancestry. Later came the migration of Toi and Whatonga from their homeland in East Polynesia. The East Polynesians eventually drove out the 'tangata whenua' apart from those women and children who were absorbed into the conquering tribes. While this process was occurring the 'Great Fleet' of migrants arrived

¹Smith, History and Traditions, p. i.
from East Polynesia. Some of the survivors of the 'tangata whenua' migrated to the Chatham Islands to become the Moriori.\(^2\)

The version of the history of migration set out above was to become widely accepted by Pakeha scholars, as well as by the Pakeha general public and by many Maori. This view held sway from the 1910s until well into the late twentieth century and, for the early twentieth century at least, was the 'orthodox' version of pre-contact history. Since its rejection by scholars in the second half of the twentieth century this history became known as the 'Moriori Myth'.\(^3\)

David Simmons has shown that while a wide variety of works repeat the 'Moriori Myth', the original literary source of this version of history can be traced to one book, the second volume of *The Lore of the Whare Wananga*, entitled *Te Kauwae Raro or Things Terrestrial*. This book was published in 1915. *Te Kauwae Raro* was based on documents written down from a variety of sources by the Ngati Kahungunu expert Hoani Turei Whatahoro. These were the same documents mentioned by Smith in the preface to *History and Traditions*. An examination of *Te Kauwae Raro* shows it to be the first published work to describe the exact sequence of the arrivals of Kupe, Toi and Whatonga, and the Great Fleet, as set out in the orthodox Moriori myth. The work also gave a detailed description of the people it claimed were the original inhabitants of New Zealand. This description indicated the 'tangata whenua' were a totally different people from Maori. In *Te Kauwae raro* it was claimed these people were the ancestors of the Chatham Island Moriori. The account professed to be from oral traditions written down in the 1860s by Whatahoro. He stated that the traditions were largely recorded from the recitations of two expert Ngati Kahungunu tohunga, Te Matorohanga and Nepia Pohuhu.\(^4\)

In the following chapter we will examine the ethnographic work of Hoani Turei Whatahoro. We will also examine the processes by which Percy Smith translated, edited and embellished Whatahoro's writings to produce the two volumes of *The Lore of the Whare Wananga*. It will be shown how the work of these two men, with some important additional contributions by Elsdon Best, became the basis for the Moriori Myth. The dissemination of this account will be traced, through the scholarly environment of the Polynesian Society and then out into more popular discourse. The critical reaction to the texts will also be outlined. In particular we will attempt to explain why Smith and Best

\(^2\)Ibid., pp. i-ii.

\(^3\)Simmons, *The Great NZ Myth*, p. 15.

\(^4\)Simmons, *The Great NZ Myth*, p. 15.

Gibbons, 'Going Native' p. 275. Gibbons describes this version of the past as the 'Smith-Best orthodoxy', reflecting the roles of Stephenson Percy Smith and Elsdon Best in promoting the ideas.

\(^4\)Smith, *Lore: Te Kauwae Raro*.
were prepared to accept most of the material in these texts as historical fact, passed down from ancient times. The texts themselves will be examined to gain some idea of how well they live up to the claims made for them.

**The Lore of the Whare Wananga: Matorohanga, Whatahoro and Percy Smith**

In the introduction to *Te Kauwae Runga*, the first volume of *The Lore of the Whare Wananga*, Stephenson Percy Smith gave an account of the provenance of the work. Smith claimed *Te Kauwae raro*, the second volume of *The Lore of the Whare Wananga*, was of the same origin as the first volume. In his introduction, Smith made it clear that he regarded himself as the editor and translator of the work, rather than its author. He acknowledged that the Maori text was written by Hoani Turei Whatahoro. According to Smith, Whatahoro's text was written down from the teachings of nineteenth century elders, in particular, the Ngati Kahungunu tohunga Matorohanga. It was claimed that Te Matorohanga and the other tohunga had recited material they had learned in the Whare Wananga, the school of traditional Maori learning. According to Smith, they had learned this material in a form unadulterated by contact with Christianity or any other Pakeha influence.5

The man Smith described as 'the Scribe', Hoani Turei Te Whatahoro, also known as John Alfred Jury, was born in 1841 and lived until 1923. His mother was Te Aitu o te rangi (?-1854), a high born woman of the Ngati Moe hapu of Ngati Kahungunu, who were based around the Papawai area of the Wairarapa. She married an English whaler and trader, John Milsome Jury (1816-1902), who had lived in New Zealand since jumping ship in 1836.6 J. M. Jury was a competent speaker of te reo Maori but never learned to read or write in Maori. He did, however, take an interest in recording Maori traditions. John Jury claimed to have had access to traditional information recited by learned men of the Ngati Kahungunu. John and Te Aitu Jury had three children, of whom Hoani Turei Whatahoro was the first born. Whatahoro was 13 years old when his mother died in 1854. His sister, Annie Eliza, who was eight at this time, and his brother, Charles Joseph te Rongotumamoa, who was four, appear to have grown up with a much greater degree of Pakeha influence than did Whatahoro. Te Whatahoro quarrelled with John Jury soon after the death of Te Aitu. He lived from then on among the Ngati Kahungunu and other Maori groups rather than with his father.7

---

While living with his Ngati Kahungunu relatives, Whatahoro took an interest in traditions from an early age. According to his own statement he began recording the teachings of kaumatuia in 1853. From the 1850s onwards increasing numbers of large pan-tribal meetings were being held in different parts of New Zealand, as hapu and iwi leaders discussed ways of dealing with the problems resulting from Pakeha colonisation. In the 1850s some of these meetings were called to discuss responses to the growth of Kirgitanga, the King Movement. Such hui were at the same time important platforms for the recitation and recording of traditions. One such meeting was held in 1860 at Te Waihinga in the Wairarapa, involving all of the Wairarapa hapu and many other southern North island hapu. It was after this meeting that the tohunga Te Matorohanga agreed to recite traditions so that they might be written down. He was to be assisted by the tohunga Nepia Pohuhu and Paora Te Kiri, who would cover areas Matorohanga was less familiar with. Whatahoro and Aporo Te Kumeroa were appointed as scribes to record this material, while Riwai Te Kukutai was also to assist in this role. These teaching sessions or wanangawere supposed to be held under traditional protocol or tikanga, but the fear that the old teachings might be lost led to the decision that they should be recorded.

As Ong has pointed out, the processes involved in writing down oral traditions lead to some alteration in their nature. Thus no recording of these teachings can be seen as 'exact' copies of some ancient, unchanging verbal text. Despite this, Smith was to accept
Whatahoro’s claim that these texts were near exact representations of ancient traditions.  

The principal teacher at these wananga, Te Matorohanga, was from the Ngati Moe, a Wairarapa hapu of Ngati Kahungunu and was born at some time around the turn of the century. As a child he had been extensively schooled in ancient lore at the Te Poho o Hinepae whare wananga in Wairarapa and at the Nga Mahanga whare wananga, in the Te Reinga area, north of Wairoa. He spent many years after this teaching at whare wananga and discussing aspects of lore with other experts, being considered one of the most knowledgeable tohunga of Ngati Kahungunu.

An important wananga was held by Matorohanga at Te Hautawa, near Masterton, in 1865. Matorohanga was assisted at this meeting by Nepia Pohuhu and Paratene Te Okawhare. Whatahoro recorded this material, with the help of Riwai Te Kukutai. It was supposedly from this particular wananga session that Whatahoro wrote down the bulk of the material which was to form the basis of the two volumes of The Lore of the Whare Wananga.

Whatahoro's career subsequent to the 1860s was to give him access to a great deal more information; from his own people and from hapu and iwi throughout New Zealand. From 1870 to 1877 Whatahoro lived in the area of Putiki, Wanganui. He was at various times a recorder, interpreter, an advocate and an Assessor in the Native Land Court.

Whatahoro's involvement with the Native Land Court in a variety of capacities enabled him to record

---

12Ong, Orality and Literacy, Chp 4.
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a great deal of the information presented to the Court by claimants from many different hapu and iwi.

Whatahoro was active in the Kotahitanga Movement, which sought to establish a separate Maori Parliament. He was elected chairman, or Premier, of the Waipatu parliament in 1892. This meant he attended many political hui, where there was much discussion and recording of traditions. The debates among the learned men of the Kotahitanga Parliament would have provided yet another forum to learn and compare traditions from different hapu and iwi. Whatahoro was also a prominent member of Ngati Kahungunu's Tane nui a rangi Komiti, a group which, as will be discussed below, attempted literally to set its seal of approval on 'authentic' Ngati Kahungunu tradition.18

In the 1880s Whatahoro became interested in the Church of the Latter Day Saints, the Mormons, who had begun to send missionaries into the area around Masterton and the Wairarapa. Whatahoro was involved from 1886 to 1888 in assisting with the translation of The Book of Mormon into te reo Maori. The emphasis placed on the collection of genealogies by the Mormons would no doubt have enhanced the already strong interest he had in the collection and recording of traditional whakapapa. His role in helping to translate The Book of Mormon would also have increased his knowledge of Western styles of narrative, as well as improving his abilities to understand the English language. He was already, like many Maori of the time, very familiar with the narrative style of The Bible.19

By the early 1900s Whatahoro had recorded a mass of information on the history and traditions of a wide range of hapu and iwi, building up a collection of writings consisting of over 125 notebooks. He collected many Maori newspapers and English language books. He corresponded with other Maori experts and swapped written accounts with them.20 Whatahoro could be seen as acting as an ethnographer; collecting and compiling material, then comparing it with that collected by others. These

---

18 T. W. Downes to S. P. Smith, 15/7/1919, Polynesian Society further records, 80-115-03/16, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
19 Simmons, 'Words of Maiorohanga', pp. 151-70.
20 T. W. Downes to S. P. Smith, 15/7/1919, Polynesian Society further records, 80-115-03/16, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.

Whatahoro's notebooks reflect the wide variety of sources he used to collect Maori traditional information. Two examples are his minute book for 1879-88, MPFB Papers, MS-Papers-0189-077, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ, which includes proceedings of Native Committees and notes taken from the Native Land Court, and the notebook for 1889-1906, MPFB Papers, MS-Papers-0189-B023, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ, which includes transcripts of material dictated by Matorohanga, material copied from the Journal of the Polynesian Society, and notes from Sir George Grey's Nga Moteatea.
processes involved a considerable rewriting of the material collected. Among those he exchanged information with were Pakeha ethnographers. Whatahoro was a corresponding member of the Polynesian Society from 1907. While it is debatable whether or not Whatahoro could read and write English we do know that he had access to people who could translate material for him. He therefore had access to at least some portion of the English language material in the *Journal of the Polynesian Society*. During the first thirty years of the Polynesian Society, many of the articles published in the *Journal of the Polynesian Society* were written in te reo Maori, and were thus fully accessible to him. T. W. Downes wrote of a discussion he had with Whatahoro over the idea of an Aryan origin for the Maori. This illustrates the fact that Whatahoro was exchanging ideas with Pakeha ethnographers and had considerable knowledge of the theories they were debating.

Whatahoro tries to get *The Lore of the Whare Wananga* Published

In 1899, Tamahau Mahupuku, the Ngati Kahungunu proprietor of the Maori newspaper *Te Puke ki Hikurangi* and a strong supporter of the Kotahitanga, proposed that Ngati Kahungunu collect together the written teachings of their elders. Mahupuku was following the call of the Maori politician James Carroll that the sayings of the surviving elders should be written down while those with the knowledge of traditions were still alive. This encouraged the formation of Te Komiti a Tupai, a subcommittee of the Te Komiti a Tane nui a rangi. This was a group of learned Ngati Kahungunu leaders, dedicated to the collection of such teachings. Te Komiti a Tupai held a meeting in 1907, in an attempt to decide which written versions of the teachings of elders, should be regarded as 'authentic' Ngati Kahungunu tradition. Those writings that were approved as authentic by the Komiti were given an official stamp of approval. Among the works stamped as approved by the Komiti were two books written out by Whatahoro. He claimed they contained the information passed on at the 1860s seminars. These books were entitled 'Te Pukapuka a Moihi Te Matorohanga' (The book of Te Matorohanga).
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21 W. H. Skinner & W. I. Newman to H. T. Whatahoro, 16/2/1907, Polynesian Society further records, 80-15-02a/08, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
22 T. W. Downes in a letter to S. P. Smith, 25/4/1914, Polynesian Society further records, 80-115-03/06, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ, mentioned that Whatahoro could not read or write English. A further indication that Whatahoro may not have been able to read or write in English is provided by his reaction on receiving, from his father J. M. Jury, in 1876, a long English language letter, containing what were claimed to be traditional Maori stories. In 1877 Whatahoro got the Pakeha interpreter Thomas Young, of the Native Department, to translate this English text into Maori, which Whatahoro then wrote down. See Simmons, *Great NZ Myth*, pp. 337, 353. Tipene Chrisp argues that at least by the 1900s Whatahoro could read and write English. Chrisp cites as evidence the number of books in English that Whatahoro owned and the remarks in Whatahoro's notebooks regarding his knowledge of material in English language works. T. Chrisp, personal communication, May 1997.
23 T. W. Downes to S. P. Smith, 27/3/1910, E. Best Papers, MS-Papers-0072-02, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ. In this letter Downes mentions talking to Whatahoro about ideas on the migrations of the 'Aryans' at which Whatahoro noted the similarity of the name to that of the supposed ancient Polynesian homeland 'Iriha'.
and 'Pukapuka whakapapa a Nepia Pohuhu' (The book of Nepia Pohuhu). The Komiti decided to lend the two books to the Dominion Museum to be copied out and hopefully to be published.24

Beginning in 1910, the books of Te Matorohanga and Nepia Pohuhu were copied out at the Dominion Museum. This work was undertaken initially by Henry Stowell, or Hare Hongi, a Ngā Pūhi scholar who worked at the Museum. Stowell was taken off the transcription job when it was discovered that he was changing the Ngati Kahungunu dialect of the original writings into his own Ngā Puhi dialect. The bulk of the transcription work was carried out by Elsdon Best, who had recently been appointed to a position at the Museum, in the influence of Buck, Ngata, Tregear and Smith. The two works were not published in the end, due to Percy Smith persuading Augustus Hamilton, the Museum director, against the idea. Smith was already well on the way to producing his own version of Whatahoro's writings and strongly believed that a publication edited by him would be of much greater value than a Museum publication of the unedited texts of the original volumes.25

We have seen that Smith was involved in a search for the story of Polynesian migrations and that he regarded it as his scholarly duty to publish any relevant material he discovered. By the early twentieth century Whatahoro was also beginning to make efforts to get his own writings published, in Maori and in English. He had been part of the Komiti a Tupai, of the Tane nui a rangi Komiti, which had stamped the 'Book of Matorohanga' and the 'Book of Pohuhu' as 'official' Ngati Kahungunu tradition. Immediately following that hui, Whatahoro made his own early attempt to get the books published, apparently before the decision to send the books to the Dominion Museum. In late 1906 Whatahoro had hoped to get the books published through the press of the Maori newspaper Te Puke ki Hikurangi. He acted in collaboration with the Native Land Court clerk and interpreter, Ben Keys, who was to be his agent in collecting subscriptions for the works. In a newspaper article of February 1907, a letter from

---

Simmons, 'Words of Matorohanga', p. 117. Simmons gives the members of the Tupai subcommittee as 'Manahi Paewai, Nireha Tamaki, Tapapa Rautahi, Renata Tohii, Hori Herewini Te Huki, Aperahama Anaru, Kiingi Ngueture, Matina Tamaiwhakatea, H. P. Tunuiarangi, Teri Paerata...; Te Momo Kingi Te Takou, Ropoaama Meihana, Hoani Rangiakaiwaho, H. T. Whatahoro, Niniwa Heremaia, and the people of Te Pooti Riri-kore of Wairarapa.' Ibid. Percy Smith maintained that the establishment of the Tane nui a rangi Committee, which he said occurred in June 1905, was a result of the discussions he had with Major Tunuiarangi while they were both on the Scenery Preservation Commission. According to Smith, after discussions with James Carroll, Tunuiarangi went ahead and set up the Tane nui a rangi Committee of Ngati Kahungunu. See S. P. Smith to A. Hamilton, 25/5/1911, Author's personal collection.
25S. P. Smith to E. Best, 10/5/1911, Polynesian Society Records, MS-Papers-1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
Whatahoro, 'Te Pukapuka a Moihi Te Matorohanga', qMS-1352, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
Whatahoro was quoted in which he stated that he hoped the books of the tohunga’s sayings would be published within a few months. It was intended that they would then be translated into English, indicating that Whatahoro was not solely aiming to reach a Maori audience.26

This early publication attempt fell through very quickly. It is not clear why this happened, but there is a strong possibility that the failure was the result of a shortage of funds. In a letter written in February 1907, immediately following his appointment as a corresponding member of the Polynesian Society, Whatahoro informed W. H. Skinner and W. L. Newman, the Polynesian Societies secretaries, of the wide range of traditional accounts he had recorded. In the same letter he complained of how expensive it would be to get the material published, mentioning that the prices quoted to him varied between £100 to £125 for 500 copies.27

It is clear that by 1909 Whatahoro wanted to get at least two volumes of writings published. These writings were claimed to be from the teachings of elders such as Matorohanga and Nepia Pohuhu. They included an account of the settlement of New Zealand by the ancestors of the Maori, with stories of Kupe, the arrival of the ancestors of the Moriori, the story of Toi and Whatonga, and the arrival of the Great Fleet. The stories were set out in a linear chronological account, following the sequence of events through time rather than linking stories through whakapapa connections.

In 1909, Percy Smith was also looking for a version of the Polynesian history of New Zealand and the Pacific that would answer the many questions he still had on migrations and early inhabitants. He wanted a clear and consistent account that would give names to peoples and places, and dates to the events of the past. Smith was looking to answer a series of historical questions, at the same time that Whatahoro was looking to publish texts that provided the very information Smith was seeking.

26‘Maori Cosmogony’, New Zealand Times, 6/2/1907.
H. T. Whatahoro, Note, 31/1/1907, Ben Keys Papers, MS-Papers-0407-12, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
Ben Keys Letterbook, pp. 40, 41, 46, Ben Keys Papers, MS-Papers-0407-23, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
Ben Keys Letterbook, p. 33, Ben Keys Papers, MS-Papers-0407-24, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
T. Chrisp, personal communication, May 1997. I must thank Tipene Chrisp for drawing my attention to this early effort by Whatahoro to get his work published.
27W. H. Skinner & W. L. Newman to H. T. Whatahoro, 16/2/1907, Polynesian Society further records, 80-115-02a/08, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
Smith and Whatahoro Produce The Lore of the Whare Wananga

In 1908 Percy Smith, who was editing the Journal of the Polynesian Society from New Plymouth, received a letter from the Wanganui-based ethnographer Thomas William Downes. Downes, a recent recruit to the Polynesian Society, mentioned to Smith that he had in his possession a manuscript he had copied out from a work lent to him by his friend Whatahoro, who had in turn obtained it from 'a Tohunga'. Downes promised to pass the manuscript on to Smith.28

In December 1909 Smith wrote to Best after reading the manuscript,

I have in the house just now a very much more important paper dictated to Whatahoro in 1863 by an old Tohunga of Wairarapa which supplies information on the subject of Kupe, Toi and Whatonga...that none of us had any idea was in existence- The whole has yet to be carefully studied, but I think it is going to throw a lot of light on the migrations and on the tangata whenua... The story confirms much that we have guessed at, whilst it contradicts other conclusions. At present I am wondering why this has not come out before. But the old man charges his hearers to keep it secret as it is Tapu. We shall see.29

From the 1870s Whatahoro had begun to live in the Whanganui area. He was to divide his time between there and the Wairarapa for much of the rest of his life. Whatahoro and Downes became friends in the mid-1900s. Whatahoro was now living at Castlecliff in Whanganui, although he still made regular visits to the Wairarapa. He became Downes' main source of Maori information. Whatahoro even trusted Downes enough to use his house on several occasions as a storage place for his books and manuscripts.30

Around 1908 Whatahoro lent Downes a large manuscript (or perhaps several manuscripts) that contained information on the ancient Maori gods, including the controversial deity Io. Downes had been able to retain this manuscript (or manuscripts) long enough to copy the information out. He then passed the material on to Smith.31

Whatahoro was not upset by Downes' action, despite the fact that the copying of the text might have been interpreted as an act of cultural theft. Instead Whatahoro gave his full co-operation to Downes and Smith, probably in the hope of getting his work published.

28T. W. Downes to S. P. Smith, 26/10/1908, Polynesian Society further records, 80-115-02A/12, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
29S. P. Smith to E. Best, 12/12/1909, E. Best Papers, MS-Papers-0072-05, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
30T. W. Downes to S. P. Smith, 3/12/1915, E. Best Papers, MS-Papers-0072-02, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
31T. W. Downes to S. P. Smith, 26/10/1908, Polynesian Society further records, 80-115-02A/12, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
Whatahoro had already been in correspondence with Smith in early 1909, regarding a traditional prayer, the karakia of Tuhotoariki, on which Whatahoro had written a commentary for the Polynesian Society. He also mentioned to Smith that a hui was soon to be held at which the tohunga of the Ngati Kahungunu would discuss ancient teachings. It seems, however, that it was Downes who introduced Whatahoro and Smith to each other in person.32

On reading Whatahoro's manuscripts Smith was immediately convinced that what they contained was genuine, unadulterated ancient Maori knowledge. Smith was particularly pleased that Whatahoro's account presented an easily followed linear chronology. The manuscripts were comprehensive enough to cover the origins of most of the major tribal groups. Despite Smith's confidence in his own ability to understand te reo Maori, he admitted that he did not understand many of the presumably archaic words contained in the text. He also had many questions on the content of the text. Smith therefore saw it as essential to enlist Whatahoro's help in the tasks of translating and editing the manuscript material. Whatahoro appears to have been only too willing to help Smith. Most of their collaborative work was carried out by correspondence, but the two men also met and worked together in person on at least two occasions. Smith maintained it would have been impossible for him to edit and produce the two volumes of the Lore without Whatahoro's co-operation, especially when it came to explaining the meanings of what he assumed were obscure, ancient Maori words. Yet it was Whatahoro's very ability to answer nearly all of Smith's questions that led some commentators such as H. W. Williams to be suspicious of the value and authenticity of his information.33

Smith was convinced that Whatahoro's works would only be of value to 'scholars' (by which he appears to have meant Pakeha scholars of Polynesian texts), if the texts were translated with full annotations. Smith believed that writings by 'natives' only had full value once they had been subject to Western interpretation. This can be seen as an example of a process where Pakeha ethnologists effectively took over or colonised indigenous texts. Through their knowledge of such texts imperial ethnologists saw themselves as having an even greater knowledge of the indigenous cultures than that held by the experts from within those cultures. Smith maintained that he personally was
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32H. T. Whatahoro to S. P. Smith, 27/2/1909, Polynesian Society further records, 80-115-02a/13, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
33S. P. Smith to E. Best, 12/12/1909, E. Best Papers, MS-Papers-0072-05, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
S. P. Smith to E. Best, 2/8/1910, Polynesian Society Records, MS-Papers-1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
S. P. Smith to E. Best, 18/9/1910, Polynesian Society Records, MS-Papers-1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
Polynesian Society Records, MS-Papers-1187-159 and 1187-160 in the Alexander Turnbull Library contain some of Smith's questions to Whatahoro over the meanings of words along with the note that word meanings have been sent on to H.W. Williams, the editor of the Maori dictionary.
the only man with a wide enough knowledge to carry out the essential task of annotating Whatahoro's works. He was therefore very worried when Best informed him that Augustus Hamilton, the director of the Museum, intended to publish the material that had been copied out from the volumes lent to the Museum by the Tane nui a rangi Komiti. Smith was able to persuade Hamilton not to publish the two books on the grounds that he, Smith, was already well advanced in the task of editing Whatahoro's texts. A letter he wrote to Best illustrated his attitudes to the editing of this material:

I ought to edit it, for I know quite well that no one has the general knowledge of Polynesian matters that I have and to publish a mere translation without notes is to detract very much from the value of the papers...

The work of Smith and Whatahoro was published in two volumes by the Polynesian Society. The first volume of *The Lore of the Whare Wananga* was published in 1913. It was subtitled *Te Kauwae Runga or Things Celestial*. This volume was chiefly concerned with stories of the Gods. A controversial element of *Kauwae runga* was a section on Io matua, described as the Supreme God. Most Pakeha ethnographers in the nineteenth century, including Grey and members of the Williams family, had found no references to Io. Instead they had recorded stories of gods of natural phenomena such as Ranginui, the sky father, Papatuanuku, the Earth mother, Tane mahuta, the god of the forests, and Tangaroa, the god of the sea. A few Pakeha, such as Richard Taylor, C. O. Davis, and John White, had recorded vague references to Io in the nineteenth century. Sceptics such as H. W. Williams and T. G. Hammond, held that Io was in fact a mid-nineteenth century derivation from the Christian idea of Jehovah. They maintained that if the Io cult were genuine it would have been much more widely known.

Whatahoro was among those Maori who advocated the authenticity of the cult of Io, but claimed that it had originally only been known to learned tohunga. Supposedly the existence of Io had been regarded as too tapu a subject to be revealed either to uninitiated Maori or to unbelieving Pakeha. This situation lasted up until the mid-nineteenth century, when changes brought about by colonisation made it necessary for
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34 E. Best to S. P. Smith, 24 or 5/1911 (date unclear), Polynesian Society Records, MS-Papers-1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, N Zealand.
35 S. P. Smith to A. Hamilton, 25/5/1911, Author's personal collection.
36 S. P. Smith to E. Best, 10/5/1911, Polynesian Society Records, MS-Papers-1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
37 M. P. Shirres, *Te Tangata: The Human Person*, Auckland, 1997, pp. 107-10. The concept of Io remains a controversial one. Many twentieth century scholars of Maori have rejected the idea that a hidden supreme being existed in Maori religion before the mid-nineteenth century. Shirres gives the examples of Sir Peter Buck, J. Prytz Johansen, and Bishop Muru Walters, as experts on Maori who rejected or were dubious about the pre-nineteenth century authentically of the Io concept. Yet other scholars such as the Rev. Maori Marsden, Pei Te Hurinui Jones, and Shirres himself, accept the idea that the belief in Io went back to the days before contact with the Pakeha. *Ibid.*, pp. 107-9.
knowledge of Io to be made more widely known. Smith and Best were both firmly convinced that belief in Io was an ancient, secret faith. They both knew how difficult it had been for either of them to obtain any information on Io, which to them only confirmed that an esoteric religion existed. Smith and Best maintained that Williams and Hammond did not believe in Io because of their 'old missionary bias'. Smith wrote that the early missionaries had been 'a very uneducated, Puritan, and prejudiced lot...', whose attitudes discouraged the old tohunga from sharing with them their most sacred beliefs. It was Smith's opinion that missionaries, such as Williams and Hammond, insisted that Io was a derivation from Biblical influences because they would not accept that Maori tohunga could have kept the Io cult from them. Smith and Best's beliefs in hidden Maori traditions enabled them to see themselves not as latecomers who had missed learning the 'real' old traditions, but as being the experts who made known the information that had remained hidden from earlier collectors, such as Grey and the missionaries.

The first six chapters, or upoko, of *Te Kauwae runga* were Maori texts derived from Whatahoro's writings, which in turn were supposedly transcripts of the oral teachings of Matorohanga and Nepia Pohuhu. These chapters were then followed by six chapters in English, consisting of Smith's rather loose translations of the Maori texts, along with his own extensive commentaries. David Simmons and Bruce Biggs, in their 1970 study of the composition of *The Lore of the Whare Wananga*, wrote that most of the Maori text of *Te Kauwae runga* matched the content of the texts in the *Tane nui a rangi* volumes, which had been deposited at the Dominion Museum. They concluded that this similarity indicated that most of the material in the Maori text of *Te Kauwae runga* reflected what could be regarded as the 'authentic tradition' of the Ngati Kahungunu at the turn of the century. Simmons and Biggs refused to accept that chapter two of *Te Kauwae runga*, the chapter which referred to Io, was 'authentic' tradition. This was a result of their inability to locate Whatahoro's original work from which this text was derived.

The second volume of *The Lore of the Whare Wananga* was subtitled *Te Kauwae raro or Things Terrestrial*. It was first published in serialised form in the *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, and then in book form in 1915. *Te Kauwae raro* consisted of ten upoko, or chapters, in Maori, each of which was followed by the equivalent chapter in
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38S. P. Smith to E. Best, 21/11/1917, E. Best Papers, Ms-Papers-0072-05, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
39S. P. Smith to E. Best, 22/9/1916, E. Best Papers, Ms-Papers-0072-05, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ. Smith even harked back to the Semitic theories of Polynesian origins by suggesting that the Io belief had been acquired 'from some of the Babylonian Semites' before the time of Jesus Christ. See *Ibid.*
40E. Best to S. P. Smith, date unclear April or May 1911, Polynesian Society Records, Ms-Papers-1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
41Simmons and Biggs, 'Sources of the "Lore"', pp. 35-6, 41.
English. As with *Kauwae runga*, the Maori chapters were claimed to be predominantly from the works of Matorohanga and Nepia Pohuhu, while the English chapters were Smith's translations. *Te Kauwae raro* set out the story of the migration of the Polynesians through the Pacific. It also gave a detailed description of the arrival and the fate of a people who had supposedly settled New Zealand before the East Polynesian ancestors of the Maori.

Percy Smith believed that Whatahoro had recorded the exact wording of ancient traditions, passed down unchanged through the centuries. Smith was aware that there had been eighty years of contact between Maori and Pakeha before Whatahoro made his first recordings of traditions. Yet he did not accept that any of the new ideas Maori had encountered through their contact with Pakeha would have found their way into the 'ancient' traditions written down by Whatahoro. Matorohanga and Nepia Pohuhu had learned their knowledge of traditions as youths in the wananga of the early nineteenth century. As this learning had occurred before the arrival of Christianity among the Ngati Kahungunu, Smith was convinced that Christian ideas had not influenced the information the tohunga passed on to Whatahoro in the 1860s. Smith seems to have been completely unaware of the fact that Matorohanga had attended a mission school in 1845, an experience which must have opened him up to many new ideas.42

Smith believed that Whatahoro had recorded the teachings of Matorohanga and Pohuhu without putting any of his own ideas into the text. While he must have been aware of Whatahoro's Mormon beliefs, Smith does not seem to have believed that these would have influenced his writings. Nor did Smith believe that Whatahoro's access to Pakeha ideas on Polynesian migrations had affected the way he had recorded older traditions. Smith held that Tane nui a rangi Komiti's seal of approval on some of Whatahoro's volumes was proof that all of Whatahoro's material was genuine, unadulterated tradition. Whatahoro had a great breadth of knowledge of the traditions of many different tribes and seemed to know the meanings of many seemingly archaic words. Smith saw this as proof that Whatahoro had gained direct access to previously hidden ancient knowledge.43

42 School Attendance Records, qMS-1408-1413a, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ. Matorohanga had attended the Te Kopi mission school in 1845. Another of Whatahoro's teachers of tradition, Paratene Te Okawhare, attended the Tauanui mission school in the same year. I must thank Tipene Chrisp, formerly of the Alexander Turnbull Library, for pointing out this information to me.


S. P. Smith to E. Best, 27/7/1914, Polynesian Society Records, Ms-Papers-1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.

Having collected traditions for many years, Smith was well aware of the wide variation between the stories of even quite closely related hapu and iwi. Traditions based around whakapapa or genealogical lines were used to establish relationships between groups of people, showing rights to land and resources. Very closely related hapu could have quite different stories about the same ancestors. Such stories were used to advance the respective claims of each group to the same resources. Smith was aware that a wide variety of origin and migration stories existed among different hapu and iwi. Some hapu or iwi had stories that mentioned earlier iwi being present before the arrival of their own tupuna (ancestors). Some other iwi had stories describing their tupuna arriving to an empty land or being born out of the land itself.

Despite his knowledge of these contradictions Smith decided that the information he had received from Whatahoro was the definitive history of all Maori, regardless of hapu or iwi affiliations. He believed that Whatahoro's information indicated that the ancestors of the Ngati Kahungunu had made a separate migration from other Polynesians, when they migrated from Indonesia to Tahiti via Hawaii. Nevertheless, he still believed that the material Whatahoro passed on from Matorohanga told the stories of most Polynesian migrations to Aotearoa. Smith knew that most Maori had never heard of the versions of their history presented in the *Lore*, but believed that this was due to the information having been kept strictly tapu.

**Whatahoro's Motives for Publishing His Material**

Much of the material Whatahoro had recorded from Matorohanga and other tohunga was described as being strictly tapu. The question must therefore be asked as to why Whatahoro had become so eager to have his material published? The Komiti a Tupai had supported the idea of publishing Whatahoro's two volumes of traditions to which
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A. Ballara, *Iwi*, passim.
45For examples of Smith's awareness of contradictory traditions see his accounts of Nga Puhi and Rarawa stories of the *Matahourua* waka in 'The Peopling of the North', supplement to *JPS*, Vols 5-6, 1896-7, pp. 13-5, and also his attempts to construct consistent stories regarding Kupe and Toi in Chapters 3 and 4 of *The History and Traditions of West Coast*. In an interesting series of letters Smith debates with Elsdon Best the identity and homeland of Toi kai rakau, given the conflicting East and West Coast stories concerning him: e.g. E. Best to S. P. Smith 23/6/1895 and 20/2/1896, E. Best Papers, Ms-Papers-0072-08, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ. S. P. Smith to E. Best, 20/10/1906, Polynesian Society Records, Ms-Papers-1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ. E. Best to S. P. Smith 23/9/1906 and E. Best to S. P. Smith, undated 1906, Polynesian Society Records, MS-Papers-1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
Best recorded origin stories of the Nga Potiki hapu of Tuhoe in which the ancestor Potiki was born at Onini, near Ruatahuna, to the union of Te Maunga (the Mountain) and Hine pukouh rangi (the Mist Woman). See *Tuhoe*, Vol. I, pp. 19-24.
Smith and Best were both also familiar with the collections of traditional stories made by Grey and by John White. Both these collections contained origin stories at variance with the version given by Whatahoro.
46S. P. Smith to E. Best, 12/12/1909, E. Best Papers, Ms-Papers-0072-05, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
they had given their seal of approval. However it would appear that they supported only a non-commercial publication through the Dominion Museum, rather than the making of money through the publication of traditions. In 1923, after Whatahoro's death, Downes wrote of Whatahoro's fear that, 'if his people thought he was selling any of their histories there would be a row'. Major Tunuiarangi, a Ngati Kahungunu expert and a member of the Komiti, was reported, in 1913, to have led a movement in the Wairarapa against the commercial publication of the *Lore of the Whare Wananga*. Yet Tunuiarangi supported the non-commercial distribution of the *Lore* through the *Journal of the Polynesian Society*. Whatahoro was able to turn Tunuiarangi and his other opponents around to actively support the sale of the *Lore*. Nevertheless their initial opposition raises the question again of why Whatahoro was so eager to publish, and to publish commercially and in English when he must have been aware of the potential opposition.

Whatahoro's publishing ambitions may have had a political incentive. He was a strong supporter of the Kotahitanga movement, having helped set up a Maori parliament to work for Maori political unity. His work for Kotahitanga directly complemented his efforts to retain Maori traditions and land in the face of Pakeha colonialism. While he had shown a willingness to cooperate with the Pakeha authorities through his roles as an advocate and an Assessor at the Native Land Court, Whatahoro was at the same time very suspicious of Pakeha attempts to acquire Maori land. Whatahoro's letters show that he continued to be involved in disputes over land into his old age.

It is likely that Whatahoro's involvement in trying to develop larger iwi and waka-based Maori political groupings strongly influenced his desire to publish accounts of waka history. Whatahoro was suspicious of the intentions of the Pakeha Government. Despite
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47 T. W. Downes to E. Best, 18/12/1923, E. Best Papers, MS-Papers-0072-02, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
48 On the tapu nature of the writings see *Kauwae-ranga*, p. vi and S. P. Smith to E. Best, 12/12/1909, E. Best Papers, MS-Papers-0072-05, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ. On the initial opposition among some Maori experts to commercial publication see W. H. Skinner to W. W. Smith, 5/6/1913, Polynesian Society further records, 80-115-03/09, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ. Skinner wrote to Smith, I have heard from Elsdon Best that there is great trouble amongst the Wairarapa natives over the publication of..."The Lore of the Whare Wananga" and its being put on the market for sale. They don't object to its publication through the Journal and being issued in that form to members of the Society. The feeling is very high and I only hope they won't succeed in makutuing Whatahoro. Major Tunuiarangi is the leader of the opposition.
49 Tunuiarangi's later support for the sale of the *Lore* is illustrated by the letter of Tu Karaitiana to Percy Smith in which he mentions that the book was recommended to him by Whatahoro and Tunuiarangi. See Tu Karaitiana to S. P. Smith, 15/2/1916, Polynesian Society further records, 80-115-03/11, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
51 O'Malley, *Agents of Autonomy*: p. 44.
52 H. T. Whatahoro to E. Best, 13/7/1919, E. Best Papers, MS-Papers-0072-07, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
this he regarded some Government-supported schemes, such as the establishment of Maori Councils through the Maori Councils Act of 1900, as potentially creating greater Maori unity. These Councils were not based around hapu or even iwi. Instead they tended to use the assumed shared descent from the crew of particular migratory waka as a basis for political organisation. In 1902 Whatahoro sent an account of the traditions of the Takitimu waka to the newspaper Te Puke ki Hikurangi, in the hope that this knowledge would help in the process of gathering the people into the waka of the Maori Councils.

Whatahoro also promoted the idea of the unity of the Ngati Kahungunu iwi rather than emphasising the smaller hapu divisions. Whatahoro’s involvement with the Komiti a Tanenuiarangi can be seen to be part of this process of encouraging iwi unity. The attempt to establish an ‘official’ version of Ngati Kahungunu iwi history helped promote the idea of the shared history of all iwi members, rather than concentrating on many separate hapu migration stories.

The idea of migration by a fleet of canoes was found in Ngati Kahungunu traditions. It was not found in the traditions of many other iwi, most of whom had stories of independent single canoe migrations. Given his support for movements such as Kotahitanga it may be that Whatahoro was trying to encourage Maori political unity by promoting the idea of a common migratory history involving a Great Fleet of canoes carrying the ancestors of most of the major modern iwi. Such an idea is supported by the fact that Whatahoro’s manuscripts, on which Te Kauwae raro was based, included stories from many different iwi, rather than just concentrating on the traditions of his own Ngati Kahungunu.

Whatahoro had built up a large collection of books by the early twentieth century. By this time many works had been published in the Maori language and many Maori were literate. The printed word was respected by literate Maori and Pakeha. Publications included religious works produced by missionaries, government proclamations, translations of Pakeha literary works and practical manuals, Maori waiata and traditions, and the production of newspapers in Maori by both Maori and Pakeha. Whatahoro was one of those who had contributed to these newspapers and obviously set

53 On ‘official’ and ‘unofficial’ Maori committees see O’ Malley, Agents of Autonomy.
54 Te Puke ki Hikurangi, 31/5/1902.
Ballara, Iwi, p. 331.
Simmons, ‘Words of Maorihanga’, p. 117.
Ballara, Iwi, p. 214.
56 Simmons, Great NZ Myth, pp. 111-25.
57 On kotahitanga see Walker, Ka Whawhai tonu matou, pp. 165-72.
a high value on the published word as a way of both preserving and distributing knowledge.58

Like many learned Maori, Whatahoro was familiar with the work of the Polynesian Society and Percy Smith. The Society's reputation for publishing the work of Maori experts meant that publication in their Journal enhanced the status of such work and its authors. Major Tunuiarangi, for example, was able to advance the claims of Ngati Kahungunu over Rangitane in the Wairarapa, by getting his version of the traditional history of the Wairarapa accepted by Percy Smith and published in the Journal of the Polynesian Society. Whatahoro would have been aware that if his versions of tradition were spread by the Journal, his own status would be enhanced among Maori and Pakeha scholars.59

Despite his active promotion of his own versions of traditions, it should not be thought that Whatahoro believed that these versions were a metanarrative, the one 'true' overall version of Maori history excluding all other traditions or versions of traditions. Whatahoro attended many hui and Native Land Court sittings through the years, hearing many speakers presenting varied and contradictory traditions from a wide range of different hapu and iwi. The great breadth of material recorded in Whatahoro's notebooks illustrates the range of his knowledge. It is unlikely that Whatahoro saw the accounts he was trying to get published as the one overarching version of the Maori past. It is more probable that he saw them as one version among the many he had heard. He may well have tried to get this particular version of traditions published for specific political and personal reasons.

Some Maori experts shared the fears of Pakeha ethnologists that traditional stories might disappear. Literate Maori therefore set out to write down and preserve traditions. Such fears encouraged James Carroll and Tamahau Mahupuku, in the 1890s, to propose that the stories of the ancestors should be written down, a suggestion which helped lead to the establishment of Te Komiti a Tupai. Major Tunuiarangi made an abortive attempt with Percy Smith and Carroll to draw up a scheme using the resources of the Polynesian Society and the Government to record and publish the teachings of Ngati Kahungunu

N. Freen, 'Niupepa in the Turnbull', ibid, pp. 19-22.
On Maori literacy and respect for literature see D. F. McKenzie, Oral Culture, Literacy and Print in Early New Zealand: The Treaty of Waitangi, Wellington, 1985. McKenzie argues that literacy was not widespread among Maori in the early nineteenth century, but that the written and printed word was regarded with a degree of reverence by the literate and illiterate alike.
elders. Whatahoro wrote that one of the reasons for recording the teachings of Matorohanga and Pohuhu in the 1860s was the fear of the loss of the material.

There may well also have been a much more prosaic motive behind Whatahoro's desire to get his material published. According to T. W. Downes, Whatahoro was often penniless and had great difficulty in retaining money. Downes noted that Whatahoro deliberately avoided paying for some of the copies of the *Lore* he had ordered, but he also noted that Whatahoro did pay his debts on the occasions when he was in funds. Downes considered Whatahoro to be 'an unsatisfactory customer to deal with as far as money is concerned' and believed that he had wasted all of £5,000 he had 'come into'.

Smith completely accepted Downes' stories about Whatahoro's inability to hang on to money, blaming this on his Maori ancestry. The attitudes of the Victorian Protestant Britishto work and money are clearly reflected in the views of Smith and Downes. Nevertheless it does appear that Whatahoro was often short of cash. He certainly did his best to sell as many copies as possible of the two volumes of the *Lore* to Maori buyers. The idea of making some money from the publication of the *Lore* may well have been a factor encouraging him to try and get his work into print.

The *Lore* and the Moriori

Percy Smith believed that the version of Maori migratory history presented in Whatahoro's texts was a largely accurate representation of the history of all Maori. Smith also argued that Whatahoro's writings presented an accurate account of the history and identity of the Chatham Island Moriori. The *Te Kauwae rararo* account described a people who arrived in New Zealand before the East Polynesian ancestors of the Maori and who were quite different from them in appearance. These people were then driven out of New Zealand by the East Polynesians who came first with Toi and Whatonga and then with the Great Fleet. Some of these exiled 'tangata whenua' reached

---

60 S. P. Smith to A. Hamilton, 25/5/11, Author's personal collection. It is interesting that in this letter Smith makes no mention of Tamahau Mahupuku, but claims that it was he, Smith, who in 1905 during their time working and travelling together on the Scenery Preservation Commission, persuaded Tumuarangi to urge the Ngati Kahungunu to write down their traditions. This then led to the meeting with Carroll and the setting up of the Tane nui a rangi Committee. See also Simmons, 'The Words of Te Matorohanga', p. 117.
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the Chathams where they became the Moriori. According to Whatahoro's account the Moriori had in fact originally been called the 'Mouriuri'. Whatahoro also wrote that the Chathams had originally been discovered by Toi on his journey to Aotearoa and that Wharekauri, rather than Rekohu, was the original name for the Chathams. The account in *Te Kauwae raro* also had two different stories of visits to the Chathams by Kahu (or Kahu-koka as one version of the story referred to him). In one version Kahu brought fern to plant, while in the second account Kahu-koka attempted and failed to grow kumara on the Chathams. In both versions Kahu did not stay on the Chathams but returned to his original homeland.66

Whatahoro claimed these writings were traditions recorded from Matorohanga and others. It should be noted that, in the *Te Kauwae raro* account, Matorohanga himself was quoted as saying that most of the accounts of the pre-Maori 'tangata whenua' came from outside the teachings of the ancient whare wananga. According to Whatahoro, Matorohanga claimed that some of his information on the Moriori came from the Ngati Ruanui tohunga, Turaukawa, along with the Te Ati Awa leaders, Nga waka taurua and Kirikumara. In addition Matorohanga claimed that he had obtained information regarding the journey of Kahu and Akaaroro to the Chathams, from two old men, Hauauuru and Taka rangi, who he had met in the Whanganui district in 1854 or 1855.67

The *Te Kauwae raro* account described Aotearoa as originally being inhabited by a people entirely distinct from Maori. A detailed description was given of the physical appearance of these earlier people. They were described as thin and tall with prominent knees; flat faces; shifty eyes; flat, blunt noses; reddish-black skin; and straight lank hair. They were also depicted as lazy and backward, a people with no agriculture, who lived in rough lean-to huts. As Peter Buck pointed out, this description does not fit any particular ethnic group, but seems more likely to be an invented description to emphasise how different the earlier people were from the East Polynesians. The description of the earlier people was also complicated by the fact that in the Whatahoro narrative the 'tangata whenua' were sometimes described as speaking a language the immigrants could understand and in other passages described as being incomprehensible.68

A possible explanation for the physical description of the tangata whenua is that it was actually based on Maori descriptions of indigenous Australians, who, in the nineteenth

66Smith, *Lore: Kauwae Raro*, Upoko 7, Chp. 7.
Buck, *The Coming of the Maori*, p. 11.
century, were regarded by many Maori as an inferior people. By the 1830s many Maori had been to Australia on whaling and trading vessels. There they had seen the poor conditions in the Sydney area of the despised Australian 'blackfellows'. King records how the chiefs Te Pahi and Tuki 'had the most contemptible opinion' of the Aborigines.\(^{69}\) Writing later in the nineteenth century, both Frederick Hunt and Bishop Selwyn noted that Maori on the Chathams referred to Moriori as paraiwharas or 'blackfellows'. Hunt pointed out that this was despite the fact that Moriori were no darker than Maori.\(^{70}\) It is possible that the description of the dark skinned, flat nosed, straight haired naked 'tangata whenua' may also have originated from Maori observations of the Australian Aborigines. It may be that the Maori vision of the Australian Aborigine became the Maori model for the appearance and behaviour of what they regarded as an inferior people, a model which passed in to Whatahoro's manuscripts.

Percy Smith accepted Whatahoro's description of the 'tangata whenua' as accurate. However in order to understand the significance of Smith's acceptance of this account it is necessary to recall his changing attitudes towards the Moriori from the late 1860s onwards. Smith spent a year surveying on the Chathams in 1868 during which time he had considerable contacts with the Chatham Island Moriori. He was therefore aware of the Polynesian appearance and cultural links of the Chatham Island Moriori. Smith used the evidence of this experience to counter Joshua Rutland's argument that the Moriori were a Melanesian people. Therefore, in 1897, almost thirty years after his visit to the Chathams, Smith was still arguing that the Moriori were an East Polynesian people quite similar to Maori.\(^{71}\)

Within ten years of his rebuttal of Rutland, Smith was to accept an account that described Moriori as a very different people from the East Polynesians. From 1909 onwards Smith seems to have changed his mind about what he had personally seen and heard on the Chathams. He came to accept Whatahoro's account of the dark, tall, lankhaired people as an accurate physical description of the ancestors of the Moriori. Smith now claimed, 'It is clear to me that the Moriori of the Chatham Islands differed somewhat in appearance and in other matters from the Maoris... a thing that was impressed on me by a years residence in that island'.\(^{72}\) Smith did not entirely reject his own earlier views on a Moriori-Polynesian connection, but compromised by arguing that the Moriori were a West Polynesian/Melanesian mix. The important point is that

---
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from the time Smith read Whatahoro's work he emphasised the differences between Moriori and Maori.73

Elsdon Best was always a stronger believer than Percy Smith in the idea that New Zealand's earliest population had a Melanesian element to their ancestry. He had held this view at least since his time in the Urewera. Best believed that the Tuhoe showed more Melanesian aspects in their appearance than other Maori. This in turn he believed to be the result of a larger element of descent among Tuhoe from the supposedly part-Melanesian 'tangata-whenua'.74 Best's belief in the Melanesian presence in early New Zealand must be borne in mind when examining the article he wrote in 1916, concerning the early population of New Zealand, the people he referred to as 'the Maruiwi'. The physical description Best gave of the Maruiwi, repeated Whatahoro's description of the 'tangata whenua', but contained one significant change. He changed the description of their hair from the 'straight' and 'lank' of the Whatahoro account to a more Melanesian appearance, 'Their hair in some cases stood upright, in others it was bushy'.75

Rekohu (Chatham Island) Moriori origin stories had, from the 1860s onwards, been collected from surviving Moriori elders by the Moriori expert Hirawanu Tapu and the Pakeha ethnographer Alexander Shand. These stories told a very different tale from those recorded by Whatahoro. According to the Moriori stories several indigenous tribes originally lived on Rekohu and had done so from time immemorial. Other canoe-borne peoples later migrated to Rekohu. The Moriori stories of these migrations told of conflict between inter-related tribes in Hawaiki, which may have been some part of New Zealand, leading to various groups migrating to a new land. There was no mention in the account of a distinct group of invading people driving the ancestors of the Moriori out of their New Zealand homeland. The original peoples and the migrant tribes were all portrayed as being physically and culturally very similar to each other and as speaking a Polynesian language.76 The descriptions of customs in these stories, along with Moriori versions of such widespread east Polynesian myths as the Rangi and Papa, Maui and Tawhaki stories, strongly suggested that the Moriori were an eastern Polynesian people.77

73Smith, _Lore: Kauwae Raro_, pp. 72, 77.
74See for example E. Best, 'Tuhoe: Children of the Mist', _JPS_, 84, 22, 1913, pp. 149-65.
75E. Best, 'Maori and Maruiwi', p. 435.
76Shand, 'The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands', Chp. 7., pp. 211-25.
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Percy Smith was quite familiar with the surviving Moriori versions of their own history. He had spoken with Hirawani Tapu during his time surveying on the Chathams. On this same surveying mission Smith met and formed a close friendship with Alexander Shand. Shand was to visit Smith several times during visits to New Zealand. The two men maintained a correspondence from 1870 until Shand's death in 1910. It was Smith who arranged the Polynesian Society's publication of the versions of Moriori legends, customs and history which had been collected by Shand and Tapu. It can therefore be seen that Smith's belief in the accuracy of Whatahoro's version of Moriori history was not a product of his ignorance the Moriori's own versions. Smith seems to have consciously decided that the version of events presented in Te Kauwae Raro was the more accurate account of the Moriori past.

Shand's views on the information he was receiving from Smith can be gleaned from letters he sent over the period from 1890 to 1910. Like Smith, Shand believed that Polynesian oral traditions held within them the 'true' historical accounts of the original migrations through the Pacific. He also followed the idea that it was the duty of the Pakeha historian to decipher and rearrange these stories in order to show the 'correct' historical sequences of events. Shand accepted Smith's view that the dates of events could be worked out by counting the generations in whakapapa. Shand differed from Smith in that he believed that Moriori traditions and whakapapa lists were in fact more historically accurate and reliable than those of the Maori.

Shand was of the opinion that Moriori were East Polynesian and that they were very closely related to Maori. In 1890, well before he had obtained Whatahoro's material, Smith had put the idea to Shand that the Moriori were the original, distinctly non-East Polynesian people of New Zealand. Shand disagreed with this idea, holding instead that the migration to the Chathams of ancestral Moriori waka such as the Rangimata, was part of the same big phase of migration which brought the Maori to New Zealand. Shand believed the waka migrants to the Chathams were essentially the same people as the Maori and that the Moriori had probably been to New Zealand before coming out to the Chathams. He saw the similarities in language and the existence of shared legends such as those of Maui and Tinirau, as providing proof of the common ancestry of Moriori and Maori. Shand did agree with Smith that an earlier people had lived in both

78 See Shand's correspondence with Smith, A. Shand letterbook, qMS 1789, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
79 Unfortunately this researcher was not able to locate any surviving letters or carbon copies of letters from Smith to Shand. Some copies may exist with Shand's original letter book which is held in the Auckland Public Library.
80 A. Shand to S. P. Smith, 6/1/1890, 28/3/1890, 25/9/1891, 3/10/1893 (in letter dated 30/9/1893), 28/12/1894, A. Shand letterbook, qMS 1789, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
81 A. Shand to S. P. Smith, 6/1/1890, 30/9/1893 (in letter dated 30/9/1893), 28/12/1894, A. Shand letterbook, qMS 1789, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
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New Zealand and the Chathams. He based this belief on Moriori and on some Maori traditions. Shand believed this earlier people were also East Polynesians, a people very closely related to the later migrants. He took this idea from Moriori traditions describing the original inhabitants of Rekohu as speaking exactly the same language as the new immigrants.82

Shand wrote to Smith in 1910, giving his opinions on the information Smith had obtained from Whatahoro. Shand was sceptical about some of the details of the account Smith had sent him. The Whatahoro account described the original people as more primitive than the immigrants, but also as being treacherous and dangerous in warfare.83 In reference to this Shand wrote,

If Maruiwi was so numerous as stated treacherous and evidently warlike- the Heke [migrants] being afraid of them-How did it happen that the Heke who could not have been very numerous at the time and scattered everywhere combine under the canoe leaders, attack and practically exterminate Maruiwi? They must have grown apace to do all this... 84

Whatahoro's account told of the 'Maruiwi' fleeing in panic to the Chathams. Shand questioned this, maintaining that only canoes specifically fitted out for a long voyage could have made it out to the islands. His scepticism was enhanced by the fact that this arrival of refugees from New Zealand was not mentioned anywhere in Moriori traditions. Much of the account Smith had acquired from Whatahoro appeared to contain information that was not present in surviving Chatham Island Moriori traditions.85

Shand went on to question two claims by Whatahoro's informants regarding placenames. These claims held that the name Wharekauri was the original name of Chatham Island and that the name Kaingaroa for an area on the North eastern corner of Chatham Island was an old Moriori name. Shand knew that the old Moriori name for Chatham Island was Rekohu and that Kaingaroa had been called Rata by the Moriori. Kaingaroa and Wharekauri were both Maori rather than Moriori names. Wharekauri was a name originally applied to one area in the North east of Rekohu. Shand related to

82A. Shand to S. P. Smith, 6/1/1890, A. Shand letterbook, qMS 1789, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ. In this letter Shand wrote:

I am afraid your theory of the Moriori being the old original race will be hard to sustain—that there was an original race if their traditions mean anything I think cannot be doubted... but that the "Heke a Ranginui" was a section of the great Maori migration who may have stayed awhile in NZ, I think is unquestionable—their old traditions, causes of leaving Hawaiki, being the same as the Maoris.
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Smith how Ropata Tamaihenga of the Ngatitoa had lived at Wharekauri for a time while sealing in the Chathams. When Tamaihenga explained to Maori in New Zealand that he had lived at Wharekauri, they erroneously applied the name Wharekauri to the whole island. Shand maintained that, 'the assumption that the old name was Wharekauri seems to induce doubt to the bona fides of the narrator'.

Shand was not, however, prepared to completely reject the account Smith had sent him. Shand was puzzled by the fact that while parts of the account did not seem to be accurate, other sections of it matched up well with information which he and Hirawanu Tapu had recorded from Moriori elders. Both Whatahoro's account and the traditions related by the Moriori elders, referred to Kahu's visit to the Chathams and his planting of kumara and fernroot. He also noted that the whakapapa in both versions matched up to some extent. These features, along with his general belief that 'old time legends' were generally reliable guides to history, meant that Shand was reluctant to completely reject Whatahoro's account. Shand believed that if Whatahoro's version was even partially accurate, it backed up his own idea that New Zealand had been settled at a much earlier time than the arrival of the 'fleet'.

Throughout the first part of 1910 Shand continued to mull over the problem of the authenticity of Whatahoro's account. Tragically we will never know if he came to a final conclusion. On 28th July 1910 Shand was killed in a fire at his home which probably also destroyed his papers on Moriori lore. A compilation of Shand's Journal articles on the Moriori were published in 1911 as a Polynesian Society Memoir, entitled The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands. This book was edited by Percy Smith. Smith was so convinced of the accuracy of the Whatahoro account of events in the Chathams that he added a final chapter to the Memoir, in which he gave an outline of Whatahoro's writings on the Moriori. The chapter described, among other things, Toi te huatahi discovering the Chathams and the later expulsion of the Moriori from New Zealand by the East Polynesian immigrants. Neither of these events were found in any of the accounts written up by Shand and Tapu. Smith also published this chapter as a paper in the Journal of the Polynesian Society.
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Shand, as the most knowledgeable Pakeha on Moriori matters, had the potential to be a major critic of *Te Kauwae raro* and its version of Moriori history. His friendship with Smith and his access to the *Journal of the Polynesian Society* could have enabled him to put something of a brake on the more extreme claims Smith and Best later made for the version of history presented in *Te Kauwae raro*. Shand's death left a situation where very few Pakeha scholars had enough knowledge to challenge the version of Moriori history and identity championed by Percy Smith and Elsdon Best.

**Early Critics of The Lore of the Whare Wananga**

A number of early critics shared Shand's doubts over the accuracy of the account of the Polynesian past presented in *The Lore of the Whare Wananga*. Archdeacon H. W. Williams, an expert linguist and the editor of the Maori language *Dictionary of the New Zealand Language*, was an early critic, voicing concerns which have a surprisingly modern ring to them. When *Te Kauwae runga* was released in 1913, Williams wrote to Best to express his disappointment with the publication. He did not accept Smith's claim that the material was handed down unchanged from ancient times without any Pakeha influence. Williams pointed out that Whatahoro had been educated in a mission school, as had his assistant Aporo Te Kumeroa. Nepia Pohuhu and Paratene Te Okawhare, who had both provided some of Whatahoro's information, had received some Christian influences as evidenced by their Pakeha Christian names. Williams found it hard to believe that Matorohanga himself could have lived right up to 1865 without, unconsciously at least, absorbing some Pakeha thought. Williams backed up this idea by citing some Maori words he found in the text that he believed were post-contact inventions rather than ancient terms.91

Williams did not believe Smith's translation was an accurate one, 'in many cases demonstrably incorrect'. He went on to complain about the many passages of commentary which Smith had added in throughout his English translation of the text. Williams regarded these as 'distracting' and 'tiresome'. He wrote, 'One has to be always keeping oneself conscious of the fact that it is not Whatahoro but SPS'. Williams was also critical of the way that Smith did something of a cut and paste job with the English translation, grouping topics and sentences together in ways that were not evident in the Maori text.92

Williams summed up his own attitude to *The Lore* in his letter to Best:

---
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Now my trouble is that this is going forth to the world as absolutely beyond question- Te Tanemui a rangi set their seal to it, by which SPS sets much store, and SFS has now set his seal to it. I think it is all exceedingly interesting - but I really want to know a good deal more about how Te Whatahoro actually did write it down and then I want to be allowed quietly to assimilate the matter without being confused by SPS's ideas of what it might mean or might have sprung from.  

Williams was eager to hear Best's opinion of the book and was no doubt disappointed at Best's general support for it. Williams was, however, reluctant to publicly criticise Smith. As he wrote to Best, 'I should not like to say in public what I have said here- the old man [Percy Smith] would be terribly hurt- but the public ought to be warned'. Best's support for Smith's theories may have lowered his status in Williams' eyes. Williams was later to remark to Johannes Andersen, after Best's death, 'As a collector of lore he [Best] was on a high pedestal, but when he formulated his deductions he was little more than ordinary'.

Williams would not come out with any public criticism of the Whatahoro/Smith/Best orthodoxy until 1937, well after the deaths of Smith, in 1922, and of Best, in 1931. Williams confined his criticism to a paper in the scholarly pages of the *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, rather than using any more public forum. This paper, entitled 'The Maruiwi Myth', sets out Williams' reasons for questioning the accuracy of the stories told in both volumes of *The Lore of the Whare Wananga*. Williams conceded that Matorohanga and his fellow tohunga were extremely knowledgeable in ancient lore. However, he pointed out that Matorohanga, Nepia Pohuhu and Paratene Te Okawhare had all received Christian teaching which would have coloured their view of the old Maori religious ideas, even if only unconsciously. Williams also noted that some of Matorohanga's teachings were acknowledged by him to be not from the whare wananga but picked up from other tohunga he happened to meet.
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Williams went on to point out that Whatahoro himself had come under Christian influence from a very early age and that this in turn would have had an impact on the way he wrote up his material. He explained the difficulties of turning a Maori oral account into a written text, resulting in something which was by no means a verbatim record of Matorohanga's teachings. Williams was convinced that Whatahoro had reworked the text several times since originally writing it down. The questions and answers between tohunga and listeners were not a sign of the authenticity of the text but a mere 'literary artifice' of the scribe, Whatahoro.98

Williams was also suspicious of the mass of detail in much of the Whatahoro record. He suspected that the Tane nui a rangi Komiti had voted as authentic those stories containing the most details, including those recorded by Whatahoro. Williams argued that the fullness of an account did not make it more reliable or authentic than a different, more patchy account of the same tale. In fact he believed that the more detailed account was, the more likely it was to have been embroidered by the storyteller. Williams argued that every storyteller added something to a tale no matter how much they tried to preserve the original version they had received.99

Williams was very critical of what was claimed to be Matorohanga's account of Toi and Whatonga, the account which contained the physical description of the 'tangata whenua'. Williams pointed out that in one part of the story no mention was made of Whatonga having any difficulty communicating with these people; while in another section it was stated that Toi could not understand the 'tangata whenua' he had come into contact with. Williams argued that any earlier people would almost certainly have been Polynesian. He rejected the description of their physical features on the grounds that the same description was also used earlier in the same story to describe the inhabitants of Rangiatea. This island Williams held to be Ra'iatea, of the Society Islands, a place he believed had always been inhabited by Polynesians. Williams appears to have believed that the description was an imaginary one used to describe an inferior and different earlier people, rather than an accurate description of their physical appearance.100

Williams rejected many of the arguments which Best presented in his paper 'Maori and Maruiwi'. He disagreed with Best's use of the term 'Maruiwi' to refer to the 'tangata whenua', quoting Smith who had pointed out that this was a personal and tribal name which Best had erroneously applied to the entire people. Williams stated there was no
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100 Ibid., pp. 112-3.
evidence that the earlier people had been referred to as 'Maruiwi' or 'Mouriuri'. Williams did not accept Best's list of 'Maruiwi' words, as Best gave no source as to where these words had come from. Williams suggested that evidence from Matorohanga himself indicated that any mixing of Polynesians with Melanesians and other peoples probably had occurred well before their arrival in New Zealand.\(^\text{101}\)

Williams further suggested that it was very unlikely that two canoe loads of Polynesians under Toi and Whatonga could have waged a war of extermination against the earlier inhabitants. He considered this particularly unlikely as the 'Maruiwi' were supposed to be 'brave and strong' and as they had plenty of room to escape into in a country as large as New Zealand. Williams believed the claim to have exterminated the earlier inhabitants was an empty boast commonly made by conquerors. He also believed that Matorohanga was wrong to claim that none of the earlier people had lived in the South Island, given the information on early southern tribes that had been gathered by Herries Beattie.\(^\text{102}\)

Williams refuted Percy Smith's idea that the 'tangata whenua' or 'Maruiwi' were the ancestors of the Moriori of the Chatham Islands. Smith based this idea on the account, supposedly from Matorohanga, telling of six canoes of tangata whenua people, driven away by Toi's people. They set off from Rangitoto (D'Urville Island) heading towards the Chathams. Williams pointed out that there was no Maori original of this text in *Te Kauwae raro*. Nor was it recorded anywhere that the exiles had actually arrived in the Chathams. Williams refuted these stories by using the traditions collected by Shand and Hirawanu Tapu. The Chatham Island Moriori oral traditions contained no record of these particular canoes. Moriori accounts did speak of the visit by Kahu, a story also told in *Te Kauwae raro*. Williams showed that the two stories did not match up as in the Moriori account Kahu arrived many generations before the time that Percy Smith believed anyone had lived in New Zealand.\(^\text{103}\)

Williams concluded by citing H. D. Skinner's archaeological work from the early 1920s, which showed the possibility of links between Chatham Island Moriori culture and that of the Ngai Tahu of Te Wai Pounamu (South Island). Williams agreed with Skinner that the name 'Mouriuri' was only found in Whatahoro's writings and had no basis in any Moriori tradition. He also agreed with Skinner that most nineteenth century accounts described the Moricri as being very similar in appearance to the Maori. Williams did not reject the supposedly traditional accounts altogether but maintained there may have

been any number of contacts between other Pacific islands and Rekohu (the Chathams).104

It should be pointed out that Williams did not completely reject Smith and Best's approach to Polynesian history. While much more wary in his approach, Williams accepted that dates of events could be worked out roughly by counting the generations in whakapapa.105 He also accepted that characters such as Kahu and Toi were historical personages, but did not accept that the accounts of them in the various traditions were historically accurate. Williams parted company with Smith and Best in refusing to accept that traditions could be passed down for generations without being altered. He held that in the process of passing from one person to another traditions incorporated, possibly unconsciously, new information picked up by its transmitters. Williams wrote: 'The ancient traditions of the Whare wananga are full of interest, but in the aeons during which they have been they have suffered accretion, erosion and distortion... All cannot be taken now as accurate history'.106

H. W. Williams had quoted extensively from the work of the young anthropologist, Henry Devenish Skinner. H. D. Skinner (1886-1978) was the son of Smith's old colleague, the pioneer surveyor and amateur ethnologist, W. H. Skinner. The young Harry Skinner had grown up around the Taranaki stalwarts of the Polynesian Society, in particular Stephenson Percy Smith. Letters between Smith and H. D. Skinner show a warm, almost familial relationship between the two men.107 H. D. Skinner developed a special interest in fossicking for artefacts and the material culture of the Maori. He was unable to pursue his interests academically, as no courses in anthropology existed at that time in New Zealand. Instead he ended up studying zoology at Otago University, where he also spent a period from 1912-13 as acting curator of the Otago University Museum. After a stint at school teaching he volunteered for the Great War in 1914.108

Skinner served as a private with the Otago Battalion at Gallipoli, where he was wounded badly enough to be discharged as unfit for active service. An unexpected consequence of Skinner's service overseas was that he was able to study anthropology as a postgraduate student at Cambridge. Skinner studied under the renowned ethnologist
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A. C. Haddon, and under the curator of the Cambridge University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Baron Anatole von Hugel. At Cambridge Skinner also got to know W. H. R. Rivers, whose diffusionist theories were to have a major influence on his thinking. Skinner carried out a major study and cataloguing process of the Moriori and Maori collections in the Cambridge Anthropological Museum. He also gained the backing of Haddon, Sir James Frazer and other major ethnologists in a campaign to set up anthropology as a subject in the University of New Zealand. On his return to New Zealand Skinner was appointed ethnologist on the staff of the Otago Museum, backed by a grant from benefactor Willi Fels, a position that also involved lecturing in Anthropology at Otago University.¹⁰⁹

Skinner relates that he had been interested in the Moriori and the question of their identity since 1906. From his early reading of literature concerning the Moriori, Skinner began to doubt the idea that the Moriori were an earlier, more primitive people than the Maori. He interpreted the craniological and osteological work of anatomists such as J. H. Scott and W. L. H. Duckworth, as indicating that Moriori were as Polynesian as the Maori. Skinner's first major work on the Moriori was carried out during his sojourn in Britain from 1916 to 1918. He examined thoroughly the Moriori collections of the British Museum, the Pitt-Rivers Museum and the Cambridge University of Archaeology and Ethnology. In 1919 Skinner made his first voyage out to the Chatham Islands. In 1924 Skinner was able to make a second visit to the Chathams as a member of the Otago Institute scientific expedition.¹¹⁰

During his two visits Skinner was able to visit both Chatham and Pitt Islands. He met with Tommy Solomon and his aunt, who Skinner believed to be the last of the 'full blooded' Moriori. From his own observations and a comprehensive examination of the literature on European observations of the Moriori, Skinner strengthened his own belief in their Polynesian nature. He wrote of Tommy Solomon: 'He appears to be in every respect a typical Polynesian, more so, in my opinion, than the average Taranaki Maori, and might easily be figured as a native of Tonga and Tahiti'.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁹Ibid.
H. D. Skinner to E. Best, 2/12/1917, E. Best Papers, MS-Papers-0072-05, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
¹¹⁰On Skinner's first trip to the Chathams in 1919, the Marine Department decided to forbid the Ngahere to take any passengers out to the Chathams. This forced Skinner and his companion, the school inspector H. S. Irwin, to stowaway in the coal hold, armed with a supply of meat pies. The 1924 expedition was made under slightly more dignified circumstances. See H. D. Skinner, The Morioris of the Chatham Islands, Honolulu, 1923, pp. 3-5.
Skinner and Baucke, The Morioris, p. 3.
¹¹¹Skinner, Morioris of the Chathams, p. 37.
In his 1923 book, *The Morioris of the Chatham Islands*, Skinner reviewed the literature on osteology of the Moriori, the studies on measurements of Moriori skeletons. While Skinner acknowledged there were contradictions between the various studies, overall he concluded that most studies indicated a Polynesian Moriori. Skinner also looked at a study that H. W. Williams had carried out on the Moriori language. Williams had concluded that while the Moriori language was a Polynesian one, he did not believe it was a dialect of Maori. Skinner suggested that a detailed study of the Kai Tahu dialect, which had not at that time been carried out, might show it to be very close to Moriori language. Skinner believed Moriori material culture was similar to that of the Southern Maori and that the languages might also prove to be quite similar.\(^{112}\)

Skinner's principal field of study was material culture, the study of artefacts. After examining the Moriori artefacts held in British and New Zealand Museums, along with those items he had found on the Chathams itself, Skinner concluded that the material culture of the Moriori indicated a close connection with the Maori. He wrote:

The evidence derived from Moriori material culture is thus decisively in favour of the New Zealand origin of that people. It will be seen... that their relationship is closest to what I have elsewhere called the southern culture of New Zealand.... It has been shown that...the Moriori culture and the southern culture of the Maoris have points of relationship far and wide in the Pacific regions and that in some respects this relationship seems closest with eastern Polynesia and particularly with Easter Island.\(^{113}\)

Skinner was particularly critical of the idea that *The Lore of the Whare Wananga* told the story of the early history of the Moriori and their migration to the Chathams. He pointed out that the physical description of the Maruiwi in *Te Kauwae raro* bore no resemblance to that of the Moriori on the Chathams. With regard to material culture Skinner pointed out that again there were major discrepancies between the *Te Kauwae raro* account and the evidence of Moriori artefacts and traditions. The unusual Maruiwi weapons described in *Te Kauwae raro* were not found among the Moriori. *Te Kauwae raro* stated that the tangata whenua ancestors of the Moriori were a people who lived exclusively as hunter-gatherers. Skinner pointed out that while the Moriori themselves had no agriculture, their traditions spoke of the use of cultivated plants in Hawaiki.\(^{114}\)

Skinner also noted that Whatahoro himself wrote that Matorohanga had acquired information on the story of Kahu in the mid-1850s. Skinner speculated that as Maori

\(^{112}\)Ibid., pp. 40-1, 43.
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had by that time been in contact with the Chatham Island Moriori for well over twenty years, stories such as that of Kahu were probably acquired from the nineteenth century Moriori themselves rather than from ancient Maori traditions. Skinner rejected the claim, made in *Te Kauwae raro*, that Wharekauri was the original name of the Chathams rather than a name recently imposed by Maori conquerors. The claim was also made that the original name of the Moriori was actually Mouriuri. Skinner could not understand how this information was not discovered by Shand, Smith, Hunt and other early Pakeha visitors to the Chathams. Skinner argued that it was unbelievable that the information recorded in *Te Kauwae raro*, which was claimed to be an accurate account of Chatham Islands history, could have remained unknown to the Moriori, to the Maori on the Chathams, and to Alexander Shand who was the most thorough Pakeha historian of both peoples. He therefore argued that the information on Maruiwi and Moriori in *Te Kauwae raro* had to be rejected as unreliable.  

H. D. Skinner, as mentioned above, had a warm personal relationship with Percy Smith. They had corresponded for years over issues concerning ethnology. Among the issues they discussed were the Moriori and the writings of Whatahoro. It is clear that Skinner in his correspondence with Smith expressed his doubts about Whatahoro. In 1917 Smith wrote to Skinner, at that stage studying at Cambridge, and took him to task for attacking Whatahoro. Smith insisted that Whatahoro had not made up any of his material but had transcribed it all from Matorohanga and his other informants. Smith wrote that in all his years of involvement with Maori, 'It is my deliberate opinion that Whatahoro is the most learned man it has been my fortune to meet'. Smith went on to disagree with Skinner’s idea that the Moriori were ‘probably the purest of the Polynesian people’. Smith maintained that his own experience on the Chathams had shown him that they were the Polynesians most mixed with Melanesians, resembling the peoples of Fiji and Niue. This statement was in direct contradiction to the view Smith had held at the turn of the century when he had declared that the Moriori were pure Polynesian.

Atholl Anderson writes that Skinner's accounts 'effectively disposed of the "Maruiwi" account of Maori and Moriori origins and freed ethnology and archaeology from dependence on traditionalist arguments'. It should however be noted that Skinner, like Williams, was initially reluctant to publicly criticise Smith and Best, and the impact of his work on the general public was probably minimal. Skinner's book, *The Morioris of the Chatham Islands*, came out in 1923, only eight years after the publication of *Te Kauwae raro*.  

**Kauwae raro.** As will be discussed below, versions of the account set out in *Te Kauwae raro* were to remain in popular literature well into the 1960s. Skinner's work on the Moriori was published in Honolulu and appears to have received only minimal coverage in New Zealand. In later years Skinner, along with his student David Teviotdale, debated the issue of early Polynesian settlement in the *Journal of the Polynesian Society* with T. W. Downes and Johannes Andersen, who both adhered to the views of Smith and Best. It is unlikely that such arguments made a large impact outside scholarly circles. These debates have been covered extensively in works by Gibbons and by Sorrenson.119

Peter Buck, Te Rangihiroa, was another of the younger generation of New Zealand anthropologists.120 Like Skinner he maintained a warm, almost familial, relationship with Smith, to whom he wrote letters signed 'na to tamaiti', 'from your son'. While he did not get on well with H. D. Skinner, Buck came to have similar doubts on the value of the teachings of Matorohanga. Buck gave a lecture in 1929 to the Cawthron Institute, in which he presented his own version of Polynesian migration to Aotearoa. Buck's version followed the *Te Kauwae raro* account to some extent. He repeated the ideas that Kupe had been the first to arrive in New Zealand and that a fleet of canoes had arrived around 1350 AD. Buck was aware at this time that many Maori in the Bay of Plenty believed Toi was tangata whenua of that region. He rejected this idea in favour of Matorohanga's story that Toi te huatahi came to New Zealand from Hawaiki searching for his nephew Whetonga. Buck was not, however, prepared to accept without question the idea that the tangata whenua spoken of in the Matorohanga account were the ancestors of the Chatham Island Moriori. Thus, while he related the Matorohanga account of the exile of these people to the Chathams, he also set out the Moriori traditional account of their own origins as collected by Shand.121

Buck gave a more developed version of his ideas on early Polynesian migration in his 1949 book, *The Coming of the Maori*. In this book Buck accepted some aspects of the *Te Kauwae raro* account while rejecting others. He accepted the story that Aotearoa was discovered by Kupe around 925 AD, but rejected the idea that Kupe had been to the South Island. He also maintained that the sites associated with Kupe's visit had in fact
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D, Teviotdale, 'The Material Culture of the Moa-hunters in Murihiku', *JPS*, 41, 162, 1932, pp. 81-120.
See especially pp. 88-92, where Teviotdale criticises the orthodox account of the 'Maruiwi'.

120 Although Buck became a professional anthropologist, his initial training was as a medical doctor, while he was largely self-taught in anthropology.

been named by later generations as memorials to their ancestor, rather than by Kupe at the time of his visit. Buck thus accepted much of the Matorohanga account by maintaining that Kupe was the first to come to New Zealand. He accepted that Toi and Whatonga were probably from Hawaiki rather than the Bay of Plenty, but believed that Matorohanga had added details from other traditions into his own account of Toi and Whatonga. Buck believed there had been a fleet migration around 1350 AD which brought the kumara to Aotearoa. It can therefore be seen that Buck accepted the system of dating devised by Percy Smith, but rejected many of the details of the Smith/Whatahoro/Matorohanga account, including some of their ideas concerning the pre-Maori 'tangata whenua'.

While Buck accepted the idea put forward in *Te Kauwae raro* that a pre-Maori population had existed in New Zealand, he rejected completely the physical description of the 'tangata whenua' contained in the Whatahoro/ Matorohanga account. He noted that Smith and Best could not have been right in surmising from this description a Melanesian element in the ancestry of the Maori. As Buck pointed out, the Matorohanga description had the 'tangata whenua' with dark skin and flat noses, but also had them with lank, straight hair, a feature not generally found among Melanesians. Buck wrote:

>The... description [of the 'tangata whenua'] would have done credit to a trained physical anthropologist and it would have been remarkable as an example of transmission by memorizing over a number of centuries, if it were true... It is evident that the Matorohanga school believed that the early settlers were different from themselves and so they made them different. The sum of physical differences formed an academic type which did not exist in real life.

Buck went on to point out that the earlier people supposedly spoke a language akin to Maori, further evidence that they were Polynesian rather than Melanesian.

Buck went on to reject the versions of Chatham Island Moriori history set out in *Te Kauwae raro*. He wrote: 'The Matorohanga account is exasperating in its copious details which make one wonder how anyone in new Zealand could possibly know more about the people on a distant island than the people themselves'. Buck believed that Matorohanga's version of the story of Kahu was initially based on the Moriori version.
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of the story and that he had obtained this in the 1850s from Hauauru and Taki rangi in Whanganui. According to Buck, Matorohanga had then added extra details to the story, as had Whatahoro when he wrote the story down.128

Buck rejected the idea that the Moriori were a non-Polynesian people who had been driven out of New Zealand by the descendants of Toi and Whatonga. Instead he held that the first settlers of New Zealand were Polynesian 'Moa-hunters' who did not have agriculture but were hunter-gatherers. One group of these people had, for some unknown reason, settled in the Chathams and became the Moriori. Buck believed this had occurred well before the arrival of the 'fleet'. He went on to declare that, on the basis of anthropometric work by Shapiro, the idea of any major Melanesian element in the Maori population had to be rejected. Buck's conclusion was that the earliest settlers in New Zealand were from the area of Tahiti and that any mixing with non-Polynesian peoples had occurred much earlier in their history.129

Buck rejected many details of the Te Kauwae raro account. Nevertheless, he continued to accept the system of historical dating devised by Smith, along with the idea of several progressive waves of Polynesian settlers, each more culturally advanced than the last. Buck also accepted the idea that Toi and Whatonga emigrated from Hawaiki, to be followed later by the Great Fleet. Buck's work can be seen as critical of the Whatahoro/ Matorohanga account, but not as a total rejection of it. His writings must therefore have sent out ambiguous messages to his readers. There is little evidence that Buck's writings caused any wholesale rejection of the idea of a non-East Polynesian 'Moriori' people having lived in New Zealand before the Maori.

The Dissemination of The Lore- The Role of Elsdon Best
The version of Polynesian migration history presented in Te Kauwae Raro became the orthodox version of the New Zealand's past and remained so for over forty years after the book's publication. Yet Te Kauwae Raro itself was probably never widely known outside the scholarly circles of the Polynesian Society. It seems likely that both volumes of The Lore of the Whare Wananga were only ever read by a limited number of Pakeha and Maori scholars. It is also probable that many of these readers only read the text in their own first language and ignored the accompanying text in the language with which they were less familiar. The real impact of the Lore, on the Pakeha general public at least, resulted from the way that Percy Smith, Elsdon Best, and other members of the Polynesian Society spread its message through a variety of media.
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While many members of the Polynesian Society were involved in the task of spreading Smith and Whatahoro's version of the past, Elsdon Best seems to have been the supreme publicist. As Best told the story he put his own emphases on it. Thus in the wide range of articles he produced, Best always promoted his idea that the earlier people had a strong Melanesian element to them. As discussed above, Smith did not share Best's enthusiasm for the idea of a Melanesian 'tangata-whenua', but after discussions with Whatahoro, Smith was prepared to concede that the earlier people were probably a West Polynesian/Melanesian mix.130 Best insisted on using the name 'Maruiwi' for the earlier people. Smith disagreed with applying this name to the whole of the 'tangata whenua', seeing it as the name of just one tribe of this supposed earlier people.131

Best helped promote the idea of a pre-Maori settlement with his speech to the Wellington Institute in 1915, which was published in 1916 as the article 'Maori and Maruiwi'. In this paper Best described them as 'tall and slim built, dark skinned, having big or protuberant bones, flat-faced and flat-nosed, with upturned nostrils. Their eyes were curiously restless, and they had a habit of glancing sideways...'. It can be seen that this description of the physical appearance of the 'tangata whenua' closely followed that which Whatahoro claimed to have recorded from Mаторohanga, as published in Te Kauwae raro. Best went on in his paper to claim that traditions described the hair of the 'tangata whenua' as 'upright' or 'bushy'.132 The Kauwae raro account had in fact described the hair of the tangata whenua as 'torotika' (straight) and 'mahora' (lank).133 Best appears to have changed this part of the description to fit more easily into his idea of the Melanesian descent of the Maruiwi.
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S. P. Smith to E. Best, 30/7/1920, E. Best Papers, MS-Papers-0072-05, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ. It should be noted that the terms 'Maruiwi', 'Mouriuri' and 'Maori' used below in describing Best's writings are used in Best's contexts and do not imply any agreement that these terms apply to groups of people in pre-contact New Zealand. Best himself was aware of the difficulties in using these terms. He acknowledged that the 'Maruiwi' probably did not have a name for themselves, but that 'Maruiwi' and 'Mouriuri' were names given them by the Maori. Best also acknowledged that the term 'Maori' for the Maori people was a modern one, not mentioned by early writers on New Zealand. Nevertheless his constant use of these terms probably reinforced to his readers the idea that these names had indeed been used in pre-contact New Zealand. It is also likely that the use of the names Maruiwi and Mouriuri emphasised to many readers the connection with the Chatham Island Moriori. See E. Best, The Maori, Vol. I, Wellington, 1924, p. 44. In this book Best used the terms Mouriuri and Maruiwi interchangeably. He later decided that 'Mouriuri' was the more correct title rather than 'Maruiwi', see The Misty Past, in The Gisborne Times, 19/12/1925. Best also suggested that 'Maioriori' was a name for the Moriori of the Chathams. See E. Best, The Maori, Vol. 1, p. 46.
133Smith, Te Kauwae raro, pp. 69, 71. It should be noted, however that the Williams dictionary gives the meanings of torotika as Straight, stiff, standing on end', see H. W. Williams, Dictionary of the Maori Language, Wellington, 1992, p. 440. Smith, who had discussed the meanings of these words with Whatahoro, was insistent that torotika meant straight. See Smith, Lore: Kauwae raro, p. 71.

237
While seeing the Maruiwi as being at least in part descended from the Melanesians, Best was puzzled by the fact that in Whatahoro's account they were depicted as speaking a Polynesian language very similar to Maori. Best noted that the tribal and personal names recorded in the 'traditional' account of the Maruiwi were all obviously Polynesian. He speculated that, in the Maori accounts, alien Maruiwi words had been "'Maorized'" and no longer bore much resemblance to the words originally used. In conclusion he stated that he did not consider the language evidence presented in the 'traditional' account of the Maruiwi to be very reliable.134

In his paper Best repeated the disparaging Te Kauwae raro account of the behaviour of the Maruiwi. He therefore described them as being lazy, improvident, treacherous, murderous and unskilled in the arts of making clothing and shelters. Furthermore the Maruiwi had no knowledge of their own ancestry, 'a sure mark of an inferior people in Maori eyes'. Best went on to repeat Whatahoro's story of how the Maori eventually drove out most of the Maruiwi. While some of the 'best-looking' Maruiwi women married into the tribes of the 'better-looking' and 'more industrious' Maori, other Maruiwi supposedly provoked the war of extermination through their treacherous behaviour. Some of the survivors of this war disappeared into the forests of the North Island interior, while the majority fled in six canoes to the Chathams.135

Best wrote, referring to Whatahoro's writings on the 'Maruiwi': 'We have, if reliable, an account of a people much inferior to the Maori in appearance and general culture'.136 Best clearly believed that the darker Melanesians were inferior to the paler Polynesians. This fitted in with common European idea of the time that the more similar a people were to Europeans in behaviour and appearance, the higher they must be in the evolutionary scale. Best quoted with approval comments from the late eighteenth century, by George Forster, describing the Melanesians of Malekula as being ugly, and inferior to, their Polynesian neighbours, who he considered better looking. Best does not seem to have questioned the idea that the standards of physical appearance and behaviour he was advocating might be culturally-based value judgements. Instead he appears to have considered them to be pre-existing truths. Nor did Best venture any criticism of the Maori action in driving out the original tangata whenua, but spent considerable time dwelling on the alleged inferiority of the original inhabitants. Best appears to have regarded the defeat and expulsion of the Maruiwi as part of the inevitable processes of cultural or physical evolution.137
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In the rest of his paper Best speculated on what traces remained of the Maruiwi, in particular, what aspects of Maori culture had perhaps been adopted from the Maruiwi. Best believed that the Moriori of the Chathams had many Melanesian aspects to their appearance. He also believed that some Maori, especially among the Tuhoe of the Urewera, showed the same Melanesian features. Best believed all such physical features originated with the Maruiwi.138

Best suggested that a series of cultural features might have been adopted by the Maori from the Maruiwi. He was intrigued by the existence of features in Maori culture that were not found in other Polynesian cultures. He proposed that the fortified pa, the curvilinear patterns of moko and whakairo (carving), and some weapons, stone adzes, and carved wooden coffins, may all have been invented by the Maruiwi. Best suggested that if this were so the Maruiwi may not have been as primitive as Maori 'tradition' had suggested. On the other hand, he suggested that such 'shocking' customs as cannibalism and human sacrifice also originated with the Maruiwi. He theorised that, as the Maruiwi were 'of a lower plane of culture' than the Maori, they may have developed these customs. The Maori then supposedly adopted the practices from Maruiwi women who had married into Maori tribes. Best offered as evidence the idea that the custom of cannibalism in the Pacific came from the Melanesians, with Fiji as its eastern limit.139

Throughout this paper Best emphasised the limited amount of information that existed concerning the earlier inhabitants. He acknowledged that the unusual features of Maori culture may have been products of their Maori cultural development in isolation from other Polynesians. Despite this his arguments leaned more strongly towards the idea of the adoption of these features from the Maruiwi.140

Two books by Elsdon Best were published in 1924, *The Maori* and *The Maori as He Was*. Both were supposed to be general ethnological accounts of 'Maori culture' in pre-Pakeha times, but were in fact largely based on his observations in the Urewera country in the 1890s. Therefore much of what he described was specific to the forest-dwelling Tuhoe and would have been subject to changes brought about through contact. Best's books were, however, greeted by Pakeha scholars as being authoritative and essential accounts of Maori customs.141 The smaller of the two books *The Maori as He Was*, was aimed at a more popular audience. This book included a mention of the craniometrical

---

138Ibid., pp. 436-7.
139Ibid., pp. 439-47.
140Ibid., pp. 439, 441, 446-7.
work of Dr. J. H. Scott as proof of the Melanesian element found within Maori and Moriori.\textsuperscript{142}

Best went on to write that the Takitimu tribes, in other words Matorohanga and Whatahoro, had the most extensively preserved traditions of migration. He repeated the stories from \textit{Te Karwae raro} of the visit of Kupe and Ngahue and the settlement of Toi and Whatonga. Toi found the country occupied by the 'Mouriuri' or 'Maruiwi'. These people had settled after a drift voyage on three canoes, landing at Taranaki. They supposedly came from a hot climate and were a dark-skinned people. Best repeated the physical description of these people he had set out in his 'Maori and Maruiwi' paper. Once again he emphasised the supposedly primitive, Melanesian nature of the Maruiwi. Best also set out the account of the attacks by Maori immigrants on those of the Maruiwi who had not married into Maori tribes, with the survivors supposedly fleeing to the Urewera or to the Chathams.\textsuperscript{143}

Best's major two volume work \textit{The Maori}, was aimed at a more scholarly audience. This work also included an account of the Maruiwi or Mouriuri. The account was basically a summary of the Whatahoro/Smith version of the early migrations to New Zealand, with the sequence of arrivals of Kupe, followed by the Moriori, Toi and Whatonga and then the Great Fleet. Best gave the account, from 'Maori tradition', of the strange physical description of the Maruiwi. He once again put forward his ideas on the Melanesian aspects of the 'tangata whenua' and the possible Maori adoption of some aspects of their culture.\textsuperscript{144}

Best proposed the idea of an ingrained racial hatred between the immigrants and the tangata whenua. Best may have been projecting some of his own prejudices when he suggested that Toi's descendants looking on the darker Maruiwi with 'hatred and contempt'.\textsuperscript{145} He believed that the Polynesian Maori would naturally look down on a more Melanesian people. His account suggested that Maori racial superiority justified their driving out of the 'inferior' Maruiwi. The Toi people in turn came to be dominated by the Maori of the 'Fleet'. Best considered the final wave of Maori settlers to have been more warlike and superior to Toi's people. He offered as proof of this the idea that the modern Maori tended to trace descent to the canoes of the fleet rather than any other ancestors. Best ever ventured the idea that Pakeha had taken so long to find the 'truth' about Toi and the Maruiwi because Maori were reluctant to show any connection with

\textsuperscript{142}Best, \textit{The Maori as He Was}, pp. 2-4.
\textsuperscript{143}Ibid., pp. 24-30.
\textsuperscript{144}Best, \textit{The Maori}, Vol. 1, pp. 42, 44, 46.
\textsuperscript{145}Ibid., p. 59.
either of these peoples. Best's idea of waves of increasingly racially superior people
taking over the islands of New Zealand mirrored the nineteenth century idea of a
process of the 'superior' Pakeha taking over from the 'inferior' Polynesians. 146

Best's classic work *Tuhoe: The Children of the Mist* contained very little material which
matched up to the Smith/Whatahoro account of migrations and the tangata whenua. This is explained by the fact that, while *Tuhoe* was first published in 1925, it was largely written during 1906 and 1907, before Smith and Best had access to Whatahoro's manuscripts. In *Tuhoe* Best repeated the common idea among the Bay of Plenty tribes that Toi te huatahi or Toi kai rakau was tangata whenua of the area rather than an immigrant from Hawaiki. Best did mention that Tutakangahau, a Tuhoe tohunga from Maungapohatu, believed that Toi was from Hawaiki. 147 Best added an insert into the work, mentioning that a tradition from 'the tapu School of Learning of the Takitimu district' spoke of a 'dark skinned, bushy haired folk, the Mouriuri people, sometimes referred to as Maruiwi'. He suggested that the supposedly Melanesian features of some of the Tuhoe were a result of mixing with these people after they had fled into the interior to escape the East Polynesian conquerors. 148

Best's books told the story of the 'Maruiwi', 'Mouriuri' or 'Moriori', to a much wider
audience than that reached by the *Journal of the Polynesian Society* and *The Lore of the
Whare Wananga*. Smith also produced a book with much the same information but aimed at a more popular audience. This was the fourth edition of *Hawaiki: The Original
Home of the Maori*, released in 1921. This latest edition contained large new sections
describing the migrations of Toi and Whatonga and of the Great Fleet. 149 There was also a section on the original 'tangata whenua', identifying them with the Moriori of the
Chatham Islands. Smith changed his conclusions on the racial identity of the Moriori. Whereas in the earlier editions he had suggested they were 'pure' Polynesians, in the
1921 edition he suggested they were Polynesians but with a considerable admixture of
Melanesian. He also suggested they came to New Zealand from Western Polynesia. All of the new material in the 1921 edition was taken from Smith's interpretation of
Whatahoro's writings. 150

An even larger number of people were reached by newspaper articles written by Smith and Best. The titles of these articles, referring to 'Vikings' of the South Seas and to 'The

---
146Ibid., pp. 58-63.
150Ibid., pp. 278-81.
Misty Past', give some idea of the degree of romanticism with which the authors invested their tales of daring navigation.151

The Spread of the Moriori Myth through Popular Literature
The version of migration history constructed by Whatahoro and Smith, and then promoted by Smith and Best, was adopted by other writers who spread it through the medium of popular historical literature. It became common for local histories to include an opening chapter or two giving the history of Polynesian settlement in that particular region. Such chapters were often lifted virtually unchanged from the writings of Smith and Best. T. Lambert, in his 1925 book *The Story of Old Wairoa*, claimed that the 'Urewera' people were descended from 'Te Tini-o-Maru' or the Maruiwi. He acknowledged that the account of this earlier, darker people came from the writings of Smith based in turn on the teachings of Matorohanga. Lambert set out the familiar chronology of Kupa’s visit in 950, the arrival of Toi and Whatonga in 1150, and the landing of the Great Fleet in 1350.152 J. A. Mackay, writing a regional history of Poverty Bay in 1949, quoted Best on the mixed Melanesian-Polynesian Maruiwi or Mouriuri population and on the arrival of Toi and Whatonga. Mackay even used Best’s phrase "'Tribes of the Rising Sun". He also quoted from a section of *Te Kauwae raro* describing Toi and Whatonga in Poverty Bay.153

A. H. Reed, author and publisher, in his popular history *The Story of New Zealand*, repeated the sequence of the explorations of Kupe and Ngahue, followed later by Toi’s search for Whatonga.154 Reed described how Toi and Whatonga found New Zealand inhabited by the 'Tangata-whenua, or Moriori'. He went on to recount that those Moriori who had not mixed with Toi’s people were driven out of New Zealand by the people of the fleet. The Moriori sailed to the Chatham Islands, where they 'dwindled in numbers, until quite recent times'. Reed reiterated the common theme where the demise

---


of the 'Moriori' was seen as something akin to a natural evolutionary process. Reed's book was first released in 1945 and was into its tenth edition by 1960.\footnote{Ibid., p. 35.} The academics J. B. Condiffe and W. T. G. Airey had set out an almost identical story to that told by Reed in their \textit{Short History of New Zealand}, published in 1938.\footnote{J. B. Condiffe and W. T. G. Airey, \textit{A Short History of New Zealand}, Christchurch, 1938, pp. 8-14.} They also portrayed the destruction of the Moriori in New Zealand as an inevitable evolutionary process. 'They [the Tangata-whenua] were inferior in fighting qualities and vigour to the later arrivals from Tahiti, and were either killed, enslaved, or absorbed by marriage into the more vigorous people'.\footnote{Ibid., p. 9.}

The southern ethnologist and journalist Herries Beattie attempted to reconcile the information he had gathered from Maori of Waitaha, Kati Mamoe and Kai Tahu descent, with the Moriori Myth as put forward by Smith and Best. Beattie conceded that Waitaha and Kati Mamoe people did not consider themselves to be Moriori. However he claimed that some of the Moriori who had been driven out of the North Island by the Maori had fled south and mixed with the tangata whenua of the South Island. Beattie chose to use the blanket term 'Moriori' for all the earlier peoples of the South Island.\footnote{H. Beattie, \textit{Moriori: The Morioris of the South Island}, Dunedin, 1941, passim, but see in particular Chp. 1.} He wrote of the terminology to be used in his 1941 book \textit{Moriori: The Morioris of the South Island}:

> These tribal names [Waitaha, Rapuwai and Kati Mamoe, the older tribes of the south] will be used in their due and proper places, but the name Moriori will be used in a general sense, as it is such a convenient term and one that is popular with Europeans.\footnote{Ibid., p. 7.}

As late as 1961, the renowned historian J. C. Beaglehole, had set out an almost exact version of the \textit{Te Kauwaeraro} account in his popular work, \textit{The Discovery Of New Zealand}. In the early 1960s, the first inhabitants of New Zealand were still being described as 'a dark skinned people, tall and slim, with flat noses and restless eyes and upstanding hair; lazy, little skilled in the arts of living'.\footnote{Beaglehole, \textit{The Discovery of New Zealand}, p. 5.} When scholars of Beaglehole's status repeated such accounts as historical facts, it is little wonder that many laypeople chose to accept them as an accurate rendition of the past.

Children's books also promoted versions of the story of the migrations and of the earlier tangata whenua. The Maori author H. D. B. Dansey wrote and illustrated a book for...
children called *How the Maoris Came to Aotearoa*. The book, published in 1947, gave the now familiar sequence of dates and migrations and described the main body of Polynesian migrants as coming in a fleet. Dansey stated that the earlier people were in fact Polynesian, but went on to say that they were considered by the 'vigorous' Maori to be 'uncouth, under-developed, and inferior'. Dansey repeated the idea that the Maori had referred to the earlier people as Maruiwi and Mouriuri. He was not prepared to say that the tangata whenua were the people who settled in the Chathams, but stated that the earlier people had much in common with the Moriori.\(^{161}\)

A. W. Reed's children's book *How the Maoris Came* had a section entitled 'The Moriori'. Reed told the children of 1950s New Zealand that the Moriori were Melanesians who probably arrived in New Zealand as storm-driven castaways. He went on to describe how the peaceful Moriori were either absorbed by the more war-like Maori, or driven out to the Chathams. Reed emphasised the idea of the natural decline of the inferior, darker, earlier people by comparing it to another famous New Zealand extinction. He wrote, 'Although the Moriori is as extinct as the moa, we can still see his dark skin and full lips in the features of some of his descendants to this very day.'\(^{162}\)

An earlier New Zealand children's book, the anonymously authored, *Our Nation's Story*, related a similar story. The imperial nature of this work, a school textbook produced in the 1920s, was indicated by its secondary title, *A Course in British History*. The edition of this book for the standard three level, told the tale of an earlier, darker skinned people who had arrived in New Zealand after Kupe, but before the East Polynesian migrants. These people were supposedly killed or enslaved by the more warlike Maori, while a few survivors became the Chatham Island Moriori.\(^{163}\)

Perhaps the most influential and widely distributed version of the Whatahoro/Smith/Best orthodoxy was the earliest version written for children. This was a series of articles which appeared in *The School Journal* for 1916. *The School Journal* was distributed to every Public School and every Native School in the country. The story was therefore taught as fact to a large proportion of the young people of the Dominion. It is particularly interesting to note that, in 1911, the Polynesian Society had actively promoted the idea to the editor of the *School Journal* that the *Journal* should print articles on 'Native History'. The Society appears to have offered Elsdon Best's


\(^{163}\)Our Nation's Story: *A Course in British History*, Standard 3, Auckland, 1920s, pp. 22-3. No exact date of publication is given for this book, nor is the author named.
services to write such articles.\textsuperscript{164} It is likely that Best was the anonymous author of the 1916 \textit{School Journal} articles, given that they placed a strong emphasis on the supposedly Melanesian affinities of the Moriori. A photograph of a particularly wild looking Melanesian was placed next to the text describing the 'Moriori'.\textsuperscript{165}

The assumed inferiority of Melanesian to Polynesian was highlighted in the \textit{School Journal} article. In the articles from Part One, the younger reader's section of the \textit{Journal}, the Moriori are described as 'People with dark skins and flat noses, who were children of those stupid people from other islands', while Maori were described as 'Nice, brown, handsome people...'.\textsuperscript{166} In Part Three, the senior section, the following was written of the supposed earliest inhabitants of New Zealand:

They are described in Maori tradition as a people of inferior culture and as not so advanced as the Maori in the various arts. They were slight of build, and had dark skins, upstanding or bushy hair, flat noses, and upturned nostrils. They had a habit of looking sideways out of the corners of their eyes, and were an indolent and chilly folk, fond of hugging the fireside.\textsuperscript{167}

There were remarkable similarities between the above description of the earlier people and that in Best's paper of 1916, 'Maori and Maruiwi', including the same description of the 'Maruiwi' as having 'upright or bushy hair'.\textsuperscript{168} The \textit{School Journal} article also follows Best's article in using the word 'Maruiwi' to describe the earlier population, a point over which Smith and Best disagreed.\textsuperscript{169} Clearly, whoever the author of the \textit{School Journal} article was, they closely followed the text of Best's 1916 article, which in turn largely followed the text of \textit{The Lore of the Whare Wananga}.

It is interesting to note that the articles in the \textit{School Journal} contained no element of guilt. Maori were presented as like an instrument of fate, improving the world by replacing the 'stupid' Moriori with a people from a higher plane of culture. The twist to the \textit{School Journal} account was that it was written in 1916, in the middle of the Great War. The Maori were portrayed to the school children of New Zealand as a people who

\textsuperscript{164}W. E. Spenser, editor of \textit{The School Journal} to W. W. Smith, Acting Secretary of the Polynesian Society, 14/9/1911, Polynesian Society further records, 80-115-03/03, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
\textsuperscript{165}The Coming of the Maoris', Pt. 2, \textit{The School Journal}, March 1916, Pt 1, p. 28. I must thank my colleague Bridget Waldron for drawing my attention to this series of \textit{School Journal} articles and for access to the information contained in her essay, 'The \textit{School Journal}: Images and Ideology, 1907-1918', History 452 Working Paper, History Department, University of Otago, 1991.
\textsuperscript{166}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 27-8.
\textsuperscript{168}E. Best, 'Maori and Maruiwi', p. 435.
\textsuperscript{169}S. P. Smith to E. Best, 30/7/1920, E. Best Papers, Ms-Papers-0072-05, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ. Smith saw the name 'Maruiwi' as applying to just one tribe of the tangata whenua and held that it was therefore inaccurate to apply the name to the whole people.
were more primitive than the Pakeha, but who had the potential to move up on the scale of civilisation to a level close to that of the Pakeha. One sign of this was that, like Pakeha, they had overcome a weaker people, who had less right to survive than them. Part of this idea of Maori worthiness to share in Western civilisation was the idea that they too could have the privilege of fighting for the King Emperor against the Germans. By the 1930s, however, the parliamentarians were already being recorded telling the familiar story that Pakeha need not feel guilty about colonisation as their efforts were nowhere near as brutal as the Maori destruction of the Moriori.

Smith and Best, along with most of the readers of the popular articles based on their works, assumed *The Lore* was a genuine record of ancient oral traditions. Smith placed particular emphasis, in the Introduction to *Te Kauwae runga*, on the fact that the material had the seal of approval of the Tane nui a rangi komiti. While he did not know whether the manuscripts on which *Te Kauwae raro* was based had the same approval his Introduction to this work left the impression that it had. We shall now consider below whether these assumptions had any basis in fact, whether the texts were ancient traditions, recent compilations, or pure inventions of Whatahoro.

The Sources of the Published Text: Did Smith Believe What He Was Saying?

David Simmons and Bruce Biggs examined the exact sources of both published volumes of the *Lore*, in a paper they wrote in 1970. They concluded that *Te Kauwae Runga: Matters Celestial* largely matched the material in the Tane nui a rangi volumes approved by the Komiti (committee) of knowledgeable elders. The exception to this was Upoko (chapter) Two, which dealt with the controversial 'Supreme God' The exception to this was Upoko (chapter) Two, which dealt with the controversial 'Supreme God' Upoko, and Biggs rejected this chapter because it contained material untraceable to 'traditional' sources. Their conclusion was that most of *Te Kauwae Runga* could be accepted as representing 'authentic tradition' of the early twentieth century Ngati Kahungunu, as it had been 'accepted as genuine by mature well informed members of the group concerned'. Simmons and Biggs did not argue that it represented the 'authentic tradition' of the 1860s or earlier periods.

In the same article Simmons and Biggs argued that the second volume, *Te Kauwae raro*, was a compilation by Percy Smith from a series of different manuscripts, which Whatahoro himself had in turn compiled from a wide range of sources. In his 1976
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171 Exchange between Messrs O'Brien and Langstone, *NZPD*, Vol. 230, 28/10/1931. I must thank my colleague Marinus La Rooj, for drawing my attention to this.
172 Smith, *Kauwae runga*, p. ii.
173 Simmons and Biggs, *Sources of "The Lore"*, p. 41.
174 Simmons and Biggs, *Sources of "The Lore"*, p. 41.
book the *Great New Zealand Myth* Simmons further asserted that Smith had deliberately falsified the source of some of the information contained in *Te Kauwae Raro*. Simmons was referring specifically to material in upoko 4, 5 and 7 which described the pre-Maori tangata whenua, along with the history of their interaction with the invading Maori, and the expulsion of the tangata whenua to the Chathams.\(^{175}\)

Smith stated that Whatahoro's information on the tangata whenua came from Matorohanga. According to the text of *Te Kauwae Raro* Matorohanga claimed this knowledge was not from the Whare Wananga but information he had received in conversation with the Ngati Ruanui tohunga Turaukawa. Smith pointed out that there was some confusion with dates as Matorohanga was said to have obtained this information from Turaukawa at a peacemaking hui in 1841, while other information indicated that Turaukawa had been killed by Ngati Raukawa at Otaki in 1834.\(^{176}\) According to the account recorded in *Te Kauwae Raro* Matorohanga also claimed to have received some of the information on Kahu's visit to the Chathams from Hauauru and Taka rangi, two elders living in the Whanganui area, who were visited by him in 1854 or 1855.\(^{177}\)

The Alexander Turnbull Library now holds the copies made at the Dominion Museum of the books of Matorohanga and Pohuhu. It also holds the original copies of both works in Whatahoro's handwriting with the Tane nui a rangi stamps of approval. Whatahoro makes the claim in the opening pages of 'The Book of Te Matorohanga' that it is an accurate record of Matorohanga's teachings.\(^{178}\) In a 1994 article Simmons points out that in fact this work is a compilation by Whatahoro from several of his earlier manuscripts. Simmons suggests that one of these earlier texts, held in the Auckland University Library, may in fact be Whatahoro's original version of Matorohanga's teachings.\(^{179}\) In reference to the volume approved by the Tane nui a rangi Komiti in 1907 and copied out at the Dominion Museum in 1910, Simmons has stated, 'The Taanenuiarangi Book of Matorohanga does not represent the words of Te Matorohanga, though it may be, and probably is, an accurate rendering of his teachings'.\(^{180}\)

\(^{175}\) Simmons, *Great NZ Myth*, pp. 64-6.

\(^{176}\) Smith, *Kauwae Raro*, pp. 69-70, 72, 143, 154, 154n

\(^{177}\) Ibid., pp. 143, 153-4.

\(^{178}\) H. T. Whatahoro, 'Te Pukapuka a Moihi Te Matorohanga', c. 1910, qMS-1352, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ. pp. 1-4. I was unable to gain access to the original volumes lent to the Dominion Museum in around 1910 and have therefore relied on the volumes transcribed by Best and Stowell. On these volumes see also Simmons, 'Words of Matorohanga', pp. 117, 127, 169-70.

\(^{179}\) Simmons, 'Words of Matorohanga', pp. 134-6.

\(^{180}\) Ibd., p. 137.
'The Book of Nepia Pohuhu', also held in the Turnbull, is in Whatahoro's hand and bears the stamp of approval of the Tane nui a rangi Committee. This work is stated to be the recording of the sayings of eight different tohunga including Pohuhu and Matorohanga.181 The Turnbull also holds the copy made of this work at the Dominion Museum. Simmons maintains that the books of Matorohanga and Nepia Pohuhu approved by the Tane nui a rangi Komiti in 1907, may be seen as representing accepted Ngati Kahungunu tradition of the early twentieth century, but can not be seen as representing tradition of the 1860s. It can, however, be argued that some of Whatahoro's writings were seen by contemporary knowledgeable Ngati Kahungunu elders, in the early twentieth century, as being representative of the teachings of earlier tohunga such as Matorohanga and Pohuhu. 182

The Book of Matorohanga' and 'The Book of Nepia Pohuhu' contain many accounts, including material which found its way into Smith's edited version of the Lore. They do not however contain references to an earlier and different population in New Zealand, preceding the east Polynesian ancestors of the Maori. It can thus be seen that the information referring to the earliest inhabitants of New Zealand contained in the second volume of the Lore, did not have its source in the books of Matorohanga or Nepia Pohuhu.

According to Simmons, Smith had in fact based the accounts of the 'tangata whenua' on two sources, neither of which originated from Matorohanga. One of these sources was a letter to Whatahoro from his father, the Englishman J. M. Jury, claiming to set out various ancient Maori traditions. Simmons thought Smith's other source was a notebook account, by Whatahoro, of a hui held in 1895 at the Turaukawa meeting house (named after the tohunga), at Taiporohenui near Hawera. Among those attending this hui were two Chatham Island Moriori, who gave an account of Moriori origins and migrations. Their account included a story of Kahu's visit to the Chathams similar to the story set out in upoko 7 of Te Kauwae Raro. It is known that Smith read this notebook, as it contains marginal notes in his hand. These notes are in the Maori shorthand invented by Smith and used by him and Best in their note taking. Simmons believed that Smith was well aware that the information on tangata whenua recorded in Te Kauwae raro came from the 1895 meeting at the Turaukawa meeting house, not from any 1830s or 40s meeting between the two tohunga Matorohanga and Turaukawa.183 Simmons stated:

181H. T. Whatahoro, 'Pukapukawhakapapa a Nepia Pohuhu', c. 1910, qMS-1419, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ, p. 1. The eight tohunga were Nepia Pohuhu, Rihari Tohi, Paratene Te Okawhare, Moihi Torohanga [Matorohanga], Te Ohau, all of the Wairarapa, Te Waka Te Kawiti of Heretaunga, Moihi Ruataupu of Tokomaru, Tamahira Waruwarutu of Te Wai Pounamu. Ibid.
182Simmons, 'Words of Matorohanga', p. 137.
183Simmons, Great NZ Myth, pp. 64-8.
'The only conclusion possible is that Smith deliberately overlooked the declared source and dating and was so eager to include the material in the *Lore* that he attributed it to *Te Matorohanga*...'.

A manuscript that was unavailable to Simmons when he was writing *The Great New Zealand Myth* shows clearly that Smith did not falsify his sources, but genuinely believed that the information he had received was from Matorohanga and Turaukawa. A notebook in Whatahoro's hand writing, entitled 'Maui tikitiki tenei...', is held in the Alexander Turnbull Library. This book sets out in chronological order the stories of Maui, Kupe, the arrival of the pre-Maori tangata whenua, the stories of Toi, Whatonga, and the Great Fleet.

The sections of this notebook covering Kupe, Toi, and the 'tangata whenua', are virtually identical to the Maori language material in *Te Kauwae Raro* that covers the same subjects. This material is found in upoko (chapters) 3-6, 9-10 and the first part of upoko 11. The material in upoko 4 and 5 sets out the non-Polynesian physical appearance of the 'tangata whenua' and describes their expulsion by the Maori. The writings purport to have their origin in the teachings of Turaukawa memorised by Matorohanga. Another section in this notebook covers some of the material found in upoko 7, though not in exactly the same words, and describes the Chatham Island Moriori. Those sections of upoko 7 and 11 not derived from 'Maui tikitiki tenei...' were all derived from the notebook MS-papers-0189-B040 which is also in Whatahoro's writing. Both the above manuscripts appear either to be the exact sources of the relevant sections of *Te Kauwae Raro* or to be almost word for word copies of those sources.

It appears that T. W. Downes copied out much of the text of 'Maui tikitiki tenei...', which had come into his possession. The other possibility is that Downes copied out an exact copy of this same text. Around 1909, Downes sent this material on to Smith, who used it with very little alteration as the Maori texts of the chapters mentioned above. In
fact the Maori texts of upoko 3-6 in the printer's copy of *Te Kauwae Raro* are literally the copies in Downes' handwriting of the relevant sections of Whatahoro's book. Smith appears to have believed the claim in the text, that this was material recorded from Matorohanga in 1860 and 1865 and that Matorohanga had received the information on the tangata whenua from Turaukawa. Smith himself may never have seen the originals of much of this material but may have relied exclusively on Downes' copies. Certainly 'Maui tikitiki tenei...' contains none of the marginal shorthand notes Smith inscribed in many of the other works he looked at.\(^{188}\)

What does this reveal about the nature of the final published work? It must first be stated that the work can not be seen as Percy Smith's alone, but must be regarded as a product of the co-authorship of Smith and Whatahoro. Downes also had a major role in the production of the work, as he appears to have done much of the locating, acquiring, and copying of Whatahoro's texts, as well as introducing Smith and Whatahoro to each other.\(^{189}\) It is clear Smith was very much in control of the production of the English text. He carried out all of the translation of Maori into English, but acknowledged that this would not have been possible without being able to consult with Whatahoro over the meanings of the many supposedly archaic words.\(^{190}\)

Smith's English translation rearranged the original Maori material in ways which he saw as avoiding repetition. Smith also wrote detailed commentaries on sections of the English translation, which emphasised his own ideas on Polynesian history and migrations. His translations and commentaries firmly stamp in the reader's mind his ideas of a linear progression of peoples into Aotearoa; with a simple tangata whenua being replaced by a more advanced Eastern Polynesian population. Smith also promoted such concepts as specific dates for events, calculated by 'evening out' the number of generations when comparing different whakapapa lines. It does not appear that Smith carried out as much of a cut and paste operation on the Maori text as originally suggested by Simmons and Biggs. Of all the Maori language chapters containing material on the 'tangata whenua' only upoko 7 and upoko 11 were
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\(^{189}\) T. W. Downes to S. P. Smith, 26/10/1908, Polynesian Society further records, 80-115-02a/12, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ. Simmons and Biggs maintain that Smith's translations 'cannot be taken as an accurate reference to the Maori version', see Simmons and Biggs, 'Sources', p. 35.
compilations by Smith from two different Whatahoro texts. The other chapters on 'tangata whenu' were directly lifted from the notebook 'Maui tikitiki tenei...'. Smith seems to have followed Whatahoro's Maori texts faithfully and to have really believed that material attributed to Matorohanga was indeed from that tohunga.\textsuperscript{191} It therefore appears that Smith was not guilty of deliberately falsifying the sources of his Maori information but simply of accepting too readily the claim that it represented ancient pre-contact tradition and was a true record of historical events.

A detailed study of the nature of the Maori text of Whatahoro's notebook 'Maui tikitiki tenei...' has yet to be carried out. This awaits the attention of scholars more skilled in te reo Maori than the author of this current work. It is nevertheless interesting to observe that some other writings by Whatahoro tend to contain a series of seemingly disconnected stories of different iwi and hapu connected through whakapapa links rather than by a linear chronological narrative. We know that by the early twentieth century Whatahoro was familiar with Pakeha literature and chronological narrative techniques. We also know that by this time he was seeking to get some of his own material published. It may be that Whatahoro was deliberately arranging his work in 'Maui tikitiki tenei...' to make it more suitable for publication. It seems likely that in the creation of\textit{Kauwae Raro}, the cut and paste operation of compiling material from a wide range of Maori texts did occur. However the main compiler of material appears to have been Whatahoro rather than Smith. This would agree with Simmons and Biggs' statement regarding\textit{Kauwae Raro}: 'On present evidence, almost all of this volume is a late compilation by Te Whatahoro from many sources'.\textsuperscript{192} It would appear that the notebook 'Maui tikitiki tenei...' was the result of such a process.

It is possible that the description within the text of 'Maui tikitiki tenei...' is correct and that the material is an accurate record of the teachings of Matorohanga from the 1860s, written down at that time.\textsuperscript{193} However several points militate against this. 'Maui tikitiki tenei...' is very clearly written and set out, indicating it is not a verbatim copy of a series of talks but must have been reworked to some degree. This becomes especially clear when compared with the very rough and hurried writing style shown in those sections of Whatahoro's notebook 'Whakapapa Takitimu...', which consist of notes taken at the hui at Taiporohenui in 1895.\textsuperscript{194} The clear and well developed writing style of 'Maui

\textsuperscript{191}This can be seen clearly by comparing the relevant Chapters. 3-7, and 9-11 of Smith\textit{Te Kauwae Raro} with the equivalent texts in Whatahoro, 'Maui tikitiki tenei...', MPFB Papers, MS-Papers-0189-B001, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ., and Whatahoro MSS, MPFB Papers, MS-Papers-0189-B040, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.

\textsuperscript{192}Simmons and Biggs, 'Sources', p. 41.

\textsuperscript{193}Whatahoro, 'Maui tikitiki tenei...', pp. 1, 102.

\textsuperscript{194}Whatahoro, 'Whakapapa Takitimu...', pp. 144-70.
tikitiki tenei...' also indicates a much later date of writing than the 1860s. As Simmons points out:

Whatahoro was able to read and write but...was initially hardly literate in Maori. His writing and general ability in writing improves and develops over time and he notes that he copied out his earlier writings because he considered that they were not well written and that the word divisions were not right.\(^{195}\)

Simmons' article 'The Words of Matorohanga' illustrates that such rewriting usually involved additions and embellishments to the material being rewritten.

A further point indicating a late origin for 'Maui tikitiki tenei...', is the fact that, unlike 'The Book of Matorohanga' and 'The Book of Nepia Pohuhu', it does not have the seal of approval from the 1907 meeting of the Tane nui a rangi committee. It is most unlikely that Whatahoro would not have presented the notebook to the committee, given the importance of its subject matter and the fact that it was claimed to be from the teachings of Matorohanga. Thus there is a distinct possibility that this text was a work dating later than 1907.\(^{196}\)

The adoption of a chronologically linear narrative structure for 'Maui tikitiki tenei...', may indicate that Whatahoro was adopting some Pakeha literary forms. Throughout his life Whatahoro would have had access to a variety of examples of Pakeha linear narratives. Of these texts The Bible would certainly have been the most significant, being a book that Whatahoro was familiar with from his childhood. He was also, from at least the 1880s, familiar with The Book of Mormon, which he helped translate into te reo Maori. Whatahoro's work with the Native Land Court may also have given him some indication of which types of narrative appealed to Pakeha audiences. It is possible that as he became more skilled in writing and more familiar with his material Whatahoro was able to shape its written form to appeal to a Pakeha audience.\(^{197}\)

We can be sure that Smith believed he had discovered in Whatahoro's manuscripts the definitive story of the Maori past of Aotearoa. He believed that elements of this story had been hidden from Pakeha up until this time; in particular, the details regarding the supposed tangata whenua. These sort of details were completely missing from major collections of tradition such as that of Sir George Grey.\(^{198}\) Smith and Best believed

\(^{195}\) Simmons, 'Words of Matorohanga', pp. 134-5.
\(^{196}\) Whatahoro, 'Maui tikitiki tenei...'.
\(^{197}\) Whatahoro, 'Te Pukapuka a Moihi Te Matorohanga'.
\(^{198}\) Smith and Best seem to have taken great delight in finding information that earlier collectors had missed and in showing that the Polynesian Society collectors had a better understanding of Maori.
much of this knowledge had remained secret due to its tapu nature, and that it was therefore unknown even to ordinary Maori.\textsuperscript{199} This idea enhanced Smith's feelings that he had located a work of great significance. The fact that Whatahoro was able to answer nearly all of Smith's questions and explain supposedly ancient and esoteric words confirmed his belief that in Whatahoro he had found the most knowledgeable living Maori.\textsuperscript{200}

It is significant that Percy Smith always referred to Whatahoro as being 'Maori', and may not have even been aware initially that Whatahoro had a Pakeha father. Most Maori and Pakeha seem to have regarded Whatahoro as 'Maori' rather than as a 'half-caste'. This raises some interesting questions on the subject of turn of the century Pakeha attitudes to people of mixed ethnic descent. It would seem that Whatahoro's lifestyle and depth of knowledge of tradition meant that Pakeha scholars saw him as fully Maori in identity. The reverse of this was that Pakeha scholars tended to view any of Whatahoro's behaviour that they disapproved of as being due to the characteristics of his race. Thus while Smith praised Whatahoro's knowledge of tradition, he also wrote, 'He [Whatahoro] is very much of a Maori, time is no object, and he spends his money foolishly'.\textsuperscript{201} Despite these negative comments, Whatahoro's status as being 'Maori' rather than a mere 'half-caste' was to be of great importance when Percy Smith and Elsdon Best presented him to the public as the last great surviving authority on ancient Maori material.

For all his faith in the high degree of knowledge possessed by Whatahoro Smith appears to have considered the real authority behind \textit{The Lore} to be Matorohanga's teachings. Smith acknowledged completely his dependence on Whatahoro to explain the material in \textit{The Lore}. Despite this Smith believed that the manuscripts themselves were not the literary adaptations of Whatahoro, but the transcribed words of Matorohanga and other tohunga. Smith did not question the issues of changes in
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structure and meaning which might occur when stories that had always been oral were transferred into a written form. Nor did he question whether the process of certifying authenticity carried out by the Tane nui a rangi Komiti might involve some alteration of the material that was to be regarded as 'genuine'.

Smith had studied the works of Max Müller and the Grimms. He had read widely on comparative philology, theories of Aryanism, and debates on the Icelandic sagas. All of this reading made him more inclined to accept the Whatahoro/Matorohanga account. He believed that the Maori, like the Icelanders, had through isolation preserved intact ancient stories that had been lost in places that had more contact with outsiders. He saw the Whatahoro/Matorohanga account as indicating Aryan connections for the Polynesians. He used Müller's term 'solar hero' to refer to Maui. Smith saw the Whatahoro/Matorohanga account as setting out a mythological origin story for Polynesians that was on a par with other great mythological systems and which showed their connections with other 'Aryan' peoples.

As Smith wrote:

> It is certain that many of the Polynesian Myths and Traditions find their counterpart in those of the Scandinavian, Celtic, Indian, and other branches of the Aryan race; and it is suggested that in the Polynesian versions we are frequently nearer to the originals as they obtained in primitive times than in any other branch of the of the Caucasian race, because of the long isolation of the people in their island homes...

Smith's reading of philological works and his comparisons of Polynesian mythology with the studies of other mythologies folklore would reward further study, being areas this current thesis has only touched on lightly.

Smith believed that Whatahorohad been a faithful scribe who had recorded verbatim, knowledge that had been handed down, by word of mouth, unchanged for centuries. The tapu nature of the stories explained the fact that few Maori had heard many of these stories before. The secrecy brought about by tapu also explained why there were many obscure events and words in the accounts which only Whatahorohad could explain to Smith. Smith and Best were able to go on and convince much of the general public

---

202 On issues of the changes in meaning and structure which occur in stories during the changeover from oral to literate cultures see Ong, *Orality and Literacy*, .
S. P. Smith to E. Best, 13/12/1909, E. Best Papers, Ms-Papers-0072-05, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
that here was the true story of the early days of human settlement in Aotearoa. Smith and Best might be seen as acting as 'tohunga' to the Pakeha population, being the men seen by many Pakeha as having the authority to interpret Maori material to the general public.

**Conclusion**

By the 1930s an account of the early years of human habitation in New Zealand had come to be accepted as the orthodox story of early migratory history. According to this orthodoxy Kupe had visited an uninhabited Aotearoa, around 950 AD. Some time after this, New Zealand was settled by a primitive, non-East Polynesian people, very different from the later Maori. The arrival around 1150 AD of East Polynesians, led by Toi and his grandson Whatonga, began the process of the expulsion of these earlier people. Those of the tangata whenua tribes who did not intermarry with the new arrivals were eventually driven out of New Zealand. This process was completed with the arrival of many more East Polynesians on the Great Fleet, around 1350 AD. The descendants of the exiles who settled on the Chatham Islands became known as the Moriori. Eventually the name Moriori came to be applied by Pakeha to all of the supposed pre-Maori inhabitants of New Zealand.

The story set out above had not been established as the orthodox version of early New Zealand history until after 1915, following the publication of *Te Kauwae Raro*, the second volume of *The Lore of the Whare Wananga*. It was from this work that the definitive version of the orthodox story can be traced. The publication of this material and the promotion of the ideas contained in it was the result of work by both Pakeha and Maori scholars.

In the early twentieth century it appears that both Stephenson Percy Smith and Elsdon Best were looking for a comprehensive 'traditional' account of the Polynesian migrations through the Pacific and, in particular, to New Zealand. They were concerned to resolve contradictions they saw between different tribal traditions regarding migrations and ancestral figures. They were particularly interested in the question as to whether an earlier people had been in New Zealand before the East Polynesian ancestors of the Maori.

S. P. Smith to E. Best, 13/2/1911, Polynesian Society Records, Ms-Papers-1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
S. P. Smith to E. Best, 10/5/1911, Polynesian Society Records, Ms-Papers-1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
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From the 1860s onwards the Ngati Kahungunu scholar Hoani Turei Whatahoro had been recording a wide variety of traditions from many different hapu and iwi. The core of his work was based around the oral teachings of the Ngati Kahungunu elder, Matorohanga. The material Whatahoro recorded included many migration stories and some accounts of earlier 'tangata whenua' people. Among the 'tangata whenua' stories were physical descriptions of people who were clearly not East Polynesian. Whatahoro appears to have constructed a narrative of the migration history of Aotearoa by combining a series of different accounts into one continuous story. The story Whatahoro set out was the sequence which was to become the basis of the orthodox migration account with Kupe, Toi and Whatonga, the Great Fleet and the pre-Maori 'tangata whenua' who were the ancestors of the Chatham Island Moriori. Whatahoro claimed this narrative came from the teachings of Matorohanga and other tohunga.

By the early twentieth century Whatahoro was seeking to get this narrative published, along with some of his other manuscripts. At the same time Smith and Best were looking for the definitive 'traditional' account of the early migrations. When T. W Downes made Whatahoro's manuscripts known to Smith, Smith believed he had found that definitive account. The fact that Whatahoro's account answered the majority of their questions no doubt strongly influenced Smith and Best's belief in its authenticity. The account also mirrored prevailing Pakeha beliefs in migratory waves of progressively superior 'races', with each new wave overcoming and dominating the more primitive earlier inhabitants.

Smith combined a series of different Whatahoro manuscripts in the final version of The Lore of the Whare Wananga. His translations into English were of questionable accuracy and acted to reinforce his own interpretations of the meanings of Whatahoro's writings. Smith's editorial comments emphasised his own views on migratory history. Nevertheless, it is clear that Smith and Best believed that Whatahoro had written down accurately the genuine, ancient oral teachings of the old Maori experts. It does not appear that Smith deliberately falsified any of the information he used for The Lore of the Whare Wananga.

The fact that the knowledge held in The Lore had remained hidden from earlier Pakeha collectors seems to have reinforced Smith and Best's desire to believe in its authenticity. This gave the writings an added status and credibility and removed the nagging fear that they had actually started their work too late to be able to record 'genuine' ancient Maori traditions.
The authority that Smith and Best held meant that a great many other lesser 'experts' and members of the public also accepted that the material was an accurate record of the past. Smith and Best were very good at promoting their ideas in more popular forums such as newspapers and school texts. Those experts who were critical of this view tended to confine their criticisms to the more rarefied forums of the lecture hall and the scholarly journal. Therefore their criticisms tended not to reach a wider audience.

The orthodox history seems to have been readily adopted by Pakeha, because it was easily understood and clearly set out a comprehensive version of the migration history of all Maori, rather than a confused mass of separate migration traditions. It had the further advantage of telling a story which fully coincided with Pakeha ideas on colonisation and the natural triumph of more advanced groups over the earlier and supposedly more primitive peoples. Pakeha were thus presented with a series of stories, sanctioned by both Maori tohunga and Pakeha ethnologists, which provided a single metanarrative of migratory history. At the same time their own take-over of New Zealand from the Polynesians was justified as part of a natural and ongoing process. Pakeha need not feel guilty about colonisation because Maori had carried out similar actions in the past. This strong combination of factors meant that the narrative was adopted relatively quickly as the orthodox account of the past. They also guaranteed the continued survival of these ideas in a variety of forms in public memory, long after the evidence of tradition and science had supposedly discredited them.
CONCLUSION

It can be seen from the account outlined in the previous chapters that Pakeha ideas concerning the early inhabitants of Aotearoa underwent a series of changes from the late eighteenth century up into the early twentieth. From the time of Cook, Forster and Crozet, Pakeha had been intrigued by the questions of how people got to New Zealand and who those people were. Such questions were often asked in the wider context of tracing the early migrations through the Pacific carried out by the ancestors of the Polynesians. Since the time of the eighteenth century explorers Pakeha had speculated over whether the East Polynesians had been the first people to arrive in Aotearoa or whether others were there before them.

Up until the early twentieth century there was no over-riding consensus among Pakeha scholars on the question of who were the first people to arrive in New Zealand. Many of the most prominent scholars clearly believed that the East Polynesian voyagers had arrived to an empty land. Both Cook and Banks had been of this view. Early Pakeha visitors such as John Savage, J. L. Nicholas, and Samuel Marsden saw no sign that there had been a population in New Zealand before the Maori. Later observers such as Dumont D'Urville, Ernst Dieffenbach and A. S. Thomson all regarded Maori as the original inhabitants. John White and Sir George Grey, in their respective collections of Maori traditions, both repeated stories referring to earlier peoples. Despite this, both men also recounted other tales that described canoes arriving to an empty land. Neither White nor Grey gave any indication in their writings of their own opinions concerning a non-East Polynesian pre-Maori population in New Zealand.

From the time of late eighteenth century contact there had been Pakeha scholars who did not believe Maori were the first people of Aotearoa. On Cook's second voyage the naturalist Johann Rheinhold Forster came to the conclusion that the Maori were of a mixed origin. He maintained that an earlier, darker, and more primitive race of 'Papuans' had been conquered by the more recently arriving 'Malays', who were lighter in skin colour and more advanced culturally. In the mid-nineteenth century the missionary Richard Taylor had developed a similar theory of migration. He also advocated the idea of an earlier darker people being overrun by a lighter people who arrived in New Zealand at a later date. The archaeologist Julius von Haast had developed the theory that the moa had been wiped out by a primitive Palaeolithic people, who themselves died out before the arrival of the more advanced Neolithic Maori.
It can be seen that the idea that an earlier people had lived in New Zealand was not unknown prior to 1910. There is little indication, however, that this idea was the dominant one. It is also clear that the Pakeha ideas of an earlier people had very little to do with Maori tales of their own origins. Instead the ideas had a great deal to do with the development of theories from European intellectual sources. Each of these ideas was connected with a particular European discourse into which ideas of the 'savage' or 'other' were placed. The 'West' was not (and is not), a monolithic set of ideas but rather a series of contesting but overlapping discourses which shared (and continue to share), many basic assumptions. While there was no one set European discourse, the range of contesting ideas in eighteenth and nineteenth century western Europe and North America all shared images of the 'other' or the 'savage'. The savage was a being of varied qualities, but always outside of 'civilisation'. The image of the other in the discourses of scientific and travel literature can be compared to the image of the savage created in western literature, as described by writers such as Said and Goldie. The image had always more to do with sets of European (and North American) ideas, than with the indigenous reality.¹

Many of these thinkers, such as Forster, Haast and Dieffenbach, were principally concerned with the ways that Polynesians and Polynesian migratory history were portrayed through the discourses of Western European scientific and travel literature. Their work displayed a great deal of reference to what other European writers had to say about 'primitive' peoples and their migrations. Only occasional references were made to Maori oral or written sources of information. Even Richard Taylor, who was a capable speaker of te reo Maori and had collected many traditional stories, based his theories on the familiar discourse of the Old Testament stories of Noah's Ark and the Tower of Babel.

**The Study of Oral Traditions**

By the second half of the nineteenth century a number of Pakeha had made fairly extensive written collections of Maori oral traditions. There was a tendency among these Pakeha collectors to rearrange the Maori material as they saw fit. Thus both John White and Sir George Grey had carried out substantial cut and paste operations on their collections, rearranging material which had originally been organised largely around whakapapa connections. Some Pakeha collectors of Maori traditions were not content to simply write down what they heard, but sought to use the traditional material in novel ways; for example as a guide to deciphering the story of Polynesian migrations to New Zealand.

¹See Said, *Orientalism*.  
Said, *Culture and Imperialism*.  
Goldie, *Fear and Temptation*.  
Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*.  
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Zealand. The synthesised versions of stories developed by these writers would almost certainly have been unfamiliar to those who had passed on the original stories.

John Alexander Wilson and Walter Edward Gudgeon were both Native Land Court Judges. Both spoke Maori to a reasonable level of fluency and both did much of their work in the Bay of Plenty region. During their respective times as Judges, both men collected a large number of supposedly traditional accounts of migration history. From studying the oral accounts recorded from Bay of Plenty Native Land Court sessions, Wilson and Gudgeon independently came to similar conclusions. Wilson and Gudgeon followed a school of thought common to other collectors such as John White, Alexander Shand, Edward Shortland, Percy Smith and Elsdon Best. All these men were of the view that Maori tradition, once stripped of its more miraculous elements, contained kernels of truth that could shed some light on the distant Polynesian past and on the migratory voyages. This attitude conflicted with the opinions of writers such as William Colenso and W.T.L. Travers, who saw Maori traditions as purely fictional or allegorical accounts.

Wilson and Gudgeon both believed that the various Bay of Plenty iwi were descended from at least two separate migratory races. An inferior earlier Polynesian group, called by Wilson the 'Maui Maori', and by Gudgeon the 'Moriori' were subjugated by the superior invading 'Hawaiki Maori', who were supposed to have arrived in a migratory fleet. Gudgeon and Wilson both rearranged oral accounts to fit into their theories. They separated those hapu and iwi who had no ancestral waka or who traced descent to obscure waka, from those who had come on the famous waka of the Great Fleet. Both Wilson and Gudgeon introduced the European concept of 'race' into this equation. They saw those people who did not claim connection with the more famous waka as being descended from an earlier, pre-Fleet race.

The idea of the Great Fleet was largely, but not completely, a Pakeha construct. The majority of migration traditions referred to canoes that travelled from Hawaiki to Aotearoa independently. A few iwi, such as Ngati Kahungunu, had stories of the waka travelling together as a fleet. For reasons that are still not altogether clear, the idea of the migratory canoes travelling in a Great Fleet caught the imagination of Pakeha scholars and became widely accepted by the late nineteenth century. This may have been a result of the story's similarity to contemporary romantic theories from Western philology and folklore studies. These emphasised the idea of sweeping migrations of races through Europe. The idea of a great Polynesian fleet was a romantic image that compared well with the popular English historical myths of fleets bringing waves of
Anglo-Saxons, Vikings and Normans to Britain. Gudgeon and Percy Smith, and later Peter Buck, all compared the Maori to these migratory ancestors of the British.

The ideas involved in these Pakeha attempts to reconstruct the Maori past were largely from the Western discourses of science, politics and literature. Nevertheless the collection of Maori oral tradition involved some crossover with Maori discourses. As a consequence, ideas from Maori traditions started to inform Pakeha scholarship. For example, Pakeha scholars adopted and promoted the Great Fleet story for their own reasons, yet they still had to acquire this story from certain Maori traditions before it became a standard part of a Pakeha discourse concerning the past. The Pakeha scholar did not simply invent Maori 'history' from previously existing Pakeha texts. Instead Pakeha looked at a variety of conflicting and complicated Maori stories, finally choosing to adopt a particular story. The adopted story was usually the one that fitted best with contemporary Pakeha ideas on race, language, and migration. Despite the fact that most stories only had currency among particular hapu in particular areas, Pakeha scholars were happy to declare some stories to be the history of all Maori, becoming in effect the 'official' version.

The Great Fleet story was, for Pakeha, a migration myth that could be easily understood. The story looked particularly clear when compared to the alternative approach of trying to make sense of a wide variety of often contradictory stories of individual waka voyages. Pakeha adopted the tradition into their own scholarly discourse on Polynesian migration, despite the fact that it was only known to a few iwi and was therefore only a minor strand in Maori migration discourse. The story was easily adopted because it fitted well into pre-existing Pakeha ideas on war, race and migration. Pakeha scholars were still largely using European intellectual methods and traditions to formulate their ideas, but they had begun to use Maori traditions as the raw material from which to manufacture such ideas. In the process Maori traditions began to have some influence over the conclusions reached by Pakeha scholars.

Some of those Pakeha who advocated the idea that there had been an earlier population in New Zealand, linked this earlier, more primitive people with the Moriori of the Chatham Islands or Rekohu. These thinkers argued that the Moriori were a remnant population of the original inhabitants of New Zealand. The destruction of the Rekohu Moriori by the Ngai Tama and Ngati Mutunga invaders in the 1830s was assumed to have been a reflection of a similar process that had occurred in New Zealand hundreds of years beforehand.
From the early nineteenth century the origins and identity of the Moriori had been a matter of speculation for Pakeha. A major question was how closely the Moriori were related to the Maori of Aotearoa. Thinkers such as Richard Taylor, W. E. Gudgeon, Joshua Rutland, all constructed theories that suggested the Moriori were an early, primitive people, who were only distantly related to Maori and who had been driven out of New Zealand by Maori invaders. All of these men drew their conclusions with very little knowledge of Moriori traditions.

The only substantial collection of Moriori traditions was made by Hirawanu Tapu and Alexander Shand. This collection, despite some major shortcomings, remains the most important surviving record of how the nineteenth century Moriori saw themselves. The traditions and religious ideas contained in this collection clearly show that Moriori were a Polynesian people. The traditions spoke of a group of autochthonous tangata whenua (or 'tchakat henu') already resident on the islands, with two groups of canoe migrants arriving at a later time. All three groups were portrayed as speaking the same language and being culturally similar. The nineteenth century Moriori traced descent to all three groups. It is significant that nowhere in the Tapu/Shand collection of traditions is there any reference to the canoe migrant ancestors of the Moriori being driven out of 'Hawaiki' (as they also named their ancestral homeland), by an invading people.

**Smith, Best, Te Whatahoro and The Lore of the Whare Wananga**

Stephenson Percy Smith was familiar with Shand and Tapu's material. He had met Shand in 1868, while surveying on the Chathams, and the two men had remained friends and correspondents afterwards. Smith helped arrange the publication of Shand and Tapu's material in the *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, as well as getting it released as a special Polynesian Society publication. Despite his familiarity with Shand's views on the Moriori, Smith was later to reject these ideas in favour of the version presented in the writings of Whatahoro.

Percy Smith was puzzled by many questions resulting from his attempts to reconstruct the history of Polynesian migration to New Zealand and other parts of the South Pacific. He was particularly intrigued by the question of whether there had been earlier migrations to New Zealand and, if so, how the people involved were related to the later East Polynesian migrants. Smith worked in collaboration with Elsdon Best to try and construct an overall history of the early migrations to Aotearoa, as part of a wider history of Polynesian migration.

Through the efforts of the Whanganui ethnologist T. W. Downes, Smith gained access to manuscripts written by the Ngati Kahungunu scholar Hoani Turei Whatahoro. These
writings were claimed to be the authentic teachings of the ancient Whare Wananga, as written down by Whatahoro from the oral accounts of tohunga such as Matorohanga and Nepia Pohuhu. The manuscripts gave many details of what were claimed to be ancient religious ideas and mythology. The documents also set out a comprehensive account of the migrations of the ancestors of the Maori. The supposedly ancient oral traditions in these manuscripts were claimed by Percy Smith, Elsdon Best and their followers to trace the ancestral migrations from Asia, through the East Indies, and out into the South Pacific.

Whatahoro's account told of the first return visit to Aotearoa by Kupe; as well as the stories of Toi and Whatonga's migration to Aotearoa from Hawaiki; and of the journeying to Aotearoa of a Great Fleet of canoes. The manuscripts also described how a people of quite a different physical appearance from the Maori had settled in New Zealand in the period between Kupe's visit and the arrival of Toi and Whatonga. These non-East Polynesian migrants were supposedly darker and more primitive than the immigrants from Hawaiki who later displaced them. A few survivors from the original tangata whenua were supposed to have escaped the invading Maori and taken their canoes to the Chatham Islands where they became the ancestors of the Moriori. This claim raised the issue once again of the identity of the Moriori on the Chatham Islands or Rekohu.

The version of migratory history set out in Whatahoro's manuscripts was modified by Smith and then promoted to such a degree that it became the orthodox version, accepted by most Pakeha and by many Maori. Whatahoro himself was one of a number of mid-nineteenth century Maori scholars, who set out to write down the oral teachings of their elders. This was, in part, a response to the fear that these teachings might disappear. It could be argued that writers such as Whatahoro and Te Rangikaihaheke created a 'discourse' of a series of written Maori texts, setting out versions of the past of their respective iwi. Whatahoro took the idea of writing down accounts of the past much further than simply recording the stories of his own people. From a wide variety of sources covering a range of iwi and hapu he collected many accounts that were claimed to be traditional. By the time Smith got access to his manuscripts, Whatahoro had spent over forty years collecting such information. In at least one of his major manuscripts Whatahoro had combined and synthesised a number of different stories from different sources in order to produce a continuous narrative.

Some writers in the late twentieth century have suggested that the Whatahoro manuscripts and Te Kauwae raro, the book Smith produced from them, should be
regarded as 'forgeries'. An alternative approach to Whatahoro's work is to take a position similar to that taken by literary scholar Fiona Stafford in her work on James Macpherson and his *Poems of Ossian*. Stafford has argued that Macpherson was a person totally familiar with the Gaelic language and traditions. From this position he repackaged Gaelic stories into a new form, in which he presented them as part of a fictionalised narrative, supposedly written by Ossian. Stafford argues that Macpherson wanted to preserve these stories in some form but that he was not worried if that form was radically different from the ways the stories may have been recounted in the Highlands. She further argues that part of the reason for the dramatic repackaging of these traditions was to make them more accessible to a non-Gaelic speaking audience.

It could be argued that, in the writing of his manuscripts, Whatahoro was carrying out a similar process to that carried out by Macpherson in the writing of *Ossian*. By the time Whatahoro came to write the final versions of the manuscripts on which *Te Kauwae raro* was based, he was very familiar with traditions from many different sources. He followed a process, somewhat similar to that carried out by Macpherson, of repackaging a wide range of old stories into a new form and binding them together into a continuous narrative. Whatahoro can be seen as trying to preserve old material, but at the same time he clearly did not believe that he had to present this material in the same form that it had been presented to him. Michael Reilly has pointed out that this revision of a written narrative was very similar to the common process where an orator revised an oral narrative to suit the occasion of their speech, a process Whatahoro would have been familiar with.

It is highly likely that Whatahoro had some political motives that help explain the way he constructed the manuscripts describing the early migrations. He was strongly involved in efforts to retain Ngati Kahungunu land, as well as the wider cause of Maori unity through the Kotahitanga movement. Whatahoro's version of the migration stories included accounts of many of the larger iwi and emphasised the idea of a fleet of canoes that travelled together to Aotearoa. He may have seen the idea of one unified history of Maori people as a powerful force in promoting the cause of Maori unity. The issue of
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2 For example Michael King writing in 1993, criticised Te Runanga o Wharekauri Rekohu for presenting 'traditional' evidence based on *The Lore of the Whare Wananga* to the Waitangi Tribunal hearing on Chatham Island fisheries. King wrote,
   
   Alas, it was not traditional evidence at all. It came from Stephenson Percy Smith's *The Lore of the Whare Wananga*. This purported to be the teachings of a learned Maori tohunga called Matorohanga, which had been written down by Whatahoro Jury. Those "teachings", as anyone with a grounding in Maori history is aware, are now known to be forgeries.


3 Stafford, *The Sublime Savage*.


4 M. P. J. Reilly, personal communication, 30/1/2001.
Whatahoro's political motivations in his writing is a subject that would repay further study.

A further consideration is that Whatahoro was familiar, through his religious beliefs, with both The Bible and The Book of Mormon. Both books contain accounts of great migrations and of conquests by people moving into 'new' lands. Whatahoro's familiarity with these discourses may have encouraged him to emphasise the ideas of mass migration and conquest in the version of migratory history that he compiled and promoted. The linear narratives contained in parts of these works may have had some considerable impact on Whatahoro's writing style. The influence of the Mormon religion on Whatahoro's approach to Maori tradition is another subject that would repay closer examination in the future.

Whatahoro had access to a wide variety of traditions and narratives through sources such as evidence presented at Native Land Court sittings and the stories told at political hui. His upbringing would have made him familiar with Maori methods of storytelling and with the fact that the origin stories of many groups contradicted those of others. An examination of the sources of Te Kauwae raro indicates that Whatahoro had compiled a range of different migration stories to produce a combined migration history of the ancestors of many of the larger iwi. With his experience and depth of knowledge, it is very unlikely that Whatahoro would have regarded the narrative he created as being the sole accurate and overarching version of Maori migratory history. This was, however, how his version of the early settlement of Aotearoa came to be seen by Pakeha scholars such as Smith and Best. Their attitude in turn would appear to be a product of the common Pakeha idea that there is one true, overall history, which is itself a continuous and progressive sequence of events.

Why did Smith and Best Accept the Whatahoro Account?
The question remains as to why Stephenson Percy Smith and Elsdon Best accepted wholesale so much of Whatahoro's narrative? This acceptance is particularly remarkable when it is considered that both of these men, by the time they gained access to Whatahoro's material, had personally recorded an enormous range of Maori material, much of it directly contradicting the stories set out in the Whatahoro account. Smith and Best were involved in a personal project which attempted to reconstruct the history of early migrations to New Zealand and throughout the Pacific. They hoped to find the details of a comprehensive history of the early canoes arriving in New Zealand. Such a history would explain the identities of the earliest canoe explorers and in particular of characters such as Toi, who were the subjects of contradictory stories. From works such as his History of the Maoris of the West Coast it is clear that Smith, along with Best,
had by the early twentieth century become convinced of the existence of an early 'tangata whenua' people.

It seems a major factor that led Smith and Best to accept the authenticity of Whatahoro's account was the sheer comprehensiveness of Whatahoro's writing. The early Pakeha collectors of Maori oral traditions found there were a great many gaps in the accounts they collected. There were also many contradictions, even in those cases where traditions had been recorded from different members of the same hapu. Whatahoro set out a series of stories that he said had the authority of the ancient school of the Whare Wananga. The stories were claimed to have been given to Whatahoro by the tohunga Matorohanga and other elderly experts. At the same time the stories gave a reasonably consistent account that provided answers to a great many of the questions that vexed the early Pakeha collector's. Along with answering questions on migration history Whatahoro's manuscripts gave a comprehensive account of what were claimed to be ancient traditions of the supreme god Io.

Smith's correspondence with Best makes it plain that he regarded the most exciting information in Whatahoro's manuscripts to be that concerning the early migrations through the Pacific leading to the final settlement of Aotearoa. The account answered Smith's questions on where the ancestors of the Maori had originated. It provided evidence of a traceable migration through the South Pacific to the islands of East Polynesia. The manuscripts answered the question as to who it was that first discovered the islands of Aotearoa, stating that it was the navigator Kupe. The question of the identity of Toi te huatahi, or Toi kai rakau, was resolved by explaining that he was in fact an early immigrant to New Zealand from Hawaiki who came in search of his missing grandson, Whatonga. Smith and Best accepted this account as true despite knowing that many stories had Toi as an ancestor born in the Bay of Plenty. The origins of most of the major nineteenth century iwi were explained in this manuscript by the story of the Great Fleet of seven canoes. To Smith's delight enough information on whakapapa was contained in these and other stories to enable him to calculate the years in which he believed these events had occurred. An important feature of Whatahoro's manuscript was that it gave a very definite account of the identity, origin and fate of the first inhabitants of New Zealand. No other account described so comprehensively how the earlier people fitted into the chronological sequence of migration.
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5S. P. Smith to E. Best, 12/12/1909, E. Best Papers, Ms-0072-05, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
The Creation of History and Identities - Smith and Best's Adoption of the Lore of the Whare Wananga

The attempts by Smith and Best to write a comprehensive history of early canoe migrations to Aotearoa was part of an attempt to create for a Pakeha audience an easily understandable 'indigenised' history. Such accounts might be seen as part of a process of the 'domestication' of the past. During the nineteenth century a whole series of fragmented and contesting versions of New Zealand's past existed. The creation of three identities, 'Moriori', 'Maori' and 'Pakeha', arriving in a progressive sequence of migrations to New Zealand, gave Pakeha an easily understandable and controllable version of the past. This can be seen as part of what Thomas Richards describes as the building of the 'Imperial Archive', the gathering and control of knowledge to control colonies and the colonised.  

The colonisers of New Zealand had to feel at home and in control in the new land they now occupied. Part of this process involved developing an easily understandable version of the history of the indigenous people who were already living in the country. The history of the colonised people's past, developed by the coloniser, would obviously be part of the discourse of colonialism. A clearly understandable version of the past helped the colonisers feel a sense of belonging in what seemed to them a new country with an unknown history. It also meant that eventually the coloniser could start teaching the children of the colonised this particular version of the indigenous people's history. Such a process is akin to the processes described by Fanon, where the coloniser has the power to define all others resident in the places under colonial control. The education and media systems of the coloniser carry out a process of colonising the minds of the indigenous people, including their views of the past. The history of the indigenous people was in effect taken and rewritten into the 'correct' version, now controlled by Pakeha scholars, media and the education system.  

Gibbons has clearly shown the workings of this process of colonial cultural appropriation in his thesis on the work of Johannes Andersen.  

The description of the 'tangata whenua' people in the Whatahoro manuscripts portrayed a dark, primitive people who were unacquainted with technologies such as agriculture, and who possessed such faults as laziness and treachery. Their Maori conquerors were, in contrast, described as being vigorous and warlike, with a more advanced technology in the form of agriculture and better houses. The Maori action in driving out the tangata
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6 Richards, The Imperial Archive.
7 Fanon, Wretched of the Earth, esp. Chp. 4.
8 Smith, Decolonizing Methodologies.
8 Gibbons, 'Going Native'.
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whenua was justified by the earlier people's treacherous behaviour. As a further twist the Whatahoro manuscripts described the tangata whenua women as preferring the 'more handsome' Maori men, to their own males.

It is not surprising that this tale was readily adopted by Smith, Best and many other Pakeha colonists. The story of an inferior earlier people being displaced by a stronger and more intelligent immigrant people fitted perfectly with the mythology of colonisation, which reached a peak in the high imperialism of the late nineteenth century. The progressive displacement of peoples was a Western European idea going back at least to the time of the invasion of the Americas. The ideas of social evolution put forward during the Enlightenment by Scottish and French thinkers had been based in part around such ideas.

The description of the destruction of the 'tangata whenua' also fitted perfectly with the ideas on progressive biological evolution that had developed from the mid nineteenth century debates centred around Darwin's theories. The idea of the women of the 'tangata whenua' choosing the 'superior' males of the invading people could be seen as an illustration of such an evolutionary process. It could also be seen as fitting with the sexual fantasies of the coloniser, as illustrated by the story of Pocahontas, where the 'native' woman chose the male from the invading group in preference to those of her own people.9 The idea of 'race' developed by nineteenth century science had been further encouraged by the ideas of the Romantic students of philology and folklore, who looked for proof of essential racial groups which had moved around the world in sweeping migrations. One reason that Pakeha were so keen to adopt the story of the conquest of Aotearoa by the East Polynesians was the fact that this story mirrored the view most Pakeha had of their own take-over of New Zealand. Here was the same scenario of a superior group inevitably gaining power over the less advanced people already in occupancy of the land.

None of the above is meant to suggest that Whatahoro himself was writing down Pakeha racial ideas in the guise of Maori tradition. Rather it can be seen that Pakeha were able to draw the parallels between the Whatahoro account and their own racial ideas, which made the account far more acceptable as the true story of the Polynesian past. While Whatahoro was not simply adopting Western racial theories he was aware of, and informed by, such racial ideas, as shown by his conversation with Downes concerning 'Aryan' migrations.

9Hulme, Colonial Encounters. Chp. 4.
In order to accept Whatahoro's manuscripts as an accurate record of past events, Smith and Best had to make several important assumptions. Each of these assumptions involved a degree of faith, along with an analysis of the evidence available. Smith and Best both believed Whatahoro's claim that his manuscripts were an accurate record of the teachings of tohunga. They further accepted that the traditions recited by Matorohanga, Pohuhu, and other tohunga, were indeed an accurate reflection of the material that had been taught in the Whare Wananga. Smith and Best assumed that Whatahoro was right in claiming that the oral traditions recited in the Whare Wananga had been passed on unchanged from generation to generation, in an unbroken line back into the distant past. The final and perhaps greatest leap of faith made by Smith and Best was the assumption that the information passed on through the Whare Wananga was a relatively accurate version of actual historical events. This version they held to be accurate enough to override contradictory stories from other Maori and Moriori sources. Smith believed that the traditions Whatahoro had recorded from the Whare Wananga were, of all surviving texts, the closest in detail to ancient Polynesian oral traditions. He believed that the isolation of the East Coast Maori had preserved the Whare Wananga account uncorrupted by outside influence. In this he compared the account to the sagas of Iceland, another set of traditions that he believed had, through isolation, survived very much unchanged through the centuries.

Smith and Best were encouraged to believe in the Whatahoro account by Whatahoro's claim that these were the teachings of Matorohanga, Nepia Pohuhu, and the other tohunga. Smith and Best were aware that these men were held in high regard by those who were knowledgeable in Maori traditions. In addition the writings had the seal of approval from Ngati Kahungunu's Tane nui a rangi Komiti. Whatahoro was able to reinforce this belief by his impressive ability to answer nearly all the questions the two Pakeha ethnologists had asked him. It should be remembered that Best was slightly more sceptical about Whatahoro's degree of knowledge. Smith on the other hand believed that Whatahoro was the most learned man on Maori traditions that he had ever met. This very ability to answer so many questions was what made commentators such as H.W. Williams suspicious of Whatahoro.

Smith and Best saw the Polynesians as an already existing 'race' who had moved as a group, or to be more exact as several groups, through the Pacific. Smith and Best believed that oral traditions had developed from a solid body of ancient knowledge which told a fairly accurate version of past events. This knowledge had been passed down from generation to generation by a small group of priestly experts. These men, and Smith and Best did believe that all such priests were men, had recited the traditions in a largely unchanged form, to be learned by each new generation of experts. Thus
Smith and Best believed a body of knowledge existed, or at least had existed, that gave a fairly accurate version of the ancient history of the Polynesians. The esoteric nature of this body of knowledge was one of the explanations for why the majority of Polynesians did not know these stories.

The idea that the real history and the real traditions were known only to a small group of priestly experts was held by many Pakeha in the Polynesian Society. It made an interesting parallel with the view they had of themselves. Smith and Best's correspondence shows that they believed only a few Pakeha were learned enough to really pronounce on Maori matters. They also believed that very soon Pakeha ethnographers and their writings would be the only repositories of ancient Maori knowledge. Once completely taken over by Pakeha scholars this knowledge would itself become part of the colonising apparatus.

Smith and Best were aware that there were many differing Maori traditions regarding migration. They were also aware that only some stories referred to the existence of earlier populations already resident on the land. Smith and Best were able to explain the wide range of migration stories and the lack of consensus among Maori over the idea of an earlier population, by the idea that some hapu or iwi had lost the knowledge they once had. Those iwi, such as those of the Te Arawa confederation, who had a fairly comprehensive series of migration stories, were seen as retaining a great deal of their ancient traditions. Those hapu and iwi, such as many of the Northland peoples, who had much less comprehensive migration traditions and often could not whakapapa to any of the more famous canoes, were seen by Smith and Best as having lost this ancient body of knowledge. When Smith saw the Whatahoro manuscripts and read that they were the teachings of tohunga from the Whare Wananga, he believed he had finally gained access to the traditions that described the actual events of Polynesian migratory history.

Smith and Best both believed that traditional knowledge was rapidly being lost by Maori. Pakeha ethnographers therefore had a duty to write down these things before the knowledge of them disappeared, in what has been referred to as 'salvage ethnology'. In the process the ethnographers saw the ownership of this knowledge as passing from Maori to Pakeha scholars. Smith and Best imagined that in the future books such as *The Lore of the Whare Wananga* and *Tuhoe*, would be the definitive sources of information on ancient Maori tradition for both Pakeha and Maori. This process can effectively be seen as one of intellectual colonisation, as Pakeha would come to be the controllers of 'Maori tradition'. The belief that young Maori did not know or understand oral traditions conveniently meant that they did not have to be consulted by Pakeha on matters to do with traditions. The Pakeha ethnologist could eulogise the 'dying race' of old,
knowledgeable, noble savages, while at the same time ignoring or criticising the
degenerate young generation of Maori who supposedly knew nothing about their own
traditions. Smith and Best regarded any changes to traditional stories by younger Maori
as a 'corruption' of the original. Yet they, like Grey before them, believed that the
Pakeha ethnographer had the right to rearrange, cut and paste, and interpret stories in
any way they saw fit.

Smith and Best were both very sensitive to the accusation that they and the Polynesian
Society had come onto the scene too late to collect any really ancient traditions. They
resented the suggestion that early ethnologists such as Grey and the missionaries, had
been able to collect 'authentic' traditions, while the Polynesian Society could only have
access to material that was half forgotten and 'corrupted'. Smith and Best seem to have
felt an inferiority complex over this matter. Such an attitude made it even more likely
that they would accept the information in the Whatahoro manuscripts as genuine. With
the 'discovery' of the Whatahoro manuscripts Smith and Best could claim that they had
access to a body of ancient knowledge more extensive, comprehensive and historically
accurate than anything recorded by Grey, John White or the missionaries. Furthermore
the teachings of the Whare Wananga as recorded by Whatahoro presented a much more
coherent portrait of early migrations to New Zealand than the writings of Grey or
White. With this knowledge in hand Smith and Best could believe they had solved
questions that had remained mysteries to the earlier ethnologists, including the question
of whether or not an earlier people had existed.

Smith's acceptance of the Whatahoro account seems to have clouded his judgement
with regard to matters Moriori. As mentioned above Smith had met and corresponded
with Alexander Shand over a forty year period. Smith had edited Shand's material
when it was published through the Polynesian Society. Smith had spent a year on the
Chathams and had met many Moriori including Hirawanu Tapu. Smith had also
attacked Joshua Rutland's idea that the Moriori were Melanesians who had been driven
out of New Zealand by the Maori. Knowing all this, Smith was so taken by the
Whatahoro manuscripts that he was prepared to reject the evidence of his own
experience of the Polynesian Moriori and accept the manuscript's unfamiliar physical
description of the 'tangata whenua'. Smith did not go as far as Best in emphasising the
Melanesian nature of the Moriori, but from reading Whatahoro he came to believe that
the Moriori were a West Polynesian/Melanesian mix. Smith also chose to believe the
account of the Moriori past set out by the Ngati Kahungunu Whatahoro, rather than that
compiled by Hirawanu Tapu from the teachings of Moriori elders. Smith seems to have
been applying a form of racial hierarchy in that he believed the more advanced Maori
were likely to have a more accurate view of the past than the more primitive Moriori.
Percy Smith appears to have become intellectually infatuated with Whatahoro, his main indigenous collaborator. Smith got to a stage where he believed most of what Whatahoro told him was the definitive account of the subject in question. Alexander Shand on the Chatham Islands appears to have had a similar attitude to Hirawanu Tapu, accepting that the information Tapu obtained for him was always 'authentic' ancient Moriori tradition. Shand accepted that Tapu had access to a wide enough range of Moriori elders to gain accurate information. Smith on the other hand held that Whatahoro had recorded the teachings of many of the great tohunga, and in the process had become a phenomenal expert in his own right. However Smith went further in that he believed that Whatahoro knew more about iwi to which he did not belong, than did the experts from those particular iwi.

The core of Smith and Best's approach was a refusal to accept the idea that each iwi or hapu was the final authority on its own particular history. Instead they accepted that a set of stories, based to an extent around the traditions of particular hapu of Ngati Kahungunu, were in fact the stories which told of all the major events in the ancient human settlement of both New Zealand and the Chatham Islands. The acceptance of these stories overrode the consideration of any other people's version of their own migratory past. In particular Smith and Best largely ignored the stories the Moriori themselves used to explain their own history and traditions.

The General Acceptance of the Moriori Myth- The Role of Knowledge Networks
Once the Whatahoro version of the past was accepted by Smith and Best it was not hard for the majority of Pakeha ethnologists to follow suit. A network of Pakeha scholars, many of them with some reasonable knowledge of te reo Maori, had built up around the Polynesian Society by the 1910s. Smith and Best were two of the most influential figures within this circle. It is also noticeable that by the 1910s this group of scholars had become very self-referential. Giselle Byrnes argues convincingly that the members of the Polynesian Society were not intellectual nationalists, but were rather seeking after Imperial and other international recognition. Nevertheless by the 1910s many of the Polynesian Society's Pakeha scholars were becoming quite elderly. Many had had a lifetime of contact with Maori. These men had come to see themselves and other scholars like them as the experts on Maori traditions. In the time of Haast and Taylor scholars had made a considerable point of showing their familiarity with the works of metropolitan scientists such as Darwin, Lyell and Lubbock. In contrast a scholar such as
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Smith considered himself, Best and Gudgeon to be the only Pakeha with sufficient knowledge to solve the mysteries concerning the tangata whenua.¹¹

The authority imparted by the recognition within the colony was added to by the fact that at least some overseas scholars acknowledged that Smith and Best were experts in their fields. The Polynesian Society and its Journal helped build up this reputation despite its relatively small circulation. Many of the people who subscribed to the Journal were themselves recognised scholars of Polynesian matters. Thus the building up of a network of scholars not only allowed a greater information exchange but also built up a body of peers who could judge each other's scholarly work. While a wealthy eccentric like MacMillan Brown could publish as many books as he liked on Polynesian migration, it was Smith, Best and to a lesser extent Tregear and Gudgeon, who were acknowledged as experts on Polynesian matters by most other scholars. In the same way Alexander Shand was regarded by most as the expert on Moriori culture and traditions. The standing of these ethnologists was further enhanced by the network of local scholars such as T. W. Downes and W. H. Skinner, who looked to Smith and Best as the leaders in all debates on matters Maori. Therefore a local scholar writing in a newspaper might repeat stories from Smith or Best's writings, claiming they were the Maori traditions of the area in question. Smith and Best were often cited as the authorities on the 'accurate' version of a particular event.

The knowledge network built up around the Polynesian Society was very influential in spreading the idea of the Moriori myth as set out in The Lore of the Whare Wananga. Many areas had local Pakeha 'experts' on Maori matters who wrote newspaper articles and popular histories, people such as T. W. Downes in Wanganui or Herries Beattie in Otago. They also wrote on the 'Moriori' as the earliest people of their areas. Such writers tended to appeal to the authority of the Polynesian Society, especially Smith and Best, as those with the knowledge of early Migration history. By the 1910s, both Smith and Best had good reputations not only in scholarly circles, but also among the interested general public, who knew of their popular books and newspaper articles. The interested public saw an the idea of the Moriori Myth being spread through their schools, media and literature. They saw that local experts tended to agree with the idea and that recognised authorities, such as Smith and Best actively promoted this version of the past.

¹¹S. P. Smith to E. Best, 20/10/1906, Polynesian Society Records, MS-Papers-1187-249, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
S. P. Smith to E. Best, 30/7/1920, E. Best Papers, MS-Papers-0072-05, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
The fact that this story was claimed to have been told by an old Maori tohunga added to its credibility with the general public. The perception that Pakeha scholars such as Smith and Best had a great deal of contact with Maori would also have enhanced the idea that they were indeed experts on Maori matters. By the early twentieth century many urbanised Pakeha had only limited contact with Maori. Such Pakeha relied on works written by other Pakeha for their knowledge of Maori, rather than direct contact with Maori themselves. A group of Pakeha scholars who claimed to have had a great deal of direct contact with Maori, and who could themselves speak Maori, were accepted by many Pakeha as experts on Maori matters. For a period in the 1920s, it appeared that prominent Maori such as Sir Apirana Ngata and Sir Peter Buck were in support of these scholars theories, which further reinforced the authority the Pakeha public saw as being attached to their ideas on migration.

An additional factor leading to the wide public acceptance of the Smith/Best/Whatahoro version of the past was the seeming lack of opposition to it among 'experts'. Not all the well known Pakeha scholars of Polynesian matters had accepted the new orthodoxy. Alexander Shand had been very doubtful of details of the account that Smith had explained to him by letter in 1910. Shand had, unfortunately, died in a fire soon after this correspondence was received. Gudgeon was another who did not fully accept either the Whatahoro version of the past, nor did he accept Smith's primacy as a Polynesian scholar. Gudgeon did however accept the idea of an earlier people than the 'Hawaiki Maori'. The relatively clear cut ideas of the Whatahoro account as presented by Smith and Best were much easier for the public to grasp, than the rather confused set of ideas presented by Gudgeon.

The pre-eminent Pakeha scholar of Maori language, Archdeacon (later Bishop) H. W. Williams, was always very dubious about the reliability of the Whatahoro account. He was probably one of the few scholars with enough standing among the general public and the scholarly community to seriously be able to debunk the 'Moriori myth'. Yet Williams, probably out of respect for Smith and Best, kept his criticism of their ideas within the private circles of the scholarly community. When Williams finally did publicly criticise these ideas he did so in the forum of the Journal of the Polynesian Society, rather than trumpeting his views out to the general public. The fact that Williams waited until 1937 to publish his ideas suggests that he was in fact waiting until Smith and Best had both died before he publicly criticised them.

The other major critic of the 'Moriori myth', H. D. 'Harry' Skinner, was of a younger generation than Smith and Best, and therefore did not at first carry the same authority in scholarly circles. Like Williams, Skinner tended to keep his criticisms within the
community of scholars. Sir Peter Buck, who had the public standing to publicise his views widely, did not come out strongly against the ideas in the Moriori Myth until the 1940s. Even then he accepted some of the basic ideas of the orthodox view of the past, including the ideas of waves of settlement and that there had been a fleet. None of the opponents of the Moriori myth seem to have displayed the same publicity skills in promoting their ideas as Smith and Best had shown in spreading the ideas in the first place.

The changing ideas about the migratory past can be seen to reflect in some ways the establishment of an intellectual infra-structure in the colony of New Zealand. The earlier scholars were isolated individuals, such as Sir George Grey or Ernst Dieffenbach, who communicated by letter with other scholars in the colony, but were largely concerned with communicating information to and receiving it back from the metropolitan centre of empire. There were few forums within New Zealand in which these people could express their ideas or spread them to other people within the colony. While the scholars of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century were still keen to exchange information with and gain recognition from the Imperial centre, they had far greater opportunities to spread and exchange ideas within New Zealand. By the early twentieth century there had been established in New Zealand a series of Museums, local branches of the New Zealand Institute, the Polynesian Society, a network of newspapers and a widespread compulsory primary education system. Networks were thus established through which ideas could be debated and disseminated. These networks made it much easier for the Moriori Myth to be spread and adopted as the orthodox view of the past.

It is beyond the scope of this research, and beyond the skills of this researcher to properly ascertain the Maori reactions to The Lore of the Whare Wananga and later to the Moriori myth itself. We know that Whatahoro sold copies of the books at hui he attended. We also know that some Maori ordered copies of the books from the Polynesian Society. Therefore at least some Maori were familiar with the books and the ideas they expressed. The only record we have of Maori opposition to the publication of The Lore of the Whare Wananga was from Major Tunuiarangi and other Ngati Kahungunu. Their opposition was based not on disagreement with the ideas in the books but on opposition to the idea of selling what they believed was sacred knowledge. They did not object to the information being distributed through the non-commercial channel of the Journal of the Polynesian Society. Within a year Tunuiarangi himself was recommending to Maori that they should buy copies of the books.12

12W. H. Skinner to W. W. Smith, 5/6/1913, Polynesian Society further records, 80-115-03/09, Alexander Turnbull Library, NLNZ.
It may be that the Maori view of knowledge, story telling, and ownership of stories was such that a wide variation between stories of the past was acceptable, without the need for one overarching metanarrative. Maori ideas on earlier peoples and Maori reactions to Pakeha constructions of the Polynesian past would repay much more intensive study. However, such a study would have to be undertaken by someone with a good knowledge of te reo Maori, of oral tradition, and of nineteenth and early twentieth century Maori literature.

The Moriori myth has proved very resilient. The story had been abandoned as the official version of New Zealand’s early settlement by the 1970s as indicated by the versions of migratory history presented in popular historical publications such as *New Zealand’s Heritage*. Despite this the story has taken a very long time to die, still having currency as a popular myth right to the end of the twentieth century. The survival of the myth is no doubt due to its political usefulness as a justification story for the coloniser. The standard theme in the modern version of the myth is that Pakeha need feel no guilt over the Pakeha invasion of New Zealand as the Maori themselves carried out an even more brutal invasion when they wiped out the earlier Moriori population. This is a theme commonly heard on talkback shows and retold in letters to the editor.

The changing nature of the story is illustrated by the fact that when it became a standard tale taught in schools, in the mid 1910s, there was no element of guilt attached to it. The theme that emerges through the writings of Smith, Best and Gudgeon, as well as in the story set out in *The School Journal*, was that a superior race had taken over from a weaker, more primitive people, in what was a natural and inevitable process. The destruction of the Moriori was portrayed as sad but necessary, rather similar to the destruction of New Zealand’s wildlife and bush in the process of Pakeha colonisation. The underlying message of this story was, of course, that the Maori arrival in New Zealand was a mirror image of what was to happen when Pakeha arrived. The Maori, though superior to the doomed Moriori, were inferior to the white coloniser who inevitably took over the country. No element of guilt over Pakeha colonisation emerges from the triumphalist turn of the century imperial writings of Smith, Best, Gudgeon, and others. This contrasts with some of the mid-nineteenth century where some Pakeha writers did appear to feel a sense of guilt over the impacts of colonisation.
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The acceptance of the Moriori myth in the early twentieth century was undoubtedly partly due to how well it fitted with leading western cultural and scientific ideas of the time. Here was a supposedly ancient tale handed down from generation to generation by the wise men of a culture which now appeared to be dying out. This fitted well with the romantic ideas connected with the study of folklore and language, which had remained popular from the nineteenth century. Percy Smith himself had compared the Maori oral traditions to the Icelandic sagas. The idea of progressive sweeping migrations of racial groups matched the ideas of waves of Celtic and Germanic peoples sweeping through Europe, as well as the ideas of colonisation and imperialism current in late nineteenth and early twentieth century Europe and North America. The story also appeared to be an example of progressive evolutionary take-over. This idea of racial triumph had become more powerful through the popularity of Darwinian and other evolutionary ideas from the mid-nineteenth century onwards. The humanitarian ideas popular earlier in the nineteenth century had been largely superseded by such ideas of biological inevitability. The story of the disappearance of the Moriori seemed too be an illustration of social and biological evolution in action.

At the same time the story was popular because of its very simplicity. Such an account gave Pakeha a view of the past they could follow quite easily. This gave them a past they could fit into as well, with the Pakeha arrival being portrayed as the next, and final, stage in the sequence. This one vision of history could be imposed and taught throughout the country, to Maori, as well as Pakeha. The more messy intricacies of individual hapu and iwi history could happily be ignored. Thus the country's past was in effect colonised just as the present had been.

**The Moriori Myth as a Product of Cultural Interaction**

The Moriori Myth, as it came to be accepted in twentieth century New Zealand, appears to have been not solely the product of Pakeha scholarly activity, nor was it the exclusive product of the development and change of Maori tradition in reaction to colonialism. Rather it appears to have developed out of a process of interaction between these sets of discourses. In effect the Myth developed out of the engagement between several interactive ethnologies. Pakeha were fascinated by the nature, history and origins of the Maori, particularly when comparing Maori with the supposedly more primitive Moriori. In the late nineteenth century Pakeha gathered this knowledge with the thought that Maori and Moriori as peoples would die out. By the early twentieth century there was no longer the certainty among Pakeha that Maori would die out. There was, however, a widespread belief among ethnologists such as Smith and Best that knowledge of 'ancient' Maori cultures was rapidly dying out. Smith and Best saw themselves as the final guardians, through their written texts, of this Maori knowledge. As 'experts' they
were part of a colonising process where representatives of the colonising people tried to take over and redefine the knowledge and the history of the colonised people. In the same process the colonisers may be seen as effectively 'domesticating' the past of their new country by trying to redefine it in a way that fitted easily into the ideas of their own culture. In the long run the audience the Pakeha ethnologists were aiming at was largely one of Pakeha or of 'educated' Maori who largely accepted the Pakeha world view.

The aims of Whatahoro were somewhat different from those of the Pakeha ethnologists. Maori ethnologists, such as Whatahoro and Major Tunuiarangi, also feared that knowledge would be lost. Thus the original recording of Matorohanga's teachings was partly an attempt to ensure they were preserved. Whatahoro's writings were, however, usually not aimed at Pakeha scholars but at a Maori audience familiar with the narrative techniques involved. It may be that the manuscripts on which The Lore of the Whare Wananga was based, were to some extent constructed to be translated for a Pakeha audience, but it is more likely that the narrative grew out of the political changes going on in Maori society in reaction to colonisation and land alienation.14 Pan-Maori movements, usually not based around traditional whakapapa relationships, grew in reaction to colonisation. Whatahoro himself was involved in the Kotahitanga movement, while the Tane nui a rangi Komiti appears to have been part of an attempt to bring greater unity among Ngati Kahungunu. It may be that Whatahoro's collection and synthesis of different waka origin stories was part of a process of creating a wider, more unified Maori history. A more in-depth study of Whatahoro's motives would be of great value in giving some answers to these questions.

What does seem likely is that Whatahoro and most Maori experts he dealt with were aware that the stories he collected, and the versions he reproduced of them, were just some among the many extant versions of migration traditions. It is highly unlikely that his account was regarded as the 'one true version' by learned Maori. Percy Smith, on the other hand, was convinced he had located the 'true' ancient account of Maori history which, once stripped of its supernatural content, gave a factual account of the past of Aotearoa and of the Moriori. Smith did not set out to create these stories nor to deliberately mislead the public. Rather he found a set of stories that fitted brilliantly with his own ideas. Furthermore he believed the stories to be genuine and to have the backing of the most knowledgeable Maori authorities. He used his recognised authority among Pakeha in Polynesian matters to privilege these stories as the true account of events. In the process all other versions, including those of the Moriori themselves, were rejected.

14Ballara, Iwi, passim. On waka as a basis of organisation see ibid., pp. 326-31.
The Moriori Myth can be seen to have been created from the interaction between Pakeha and Maori scholars, and indeed between Pakeha, Maori and Moriori in general. Once the Myth became solidified in Pakeha literature, in the official education system and Pakeha popular culture it changed and became a tool in the discourse of ideas used by Pakeha to reinforce control by the coloniser. The political utility of the Moriori Myth as a justification for Pakeha colonial take-over guaranteed that the story would last in various forms right into the late twentieth century.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

UNPUBLISHED

ALEXANDER TURNBULL LIBRARY (NATIONAL LIBRARY OF NEW ZEALAND)

POLYNESIAN SOCIETY COLLECTION

Polynesian Society Records (MS-Group-0677)


MS-Papers-1187-037. Elsdon Best miscellaneous notes, c. 1893-95.


MS-Papers-1187-125. Papers relating to the formation of the Polynesian Society.


MS-Papers-1187-155. Stephenson Percy Smith miscellaneous notes, including Moriori material.

MS-Papers-1187-159. Stephenson Percy Smith notes for The Lore of the Whare Wananga, c. 1910-11, including the pages of the J. M. Jury letter concerning 'Maruiwi'.


MS-Papers-1187-250. Elsdon Best correspondence.


Microfilms

MS-Copy-Micro-0099. Microfilm of Stephenson Percy Smith- Maps and other papers extracted from Polynesian notebook Vol. 1. (MS-Papers-1187-162A); Polynesian notes vol. 2 (MS-Papers-1187-163); Polynesian notes vol. 3 (MS-Papers-1187-163A); Polynesian notes vol. 1 (MS-Papers-1187-162).


280
Bound Volumes.


Polynesian Society Further Records (80-115)

80-115-02A/06. Polynesian Society inward correspondence, 1906.


80-115-02A/14. Polynesian Society correspondence concerning the publication of A. Shand's Chatham Island papers.

80-115-03/01. Polynesian Society correspondence, 1911.

80-115-03/02. Polynesian Society correspondence, 1911.

80-115-03/03. Polynesian Society correspondence, 1911-13.

80-115-03/04. Polynesian Society correspondence, 1911-12.

80-115-03/06. Polynesian Society correspondence, 1912-18.

80-115-03/07. Polynesian Society correspondence, 1913-14.

80-115-03/08. Polynesian Society correspondence, 1908-14.


80-115-03/17. Polynesian Society correspondence, 1919-20.

281
80-115-03/18 Polynesian Society correspondence, 1912-17.
80-115-04A/04A. Polynesian Society miscellaneous correspondence, 1864, c.1913-33.

**STEPHENSON PERCY SMITH COLLECTION**

**Bound Volumes**

qMS-1835, Stephenson Percy Smith, 'Reminiscences of a Pioneer Surveyor, from 1840-1916'.

qMS-1837, Stephenson Percy Smith letterbook, 1900-06

**Microfilm**


**Stephenson Percy Smith diaries**

MS-1989. Diary 1890.
MS-1990. Diary 1891.
MS-1996. Diary 1897.
MS-2006. Diary 1907.
MS-2010. Diary 1911.
MS-2011. Diary 1912.

**Alexander Shand Papers**


**Elsdon Best papers.**

**Manuscripts**

MS-Papers-0072-02. Inward correspondence, C-E, 1901-29.
MS-Papers-0072-03. Inward correspondence, F-H, 1886-1930.
MS-Papers-0072-07. Inward letters and miscellaneous papers in Maori, 1852, 1911-30.
MS-Papers-0072-08. Stephenson Percy Smith correspondence, 1895-96.

**Bound Volumes**

qMS-0197. Elsdon Best Maori notebook No. 17.

**Microfilms**

MS-Copy-Micro-0650-10. Microfilm of Elsdon Best- Maori notebook No. 16 (qMS-0195), Index to Maori notebook No. 16 (qMS-0196), Maori notebook No. 17 (qMS-0197), Maori notebook No. 19 (qMS-0199), Maori notebook No. 20 (qMS-200), Maori notebook No. 21 (qMS-201), Maori notebook No. 23 (qMS-0202), Index to Maori notebook No. 23 (qMS-0203).

**Ben Keys papers**

MS-Papers-0407-12. Maori correspondence of Ben Keys, 1907. (Includes letter from Whatahoro regarding publishing his material).

**Maori Purposes Fund Board Collection.**

MS-Papers-0189-120. H. T. Whatahoronotebook, 1904


MS-Papers-0189-B001. H. T. Whatahoro notebook, notebook of traditions dictated by Matorohanga, 1860. (This date is the one given to the notebook by the Alexander Turnbull Library, but, for reasons explained within this thesis the 1860 date is unlikely to be accurate).


MS-Papers-0189-B023. H. T. Whatahoro notebook with cosmological information, 1899-1906.

MS-Papers-0189-B034. H. T. Whatahoro notebook, 1865. (Also includes enclosed letter from Stephenson Percy Smith to Whatahoro 29/12/1910).

MS-Papers-0189-B038. H. T. Whatahoro minute book, 1879-88. Includes proceedings of Native Committees and Native Land Court, also cosmological.

MS-Papers-0189-B040. H. T. Whatahoro notebook, 1873-76.


MS-Papers-0189-B102. T. W. Downes correspondence regarding the acquisition and provenance of H. T. Whatahoro manuscripts, 1923-27.


Richmond-Atkinson papers- MS-Group-077.


Dominion Museum transcribed volumes

qMs-1352. The Book of Te Matorohanga, original transcribed by H. T. Whatahoro from the teachings of Matorohanga. Transcript copied out from the volume lent to the Dominion Museum by the Tane-nui-a-rangi Komiti. The first section of this transcript was copied out by Henry Stowell (Hare Hongi), but Stowell was taken off the job when it became clear he was converting the text from Ngati Kahungunu into Nga Puhi dialect. The remainder of the text was transcribed by Elsdon Best, c.1910.

qMs-1419. The Book of Nepia Pohuhu (actually a compilation of various elders teachings; unclear which sections belong to which person), original transcribed by H. T. Whatahoro. Best transcript copied out from the volume lent to the Dominion Museum by the Tane-nui-a-rangi Komiti, c.1910.
D. R. Simmons papers

Ms-papers-4717-1. The Book of Matorohanga (D. Simmons translation of qMS-1352), vol. 1.


Native School Attendance Books

qMS-1408-1413a, Native School Attendance books, 1844-45. Mohi Torohanga (Matorohanga) and Paratene Okuwhare are among those listed.

HOCKEN LIBRARY

T. M. Hocken collection


H. D. Skinner Papers


OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS

Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives

New Zealand Gazette

New Zealand Parliamentary Debates

School Journal

NEWSPAPERS

The Dominion

The New Zealand Herald

The New Zealand Times

The Otago Daily Times

Te Puke ki Hikurangi

The Weekly Times

TELEVISION PROGRAMMES


FILMS

PUBLISHED ARTICLES


'Abstract of the Address by the President, Wellington Philosophical Society', *TNZI*, 17, 1884, pp. 449-50.


Atkinson, A. S., 'What is a Tangata Maori?', *JPS*, 1, 1892, pp. 133-6.


· 'Notes on the Art of War, as conducted by the Maori of New Zealand'. Pt. 4, *JPS*, 11, 44, 1902, pp. 219-46.

· 'Tuhoe: Children of the Mist', *JPS*, 84, 22, 1913, pp. 149-65.


· 'The Land of Tara'. Pt. 6, *JPS*, 28, 109, 1918, pp. 1-17.


· 'The Maori as a Seafarer, Explorer and Coloniser', *Otaki Mail*, 20/9/1922.

· 'Maoris of New Zealand: Their Fearless Ancestors', *New Zealand Times*, 24/2/1923.

· 'Vikings of the Sunlit Sea', *New Zealand Life*, 15/7/1925.

· 'The Misty Past', in *The Gisborne Times*, 19/12/1925.

· Maori and Maruiwi: The First Polynesians at Whakatane', *JPS*, 37, 2, 1928, pp. 175-225.


Buller, W. L., 'Illustrations of Darwinism', *TNZI*, 27, 1894, pp. 75-104.

Colenso, W., 'On the Maori Races of New Zealand', *TNZI*, 1, 1868, pp. 1-76.


Downes, T. W., 'Correspondence', *JPS*, 42, 165, 1933, pp. 24-6.

· 'Maruiwi, Maori and Moriori', *JPS*, 42, 167, 1933, pp. 156-66.


Fraser, J., 'The Samoan story of Creation - A 'Tala', *JPS*, 1, 1892, pp. 164-89.

_____. 'The Malayo-Polynesian Theory', *JPS*, 4, 1895, pp. 241-54.


_____. 'Nga Tangata Maori'. Pt. 11, *MR*, 2, 9, 1890, pp. 517-33.

_____. 'Nga Tangata Maori'. Pt 13, *MR*, 2, 10, 1890, pp. 585-98.

_____. 'Paoua', *JPS*, 1, 1892, pp. 76-9.

_____. 'Maori Migrations to New Zealand'. Pt. 1, *JPS*, 1, 1892, pp. 212-32.

_____. 'A Maori Generation', *JPS*, 2, 1893, pp. 113-5.


_____. 'Maori Traditions as to the Kumara (Convolvulus batatus)', *JPS*, 2, 1893, pp. 99-102.


_____. 'Maori Tribes of the East Coast'. Pt 1, *JPS*, 3, 1894, pp. 208-19.

_____. 'Maori Tribes of the East Coast'. Pt 2, *JPS*, 4, 1895, pp. 17-32.

_____. 'Maori Tribes of the East Coast'. Pt 3, *JPS*, 4, 1895, pp. 177-82.


_____. 'The Maori Tribes of the East Coast: Those Inhabiting the Wairoa District of Northern Hawke's Bay'. Pt. 5, *JPS*, 6, 24, 1897, pp. 177-86.


_____. 'The Whence of the Maori'. Pt. 3 cont.', *JPS*, 12, 46, 1903, pp. 120-30.


_____. 'The Toa Taua or Warrior', *JPS*, 13, 52, 1904, pp. 238-64.


_____. 'Additional Notes', *TNZI*, 4, 1871, pp. 90-4.

_____. 'Third Paper on Moas and Moahunters', *TNZI*, 4, 1871, pp. 94-110.

_____. 'Researches and Excavations carried on in and near the Moa-bone Point Cave, Summer Road, in the Year 1872, *TNZI*, 7, 1874, pp. 54-85.

_____. 'Notes on an Ancient Native Burial Place near the Moa-bone Point, Summer', *TNZI*, 7, 1874, pp. 86-91.

_____. 'Notes on the Moa-hunter Encampment at Shag Point, Otago', *TNZI*, 7, 1874, pp. 91-8.

_____. 'Proceedings, Philosophical Institute of Canterbury', *TNZI*, 7, 1874, pp. 528-33.

_____. 'Address', *TNZI*, 10, 1877, pp. 37-55.


Hammond, T. G., 'Te Tai Hauauru or the West Coast', JPS, 10, 40, 1901, pp. 194-202.


Locke, S., 'Historical Traditions of the Taupo and East Coast Tribes', TNZI, 15, 1882, pp. 433-59.


Mair, G., 'Notes on the Chatham Islands and their Inhabitants', TNZI, 3, 1870, pp. 311-3.

Mantell, W. B., 'Extracts from an address on the "Moa", TNZI, 1, 1868, pp. 18-20.


Nahe, H., 'A Reply to A. S. Atkinson's "What is a Tangata Whenua?", JPS, 3, 1894, pp. 27-35.


Orsmond, J. M., 'Genealogy of the Pomare Family of Tahiti', JPS, 2, 1893, pp. 25-42.


'Proceedings of the Philosophical Institute of Canterbury, 15 September, 1874', TNZI, 7, 1874, pp. 528-30.

'Proceedings of the Philosophical Institute of Canterbury, 1st October, 1874 and 5th January 1875', TNZI, 7, 1874, pp. 531-8.

'Proceedings of the Wellington Philosophical Society, 7 September 1904', TNZI, 37, 1904, p. 604.


____. 'On the Ancient Pit Dwellings of the Pelorus District, South Island, New Zealand', JPS, 6, 22, 1897, pp. 77-84.

____. 'Ancient Moriori Art in New Zealand', JPS, 9, 36, 1900, pp. 142-3.

Scott, J. H., 'Contribution to the Osteology of the Aborigines of New Zealand and of the Chatham Islands', TNZI, 26, 1893, pp. 1-64.


____. 'The Occupation of the Chatham Islands by the Maoris in 1835'. Pt. 2, JPS, 1, 1892, pp. 154-63.

____. 'The Occupation of the Chatham Islands by the Maoris in 1835'. Pt. 3, JPS, 1, 1892, pp. 202-9.

____. 'The Occupation of the Chatham Islands by the Maoris in 1835'. Pt. 4, JPS, 2, 1893, pp. 74-86.

____. 'The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands: Their Traditions and History'.

Chp. 1, JPS, 3, 10, 1894, pp. 76-92.

____. 'The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands: Their Traditions and History'.

Chp. 2, JPS, 3, 11, 1894, pp. 121-33.

____. 'The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands: Their Traditions and History'.

Chp. 3, JPS, 3, 12, 1894, pp. 187-98.

____. 'The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands: Their Traditions and History'.

Chp. 4, JPS, 4, 13, 1895, pp. 33-46.

____. 'The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands: Their Traditions and History'.

Chp. 5, JPS, 4, 14, 1895, pp. 89-98.

____. 'The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands: Their Traditions and History'.

Chp. 6, JPS, 4, 15, 1895, pp. 161-76.

____. 'The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands: Their Traditions and History'.


____. 'The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands: Their Traditions and History'.

Chp. 8a, JPS, 5, 17, 1896, pp. 13-32.
Shortland, E., 'A Short Sketch of the Maori Races', *TNZI*, 1, 1868, pp. 1-11.


'Kilopai Ariki', *Ariki Mautu*.


'The History and Traditions of the Taranaki Coast', Chps. 1-3, *JPS*, 16, 63, 1907, pp. 120-73.

'The History and Traditions of the Taranaki Coast', Chps. 4-6, *JPS*, 16, 64, 1907, pp. 175-219.

'The History and Traditions of the Taranaki Coast', Chp. 7, *JPS*, 17, 65, 1908, pp. 1-47.

'The History and Traditions of the Taranaki Coast', Chp. 8, *JPS*, 17, 66, 1908, pp. 51-78.


'The History and Traditions of the Taranaki Coast', Chps.. 11-12, *JPS*, 18, 69, 1909, pp. 1-43.

'The History and Traditions of the Taranaki Coast', Chp 13-14, *JPS*, 18, 70, 1909, pp. 47-83.


'The History and Traditions of the Taranaki Coast', Chp. 16, *JPS*, 18, 72, 1909, pp. 157-203.


Discovery of the Chatham Islands: A Romantic Story, Church Gazette, 1/1/1918.

Stack, J. W., 'Some observations on the Annual Address of the President of the Philosophical Institute of Canterbury', TNZI, 4, 1871, pp. 107-10.

'Sketch of the Traditional History of the South Island Maoris', TNZI, 10, 1877, pp. 57-92.


Teviotdale, D., 'The Material Culture of the Moa-hunters of Murihiku', JPS, 41, 162, 1932, pp. 81-120.


Travers, H. H., 'Or the Chatham Islands', TNZI, 1, 1868, pp. 173-80.


Notes upon the Historical Value of the "Traditions of the New Zealanders" as collected by Sir George Grey', TNZI, 4, 1871, pp. 51-62.

Notes on the Traditions and Customs of the Mori-oris', TNZI, 9, 1876, pp. 15-27.

Tregear, E., 'The Mori oris' TNZI, 22, 1889, pp. 75-9.


Tuta Tamati, 'A Reply to Mr. A. S. Atkinson's Paper "What is a Tangata Maori?"', JPS, 2, 1893, pp. 50-62.


**PUBLISHED BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS**


Chapple, L. J. B., *Wanganui*, Hawera Star, Hawera, 1939.


Crozet, J., *Crozet's Voyage to Tasmania, New Zealand, the Ladrone Islands, and the Philippines in the Years 1771-1772*, H. Ling Roth trans., Truslove and Shirley, London, 1891.


Lang, J. D., *Origin and Migrations of the Polynesian Nation*, George Robertson, Sydney/Melbourne/Adelaide, 1877.


Roberts, C. J., *Centennial History of Hawera and the Waimate Plains*, Hawera Star, Hawera, 1940.


**SECONDARY SOURCES**

**Published Articles**


Davidson, J., 'Early Man in New Zealand', New Zealand's Heritage, 1, 2, 1971, pp. 29-32.


Gilling, B. D., 'By Whose Custom? The Operation of the Native Land Court in the Chatham Islands', VUWLR, 23, 1993, pp. 45-58.


Published Books and Pamphlets


**Unpublished Secondary**


Gibbons, P. J., "'Going Native": A Case Study of Cultural Appropriation in a Settler Society', D. Phil. in History, University of Waikato, 1992.


