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ABSTRACT

It is a notable feature of some iwi that they have a highly developed traditional cosmology that is purported to be pre-European, for example Ngāi Tahu, Taranaki, Ngāti Porou and Ngā Puhi. There is no shared written or oral memory of such a cosmological whakapapa amongst Pirirākau in Tauranga Moana. The foundation of the general questions is a curiosity as to whom Catholic missionaries encountered, in a theological sense, upon their arrival in Tauranga Moana. There is a rich history of post-contact faith, religion and prophets amongst the three iwi of Tauranga Moana; Ngāti Ranginui, Ngāi Te Rangi and Ngāti Pukenga, which is suggestive of an intelligent and inquiring tāngata whenua in matters of faith and spirituality. The research intends to contribute to local knowledge of the development of Pirirākau theology in those encounters by:

- describing the pre-contact contextual theology and cosmology of members of the hapū of Pirirākau at the time of first contact with Catholic missionaries in 1839;
- exploring how that pre-contact contextual theology enabled Pirirākau to adopt and adjust to a Catholic missional theology and faith between 1839 and 1865; and
- explaining how Pirirākau moved from Catholicism to adopt Pai Mārire, a contextual theology and faith founded by Te Ua Haumene in 1858, and maintain that faith to the laying down of arms by King Tāwhiao in 1881.
Rather than providing the English translations of Māori words within the text, I have assembled a glossary of Māori words, which follows Appendix One | Tākitimu Karakia. All definitions are my own.

The Māori words used in this thesis are macronised as appropriate to indicate a double vowel. The exception to this is within quotes. In many texts, there are differences in spelling, grammar, punctuation and the use of macrons. I have preserved the original text’s rendition when quoting from those texts.

Throughout the thesis, and particularly within Chapter Three, I have provided interpretations of Māori names. I have used a semantic methodology to dissect and posit possible meanings of those names. I acknowledge that a linguistic or etymological methodology are also available for such an interpretative task. I have chosen a semantic approach so as to remain consistent to my use of a hermeneutic of whakapapa throughout my thesis, as explained more fully in the beginning of Chapter Two | Contextual Theology.
CHAPTER ONE | INTRODUCTION

I arahina te waka Tākitimu e tō mātou tupuna ko Tamatea Arikinui
Kia tiritiri te kawa ki ngā rekereke o Mauao
hei uru mai ki te wai marino o Te Awanui.
I tātu mai a Ranginui ki te awa o Wairoa, kia whakatū i tōna pā tūwatawata o
Pukewhanake,
Ā, ka nehua a Tutereinga ki Tahataharoa hei whakapūmau te mana o te Pirirākau mai i a Wairoa ki a Waipapa,
Toitū te kupu, toitū te whenua, toitū te tangata.

It is a notable feature of other iwi that they have a highly developed traditional
cosmology that is purported to be pre-European. Elsdon Best provides
multitudinous cosmological whakapapa from a variety of iwi including those
descended from the Matāatua canoe, Kāi Tahu,1 Taranaki, Ngāti Porou and our
own Tākitimu canoe. Notable is a fascinating list of the 70 offspring of Ranginui
and Papatūānuku and a comprehensive discussion of departmental deities.2
Similarly, Te Rangi Hiroa provides evidence of a complex whakapapa for many
features of our environment including the moon, the sea, and the winds, as well
as an in-depth discussion of the Io tradition.3 In Te Ahukaramū Charles Royal’s
Te Whare Tapere he introduces 27 generations of whakapapa from Io to Ranginui
and Papatūānuku that he heard presented by Māori Marsden, who in turn had
been taught this knowledge at a Ngā Puhi whare wānanga in 1958.4 He notes
that there are multiple names given at each level of the whakapapa. Pā Hēnare
Tate in his Foundations of a Systematic Māori Theology has attempted to provide
some insight as to the validity of presenting Io Matua Kore and the associated

---

1 Macrons are used throughout this work where the correct spelling of a Māori word includes
macrons. However, in quotations I have used the spelling of the original author, rather than
correct the spelling and use of macrons.
4 Te Ahukaramū C. Royal, Te Whare Tapere: Towards a New Model for Māori Performing Arts
(Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington, 1998); 39.
whakapapa as a pre-Christian rather than non-Christian theology.\(^5\) I began this work with the conviction that there is no shared written or oral memory of such a cosmological whakapapa in Tauranga Moana in the Bay of Plenty. This piqued my curiosity; who did the Catholic missionaries encounter in 1839, in a theological sense, upon their arrival in Tauranga Moana? The rich history of post-contact faith, religion and prophets amongst the three iwi of Tauranga Moana; Ngāti Ranginui, Ngāi Te Rangi and Ngāti Pukenga, suggests an intelligent and inquiring tāngata whenua in matters of faith and spirituality. This has inspired me to attempt to recover what I can of Pirirākau pre-contact theology and to trace the development of that theology through the missionary era and into our own indigenous Christian expression in Pai Mārire. In doing so I believe it is viable to restore our ancestors from a narrative of merely passive receivers to a narrative of our ancestors as active participants.

KO WAI TĒNEI?

My motivation and my intentions are clearer with some knowledge of what I bring as a researcher. My father is a Bidois from Pirirākau of Ngāti Ranginui, Ngāti Tokotoko and Ngāti Rangiwewehi. My mother is a third generation Pākehā whose ancestors came from Prestonpans and the Shetland Islands in Scotland. They divorced when I was young, and we moved to the South Island with my mother where we lived predominantly in Christchurch until I left at 19 years old. She re-married and so my childhood and teenage years were in a Pākehā family and I was effectively unaware I had Māori whakapapa. Towards the end of college I was made aware of this gap in my identity when I was approached about scholarships for university. Words I had never heard before like ‘iwi,’ ‘hapū’ and ‘whakapapa’ caused me to wonder anew, who am I? This inspired me to begin my first Māori language lessons and I have carried on,

eventually to complete a BA (Honours) in Māori Studies at Victoria University of Wellington.

I attended a Catholic Boys College; though not a Catholic, I was fascinated by the traditions and sacraments, and regularly attended Eucharistic Mass (though I was unable to partake of the Host) and sung in the schola including in the regular Latin Masses held in the Christchurch Cathedral. This sowed a seed and many years later my wife and I joined an Assembly of God church in Wellington. Whilst in this church we were introduced to Urban Vision, now an Order of the Anglican Church here in Aotearoa New Zealand. We joined them in central Wellington, supporting and advocating for the homeless community whilst living in an intentional Christian community.

This discipleship of faith, living in community and exploring my Māori whakapapa led my wife and me to choose to raise our children in a Māori community in Tauranga Moana, where we have now lived for 10 years. My great grandfather Erueti Pōnui Bidois was the last of my direct descendants to regularly connect with our ancestral marae and to speak the Māori language. We wanted to rebuild those connections for our children and to contribute to strengthen our marae. I now have the honour to be a speaker at our marae. In that role I have sat through hundreds of speeches from our speakers and guests who arrive. I have listened to outstanding oration and the simplest rote learnt greeting delivered by men from many and varied backgrounds and stages of life. I have often sat and wondered about the mix of Catholic and Christian theology, Māori cosmology and New Age spirituality that pervades the art of whaikōrero and is often justified with a glib statement: Māori are a spiritual people. I wondered where this strange jarring combination came from and if there was a dogged thread of whakapapa that persisted despite colonisation.
If I am to attempt to place my value systems and influence, I start by acknowledging I am a middle aged Māori male, highly educated and with an extensive and varied work experience. I have a strong ethic of social justice and a bias to the poor and the oppressed which has been expressed in a long involvement in activist movements concerned with peace and non-violence, economic transformation and community autonomy. I am a Christian Anarchist with 10 years of theological study attending an Anglican Church. I am one of the six percent of the Māori population fluent in the Māori language, I have a passable knowledge of my whakapapa, and I am a governor for my marae and my iwi. All of this is to say I have an authority within my community to speak to the theology and cosmology of our marae and our hapū, and I am acknowledged as having a voice, rather than an authority, to speak to this in relation to our iwi. I write as an insider of Pirirākau, Ngāti Ranginui and Tauranga Moana and in relationship but often on the edge of the Anglican and Catholic Churches. I am less concerned with attaining an objective view, than with advocating for the decolonisation of ourselves as part of our response and reaction to colonisation and confiscation.

PIRIRĀKAU, TE KORE TUOHU

Pirirākau is a hapū of Ngāti Ranginui, one of three main tribes in Tauranga Moana. Our interests lay between the Wairoa and Waipapa Rivers, and historically we had the right of use of land up to the Aongatete River. Today we have four marae: Poutūterangi, Paparoa, Tutereinga and Tawhitinui. Ngāti Tokotoko and Ngāti Hinerangi border our whenua in the Kaimai ranges, and have close whakapapa connections to Pirirākau. Both of these iwi had the right of use of land within Pirirākau boundaries. There are no reliable statistics as to the demographics of Pirirākau. I have heard in general conversation at our marae an assertion that there were 1,500 to 2,000 descendants of Pirirākau, but no evidence to support that. There are just under 9,000 descendants of Ngāti
Ranginui across Aotearoa New Zealand. The most common religious affiliations in Ngāti Ranginui are Rātana (17 percent), Catholic (15 percent) and Anglican (seven percent). The largest grouping are people who have no religion (39 percent). No religion has a higher number of adherents in the younger age groups. I suggest it is likely there are a higher number of Catholics amongst Pirirākau than the generic statistics for the iwi. There were no adherents to Pai Mārire in Ngāti Ranginui in the last census.6

Pirirākau suffered significant land loss and the destruction of our economic and social base in the nineteenth century as a result of conflict and confiscation. In that period, Pirirākau were regarded as “in rebellion against her Majesty’s authority”7 and were subject to the full force of the New Zealand Settlements Act 1863. We regard ourselves as being te kore tuohu [the unsurrendered]. Consequently our ancestors were caught up in the 290,000 acres of Tauranga Moana that was confiscated by Order-in-Council following the Pacification Hui8 in August 1864. Of that 50,000 acres was taken under confiscation, including land belonging to Pirirākau and many other Ngāti Ranginui hapū. A further 93,188 acres was taken by way of a forced sale of the Te Puna-Katikati block, which constituted the majority of the Pirirākau land. The full confiscation was not complete until the last payment for the Te Puna-Katikati block was paid in 1871.9 The majority of Pirirākau never agreed to the surrender, to the confiscation or to the sale, a point made in no uncertain terms by Rāwiri Tata, the leader of the majority of Pirirākau in 1866:

---

8 Following the British victory at the battle of Te Ranga, on 5 and 6 August 1864, Governor Grey and officials held a Pacification Hui at Te Papa in Tauranga to facilitate the confiscation of land from tāngata whenua.
9 Waitangi Tribunal Te Raupatu o Tauranga Moana (Wellington: Legislation Direct, 2004); 193.
You shall have no land from me for my participation in rebellion, and none for your money. I have been at war in Taranaki and at Waikato, and will give up none here. I have not made peace with you and do not mean to do so. I do not admit the right of the Ngaiterangi to give up my land, even though I have been in rebellion. Let Ngaiterangi have your money, but I will not let you have my land.  

In the period of conflict through the 1860s and 1870s, Pirirākau were often referred to as belonging to Ngāi Te Rangi, a convenient mythology that allowed our concerns and protests to be invalidated by the rebuttal of friendly Ngāi Te Rangi chiefs, a mythology encouraged and formalised in the official historical record by the civil commissioner to Tauranga, Henry Clarke. This is entirely in error; Pirirākau is a hapū of Ngāti Ranginui. Many of our ancestors were, of course, married to Ngāi Te Rangi ancestors. For example, Takurua, the ancestor for whom the meeting house at Poutūterangi Marae is named, had a liaison with Mapihi Te Rangi, an ancestor of the Ngāi Tauwhao hapū of Ngāi Te Rangi, for whom our dining hall is named. Due to these liaisons it is common for Pirirākau members to acknowledge both Tākitimu and Matāatua as our canoes, but we have never claimed Ngāi Te Rangi as our iwi.

As with any community, it is difficult to speak of Pirirākau as though we are one in thought and action. In the period that we are considering, there were significant divisions within Pirirākau: my ancestor Te Ua Maungapōhatu was one of five Pirirākau chiefs, and the most significant, to surrender to the Crown at the Pacification Hui in 1864. Though his children and grandchildren had provided food and medical supplies to the returning warriors after the battle at Pukehinahina, following Maungapōhatu’s surrender, at which time the whānau were granted a reserve, his whānau did not take up arms again against the

10 Rāwiri Tata quoted in Mackay to Richmond, 22 Nov. 1866, AJHR, 1867.
11 Clarke to Richmond, 25 Apr. 1867, AJHR, 1867.
Crown. This is not to say they in any way prospered by their actions; over the years, the reserves of the whānau of Te Ua Maungapōhatu were reduced and reallocated to their great impoverishment. The ‘half-caste’ children of the Frenchmen, Emile Borell, Louis Bidois and Pierre Poitier tended to maintain a neutral position over the period of conflict and consistently practiced Catholicism. Joseph Bidois, the brother of my ancestor Pita Pōnui Bidois, is one ancestor that I am aware joined the local constabulary and fought with the Crown; he was killed at Ōpepe by Te Kooti Arikirangi’s men. These whānau did not constitute the majority of Pirirākau members at that time and they are notable for having stronger connections with Pākehā settlers.

The other division has risen more recently. Ngāti Taka is an active hapū of Ngāti Ranginui who sit within the same boundaries as Pirirākau. My understanding of their whakapapa as presented in a wānanga at Tutereinga Marae in 2009 is that it is concordant with that of Pirirākau, and they particularly emphasize their connection to Te Ua Maungapōhatu. Ngāti Taka was certainly a name that has been used for Pirirākau in the past, though I am not convinced that Ngāti Taka is distinct from Pirirākau. I readily acknowledge the mana of those whānau who are committed to Ngāti Taka as their identity. My view is that Pirirākau are Ngāti Taka, and Ngāti Taka are Pirirākau. None of the decisions of my Pirirākau ancestors that led to these divisions should be regretted. I believe their motivation, whether surrendered, unsurrendered or supporters of the Crown was to protect a legacy for their children and descendants in the face of great odds and terrible injustice. Nevertheless, when I speak of Pirirākau throughout this work, I do so aware of the divisions, but recognising that my research is a reflection on the actions of the majority of Pirirākau members in the period of 1839 to 1881.
There are significant variations in the whakapapa of Tamatea Ariki Nui and Tamatea Pōkai Whenua. Notably Ngāti Kahungunu records three wives rather than the two recorded by Ngāti Ranginui, and also records different parentage for some ancestors.
This work attempts to rediscover the cosmology of Pirirākau at the time of first encounter with Catholic missionaries in 1839, and to suggest a pre-contact theology congruent with that cosmology. I then consider the theology and missiology of the French Catholic missionaries before finally considering Pai Mārire orthopraxy and theology in Tauranga Moana up until 1881. This was a dynamic period and has been a complex research exercise.

Where possible I have used primary sources from the period. Journals of officials and missionaries, newspapers and the parliamentary record were particularly useful for sourcing the colonial authorities’ views, opinions and accounts from the 1850s to 1881. For the missiology and theology of Catholic missionaries in the early nineteenth century, it has been possible to access the letters and epistles of Bishop Pompallier and his priests from that period, an invaluable resource that provides an insight to their intent and motivations. Te Ua Haumene’s own letters, speeches and Te Ua Rongopai are readily available in both translation and the Māori language, which was an invaluable resource from which to regard Pai Mārire anew. Overall there was limited recording of Pirirākau experience, views and knowledge between 1839 and 1881. However, I was able to access some outstanding original Pirirākau sources, including letters from Pirirākau chiefs of that period to Māori newspapers, a maramataka [lunar calendar] from Pirirākau chief Te Ua Maungapōhatu’s son Kerekau, and the original journals of Haare Te Piahana, a descendant of two Ngāti Ranginui hapū, Ngāi Tamarawaho and Ngāi Ruahine, and Te Pohoi Tahatika, a grandchild of Te Ua Maungapōhatu. Collectively their journals record whakapapa, stories, a variety of waiata and the names of atua from the period I am considering. Te Pohoi notably lived through the events of the 1860s.
onwards, and in a Māori Land Court transcript\(^\text{13}\) says that he visited the site of the battle of Pukehinahina in the day afterwards.

The scarcity of primary sources was expected for the pre-contact cosmology and theology, and so an in-depth consideration of secondary sources provided a significant source of data and information. The pre-contact cosmology and theology is more challenging due to the impact of colonisation and confiscation on the Māori population of that period which saw a rapid loss of knowledge combined with a rapid introduction and deification of western and Christian epistemology. Late twentieth century Tauranga Moana kaumātua Manu Te Pere and Hōhua Tūtengahe both wrote extensively about the Tākitimu canoe, its whakapapa and cosmology, and they feature in my consideration of the pre-contact period. However, I have also sought out secondary sources writing closer to 1839, so for the pre-contact period, there are four key informants from the nineteenth century on the Tākitimu traditions whom I will consider, all of whom shared their information with well-known Pākehā anthropologists in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century: Te Whatahoro; Tūtakangahau; Haare Hongi; and Matiaha Tiramōrehu.

Te Whatahoro Jury (1841-1923) recorded the teachings of two tohunga, Te Matorohanga and Nepia Pohuhu of Ngāti Kahungunu, at the Papawai hui in the Wairarapa in 1865. Te Matorohanga had converted to Christianity by the time of this hui. Te Whatahoro’s manuscript was in turn relayed to Stephenson Percy Smith whose sponsorship saw it published as *The Lore of the Whare Wananga*.\(^\text{14}\) Over a period of forty years, Te Whatahoro’s manuscript quadrupled in size and in 1907 it was approved as an agreed expression of

\(^{13}\) Investigation of Title, Whakamarama Block, 4 Nov. 1901. Māori Land Court Tauranga Minute Book 5.

genuine Ngāti Kahungunu tradition. *The Lore of the Whare Wananga* was enormously influential on early twentieth century anthropologists, including Elsdon Best who lauded Te Whatahoro as a “remarkably intelligent and intellectual native, now seventy-three years of age, who was taught the old-time beliefs of his people during his youth” 15. Te Whatahoro was the son of an English carpenter and a Māori mother raised on a mission station; later in life he converted to Mormonism. The manuscript uses clear Biblical allusions, with Genesis, Noahic and Mosaic themes throughout; certainly cause for suspicion as to the historical accuracy and reliability of Te Whatahoro’s writings. Perhaps the best that can be said about it is captured by Michael Shirres: "It does not necessarily represent the tribal tradition in 1865. However, it is an oral tradition approved by a responsible body of elders.” 16

Tūtakangahau (1830?-1907) of Tūhoe was the principle informer of Elsdon Best from the time they met in 1896 and features in all of his early work, including the significant study *Tuhoe: The Children of the Mist*. 17 Best at that time was a quartermaster on the roading project in the Urewera. Tūtakangahau had a colourful history that included having been a follower of Te Kooti Arikirangi and a convert to Ringatū. Best had a romantic notion of Tūtakangahau as “an old tattooed survivor of the Neolithic era” 18 that belied the dynamic mix of views and beliefs that he had formed through the period of conflict, colonisation and assimilation. For example, at the time Best and Tūtakangahau met, Tūtakangahau was the Commissioner for the Urewera District Native Reserve. Furthermore, Tūtakangahau’s father was biblically literate and so his son grew up around missions and missionaries.

15 E. Best, “The cult of Io, the concept of a Supreme Being as evolved by the Ancestors of the Polynesians.” *Man*, 13 1902; 98-9.
Matiaha Tiramōrehu (1800?-1881) shared his own knowledge with Edward Shortland, which was the foundation of Shortland’s 1882 opus *Māori Religion and Mythology*. Tiramōrehu was a significant Kāi Tahu tohunga who became a fervent Wesleyan convert many years prior to meeting Shortland. Tiramōrehu taught a wānanga in traditional practices and learnings at Moeraki until 1868. In his youth he is said to have fought alongside his father in retaliation for the sacking of Kaiapoi by the war parties of Te Rauparaha, and he then led an exodus further south to Moeraki. It was here that he met Wesleyan missionary James Watkin who asserted that he was “perhaps better acquainted with genealogical antiquities than any other person.” The majority of his later years he spent fighting the government for the Kāi Tahu land, and is regarded as one of the most significant Kāi Tahu leaders since colonisation.

Hare Hongi (1859-1944), also known as Henry Matthew Stowell, was the son of a Pākehā engineer and Huhana from Ngāpuhi. He worked with surveyors in Northland, during which time he studied Māori language and tribal lore, and was admitted to the whare wānanga. Later in life he worked as an interpreter in the Native Land Courts and as a writer for professional journals and newspapers. He was an avid collector of history and lore, most notably from Ngā Kuku Mumu in Ahipara. It seems likely that his Tākitimu story was based on the knowledge he gleaned from this Ngāti Kahungunu tōhunga.

All four men provided knowledge about atua on the Tākitimu canoe, the cosmology of Tākitimu tribes, and the features and qualities of atua. Unfortunately none of these are the unadulterated voice of a pre-contact tohunga; all of them have been scribed, edited and represented for the purposes

---

21 James Watkin quoted in Evison, “Tiramorehu.”
22 H. Hongi, “The Story Of The "Takitimu" Canoe.” *JPS*, 17 2 (66) (June 1908); 95-6.
of Pākehā anthropologists trying to rediscover and protect a historical Māori world they saw as disappearing. Nevertheless, I considered their narratives and the criticism and support for their views against four criteria for validity and reliability in relation to this work: firstly, their whakapapa connection with the Tākitimu canoe and traditions; secondly, the use of pre-contact forms of organisation, authority and social connection in their explanation of the Tākitimu tradition; thirdly, the use of Christian allusions in their narrative; fourthly, the relationships they had with the Crown and/or missionaries. Haare Hongi has no clear whakapapa connection to the Tākitimu tradition and Tūtakangahau is more directly a descendant of the Mataatua canoe. Te Whatahoro and his informing tohunga as members of Ngāti Kahungunu have a stronger case to represent the Tākitimu tradition, as does Tiramōrehu who is a descendent of Hotumamoe, the progenitor of Kāti Mamoe from Te Arai te Uru23 canoe24 and Tahu-pōtiki, the progenitor of Kāi Tahu, who was handed command of the Tākitimu canoe by Tamatea Arikinui in Tauranga Moana.25

Hongi, Te Whatahoro and Tūtakangahau provide whakapapa and cosmology that is notable for modeling western social arrangements, particularly in marriage partnerships. All three represent atua as having one lifelong partner, and all of their atua wāhine are in a marriage relationship, none independent. Tiramōrehu offers a noticeably different series of relationships that includes polygamy in the cosmology and the atua wāhine operating independently on the authority of their own mana.

23 Suggestively, this pre-migration canoe is also the name of one of the atua carried aboard the Tākitimu canoe.
Te Whatahoro most clearly uses biblical allusions throughout his Tākitimu traditions and cosmology, and not surprisingly makes the strongest case for a monotheistic Io tradition. Tūtakangahau also tends to represent his cosmology in terms that could be considered biblical, though not following the clear pattern used by Te Whatahoro. Hongi and Tiramōrehu’s narratives have no obvious and intentional biblical parallel. Finally, Te Whatahoro, Hongi and Tūtakangahau had close and long-term relationships with Crown officials and missionaries well-before recording their narratives. Tiramōrehu was a committed Wesleyan and held their missionaries in high regard; however he was consistently an activist for the rights and lands of his iwi throughout his life and cannot be regarded as having intentionally accommodated the Crown narratives into his own.

All of this has drawn me to conclude that Tiramōrehu’s whakapapa, cosmology and traditions for the Tākitimu canoe carry an authority of validity and reliability. Tiramōrehu’s cosmology was recorded only about ten years after his last wānanga; It is not a Pirirākau cosmology, but it is clearly a Tākitimu cosmology.

In addition to these primary and secondary sources, I conducted qualitative interviews with seven individuals about pre-contact cosmology and theology, early Catholicism and Pai Mārire. I initially approached ten individuals, but one felt that he knew nothing of the topic and the other two were not available in the period in which the interviews were conducted. At the beginning of my research I had thought to conduct the interviews before examining the primary and secondary sources, with the intent of being guided by the key themes that arose in the interviews. I had also considered using the same open questions for each interviewee. Two encounters changed my mind: firstly, in an early interview with Tawharangi Nuku, he informed me of having attended a gathering of the key kuia and kaumātua of his parents’ generation and having
asked about pre-contact cosmology, to be informed that none of them could recall anything of the like; secondly, three of my interviewees were hesitant to answer generic questions about cosmology and theology as they felt unsure of the terms, but when I offered an historical example they were interested in having a discussion. I decided I needed to have key names and events clear before talking to my interviewees to present them with a hypothesis for us to discuss. Therefore my interviews were a discussion about hypotheses that I presented to my interviewees, guided by the areas of interest that they highlighted as we talked. I have used key quotes throughout this work that contribute to or contradict my hypotheses.

My first choice of interviewees were kuia and koroua from Pirirākau, and Poutūterangi Marae in particular. Tame Kuka is our senior kaumātua with an extensive knowledge of the Māori language, local history and whakapapa. He had a long career in education and was a significant leader in mentoring Māori youth. He has lived in Tauranga Moana the majority of his life and is from a long and illustrious line of speakers at our marae. Colin Maungapōhatu Bidois is our oldest living kaumātua. He had a long career in the public service and then led our Ngāti Ranginui rūnanga for many years. To this day he is an iwi representative on boards in Tauranga Moana. He grew up amongst Tūhoe and Te Arawa in the Bay of Plenty and returned home to play an important role in our Treaty settlement negotiations. I interviewed Atiria Ake (née Bidois) for my dissertation whilst studying for my Post-Graduate Diploma in Theology. That interview was particularly focused on pre-contact cosmology and Catholicism, so I have again gone back to her interview for this work. She passed away in 2013; prior to this she was a wise, well-loved kuia with a rich knowledge of tradition and whakapapa who connected three of our significant whānau in marriage at our marae. Christina Rolleston, whilst still a pākeke, is a kaikaranga at our marae, sits on the marae executive and is an active presence in all aspects
of marae life. She has a very sharp mind with an extensive knowledge of whakapapa and history that is complemented by her insightful questioning. I also sought out an interview with our hapū historian Patrick Nicholas. He has been a key source of our local history, tikanga and whakapapa for over 30 years. In that time he has been entrusted with a cache of original documents, photographs and recordings from many whānau in our hapū. He has been an invaluable resource and sounding board for this work. In addition to these Pirirākau descendents, I also interviewed Tawharangi Nuku and Tracey Ngatoko. Tawharangi Nuku of Ngāti Hangarau is the current chairperson of our iwi Ngāti Ranginui; Tracey Ngatoko of Ngāi Tamarawaho is a Ngāti Ranginui expert in the Māori language, a renowned composer for our kapa haka o Ngāti Ranginui and her whānau are steeped in the history and whakapapa of our iwi.

NARRATIVES AND STORIES

In Chapter 2 I will consider in more depth the theological model through which I will analyse the faith story of Pirirākau between 1839 and 1881 that these sources provide. However, I note here that story, or narrative, features prominently in this work. My theological framework is based on narrative, and I am committed to both finding the revelatory “story within a story” of our Pirirākau context and history and see value in “mutual reinterpretations” of our narrative. Narratives are, in the simplest definition, the story of how we got here. A faith journey such as that taken by Pirirākau is a narrative from out of history, not a series of linear facts. A modern framework for understanding narrative is provided by Johann Baptist Metz who was deeply concerned with allowing real subjects and their historical experiences to appear. He called this a

26 A mutual reinterpretation is the process of placing one narrative within another narrative as means to examine again the meaning and import of the story. Cf. M. Doak, Reclaiming Narrative for Public Theology (New York: State University of New York Press, 2004); 163.
Practical Fundamental Theology. His own motivation was driven from a deep concern at the silence and lack of change in Christian theology after and despite the Holocaust in World War II. Similarly, I profess a deep concern about the lack of change in Christian theology after encounter with indigenous peoples, both in Aotearoa New Zealand and throughout the Fourth World.

Exploring this concern led Metz to regard it as a failure of memory and narrative, which meant he argued, that there was no sense of solidarity with the suffering of the Jews and other groups. His Practical Fundamental Theology is founded on the inter-relatedness of memory, narrative and solidarity:

Memory and narrative can no more be practical categories in theology without solidarity than solidarity can give expression to the practically humanizing form of Christianity without memory and narrative.27

Memory refers to the appearance in history of a particular event; narrative is about how memory’s character is expressed in story form; and solidarity is about our own subjective identification with a memorative hope; it is the character of this memorative hope that allows subjective identification with the poor and oppressed to emerge. By way of example, my Pirirākau ancestors fought with the Kīngitanga28 supporters at Pukehinahina on 29 April 1864 and achieved a resounding victory. This is memory. In recalling this, we assert that our power and authority, our mana over our land and ourselves was affirmed locally and nationally in that new era of encounter, conflict and colonisation. This is narrative. Today we object to the confiscation of our land and the impoverishment of our people as an offense against our mana as affirmed at

28 “The Kingitanga, the King Movement, began in the 1850s as a response to the pressure on Māori to sell land. A number of different iwi agreed on Te Wherowhero, a Waikato chief, as the first Māori king. He became known as Pōtatau Te Wherowhero.” N. Hopa “Ngā rōpū - Māori organisations - 19th-century Māori organisations,” *Te Ara* 2011 URL: http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/nga-ropu-maori-organisations/page-1
Pukehinahina. This is solidarity, an identification with memorative hope in the midst of our suffering and poverty. Metz’s theology, which is a narrative theology, is a historical praxis grounded in suffering. I too am seeking a narrative rather than facts. My narrative is founded in the historical experience of Pirirākau, the story we have told as Pirirākau, and my own sense of solidarity with the suffering of Pirirākau then and today. With Metz I embrace narrative as the opportunity to move this work away from an historical artefact into a relevant commentary.

**THE STRUCTURE OF THIS WORK**

This work is a movement from 1839, an era of Pirirākau’s first contact with the Catholic missionaries through their attempt to evangelise Pirirākau, the missionaries leaving in the face of the slow inexorable arrival of conflict that culminated in devastating land loss and impoverishment in the 1860s and then closes with the symbolic laying down of arms by King Tāwhiao in 1881 and the return of the majority of Pirirākau as the poor and oppressed to a land and communities permanently transformed. Chapter Two provides the methodological framework to consider this narrative. I begin by defining and comparing the utility of contextual theology and indigenous theology, including outlining the imperatives of contextual theology. This provides the foundation for examining the Maori contextual theologies of Reverend Māori Marsden, Father Michael Shirres, and Pā Hēnare Tate. Three key concepts they share are tapu, mana and whakawhanaungatanga and these are central to structuring a contextual theology for Pirirākau. In doing so I outline five criteria for orthodoxy, consider six possible models of contextual theology and close with a consideration of syncretism and dual systems.

Chapter Three attempts to use the historical echoes and clues to suggest a pre-contact cosmology and theology for Pirirākau that represents their world view at the time of first encounter with Catholic missionaries. I briefly look at the
case for atua wāhine in Tauranga Moana and an appropriate division of atua into atua take and atua wawao.\textsuperscript{29} I then consider the validity of an Io tradition for Tauranga Moana by looking at the evidence for the tradition in Ngāti Kahungunu, Waikato and Kāi Tahu. This basis allows me to examine the atua of the Tākitimu canoe, suggesting a potential cosmology of atua take and then the extensive and varied atua wawao on the Tākitimu in different traditions. In doing so I suggest a link between the atua and navigational features on the journey of the Tākitimu, including stars, rainbows and lunar bows, lunar cycles, oceanic features, comets and war as a key societal component. In this examination I have made a clear distinction between roles for atua I can evidence from a variety of sources, or roles for atua that the etymology indicates, or roles for atua that I have suggested as an opinion. I also describe what we know of the spiritual tools carried aboard the Tākitimu. Finally I propose a pre-Christian Tākitimu contextual theology that may represent the world view of our ancestors who encountered the Catholic missionaries.

Chapter Four focuses on the French men who felt called to Tauranga Moana as missionaries of the Catholic Church. Their experience was markedly different to that of the Anglican missionaries and is less well-known in Aotearoa New Zealand today. I start with an explanation of the relations between the French State and the Catholic Church, particularly in the French Revolution and the next few decades. Understanding the views on gender, race and class in French society at the beginning of the nineteenth century allow us to consider the formation of the men who chose to become missionaries. I move from these broad social and political foundations to describe the historical Catholic mission in Tauranga Moana before then examining the nineteenth century Catholic

\textsuperscript{29} ‘atua take’ are originating beings and ‘atua wawao’ are interventionist deities. I provide a fuller definition and explanation on page 52, however the division is made on the basis of the expectations of our ancestors as to which of the atua they could direct, manipulate or beseech to take particular actions.
missiology and how that missiology was enacted in Aotearoa New Zealand. We are given valuable insights to this with a particular consideration of Bishop Pompallier’s 1842 pastoral *Ako Marama o te Hahi Katorika Romana ko te Pou me te Unga o te Pono*.

The final Chapter Five closes our narrative by looking at the final theological development for Pirirākau in the period which we are examining. The movement from a pre-contact Tākitimu contextual theology to the acceptance of an orthodox Catholic missiology and theology were the foundation that led to the acceptance of Pai Mārire. I look at the beginnings of Pai Mārire following Te Ua Haumene’s revelation in Taranaki. To understand how it came to be so influential amongst Pirirākau, I narrate the period of conflict and confiscation in the 1860s in Tauranga Moana with a particular view as to the conflict’s impact on Pirirākau. It is this conflict that encourages the introduction of Pai Mārire to Pirirākau and Tauranga Moana more widely. Rather than a regression or a rejection of Christianity, I consider the theology and orthopraxis of Pai Mārire and make a defence of Pai Mārire as an orthodox Christian contextual theology, and therefore a clear development of theology and orthopraxis for Pirirākau.

In concluding, the record of the cosmology of the Pirirākau hapū, and indeed the wider Tauranga Moana community, between 1839 and 1881 is fragmentary and layered with the worldview and theology of writers of the period. The agenda of those writers, British, French and indigenous, is difficult to clearly unpack and explore, and has been further complicated by the hermeneutic of later scribes, leading me to concur with Jeffery Holman that “there is no possibility of a late 19th century Māori epistemology unmediated by Pākehā influence.”

Nevertheless, there are traces of a Tākitimu cosmology in oral tradition and writings from the period that are suggestive of the view of our

---

Pirirākau ancestors. It is clear in this work that Pirirākau underwent significant changes in the structure of their lifestyle, society, economy, and technology in the period. Some of the changes were pursued and taken up by Pirirākau as positive contributions to their lives, whilst other changes were thrust upon them in this period of colonisation, and other changes were the unexpected and unintended consequences of this complex period of history. All of those factors led to Pirirākau asking fresh questions of their pre-contact Tākitimu contextual theology and looking for new answers in Christianity. Christian theology and faith were accepted because they supported the tapu, mana and whakawhanaungatanga framework of the Pirirākau world view, whilst providing new processes and a relationship with a new god who more effectively provided answers and strategies in a dynamic geo-political environment.

This work demonstrates that whilst missionaries lost power and authority in the face of the unjust actions of the military against churches and Māori Christian communities, our ancestors looked to connect directly with this new god, and the rapid and fervent adoption of Pai Mārire was both a reaction and an act of creation that stepped beyond adding Christianity to their world view to transforming Christianity in service of that world view. The original cosmology, a creative, fluid orthopraxy, is the foundation that Pirirākau built upon in order to create an orthodox Christian expression that was itself creative and fluid. This is a narrative of a creative movement from a pre-contact Tākitimu contextual theology, through a received Catholic mission theology to an orthodox Christian contextual theology. It is a narrative in which Pirirākau, against the odds, maintained and enhanced their authority over their own faith journey.
Tracing the development of my Pirirākau ancestors’ cosmology and theology from first encounter with the French Catholic missionaries through to the end of armed hostilities with the Crown in 1881 requires a framework that is flexible enough to move with the rapidly changing environment my ancestors encountered and engaged, yet structured enough for us to see patterns that ran through the experience of people a century and a half ago. At the outset then, let us be courageous enough to admit that the patterns we see will be the patterns we wish to see, and that we are capable of seeing. In this I lean on the wisdom of the teachers and kaumātua in my life: whakapapa is the living embodiment that the linear conception of time is an illusion; our ancestors speak into our lives today as the examples and models we need today, rather than being dead figures frozen in the past. There is a continuity between past, present and future, so the patterns we find in the experience of the nineteenth century should not be nineteenth century patterns, but twenty first century patterns, as this present is where the past is still alive. I regard this as a hermeneutic of whakapapa; the whakapapa that was written and spoken by my ancestors was a part of an ongoing and eternal act of weaving a whakapapa that binds them, their ancestors and me. None of us are the originators of the whakapapa; we merely weave ourselves into it and offer it to generations to come. Any hermeneutic that seeks the understanding or interpretation of our ancestors as though it were static, frozen in the nineteenth century for us to turn over in our hands like a fossil, denies the dynamism of whakapapa. In a hermeneutic of whakapapa, the understandings and interpretations of our ancestors, as much as they are discoverable, are a contribution to the pattern we are weaving now; not dictating what is possible, but a foundation for our new patterns that we weave.
So I intend to examine my ancestors’ experience as the development of a contextual theology. Given my assertion that the present is where the past is still alive, it is more accurately a contextual theology rather than an indigenous theology because we need “to interact and dialogue not only with traditional cultural value, but with social change, new ethnic identities, and the conflicts that are present as the contemporary phenomenon of globalization encounters the various peoples of the world.”

Developing a framework requires a working understanding of the terminology and models of contextual theology. I will begin with a brief examination of the history of the term contextual theology and the identified imperatives of said theology. I will then look at the three significant theologians in Māori contextual theology: Māori Marsden; Michael Shirres; and Hēnare Tate. I will consider three shared and central concepts – tapu, mana and whakawhanaungatanga – and the theologies that these led them to develop. I will then briefly traverse creation-centred and redemption-centred theologies, orthodoxy and models of contextual theology. This chapter will conclude with a statement on where I stand on considering orthodoxy and syncretism and the model of contextual theology I will be using to examine the forty year journey of Pirirākau from first encounter to the tragic end of hostilities.

**CONTEXTUAL OR INDIGENOUS THEOLOGY?**

The term indigenous theology was probably first used in 1949 in relation to theology undertaken by the minority populations of the Tribal and Dalit theologians in India. However, in Africa, the term was actually used to describe theology undertaken in relation to the majority populations, as
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31 S. Bevans, *Models of Contextual Theology* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2004); 27.
theology “done in Africa … arises out of the identity of African people, draws on African categories of thought and speaks to the historical situation of African people.”  

Whilst writers are quick to point out there are, of course, many African theologies, the use of the term indigenous theology is focused on the identity of the theologians. In the Australian context, First Nations Australians describe Aboriginal theology, which they categorise as an indigenous theology, as “a radical movement in theology… leaning heavily towards biblical justice. It is autonomous (post-western, post-denominational), and emphasises liberation, prophetic obedience, and action. It treasures traditional Aboriginal religion as the divine grounding for contemporary faith and identity. It keeps traditional practices as potent reminders of important cosmic and temporal truths.”  

That is to say, indigenous theology in Australia is a liberation or a praxis theology. In the Pacific context, with the complex series of identities and ethnicities, theology is both an expression of Pacific identity and a statement of liberation for specific people groups; these two imperatives are denoted by the terms Pacific theology and Oceania theology respectively. Proponents of Oceania theology tend to use the term contextual theology and question the relevance in contemporary societies of the term indigenous, suggesting only traditional societies could claim the homogeneity it implies. Conversely, Pacific theology proponents tend not to recognise this as a conflict, and use the term indigenous theology as capturing both contemporary context and indigeneity.

In my reading, contextualization seems to be replacing indigenization and inculturation as the term to describe the theology that is occurring. Firstly, it

---


more comfortably holds the tension between identity and justice as it does not privilege expressions of identity, which is my criticism of the term indigenous theology. Secondly, theology very clearly has three loci: scripture; tradition; and present human experience. The latter is best conceived as contextual:

...there is always a difference between reality and human culturally conditioned understandings (models) of that reality. We assume that there is a reality “out there” but it is the mental constructs (models) of that reality inside our heads that are the most real to us. God, the author of reality, exists outside any culture. Human beings, on the other hand, are always bound by cultural, subcultural (including disciplinary), and psychological conditioning to perceive and interpret what they see of reality in ways appropriate to these conditionings. Neither the absolute God nor the reality created is perceived absolutely by culture-bound human beings.

Rather breathlessly, many of those who write about contextual theology tend to rush to the conclusion that all theology is essentially contextual theology; those actually busy doing contextual theology in their context are mute on the issue. I am not sure the desire to so forcefully enthrone contextual theology is helpful; my own experience of a praxis model of contextual theology within Christian Anarchist circles in Aotearoa New Zealand is that contextual theology provides an alternative pathway from theologies that support Christian triumphalism, away from control and power over others. As we cannot conceive “the absolute God nor the reality created... absolutely,” it strikes me as arrogant to develop theologies that celebrate and pursue power; no, that is for God, not humanity. And entrusting our human desire and longing for power to
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38 Bevans, Contextual Theology; 3-4.
39 C. Kraft, Christianity in Culture (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1979); 300.
40 Cf. D. Hall, Thinking about Faith: Christian Theology in a North American Context (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989); 21; Bevans, Contextual Theology; 3.
God, we are faced with a mystery: we find that Christ uses all power in a wholly unexpected way:

Christ Jesus, who, though he was in the form of God, did not regard equality with God as something to be exploited, but emptied himself, taking the form of a slave, being born in human likeness. And being found in human form, he humbled himself and became obedient to the point of death — even death on a cross. (Philippians 2.6-8)

In what I regard as one of the great truths of the Word, Christ uses His complete mastery of all powers to become power-less. Who are we to strive for more? So I argue that contextual theologies are small theologies, tribal theologies about a God who transcends the tribe. Contextual theologies are intimately tied to justice because they are written for those who have had their power taken away, so contextual theologies are read from the view of the power-less rather than the power-full. So I add an imperative to justice to the five imperatives identified by Stephen Bevans for contextual theology:

1) it starts from the position that God became flesh, so affirms the incarnational nature of Christianity;
2) it recognises that God is revealed not in ideas but in concrete reality, so reality has a sacramental nature;
3) it acknowledges that revelation is both an inter-personal experience and a personal response;
4) it affirms the inclusivity and the diversity, that is the catholicity of the church; and
5) it upholds the Trinity as the incarnation of relational community.

Whilst these imperatives are the central components of a theology identifying itself as a contextual theology, there are also common features to contextual
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41 Bevans, *Contextual Theology*; 13-5.
theologies that arise out of indigenous communities. In this context, contextual theology tends to be communitarian rather than focused on the individual. These theologies are oriented toward spatial rather than temporal categories, and so the land is the beginning and the ending point, particularly as it is central to the resistance of every indigenous people. Consequently, contextual theologies in these contexts are often theologies of resistance to ecclesial hegemony and cultural imposition, to political and economic marginalization, and the noxious effects of colonisation and globalisation. As I myself will do here, contextual theologies amongst indigenous communities privilege oral traditions, emerge from the categories of native indigenous languages and use them in theological thinking.\(^{42}\) It is also a peculiarity of the experience of colonisation that contextual theologians in indigenous contexts are subject to the gaze of those outside of their community, and so are required to “articulate their indigenous theology for their own people, while also being in some sense, held to account by Christians not of their own context.”\(^{43}\) We feel the weight of expectation; translating every prayer or song in our own language, subject to questions about the orthodoxy of our services in our community settings. As Māori, we have to ‘prove’ we are Christians in lifestyle and tradition to the dominant Pākehā church communities, yet that lens would never be applied to themselves.

**MĀORI CONTEXTUAL THEOLOGY**

In that spirit, I contend that it is essential that Māori do their own contextual theology as “a person who does not fully share one’s experience is not to be fully trusted to speak of God in that person’s context.”\(^{44}\) The intentions of Māori contextual theology is recovery of our own relationship with God, critique of

---


\(^{43}\) Tate, *Systematic Māori Theology*; 10.

\(^{44}\) Bevans, *Contextual Theology*; 19.
the theologies offered to us by the church over many years, and reform of theologies and orthopraxis in relation to the God that is encountered here, the land by whom we are formed and the tāngata whenua, the first peoples in this place. Bevans cautiously suggests a role for non-participants to contribute to a contextual theology, and Aotearoa New Zealand has demonstrated some successful instances of this type of collaboration, latterly Mana Māori and Christianity. Pā Hēnare Tate, a Māori Catholic priest from the Hokianga, Reverend Māori Marsden, a member of the 28th Māori Batallion, an Anglican priest and a tōhunga, and Michael Shirres, a Pākehā Dominican priest, all concentrated on explaining key concepts of a Māori theology. It was Tate who attempted to bind those concepts to a Christian theology, building the foundations of a systematic Māori Christian theology. I will briefly consider three concepts they all use and/or consider – tapu, mana and whakawhanaungatanga – and then summarise the three models of contextual theology they developed.

**TAPU**

Marsden equated tapu with “the Jewish idea translated in the words ‘sacred’ and ‘holy,’” though he conceded it lacked the “ethical connotations of the New Testament of moral righteousness.” Marsden was convinced that tapu was a process in which a person, place or object was “set aside or reserved for the sole use of that deity” and became as such “untouchable”. Marsden considered this to be the main element of tapu. He relied on a duality existing in Māori society between the sacred and profane. It is a mark of the assimilation of the generation that Marsden grew up in that his own frameworks for explaining the Māori worldview are Pākehā frameworks, legal and religious. He again explains tapu as a “contractual relationship” with a deity to be protected from
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“malevolent forces and the power to manipulate his environment to meet needs and demands.”

Shirres identified two elements to tapu, the “element from reason… ‘being with potentiality for power.’ The element from faith sees tapu as the ‘mana of the spiritual powers’.” The first element, which he regarded as the primary meaning, “begins with existence. Everything that is, has its own intrinsic tapu, a tapu which begins with its existence and which is sourced in the mana of the spiritual powers.” As tapu is potentiality, then the point is “not… what it is, but… what it can become.” Shirres owes a debt to Marsden for his understanding of tapu, but has also tried to extend that understanding to develop an ontological system in which tapu operates.

Tate’s view on tapu is very similar to that of Shirres. He offers a definition of tapu that is more concerned with its day to day utility by asserting it is best expressed as dignity and well-being. With this definition he develops a systematic view of tapu that he sets as foundational in a Māori Christian theology:

Tapu is one concept that has three related perspectives. Firstly, tapu is the restricted or controlled access to other beings—Atua, tangata and whenua. Secondly, tapu is ‘being,’ understood as ‘being-in-itself.’ Thirdly, tapu is being-in-relationships with primary being or with other beings, such that the relationships enhance, sustain, restore, and empower those in relationship.

Tate’s contention is that the enhancement and diminishment of tapu occurs with relationships, and therefore tapu restrictions exist to mediate relationships.

48 M. Shirres, Tapu (Ponsonby: Te Hahi Katorika ki Aotearoa, 1993); 5.
49 Shirres, Tapu; 10.
50 Tate, Systematic Māori Theology; 44.
to ensure that they enhance tapu. The potentiality of tapu in Tate’s definition is enacted in mana.

**MANA**

Marsden stays with the legal analogy in explaining mana as “lawful permission delegated by the gods to their human agents and accompanied by the endowment of spiritual power to act on their behalf and in accordance with their revealed will.” Marsden defines mana as power and authority and provides a distinction between the two:

A person approaches a traffic crossing and the lights turn red. He has power to cross but no permission. The lights turn green but his car stalls at the moment. He has permission to cross, but no power. His car starts and the lights remain green. He has both authority and power to proceed.  

Marsden’s concept of mana as spiritual power is central to both Shirres’s and Tate’s view. For both, mana is tapu in action, that is to say that in “its operation, it acts either to create, or to produce (from existing material), further beings with their own tapu. Each of these beings has, and exercises, its own mana, deriving from its own tapu, or from the tapu of others.”  

Mana is, then, tapu-centred and therefore acts to enhance tapu in relationships for both or all parties. The enhancement of tapu further enhances mana, so greatly increases a person’s capacity to act. Mana in this view is a quality that folds back in on itself like a koru, as when a “thing has its full mana, is fully powerful, when it has its full ‘being’... [then] it is fully alive, fully active,” and it is fully active when it has its full mana as “the mana deriving from tapu acts, to manifest,
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51 King, *Te ao huruhuri*; 119.
52 Tate, *Systematic Māori Theology*; 84.
address, enhance, sustain, and restore its own tapu and the tapu of other beings until the goal is reached of possessing tapu in its fullness.”

WHAKAWHANAUNGATANGA

Whilst Marsden and Shirres refer to whanaungatanga and whakawhanaungatanga, neither explores the concept in any depth. It is Tate who links tapu and mana to whanaungatanga and, in its active sense, whakawhanaungatanga. He asserts that whakawhanaungatanga is the goal of the enhancement of tapu and mana. At the centre of both the word and the meaning is the word whānau. Whānau can be defined as both the family unit and to be born or to give birth. In this instance, it is the family unit. Speaking at an event at Tauranga Boys College in 2015, Professor Mason Durie explained the breadth of what is captured in the word whānau: think of the oldest living relative in your family and ask them who is the oldest relative they remember meeting in their life. Then think of the latest addition to your family. From that oldest memory to the youngest child is your whānau. In this definition, whānau is a community that includes those who have gone before us, those we live with today, and those who are yet to come. In this mythologised ideal whānau, there are both patriarchal and matriarchal roles, so power is diffuse. The economy is a gift economy where the basic unit is reciprocity. Children and grandchildren are a shared responsibility and a shared future resource. The whānau is oriented around protecting the relationships that ensure the continuity of whakapapa, or ongoing blood lines, so activities like employment are only valuable insofar as they help to ensure that continuity. Your first responsibility is to your relations and community is central; a whānau cannot be functional if it excludes the community.

54 Tate, Systematic Māori Theology; 84.
Whānau then is the family unit. It is a dynamic, evolving unit within a community that carries a sense of both past and future connections. If we are then to add the suffix –nga (akin in use to the English language suffix -ness) to create whanaunga, the word is now relative or kin. The additional suffix –tanga creates whanaungatanga meaning relationship. Finally, the prefix whaka-indicates to make, to create or to do, so whakawhanaungatanga means relationship building or to build relationships. Whereas relationship building provides little indication as to the nature of the relationships being built, whakawhanaungatanga provides a very clear indication of the intent of relationship building in Māori communities; it involves building relationships that augment the central concept of whānau. We are building relationships that connect people to us in ways that provide the rights and obligations of members of our whānau. Tate’s assertion that whakawhanaungatanga has the goal of enhancing tapu and mana is a statement that we build the dignity and wellbeing, and power and authority of others because in doing so we connect them into trusting, intimate relationships with ourselves that provide us and them protection and support that is the equivalent of being family:

On the one hand, whanaungatanga applies to both vertical and horizontal dimensions and determines who people are. On the other hand, the concrete conditions of belonging to this whānau, to this hapū, and to these iwi groups, or bodies, directly affect a person, shape them, constitute their being and determine what they are.56

56 Tate, Systematic Māori Theology; 53.
THREE MODELS OF MĀORI CONTEXTUAL THEOLOGY

Marsden provides a foundation for a pre-Christian theology by expanding our understanding of the three baskets of knowledge obtained by Tāne-nui-a-Rangi: Tua-uri, Aro-Nui, and Tua-Atea. His explanation is what was passed to him in wānanga he attended and is rooted in his whakapapa in Te Tai Tokerau. This whakapapa includes a complex cosmological whakapapa that is provided here in summary:

The three kete provided humanity an understanding of the connection between cosmology and creation. On the three kete it is worth quoting him in full:

Tua-Uri literally translates as ‘beyond in the world of darkness’. There were twenty seven nights each of which spanned aeons of time. This is the ‘real world’ behind the world of sense perception or the natural world.

It is the seed bed of creation where all things are gestated, evolve, and are refined to be manifested in the natural world. This is the world where the cosmic processes originated and continue to operate as a complex series of
rhythmical patterns of energy to uphold sustain and replenish the energies and life of the natural world.⁵⁷

Te Aro-Nui. Literally, this translates as ‘that before us’, that is, ‘before our senses’. This is the natural world around us as apprehended by the senses.⁵⁸

Te Ao Tua-Atea is the world beyond space and time. Atea is the word for space. It was usually combined with wa-(time) to form waatea (space-time). They saw space and time as conjoined together and relative to each other. The final series of the Tua-Atea genealogy is recited as: ‘Te Hauora begat shape; shape begat form; form begat space; space begat time; and time begat Rangi and Papa (heaven and earth)’. Thus the space-time continuum became the framework into which heaven and earth were born.⁵⁹

In addition to the kete, Marsden particularly identified four concepts that appear at different stages in the cosmological whakapapa, the fruits of the “seed bed of creation” that are key to the creative act: Mauri which “interpenetrates all things to bind and knit them together and… acts as the bonding element creating unity in diversity”; Hihiri which is “pure energy… manifested as a form of radiation or light and aura, that… is especially evident in living things”; Mauri-Ora the life principle that makes life possible; and finally Hau-Ora which is the “breath or wind of the spirit which was infused into the process to birth animate life.”⁶⁰ In Marsden we see the faithful optimism of an Enlightenment man raised in a tradition of Māori knowledge unquestioningly mediated by a century of colonisation. He firmly believed that the cosmological whakapapa he provided and the concepts that underpinned creation as a dynamic process “trace the logical sequence of the evolution of the processes that occurred” and
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were as such empirical, based on the same principles as “applied in the world of sense perception in a multitude of ways.” 61

Throughout Shirres’ writings he focuses on expanding the understanding of key Māori theological concepts and their application to the gospel. He considered that in doing so he was developing a liberation, contextual and Māori theology. He saw his roles as Inculturation:

Inculturation is a theological term taken from two words, enculturation and Incarnation. Enculturation is the taking on of a culture. Incarnation is a theological term used to express God’s becoming man, Jesus taking on a human nature. Inculturation signifies the taking on of a particular human culture by Jesus. Just as he became a Jew so he becomes a member of another race, taking on their particular culture. As the Word was made flesh becoming a Jew, so "the Word is made flesh", becoming a member of another race. The Gospels themselves provide the guidelines for this process. 62

The theology that he does develop is founded in his research on the Io tradition; ultimately he concludes that the Io tradition existed pre-contact and asserts that Io has similar qualities and roles to the Judeo-Christian God. It is from this basis that he asserts that the Māori faith vision and Māori belief system are broadly consistent with orthodox Christian theologies. He applies the cosmological whakapapa and tapu and mana as a lens through which to view the actions and life of Jesus of Nazareth and interprets Christ’s work as the restoration and enhancement of tapu and mana. His definition and explanation of tapu and mana as outlined above are his most extensive contributions to a Māori theology to which Tate is indebted. Shirres is a fascinating and delightful writer: his knowledge was attained out of his interest and passion, so he is an
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eclectic mix of academic, activist and pastoral connections. Ngāpuhi and specifically Marsden are a key source of his information and knowledge. Whereas Marsden’s theology is derived from his whakapapa, Shirres’s is derived from his experience in modern Māori communities, many of them urban. Therein lies his conviction that theology is a praxis, that a “Christian Maori Theology is coming out of the experience of people living out their being Christian Maori.”

Tate and Shirres were friends and colleagues who developed a Māori Theology course at the University of Auckland in 1989. Tate’s own work is informed by Shirres’s at many levels and extends beyond the beginnings he made to develop a systematic Māori theology. It is worth noting that Tate’s theology is a milestone in Māori contextual theology. Whether it is rebutted or extended, his work will be a stepping stone for the future development of Māori contextual theology. Tate states that first and foremost Māori theology must be by Māori Christians, for Māori Christians. The challenges of such a statement - whilst apparently straightforward for Tate, who is after all a Catholic priest and Māori kaumātua resident in his traditional homelands of Hokianga Whakapau Karakia – is that the historical and current experience of tāngata whenua in Aotearoa New Zealand has generated a myriad of responses amongst individual Māori both within and without the church; it is impossible to speak of a Māori Christian as a distinct person. What is the primary identity: her faith; her culture; her experience of being a citizen of Aotearoa New Zealand? What role for the church and for the iwi in setting the boundaries of what it means to be a Māori Christian? Add this to the perennial questions of what it means to assert an identity as Māori after 175 years of colonisation and the confident place asserted for Māori Christians is questionable.

Shirres, *What is Māori Theology?*. 
Inspired by Marsden and Shirres, at the outset Tate links Atua with Creator. In assuming a link between these concepts he passes quickly over the significant cultural appropriation of the concept undertaken by missionaries and privileges Judeo-Christian definitions over that of his own ancestors. Tate then lays out the concepts of tapu, mana, pono, tika and aroha, kaiwhakakapi tūranga, whakanoa and hohou te rongo as a systematic theology that enhances tapu and mana to allow for a full and reconciled whanaungatanga:

With Christ all share the inheritance of Atua. As adopted children all cry out, Matua, Abba, Father. Further, Christ, the mātāmua, addresses, enhances and restores our tapu. He is the head of the whānau. We become members of his whānau through baptism, and so enter the salvific structure that is whanaungatanga based on Christ. Because of him, the whole whānau is essentially related to who he is and what he does, in clearly defined whānau lines.64

Tapu has both an intrinsic and extrinsic element. Intrinsic tapu is a gift of birth, a dignity and well-being that is derived from that of our ancestors. It is unable to be extinguished, however extrinsic tapu is dignity and well-being as it is affected by relationships in which it can be diminished or enhanced. Tate asserts that all cultures hold three things to have tapu: tangata (people), whenua (land) and atua (the spiritual realm). This structure for tapu provides an explanation for the existence of tapu restrictions (the ‘rules’ that most people think of when asked about tapu): the restrictions mediate the relationships between tangata, whenua and atua to ensure the interaction is tapu enhancing. Mana also has an intrinsic and extrinsic element. Tate identifies three ways in which mana is gained: we are born with it; it is given to us; and/or we inherit it. Significantly, mana is not just for the individual. Groups and collectives have mana, and it is often greater than that of the individual. Extrinsic mana, as with

64 Tate, Systematic Māori Theology; 56.
extrinsic tapu, is enhanced or diminished in relationships. If mana is being used in an appropriate manner in relationships then the mana of others is enhanced as is indicated by others’ acknowledgement and support. Tate emphasizes the dynamic aspect of mana: if mana is unused, that is if power and authority are not enacted, then that mana moves to others to enact.

Tate substantially extends the work of Marsden and Shirres. Firstly he identified pono (truth, honest, reality), tika (right, correct, appropriate) and aroha (love, compassion, empathy) as a moral decision making framework that enables discernment as to whether actions and choices will enhance or diminish tapu and mana. He identified four models of relationships operative in Māori society in which mana is enacted for the whānau and the community. He considers the issue of violation with whakanoa, which is a process of diminishing tapu. Whilst there are positive instances of diminishishment of tapu in which the process is planned and consensual - such as that required for a whānau who are in an enhanced state of tapu following a bereavement - negative whakanoa is a violation committed by spirit/attitude, thought, word, actions or omission. The impact is to diminish tapu, which Tate asserts is demonstrated in our lives by an inability to cope, a breakdown in relationships and a descent into chaos. Tate then goes on to show how violated tapu is restored through the process of hohou te rongo (to restore peace). Hohou te rongo is an informal or formal process of restoring tapu that ideally involves both the violated and violator, but can be done just with the violated in an instance where involving all parties is not possible. Finally, Tate provides some insight into the Māori view of time and preparedness for restoration in looking at te wā, or more specifically he wā (seasons or eras) and te wā (moments in time) as points of possibility and opportunity that define our readiness for newness and wholeness. I greatly admire Tate’s theology; it has depth and clarity. However, it is also structuralist and linear, and so systematic as to have
moved beyond the very context of modern Māori communities in which Shirres located the gospel and its message.

STRUCTURING A CONTEXTUAL THEOLOGY FOR PIRIRĀKAU

Broadly speaking, theology tends to one of two unifying elements: a creation or a redemption-centred theme. Creation-centred theology posits that “grace builds on nature, but only because nature is capable of being built on, of being perfected in a supernatural relationship with God.” In this theme the world is regarded, by virtue of the act of creation, as sacramental, and revelation is found in the every day. Redemption-centred theology contends that culture and human experience are in need of transformation or replacement. As such, grace cannot build on nature as creation itself is fallen and therefore corrupt, demonstrating the “infinitely qualitative difference between God and man.” In these theologies, God breaks into the world and disrupts. Māori contextual theology, indeed all indigenous contextual theology, is creation-centred theology. Pirirākau contextual theology is consistent with this basic foundation in regarding creation, personified as the children and descendants of Toko-mua, Toko-roto, Toko-pā and Rangi-pōtiki, as sacramental, as a mutually affirming familial relationship with humanity that enhances tapu and mana. Divine revelation builds off this foundation, so I will use tapu, mana and whakawhanaungatanga (also represented by whakapapa) as the language of a creation-centred theology amongst Pirirākau.

Marsden, Shirres and Tate provide a foundation for developing a contextual theology through which to examine Pirirākau’s own cosmology and theology through the historical experience of first contact and evangelisation, to conflict, to colonisation and loss. However, all three either assume a consistency and
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continuity between Māori contextual theology and orthodox Christian theologies or have no regard for that question. In examining Pirirākau history, we cannot rely on that assumption, and need to be able to adjudge both the orthodoxy of a Pirirākau contextual theology and the underlying assumptions of that theology to then understand the implications therein. The orthodoxy of a Pirirākau contextual theology must be judged within the imperatives of contextual theology outlined by Bevans, namely: it starts from the position that God became flesh, so affirms the incarnational nature of Christianity; it recognises that God is revealed not in ideas but in concrete reality, so reality has a sacramental nature; it acknowledges that revelation is both an inter-personal experience and a personal response; it affirms the inclusivity and the diversity, that is the catholicity of the church; and it upholds the Trinity as the incarnation of relational community. With regard for these imperatives, I begin with Jose de Mesa and Lode Wostyn who suggest three criteria for orthodoxy:67

1) the theology accepts the basic religious proposal of Christianity that God is Love;

2) were the orthopraxis of the theology a “theological expression that would lead to actions that are clearly un-Christian... [it] could never be considered orthodox,” however, they sound a note of caution, noting that “an expression that seems at first unorthodox might be justified in that it leads a group to truly Christian behaviour;”68 and

3) the theology gains a proper reception, in that it is accepted by the people of God as an expression of the catholicity of Christianity. Key to this is that a theology is open to criticism from the people of God.
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In addition to the criteria proposed by de Mesa and Wostyn, I would add two additional criteria from those proposed by Robert Schreiter: 69

4) the theology is able to be translated into worship of God and in doing so it is clear to whom the community are directed in that worship; and
5) the theology makes a positive contribution to other theologies and has the strength to answer the challenge in other theologies.

These five criteria for orthodoxy provide a structure to test the first principles of a Pirirākau contextual theology. Once we have established the underlying principles, then using a method of theology, we can examine the threads of faith in the Pirirākau story. Stephen Bevans outlines six possible models of contextual theology that each explicate a way to makes sense of the complexity of the Pirirākau story and understand the development of my ancestors’ faith.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation Model</th>
<th>Anthropological (Indigenization/Inculturation) Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Translation Model is insistent that the “essential message of Christianity is supracultural or supracontextual.” 70 The gospel is the unchanging reality around which all else is in flux, “a disposable, nonessential cultural husk.” 71 This particular model posits a “naked gospel” which allows the gospel to stand as “judge of all contexts, even though it seeks to work with and within</td>
<td>The Anthropological Model is founded in a hermeneutic of suspicion that the challenge of the gospel is often “not coming from God as such, but from a tendency of one... contextual perspective to impose its values on another.” 74 This hermeneutic encourages the view that it is most reliable to view God as manifest independently in every culture and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69 R. Schreiter, Constructing Local Theologies. (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1985); 117-21.
70 Bevans, Contextual Theology; 40.
71 Bevans, Contextual Theology; 40.
74 Bevans, Contextual Theology; 54.
The gospel as understood in this model has “four doctrines... (1) that humanity is fallen and is in need of healing and salvation; (2) that... God’s revelation takes place within human history; (3) that the doctrine of the Trinity articulates best what God is truly like and what faith in God means for life in the world; and (4) that Jesus is the Christ... the true meaning of life.”

Implicit in the delivery of the gospel is the idea that all cultures have essentially the same structure, and therefore the gospel will consistently find a point of entry or connection in every culture. This model ignores the reality that from the very outset the gospel message itself has always been delivered to other cultures from a particular cultural context, and historically has struggled to rise above that context. There is no such thing as a naked gospel. The Translation Model provides that most dangerous of theologies: a theology that pretends to have risen above its own history and context.

Consequently the gospel may challenge culture, but the users of the model would be suspicious of an imposition of values rather than an offering of the gospel were there radical alterations to the indigenous culture. Tate’s theology includes the Anthropological Model (as well as the Praxis model):

…there is an inner harmony between the Gospel and any culture in this sense: the potential for a culture to receive the Gospel and express it in its own form has always been there.

This model emphasizes listening to a culture. As a development in theology, it encouraged viewing the person and their experience as central to understanding faith; it affirms the goodness of humanity; and it provides a robust defence of colonised cultures and ethnicities. However it does tend to a cultural romanticism and can be driven from a reaction against a people’s historical experience of a colonising Judeo-Christianity. The hyper-awareness of the
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context in which the gospel is delivered can, at worst, silence the authority of the still, small voice of the gospel to transform that context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Praxis (Liberation/Practical) Model</strong></th>
<th><strong>Countercultural (Contrast) Model</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Praxis Model contends that theology is developed in the practice of Christian identity and formation particularly in impacting and changing society. God, then, is not outside of history and humanity but “in the fabric of culture, but also and perhaps principally in the fabric of history.”[^77] In this model, orthopraxy is more important than orthodoxy. This model of theology is more likely to be removed from scholars, and “generated in the writing of throwaway leaflets, in unrecorded homilies, group discussions, and in people’s hearts.”[^78] The Praxis Model is a practical theology that comes out of the experience of predominantly indigenous and/or oppressed communities and is focused on justice in this world:</td>
<td>In the Countercultural Model, the gospel is not a series of moral principles, but the incarnation of Christ, and an actual series of events that provide us with a revelation of truth against which all cultures and context are measured:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...if it is truly the communication of the gospel it will call radically into question that way of understanding embodied in the language it uses. If it is truly revelation, it will involve contradiction, and call for conversion, for a radical <em>metanoia</em>, a U-turn of the mind.[^81]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therefore Christian communities consciously model themselves as contrast communities with Christian practices, though said Christian communities do this in the world, not apart from the world. This model of theology encounters and engages its context; it is not anti-culture, but the gospel takes the lead with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^77]: Bevans, *Contextual Theology*; 70.
[^78]: Bevans, *Contextual Theology*; 74.
...to know the truth is to do the truth, to know Jesus is to follow Jesus, to know sin is to take away sin, to know suffering is to free the world from suffering, to know God is to go to God in justice.\textsuperscript{79}

The criticism of the detractors and the statements of the practitioners both hold to the view that in this model “any kind of articulation of faith cannot be politically or economically neutral.”\textsuperscript{80}

The difference is the detractors believe this to be a weakness, whereas practitioners believe this merely to be a statement of a historical truth we would be foolish to deny.

\textbf{Synthetic (Semiotic) Model}

Synthetic is used here to indicate a synthesis of the Translation, Anthropological, Praxis and Countercultural models. The basic methodology of this model is openness and dialogue between context and gospel. The model accepts that “every context has both elements that are

\textbf{Transcendental Model}

The Transcendental Model is more concerned with the principle rather than the discipline of theology:

What is important is not so much that a particular theology is produced but that the theologian who is producing it operates as an authentic, converted subject.\textsuperscript{86}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
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\item \textsuperscript{86} Bevans, \textit{Contextual Theology}; 103.
\end{itemize}
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unique to it and elements that are held in common with others”⁸³ whilst affirming that “some features of a culture... are totally neutral; some features of a culture... are clearly good or clearly bad.”⁸⁴ In relation to the gospel, again the Synthetic Model is a both/and approach:

Revelation is both something finished, once and for all, of a particular place – and something ongoing and present, operative in all cultures, and uncircumscribable in every way.⁸⁵

The Synthetic Model does not recognise, adjust and respond to the dominance of the dominant culture in a dialogue in the way that both the Praxis and Countercultural Models attempt. This risks embedding status quo power imbalances. Furthermore, the very openness to dialogue in the model could lead to a mish mash with no synthesis, a weak concession to whatever arises in either the context or the gospel.

Those employing this model are convicted that you have to know your interior world, your view, your reality, to develop a theology that makes sense of the world around us, for as Brendon Lonergan asserts “genuine objectivity is the fruit of authentic subjectivity.”⁸⁷ There are some connections here with the Praxis Model in that the process is a theology that says who I am or we are. The model takes the Incarnation of Christ in flesh to its fullest expression as “the only place where God can reveal Godself truly and effectively is within human experience.”⁸⁸

This is theology for believers; it is suspicious of the outsider’s motives and view. As it takes the Incarnation to its furtherest point, so does it also take cultural relativism. The Transcendental Model relies on an assertion that whatever the culture or context, our minds are identical and therefore we think and process information in the same way. The cultural blindness and projection is breath-taking to say the least.
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Marsden, Shirres and Tate all use the Anthropological Model to develop their theologies. There is never a sense in which the gospel critiques the concepts that underpin their theologies; there is an easy connection that affirms their desire for their faith and their context to be congruent. That is actually no great criticism of these three men; I experience the same desire as does every thoughtful Māori Christian I have met over my life. We want it to fit together. We want our culture, so bereft and abused, to be affirmed by our faith. Yet this may do a disservice to the intellectual and spiritual rigor that our ancestors brought to their engagement with this new faith introduced from overseas. Consequently Māori theologians rarely considered the possibility that Māori contextual theology is syncretic or a dual system. Robert Schreiter identifies four cultural responses to Christianity that lead to either syncretism or dual systems:

1) the signs in Christianity appear similar to the signs in the receiving culture, but are adopted without realising the underlying meanings are different;
2) Christianity provides signs or codes that deal with problems not adequately dealt with in the tradition of the receiving culture;
3) when the receiving culture is under duress and its signs and codes are consequently stressed, whole new sign systems like Christianity can be adopted but the signs become mixed & re-tooled with different meanings; and
4) the signs and codes of Christianity replace the local sign system.

In the Pirirākau history we are to consider, all of these are highly likely. In my conclusion then, I will specifically examine the possibility of Pirirākau contextual theology being syncretic or a dual system. As with an examination of
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the risk of syncretism, so too I will examine in more depth the orthodoxy of a Pirirākau contextual theology in the conclusion. However it is worthwhile remarking that in considering orthodoxy and syncretism I will not be standing with the church in judgement, rather I will stand as a member of Pirirākau. It is our perspective on orthodoxy that is significant in regard to our history, not that of a church tradition brought from overseas. Whilst I value and will use the five criteria outlined above, it is not Christianity who will speak to Pirirākau; it is Pirirākau who will speak to Christianity. I often read theologians who unconsciously speak of ‘Christianity;’ in the main, they do not feel compelled to clearly place themselves and their worldview in relation to a worldwide church because they are unconsciously privileged by their position within mainline denominations in the Minority World.90 The privilege of this Christianity and its theologians impels them to caution; there is no implicit moral authority derived from a position of having resource and power to dictate who the Christ is and how we are to follow Him. Nor is there an implicit moral authority that can be derived from the sacrifice of a few European missionaries in this country in the nineteenth century. We now speak honestly as equals, face to face, unified by the diversity of our faith. The assumption of my research is that Pirirākau can and will speak of our faith not as an outlier to the church, but as a legitimate expression of Christianity and a legitimate interpreter of the message and intent of the gospel in our own right. Consequently the method I will use to pull the threads of that history together is the Praxis Model; I will read our history from the perspective that faith was tied to contact, to colonisation, to the theft of our land, our economy and our society by a rapacious invading empire. If my ancestors carried and developed a theology on that journey of loss and grief, it

90 The Minority World and Majority World is also characterised as the First World and the Third World respectively, developing economies and developed economies, and the South and the North. The use of the term ‘Minority World’ and ‘Majority World’ is a deliberate attempt to address the power imbalances of other terminology by recognising the minority of the world’s population are in the most developed economies.
is on that journey that they encountered the Christ more in the flesh than in the
Word, and on that journey they clung to a theology of liberation. I do them a
disservice to attempt to distance their faith from their context.
The Tākitimu arrived at Te Awaiti, a small channel on the seaside of Mauao in Tauranga Moana on the 28th day or Ōrongonui. Tamatea Arikinui, ariki of the canoe, dived into the ocean and placed an atua called Uenukurangi or Kahukura at the base of Tirikawa Rock. Upon surfacing, he performed an uruuruwhenua rite, a ceremony on entering new territory. After Tirikawa, Tamatea Arikinui went to the harbour side of Mauao and built a tuahu [altar] at Waipatukākahu where he placed the stones hukatai and rehutai and offered karakia. These two stones carried the mauri of the wānanga that he had brought from the Whare Wānanga in Taputapuatea in Rangiātea. These initial actions are “the reason we’re still here today.” By deliberately connecting the tapu and mana of the atua wawao of Rangiātea with the land of Tauranga Moana, Tamatea Arikinui built an enduring relationship in which atua from his ancestors and this new land enhanced the tapu and mana of his children and descendents. He then reinforced this by marriage to Toto, a descendent of Toi te Hautahi, the eponymous ancestor of the Matāatua canoe, which ensured all of his children and descendents would have a direct descent from, and therefore the tapu and mana of both whakapapa. Tapu, mana, whakapapa and whakawhanaungatanga are the key theological concepts that allow us to understand the enduring theology of the connection between Pirirākau and
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their atua take and atua wawao that was theirs from this first arrival in the eleventh century up until they first encountered the Roman Catholic missionaries in 1839.

Mapping a Pirirākau cosmology to discover the pre-Christian theology is a fraught exercise. My interviewees were not aware of a Pirirākau or Ngāti Ranginui cosmology that was still in existence, nor could they recall their parents or elders speaking of such knowledge. Tawharangi Nuku recalls:

> Ten years ago at a Te Arataki Manu Kōrero Wānanga, I posed the question to Tauranga Moana kaumātua, if there was a traditional Māori cosmology story for our rohe. To my surprise, none were aware of any cosmology traditions. My parents, akin to those kaumātua present were raised immersed in marae tikanga and kawa and fluent in Te Reo Māori and yet they too, were unaware of Māori cosmology.⁹⁷

In considering the retention of oral and written knowledge, Dr Yates-Smith comments that those waiata, karakia and mythos “...have probably survived because they did not threaten the dogma and ethos of the Christian church.”⁹⁸ The insinuation is that a significant body of ‘threatening’ knowledge was deliberately destroyed or faded by omission. The search for a pre- or early colonisation form of Tauranga Moana cosmological knowledge is perhaps a fool’s task. The knowledge seems to be either gone or manifestly transformed by the arrival of other epistemologies and hegemonies that were adopted, rejected and/or manipulated by our ancestors in Pirirākau. It is a common assertion on the marae today that our current practices are the practices of ‘the old people’; a comforting lie which enables “men [to] make their own history, that what they can know is what they have made.”⁹⁹ This stands out in an
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overbearing patriarchal machismo on our marae, an unconscious misogyny. Today the inclusion of the feminine in Pirirākau is often jarring and in servitude, whilst we hold a contrary acceptance that “woman are conduits between the physical and spiritual world, at birth delivering the body into Te Aotūroa, and with death, releasing it into te Pō to join the multitude of ancestors again.” So whilst the feminine in the pōwhiri and tangihanga today is ritualism that allows only for background leadership roles, it is suggestive of greater balance in the ira tangata prior to colonisation, though this is difficult to evidence.

I will propose a greater role for atua wāhine in our cosmology than would be commonly accepted in Pirirākau. I do this on the basis that the retained knowledge and tradition about the Tākitimu canoe names atua wāhine who are instrumental in its creation, launching, journey and arrival, and none of these are secondary or subservient roles. I also propose that the knowledgable experts of te ira wāhine and therefore the appropriate actors in interactions with atua wāhine were ruahine. “The term ruahine applies to a woman of high rank, usually the eldest daughter... who possessed knowledge of karakia and ritual behaviour which enabled her to carry out her tasks among her people.... The ruahine was past childbearing age and the restrictions of menstruation, or was childless.” This is not a commonly used term in Tauranga Moana today (though it is certainly known to fluent speakers of te reo Māori and kuia/kaumātua) and the role is no longer fulfilled. Interestingly I am personally aware of two kuia from Tauranga Moana who live outside of the region who could be considered to be fulfilling the role of ruahine in other iwi: one in leading the revitalisation of the community visions of Te Whiti o Rongomai and

100 A. Hanson, “Female pollution in Polynesia?” JPS 91; 356-7.
101 Cf. Yates-Smith, Hine! E Hine!; 221.
102 Yates-Smith, Hine! E Hine!; 163.
103 Yates-Smith, Hine! E Hine!; 161.
Tohu Kakahi at Parihaka; and the other in re-discovering Māori funeral knowledge and practices.

It is obvious from the outset that to consider our atua as making a contribution to any systematic theology requires some way to delineate the relations between atua, to the environment and to people. Elsdon Best provides a cosmological hierarchy from Io as the progenitor to departmental gods as originating beings, tribal gods and finally ancestors.\(^{104}\) As with other early writers, Best uses the word atua to describe these beings and translates this word as god. Our earliest Māori-English dictionaries define atua as “god, demon, supernatural being, ghost”\(^{105}\) and missionaries, at their innovative best, just capitalised the word to Atua to denote the Judeo-Christian God. These definitions and re-definitions are something of a misnomer, because they carried a weight of Catholic and Protestant theology that the Māori word did not denote. For example, in Tauranga Moana, atua was used for ancestors. Rather than tūpuna or tīpuna for ancestors, I understand that in the Tauranga Moana dialect it was previously common to refer to tūpuna as atua.\(^{106}\) Re-examining the word provides some clarity to how it came to be used for such a variety of ideas: ‘a’ can mean belonging to or of; ‘tua’ is a locative that means beyond or the other side or apart. So an atua is basically something or someone that is from that place which is beyond us in our physical reality; hence the sense of being a divine being or an ancestor. This is significant as there is no sense in which the word ‘atua’ conveys the characteristics of the mana or power and authority of a being from beyond. Hence the need to provide some sort of division to those things that may be considered atua. Best’s hierarchy from Io as the progenitor to departmental gods as originating beings, tribal gods and

\(^{104}\) E. Best, Some aspects of Maori myth and religion (Wellington: Government Printer: 1954); 23.
\(^{106}\) R. Te Mete, personal communication, 2014.
finally ancestors was a division based primarily on how widely known the different atua were, excepting the knowledge of Io who Best considered fulfilled his quest to find a recognisably monotheistic centre to indigenous cosmology. In my reading, his hierarchy of four divisions has been universally accepted up until the present time by all writers, including indigenous theologians such as Pā Hēnare Tate. Whilst I consider his hierarchy Eurocentric and self-serving, a division does serve a useful purpose in providing clarity. However I suggest a simpler division and eschew the hierarchy as without justification.

I propose a division between originating beings, atua take, and interventionist deities, atua wawao. ‘Take’ in this sense means to originate, derive or cause. ‘Wawao’ means to ward off or defend, which I use to indicate intervention. The other possibility I considered was ‘waenga,’ but this tends to refer to intervening in this sense of locating oneself between things. The division between atua take and atua wawao is that our ancestors had an expectation they could direct, manipulate and beseech atua wawao to act in certain ways if appropriate and correct processes were followed. They had no such expectation that human interaction would impact on the actions of atua take, but saw the atua wawao as mediators in the relationships with atua take. A note of caution: our Judeo-Christian heritage means that we tend to presume an interventionist god is intervening for our good and benefit; atua wawao did not always do so, were not expected to do so, and consequently trickery and deceit of atua wawao was an expected and appropriate practice in our relationship with them. Let me emphasize, the division between atua take and atua wawao is without

\[107\] Best’s hierarchy is almost an exact match for Medieval Christian cosmological hierarchies. It is self-serving in that Best desired people view Māori as an Indo-Aryan offshoot (Cf. Holman, Best of both worlds; 233-44), and his proposed hierarchy again enforces his anthropological idea that whilst a dying, stone age culture, Māori were still distantly connected to the ‘superior’ Aryan races.
hierarchy; their relationship to each other is a spiritual whakapapa; the whakapapa explains the dispersal and inheritance of power and authority, or mana, amongst the various atua, but does not seek to measure mana, as a hierarchy would intend.

This chapter begins by considering the relevance of an Io tradition to Pirirākau as part of the Tākitimu knowledge. I will examine the three traditions of iwi with close whakapapa ties to Pirirākau, and then comment on how this may or may not be a foundation knowledge for our cosmology. I will then move to consider the range of writings about the atua wawao who were carried aboard the Tākitimu on its journey to Tauranga Moana. I will begin by suggesting a cosmology from Kāi Tahu that provides a whakapapa for our atua wawao, and then propose the likely Pirirākau and Ngāti Ranginui atua wawao. I will examine each of these atua wawao in relation to their role in the navigation of the Tākitimu canoe, and where possible comment on their development once here in Tauranga Moana and Aotearoa New Zealand. Finally, I will examine the other objects carried on the Tākitimu and how they are also connected into the whakapapa of the atua take and the atua wawao. The chapter closes with some reflections of the possibility of identifying a Pirirākau cosmology and then a proposal for the pre-Christian theology of Pirirākau in 1839.

IO MATUA KORE

Io Matua Kore is a fluid concept generally defined as the originating creative being in Māori cosmologies; the name is quite simply the highest being who is without a parent. There are between five and seven iwi with some record of Io that all date from the mid to late nineteenth century. Frustratingly, as with all records from the period of the mid to late nineteenth century, a hermeneutic to read a Māori historical record is an intractable problem because of an inability to ascertain the reliability of sources, the traces of missionary influence that pervade Māori thought, and the agendas, known and unknown, of the scribes
and editors. Three of those iwi are directly connected with the Tākitimu canoe or Pirirākau: Ngāti Kahungunu; Waikato; and Kāi Tahu.

NGĀTI KAHUNGUNU

The Ngāti Kahungunu Io written tradition derives from Percy Stephenson Smith’s *The Lore of the Whare Wānanga*. Te Whatahoro’s writings brought the idea of a deity of strikingly similar characteristics to the Judeo-Christian God into common and academic parlance through his influence on Elsdon Best. Io has many features of the pre-exodus God of the Temple in Jerusalem: his name is never spoken openly; he is attended by a priestly class; he demands sacrifices of worship and atonement. Te Whatahoro’s influence on Best was the confidence shown in Te Whatahoro by Best’s mentor Stephenson Percy Smith. Whilst I will not consider this development in any depth, it is important to note that Best’s heavy, uncritical reliance on and identification with Tūtakangahau and Te Whatahoro seems influenced by a desire amongst anthropologists in the nineteenth century to find something like Io, the “holy grail” that demonstrated the “theological equivalencies in both peoples.” 108 Best proposes a re-tooled Medieval Christian cosmology couched in the language of the Io tradition, and then applies it to all tāngata whenua in Aotearoa New Zealand. *The Lore of the Whare Wānanga* may “not necessarily represent the tribal tradition in 1865.” Nevertheless, “it is an oral tradition approved by a responsible body of elders” 109 in the early twentieth century.

108 Holman, *Best of both worlds*; 258.
**WAIKATO**

Early written material for an Io tradition in Waikato derives from John White’s *The Ancient History of the Maori*.110 One of his key sources was Reverend Richard Taylor who was writing in 1852:

> Their chief god was Io. He was the creator of heaven and earth. *E lo e, rangi tapapa mai e koe a taua tama, ko te whakarongorongo i raro i to tawhito tapa rongo nui a Rangi ka tokoto Rangi ki te ahu Rangi*. This was the beginning of a karakia addressed to Io in the *hahunga tupapaku* and afterwards another was addressed to Tiorea (the *mokai* servant of Uenuku), an ancestor. Uenukuatu was once a man and afterwards became a god. Io made the heavens and the earth and Tiki.111

In addition to the notebooks of Reverend Taylor, the other Waikato evidence for an Io written tradition comes from Pei Te Hurinui, a Waikato historian who wrote a biography of the first Māori king, Potatau Te Wherohero.112 He cites the Io karakia used by Te Tapihana in the raising up ritual for the King in 1859: “E Io! e Rangi! tapa mai ra ia ta taua tama.”113 He asserts that Te Tapihana was “a High Priest of the ancient Io (Supreme Being) cult of the Tainui tribes.”114

**KĀI TAHU**

Finally, Herries Beattie provides written evidence for the Io tradition for Kāi Tahu. He recorded the material of Teone Taare Tikao of Banks Peninsula in 1920. Tikao was a tohunga and a recognised expert in Kāi Tahu culture and belief. According to Tikao’s creation story:

> At the conclusion of the Po ages, Io, the Supreme God, brought the sky (Rangi-nui or Rangi) and land (Papa-tuā-nuku or Papa) into being. Io was the supreme

---

113 Jones, *Potatau*; 224.  
114 Jones, *Potatau*; 225.
god of the Maori. He is far and away the greatest of our many gods, and it was through his act of creation that the other gods appeared.¹¹⁵

The evidence of these three iwi, indeed the evidence overall for an Io written tradition, has been vigorously rebutted by other Māori historians and leaders. Te Rangi Hiroa, Sir Peter Buck wrote that the discovery of a supreme God named Io was “a surprise to Māori and pakeha alike.” He was suspicious and critical of the role of Percy Smith and Elsdon Best and other Pākehā anthropologists noting that “it is amazing what a mass of secret information was alleged to have been locked away in the minds of cautious Christians who but awaited the inquiry of sympathetic seekers to unloose the floodgates of memory.” He considered the Io version of the separation of light from darkness, the division of the waters, and the creation of the earth to be “too reminiscent of similar episodes in the first chapter of Genesis.”¹¹⁶ Buck posits the idea that the name Io is the same as ‘iho,’ meaning ‘core,’ and such was probably the name that was selected for a supreme god who was to be the core or heart of all things.¹¹⁷ In 1993, Anglican Bishop Muru Walters rejected the tradition of Io, claiming: “The invention of a supreme god Io was a response to the political, social and economic circumstances of the times.” Other than an analysis very similar to Buck, he connects his rebuttal with the knowledge and recollections of his own ancestors, noting “the supreme god Io which was developed about the late nineteenth century was not known by my elders’, my parents’, my uncles’ and my aunts’ tribes. It was developed by a few Maori of the Kahungunu tribe.”¹¹⁸

¹¹⁵ H. Beattie, Tikao Talks: Ka Taoka Tapu O Te Ao Kohatu—Treasures from the Ancient World of the Maori/Told by Teone Taare Tikao to Herries Beattie (Dunedin: Reed, 1939), 24.
¹¹⁶ Hiroa, Coming of the Māori; 526.
¹¹⁷ Hiroa, Coming of the Māori; 444.
¹¹⁸ M. Walters, "Io - Where From? Written Evidence" (Pacific Region Religious Liberty Congress; 1993).
As with Walters, I am aware of no evidence for an Io tradition in our own tradition amongst Pirirākau and Ngāti Ranginui, nor was it volunteered by my interviewees. The evidence for an Io written tradition in our relatives of Ngāti Kahungunu, Waikato and Kāi Tahu is debatable, particularly with the role of scribe and editor played by Pākehā anthropologists who clearly desired to discover just such a tradition. However, I also need to note that this tradition has now been thoroughly integrated into those tribes’ knowledge and whakapapa and many in those iwi would argue vigorously for it being a genuine pre-contact oral tradition. It has been integrated because traditions evolve to meet the needs of the current context, and the Io written tradition does this for many who hold both a Christian faith and a commitment to pursuing ‘genuine’ Māori cultural practice and knowledge. By way of example, an educator at our son’s kōhanga reo is currently enrolled in a tertiary course specifically designed to impart aspects of Tākitimu and Ngāti Kahungunu identity to tribal members; the course text is Percy Smith’s translation and redaction of Te Whatahoro’s *The Lore of the Whare Wānanga*. Perhaps the truth or otherwise of the Io tradition is a debate that need not be concluded; the debate concerns whether an Io tradition contributes to the decolonisation and revitalisation of our tribal and collective identity and knowledge. Whilst I am convinced that there are echoes of our past Tākitimu cosmogony, the cosmogony we create today from what we know and what we need is eminently more important. I am not convinced the Io tradition is a necessary or reliable foundation to our own search today.119

**NGĀ ATUA O TĀKITIMU**

Uncovering our own Pirirākau atua wawao and atua take is an investigation that returns to the beginning of our Pirirākau and Ngāti Ranginui whakapapa;

the launching of the Tākitimu canoe on its journey to Tauranga Moana. It is widely assumed in our oral tradition that the Tākitimu came from the Cook Islands. The connections between Tauranga Moana and the Cook Islands are compelling; one of the three districts on Rarotonga is called Tākitimu; on Aitutaki is a wāhi tapu that is purported to be the herenga waka of the Tākitimu canoe once it was launched. In the modern era with the return of the technology and navigation techniques for waka hourua, the journey between the Cook Islands and Tauranga Moana has now been made numerous times. Finally, there are shared whakapapa connections in the modern era; ironically, many of these started with the travels and relationships of Pākehā ancestors between our two islands. Alternatively, Haare Te Piahana, a respected elder of Tauranga Moana, proposes the Tākitimu came from Tahiti in his writings; whether he means the current islands of Tahiti or the traditional use of the name Tahiti to refer to somewhere very distant (‘tawhiti’ is the Māori word for distant) is not explained. The various recorders of a Tākitimu tradition here and in the Cook Islands predominantly refer to atua wawao in relation to the Tākitimu.

The most extensive cosmology outlining a whakapapa between atua take and atua wawao in the Tākitimu tradition comes from Matiaha Tiramōrehu. In this cosmology, the whakapapa begins with four uncreated divinities: night and darkness; light; the cosmos without form, the void; and the expanse of the heavens.

---

120 Piahana, papers; 15.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Night and Darkness</th>
<th>Light</th>
<th>The Void</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Te Pō</td>
<td>Te Ata</td>
<td>Te Kore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Pō-toki</td>
<td>Te Ao-tū-roa</td>
<td>Te Kore-tuatahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Pō-terea</td>
<td>Te Ao-mārama</td>
<td>Te Kore-tuarua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Pō-whāwhā</td>
<td>Whaitua</td>
<td>Kore-nui</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Te Mangu and Mahorahora-nui-a-Rangi (the great expanse of the heavens) came four children:

- Toko-mua
- Toko-roto
- Toko-pā
- Rangi-pōtiki

From Toko-mua came all of the atua take related to the air and winds:

- Tū-awhio-nuku
- Tū-awhio-rangi
- Paroro-tea
- Hau-tuia
- Hau-ngangana
- Ngana
- Ngana-nui
- Ngana-roa
- Ngana-rūrū
- Ngana-mawaki
- Tapa-huru-kiwi
Tapa-huru-manu

Humanity traces descent through Tiki, a descendent of Tapa-huru-manu and an ancestor of Toi Te Huatai, an eponymous ancestor of Tamatea Arikinui and therefore Pirirākau.

From Toko-roto came all the atua take related to the heavens:

- Rangi-nui
- Rangi-roa
- Rangi-pōuri
- Rangi-pōtango
- Rangi-whetū-mā
- Rangi-whekere
  - Ao-nui
  - Ao-roa
  - Ao-tara
  - Urupā
  - Hoehoe
  - Puhaorangi

From Toko-pā came Kohu (the mist) who married Te Ika-roa (the Milky Way). These two gave birth to Ngā Whetū (the stars).

Finally, Rangi-pōtiki had three partners, the first of which was Hine-ahu-papa; from her descended the atua take of the sky:

- Tū-nuku
- Tū-rangi
- Tama-i-koropao
  - Haronga

Haronga’s partner was Tongo-tongo and their children were a son and daughter, Te Rā (the sun) and Marama (the moon). As Haronga perceived there was no light for his daughter Marama, he gave Te Kohu in marriage to Te Ikaroa so that their
children, Ngā Whetū would provide light. Tiramōrehu gave “Ngā tokorua a Tongotongo” as a proverbial term for the Sun and Moon.

Rangi-potiki’s second partner was Papatūānuku. She gave birth to the following, well-known atua take:

- Rehua
- Rongo
- Tangaroa
- Tahu
- Punga and Here (twins)
- Hua
- Ari
- Nukumera & Rango-maraeroa (twins)
  - Marere-o-tonga
  - Takataka-pūtea
  - Tū-matauenga
  - Tū-pōtiki

Tangaroa is the ancestor of all fish and also pounamu,122 which Tiramōrehu included in a class with fish. Tangaroa’s partner was Te Anu-matao (the chilly cold), from whom descended:

- Te Whata-ui-ra-a-tangaroa
- Te Whatukura
- Poutini
- Te Pounamu

Rangi-pōtiki’s third partner was Papa. Tangaroa is purported to have had an affair with Papa. Incensed, Rangi-pōtiki attacked Tangaroa, but was wounded in the

122 In Tauranga Moana oral tradition, Pounamu was originally an aquatic people who come into conflict with the land based Tuhua people. Pounamu is defeated in a series of battles and driven away from the Bay of Plenty by the Tuhua, pursued and forced into hiding themselves in the Arahura River on the West Coast of the South Island. There they transform themselves into stone.
exchange. Whilst Rangi-pōtiki lay wounded he had nine children whose names all track stages of his recovery from the wound:

Kueo
Mimi-ahi
Tane-tuturi
Tane-pepeki
Tane-ua-tika
Tane-ua-ha
Tane-te-waiora
Tane-nui-a-Rangi
Paea

In this tradition, it is Tane-nui-a-rangi who co-operated with his other siblings to separate Rangi-pōtiki and Papa, lifting Rangi-pōtiki on the back of his daughter Paea and then establishing him in the heavens using two props called Tokohurunuku and Tokohururangi. As we will see below, there are obvious and implied connections in the names and the characteristics between these atua take and the atua wawao carried on the Tākitimu canoe.

Manu Te Pere, a significant Tauranga Moana kaumātua of the twentieth century, is recorded by Gregory Tata as having named the atua on the Tākitimu as “Arai-te-uru, Hinekotea, Hinemakehu, Harua-tai, Hinekorito, Hinehuru-huru. Arai-te-uru was a sea god. Hinekotea, Hinemakehu and Hinekorito were women (moon maidens).... Tutara kauika and Te Wehenga-kauki... represented ocean monsters such as octopus and whales which surrounded Takitimu.”¹²³ Manu Te Pere records some of the tohunga on the canoe was Kohupara, Tupai, Rongopatahi and Ruawharo, and assigns specific roles in relation to atua wawao: “Kohupara and Tupai’s final duties were to take care of the gods, closing their vessel at night and re-opening again

---

during the day. Rongopatahi and Ruawharo as priests were to attend to the requests of these gods.”

According to Tūtakangahau, Te Rongo-patahi, Ruawharo, Tupai (teina o Ruawharo), Kohupara, Kaewa, Puhi-whanake, Mokinokino, Whatuira were the tohunga on the canoe. Each tohunga had their own taumanu and Tamatea-ariki-nui sat upon two. Kahukura, Rongomai, Tunui-o-te-ika, Ruamano, Hine-kōrako, and Tuhinapo were the atua carried on Takitimu in seven carved wooden tahā. Each evening the tahā were closed, and during the day opened for the spiritual mediums. Kohupara and Tupai were experts in getting the greatest speed out of the canoe. Kawea was responsible for the sacred fires and tools associated with those fires. Puhi-whanake and Whatuira were experts in the stars, constellations and navigation. Both worked through the night and slept during the day. Kohupara and Tupai were also responsible for the care and opening of the tahā of the atua. Mokinokino was responsible for fishing and feeding the tohunga. Finally Rongo-patahi and Ruawharo were responsible for releasing, directing and interceding with the atua from their confinement.

Te Whatahoro provides an alternate account in which Ruamano and Ārai-te-uru guided the vessel forward, Hine-korito, Hine-kotea, Hine-makehu, and Hine-huruuhuru sheltered it, whilst the taniwha Te Wehenga kauki, Rua-riki and Maurea increased the speed of the canoe. Other atua that Te Whatahoro claimed to have been on the vessel were Tunui-e-te-Ika, Te Pō Tuatini, and Moko.

Hare Hongi divides the atua into atua with responsibility for the sky, for the land and for the sea. He records the atua on the Tākitimu responsible for the sky as Kahukura, Tama-i-waho, Motipua, Tu-nui-o-te-ika, Tu korako, Te Pō Tuatini, and

124 Tata, Takitimu; 27.
125 Best 1976, Māori Religion; 407-9. NB Tutakangakau probably provided these addenda; Cf. Holman for a fuller examination of him.
126 J. Mitchell, Takitimu (Christchurch: Cadsonbury 2013); 35.
Hine-pukohurangi, who had authority over the sky, the sun, the moon, the stars, the wind, the rain, the mist, and the seasons. He records the atua responsible for the land as Ruāūmoko, Puamano, Houmea, Hakikino, Te Oi, Te Ririo, and Tarakumukumumu, who have authority over people, animals, land, mountains, hills, trees, food, work, birds, and rivers. He records the atua responsible for the sea as Ruamano, Ara-i-te-uru, Tutara-kauika, Houmea, Te Petipeti, Te Panga hua, Tai-mounu, and Tane-rakahia as responsible for the sea, the seaweed, fish, shellfish, whales, dolphins and waves.127

I suggest the likely atua wawao that Tauranga Moana associated with the Tākitimu were: Ārai-te-uru; Hine Huruhuru; and Tunui o te Ika. Strong possibilities of atua wawao were: Hine-kōrako; Hinekorito; Hinekotea; Hinemakehu; Kahukura; Ruamano; Te Wehenga Kauika; Te Pō Tuatini; and Tutara Kauika. I also include Haurua Tai. Even though there is only one reference, it is a Tauranga Moana reference and is not mentioned elsewhere, suggesting it is locally generated. Other than the name, there are no records of Haurua Tai. I have been led to conclude that the above are the likely or possible atua wawao for Tauranga Moana either because they feature in cosmologies written by Tauranga Moana sources or there is broad agreement across all sources on the names and characteristics. I believe each of these atua wawao originally featured as a tool for the navigation of Tākitimu; this is not to say that their only role was in navigation, but rather that the mana of atua wawao was tied to their utility over circumstances and environment. I have grouped them by their likely roles in navigation below, and where appropriate included an explanation of the differing role they can be evidenced playing amongst iwi in Aotearoa New Zealand after their arrival on the Tākitimu. Finally, every stage of the carving, dedication, launching and journey of Tākitimu was a complexity of karakia and ritual. Some of those karakia as provided by Manu Te Pere are reproduced in

full in Appendix One and demonstrate the connection between atua wawao and the practical success of the Tākitimu journey.

NGĀ WHETŪ | STARS

Ngā Whetū are the children of Kohu and Te Ika-roa, the descendents of Toko-pā. Their regular orbit in the night sky provided a reliable star compass to the canoe navigator when planning a journey whilst still on land.\(^{128}\)

![Image of a star chart](image1)

Figure 3: A star compass provided by Mohi Turei (Best, Astronomical Knowledge)

However the key to any journey was the mapping of a star path, “a series of stars that either rise or set in the same part of the horizon.... [that] are usually employed when they are still low in the sky, as it can be difficult to judge the exact spot they have cut the horizon once they begin to climb high.”\(^{129}\) Ten to 12 stars were normally regarded as sufficient for a successful journey, though as few as four were used in some instances. Our current modern navigators use Te waka o Tamarereti as a star path. I believe the characteristics I describe below imply that these atua wawao Ārai-te-uru, Tūtara Kauika and Te Wehenga Kauki are stars on the Tākitimu’s star path.

---


\(^{129}\) J. Evans, *The Discovery of Aotearoa* (Auckland: Reed, 1998); 62.
whilst Ruamano is perhaps a name for a star compass. This is supported by Jeff Evans, who explains:

In light of the need to use stars irregularly spaced about the horizon... the reference to taniwha swimming in front of, to the side of and behind the Takitimu... may lend further strength to the argument that some of the taniwha named in this tradition could be the names of navigation stars.

Evans proposes that Te Kohurau, the cave in which many of the atua wawao that boarded Tākitimu were stored, is a name for a star path. Tākitimu has amongst the most extensive list of navigation stars associated with their journey that remains available to us today:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>navigation stars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atutahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tautoru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karewa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takurua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meremere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meremere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matariki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamarereti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Ika-Roa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ĀRAI-TE-URU

Translation: To obstruct the west wind
Ārai: to obstruct or hinder
Te Uru: the west, the west wind

Ārai-te-uru is recorded by Hare Hongi in his account of the Tākitimu as one of the “divinities of the ocean,” grouped with Ruamano, Tutara-kauika and other “fish and monster deities”.

---
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Te Whatahoro also confirmed this connection between Ārai-te-uru and Ruamano in protecting the Tākitimu on its journey. Elsdon Best provided more detail from Tūtakangahau on their whakapapa as removed from “the *ira tangata*” and with specific tasks as atua wawao in “assisting distressed mariners and deep-sea voyagers.” Margaret Orbell claims Ārai-te-uru is a taniwha who gave birth to eleven taniwha upon her arrival at Hokianga Whakapau Karakia and is the guardian of that harbour. Ārai-te-uru is also recorded by John White as the canoe that brought ancestors Kirikiri-ka-tata, Aroarokaehi, Mangaatu, Aoraki, Kakeroa, Te Horookoatu, Ritua, Ngamaautaurua, Pokohiwitahi, Puketapu, Te Maro-tiri-a-te-rehu, Hikuroroa, Pahatea, Te Waioteao, and Hapekituaraki to the South Island. The canoe remains at Matakaea. As noted in the whakapapa of Kāi Tahu tohunga Matiaha Tiramōrehu, Hotumamoe, the progenitor of Kāti Mamoe, traces ancestry to the Ārai-te-uru canoe. In Tiramōrehu’s cosmology, all fish are the offspring of the children of Tangaroa and Te Anu-matao, and stars come from the partnership of Kohu and Te Ika-roa. Te Ika-roa is an old name for the Milky Way, and can be translated as the long fish or the multitude of the slain. The evidence from the variety of authorities briefly covered here, particularly Tiramōrehu’s specific whakapapa reference link the image of fish in the sea and the vast expanse of stars in the sky; on that basis I also infer that Ārai-te-uru and the other fish deities represent key stars on the star path to Tauranga Moana.
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There are few specific records of Te Wehenga Kauki and Tūtara Kauika, yet Tūtara Kauika is a very well known name in Tauranga Moana and is currently the name of one of our leading kapa haka groups who took the stage in Te Matatini 2015, Tūtara Kauika ki Rangataua (see Figure 4). They were both represented as whales and were said to have traveled beside the Tākitimu on its voyage to Aoteroa. Figure 5 is a sketch done by Timi Waata that shows both whales in relation to another, later story about the Ngāti Awa tohunga Te Tahi O Te Rangi who escaped being marooned on Whakaari Island. He had been marooned because he was renowned to have control of the weather yet tended to inconvenience his tribe with floods. When he was left on the island he called on Tūtara Kauika and Te Wehenga Kauki to carry him back to the mainland, arriving before those who had
marooned him, much to their chagrin. Tūtakangahau emphasized that they did “not possess any portion of the *ira tangata*...; they remain apart as a different folk” and that their role as “giants and *taniwha* of the deep... [was] assisting distressed mariners and deep-sea voyagers.” Te Wehenga Kauki as a pod of whales and Tūtara Kauika as the leader of a pod are an obvious pairing and explains why they are frequently spoken of together. Interestingly, whale pods are a matriarchy, so Tūtara Kauika is a matriarch. In relation to the journey of the Tākitimu canoe, I infer that Tūtara Kauika and Te Wehenga Kauki, along with Ārai-te-uru represent key stars on the star path to Tauranga Moana. Stars are indeed an assistance to “distressed mariners and deep-sea voyagers,” providing a path home, so their comparison to whales as protectors and guardians, the giants of the sea, strikes me as appropriate.
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RUAMANO

Recorded as a whale and/or a taniwha, Ruamano is said to have accompanied the Tākitimu on its journey to Aotearoa. Ruamano was the offspring of Tūtara Kauika and his role was “the saving of shipwrecked people and guarding vessels.” Ruamano is also recorded as one of the atua wawao who was included in the ritual prior to the departure of the canoe having been “carried out of a cave called Kohurau” in Hawaiki. He and his sister Hinekōrako are guardian taniwha of Ngāti Hinehika of Ngāti Kahungunu, where he was responsible for carving out the Ruakituri River on his way down from the Huiaura Ranges. In relation to the journey of the Tākitimu, the connection of Ruamano with Tūtara Kauika and also Te Wehenga Kauki may point to this atua wawao being another of the stars on the star path. If we accept the familial connection to Tūtara Kauika the inference again relates this atua wawao with the stars. The etymology of the name which refers to a multitude or an infinite number also leads me to suggest that this atua wawao could alternatively be another name for a particular star compass.
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The mathematics and physics of the rainbow are shudderingly complex. Suffice to say the exact nature of any rainbow – including moon or lunar bows – is a combination of reflection, refraction, interference and diffraction theories that rely on an understanding of light, water droplets and our own eyesight and perception of colour.143 Rainbows have stunned people for thousands of years and taken significance reflecting their miraculous appearance. For example, in Aotearoa New Zealand, “[i]n some cases it is a sign of death. If it appears incomplete, or of a pale appearance, it is a portent of evil. If a war expedition sees such a bow before it, then the party returns home. Other signs pertain to storms and rain.”144 All iwi have a rainbow tradition, personified as Kahukura (or Tahaereora), Uenuku (or Uenukurangi and Uenuku-kai-tangata), Haere (variously Haera-a-Tautu, Haerewaewae, and Here-kohiko), and Pou-te-aniwaniwa.145 Kahukura is a highly significant atua wawao because the rainbow was a key navigation tool for Tākitimu. When Tākitimu sailed to Tauranga Moana they followed the instructions of Kupe to travel in November when food was plentiful and sail to the left of the setting sun. This latter instruction is the ideal condition to create rainbows. The rainbow in this instance would have been behind the canoe, putting the canoe between the sun and rainbow.

KAHUKURA

Kahukura is one of two entities connected with the Tākitimu tradition that are widely known and included in other traditions amongst iwi in Aotearoa New Zealand. Carried from the aforementioned Kohurau, during the journey of the canoe Tūtakangahau claims that he “was sent to stand on high as a guide-mark, and the prow of ‘Takitimu’ was laid on him. As night fell, Kahukura returned to the stern of ‘Takitimu’”.¹⁴⁶ His role is greatly expanded in the Reed Book of Māori Mythology, though the mix of iwi traditions does not contribute to an understanding of a tradition from Tauranga Moana:

Standing with one foot on land and the other on the ocean, Kahukura spanned earth and sea, and was a guide to the canoe voyagers on their long voyage to Aotearoa. During the daylight hours he went before the canoe, but when night fell he took his place at the stern, while his sister Hinekōrako, who was a pale, luminous arch, went in front....

Kahukura persuaded his mother, Hinetōwai, to stand as a bridge between Hawaiki and Aotearoa, with her feet in the homeland and her arms supporting her in the new land across the sea. He also placed his father, Rongomai, on her to strengthen the arch, whereupon Kahukura and a companion walked across from the old land to the new. Kahukura was known in Rarotonga and different traditions state that he made the voyage to Aotearoa in the Aotea and the Takitimu canoes respectively.¹⁴⁷

What is clear across all references to Kahukura is that he was key to the navigation of the canoe. His appearance is a rainbow, which has led to some speculation that “Uenuku [common in other iwi cosmology] and Kahukura are the same god”.

Kahukura was a well known atua wawao whose influence was apparent across
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many aspects of life. In times of war, “if his rainbow appeared in the path of a taua it was an unfavourable omen, but if it appeared behind or to one side of the warriors, the portents were favourable.” In the management of weather, “if rain was not wanted, the tohunga addressed the god in an insulting manner. He was easily deceived, and being offended by their words, would withhold rain”. Te Mātorohanga, as reported by Te Whatahoro, also links Kahukura with Tākitimu whakapapa in his account of Iwipūpū and Uenukurangi, whom he asserts is also known as Kahukura. Deceived into thinking Uenukurangi was her partner Tamatea, Iwipūpū became pregnant and gave birth to a daughter, Uenuku-titi. Kahukura is the only atua wawao who is also an ancestor included in Tākitimu whakapapa. In oral tradition in Tauranga Moana, Uenukurangi (that is Kahukura), represented by a mauri stone, was carried by Tamatea Arikinui beneath the waves of Te Awaiti to the bottom of Tirikawa rock upon the arrival of the Tākitimu canoe to Tauranga Moana.

**TE MARAMA | THE MOON & LUNAR BOWS**

The moon functions as both a calendar and the arbiter of appropriate life actions throughout Aotearoa New Zealand. Elsdon Best asserts that a journey was not measured by the days, but the nights: “Pō hia koe ki te ara?” [how many nights have you been traveling?] The references to atua wawao associated with the moon on the Tākitimu are a track of the nights journeyed and also about the transmission of the knowledge of the nights and the months of the year, the maramataka, from Rangiātea to Tauranga Moana. Indeed, this is the most enduring legacy of that journey that remains amongst Pirirākau:

> There was a very intimate knowledge around nature’s signs that would indicate the type of season we would have. This was a knowledge my Mum had through her adherence to maramataka (passed down from her Mum and elders) and the phases
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of the moon…. to determine when to weed, plant, cut hair and toe nails and even to predict which days were the best for lighting fires….

Whilst the link to these atua wawao has been extinguished, as with Chrissie Rolleston, my other interviewees all commented that their parents’ generation based all of their actions, from gardening, to fishing, to diving, to personal hygiene, to rubbish disposal on the maramataka. Best provides a collection of the lists of the nights of the month and the months of the year, including lists from a “Kahungunu source.” In addition, Kerekau, the son of my Pirirākau ancestor Maungapōhatu from the nineteenth century, wrote a maramataka in his journal. Below is a comparison between the Kahungunu source and Kerekau which provides an insight into both the Tākitimu maramataka and how this varied between regions. Colin Maungapōhatu Bidois, who as a boy lived both in Tauranga Moana and in the Urewera, suggests the variation reflects both environmental factors and regional wording:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kerekau</th>
<th>“Kahungunu source”</th>
<th>Expectations for the Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Tirea</td>
<td>2. Tirea</td>
<td>The moon is seen very small.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ōuenuku</td>
<td>4. Ōuenuku</td>
<td>Get to work! A good night for eel fishing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ōkoro</td>
<td>5. Ōkoro</td>
<td>A pleasing day in the afternoon. Good for eel fishing at night.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Huna</td>
<td>11. Māwharu</td>
<td>Crayfish are taken on this day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ōhua</td>
<td>12. Ōhua</td>
<td>A good day for working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Māwharu</td>
<td>13. Hotu</td>
<td>An unpleasant day; the sea is rough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Atua</td>
<td>15. Turu</td>
<td>Collect food products from the sea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Maure</td>
<td>16. Rākau-nui</td>
<td>The moon is filled out. Sea products are the food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Turu</td>
<td>17. Rākau-mātohi</td>
<td>A fine day. The moon now wanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Korekore II</td>
<td>23. Tangaroa-ama</td>
<td>A good day for fishing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Kiokio</td>
<td>27. Ōrongonui</td>
<td>A desirable day. The <em>inanga</em> now migrate if the proper moon has arrived.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Ōtane</td>
<td>28. Mauri</td>
<td>The morning is fine. The moon is now darkened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Ōrongonui</td>
<td>29. Ōmutu</td>
<td>A bad day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An exceedingly bad day. The moon has expired.

The months of year from the Tākitimu tradition included the following remark: “Without exception, stars were the *ariki* (controllers, heads) of these months. The year commenced with the appearance of Matariki (Pleiades) on the horizon at dawn.”

Commenting on the suggestion that the season of Matariki was a revisionist ideal, Dr. Rangi Mataamua, a leading expert on Matariki in Aotearoa New Zealand, assured me that his current research indicates that Matariki is an old and likely pre-contact tradition to Tākitimu tribes. Tame Kuka also independently commented that his parents and grandparents tracked their year from the season of Matariki. This certainly indicates that we can have some confidence that the knowledge of these months of the year was within Pirirākau at the turn of the twentieth century. Ao-nui, the first month, is June in the Gregorian calendar:

1. Ao-nui
2. Te Aho-turuturu
3. Te Ihomatua
4. Tapere-wai
5. Tatau-urutahi
6. Tatau-uruora
7. Akaaka-nui
8. Ahuahu-mataora
9. Te Ihonui
10. Pūtoki-nui-o-tau
11. Tikaka-muturangi
12. Uruwhenua
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It is also worth noting that the seventh month of Akaaka-nui is included in karakia at the departure of the Tākitimu from Rangiātea:

Tēnei au haere mai te akaakanui
Tēnei au haere mai te akaakaroa
Tēnei au haere mai te akaakana i tō matua
Taketake te waiora
Ki tēnei tama nāu e io tikitiki o rangi

Here I am coming in the month of Akaaka-nui
Here I am coming in the month of Akaaka-roa
Here I am coming in the month blessed by the divine
This is your son, you located in the heavens.

### HINE-KÖRAKO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation: the white woman</th>
<th>Hine: a young woman, a girl</th>
<th>Kōrako: albino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Hine-kōrako is that rare instance of an atua wawao who is also an atua wāhine for whom there are substantial records. She was known as a guardian spirit, it is also suggested that she is a deified ancestor, and her appearance is a lunar halo or a lunar bow. She is one of the atua wawao who was located in the Kohurau cave on Rangiātea. Manu Te Pere suggests that she “personified the moon. We can only assume that this goddess had knowledge of the tides and of when it was best to fish for food. With this capacity she was able to provide those things usually associated with womanly craft.”

According to Tūtakangahau, during the navigation of the Tākitimu, “as night fell Kahukura returned to the stern of “Takitimu”, and his sister, Hine-kōrako… was sent forward to take his place.” Hinekōrako is also mentioned by Te Whatahoro in the account of Iwipūpū and Uenukurangi/Kahukura. He refers to Hine-kōrako being present when Uenukutiti, the daughter or Uenukurangi and Iwipūpū, is removed from her mother Iwipūpū at birth by her atua father Uenukurangi, and also that Hine-kōrako is present on Uenukutiti’s return at the dedication of her brother,
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Iwipūpū’s son Kahungunu.\textsuperscript{163} She and her brother Ruamano are guardian taniwha of Ngāti Hinehika of Ngāti Kahungunu, where she was responsible for carving out the Hangaroa river on her way down from the Huiaarau Ranges, but remained at Te Reinga Falls rather than continuing to the sea.\textsuperscript{164}

Hine-kōrako is not mentioned in Tiramōrehu’s cosmology, which does not extend to atua wawao. However, I posit that her appearance and qualities would connect her to Harongo and Tongo-tongo’s daughter, Marama, and as a sibling of Kahukura, also connect her to Tū-ōwhio-rangi, the child of Toko-mua, whose appearance is a rainbow. I find it interesting that whilst the maramataka and its relationship with the atua wawao is practical, the lunar or moon bow has an almost whimsical quality. As with the rainbow, a lunar bow is formed through the bending of light (in this case from the moon) through rain drops, again cast up from the bow of the canoe. Whilst the lunar bow technically has the same division of colours we associate with a rainbow, the lunar bow normally appears white when we observe it. I have found no evidence that it serves a navigation purpose and it is rare (as the light of the moon is inconstant), so my own suggestion is that Hine-kōrako’s value as an atua wawao is more to do with her ethereal qualities than her utility. V. Mikkelson’s description of seeing a lunar bow as a 23 year old Ensign in World War II gives some feeling for the experience:

It was an altogether beautiful night... but it was made even more spectacular by the appearance of a nearly full moon rising just off the bow. As the moon rose to about 20 degrees, I noticed what I first thought was a spotlight beam rising off the port quarter (the left rear of the ship). As it lengthened, it became obvious that it was not a spotlight beam.... The rainbow was composed of the standard colors, but they were softer and paler than those generated by direct sunlight.... I was truly entranced. I

\textsuperscript{163} Jury, \textit{Whare Wānanga}; 177.
\textsuperscript{164} iTravel, “Te Reinga Falls”.

have seen many of nature's beauties, but none have ever impressed me so powerfully…. Its beauty will haunt me for the rest of my days.

HINE-KŌRITO, HINE-KŌTEA, HINE-MAKEHU AND HINE-HURUHURU

In the accounts given of these atua wawao, these four names are given together. Te Whatahoro records these four as bonding together to assist in the journey of the Tākitimu. He also suggests they appear as whales, “who by force of [an] invocation…, swam along on each side to guard the canoe.” They are also recorded by Hirini Moko Mead as “Moon Maidens… all of whom have something to do with childbirth.” Hine-huruhuru is also known elsewhere as Hine-te-iwaiwa, an atua who was a model of an exemplary wife and mother. Her partner was Tinirau and she gave birth to Tūhuruhuru in some narratives. Tūhuruhuru is elsewhere known as pūhuruhuru, which is puberty. So potentially Hine-huruhuru is also a model of maturity and motherhood. Huruhuru as a reference to pubic hair, strikes me as a reference to a mature woman, and hence connected to the moon cycles, menstruation and pregnancy. The evidence supports that these atua wawao represent phases of the moon; I infer from this that they had a role in providing a marker of progress for Tākitimu on its journey.

It is commonly argued that due to the tapu on the Tākitimu canoe, there were no women aboard. In my research only J. Mitchell’s Takitimu asserts there were no women aboard this canoe, on the basis of two quotes that indicate the canoe was
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held sacred as it was a depository of knowledge and carried “chiefs and priests”. Neither of these quotes support his contention there were no women, and I argue from my analysis that it is just as likely it is only his prejudice that women could not be numbered amongst “chiefs and priests”. I have become convinced by other tribal traditions that the relationship with these atua wawao was for ruahine, not tohunga, to mediate. However, I have not found any recollection that supports women having been aboard the Tākitimu, excepting these atua wawao names and their explicit connection with the moon, menstruation and pregnancy. I conclude that it is a possibility that ruahine were amongst the crew of the Tākitimu, but that is intuitive and would require more evidence.

**TANGAROA| THE OCEAN**

The ocean provides a plethora of signs for the experienced navigator to arrive safely at their destination. The ability to find an island a few tens of kilometres across in an ocean many tens of thousands of kilometres wide relies quite heavily on the capacity to read the swells, currents and waves of the ocean. Ocean swells “are spaced wider apart [than localised waves] and move across the ocean in a slow undulating motion.” For the navigator they provide a visual guide that the canoe is on course, by sighting “the exact spot the swell meets the hull of the waka. If the waka moves off course, the point of impact will correspondingly move along the hull.”

Navigators also need to read the direction and strength of mid-ocean currents, indicated by the shape of each individual wave. Finally, islands and reefs cause subtle changes in waves, In particular, the ocean swell will change due to where either refraction which is caused by a swell bending around an island or reflection caused by a swell bouncing back from an island.
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HAURUA TAI

Other than the local reference to Haurua Tai, there is no evidence about this atua wawao. I have noted above the significance of the ocean swells and waves to successful navigation.

Aotearoa New Zealand is significantly further south than other islands in the South Pacific, so a journey here takes a vessel from potentially 15°S to 40°S, which crosses from the confluence of the Southern Equatorial Current and the Antarctic Circumpolar Current. Most vessels travelling between other islands in the South Pacific journey between 15°S and 25°S. There is no further evidence to rely on, so I suggest the etymology of the name Haurua Tai indicates that the significant change in swells and waves was a notable experience for the navigator and his crew.

TŪNUI|COMETS

The appearance of a comet as one of the atua wawao provides a fascinating window into the possible dates that the Tākitimu travelled to Tauranga Moana. Comets that are visible to the naked eye are infrequent and notable events. There are at least ten possibilities for the comet that was observed on the Tākitimu if it is agreed that the eleventh or twelfth centuries is the earliest arrival date for the canoe. Tracey Ngatoko suggested a date of 1050CE for the arrival of the Tākitimu canoe, but the majority of my interviewees who commented on this suggested Percy Smith’s date of 1350CE, reflecting the continued power of his creative dating and the great fleet myth. Most academics suggest migration between the eighth and eleventh centuries, and the Tākitimu whakapapa are not extensive, suggesting a later date to me. Halley’s comet, as we now know it, was observed by Chinese and Korean astronomers in 989CE. Its return in 1066 was noted worldwide. In a Hawaiian oral tradition from about this period, it is said that “Paumakua was called the “chief who traveled to the Pillars of Kahiki,” which [may be]... an allegorical reference to the
edge of the sky or the ends of the earth.” Korean astronomers noted its initial brightness was like the moon. In 1080CE a comet was noted exclusively by Chinese observers. The Great Comet of 1106CE was visible for 30 days by Chinese and Korean astronomers. In 1110CE, Korean astronomers observed a comet, and then through May to June of 1145CE, Japanese, Korean and Chinese observers all noted a comet. The Halley’s Comet of 1222CE was noted by Koreans and Japanese observers as “white, but its rays were red,” and the 1240CE comet was observed over January and February by Japanese astronomers who noted it was the “same size as Saturn.” A comet in 1265CE was seen by the Japanese to have “rays extended across the heavens.” Finally in 1301CE Halley’s Comet was observed by Japanese and Chinese astronomers around the middle of September until the evening of October 31. The consternation and fascination that observers felt in seeing any of these comets gives some insight as to why they were of notable significance to navigators and carried such dire omens. If we are to accept an eleventh century dating for the journey of the Tākitimu, then Tūnui-o-te-ika is most likely the 1066CE return of Halley’s comet, particularly given its impact at that time on Hawaiian oral traditions.

**TŪNUI-O-TE-IKA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Translation:</strong> Comet of the sea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tūnui:</strong> always used in regard to comets/meteors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tū:</strong> set in place, establish, raise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nui:</strong> superior high rank, important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ika:</strong> any sea creature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A well-known atua wawao throughout the East Coast and Bay of Plenty, Tūnui-o-te-ika, said by “Tutaka[ngahau], of Tuhoe... that Tunui is not a star, it is a demon, a spirit that flies through space,” is now widely considered to be a comet in appearance. He was one of the atua wawao carried with Ruamano out of Kohurau in
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Hawaiki before the departure of the Tākitimu. On the journey of the canoe to Aotearoa, “...Tunui-a-te-ika acted as a messenger, for he moved far ahead, and returned to tell of the nearness of land.” Tūnui-o-te-ika is reputed to be an atua toro, often considered “malignant beings” who require careful intercession and direction, so tended to be “sent by their human mediums on errands to distant parts.” He is specifically noted as associated with Tamatea Pōkai Whenua, the grandson of Tamatea Arikinui in our Pirirākau whakapapa, on his journeys around Aotearoa:

When Tamatea visited Taupo, he heard that Ngatoro-i-rangi was approaching the place, and so despatched the atua called Tunui-o-te-ika to act as a guide to him. Ere long Tunui was seen gleaming above the hill Pihanga, hence it was known that Ngatoro had arrived there.

Tūnui-o-te-ika, like Te Pō Tuatini, was still regarded as an atua wawao in the nineteenth century; he is recorded as being “sent to reconnoitre the enemy position and report back to the tribe which he guarded.” In 1864, at “the siege of Ōrākau, Tūnuiateika was believed to aid his people.” It was also said that the appearance of Tūnui-o-te-ika “denotes the death of some person” and in a specific Tākitimu tradition spoken of by Te Kawatini, he was included in incantations to overcome sickness. Other comets that are commonly known are Tūnui-o-te-pō and Tūnui-o-te-rangi. It seems likely that this atua wawao, linked as he is with the Tākitimu journey, was a comet that was seen whilst on the ocean.
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PAKANGA | WAR

Tracey Ngatoko commented that the Tākitimu likely left Rangiātea because of conflict. Whilst she did not expand on this, it is widely agreed that initial exploration was undertaken by essentially professional sailors, while the later migration was motivated by a variety of needs: the younger sons and daughters of chiefs looking for new lands; devastation from natural disasters; and conflict in an often confined island setting. It is only speculation that conflict was part of the reason the Tākitimu sailed, but the presence of Te Pō Tuatini adds to the possibility due to this atua wawao’s long association with war and violence. It is a sobering thought that our ancestors left with a realistic view of their legacy, not just hopes for a new start.

TE PŌ TUATINI

Translation: the night of sharks, the shark hidden in dark waters

Pō: night, darkness, can be a shortening of Hine nui te pō

Tuatini: a great white shark, a white pointer

I have found few references to Te Pō Tuatini; the longest refers to the atua as being personified as a dog and an atua of the whare maire, so a malevolent spirit. The other references refer to Te Pō Tuatini as a war god. Te Pō Tuatini as an atua wawao related to war continued to be present into the late nineteenth century. Paitini Wi Tapeka of Ruatāhuna in the Tūhoe contingent to Ōrākau reported that Penetiti was their tohunga of Te Pō Tuatini, assisted by Tapiki. At Ōrākau, Penetiti was recorded as offering this karakia:

---

182 Ngatoko interview.
183 Mitchell, Takitimu; 48.
184 Ōrākau, near Pūniu east of Kihikihi, was the site of a battle between 300 supporters of the Kingitanga in partially complete redoubt and 1,400 Crown troops between 31 March and 2 April 1864.
185 “The siege of Orakau Pa” Bay of Plenty Beacon, Vol. 1, Iss. 61, 13 Sept 1939; 3.
Tomina noa atu taku kāki
He turi ngongengonge-e
Ki te kai ki te ure
E hika hoki koe e kuika noa nei
Ka hoki mai oneone rā
Waihō ki te mea ki waenga ota
Ka whano, ka wareware
Ka wairutu ai ahau ki te auē
Ki te whakatangihanga
O te ngū parera
Nā Te Whatanui me ko 'Haeata
E whakakeua,
He tama kiri ngutu
Pahu te kiri o te kai
Pau koroki i au-ē.

Parched (with vain regrets) is my throat,
But disabled am I,
From enjoying the fruits of the land.
0 woman, that vainly desires,
The return of our lands.
Now left for useless weeds
Soon will all be forgotten.
Tears course down as I lament
On listening to the loud reports.
Of the sounding guns.
By Te Whatanui’s and Rangi-haeata’s spirits
Are they directed,
With loud report but resultless,
Wounding only the skin
I speak in vain.\textsuperscript{186}

This karakia is reminiscent of Lamentations 5.1-18, Psalm 13, Psalm 74.1-11 and Isaiah 59.1-15. It is likely that Peneti’s karakia and rituals had been influenced by Christianity and possible that he had some acquaintance with the writings in the Bible, though a full translation of the Old Testament was not completed by Reverend Robert Maunsell until 1857, and the full Bible translation was not published until 1868. There is a potent nihilism to this karakia from a Tūhoe tohunga that is consistent with the well-known tribal saying Tūhoe moumou kai, moumou tāonga, moumou tangata ki te Pō [Tūhoe wasteful of food, wasteful of treasures, wasters of

\textsuperscript{186} E. Best, “Notes on the art of war, as conducted by the Maori of New Zealand, with accounts of various customs, rites, superstitions, &c., pertaining to war, as practised and believed in by the ancient Maori. Part II” \textit{JPS} 11 2 (42) (June, 1902); 60.
people to Death]. The lauded attitude to death amongst Māori throughout Aotearoa New Zealand in the nineteenth century, exemplified in numerous whakataukī and whakatauākī, is to face it, even embrace it courageously, and the karakia to Te Pō Tuatini seems to expect no quarter but ask a grim determination.

The image of the great white shark in the name Te Pō Tuatini requires some consideration. Great white sharks are now known to migrate thousands of kilometres in reasonably short periods of time in both the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, including south past Aotearoa New Zealand. It may be that the Tākitimu followed the migratory paths of great whites and consequently were accompanied by them on the journey; alternatively it may be a reference to the danger faced on this long journey, conjuring a picture of the hidden and sudden violence of sharks in the night waters. In any case, the unrestrained power and violence of great whites is a strong image for an atua wawao regarded as malevolent spirit and a god of war.

The crew of the Tākitimu would have been no strangers to danger, violence and war in Rangiātea, on the journey and in Tauranga Moana; close proximity of such an atua wawao is an acceptance that their journey poses risks, some of which cannot be managed. Clearly there is evidence the Te Pō Tuatini is a personification of war, whilst other possible roles are a matter of conjecture related to its etymology.

NGĀ TAPUTAPU O TĀKITIMU

In addition to the atua wawao carried on Tākitimu were sacred objects in the forms of adzes and stones. In this tradition, Te Awhiorangi (the name has connections to both whirlwinds and lunar bows) was one of the two adzes carried by Tamatea Arikinui aboard the Tākitimu that he used to cut his way through a storm on the

---

journey to Tauranga Moana. Te Awhiorangi has a celebrated whakapapa for the people of both the Tākitimu and Aotea canoes:

E hoa mā, e ngā iwi katoa o ngā motu nei, tēnei te oha atu a tō tātou tīpuna, arā, a Ruatitipua. I kimihia hoki e Ruatitipua ki roto i te kahuikore; te anga ki runga, ko te whatu a Ngahue, arā, Te Awhiorangi. Ka whakarawea e Ngahue i te rangi ki a Tāne i tana wā e awhi ana anō a Rangi rāua ko Papa; kātahi ka tapahia e Tāne ngā uaua o te Rangi rāua ko Papa.

Ka wehe a Rangi, ka wehe a Papa; ka waiho te ingoa o Tane, ko Tāne Tokorangi, ka waiho a Te Awhiorangi hei mana mō ngā toki katoa i te ao nei. Ko te pare o Te Awhiorangi ko te Rangi Whakakapua; te kaha, ko Kaawekairangi; te kakau, ko Mataaheihei; ko Whakawhana-i-te-Rangi, koia Te Aheihei e tū nā i te Rangi i heke ariki tonu mai a Te Awhiorangi.189

O friends, and all the tribes of these islands, this is the sacred relic of our ancestor Ruatitipua. He sought it amongst the Hosts of the Void; when it came, it was the stone of Ngahue, that is Te Awhiorangi, employed by Ngahue. It was employed by Tane at the time when Rangi the Sky Father and Papa the Earth Mother were still embraced; with it, Tane cut the sinews binding Rangi and Papa.

Rangi stood apart; Papa stood apart: from that time, Tane was known as 'Tane who propped up the Heavens,' and Te Awhiorangi became the representative and spiritual source of all the axes in the world. The head of Te Awhiorangi is named Te Rangi Whakakapua [the obscured heaven]; the cord is named Kaawekairangi [to be taken up to heaven]; the handle is named Mataaheihei [the face of the wave]; Whakawhana-i-te-Rangi [the pride of heaven] is the rainbow standing in the heavens from which Te Awhiorangi in so noble a fashion descended.190

---

189 “Ko Te Kiteatanga o Te Awhiorangi (He Toki)” Korimako, Iss. 71, 20 Jan 1888; 4.
190 “The Finding of Te Awhiorangi” Te Ao Hou No. 51, Jun 1965; 39.
The connections with the proposed cosmology above are clear: from Te Kore to Te Mangu and Mahorahora nui-a-te-Rangi came Tokomua, from whom came Tuawhiorangi, from whom Ruatitipua gained Te Awhiorangi. Prior to Ruatitipua, Tane-nui-a-rangi had used Te Awhiorangi to cut the sinews between Rangi-pōtiki and Papa, his third partner and Tane’s mother. Finally the construction of Te Awhiorangi is a co-operation between the children of Toko-mua and Toko-roto, that is the atua take of the air, wind and heavens. Toko-mua’s child is Tapa-huru-manu from whom descends Tiki, the foundation of humanity. Te Awhiorangi is able to be utilised by humanity because our mana descends through the same whakapapa lines as the adze, that is Toko-mua, and it is used in the control of weather and the environment because it descends through the same whakapapa lines as wind, air and heaven, that is Toko-mua and Toko-roto. Other adzes were also carried aboard the Tākitimu. Te Haare Piahana provides the name of the other adze of Tamatea Arikinui as Te Whironui, and the five adzes of Ruawharo and Tupai, both tohunga of carving and tā moko as: Hui Te Rangiora; Wharaurangi; Rakuraku a Tawhaki; te iwi a Rona; and te Kaukau. In addition, he states that the guiding paddle of Tamatea Arikinui is Rapanga i te Ata Nuku. Finally, two sacred stones that carried the mauri of the wānanga were also transported aboard the Tākitimu:

Ka whakanōhia ngā kohatu tapu ki runga i te tūāhu he hukatai tetehi he rehutai tetehi... nō Tahiti nō roto i te whare wananga Taputapuatea he wāhi tino tapu tēnei.192

[The sacred stones were set upon the altar; Hukatai was one and Rehutai the other... they were from Tahiti in the school of learning of Taputapuatea; this is a very sacred place.]

Rehutai is the sea spray that is created as a vessel moves forward and hukatai is the sea foam on either side of the vessel. As the sea foam is thrown up by the bow, the

191 Piahana, papers; 18.
192 Piahana, papers; 15.
rays of the sun piercing the foam create a rainbow effect that is also known as rehutai.

CONCLUSION: A CONTEXTUAL TĀKITIMU THEOLOGY

The journey of atua wawao aboard the Tākitimu canoe, and their subsequent history, where discoverable, demonstrates an intimate connection between the Tākitimu ancestors of Pirirākau and the natural environment. They had a confidence of relationship, for “the man... who knows well the lore of his hapu is freed from all uncertainty whilst remaining in that hapu; only his own atua have power over him.” The noted characteristics of atua wawao and atua take, their predictability or predictable unpredictability, reflect the reliability of that relationship when making significant life decisions. That relationship was understood by Pirirākau as a whakawhanaungatanga, reflected in the shared whakapapa of atua, the environment and people. Tiramōrehu, who I consider to be the most reliable Tākitimu source remaining, suggests a cosmology of atua take that have credible though not explicit whakapapa connections to the 13 likely atua wawao on the Tākitimu, as well as the adzes and stones carried aboard. I have attempted a redaction of a proposed Tākitimu cosmology for Pirirākau in Figure 7. The limited and contradictory evidence I have gleaned makes it more accurate to speak of a Tākitimu cosmology than a Pirirākau cosmology. The differentiation between atua take and atua wawao provides an explanation for the convoluted whakapapa to arrive at a group of atua who could be directed, manipulated and beseeched to act for the benefit of the Tākitimu journey and subsequent settlement. Clearly some atua, whom I have defined as atua wawao, acted in certain ways if appropriate and correct processes were followed, whilst other atua, the atua take, were not expected to make any intervention. This is a useful categorisation that explains the day-to-day interaction with some atua and mere esoteric acknowledgement of others. Amongst other

193 J. Andersen, Maori Life in Ao-tea-Roa (Christchurch: Whitcombe & Tombs Ltd, 1908); 15.
Figure 7: a proposed Tākitimu cosmology for Pirirākau (dotted lines indicate uncertain whakapapa connection)
aspects, the feminine, our atua wāhine, remain a central feature of this whakapapa and the subsequent Tākitimu journey. The modern oral contention that Tākitimu was a male only canoe is based on Mitchell’s misreading of two quotes through the lens of his own expectations. I believe the presence of five atua wāhine aboard the Tākitimu encourages us to allow for the possibility that women in ruahine roles were included amongst the “chiefs and priests” on the journey.

The pre-Christian contextual theology that may have been held by Pirirākau when they first encountered Catholic missionaries in 1839 is not certain, however, it is possible to sketch an outline of what I will characterise as a Tākitimu contextual theology for Pirirākau. This contextual theology is a Praxis Model in which the day-to-day interaction and relationship with natural environment and historical experience are then translated into theological language and thinking. The first principles of a Tākitimu contextual theology is that all beings and objects, created and uncreated, have a tapu, a dignity and well-being that is to be enhanced in relationship to the tapu of others. All cosmologies exist to exemplify the enhancement and inter-relationship of tapu between people, atua and the environment. In this sense, cosmologies are not fixed but have a utility and a praxis. Cosmologies like that in Figure 7 explained to Pirirākau ancestors the appropriate relationships within and with a personified environment for people to achieve the first principle of a Tākitimu theology: to enhance their own dignity and well-being, that of their ancestors and of their descendents. Pirirākau ancestors would also have understood through a cosmology and the associated mythologies that to enhance their own tapu required that they respect and protect the tapu, the dignity and well-being, of the natural environment and its personified face, the atua wawao and atua take. The cosmology also provides an operable theodicy, in that it allows for accident, war and conflict as accepted and acceptable as their personifications have a whakapapa connection to people and the environment through this cosmology, so cannot be characterised as an evil that is antithetical to life. Indeed the cosmological
whakapapa reinforces the relational connectedness of all atua and people, including long-term enemies; accident, war and conflict fit into the flow of actions that diminish and enhance tapu. The tapu of people, atua and environment provides a power and authority, a mana, that is the source of all action. The cosmology is a foundation of the tikanga, or correct processes, to guide actions that are an appropriate use of the mana, the power and authority of atua and people.

There is evidence in the names of our atua wawao and atua take for a reintroduction of the feminine into the narratives we hold about the Pirirākau cosmology, and doing so provides potent reinterpretations of our formative mythologies. By way of example, in a common interpretation of a widely known Tauranga Moana myth, when the Tainui canoe entered into Tauranga harbour between Matakana Island and Mauao, the Tainui grounded on a sandbar that is today known as Ruahine. Hoturoa, the captain of the canoe, looked for the cause of the grounding. Wahinerua, an older woman, either because it was identified that she had committed a wrong (some sources say that she had eaten seed kumara which was restricted and highly tapu) or because she volunteered, was selected for a sacrifice to atone for the wrong. Hoturoa had her ejected from the canoe. She drowned and in other interpretations her body was a roller for the canoe. Her body floated away to become Kuia Rock, a rock at the entrance to the harbour at which many fisherman conduct a simple rite of a food offering on the way out of the harbour.

The naming of the sandbar Ruahine and the age of Wahinerua suggests another possible interpretation. Journeying to Aotearoa New Zealand is a long, difficult journey and the environment was new and required a pioneering ethic. It seems unlikely that a kuia, an older woman, would be included on the canoe without her fulfilling a key function. The name Ruahine could be a descriptor of the role that Wahinerua played. If she was indeed a ruahine, then in Hoturoa’s search for a solution Wahinerua may have offered to conduct a ritual to repair the wrong. Ruahine ceremonies often involved a crossing over to remove or diminish tapu.
Perhaps Wahinerua was required to cross over the Tainui to remove the diminishment of tapu that had led to the grounding. In this dangerous act she may well have died but it is also possible the death referred to is a spiritual death: the removal of tapu was an act akin to dying. In any case, reinterpreting the myth along these lines transforms a grim warning in which the woman is an object fulfilling a role to a story of sacrifice that celebrates the strength of our women.

A Tākitimu theology is a dynamic theology; it requires action and reflection to enhance tapu rather than stillness. The atua themselves are dynamic actors, and the mythos about those atua in a Tākitimu theology enforces a notion that those who do not act in a dynamic and changing environment will be stripped of the ability to act, as either atua, tangata or the environment will act in the stead of those who hesitate. In a Tākitimu theology, these relationships of actors with their mana and tapu are mediated by the complexity and accuracy of the understanding of the whakapapa connection to atua, not through the worship of atua. So the centre of a Tākitimu theology is whakawhanaungatanga, building familial relationships. Notably, cosmologies like that in Figure 6 reminded our Pirirākau ancestors that all appropriate relationships are enduring, transcending death. Death does not denote leaving to be with atua and ancestors; whakapapa means we are already connected with them and death is but a different expression of those same relationships. The Pirirākau ancestors who encountered the Christian god through Catholic missionaries in 1839 would have tried to understand the gospel message through a framework with some or all of the hallmarks of a Tākitimu theology. The Pirirākau tohunga and other experts in cosmology in this period were likely architects of truth, rather than receivers of truth; they would have regarded the

---

194 One Pirirākau tradition that still features in tangihanga today is that once a person is buried, their spirit goes to Mauao and hangs all of its memories on Mauao (he maunga iriiri kōrero). There is no further journey or purpose to the spirit at that stage. The person is then an atua, or an ancestor whose tapu and mana resides with their descendents.
Christian god as a new, possibly fruitful relationship that could be connected with their relationships with other atua wawao and atua take to enhance tapu and mana.

Today, the cosmological relationship remains in the maramataka, but the understanding of the whakapapa connection to us as Pirirākau in the cosmology is essentially lost. The maramataka is really the only surviving expression of the cosmology. Chrissie Rolleston’s reflection on her parents’ connection with the environment is almost a lament that closes with the uncertainty that marks our collective hapū experience of loss and failure today:

...my Dad’s intimate knowledge of weather patterns..., water currents, shellfish beds and ideal gathering times for kai moana and bush foods, and my Grand Uncle’s knowledge of some rongoā to deal with specific illnesses amongst whānau members and his ability to read signs from cloud formations, the colour and appearance of sunrises and sunsets, insect, bird and animal life around him. It was like reading nature’s signs to determine the best way to ensure bountiful food supplies for all and protecting crops and mataitai.... Mum would always listen for the return of pīwharauaroa to our shores in September. Even those first calls on arrival were a sign of what sort of growing season was ahead of us. If we saw large flocks of kōtare in the trees near the beach or in our garden – that was a sign that fish were going to be plentiful... Other seabirds heralded the arrival of white bait, then kahawai and mullet.... we learned to tell which beds pipi came from just by looking at the shape and colour of their shell and sometimes the flesh within.

I guess it was a whānau cosmology.195

195 Rolleston interview.
The story of Anglican missionary work to Māori through the Church Missionary Society (C.M.S.) is well-known in Aotearoa New Zealand history, has gained some traction in popular consciousness, and has been subjected to both sympathetic and critical lenses. C.M.S. missionaries, as British citizens, carried the double weight of being ambassadors for both the British Empire and their Church, and their missiology was based on the firm belief “that Maori and Polynesians needed to be civilised as well as Christianised.” By contrast, the role of Catholic missionaries is less well known in the public sphere and often fixated on the role and personality of Bishop Pompallier, despite the careful work and academic efforts of Catholic historians here in Aotearoa New Zealand. Quite naturally, the colonisation of Aotearoa New Zealand by the British, the conflict between Māori and British and settler troops and our geopolitical role in the British Empire, particularly in the first half of the twentieth century, has given us pause to reflect on our experience of empire as part of the Commonwealth. Yet another empire also played a role amongst Pirirākau: the French Colonial Empire in its fraught relationship with French Catholic missionaries.

This chapter begins with an attempt to understand how the experience of life in France had a direct impact on how French Catholic missionaries conducted themselves in the early nineteenth century amongst Pirirākau. I will examine the impact of the French Revolution on the Catholic Church and the ongoing relations between church and state as a result of these turbulent years. Secondly, I will consider the developing discourse in this period about gender, race and class, all

196 A. Davidson, “The Interaction of Missionary and Colonial Christianity in Nineteenth Century New Zealand” Studies in World Christianity Vol 2, Iss. 2; 147.
197 Cf. P. Lineham, New Zealand Religious History Annotated Bibliography (2015 Edition), http://www.massey.ac.nz/~plineham/RelhistNZ.htm; there are 115 academic texts on the Church Missionary Society, 113 biographies of members of the CMS, 31 texts on the CMS mission stations. In comparison, there are 53 texts about the Catholic Māori Missions and over a quarter of them are about Bishop Pompallier.
modes of thought that will have impacted on these French men before they left to become missionaries for their church. This will allow us to examine the Catholic mission amongst Pirirākau and what we know of the impact of a little over a decade of mission. To understand what they communicated, I will consider the development of nineteenth century Catholic missiology, tracing the mission theology from the end of seventeenth century. Finally, I will consider an early pastoral from Bishop Pompallier that explains what he intended his priests to teach and communicate to neophytes throughout Aotearoa New Zealand. This will allow me to propose how this Catholic mission in Tauranga Moana impacted on the contextual Tākitimu theology of Pirirākau.

AN UNEASY TRUCE: THE FRENCH STATE AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

The Church Missionary Society and other Protestant missions to Aotearoa New Zealand generally enjoyed good relations with the British government throughout the period of first contact and initial settlement. In the main, the missionaries were middle class men and their wives backed by a strong group of parliamentarians with a clear humanitarian ethic, who operated mostly within the colonies of the British Empire. The life of nineteenth century French Catholic missionaries could not have been more markedly different. Whilst “at no time did any British government adopt an openly hostile stance toward Christianity at home or abroad…. anticlericalism was the official policy of France for long periods.”\(^{198}\) Unlike their Church Missionary Society peers, the French men and women of the Catholic Church had an uneasy role in the expansion of French influence as they were “regularly at the forefront of their nation’s expansion in the New World, Africa, Asia, and the Pacific,”\(^ {199}\) yet:

...the possibility of missionaries acting as ambassadors of France abroad was not universally welcomed in a society torn by religious conflict and steeped in secular


\(^{199}\) White & Daughton, *In God’s Empire*; 6.
Enlightenment ideals. Nor were missionaries, who often considered their vocation to be purely religious and therefore unsullied by the baseness of worldly politics, always eager to play the role of diplomatic envoy on behalf of the French government.\

The seeds of this unease lie in the French Revolution of 1789-1799. Amongst its many ramifications, the revolution “destroyed a religious as well as a political regime.” The schism between the later French state and the Catholic Church has its foundation in the revolt of the peasants of Vendée against the French Revolutionary government in 1793. They were offended by the 1790 Civil Constitution of the Clergy and defied military conscription. Their rebellion against conscription led to a full-fledged guerrilla war against the French Revolutionary government, known as the War in the Vendée. Estimates vary widely, but it is thought that between 117,000 and 250,000 lives were lost in massacres, executions and civilian casualties. The War in the Vendée is notable for the brutal Republican repression that took in many places, such that Reynald Secher and other historians have called the event a "genocide". Furet concludes that the repression in the Vendée “not only revealed massacre and destruction on an unprecedented scale but also a zeal so violent that it has bestowed as its legacy much of the region’s identity.” A letter purportedly from General Westermann, the French Revolutionary government’s military commander in this war, is reported to have written:

The Vendée is no more ... According to your orders, I have trampled their children beneath our horses' feet; I have massacred their women, so they will no longer give

---

200 White & Daughton, In God’s Empire; 6.
birth to brigands. I do not have a single prisoner to reproach me. I have exterminated
them all.\textsuperscript{205}

Whilst the authenticity of this letter is debated, the sentiment captures the spirit in
which battles were fought. The peasants of the Vendée were in revolt from 1793-
1799, and further revolts occurred in 1813, 1814 and 1815. The impact of this regional
war on the Catholic Church throughout France was widespread; of the 136 sees in
France, titulars were in some instances executed or assassinated, and many others
were forced to emigrate. In Paris, the Cathedral of Notre-Dame and the church of St-
Sulpice were in the possession of ‘constitutional’ clergy and Royer, a ‘constitutional’
bishop, had taken the place of the Archbishop of Paris. Even as Catholicism
recovered in some areas, the heresies of the Theophilanthropists\textsuperscript{206} and the Decadi\textsuperscript{207}
in churches became more widespread due to the lack of church leadership.\textsuperscript{208} The
Catholic Church was not formally re-established in France until 1802, when Pope
Pius VII and Napoleon Bonaparte, the First Consul, signed the convention of the
26th Messidor, year IX on July 16, which is popularly known as the Concordant of
1801 (the year in which it was drafted). The stipulations of the concordant
recognized the Catholic religion as the religion “of the great majority of Frenchmen,”
replacing the previous formal position that Catholicism was the religion of the State.
The Catholic Church argued for, and received, a statement that Catholicism was the
“personal profession… on the part of the Consuls of the Republic.”\textsuperscript{209} This agreement
was key to the Pope then agreeing that the State could police matters of public
worship in Article I:

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{205} Quoted in M. Levene, \textit{Genocide in the Age of the Nation State: Volume 2} (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005); 104.
\textsuperscript{206} A dualistic, deist cult promoting individual self-reflection and development.
\textsuperscript{207} A naturalistic patriotic cult that promoted the replacement of Sunday as the Sabbath with every
tenth day in the French Revolutionary calendar.
\textsuperscript{209} Goyau, “French Concordant.”
\end{footnotes}
The Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Religion shall be freely exercised in France. Its worship shall be public while conforming to such police regulations as the government shall consider necessary to public tranquillity.\textsuperscript{210}

There was also a restructuring of the Church, a reduction in French dioceses from 136 sees to only 60. The actual titulars of the dioceses were instructed by the Pope to offer “every sacrifice,” for this new peace, even that of their sees. Articles 4 and 5 gave authority to the French Government to present new bishops, but left the papal authority to give them canonical institution. Article 9 required that bishops only appoint parish priests who were acceptable to the Government, whilst Article 12 allowed that churches that had not been seized in the revolution were under the authority and rule of bishops. In Article 13, the Church agreed not to “trouble the consciences” of citizens who had seized church property during the Revolution, a significant loss of resource. Yet in Article 14, the Government promised the bishops and parish priests a fitting maintenance payment. Finally, despite the protest of the Pope immediately after its publication that it infringed the spirit of the concordant, Napoleon summarily inserted the Organic Articles, a lengthy series of stipulations for controlling the movement and gathering of groups of people by confining these activities to specific places.\textsuperscript{211} The concordant is a torturous document of unworkable and unsatisfactory compromise; yet it achieved its only real aim: a largely peaceful reintegration of the Catholic population into post-revolutionary France.

The French Revolution, the experience of the Vendeans and the subsequent Concordant are the foundation from which French Catholic mission moved into the nineteenth century. The ascension of Pope Gregory XVI in 1831 oversaw a great extension of Catholic mission activity. Missionaries were a significant presence throughout the world; it was estimated at the end of the nineteenth century “…about 4,500 French priests, 3,300 lay brothers, and 10,500 nuns were active in the field [and]

\textsuperscript{210} Quoted in Goyau, “French Concordant.”
\textsuperscript{211} Goyau, “French Concordant.”
…that French citizens made up two-thirds of the Catholic priests at work overseas.”212 However, the support of the State throughout the nineteenth century was unreliable, and depended on the view of the regime in power at that time. Napoleon Bonaparte, who negotiated the concordant with Pope Pius VII, clearly regarded the Church as a political tool in the extension of the empire:

…these secular priests will be very useful to me in Asia, Africa, and in America; I will send them to gather information on the state of countries. Their robes protect them and serve to conceal political and commercial designs.213

Conversely, Charles X, whose six year reign ended in 1830 in the July Revolution, regarded the French Empire as an extension of the Christian Empire.

Nor were those heading the Catholic missions in France as one in their view of the role of the missionary. Monsignor Guébriant, who was superior-general of the Société des Missions Étrangères in 1831, stated that “…in the colonies, as elsewhere, the missions have only one goal, exclusive of any other: to convert pagan lands to Christianity,”214 but Catholic historian Valérien Groffier, writing in the earlier twentieth century, believed that there was evidence to support a conclusion that religious workers always knew how “to reconcile [their] patriotic obligations with the obligations of their sacred ministry.”215 In real terms, the “map of worldwide missionary activity … does not resemble the map of formal Empire in any era,”216 missionaries frequently operated outside of the authority of the French Empire, in some senses informing “…French relations with the wider world, not simply the empire.” 217 This leads me to agree with White and Daughton’s view that
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“...missionaries operated according to a rationale that bore little relationship to those of conventional nation- or empire-builders.”

French missionaries were often the sons and daughters of regions that were fervently Catholic and had been at the forefront of counter-revolutionary activity during the French Revolution. For example, three of the four priests who missioned amongst Pirirākau were from Lyon and Nantes, which had suffered horrific violence, death and poverty as a result of the revolution. My conviction is that this traumatising legacy is a foundation of both the region's identity and the identity of these men. Many French missionaries are said to have held a “counterrevolutionary vision of a bygone France” and were suspicious that French civilisation was imbued with an anticlerical republican agenda so they “made little effort to force converts into European modes of dress and behaviour.” As for the missionaries themselves, it seems “few... considered themselves agents of imperial expansion; in fact, many worried that French colonialism, driven by anticlerical republicans, would spell the end of evangelizing.”

GENDER, RACE AND CLASS IN 19TH CENTURY FRANCE

Whilst French Catholic missionaries did not intend to take an active role in spreading French civilisation, these men and women were, nevertheless, raised in a society that expressed and taught particular views on gender, race and class that unconsciously informed mission work. France, indeed the continent of Europe, in the nineteenth century saw the emergence of empirical observation, that is the scientific study of humanity. Combined with this positivism were two key philosophies: humanism, or the care for mankind, and materialism, the rejection of
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metaphysics. Positivism, combined with these two philosophies, encouraged the “study of the origins of human physical variation, and ...the connection between physical and cultural differences.”

French naturalist, Etienne Geoffroy de Saint-Hilaire (1772-1844) termed this 'transcendental anatomy,' implying that all living organisms were structurally similar or analogous. Consequently he believed that all creation conformed to a single, 'transcendental' plan, stating that "there is but one animal, not many" and that deviation from the plan was deformity. His peer, French naturalist Georges Cuvier (1769-1832) contributed the belief in the primordial existence of a limited number of permanent forms, which is to say that races are a distinct historical record of the evolution of humanity. This racial determinism allowed cultural diversity to be explained by physical diversity, principles laid out in the foundation text for racial determinism in France, Pierre Cabanis's book *Rapports du physique et du moral de l’homme* (1795-1798).

By the mid-nineteenth century, in trying to categorise peoples across the world, Jan Goldstein has identified four considerations: 1) “the ethos of science, a set of implicit moral norms” that moves morality out of metaphysics and into the realm of what is observable and measurable; 2) trying to understand the impact of scientific conclusions, asking the question whether they were “morally obliged to consider the probable consequences of one’s pronouncements”; 3) a “traditional discourse of matter and spirit” in which “materialism, or the reduction of the human to the material component, was equated with fatalism and condemned for its denial of the freedom of the human will,” a humanist revision of Catholic doctrine developed by Victor Cousin; 4) finally, “the widely accepted postulate of the equality of all human
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beings, grounded either in Christian doctrine or in the secular principles of universal human rights.”

The Catholic missionaries, particularly if they engaged with higher education, would have supped on this complex mix of racial determinism, humanist equality and paternalistic moral framing; whether they imbibed or refused, they had to take a position on race in light of these new fields of ethnology and anthropology and that would have coloured their encounter with indigenous people, including my ancestors in Pirirākau. It is telling that Catholic missionaries who had spent a decade in Tauranga Moana and remained in Aotearoa New Zealand their whole lives are not noted for vigorously protesting the war and the confiscation of the land and property of Pirirākau. There is little evidence for why they were inactive in doing so, but I am left to wonder if the racial theory they were raised with led them to believe that colonisation was an inevitability due to what they regarded as the scientifically proven superiority of the white races. In their defence I would comment that, whatever their view of the equality of people and societies, Catholic missionaries recognised the reality of their place in Aotearoa New Zealand; their power and influence carried very little political weight, so they concentrated on their theological and social influence.

In addition to its impact on race, the rise of positivism fundamentally changed the foundations on which views of gender in France were argued. Between 1780 and 1830 a new field of research called ‘bio-ethnography’ used the scientific method to catalogue the biological differences between men and women. Their complimentarity model led academics of that era to locate the feminine in the reproductive, maternal body. Prior to this model, women had been regarded as

---

similar to men, if rather less perfect. The implications of the similarity was that, whilst often excluded from public life, women were not excluded on biological grounds and potentially could attain a role in public life. In the complimentarity model, women became the opposite of men, the Other: “He embodied reason; she embodied emotion. He was an autonomous individual, capable of governing his own behaviour and hence that of others. She needed to be governed.” Their exclusion was made normative because “biology [had] now became destiny for women”; consequently “man’s ‘natural’ sphere was identified as the public world of business and politics, and woman’s as the private world, governed by sentiment and emotion.”

The impact of applying the scientific method to gender and gender roles was far-reaching. During the French Revolution, there was a clear reassertion of men’s power over women in all spheres. Women who were revolutionaries often fought, in the wars and in the revolutionary institutions, on two fronts: both against anti-revolutionary forces, and for the extension of the rights promised in the French Revolution to include women. It was this latter battle that saw revolutionary women mocked and shouted down in political debates, satirised in society, and in some instances violently repressed. Catholic women joined the fight against the Revolution because of attempts to remove Catholicism from France; the commitment of these women to the veneration of the Virgin Mary now seems a quaint motivation for violent conflict, but led many to take roles supporting troops at the frontlines. Many of these women also suffered violent repression. Susan Foley suggests the greater role for women in a time of conflict in public life is the likely reason men were required to articulate in speeches and writing their specific views of gender roles, particularly women’s ‘natural’ role being the private domestic sphere.

Napoléon Bonaparte brought a modicum of peace at the turn of the nineteenth
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century and re-established law and order in the Civil Code of 1804. This code enshrined in law the inequality of women that had emerged in stark terms in the French Revolution and, in particular, the principle in law that women were chattels of their husbands: “Women and children belong to the man as the tree and its fruits belong to the gardener.” In this area there was no conflict between the Catholic Church and the French Empire; their views dovetailed together to confine women to the private world of domesticity.

The private functions for which women are destined by their very nature are related to the general order of society; this order results from the differences between man and woman. Each sex is called to the kind of occupation which is fitting for it; its action is circumscribed within this circle which it cannot break through, because nature, which has imposed these limits on man, commands imperiously and receives no law.

The complementarity model of course extended from gender into sexuality. Whereas prior to the nineteenth century the control and repression of sexuality had been confined to theology and the church, the complementarity model brought a new imperative to control women’s sexuality. The Catholic Church had long been insistent that sex was for procreation, not pleasure, and eroticism was an anathema. The complementarity model added the perception that sexuality was governed by sentiment and emotion, and therefore women’s sexuality was also dangerously uncontrolled and worryingly irresistible to men. Their exclusion to the private sphere was to protect men from their wiles so that men could focus on their role as governors and public actors. Jean-Jacques Rousseau promoted what became a societal ideal: women remain in the private sphere, the ideal woman was chaste and
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unattainable, and in doing so men would be encouraged to overcome their baser
instincts and devote their energy to public service.\textsuperscript{232}

Outside of the urban areas, the ideal woman barely retained her sexuality, almost
made of the very earth that she worked, “the hardy peasant woman, impervious to
pain, giving birth rapidly in the fields before returning to her duties.”\textsuperscript{233} This
‘natural’ imagery and metaphor was a very powerful social construct at this time, a
hankering for simpler times and a lament of the decadence in cities. Our French
Catholic missionaries, with these norms in mind, were likely edified by the hard-
working Pirirākau women they encountered whilst horrified by the public nature of
sexuality between men and women. Certainly Pirirākau women who married French
men took on far more traditional attitudes to public and private life that model
orthodox Catholic marriage relationships. Furthermore, polygamy, a chiefly practice
in many tribes, is entirely absent in our whakapapa from the time of first encounter
with Catholic missionaries, suggesting they were not leery of imposing their societal
and church norms on gender and sexuality.

It is a common view that class\textsuperscript{234} played a role in the British colonisation of Aotearoa
New Zealand and subsequent development of settler communities, as it encouraged
England’s poor to settle here and attempt to build a more egalitarian society (for
British settlers, not Māori) and inspired a social concern amongst British
missionaries to avoid repeating the excesses of industrial England here.\textsuperscript{235} Like
England, France’s social structure changed rapidly with their own industrial
revolution in the early nineteenth century, moving from landed gentry to the new
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money of industry and from a peasant class to a growth in the urban poor. Unlike England, the rise of the city, of industry and the rise of class struggle in France is muddied. The early nineteenth century for the French people is marked more by the Napoleonic wars than a class consciousness, and there is no clear launch of the industrial revolution in France, though most agree broad scale French industrialisation was post the Napoleonic wars from 1815 to 1860.236

There are academic divisions about whether the French Revolution was a class struggle. Traditionally, French historians from Jaures to Lefebvre regarded it as a struggle between a feudal old regime and a capitalist bourgeoisie. In the late twentieth century there have been three revisions of that view: firstly, empirical studies showed that the Revolution began as old regime factional fighting and continued under non-bourgeois leadership;237 secondly the Revolution was an economic revolution triggered by a fiscal crisis, from which class struggle emerged;238 thirdly, the Revolution was ideological, a revolution of ideas, emotions, and cultural forms.239 I agree with Michael Mann, the latest academic to wrestle with the motivations of the French Revolution, that it is likely a combination of all three as all of the revisions rely on quite separate historical evidence to support their arguments, yet none can point to a fundamental weakness in the evidence supporting the other revisions. There are class struggle features of the French Revolution, but in no sense was it a pure class struggle, as “to the mob, bread mattered most,”240 not the means of production. Yet for the peasantry, it clearly became a class struggle because “France’s fiscal problem was not a lack of wealth but a tax system bearing down hardest on those who were becoming the least able to
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pay: the peasants.”\textsuperscript{241} The imperial activities of France had quite a different outcome to those of England:

Throughout the eighteenth century Britain and France struggled for global supremacy. Britain was victorious in three of the four wars, losing only when confronted also by rebellious American colonists. Even in that war, France made no gains to pay for its high cost. Britain acquired a global empire; France acquired debts.\textsuperscript{242}

Whilst the idea of class struggle makes sense for the peasantry, the leadership of the French Revolution were ultimately more concerned with the triumph of ideas than wrestling away the means of production. They were Ideological elites – lawyers, doctors, regional politicians, even 55 clerics. The schism with the Catholic Church was not about class, but about ideas; Catholic sympathies were seen as anti-revolutionary because of the support for the ruling authorities and the declared disagreement with the humanistic aims of the revolution.

The men who took up Pompallier’s call to mission in Aotearoa New Zealand for the Catholic Church were all born in the first decade or so of the nineteenth century. Their parents had suffered through the French Revolution and were living in a nation marked by nationalistic fervour, enamoured with the power of Napoleon’s personality and vision, yet with no resolution to the fiscal failure upon which revolution had begun; France was poor, its military was over-stretched and its social structure had been uprooted, laid bare without resolution. Before any of these men left for Aotearoa New Zealand, Napoleon had been defeated in 1815, a monarchy re-established and then overthrown again in 1830, a different monarchy established and then this was overthrown in 1848. One of the persistent myths as to a motivation of the British for the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi was that France wished to colonise Aotearoa New Zealand themselves; as evidenced by the existence of
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Akaroa, its missionaries and the aspirations of Baron Charles de Thierry. This brief examination of early nineteenth century France suggests to me that France itself was in significant chaos and its agents in the Empire operated quite independently of any central control, none more so than the Catholic missionaries in nations far outside of French influence. Whilst the missionaries to Pirirākau were French men, it seems nonsensical to consider them agents of the French Empire.

THE CATHOLIC MISSION IN TAURANGA MOANA

First contact in Tauranga Moana was somewhat later than other parts of the North Island, and for some time there were few other European settlers than the Anglican and Catholic missionaries. It should be noted that up until the confiscations of the 1860s, Pirirākau had not sold any of their land to settlers or missionaries, and Ngāti Ranginui more broadly had only seen two land purchases to the Church Mission Society (C.M.S.) and John Lees Faulkner respectively. Archdeacon Brown ran an Anglican mission at Te Papa on the block purchased by C.M.S. in what is now the central business district of Tauranga city. The Catholic mission came to Te Puna in 1840. The success of this mission to Tauranga Māori, particularly amongst Pirirākau, was because of inter-marriage by early French settlers Louis Bidois and Emile Borell. Oral tradition in Pirirākau reports that these two travelled together from near the French-Belgium border on a whaling ship bound for Akaroa. Upon arrival they travelled north to the Bay of Plenty. Louis Bidois married Irihapeti Whakamomori and resided at Te Puna. Peter Tremewan is somewhat less complimentary about the Frenchmen, suggesting both may have been deserters from ships that arrived in Aotearoa New Zealand. Certainly this is a realistic scenario as Charles Poitier, another French settler, is known to have deserted in the Bay of Islands before traveling to Tauranga. In any case, these settlers became traders who “engaged in trading pigs, potatoes, and dressed flax for muskets, powder, blankets, tobacco, and
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other goods.” It is an oral tradition in Tauranga that Louis Bidois encouraged the establishment of a mission station in Te Puna. Tawharangi Nuku suggests that Pirirākau motivations for a mission station were a desire for improved trading opportunities, particularly the attraction of acquiring muskets. Whether they came with a gospel would have been neither here nor there: “The new theologies espoused by the missionaries would have been of secondary concern; the priority being, to establish trading link opportunities.”

Ten years after the Anglican mission had started in Tauranga Moana, Father Philippe Viard, travelling with Bishop Pompallier from the Bay of Islands to Akaroa from 1840 to 1841, founded a Catholic mission in Tauranga Moana in May 1840, establishing his base at Ōtumoetai and ranging as far as the Waikato and the Waipa. Both Pompallier and Viard were born in Lyon, in 1802 and 1809 respectively. Lyon, like the Vendée region, had fought a counter-revolutionary war against the National Convention during the French Revolution, with the result that in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century it was impoverished due to the decimation of the silk trade and lower wages. The prospect of leaving cannot have been too difficult a choice for both men. Viard had entered the Society of Mary in 1839 and left for the Māori Mission in Aotearoa New Zealand in June of that year. Viard was a formidable leader in his own right: he was given charge of the Marists in Aotearoa New Zealand in 1848 and in 1860 was officially made the Bishop of Wellington Diocese. Pompallier enthused about his missionary to Tauranga: “I sent them a priest in the person of Father Viard whom they loved. He was accompanied by the native neophyte Romano who had relations at that place and who enjoyed much esteem and confidence… The mission in that place had prompt success.”
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judgement of prompt success may have been coloured by competition with the Anglicans. Dom Vaggioli recorded that “Tauranga, in the Bay of Plenty, founded in 1840, had a priest and a Marist lay-brother. They had two raupo huts at Tauranga and another at Mounga-tapu [sic]. They ministered to six tribes who had three raupo chapels. The missionaries owned a boat.”\textsuperscript{249} It is recorded that the closest chapel for Pirirākau was on Motuhoa Island, just off the coast from Te Puna within the harbour.\textsuperscript{250}

It is important to recognise that “Māori dictated the direction of the early mission, inviting or forcing Pompallier to establish stations among particular iwi and hapū;”\textsuperscript{251} the Tauranga Moana mission was more the brain child of the Bidois and Borell whānau than Pompallier or Viard. Viard was replaced by Father Jean Pezant in late 1840 who transferred up from Akaroa, and was himself another Marist missionary. Born in 1809 in Chanonat, a commune in the Auvergne region, Penzant was from quite a different political and social background. Whereas his leaders had experienced poverty in an urban setting, Penzant grew up in an idyllic rural region that was the celebrated birthplace of three significant revolutionary leaders, including Pierre-Andre Coffinhal who was a close friend of Robespierre. Penzant may well have had a more nationalistic view, given he grew up in a commune whose independence and authority was established by the National Assembly to demonstrate the benefits of the revolution to the French people. Unsurprisingly, Penzant was far more realistic in his appraisal of the mission:

In sole charge of the two districts of Rotorua and Tauranga, all I could aim to do, while waiting for reinforcements, was to prevent them becoming Protestants, to
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catechise them ‘on the run’, as they themselves would say, and to provide baptism for the ill and for the healthy who desired it.\footnote{Fr. Pezant quoted in Harman, Struggle for Success; 189.}

Penzant was a Māori Missioner the majority of his life, leaving Tauranga to work in Matamata, then Taranaki and finally Whanganui.\footnote{Harman, Struggle for Success; 405.} By the time Penzant left Tauranga in 1844 there were 343 neophytes in the whole of Tauranga Moana;\footnote{Stokes, Tauranga County; 51.} the figures provide little assurance of the prompt success that Pompallier wrote so glowingly of.

When Penzant left, he was replaced by Father Jean-Simon-Marie Bernard, who led the Māori mission in Tauranga Moana until its close.\footnote{Harman, Struggle for Success; 401.} Bernard was born in 1807 in Chantenay in the Nantes region. Nantes borders Vendée, but sided with the Republic in the War of Vendée, despite their long Catholic association. Consequently, Nantes was the location of mass drownings of Catholic counter-revolutionaries from Vendée. Importantly, Nantes, including the commune of Chantenay, was at the forefront of the industrial revolution in France, an urban environment that cannot have failed to make an impression on Bernard. In coming to Tauranga, Bernard had expected to find a vibrant and committed Māori Catholic community “but was met instead with indifference. He reported to Marist headquarters that Māori had lapsed in their Catholic prayers and attendance at the chapel.”\footnote{Harman, Struggle for Success; 212.} Other men who joined the Tauranga Moana Māori Mission in its just over ten years of history included Brother Justin (Etienne) Perret, Brother Euloge (Antoine) Chabany and Coadjutor Brother Luc Mace.\footnote{E. Clisby, Marist Brothers and Maori 1838-1988 (Auckland: Marist Publications, 2002); 9-10.} Tauranga Moana was a convenient location for Marist missionaries from throughout the country to gather, so “in March 1845, there were 11 of them, priests and brothers, probably a record
number for any station at that time outside the procure.” However, growing conflicts in the Waikato and Bay of Plenty led to the departure of Bernard as part of a Marist exodus to the Wellington diocese in the 1850s. Bernard was exhausted and downhearted:

I do not see how, without a great miracle of grace, New Zealand could become truly Catholic. If these peoples do not come together into a social unit, and if they remain forever nomadic, I believe that humanly speaking we could never convert them. Today they are here, tomorrow they will be 5 or 6 leagues from here. They spend 7 to 8 months in their pa; then they disperse into the forest 5 or 6 leagues away to spend the winter, dig up potatoes and plant others.

By 1863 there were no priests visiting Tauranga Moana, and it was noted gloomily by “the Resident Magistrate at Tauranga, Henry Tacey Clarke, [that] in 1861… ‘two-thirds of these people during the Taranaki contest called themselves King’s Men, especially those of the Pirirakau and Matewaitai hapus [sic].’”

While success may have eluded the Catholic mission, conflict between C.M.S. and the Catholics was ever present: “there was bitter rivalry between the C.M.S. and Roman Catholic missionaries. Dieffenbach commented in 1841: ‘The missionaries of both persuasions reside here and oppose each other as much as they can, and of course the native converts do the same.’” Incendiary letters and polemics were rife in local newspapers and in correspondence back to the parent churches. For example, Thomas Chapman, a C.M.S. missionary, wrote in December 1841 asking “How low is the Church of Rome fallen since the bishop here is content to purchase adherents to her cause with cloaks and blankets; and even to baptise positive heathens into her communion. We hear the bishop boasts of his ‘thousands’. We can confidently state that within the range of our observation, his proselytes are very
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few, and the majority of those baptised by him and his priests are the children of heathen parents, won by trifling presents.”

The first Catholic Māori Mission in Tauranga Moana lasted a little more than a decade, and within another ten years priests had ceased visiting the area at all. For the next twenty years, until the arrival of two priests in 1886, Pirirākau were left to their own devices to follow their Catholic faith as their conscience dictated. This does not strike one as the recipe for ongoing success, yet I find I concur with Atiria Ake and Tame Kuka that “…the Catholic Church had a huge influence on getting rid of [traditional] knowledge and those practices,” irrevocably transforming Pirirākau understanding of their atua and their own circumstance, but perhaps not in the way the priests and brothers intended. My view is that Pirirākau were not transformed by the efforts of the missionaries nor eschewed their traditional practices to meet the social norms encouraged by missionaries. Rather, Pirirākau was transformed because of the conviction of Pirirākau leadership that Catholicism, and more generally Christianity, enhanced their power and authority, their mana, to a greater extent than their pre-contact Tākitimu contextual theology. Pirirākau leadership understood that the atua wawao and atua take of their ancestors lacked the mana to maintain the tapu of Pirirākau in this dynamic environment of encounter and colonisation; the God of Christianity had prevailed. Yet it appears that they also understood that this God could be viewed through tapu, mana and whakawhanaungatanga. Perhaps it is more accurate to say this new relationship with God had a huge impact on Pirirākau, rather than the missionaries themselves. The Catholic missionaries may have arrived with the gospel, but our Pirirākau ancestors very quickly took it out of their hands.
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To understand this transformation in Pirirākau theology, we first need to understand what the Catholic Church was attempting to communicate in the nineteenth century, and therefore what kind of God Pirirākau may have encountered. Over those first ten years of mission, the priests and brothers of the Catholic mission attempted to impart the teaching of the Catholic Church to inculcate Pirirākau into a church stretched across the entire globe, and a church that regarded itself as in a conflict with Protestantism. Pirirākau conversion and faithfulness was another sign to these missionaries of the truth and reliability of the message. These priests and brothers were guided by a coherent Catholic missiology that sought to be broad enough to meet any context missionaries encountered but clear enough to give missionaries confidence that their mission activity was consistent with the theology and practice of the Catholic Church worldwide.

19TH CENTURY CATHOLIC MISSIOLOGY

Nineteenth century Catholic missiology developed out of vigorous debates about Catholic missiology from the end of the seventeenth century and throughout the eighteenth century. Alphonsus Maria di Liguori (1696-1787), a Neapolitan moral theologian and founder of the Redemptorist Congregation, was central as he proposed a workable defence of equiprobabilism that was to have a profound impact on missionaries. Probabilism was initially posited by Bartolomé de Medina in 1577: "If an opinion is probable, it is allowed to be followed, even if the opposing opinion be more probable." By the middle of the seventeenth century, this doctrine had become firmly associated with the Jesuits. Initially, the debate about probabilism was a debate between those who favoured regular and wide sharing of the eucharist (often known as laxism and favoured by the religious involved in pastoral care), and those who insisted that the eucharist be restricted to those who had pursued a path of rigorous self-examination and moral purification (often called rigorism and
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favoured by the Jansenists). The first refutation of probabilism was probabiliorism, which was to say "more probable." Probabiliorism asserted that in competing opinions on what a moral law may propose, the more probable opinion had to be followed. Jansenists then suggested an even more rigorous response, called tutiorism, from the Latin for "safer". Tutiorism claimed that whatever the probability for or against a moral law, one must always follow the safest and most rigorous route, which is to say, the Jansenists thoroughly rejected probabilism. The problem then, at the end of the seventeenth century, was that probabilism, probabiliorism and tutiorism all failed to provide a bridge between Augustinian notions of grace and Catholic universalism. So it was that Eusebius Amort, a German theologian, proposed Equiprobabilism. Equiprobabilism is a tightrope between laxism and rigorism; an opinion on a moral law that favours freedom is equally or almost equally probable as the one that favours the law. Notably, Amort was clear that equiprobabilism may only apply when there is doubt concerning the existence of a law, not in a doubt as to whether an existing law has ceased to bind or has been fulfilled.  

De Liguori’s contribution was to argue for the place of reason in our decision making as a reflection of our conscience. He claimed the use of reason was practical and immediate. Whilst deliberately deciding on a course of action that went against what one knew was moral and right, even if the outcome was intended to be good, was a sin, an honest error of judgement in which one believed both the actions and outcome were good yet were not, was not a sin. This complex argument for the place of reason, conscience and faith in deciding between opinions, and recognition that even with the best of intentions it is possible to reach an impasse and even commit to an erroneous action, had a profound impact on mission: for those who had yet to encounter Christianity (by which he, of course, meant Catholicism), if their

---

particular interpretation of the moral law is probable it can be followed, even if another interpretation, that proposed by the Catholic Church as a revelation of Christ’s word, is more probable. To reiterate: de Liguori was proposing that if the people encountered by missionaries were living lives following their conscience, the Church could accept that those people were already amongst God’s elect as the conscience is evidence of God’s work in their lives:

He who has an invincibly erroneous conscience and acts according to it not only does not sin; moreover he is obligated to follow it. The reason is that even if the action in itself is not right, the operation of the conscience however is right. One is held to act according to the conscience, which is the immediate rule, if it suggests to act thus. 267

De Liguori reached this conclusion because he recognised that humanity was created, and declared good, by God prior to the creation of the Law.

By the priority of reason or nature, man was in the divine mind before the law was contemplated. For a legislator considers his subjects according to their nature and status and after that considers which appropriate laws ought to be imposed... and thus first God considered man, and then he considered the laws by which he was to be bound. 268

For de Liguori and proponents of equiprobabilism, this applied not just to the first act of the creation of Adam and Eve and their descendents up until the Law was given to Moses, but also to those people who had yet to hear the Good News throughout the world in the eighteenth century. He asserts that Christ’s choice “to place himself under the species of bread” was a deliberate use of that which is common so that his message and grace would be available to all people as “bread costs very little and can be found everywhere.” 269 This caused consternation, particularly amongst Jansenists. Central to the Catholic Reformation of the
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eighteenth century, and flowering in different contexts throughout Europe (the rejection of the Jansenist movement in France being a notable exception), Jansenism was part of a Catholic Reform programme that suppressed the influence of monasteries, attempted to integrate education under state control, and restricted popular devotions, pilgrimages, and rituals. Austria saw this develop into a systemic theology of Josephenism. Probabilism is the early expression of a popular Catholic revival that served as a balance to Catholic Reform. The Catholic revival was driven out of the religious and laity who were closely connected with the poor in Europe, as a defence of those communities’ own self-expression of faith and belief. In this, we can see that de Liguori’s reaffirmation that Christ comes as bread is a laxist argument that Christ makes himself available to as many people as possible, and that the argument is clearly grounded in his desire to defend human liberty in reason and conscience amongst the poor he himself worked with. He argues that as we are made in the image of God, so we are gifted the liberty by grace to determine the law, not slavishly follow the law out of fear of judgement:

...what is necessary, I said, is not a worthy disposition but an appropriate one. If it were required that one be worthy, who would ever dare communicate? Only a God could ever be worthy to receive a God. By appropriate disposition, I mean that of a feeble creature, dressed in the unhappy flesh of Adam. For it suffices, normally speaking, to be in a state of grace and to have a vibrant desire to grow in love for Jesus Christ.270

De Liguori, following the foundations of Amort, found the bridge that had been lacking and transformed religious and laity work amongst the poor and then Catholic mission work throughout the world.
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By the time of the eighteenth century, missionaries in Europe had abandoned attempts to force the peasants to eschew their own spirituality. As noted above, missionaries now affirmed genuine piety, and sought instead only to strengthen the connections between popular piety and the institutional Catholic Church. Where Pirirākau transformed their traditional practice, it was not driven by the missionaries, but on their own terms and for their own motivations, they developed the practice and process that most enhanced tapu and mana. The approach to mission taken by Pompallier and his missionaries has this theological basis; “while not abandoning the concept of original sin [it] downplayed the strongly negative Augustinian condemnation of human nature and embraced a generally more optimistic view of human moral capability.”

Nineteenth century Catholic missionary work in Aotearoa New Zealand is notable for the lack of sustained efforts to transform Māori communities socially or politically; this is not to say that the power relationships between Catholic missionaries and Māori were balanced and mutually enhancing, nor that Catholic missionaries stood innocently apart from efforts to colonise the country, but to note that the first priority for the Catholic mission was not integrating Māori into servitude for the benefit of a particular European empire, but integration into the Roman Catholic church, an empire in its own right.

Pompallier’s early pastoral *Ako Marama o te Hahi Katorika Romana ko te Pou me te Unga o te Pono* was translated and shared with the Māori missions throughout Aotearoa New Zealand in 1842-43. It gives an insight into both the missiology and theology of the Aotearoa New Zealand mission of the period, and is the only published document we still retain that would have been in circulation whilst there was an

---

active Māori mission in Tauranga Moana. The first part of the pastoral explores the conflict with the Anglican mission, answering what were clearly regular questions and concerns for new Catholics in the predominantly Anglican nation. At this time of early mission in Aotearoa New Zealand, starting some time after the Anglican missions, clearly the first priority for Pompallier in integrating Māori Catholics into the Roman Catholic church was that they understood that the Roman Catholic Church was in an international conflict with Protestantism, and were clearly able to draw a line between themselves and the Anglican communion. Pompallier juxtaposes the motivating love of the Catholic Church that has led to a mission in Aotearoa New Zealand against the desire of others for land: “Kihai hoki ta ratou mana me ta ratou wenua i riro mai ki ahau; engari ka riro atu taku aroha me te aroha o te Atua ki a ratou.”272 Their power and authority and their land was not acquired by me; but my love and the love of the Lord was given away to them.273 The implicit criticism of the Anglican missionaries is both clear yet politely deniable. Yet his assertion that the Catholic Church had no interest in Māori land was regarded with suspicion by Atiria Ake. She was strident in her view that “the Catholic Church is just a party to being thieves of Māori land” and that the missionaries were “bringing the Word of the Lord there, taking their land from under their feet... amassing such vast amounts of land.”274 In any case, Pompallier continues and reminds the reader that the Catholic mission came to Aotearoa New Zealand in response to the peoples’ own desire: “e mahara ana ano ahau ki te koutou pirangi ki te matau i te kupu o te Atua.”275 I also remember your desire to understand the word of the Lord. Nevertheless, Pompallier acknowledges that there has been conflict in trying to impart the teaching of the Catholic Church and compliments readers on their commitment to

---
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the faith: “Kua turituri hoki koutou, i Niutirene, ki nga korero e wakahe ki te ako o te hahi take Katorika Romana.” You have all been unyielding, here in New Zealand, to the gossip that has belittled the teachings of the Roman Catholic church. He expands on the more wild accusations and instructs his readers to dismiss the gossips: “he hahi Wakapakoko, he Hahi Kohuru, he Hahi tango wenua” A church of idols, a church of murder and a church that takes land. In defence of the Catholic Church he leans on the religious vows of chastity, poverty and obedience: “ko wai i mahue i ona matua, i ona teina, i one tuahine, i tona iwi, i tona kainga, ara i nga mea katoa o te ao ki mahi utu kore mo koutou?” Who has left his parents, his brothers, his sisters, his people, his home, that is to say everything in the world to freely work for you.

In the second part of the pastoral, Pompallier establishes the purpose of this document: “ko te pukapuka nei e wakamatau ai ki a koutou i te pukapuka tapu ano, i te tikanga o te kupu o te Atua, ara, te wakaponotanga o te nuinga o nga keritiano... o te Hahi Katorika Romana.” This book explains to you the scriptures, the purpose of the word of God and the beliefs of most of the Christians in the Roman Catholic Church. He asserts the authority of the Catholic Church, emphasizing its legacy and geneology: “Ko te hahi Katorika Romana te hahi o te Atua ora; ta te mea kei taua hahi e piri ana te nuinga o nga keritiano no nga tauiwi o te wenua, nga tau katoa.” The Roman Catholic Church is the church of the living God; because the majority of Christians throughout the world and throughout time have been a part of that church. Pompallier then affirms that the Church tradition and scripture provide understanding: “e rua mea e pai tahi ai ki te wakarite i taua rapunga, na, ko te tukunga korero o te nuinga o nga keritiano o te ao, me etahi wahi marama o te pukapuka tapu” Two things are
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trustworthy in preparation for seeking the truth, the traditions of Christians throughout the world and some enlightenment of the scriptures.

Part three of the pastoral is instructive, providing the reader with a list of the right beliefs for a member of the Catholic Church:

1. Jesus is a member of the Godhead: “Ko Hehu Kerito te hunga tuarua o te hata Terinita, ko te kai wakaora ia...” 282 **Jesus Christ is the second part of the holy Trinity, he is the saviour.**

2. There is only one true church: “kihai hoki tana Kupu i mea ai: ko ahau e hanga i aku hahi, engari i taku hahi.” 283 **It is also not said in his Word: I will build my churches, but I will build my church.**

3. That church is anointed: “ka huaina Tapu te hahi o Hehu Kerito.” 284 **The church of Jesus Christ is named Holy.**

4. That church is the Catholic Church: “ka huaina te hahi o Hehu Kerito, ko te hahi Katorika” 285 **The Catholic church is named the church of Jesus Christ.**

5. Scripture cannot be separated from the tradition of the Church: “kahore ko te pukapuka kau ki te hahi...” 286 **The book is not apart from the church.**

6. The church’s teaching is wholly true and correct: “ko te hahi... e kore e ahei te ako he, te ako kino...” 287 **The church is unable to teach incorrectly or teach evil.**

7. Those outside of the Catholic Church are subject to judgement: “...ki waho i taua hahi, kahore te ora tonu mo te tangata.” 288 **Outside of that church, there is no everlasting life for a person.** This is still a noted feature of local understanding.
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of Catholic teaching today. My interviewees all regarded this as a lasting, negative legacy of Catholicism:

...fire and brimstone came into being. Before that, we never heard about going to hell, there’s no such thing as going to hell. If you sinned you were a bad person? No such thing.269

...the fear of hell was never at the marae. It was at the convent.290

Pompallier wrote at least 400 letters,291 but Ako Marama is the longest pastoral in the Māori language from this first period of Catholic Māori mission. Five years later, in 1847, the first Māori language Catholic prayer book Ko te ako me te karakia o te Hahi Katorika Romana292 was published that includes a short instruction, the Gospel of St. Matthew, catechisms, devotions, Stations of the Cross, the Rosary, hymns and prayers. Ako Marama is a notable example of orthodox Catholic missiology in nineteenth century Aotearoa New Zealand that explicates the more immanent concerns of the church to ensure their flock were firm allies in the international battle for souls with Protestantism, and specifically Anglicanism.

CONCLUSION: TAPU, MANA & CATHOLICISM

The French Catholic missionaries to Pirirākau in the first half of the nineteenth century were significantly different in outlook, experience and political sympathies than the Protestant and particularly Anglican missionaries who had a much larger presence throughout Aotearoa New Zealand. Born in the first decade of the nineteenth century, they were predominantly from communities in France who had suffered terribly from the excesses of the French Revolution because of their counter-revolutionary activities or those of close neighbours. The French missionaries were
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men from communities marked by poverty and often disassociated from the nationalism generated by the revolution. In their lifetime, these men lived through the Napoleonic Wars and the establishment and overthrow of two monarchies. They were missionaries beyond the borders of the French Empire, with little reason to trumpet the benefits of French civilisation. In addition, they were part of a Catholic Church whose members had actively fought against the revolution and had then suffered an attempted genocide. In their childhood, the church had only recently been rehabilitated back into French society to the satisfaction of the Emperor, but to the disquiet of the Pope. Whilst the largest faith in France, it was not comfortably ensconced within this reformed nation state.

Yet the explosion of ideas and philosophies that accompanied the revolution would have had a significant impact on the formation of these men. Post-revolution, France was marked by clear and repressive attitudes to gender; women had been scientifically proven to be the gender of emotion and sentiment, and were consequently excluded from public life and objectified for their dangerous sexuality whilst idealised as chaste mothers in both urban and rural settings. Women as leaders of action, thought and idea was an anathema; this was doubly so for members of the hierarchy of the Catholic Church who had codified the feminine into the dualism of virgin/whore. Attitudes to race in nineteenth century France were transformed by the introduction of a positivism that merely affirmed a racial determinism that ethnologists and then anthropologists had expected to find: cultural diversity was explained by physical diversity and suggested a hierarchy of civilisation and evolution in humanity. The case for class consciousness is less certain. Whilst most of the missionaries were from regions in France that had experienced harsh poverty because of the failure of the French economy, those same regions had aligned themselves with the Catholic Church more than the revolutionaries. In addition the industrial revolution and its impacts were initially far less pervasive in France than in England, so whilst these men would have been
aware of the urban poverty driven by industry, poverty was also clearly linked to the ongoing social unrest during and proceeding from the Napoleonic Wars. This French society, either in a direct or communal manner, formed the missionaries who made their way to Tauranga Moana. They arrived with a worldview from which they gazed upon Pirirākau society, and this contributed to the actions and ideas of their mission work.

Their experience of mission in Tauranga Moana amongst Pirirākau met with mixed success at best. Over the decade of mission, a few hundred Māori were nominally converted to Catholicism, but most sober estimates seem to raise doubts about the reliability of the numbers and the commitment of the people. The Bidois, Borell and Poitier families were clearly desirous of the mission, but this does not speak to the appeal of the mission to Pirirākau in the wider sense. In addition, as the developing conflicts and tensions led to the abandonment of the mission station by the priests and brothers, there was really very little opportunity for the Catholic missionaries to embed a tradition in Tauranga Moana. And yet, in spite of these events, Catholicism did transform Pirirākau. The pre-contact Tākitimu contextual theology had failed to maintain the tapu and mana of our ancestors in a time of flux and change. Our ancestors recognised that the Christian God had enhanced the power and authority of settlers and the missionaries such that their efforts and works were successful. So Pirirākau deliberately and intentionally invited a new relationship with this Christian God. I can find no evidence that Pirirākau ever returned to their previous theology or practice. Catholicism did not take our atua wawao and atua take from us as part of the experience of colonisation; we chose a new path with this new God that would enhance our tapu and mana. It is this new relationship that had a huge impact on Pirirākau and they had practices and process for whakawhanaungatanga that ensured they would maintain this new divine relationship, missionaries or no.

This is not to downplay the fact that those early years of mission had an impact on the cosmology and the theology of Pirirākau as it offered a new terminology and
new concepts. Nineteenth century Catholic missiology ensured that when the missionaries arrived, they arrived with an expectation that Christ makes himself available to as many people as possible, and therefore they would find the gift of reason and conscience amongst Pirirākau. As such, they presumed our Pirirākau ancestors already had the capacity to recognise and determine to live life according to the law that was pleasing to God; in this sense the missionaries intended to interpret that which they found rather than arriving with a pre-determined motivation to transform or civilise us. The missiology is born out in the disinterest of Catholic missionaries in affecting the Māori social structures and cultural practices; while there were some practices that would have been an anathema, the faith of the missionaries was that the truth of the message and the grace extended would see the abandonment of those practices contrary to the law of God.

The delivery of that message through letters and pastorals such as *Ako Marama o te Hahi Katorika Romana ko te Pou me te Unga o te Pono* bear out these conclusions. The understated but significant connection between the Catholic Church and Pirirākau experience is that Pompallier appeals to the long church history and the relational connectedness of the communion of saints as the basis of his authority, which is to say he appeals to whakapapa. Whakapapa has significant power and authority, that is mana, because it establishes the connection between the divine, those who have passed on, those who are currently living and those who will come; I am not sure if Pompallier meant to connect the church with this central of tenet of Pirirākau life, but he certainly achieved that in his pastoral. Our Pirirākau ancestors invited the message of the Catholic Church because they were desirous of making a connection into this new whakapapa. While the teachings about Jesus Christ and the good news are quite alien, the appeal to mana is not. Whatever the geopolitical reality of France at this time, the picture painted for our ancestors of the technology, the military power, the sheer size of the population behind the Catholic missionaries was evidence for them that the gospel message had mana. The appeal to whakapapa, to a
church tradition and particularly to a communion of saints in the Catholic missiology, provided a connection to understand and perhaps integrate this new god, his son and his helper into a Pirirākau cosmology and theology, and by doing so to enhance the mana and tapu of Pirirākau itself. All that now remained, was the testing and purifying of the relationship with this new God in the crucible of conflict.
As the Catholic missionaries left, Pirirākau trod a path to conflict as part of the Kingitanga with the Crown. Today it is difficult to see any pathway other than our historical experience, but at the time our ancestors did not desire war and had the mana to make decisions that could potentially avoid it. They made decisions with the hope for peace rather than the hopelessness of inevitable war. Nevertheless, war came and sides had to be chosen. The theology and cosmology of Pirirākau was to be tested in conflict. Left to their own development, Pirirākau, like other Māori throughout the country, nominally retained the Catholic identity. Whilst the missionaries had left, those early years of mission had seen Pirirākau choose to transform their own pre-contact Tākitimu contextual theology to a Catholic orthopraxis with the apparent goal of building a relationship with this Christian God. The French Catholic missionaries had shown little real interest in affecting the Māori social structures and cultural practices, so Pirirākau still regarded their divine relationships in terms of tapu, mana and whakawhanaungatanga; the enhanced mana and tapu of the Christian God was a desirable connection. Their Catholic orthopraxis lacked the leadership the priests had provided, and Pirirākau looked, with increasing confidence, for a Christian expression that supported their geopolitical reality. Into this void and into our military losses here in Tauranga Moana stepped Tiu Tamihana and the Pai Mārire faith.

Pai Mārire has been unfairly maligned for over a century as a violent, bloodthirsty, syncretic, eclectic, polytheistic faith that returned to the worst practices of pre-contact Māori society. Whilst academic thought has moved on, this picture is still firmly entrenched in popular discourse such as it is on nineteenth century Aotearoa New Zealand life. To debunk this insulting myth, I will examine Pai Mārire’s beginning with Te Ua Haumene in Taranaki before examining in depth the arrival of Pai Mārire into a hotbed of conflict and loss in Tauranga Moana and to Pirirākau. The history will allow us to question the charges made against Pai Mārire as I
explicate its theology and orthopraxy. In light of this, I will finish with the conclusion I have been drawn to, namely, that Pai Mārire is an orthodox Māori contextual theology formed in the most remarkable of circumstances.

PAI MĀRIRE BEGINNINGS

Paul Clark’s seminal work, Hauhau, provides an in-depth examination of the life and impact of Te Ua Haumene Horopāpera Tuwhakararo and the indigenous religious movement he founded, Pai Mārire. Whilst significant, Clark’s work does suffer from a tendency to treat tribes as homogeneous in their political leanings and loyalties. For example, he consistently states that Te Arawa were loyalists to the Crown, whereas the reality was more complicated; in just one instance of this, Ngāti Rangiwewehi supported the Kīngitanga supporters in both the battles at Pukehinahina and Te Ranga. He also mistakenly identifies tribes; Pirirākau are consistently refered to as Ngāiterangi in the book; whilst we can whakapapa to Ngāiterangi, we consider our tribe to be Ngāti Ranginui and did so in the period for which he is writing.

Te Ua Haumene was born in Waiaua, Taranaki. At age three, he was captured and taken to Kāwhia. In his early adult years he joined the Wesleyan missionary John Whiteley and was baptized Horopāpera (Zerubbabel). In 1840 he returned to Taranaki as an assistant monitor for missionaries Creed and Skevington. It was 22 years later in 1862 that a strange series of events occured that coincided with Te Ua’s vision. The Lord Worsley grounded upright at Te Namu on the Taranaki coast. Te Namu was within the aukati of the Kīngitanga but under the mana of Wiremu Kingi Matakatea who was not himself a Kingite. On board the Lord Worsley were 60 passengers and crew with a cargo of 180 tonnes of coal, provisions, 4,500 feet deck

293 P. Clark, ‘Hauhau’ (Auckland: Auckland & Oxford University Presses, 1975); 5-6.
planks, 60 kegs of shot, 8 wool bales, and 3,000 ounces of gold dust. In the first week of September 1862, the angel Gabriel spoke to Te Ua Haumene:

> It was on the first day, 1862, that God’s message of love was taken to his forgotten and deserted people. Little was known of the people’s thinking and feeling and so we coined the term ‘tuwareware’ (forsaken).... It was on the fifth day of September that the Angel of God appeared to me. He asked me to keep my counsel [or start fasting] on the sins of my people.

He later explained the experience in an interview with a local reporter, commenting, “I was one night seized with an illness (or affliction), and felt as if some one were shaking me. I heard a voice saying, “Who is this sleeping? Rise up! Rise up!” I then became pwarewa”. Te Ua’s over-riding concern from his vision was tied to the fate of the Lord Worsley: “I urged that the ship and its cargo be guarded so that the news might be taken and reach the councils of the Kingites.” Whilst not explicitly stated, it seems that his influence was not sufficient to persuade people at that time to his course of action, and he himself stated that:

> ...still my people considered me not, for they believed I was mad. Yet God reminded and asked them to take me into the midst of the people that my relations might taunt and chide me.

However, a series of miraculous acts persuaded people of Te Ua’s prophetic calling. Te Ua claimed that “thrice I was bound in chains and thrice I was freed by the angel” and whilst obtuse, he also seems to have claimed to have resurrected his own child:
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The eleventh [day] was a day of putting to death – the day on which I killed my child as a living payment (redemption) for my people, forgetful, desolate and in doubt.\textsuperscript{300}

Whilst this is hyperbolic and the child was not deliberately sacrificed, it is nevertheless true that his child was ill and returned to health, which came to be seen as a miracle healing or a resurrection. Evidence of these powers was central to the truth of Te Ua’s claim; Pai Mārire was after all, an “adjustment cult,”\textsuperscript{301} an attempt at an integration of narratives, connecting “the plight of his people with the threatened or homeless condition of the Jews.”\textsuperscript{302}

**PAI MĀRIRE AND PIRIRĀKAU**

From small beginnings Te Ua Haumene and his followers built one of the significant Māori prophetic movements of the nineteenth century that has continued, in a somewhat different form, to this century. The introduction of Pai Mārire to Pirirākau and Tauranga Moana generally sits within the context of the land alienation, the inter-tribal wars of the 1850s and the New Zealand Wars of the 1860s. Pirirākau were very early supporters of the Kīngitanga after its formation in 1858. In early 1859, three letters from Tauranga chiefs Huituara, Wira, Te Moananui, Wiparera-Tarakiteawa, Hohepa, Heremaia, Hamuera, Te Uatuku, Hori, Te Kanae, Tone, Tame, Tame Petarika, Te Reweti Manotini, Rini, and Tangimoana were published in *Te Hōkioi*, a Kīngitanga newspaper that acknowledged the mana of King Tāwhiao over their lands and people.\textsuperscript{303} Henry Clarke, Resident Magistrate in Tauranga, suggested the strong Pirirākau support was because “the Tauranga Natives owe a debt of gratitude to Te Waharoa for the assistance rendered by himself and tribe during the bloody conflict between the Tauranga and Arawa tribes,”\textsuperscript{304} touching on the familial
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connections to Ngāti Hāua. Certainly this is probably a motivating factor, but another may have been the new possibilities to differentiate from the powerful Ngāi Te Rangi neighbours who had chosen over this period a closer relationship with the Crown.\textsuperscript{305} The cost to Pirirākau of commitment to the Kīngitanga during the early 1860s is perhaps best illustrated as follows:

During the course of the Waikato campaign, Pirirakau... sent food, arms, and most importantly soldiers to the front. Some 23 out of 27 adult males from Poututerangi, a Pirirakau settlement where the Kīngitanga flag was raised, went to the Waikato.... Traveling through the Wairere track, the soldiers from Tauranga fought at Meremere and Rangiriri in November 1863, and were present at Hairini (Waikato) in February 1864.\textsuperscript{306}

Whilst involvement of Ngāti Ranginui was no doubt a frustration to the military effort in the Waikato, it was not the motivating factor that led to the invasion of Tauranga Moana. The plans for confiscations of land in Tauranga Moana were fully formed well before the suggestion of a military campaign here against the Kīngitanga. Colonial Secretary Dommett presented a scheme for large scale confiscation of land to Parliament in October 1863. He envisaged:

...the establishment of a frontier zone of European settlement 193 kilometres long, stretching from Raglan to Tauranga. He proposed to place 10,000 men on this frontier in 100 settlements of about 100 men in each.... the building of roads, hospitals, schools and Telegraph lines. To pay for these the Government proposed a 3 million-pound loan, which was to be paid off by the sales of confiscated Māori land.\textsuperscript{307}

The motivation for confiscation was more concerned with increasing land settlement than punishing a rebellion. The arrival of troops under the command of Colonel Greer in mid-1864 led to the quick return of Pirirākau men from Te Tiki a
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Ihinarangi at Maungatautari to defend their own settlements. The two most significant military engagements of this period were at Pukehinahina (Gate Pā) and Te Ranga (Pyes Pā). Under the direction of Penetaka Tuaia, a pā was built on the boundary of C.M.S. land and Māori land at Te Papa:

The main pa was separated from the lower one by a ditch and parapet, was garrisoned by about two hundred warriors, Ngaiterangi with a few men of the Pirirakau and other tribes. The small pa was occupied by the party of Koheriki, under Wi Koka, of Maraetai, who had been in Tawhitinui [a Pirirākau pā at Whakamarama] after leaving the Waikato. With them were about ten men of various tribes, chiefly Pirirakau.308

Approximately 25 of the 250 warriors at Pukehinahina were Pirirākau.309 The battle, result and fallout on 29 April 1864 is recorded at length elsewhere,310 but suffice to say that we regard it as one of our greatest victories of that period, with 110 British dead and wounded left behind after the rout. Twenty five tūpuna were killed, three of whom, Te Kiriparara, Te Wano, Motupuku,311 are known to be from Pirirākau. This victory led to plans for a larger attack on three fronts in June 1864, a pā at Te Ranga with a rear guard action of a pincer attack on the exposed Te Papa redoubt. Pirirākau warriors were in the party to come from Waikareao estuary to attack the redoubt. It is considered likely by local historian Patrick Nicholas that Colonel Greer had received intelligence about the planned attack,313 and consequently pre-emptively engaged and defeated Puhirake of Ngāi Te Rangi and his war party at a partially built pā at Te Ranga on 21 June 1864. Though it is denied by military historians, our history is that women and children were in the pā at that time as the
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construction was not complete and they were amongst the dead. Pirirākau were unable to take advantage of the absence of the troops from Te Papa due to unfavourable tides. The failure of Pirirākau and Ngāti Rānginui warriors to press the advantage is a long-standing grievance between our two iwi, described by a Ngāi Te Rangi warrior who survived Te Ranga: “Now, while the firing was going on between us and the soldiers, Rāwiri [Puhirake] listened for the reports of guns from the Huria (direction); he listened, but listened in vain. Rāwiri and all of us exclaimed, ‘Oh! We have been sold by these tribes.... We afterwards heard that when they did stand up it was to go to their homes.’”

The assertion of cowardice and deceit is poorly made; Pirirākau also lost members of the hapū at Te Ranga, and my own ancestor Te Kapaiwaho from Ngāti Rangiwewehi fell at that massacre. The defeat at Te Ranga led to the signing of a surrender on 25 July 1864. Ngāi Te Rangi signed the surrender on behalf of Pirirākau and Ngāti Ranginui, leading to confiscation of our land. In actuality, only five Pirirākau men signed the surrender document: Parata Kanamora, Te Wanakore, Aperahama, Mamera Taiao and Maungapōhatu. These men lacked the authority to surrender on behalf of Pirirākau, a fact best summarised by the Waitangi Tribunal findings:

The remainder [of Pirirākau] retreated inland to their bush kainga and remained in the category of ‘unsurrendered rebels’. The behaviour of these five men did not constitute the surrender of the hapu and as later events clearly show, Pirirakau could not in any circumstances be construed to have renounced their allegiance to the Kīngitanga.

After the Pacification Hui in August 1864, a forced purchase was made that is known as the Te Puna-Katikati Purchase. This took in a large part of Ngāti Ranginui land, and was latterly extended beyond the Wairoa river into Pirirākau land, without our consent or agreement, and despite a commitment by Governor Grey at the
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Pacification Hui to take no more than a quarter of land from any group of people. Indeed, “of all the groups which were affected by an ‘involvement in the Te Puna-Katikati purchase, only Pirirakau opposed the sale itself, and... they remained consistent in their opposition.”

It was within this cauldron of dissent, betrayal and rebellion that Pai Mārire became influential in Tauranga Moana. Pirirākau remained supporters of the Kīngitanga and enforced an aukati under Tāwhiao’s instruction on their own land. It was a difficult position, as “the Pirirakau have met with the cold shoulder from all the tribes to which they have applied for assistance.”

So in support of local efforts, Pai Mārire emissary Tiu Tamihana was sent and supported by Hōri Tūpaea, a Tauranga ariki of significant mana, in December 1864:

Hori Tupaea and Te Tiu Tamihana were actively engaged in propagating the Pai Mārire superstition, and that their efforts were attended with considerable success.

Pirirākau responded, going to “…hear the emissary of the Prophet and be initiated... they now generally believe in the miraculous power of the Angel or God, ‘Pai Mārire’ – in fact they appear to be mad on the subject.” Wiremu Tamihana acted as a mentor for the Pai Mārire members of Pirirākau, supported by Ngāti Haua, particularly after the capture and incarceration of Hōri Tūpaea by Ngāti Pikiao at the behest of the Crown. Local newspapers and letters of the time were full of dark predictions with the arrival of the new faith:

[T]he same power that induced them to forget their promise [of allegiance] and go out and join the enemy, leaving their crops standing, will have little difficulty in
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persuading them to take up arms – and I consider that the remarkable secrecy, and
the close and general combination, shown in this movement, can only lead to the
conclusion that they have been brought out for that purpose...  323

The warnings of Pai Mārire followers in Tauranga Moana taking up arms against the
Crown represents the same dehumanising propaganda that was a feature of
coverage about Pai Mārire around the country. Indeed, a disbelieving Colonel Greer
noted that in actuality, “converts at Tauranga assured the Governor they would
never again fight the Pakehas.”  324 As with elsewhere, new followers took seriously
the instructions of the prophet, of Tuku Pai and Tuku Akinhī to be peaceable in
their conduct. Nevertheless, whilst deluded, the concern of settlers and the military
was real as they believed that “the King movement was only a shadow compared to
what has taken place with the Pai Mārire devotees.”  325 Indeed, their fears were
played on by Ngāi te Rangi at this time who claimed that “the Ngati Porou Hauhau
from Mataora... had joined Pirirakau with the intention of killing the surveyors.”  326
Archdeacon Brown, the C.M.S. missionary in Tauranga, despaired of the influence of
this new faith in a population struck low by death and loss:

In this fearful state of mind they were of course an easy prey for Satan, and many
were led to embrace the new fanaticism that has sprung up at Taranaki. On Sunday I
was convinced that the natives were under the influence of some superstitious dread,
and on the following morning information was brought that the Tauranga natives
had departed during the night to join (as is supposed) the Pai Mārire party. The
secrecy of their movements leads to the suspicion that there is some widely-
organised system at work; and if the natives are indeed resting upon the assurance of
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the false prophet that he will drive all the Europeans into the sea within a few weeks, it is impossible to say what mad course a spirit of fanaticism may urge them on.327

A unique feature of Pai Mārire in Tauranga Moana is the fervent millenarianism. There are only two recorded instances of Te Ua Haumene himself prophesying an end times, and only one of those is clearly a millenarian statement; at Okioki in mid-1865 he stated that “I believe the Day of Reckoning has come.”328 There are many references to Pai Mārire millenarianism in letters by British commentators and correspondents of the period, but no evidence beyond these two references that link these assertions to Te Ua. However in Tauranga Moana, there was a “more exaggerated version of the millenarianism embodied in Pai Mārire, and indeed in the Christianity of loyalist Maoris and of the Pakehas.”329 Henry Clarke, the Civil Commissioner at Tauranga reported to the Colonial Secretary William Fox in November 1864 that “the great day of Deliverance, in which all the Pakeha are to be destroyed, is to be the latter part of December.”330 When December arrived, Pai Mārire converts moved to bush villages.331 It is not clear to me why Pai Mārire took on this aspect in Tauranga Moana in particular. It may have been the particular evangelical message that was brought by the Pai Mārire emissaries, but there are no records of the message that I have been to able to find. I am not convinced it was a consequence of the circumstances in which Pirirākau and Tauranga Moana tribes found themselves as the pattern of war, land loss and impoverishment was quite similar here as in other parts of the country. I think the competitiveness of the Anglican and Catholic missions in Tauranga Moana meant that it was not unknown to change denominations and that there was a high awareness that denominations
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had created their own and different interpretations of the scriptures; this may have contributed to an environment in which there was more enthusiasm for interpreting the scriptures for one’s own needs, leading one correspondent to note “the religion which they had hitherto, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, is now totally set aside”.  

As noted above, Pirirākau continued armed conflict with the Crown well after the Pacification Hui of 1864, leading to the Bush Campaign, the major battles of which were fought in 1867. The inability of the military settlement in Tauranga to subdue Pirirākau led to the involvement of Ngāti Pikiao led by Gilbert Mair. These skirmishes are barely recognised outside of Tauranga Moana, but were to have an indelible impact on Pirirākau, driving many of our ancestors out of our traditional Tauranga lands to dwell for the next fifteen years with our whanaunga in the Waikato and Hauraki. It is during this campaign that remarkable sketches held by Rota Te Kotuku, a Pirirākau and Ngāti Tokotoko member and Pai Mārire follower, were looted from his body by Gilbert Mair:

In the first bush, Lieutenant Pitt saw spots of blood, and followed the track with some of the Arawas, who killed the man. It turned out to be Te Rota te Kotuku, a native of Te Irihanga, and who had persistently refused to take the oath of allegiance. A few years ago Rota murdered a relative of his own. Being a baptised native, Archdeacon Brown went up to Te Irihanga about the matter, and the only punishment Rota received was a good scolding. His weapon was a rifle that had belonged to a sergeant of the 43rd Regiment, and which had probably been taken at the Gate Pa.  

There is little information on the sketches. There appears to be more than one artist, and the originals are in “pencil and/or water colour, some in black ink and/or blue

Figure 8: sketches looted from the body of Rota Te Kotuku
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pencil, on different sorts of paper, and there is different handwriting in the inscriptions on some of the drawings.” Potentially, there was a series of sketches. As can be observed, some refer to Tauranga, whereas others do not. What they do provide is evidence of Pai Mārire faith amongst Pirirākau, a view that equates
Pākehā government, politics and religion with devils, and some of the symbolism of Pai Mārire, such as the niu.\textsuperscript{334}

Our military defeat was a great setback for Pirirākau and Tauranga Moana, and people looked for an explanation in their faith that had promised so much. King Tāwhiao himself attributed failure to the fulfilment of his vision that “an angel would be sent with precise directions as to the conduct of the war.” To his disappointment and despair, the angel failed to appear as promised in the midst of the war, and his followers were greatly grieved, some declaring “the whole thing was a humbug.” However in Tauranga Moana, failure was attributed to the people, not the gods. At the tangihanga of Tomika, when challenged by Puru that the Pai Mārire god was a false god, Penetaka Tuaia responded, “we have not seen that our god is wrong... the error has been with the men.”\textsuperscript{335}

The demise of Pai Mārire amongst Pirirākau is clearly related to the failure of the Kingitanga to achieve its aims of restricting land sale and confiscation. It is also likely that King Mahuta, the heir to King Tāwhiao, who instructed Kingitanga supporters to return to the “mihinare”\textsuperscript{336} had some influence on our decision to abandon this faith. I would add to this the socio-economic status of our ancestors at the end of their long war. They returned impoverished and landless, as Pirirākau lands had been forcibly sold. The few remaining blocks of land were retained by those Pirirākau whānau with French Catholic heritage, now in the names of those men, not their Pirirākau wives. These men were generous in finding room for our ancestors to return home, and whilst it is an assumption, I imagine the responsibility and desire to reintegrate into this community that was rebuilt on the charity of our French in-laws led many back to their church; the Catholic Church.
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THE THEOLOGY AND ORTHOPRAXIS OF PAI MĀRIRE

Whilst Pai Mārire was brought to Tauranga Moana by Tiu Tamihana, an emissary appointed by Te Ua for the purpose of proselytisation, as noted above the expression of Pai Mārire in Tauranga Moana varied from that in other areas of the country. This lends weight to Paul Clark’s assertion that “Te Ua himself did not attempt and may not have wished to establish a systematized and rigid orthodoxy for his converts.”\(^{337}\) This is not to say that Pai Mārire lacked ritual or theology. Indeed the niu stands out as a “universal sign of adherence”\(^{338}\) not apparent in other Māori prophetic movements. What Pai Mārire lacked was a canon law and an enforcement of said law; there is no single orthodox expression of Pai Mārire.

The perspective of the Christian churches in Aotearoa New Zealand at that time (and indeed in most cases to this day) is that Pai Mārire is a syncretic Christian movement. However, their view is more perjorative than academic. Whilst Clark concurs, there is little evidence to support this conclusion in either his work or in other research and evidence. Syncreticism arises in three forms:\(^{339}\)

1) Christianity and another tradition form a new tradition, with the other tradition as the foundation framework;

2) Christianity is the foundation framework but is substantially reshaped so it cannot dialogue or connect with established Christianity; or

3) selected elements of Christianity are incorporated into another system.

Were Pai Mārire to follow the first syncretic form, we would see a Māori cosmology and theology as the foundation framework. However, a careful examination of Te Ua Rongopai by Lindsay Head leads her to conclude that “nothing in the Ua Gospel suggests a reversion to older Maori concepts of spiritual forces or an attempt to
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relate to the ‘new’ God in ways which were proper to those concepts.”  

An assumption is made that Pai Mārire is polytheistic because of references to Rura and Riki, however again, the evidence is weak. Head points out that there are few references to Rura in Te Ua Rongopai and none for Riki. Where Rura is referred to, only once is the short form Rura used, whereas in the other references it is the full name Kapariera Rura, a transliteration of Gabriel Ruler. Head connects Te Ua Rongopai in this instance with Revelation, as the functions of Kapariera Rura mirror the archangel Gabriel. Head also suggests that Riki may be a shortening of Ariki and tied to the one reference to Ariki Mikaera, the archangel Michael, in Te Ua Rongopai. Again there is a parallel between the archangel Michael and Ariki Mikaera in their warlike roles. Head makes a compelling argument; Rura and Riki are not deities alongside God, but function as angels similar to that of their biblical counterparts. There is no evidence in Te Ua Rongopai for a Pai Mārire cosmology that is founded in a pre-contact cosmology; on the contrary Te Ua Haumene clearly had a mature grasp of Christianity.

In the second syncretic form we can expect to see Christianity at the foundation of Pai Mārire but so significantly reworked as to be unable to dialogue with established Christianity. This returns to the assertion that Te Ua Haumene’s grasp of Christianity was sufficiently mature to develop an orthodox contextual theology. It is clear that from the outset Te Ua was well-versed in the Scriptures and had an ability in interpreting and communicating them into his indigenous context. For example, evidence from October 1862 demonstrates his already well-established use of trinitarian prayers to the God of Goodness and Peace. By January 1863, he had already written the earliest chapter of Te Ua Rongopai which preached a “special relationship of the Maori people to God” that assured them of deliverance that was
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derived from the book of Revelation. This idea of a special relationship was derived from the European missionaries of that era identifying Māori as descendents of the Israelites; it was not Te Ua’s creation or imaginary exercise. He then searched the scriptures for inspiration as to God’s promises to his people, particularly in the books of Daniel, Zechariah and Revelation. Te Ua used the language and the message of the scriptures, but removed the missionaries as the intermediaries. His reworking is an orthodox message that is consistent with the prophetic tradition of biblical interpretation. All of his maxims and proverbs bar one, “were biblical in origin or tone,” including: “seek diligently”; the “thoughtful heart”; “only by prayer and fasting” can truth be uncovered; “continually entreat God and practice love and seek salvation”; “Your word is a lamp unto my feet, a light unto my pathway”; “Never let your manner be called a reproach for the foolish” “for they are like the weed which withers up in the summertime.” In addition to his maxims, he also consistently paraphrased, quoted and combined biblical passages throughout Te Ua Rongopai. Te Ua was a confident interpreter, and an orthodox Christian God and an active faith relationship with God was central to his thinking. Rather than raising the spectre of syncreticism, examining Te Ua’s reworking of the scriptures and church traditions can only lead us to conclude that “the strength of the message lay in its biblical authority: Te Ua’s own strength as its disseminator derived likewise from the biblical correctness of his preferment by God.”

The final syncretic form we may expect to find is that selected elements of Christianity are incorporated into Pai Mārire. Instead, we discover the opposite: Te Ua sifted the traditions of our ancestors for elements that could serve as vehicles to enhance an orthodox Christian message. Whilst he clearly rejected “the equation of
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Christian propriety with a Pakeha lifestyle,” 347 Te Ua also promoted a conservative Christian social ethic grounded in the scriptures. The wide and rapid acceptance of this faith and lifestyle should not surprise given the majority of Māori throughout Aotearoa New Zealand had encountered Christianity, and many, perhaps the majority, had converted. Even post-1850, as conflict approached and many missionaries left their more isolated mission stations to the relative safety of large Pākehā settlements, Māori throughout Aotearoa seemed to retain a Christian faith. Two examples that are indicative of the influences on Pirirākau at the time stand out: the crowning of both Pōtatau Te Wherowhero and Tāwhiao were Christian ceremonies that included scriptural references; the conduct of Pirirākau and Tauranga Moana people at the battle of Pukehinahina was led and inspired by Christian members of our iwi, and the rules of conduct are an important and early attempt to conduct war in a just and faithful manner. Importantly, by the 1860s Christianity had not been subsumed into traditional spirituality nor was it used in a cynical ploy to gain technologies and literacy; traditional concepts of tapu, of mana, and of whakawhanaungatanga were now couched in terms of the scriptures and church traditions, as Christianity “had become instead a source of ideas: a world view, a code of living, a religion of worship.” 348

A careful examination of Pai Mārire finds the charge of syncreticism patently false and derived from sources who had a vested interest in quelling the rise of this contextual theology. Pai Mārire was not a rejection of Christianity; it was a rejection of the cultures and empires of the missionaries. A letter to Volkner in 1865 is a telling statement: “we received our Christianity from you formerly, and now we give it back again, having found some better way, by which we may be able to keep possession of our country.” 349 The scriptures and literacy of the Māori population
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were the catalyst for Pai Mārire because it allowed Te Ua Haumene and others to read and interpret for themselves. They discovered the opportunity to whakawhanaungatanga with God without the guidance of the established European churches; and the mana of that relationship, removed from the missionaries, was now at the behest of the Tuku Pāi (Dukes of Peace) and Tuku Akinihī (Dukes of Action) in Pai Mārire, who took roles more like tohunga than priests. Indeed, Clark hits the nail on the head when he asserts that “Christianity could be said to have invigorated the tohunga tradition.”

The reporting and hysteria of the period often blurs the reality of the specific message of Te Ua Haumene and his Tuku Pāi and Tuku Akinihī. Real and imagined crimes of quite bloodthirsty nature were ascribed to Pai Mārire, in contradiction to the clear direction to followers to adopt a policy of pacifism:

> let them go back over the sea in goodness and peace - go back in goodness and peace, for the God of Peace has told me many times that his forgetful, naked-standing people in the half standing land shall be restored, even to that which was given unto Abraham, for this is Israel.

> It was an evil thing to exclude them and the black race of old, because He made both black and white. Thus they are one flesh in the God of Peace. Mocking is wholly wrong; for the white should not want to mock the black, nor the black the white.

I agree with Clark that “this is perhaps the clearest and most consistent element of Pai Mārire belief.” However, the stain of horrific crimes has remained attached to Pai Mārire in defiance of the facts for decades to today, such as in the instance of the death of Carl Volkner in Ōpōtiki in March 1865. Mokomoko of Whakatōhea and Kereopa Te Rau of Ngāti Rangiwewehi, both Pai Mārire evangelists, were falsely accused of the murder of Carl Volkner and hung for the crime. It was not until 1993
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that Mokomoko was pardoned, and the Ngāti Rangiwewehi Claims Settlement 2014 did the same for Kereopa. Connected to the idea that Pai Mārire was a violent, terroristic movement is the myth of followers’ belief that they were invulnerable to bullets; indeed the raised hand shown in portraits of Te Ua Haumene has shifted from being a symbol of blessing to evidence of this mad conviction. However, the only evidence of this belief is from European writers; “concrete evidence of specific Pai Mārire reliance on invulnerability is non-existent.”

Unfortunately, the stain of fanaticism continues to be perpetuated today, notably by Carmen Kirkwood from Waikato and Te Miringa Hohaia from Taranaki, who persist with confusing the pejorative Hauhau with Pai Mārire and maintain the myth of invulnerability to bullets respectively. At its height in 1865-66, there were perhaps 10,000 adherents to Pai Mārire in a population of some 50,000 Māori. In the 2006 New Zealand Census, 609 people identified their religion as Pai Mārire.

Pai Mārire is monotheistic; the Christian God is not subsumed or included into a Māori cosmology, but the essence and qualities of the atua in those cosmology are subscribed to the one true God. That one true God is Trinitarian; Jehovah, Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost are all included and referenced in both A song of love of Gabriel Rura and Te Ua Rongopai. Jehovah was regarded as the supreme controller who had a vengeful nature, an unpleasant reality explained to followers in Te Ua Rongopai: “Understand that he visits you with punishment for it is his way of
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teaching.” In addition, Te Ua’s revelation also reinforced the roles of Gabriel and Michael, the only two angelic figures named in the scriptures: Kapariera Rura and Ariki Mikaera (often shortened today to Rura and Riki respectively). Kapariera Rura had an apparently significant role, represented by a flag on niu and identified with the angel Gabriel. He was regarded as a pacifier. Ariki Mikaera is more closely aligned with warlike functions. As with Kapariera Rura, he was often represented by a flag on niu, and identified with the angel Michael. Clark suggests that Ariki Mikaere, when considered against the reality that many followers of Pai Mārire were by necessity engaged in conflict in the New Zealand wars, was used essentially to quarantine the other Kapariera Rura from a war role and to limit the excesses of behaviour, “by providing his followers with a god of war, isolating areas of fighting and refusing to engage in battle unless attacked.” Head is doubtful of this conclusion and the dualism Clark establishes and points out there is no evidence to enforce such strict roles on the two figures as “whether the two figures are seen as the avenging arm of God or as his protecting wing, Gabriel Ruler and Lord Michael are much more united by their status as angels than they are divided by function.” Angels in the biblical tradition praise and glorify God and act as messengers, and in Te Ua Rongopai, his writings and his preaching, Te Ua consistently promoted these roles for these two figures. Another problem with Clark’s view that Pai Mārire formally condoned warfare through the figure of Ariki Mikaere is that Te Ua Haumene himself was consistently critical of war in all instances:
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360 Ua Rongopai; 46.
361 Niu were flagpoles about 18 foot tall with yardarms from which hung ropes and flags. They were central to the communal services at which followers circled the niu, led in chants and prayer.
362 Clark, Hauhau; 81.
363 Head, Te Ua; 114.
The message of Gabriel was that I should reject warlike practices. That is to reject the heavy yoke of the flints of the rifles, that you might be glorified by God, that you might stand here on the roof of the clouds.\textsuperscript{364}

In addition to the role of the angelic figures, Te Ua instituted the use of religious icons in worship. Shockingly for observers at the time, these icons were the preserved heads of enemies, with reports of Te Ua Haumene and later Pai Mārire leaders Matene Rangitauira and Epanaia Kapewhiti using “the preserved head of Captain Lloyd”\textsuperscript{365} in religious ceremonies. Clark suggests that heads were a “symbolic act of defiance” that indicated the “acquisition of the power, material and spiritual, of the culture that Lloyd and the other European victims represented.”\textsuperscript{366} Preserved heads in Māori tradition relate to the diminishment of tapu and the acquiring of a person’s mana; in the same way a crucifix focuses us in prayer on the tapu and mana of the suffering Christ, so preserved heads likely gave focus to affirming the mana and tapu inherent in Pai Mārire to overcome Māori suffering at that time of conflict.

The Pai Mārire ordinances were based around morning and evening prayer, a uniform ritual modeled off other Christian denominations. These were led at niu by Tuku Pai and Tuku Akinihi, who promoted peace and responded to Crown aggression respectively, as observed, rather judgementally, by William Williams:

After a number of formal speeches from both parties they all started up and rushed together in a state of wild confusion with uplifted hands, giving loud utterance at the same time in unintelligible gibberish, and then, still jabbering, made for the “niu”... which they had erected in one corner of the pa. Arriving there they marched several times round the pole, and then standing in a compact body, commenced their karakia... The karakia was the same as what we had already heard, and consisted of a
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number of transliterated English words as might have been chalked on a blackboard by someone who was teaching Maori children English. The usual practice was that the leader would call our “Porini hoia” (Fall in soldiers). Then when the people had come together, he would say “Teihana” (Attention). All would then begin to chant such words as these viz. “Mauteni, piki mauteni, rongo mauteni, teihana (Mountain, big mountain, long mountain); with much more the same character.\(^{367}\)

The Tuku were responsible for verifying prophecy, subject to the authority of Te Pou (The Pillar), the national overseer of the faith. Te Ua Haumene stood apart from this structure as ‘the first of the prophets’. Verification was communicated by the Tuku entering into a state of pōrewarewa,\(^{368}\) which was to:

\[\ldots\text{provide reinforcement, through his dreams and prophecy, for the emissaries whose message of unity and peace had already been established by Te Ua and his own visions.}\(^{369}\)\]

This state was recognisably similar to the trances and visions that seized tohunga, a deliberate connection with the traditional roles expected of spiritual experts to build the confidence of followers in the message. During services, followers proceeded around the niu, a process called pōti, led by incantations, from the Tuku taken from Te Ua Rongopai.\(^{370}\) Followers famously chanted “hau” as they rounded the niu. Hau has myriad meanings; Clark suggests that the more likely meanings are “wind or breath, vitality or soul, and food used in removing tapu.”\(^{371}\) My own view, given the significance placed on the sounds that emanated from the ropes and flags on the niu, is that ‘hau’ is related to the wind or breath necessary for these noises. External observers often allowed themselves to fly into flights of fancy when considering a Pai Mārire service: Stuart Babbage recorded that the "angels of the wind" were said
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to be present during the service, ascending and descending the ropes dangling from the mast’s yard-arm. The evidence for the role that “angels” played in Pai Mārire is weak and reliant on outside observers. In addition to the prayers and chants, glossolalia was a sacrament of Pai Mārire that signified direct, Spirit inspired prayer in the same manner in which it is seen today in Pentecostalism. The rejection of missionary leadership was regarded in the day, incorrectly I believe, as deliberate rebellion against Christian orthodoxy. In reality, the evidence supports a conclusion that it was a rebellion against the Crown, as noted by a sympathetic Octavius Hadfield:

...their dissent arose from the conviction that the object of the whiteman was to conquer and subdue them; and that missionaries must be expected to sympathise with their own countrymen; that a maori form of religion was therefore necessary for them.

The key text was, of course, Te Ua Rongopai. Much has been made of that, claiming it is a rejection of the scriptures. However, access to the scriptures was limited by the ability to print the scriptures, and the smaller and less costly Te Ua Rongopai was practically easier to produce. As noted above, Te Ua’s biblical literacy and commitment to the message and intent of the scriptures is very clear in Te Ua Rongopai. The only rejection in Pai Mārire was the role of the British missionary as an intermediary with Jehovah.

By 1868, at least according to Pākehā commentators, Pai Mārire had evolved to exclude the pōti at the niu for a ceremony called Ohaoha:

Hauhauism has taken several different forms since it was first introduced. At one time they erected a pole, danced around it with extended hands, and gabbled the
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“unknown tongue,” like human beings demented. Soon after, the pole was given up and a more rational mode of worship was adopted, a mixture of Judaism, Christianity and Maori superstition; this is called “Ohaoha.”

I have some confidence in his recollection as it begins to explain the development of modern Pai Mārire liturgical ceremonies. Indeed, ten years after Clarke’s observation in 1877, Reverend Grace attended two separate ohaoha at Te Waotu that are strikingly contemporary:

Friday – I was present at the worship of the Hauhaus. I had slept in the big house, and they all came early. The worship consisted of the chanting of two or three prayers, followed by several Maoris offering short prayers, each of which they concluded with a chant. Their prayers consisted in giving glory to God, praying for their King and asking God to bless him, so that he might save them in the time of trouble. The whole three persons of the trinity were mentioned, but it was evident they expected more from their King, than from Christ. These prayers were offered by different parties – first a man, then a woman; even boys and girls took part!

The Hauhau worship was going on, and I had a good opportunity of listening to it. On this occasion I found it more objectionable than before! They clearly put the King in the place of Christ. Hanauru [the predominant Pai Mārire teacher in this period] in his address, spoke of taking up the cross of Tāwhiao! On this occasion they did not know I was present, which may have made some difference.

Grace’s observation is the form of Pai Mārire that was later revived by Te Puea Hearangi in the beginning of the twentieth century and that has remained with the Kingitanga since that time. Whilst “Te Ua set up a theology of defence and deliverance” this was not the limit of its development as a faith. By the time that King Tāwhiao lay down his arms in 1881 and when his granddaughter reinvigorated
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the faith at the turn of the century, Pai Mārire became a Māori Christian theology that established tapu, mana and the role of tohunga and matakite as central to the experience of Christianity in a Māori world:

The worship of ancestors – the belief that there was no impenetrable barrier between life and death – was the dominant principle of Pai Marire as practiced in Waikato. It taught that death did not close a relationship, it merely transferred a person’s spirit from one plane to another; it transformed that person from a living relative or friend into a “living” tupuna or ancestor. Pai Marire prayers invoked the dead as companions of the living.\(^ {378}\)

Whilst the overall statement is a useful reflection on Pai Mārire in the early twentieth century, the use of the term “worship of ancestors” is problematic as it raises the spectre of the deification of ancestors. Rather than deification, Māori venerate their ancestors. Our tapu and mana are bequeathed to us by virtue of birth; we are the culmination of the skills, abilities, capability and actions of our ancestors. Our role in life includes following the model of our ancestors to enhance our dignity and well-being to pass on to our children, grandchildren and descendents. In Māori communities that use Christian forms of worship and prayer such as Pai Mārire, they are oft-times included in prayers as part of the communion of saints. Pai Mārire provides a clear and regular opportunity for individuals to ensure they are good guardians of the tapu of their whānau and ancestors which is essential to being in a healthy relationship with atua; as Poutapu comments, Pai Mārire ensured “we were all right.”\(^ {379}\)

**CONCLUSION: THE ORTHODOXY OF PAI MĀRIRE**

Despite a popular and academic tradition over a century that Pai Mārire was syncretic, unorthodox and eclectic based on the writings of English observers at the time and translations supplied by said observers, Head demonstrates that returning
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to the actual writings and statements of Te Ua Haumene compels us to conclude that Pai Mārire is neither a syncretic nor dual form of Christianity, but is based in a mature theology of scripture and church tradition, and that the features of the practice of the faith are an indigenous development of the Wesleyan and Anglican traditions. In Chapter 2, I affirmed the imperatives of contextual theology proposed by Bevans: it starts from the position that God became flesh, so affirms the incarnational nature of Christianity; it recognises that God is revealed not in ideas but in concrete reality, so reality has a sacramental nature; it acknowledges that revelation is both an inter-personal experience and a personal response; it affirms the inclusivity and the diversity, that is the catholicity of the church; and it upholds the Trinity as the incarnation of relational community. I then proposed five criteria for orthodoxy:

1) the theology accepts the basic religious proposal of Christianity that God is Love;
2) were the orthopraxis of the theology a “theological expression that would lead to actions that are clearly un-Christian... [it] could never be considered orthodox,” however, they sound a note of caution, noting that “an expression that seems at first unorthodox might be justified in that it leads a group to truly Christian behaviour;”380
3) the theology gains a proper reception, in that it is accepted by the people of God as an expression of the catholicity of Christianity. Key to this is that a theology is open to criticism from the people of God;
4) the theology is able to be translated into worship of God and in doing so it is clear to whom the community are directed in that worship; and
5) the theology makes a positive contribution to other theologies and has the strength to answer the challenge in other theologies.

380 Bevans, Contextual Theology; 23.
My view is that Head’s sober reflection on the actual writings and speeches of Te Ua Haumene demonstrates that Pai Mārire is driven by the very imperatives that Bevan outlined for a contextual theology. Furthermore, it meets the criteria for orthodoxy. Propositions one, two and four are well-evidenced in the writings, preaching and practice of Pai Mārire. Te Ua Haumene was focused on communicating a gospel of love to his followers and encouraging them to do so in the midst of war and conflict. Whilst subject to slander and misunderstanding, the followers of Pai Mārire generally lived out a practice of peace against maxims and proverbs that are biblically derived. The pōti around the niu and the later development of ohaoha are both ceremonies oriented to the worship of God to build a relationship through which He can communicate His purpose. Proposition three, that the theology gains a proper reception was exceedingly unlikely at the time at which Pai Mārire developed because of the racism, bias and fear of missionaries, politicians and the military that undergirded their colonising war. Today, Pai Mārire still suffers from the reputation given it by those historical records; yet to step back and regard Pai Mārire with fresh eyes must give hope that the current generation can rehabilitate that reputation and change the view in the wider church. Doing so would fulfill the intent of the fifth proposition, that Pai Mārire can contribute and be contributed to by other theologies. Pai Mārire is the original contextual theology formed in Aotearoa New Zealand. Rather than a historical artifact, it is a pathway to an indigenous expression of faith and church.

Pai Mārire is a Praxis Model of contextual theology: formed within a culture under stress, its orthopraxy led to its development and relevance to the justice issues that faced our ancestors in the nineteenth century. Te Ua wanted to transform his society for all peoples, not just Māori. With that intent, Pirirākau again transformed Pai Mārire to a faith that met them at the point of their needs. The orthopraxy and theology of Pai Mārire really resembles contemporary pentecostalism in the encouragement to personal relationship with God, the sacrament of glossolalia, the
socially conservative interpretation of scripture, the heavy reliance on the apocryphal scriptures and the Pentateuch, the encouragement to emotional expression in worship and the rejection of a priestly hierarchy. Yet while Pai Mārire meant that Pirirākau left behind their pre-contact theology and cosmology, it retained tapu, mana and whakawhanaungatanga: the relationship with God was one in which the tapu and mana of followers was enhanced by the tapu and mana of God, and that enhancement occurred because of the whakawhanaungatanga. The whakapapa, the cosmology was fundamentally reworked from a pantheon to one true God, but the concept of our whakapapa to the divine being the relationship through which we derived our tapu and mana remained the same.
I love stories, rich with truth and wisdom. In the Māori language, story is referred to as a pūrākau. ‘Pū’ in this refers to originating or root, and ‘rākau’ a tree. A pūrākau then is the tap root of the tree, a rich image that conveys a truth: that the great stories have no end but grow, develop and seed further stories, eventually a forest of stories. Tāngata whenua today regularly lament how much has been lost of our knowledge. Yet the wisdom of our ancestors was never kept as knowledge, but as narratives, created with a purpose and a whakapapa. One line of a narrative that is rediscovered acts as a seed from which a narrative can flourish again into its fullest expression with the right nurturing and conditions. This work is just such a tap root; a narrative that has the potential to seed anew stories of Pirirākau and Tauranga Moana.

This narrative is two stories that miraculously, wonderfully became one. The first the story of Pirirākau, a people formed by the sea, the rivers, the land and the mountains into tāngata whenua; a people whose very language was formed by the sounds, images and experiences in that land; a people whose whakapapa assured them of a tapu and mana connection from the divine, to chiefly ancestors to themselves. This first story picks up at the point at which Pirirākau faced its greatest existential threat: an encounter with a people and an empire who were more powerful, more numerous and regarded themselves as superior. This first story tells of Pirirākau attempting to adapt, to respond, to react and then to survive this encounter. The second is the story of writings from an indigenous people in the Middle East made scripture, made law, and then attached uncomfortably to power and might. Writings that spoke of grace and love but arrived in the hands of men who spoke of change and sovereignty. This second story tells of the scriptures arriving with Catholic
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missionaries to Tauranga Moana and finding a way past the bias and prejudice of the men who carried it to speak to the hearts and inspire a new thought in tāngata whenua. Scriptures that allied themselves with tāngata whenua at their point of suffering to the chagrin of the authorities who presumed it belonged to them.

The work describes how these two stories moved together to become one, from a Pirirākau cosmology and theology to received theology to an indigenized theology. I have examined this as a development of a contextual theology. Marsden, Shirres and Tate provided the central concepts that are the framework on which our understanding of a Pirirākau contextual theology rests: tapu best expressed as dignity and well-being; mana, tapu-centred and providing the impetus and capacity to act with confidence; and whakawhanaungatanga to build relationships that augment the central concept of whānau. Marsden explicated the three baskets of knowledge obtained by Tāne-nui-a-Rangi, Shirres expanded our understanding of key Māori theological concepts and their application to the gospel and Tate provided a systematic theological framework for tapu, mana, pono, tika and aroha, kaiwhakakapi tūranga, whakanoa and hohou te rongo.

This work has relied on the Praxis Model to demonstrate how theology is developed in the practice of Christian identity and formation particularly in impacting and changing society. The model contends and the experience of Pirirākau shows that God is not outside of history and humanity but in the fabric of our culture and history. A Pirirākau contextual theology is founded in orthopraxy, right actions, more than orthodoxy, right thinking. Pirirākau contextual theology was not founded by academics but by our ancestors in the midst of their need and desperation.

PRE-CONTACT TĀKITIMU CONTEXTUAL THEOLOGY

In the search for our pre-contact cosmology and theology, we divided atua into originating beings, atua take, and interventionist deities, atua wawao. The expectation of our ancestors was that they could direct, manipulate and beseech atua
wawao to act in certain ways if appropriate and correct processes were followed. They had no such expectation that human interaction would impact on the actions of atua take, but saw the atua wawao as mediators in the relationships with atua take. Unlike Best, my division does not include a supreme being, Io. I believe that the evidence for an Io tradition in Ngāti Kahungunu, Waikato and Kāi Tahu is debatable, in particular because of the role of Pākehā anthropologists in discovering just such a tradition. Furthermore, I am suspicious that the Io tradition serves a particular purpose of smoothing any tensions between Christian faith and ‘genuine’ Māori cultural practice and knowledge. However, these are suspicions and opinions, and I return to my previously stated view that the Io tradition is neither necessary nor reliable as a foundation to examine a pre-contact contextual theology.

More fruitful in searching for a Pirirākau cosmology is the extensive cosmology outlining a whakapapa between atua take and atua wawao in the Tākitimu tradition that comes from Matiaha Tiramōrehu. As a descendent of Kāti Mamoe and Kāi Tahu, he has a clear and distinct whakapapa connection to the Tākitimu canoe and therefore Tauranga Moana. Tiramōrehu offers a cosmology that includes recognised pre-contact features such as polygamy and atua wāhine operating independently on the authority of their own mana. Despite his Wesleyan conversion, there is no obvious and intentional biblical parallel and furthermore he consistently advocated for the rights and lands of his iwi and cannot be regarded as having intentionally accommodated the Crown narratives into his own. These are strong arguments for the validity and reliability of his cosmology of atua take.

Across a variety of sources of evidence, it seems that the likely atua wawao that Tauranga Moana associated with the Tākitimu were: Ārai-te-uru, Tūtara Kauika and Te Wehenga Kauki, and Ruamano, associated with the stars; Kahukura, associated with the rainbow; Hine-kōrako, Hine-kōtea, Hine-kōrito; Hine-makehu and Hine-huruhuru associated with the moon; Haurua Tai associated with the ocean currents; Tūnui o te Ika associated with comets; and Te Pō Tuatini associated with war. I
believe each of these atua wawao originally featured as a tool for the navigation of Tākitimu (excepting Te Pō Tuatini who has a long connection with war); this is not to say that their only role was in navigation, but rather that the mana of atua wawao was tied to their utility over circumstances and environment.

Three points stand out: first, the maramataka, associated with the atua wawao connected with moon, is all that remains of these atua amongst Pirirākau. Secondly, the journey of atua wawao aboard the Tākitimu canoe, and their subsequent history demonstrates an intimate connection between the Tākitimu ancestors of Pirirākau and the natural environment. Tiramōrehu’s cosmology of atua take bears this out with credible though not explicit whakapapa connections through to the 13 likely atua wawao on the Tākitimu, as well as the adzes and stones carried aboard. Thirdly, I am convinced that the presence of five atua wāhine aboard the Tākitimu encourages us to allow for the possibility that women in ruahine roles were included amongst the “chiefs and priests” on the journey, despite the academic tradition to date.

The cosmology of atua take and atua wawao and how they were utilised is a pre-contact contextual theology. As a Praxis Model, the day-to-day interaction and relationship with natural environment and historical experience are then translated into theological language and thinking. The first principle of a Tākitimu contextual theology is that all beings and objects, created and uncreated, have a tapu, a dignity and well-being that is to be enhanced in relationship to the tapu of others. All cosmologies exist to exemplify the enhancement and inter-relationship of tapu between people, atua and the environment. It is also a dynamic theology; it requires action and reflection to enhance tapu. The atua are themselves dynamic actors and the relationships with these actors is mediated by the complexity and accuracy of the understanding of the whakapapa connection to atua, not through the worship of atua. So the centre of a Tākitimu theology is whakawhanaungatanga, building familial relationships.
Whether the details are accurate is a moot point with the dearth of sources, but we can be assured that a pre-contact Tākitimu contextual theology was a central feature of life, success and well-being for Pirirākau for upwards of six centuries. With first encounter, Pirirākau were transformed from members of an insular Pacific society to world citizens alongside the new European settlers. Significant Pirirākau women had married French men in the early nineteenth century. Along with their valued trade connections and artisan skills, these men brought their Catholic faith, and so they extended an invitation to Bishop Pompallier to found a mission in Tauranga Moana. The French men who arrived were members of a Catholic Church that had an uneasy role in the expansion of French influence. The French Revolution of 1789-1799 created a fundamental schism between the later French state and the Catholic Church when the peasants of Vendée revolted against the French Revolutionary government in 1793. Consequently, the experience of Catholic missionaries in the early nineteenth century was that support from the French state was unreliable and entirely dependent on the whims of the regime in power at any particular time.

These French missionaries were likely sons of regions that were fervently Catholic and had been at the forefront of counter-revolutionary activity during the French Revolution. Nevertheless, they could not help but to have been affected by the transformation wrought by the scientific method and positivism in their society. Their encounter with indigenous people like Pirirākau would have coloured by a complex mix of racial determinism, humanist equality and paternalistic moral framing. In their encounter with Pirirākau women, they would likely encourage the confinement of women to the private world of domesticity, enacting the complementarity model which had led to a societal perception that women’s sexuality was governed by sentiment and emotion. The roles and mythology of women’s leadership would have rankled and seemed an affront to good sense. However, the missionaries would have been more comfortable with the clarity of
hierarchy in Māori society, privileging leadership and affluence as they would have in France.

Father Philippe Viard founded a Catholic mission in Tauranga Moana in 1840, establishing his base at Ōtumoetai. That first Catholic Māori Mission in Tauranga Moana lasted a little more than a decade, and within another ten years priests had ceased visiting the area at all. Until the arrival of two priests in 1886, Pirirākau were left to their own devices to follow their Catholic faith as their conscience dictated. Yet I believe the evidence is that Pirirākau was irrevocably transformed, not so much by the efforts of the missionaries as the conviction of Pirirākau leadership that Catholicism, and more generally Christianity, enhanced their power and authority, their mana, to a greater extent than their pre-contact Tākitimu contextual theology. This was possible because as early as the eighteenth century, Catholic missionaries had abandoned attempts to force the peasants, and then peoples they encountered farther afield, to eschew their own spirituality. Nineteenth century Catholic missionary work in Aotearoa New Zealand is notable for the lack of sustained efforts to transform Māori communities socially or politically; the first priority for the Catholic mission was not the integration of Māori into servitude for the benefit of a particular European empire, but integration into the Roman Catholic church, an empire in its own right. In this they presumed our Pirirākau ancestors already had the capacity to recognise and determine to live life according to the law that was pleasing to God; in this sense the missionaries intended to interpret that which they found rather than arriving with a pre-determined motivation to transform or civilise us. Rather than slavish obedience to the law, Pompallier focused on relationship to connect Māori to the Catholic church. He appealed to the long church history and the relational connectedness of the communion of saints as whakapapa basis for his authority.
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PAI MĀRIRE: OUR FIRST ORTHODOX CONTEXTUAL THEOLOGY

The potential to bring the story of Pirirākau and the story of the gospel together was realised in Pai Mārire. Pai Mārire has been unfairly maligned for over a century as a violent, bloodthirsty, syncretic, eclectic, polytheistic faith that returned to the worst practices of pre-contact Māori society. Yet from small beginnings Te Ua Haumene and his followers built one of the significant Māori prophetic movements of the nineteenth century that has continued, in a somewhat different form, to this century. The introduction of Pai Mārire to Pirirākau and Tauranga Moana arose out of land alienation and war in the 1860s. Pirirākau and other hapū and iwi suffered a terrible injustice in confiscation that was more concerned with increasing land settlement than punishing a rebellion.

This cauldron of dissent, betrayal and rebellion created an environment for Pai Mārire to become influential in Tauranga Moana. As supporters of the Kingitanga Pirirākau suffered ongoing oppression and injustice; in support of them, Pai Mārire emissary Tiu Tamihana was sent and supported by Hōri Tūpaea, a Tauranga ariki of significant mana, in December 1864. Despite popular belief, Pai Mārire arrived with a message of peace in the face of sharp conflict; followers took seriously the instructions of the prophet to be peaceable in their conduct. Unlike other areas, a unique feature of Pai Mārire in Tauranga Moana was a fervent millenarianism. Unfortunately, the message of peace was unheard by the Crown; in 1867 they launched the Bush Campaign against Pirirākau. These skirmishes had an indelible impact on Pirirākau, driving many of our ancestors out of our traditional Tauranga lands to dwell for the next fifteen years with our whanaunga in the Waikato and Hauraki. Sadly, the demise of Pai Mārire amongst Pirirākau is clearly related to the failure of the Kingitanga to achieve its aims of restricting land sale and confiscation.

Kahotea, Rebel Discourses; 103.
Pai Mārire is one of our first orthodox contextual theologies. There is no sense in which there was reversion to older cosmologies and theologies; rather Te Ua sifted the traditions of our ancestors for elements that could serve as vehicles to enhance an orthodox Christian message. The Trinity remained central; Rura and Riki have been incorrectly identified as deities, whereas the evidence disputes this and applies the function of angels to these two. Te Ua was a confident interpreter of the gospels, and an orthodox Christian God and an active faith relationship with God was central to his thinking. Rather than raising the spectre of syncretism, examining Te Ua’s reworking of the scriptures and church traditions can only lead us to conclude that Pai Mārire is a mature, insightful indigenous development of Christianity that addressed the political, social and spiritual needs of the people in that time of conflict. This maturity can be traced to prior to Te Ua’s revelation; by the 1860s Christianity had not been subsumed into traditional spirituality nor was it used in a cynical ploy to gain technologies and literacy; traditional concepts of tapu, of mana, and of whakawhanaungatanga were now couched in terms of the scriptures and church traditions, as Christianity became the vehicle for the expression of tāngata whenua identity and ideas. So again I return to the conclusion that Pai Mārire was not a rejection of Christianity but a rejection of the cultures and empires of the missionaries. Today as we examine Pai Mārire it resembles quite closely contemporary pentecostalism in the encouragement to personal relationship with God, the sacrament of glossolalia, the socially conservative interpretation of scripture, the heavy reliance on the apocryphal scriptures and the Pentateuch, the encouragement to emotional expression in worship and the rejection of a priestly hierarchy.

The story of Pirirākau and the story of the scriptures have come together as one narrative of a God revealed as the true expression of tapu and mana who offers whakawhanaungatanga with the oppressed, the suffering and the impoverished within their language, their land and their culture. In attempting to express their
faith and spirituality, Pirirākau were motivated by their desire to maintain their identity whilst seeking justice; and so developed a small tribal theology in Pai Mārire that nevertheless transcended the tribe. A Pai Mārire contextual theology led us to a God of the power-less. Visions, wisdom, the environment and the community affirmed a God made flesh in their concrete reality of colonisation, conflict and confiscation; life, under constant threat, was itself sacramental for both the individual and the community. This Pai Mārire contextual theology has never lost track of its connection with the catholicity of the church and the centrality of the Trinity: the tapu and mana of the Matua, the invitation to whakawhanaungatanga through the Tama and their solidarity in the Wairua Tapu. Like all Māori contextual theologies the Pai Mārire intention was maintenance of their relationship with God as the source of all tapu and mana as well as a critique of the theologies of the settler Church and its support for colonisation and confiscation. Considered against a set of criteria for orthodoxy we find the theological narrative is a movement to orthodoxy away from syncretism or duality.

In our historical experience it is clear that syncretism was a legitimate threat. However I contend that it was avoided. Rather than the receiving culture merely mimicking the symbols of Christian faith, we see Pirirākau in Pai Mārire indigenising, replacing and renewing the symbols of their Christian faith. The centrality of the criteria of orthodoxy indicate that the meaning of the new signs in the Pirirākau contextual theology as expressed in Pai Mārire were considered and connected with the wider Christian traditions. The journey is all the more remarkable because our ancestors chose to move from their pre-contact theology to embrace Christianity and yet retained their autonomy to connect it deliberately and firmly with their own world and experience.

Much of my paid employment is spent travelling Aotearoa New Zealand talking to a variety of predominantly church organisations about biculturalism and hearing their desire to see their faith expression genuinely reflect the land, the people and the
history. Their desire is for two seemingly unrelated narratives to fit together. They hope that the scriptures will speak anew and make sense in this place, and all of them are persuaded that it will speak first to tāngata whenua. Some of them suspect that it has already done so. It is my honour to tell them that in Tauranga Moana, amongst Pirirākau, during a time of conflict and loss, the scriptures spoke in a new way about ancient relationships between the divine and people. That tap root endures and we, the first people of Tauranga Moana, strive to see the return of our great forests of narrative, giants within whose branches we will again “stand... on the roof of the clouds.”
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384 Haumene, “He ohaki.”
TANGA O TE WAKA/OPENING CEREMONY

Tēnei au haere mai te akaakanui
Tēnei au haere mai te akaakaroa
Tēnei au haere mai te akaakana i tō matua
Taketake te waiora
Ki tēnei tama nāu e io tikitiki o rangi

Tēnei haere mai te akaaka matua
Ki ēnei tama tipua
He tama tāwhito
He tama atua
He tama atua
He tama nāu e io akaaka

Tēnei au te hapai ake nei i aku toki
Ko wai aku toki
Ko Huiterangiora taku toki
Ko wai aku toki
Ko Wharaurangi taku toki
Ko wai aku toki
Ko Te Iwi A Rona taku toki
Ko wai aku toki
Ko Te Kaukau taku toki

Nā wai aku toki
Nā Tāwhaki aku toki

---
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Nā wai aku toki
Nā rātau aku toki
Nā wai aku toki
Nā Rata i Te Pukekenga
Nā Rata i Te Wānanga
He toki tipua
He toki tāwhito

Hāpai ake nei au i aku toki
He toki aha aku toki
He toki topetope i te Waonui a Tāne
He toki whakahekena ki raro
He toki tipua
He toki aronui
He aha aku toki
He toki tēnei i tōku waka i a Pūwhenua

He waka aha taku waka
He waka tapu taku waka
He waka aha taku waka
He waka atua taku waka
He waka aha taku waka
He waka wāwahi i te tuahiwi o Hinenui Moana

Ko wai taku waka, Ko Takitimu taku waka
He waka aha taku waka
He waka tangata, he waka Ariki
Hei waka ki Aotearoa
Ki te take whenua ai.
KARAKIA KI A TĀWHIRIMATEA\textsuperscript{386}

Tēnei au! Tēnei au!
Kei te uru-urutipua
Kei te uru-urutawhito
Nāu e Tāne Matua

I te pū matua i te take i te toi
Huawera matua i te aratiatia
Ki unu o Mauao
Whai ake nei

Whai ake nei au
Ki te whai ko puororangi
Unuhia tō puru o hururangi e
Kia puta mai koe
Tuatea
Tuapou
Tuataatua
Taniwanaipata

Tahuna te ahi
Ko te ahi kapakapa
Ko te ahi rererangi
Ko te ahi tikawe
Ko te ahi torotoro
Hei ara atu mōu e Tawhirinuku, e Tawhirirangi
Tēnei te ahi nā Titimatanginui, Titiparauriuri

\textsuperscript{386} Tata, Takitimu; 17-8.
Tēnei te ara ki te ihuwhenua, ki Aotearoa
Ko te au kume
Ko te au rona
Ko te au papa
Ko te tarere
Ko te ao hōkai
Ko te au tipou
Ki te matawhenua, ki Aotearoa
Poutini, poutaka
Ki te ihuwhenua i te Tiritiri o te Moana
Ki Aotearoa ai ooo

TE KARAKIA I MUA O TE RERENGA MAI O TĀKITIMU\textsuperscript{387}

Ko wai taku tapuwae
Ko te tapuwae o Tuhoronuku, o Tuhororangi
Tēnei au te tupe atu nei i taku tapuwae
Ko te tapuwae o ngā atua
O Kahukura
O Tamaiwaho
O Ruamano
O Hinekorako

Ki te mata whenua ki Aotearoa i te Tiritiri o te Moana

Ko wai taku tapuwae
Ko te tapuwae o tuamata kapa
Ko te tapuwae o Tumatauenga

\textsuperscript{387} Tata, Takitimu; 19-20.
Whakahoro na
I tāwhiti rangiuru
I tāwhiti rangiewa
Tēnei au te tupe atu nei i taku tapuwae
Ko te tapuwae o Tangaroa, whakamau tai o Tangaroa
Ko te tapuwae o Uenukurangi
Ko te tapuwae o Tutara Kauika
Hōmai kia tata
Hōmai kia piri
Tēnei tuku waka, he waka tapu tuku waka
Ko te waka o Awhiorangi
Ko te waka o Te Whironui
He waka tapu tuku waka
Ko wai tuku waka
Ko Tākitimu tuku waka
Ko te waka o Tamatea Arikinui oi ooo

**KARAKIA RERENGA MAI**

Wairea
Te ngaru roa
Te ngaru tiketike

Wairea
Te ngaru wanawana
Te ngaru paepae

---
Waïrea
I te ngaru ihiihi
Te ngaru haere rua

Hāpai ake nei au i taku hoe

Ko rapanga i te ata rangi
Ko rapanga i te ata nuku
Ko manini kura
Ko manini aro

He hoe atua nō te toi rangi nō ngā rangi tuhāhā
Nāu ki ēnei tama pi ooo
Hāpai ake nei au i taku toki
Ko wai taku toki
Ko Te Awhiorangi taku toki
Hei aha taku toki
Topetope i ngā ngaru tupe

O te tuahiwi nui Hine Moana taku toki
Hāpai ake nei ahau i taku toki
Ko wai taku toki
Ko Te Whironui taku toki
Hei aha taku toki
Hei topetope i ngā taiwiniwini
I ngā tai wawana
Kia aro atu ai ki mata whenua
Ki Aotearoa o ooo

Ka pai te marangai i te rerenga mai o Tākitimu ki Hawaiki, arā i Tāhiti
Ka tū a Tamatea Arikinui
Ka mau ki tana toki ki a Te Awhiorangi
Katahi ka karakia kia maea ai te waka i te tupuhi.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ao</td>
<td>world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ariki</td>
<td>most senior position or geneology, king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aroha</td>
<td>love, compassion, empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atea</td>
<td>space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atua toro</td>
<td>malignant being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atua</td>
<td>god, demon, higher power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atua take</td>
<td>originating beings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atua wawao</td>
<td>interventionist deities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aukati</td>
<td>obstruction, blockage, notional boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hapū</td>
<td>sub-tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hohou te rongo</td>
<td>restorative process to enhance diminished tapu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hui</td>
<td>meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inanga</td>
<td>whitebait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Io Matua Kore</td>
<td>the highest being who is without a parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ira tangata</td>
<td>the human element, genes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iwi</td>
<td>tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kai moana</td>
<td>seafood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaikaranga</td>
<td>woman who calls guests onto the marae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāinga</td>
<td>home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapa haka</td>
<td>cultural performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karakia</td>
<td>prayer, to pray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaumātua</td>
<td>respected elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kawa</td>
<td>cultural or tribal practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kete</td>
<td>bag, normally woven from flax or bulrush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kōhanga reo</td>
<td>Māori language nest for pre-schoolers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kōrero</td>
<td>speech, to speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koroua</td>
<td>older man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kōtare</td>
<td>kingfisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuia</td>
<td>older woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana</td>
<td>power and authority, prestige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manu Kōrero</td>
<td>annual student speech competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marae</td>
<td>community centre for Māori communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maramataka</td>
<td>lunar calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātaitai</td>
<td>area where tāngata whenua manage all non-commercial fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātāmua</td>
<td>first born child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niu</td>
<td>flagpole used in Pai Mārire ceremonies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pā</td>
<td>fortified village, fort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>New Zealand Europeans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pākeke</td>
<td>adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pīpīwharauroa</td>
<td>shining cuckoo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pō | night
pono | honest, truth
pounamu | greenstone
pōwhiri | welcome, formal process of welcome at a marae
pūrākau | story, myth
raupō | bulrush
rohe | area
rongoa | medicine
ruahine | learned expert (female)
tahā | bailer, container for liquid
tāne | man
tāngata whenua | people of the land, Māori
tangata | person
tangihanga | funeral ceremony
taniwha | monster, guardian
tapu | dignity, well-being, sacred, set apart
taumanu | thwart of a canoe
teina | younger sibling of the same gender
tika | right, correct, appropriate
tikanga | agreed cultural practice
tohunga  learned expert (male)
tuahu  altar
tuakana  older sibling of the same gender
tuhua  obsidian
tūpuna/tīpuna  ancestor, grandparents
wā  time, moments, instances
wahine  woman
waiata  song, to sing
wānanga  educational forum, tribal lore
wātea  free, space-time
whaikōrero  formal speech
whakanoa  process for diminishing tapu, to create a state of ‘noa’
whakapapa  genealogy
whakawhanaungatanga  relationship building
whānau  family
whanaungatanga  relationship
whare wānanga  house of higher learning, tertiary institution
whare  house, building, dwelling
whenua  land, environment
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