

**“ ... AND DID SHE CRY IN MĀORI?”**

**RECOVERING, REASSEMBLING AND  
RESTORYING TAINUI  
ANCESTRESSES IN AOTEAROA NEW  
ZEALAND**

---

Diane Gordon-Burns

Tainui Waka—Waikato Iwi

---

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the  
requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in  
History

The University of Canterbury

2014

## Preface

*Waikato taniwha rau, he piko he taniwha he piko he taniwha*

Waikato River, the ancestral river of Waikato iwi, imbued with its own mauri and life force through its sheer length and breadth, signifies the strength and power of Tainui people. The above proverb establishes the rights and authority of Tainui iwi to its history and future. Translated as “Waikato of a hundred chiefs, at every bend a chief, at every bend a chief”, it tells of the magnitude of the significant peoples on every bend of its great banks.<sup>1</sup> Many of those peoples include Tainui women whose stories of leadership, strength, status and connection with the Waikato River have been diminished or written out of the histories that we currently hold of Tainui. Instead, Tainui men have often been valorised and their roles inflated at the expense of Tainui women, who have been politically, socially, sexually, and economically downplayed.

In this study therefore I honour the traditional oral knowledges of a small selection of our tīpuna whaea. I make connections with Tainui born women and those women who married into Tainui. The recognition of traditional oral knowledges is important because without those histories, remembrances and reconnections of our pasts, the strengths and identities which are Tainui women will be lost.

Stereotypical male narrative has enforced a female passivity where women’s strengths and importance have become lesser known. Through this thesis I offer a sharp and unsympathetic critique of patriarchal disempowerment of the feminine and I resist their constraints; rather, I strive to empower the feminine. My work advocates female agency. Tainui women’s traditional roles and significance are here rekindled to spark encouragement and celebration of the heritages and influences from which Tainui sisters have descended.

Of significance for me during this journey was the question my then three-year-old moko Kaiau asked when he learnt that his mother spoke only reo Māori as a young girl. His thoughtful “... and did she cry in Māori?” proffered an emotional symmetry to my research because when Kaiau asked the question, I was in the process of realising the extent of the silencing of our

---

<sup>1</sup> Tainui kuia and academic Professor Ngapare Hopa (1988) gives a deeper understanding to this proverb: At every bend of the river there is a new centre of mana whose autonomy must be acknowledged (p.36).

tīpuna whaea herstories during the transition from reo Māori narrative to English publications. Kaiaua's question illustrated to me an innocent recognition that people differ in how they express language, emotion and spirituality. Yet the social messaging that, over decades, a patriarchal canon has constructed of the Tainui feminine is bereft of any such sensitivities. The adamant ideological presentations have been problematic as my research into the traditions of Whakaotirangi, Marama, Ruapūtahanga and my kuikui Kenehuru highlight. While these women may surely have cried (in Māori) at the injustice of the progressively minimalized and distorted retellings of their herstories, my participation in the re-evaluation and the restorying has been an opportunity to investigate symbols of female powerfulness and expressiveness throughout women's historical complexities. And, it has been a privilege to do so.

*E kore rawa au e ngaro he kakano i Rangiatea.*<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> I, a seed from Rangiatea, will not be lost. Taken from the song by Henrietta Maxwell and Kuini Moehau Reedy 'E kore rawa au e ngaro'.

## **Abstract**

This thesis examines and reveals pre-colonial and colonial organisation of oral traditions, attitudes and positions in relation to significant Tainui ancestresses. Mana wahine, womanist, Kaupapa Māori and Indigenous autoethnography are key theories and methodologies that I have used to reclaim, rediscover and retell their herstories. This approach allows for the contextualisation of Tainui women based on Māori cultural values and practices. The women examined are Whakaotirangi, Marama, Ruapūtahanga and Rehe Hekina Kenehuru. The information that informs this thesis is from textual sources including those from the chiefly narrated accounts, publications, newspapers and manuscripts.

This thesis is a challenge to patriarchal understandings and interpretations of female inferiority in ancient practices, including karakia and whakapapa rites. I argue that the study of ancient karakia, whakataukī and tradition reveals that Māori women held a place of the highest regard and at times exerted power of a stronger force than their male counterparts: only the women's voice could whakatika certain events. Tainui women were crucial representatives between the earthly and the spiritual domains. Significantly, I have 'restoryed' the ancestresses, the effect being to reclaim a powerful place for women in Māori societies in contemporary times.

## Acknowledgements

This work would not have been completed without the support of many, and so paying tribute in this section to the learning and sharing I have experienced from and with others is important. Pre-thesis, my confidante, teacher, mentor and supervisor, Dawn Wells (Ngāti Porou) supported my enthusiasm to learn about my Māoriness through our Kōhanga Reo involvement together. Our Kōhanga in the top of the South, was called Te Waikoropupu Te Kōhanga Reo and through that movement in the early 1980's, wonderfully strong and active women have made lasting impressions on my activist stance. Maria Hambrook, Marama Harrington, Kuini Moehau Reedy, Henrietta Maxwell, Tini Stocker, whaea Te Aroha, Fay and John Cowan, Leeanne Campbell, whaea Peggy Whitten and Mere Pettit are some of these, and I have wonderful memories of deep and reflective conversations and debates over the state of *everything*!

The idea of a thesis about the work of women first came from Rawiri Taonui (I had set out to study ancient iwi childcare practices). His specialty was oral tradition, and so my ideas regarding children morphed instead into those who produce them, their mums. In those early years of study, Rawiri's guidance on oral tradition was fascinating, which fed my enthusiasm. Averil Herbet and Angus Macfarlane provided guidance, support and encouragement at a tricky time in the research. Their support meant I could proceed with the task in front of me in a timely way. Gina Colvin kept up a vigilant overview of my progress until finally stepping up together with Katie Pickles as co-supervisors to the project, which saw the study accelerate into exciting new territories of sexuality and socio-political renderings that I had not seen before within the women's herstories. Professor and whaea, Ngapare Hopa, was associate supervisor and confidante throughout the research. She provided important and unique Tainui observations and queries focused on mana wahine perspectives, discussed as they were around the table and in the company of other like minded women.

The women who read and provided priceless comment and critical ideas on the many drafts and edits—Margaret Evans, Mere Skerrett, Paula Wagemaker, Frieda Looser, Barb Madden, Tui Summers, Hēni Collins, Ani Mikaere and my mum, Marie—made a significant impact on my theorizing and writing. Margaret's hospitality and ongoing support in particular during the many trips I made to the Waikato has been absolutely invaluable. I have appreciated too the many cultural events and activities that I have been able to participate in through the friendship that

developed during the research. My whanaunga, Tonga Kelly, and June Kelly, welcomed me as a distant cousin into their home in 1999 when I was attending Te Wānanga o Raukawa and was completing family history papers. Tonga's ongoing support has been very important towards the completion of this work and it includes too the trips through and around the Waikato region to view many of the land marks that I have spoken of within my research. My father, Bruce Gordon, had an early interest in my work and my brother, Bruce, and sister-in-law, Marion, housed and fed me on my many trips to Wellington to gather information.<sup>3</sup> My step-mum, Rose Paewai, constantly asked when I thought I might be finished, and my mum-in-law, Edith Gilmour, from a different era and culture, tried to understand what it was all about and its relevance. Sadly, my mum, Marie, my stepmum, Rose, my mum-in-law, Edith and June Kelly, have passed on without seeing the final result of their queries and musings, as has my father-in-law, John. Their absence in my life has been the cause of much retrospective thought and pondering and I miss them all terribly. In the midst of their passing and my research came the Canterbury earthquakes, the consequences of which brought about severe disruption and heartache to our region. This study period, then, has been an unforgettable time and experience for my family.

My husband, staunch advocate and mate, John, who unhelpfully almost always agreed with what I wrote and said, provided me with the very occasional male critical thought and emotional, supportive advice at just the right time. My children, Turi, Kahu and Peata, Hēmi, Manaia and Te Hani, who were part of the impetus and passion to both start and complete the PhD journey, have been mostly understanding of my long absences and time away in isolation to write and think and write some more. And there are my moko, Calib, Ihaka, Jordyn, Kaiau, Kruz, Charlee, Leo, Pippa and Kahu who have been wonderful beacons of encouragement in the many agonising rewrites.

The University of Canterbury was there at the beginning of my study and remained so until its completion, providing practical support such as a place to study, fees, sabbatical and processes that ensured everything was time bound and would eventually finish. The librarians at the different libraries I had contact with, the Auckland War Memorial Library, Macmillan Brown,

---

<sup>3</sup> My father passed away on August 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2014. I am glad to say that he had viewed a draft copy of this thesis before he died.

Canterbury University Henry Field Education Library, Waikato University and the Alexander Turnbull were always helpful. The personal help from the Canterbury University libraries staff, in particular Jan, Kathryn, Jane, Sue and the Asklive team, was crucial, and the depth of support, particularly from Nekerangi Paul in relation to ancient tribal work, was phenomenal; I owe a great deal to him. And also to Caroline Syddall for her endless patience and support with Endnote, checking of references and organising scanning of materials to be sent to me at my base in the Ōtira mountains. Also my colleagues, who, over the years have consistently taken the time to enquire about my progress (or lack of it). Their enquiries meant that I was constantly reminded that others knew what I was about and that I needed to keep plugging on so that I could one day produce a final result.

I acknowledge, too, those of the patriarchy canon who told and kept the oral traditions about our ancestresses, and I consider in this regard the era in which they lived and so believed they were The Word. I am grateful to have had the accounts they left to consult. Finally, and importantly, I acknowledge those dynamic women, our wāhine pūrotu, our tīpuna whaea, our kuikui, whose traditions and herstories I have intimately explored and made judgements about and on. I have endeavoured to do this respectfully and humbly for those whom I present in this research, but I acknowledge that I may not have always got this right.

*E raka te mauī, e raka te katau (he tangata anō mā te mauī, he tangata anō mā te katau).*<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> The right hand is adept, the left hand is skilful (some people to attend to the left and some to attend to the right). A community can use all of the skills of its people (Mead & Grove, 2001, p. 43).

# Table of Contents

## Contents

<b>Abstract .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Acknowledgements .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Table of Contents .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Chapter One: Introduction .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<i>Study Impetus and Scope .....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>My Tainui Whakapapa and Ancestresses .....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Implications of Women Silenced .....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>A Consideration of Some of the Dynamics in Examining and Presenting this History .....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Summary and Thesis Outline .....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>A Note on the Technical Conventions in this Work .....</i>	<i>22</i>
<b>Chapter Two: Literature Review .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Part 1: Oral History, Oral Tradition, Myth, Kōrero Tuku Iho .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<i>Te Rangi Hiroa (Peter Buck) (1877–1951) .....</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Paula Gunn Allen (1939–2008) .....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>David Henige .....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Vincent Malcolm-Buchanan .....</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Ngāhuia Murphy .....</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Michael Quinn Patton .....</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>Jan Vansina .....</i>	<i>29</i>
<b>Part 2: Relevant Discourses .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<i>Colonisation .....</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>Race .....</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>Gender .....</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Knowledge and Power .....</i>	<i>41</i>
<b>Part 3: Social Constructions .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<i>Patriarchy .....</i>	<i>43</i>
<i>The Social Construction of Women’s Stories and Herstories .....</i>	<i>45</i>



<i>Summary and Research Enquiry</i> .....	49
<b>Chapter 3: Research Approach</b> .....	<b>51</b>
<i>Theoretical and Methodological Frameworks and Data</i> .....	51
<b>Part 1: Theoretical Frameworks</b> .....	<b>51</b>
<i>Womanist, Womanism and Feminism</i> .....	52
<i>Mana Wahine and Kaupapa Māori</i> .....	53
<i>The Nature and Existence of Matriarchal Societies</i> .....	56
<i>Patriarchal Hierarchies</i> .....	63
<i>Post-colonial Theorising</i> .....	65
<b>Part 2: Methodological Frameworks</b> .....	<b>66</b>
<i>Qualitative Research</i> .....	66
<i>Textual Analysis</i> .....	67
<i>Autoethnography</i> .....	70
<i>A Response to Colonising Texts</i> .....	71
<b>Part 3: Supervisory Whānau and Data</b> .....	<b>72</b>
<i>Supervisory/Research Whānau</i> .....	72
<i>Dataset</i> .....	74
<i>Data Collection and Analysis</i> .....	76
<i>Summary</i> .....	80
<b>Chapter Four: Canoe Traditions</b> .....	<b>82</b>
<i>Whakaotirangi</i> .....	82
<i>What Was Said</i> .....	83
The Early Māori Manuscripts .....	83
Pre-1900 Pākehā-Published Sources .....	94
Post-1900 Tainui Sources .....	102
Post-1900 Pākehā Sources .....	113
<i>Conclusion: Politics that Emerge</i> .....	123
<i>Whakaotirangi Restoryed</i> .....	126
<b>Chapter Five: Canoe Traditions</b> .....	<b>131</b>
<i>Marama</i> .....	131
<i>What Was Said</i> .....	132

The Early Māori Manuscripts.....	132
Pre-1900 Pākehā-Published Sources .....	144
Post-1900 Tainui Sources.....	150
Post-1900 Pākehā Sources.....	157
<i>Conclusion: Politics that Emerge</i> .....	166
<i>Marama Restoryed</i> .....	170
<b>Chapter Six: Early Traditions pre-European Contact .....</b>	<b>174</b>
<i>Ruapūtahanga</i> .....	174
<i>Tainui Expansion</i> .....	175
<i>What Was Said</i> .....	176
The Early Māori Manuscripts.....	176
Pre-1900 Pākehā-Published Sources .....	185
Post-1900 Pākehā Sources.....	188
Post-1900 Māori Sources.....	191
<i>Conclusion: Politics that Emerge</i> .....	206
<i>Ruapūtahanga Restoryed</i> .....	209
<b>Chapter Seven: Post-Colonisation .....</b>	<b>213</b>
<i>Rehe Hekina Kenehuru</i> .....	213
<i>Kenehuru—Her Whakapapa and Marriage</i> .....	214
<i>The Land Case: What Was Said</i> .....	216
Article 1: <i>Daily Southern Cross</i> , 16 September 1848, p. 2 .....	216
Article 2: <i>Daily Southern Cross</i> , 14 October 1848, p. 2 .....	220
Article 3: <i>The New Zealander</i> , 25 August 1849, p. 2 .....	222
Article 4: <i>Daily Southern Cross</i> , 31 August 1849, p. 4 .....	226
Article 5: <i>Daily Southern Cross</i> , 31 August 1849, p. 2 .....	232
<i>Kenehuru Visibilised: The Ongoing Case for Redress and What It Meant for Her</i> .....	248
<i>Conclusion: Politics that Emerge</i> .....	259
<i>Kenehuru Restoryed</i> .....	264
<b>Chapter Eight: Conclusion .....</b>	<b>269</b>
<i>Insights from the Literature</i> .....	272
<i>Findings: Masculinization of the Feminine</i> .....	274
<i>Addressing the Restorying</i> .....	277

<i>Research Implications</i> .....	278
<i>Implications for the Future</i> .....	279
<i>Future Research</i> .....	280
<i>A Final Word</i> .....	281
<b>Glossary</b> .....	<b>283</b>
<b>Appendices</b> .....	<b>285</b>
Appendix A: Whakapapa table in Bruce's typical uppercase handwriting .....	285
Appendix B: Example from Aoterangi's manuscript .....	286
Appendix C: My kuikui's family: Elvira Izetta Meurant, her husband John Stuart Kelly and their children .....	287
<b>References</b> .....	<b>288</b>
<i>Primary Sources</i> .....	288
<i>Secondary Sources</i> .....	294

## Chapter One: Introduction

This thesis joins the work of many others who have striven to understand, critique and rework the effects of colonialism. Here I am concerned with reclaiming tīpuna wāhine Tainui. My main reason for this Tainui focus is my iwi links to North Island iwi Tainui Waikato, and, while it may be deemed important to study Māori women further afield, such an undertaking is beyond the scope of this thesis. During the process of reclamation, I have consciously and rigorously sought to provoke the definitions, interpretations and understandings of what we currently know or believe we know in regards to the status of our tīpuna wāhine, our wāhine purotu, bequeathed as they have been through the words of colonists. In this thesis I have taken apart (critiqued) the stories of a selection of important Tainui women and I have analysed the text for underlying messages about them. I re-present these through the restorying with which I end each of their chapters.

I also want to emphasise at this early point in my thesis the deep personal resonance the work of reclaiming my Tainui ancestresses has for me. My intention in saying this is to acknowledge the likely influence this resonance will have had on how I conducted this research and the conclusions I draw from it. However, I state this influence unashamedly, given a comment made by author Patricia Grace (Ngāti Toa, Ngāti Raukawa and Te Ati Awa) at a writers' conference held in Oklahoma in 2008. She urged attendees to "write what you know and push the boundaries of what you know" (n.p.). I am also mindful of the following words from a researcher of matriarchal societies, Heide Götter-Abendroth (1999): "... female researchers should use the strongest and most provocative words for their task; it helps to prevent their work from being ignored" (p. 2).

This type of advice from prominent women researchers and writers explains in part, my desire to critically examine the positioning of Tainui women in the oral and written accounts of those traditions available to us today. Through this research, which pulls together and connects a heterogeneous contribution of womanly involvement in rituals and sacred ceremony, such as karakia, waiata and tauparapara, I have sought to open or reopen the herstories of these women. I have also endeavoured to proffer a contemporary thesis that not only incorporates my 'womanist mana wahine' ideas and thoughts about my discoveries but also pushes the boundaries within which these accounts, as I later explain, have typically constrained Tainui women.

Traditional Māori culture, as with other Indigenous cultures, observed a synergy between genders, where female and male roles supported and enhanced each other in complementary ways that benefited the people as a whole (see, for example, Mikaere, 1999). Anna Cooper, a black American women's rights advocate, argued in both speech and writing (her book *A voice from the South* was published in 1892), during the early 1900s that there is a feminine and a masculine side to truth and that these “are related not as inferior and superior, not as better and worse, not as weaker and stronger, but as complements” (1988, p. 60). Black American women were writing their worldviews long before Māori women had the opportunity to do so. Their work highlights a synergy with Māori practices. Furthermore, according to white Australian anthropologist Diane Bell (1993), who studied Aboriginal lore and is now retired, before colonisation, indigenous women's roles were based on ritual domains where women engaged in work “distinctly theirs” (p. 337)—work that provided for women's autonomy and independence. Naomi Simmonds (Ngāti Raukawa) (2011) acknowledges in her research that the mana of wahine – mana wāhine and that of mana tāne are intimately woven together and that they work inseparably with mana whenua, mana whānau, mana atua, and I would add mana aotūroa (the environment). Today, however, as Bell (1987, p. 115) argues, the separation of roles has been superseded by “sexual asymmetry”, which has replaced complementarity and interdependence with powerlessness in favour of men's prominence and importance, while women are seen to hold two tasks, to make love and to bear children.

Various Aotearoa New Zealand commentators concur with regard to Māori. They maintain that oppression of Māori women began with a patriarchal mindset brought in to the country by European colonisers and is still a mindset which is evident today (see, for example, Colvin, 2009; Jenkins & Morris Matthews, 1998; Johnston, 1998; Mikaere, 2011; Murphy, 2011; Rei, 1998; Te Awēkotuku, 1989). Careful examination of oral traditions and remembered histories illustrates, however, that gender roles for Māori were non-oppressive. According to Tuhoe kuia and educator Rangimarie Rose Pere (1987; 1994), women held crucial roles in the maintenance of iwi affairs, including sexuality, health and tribal leadership. This positioning meant that both men and women, while observing tikanga Māori, had important roles to play in the day to day events of tribal life and that one gender needed the other in order to exist. As Ani Mikaere (Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Porou) (2011) observes, “The very survival of the collective is dependent upon everyone who makes it up, and therefore each and every person within the group has his or her

own intrinsic value” (p. 187). Tikanga Māori world views, then, observe that the roles of men and women enhanced each other and that the “interrelationship of all living things” created an “overarching principle of balance”. Mikaere (2011) provides evidence of these interrelated roles within waiata, whakataukī, haka and iwi traditions. There is also evidence of them, as I have since discovered, within karakia. Colonisation thus meant marked changes for Māori women. Pere (1994) for example states “Some ... [Maori] women have ... been led to believe that this loss of dignity and the right to be involved with decision making stems from Maori traditions” when, in general, the history of their “own descent-lines makes it quite clear that the men and women complement, support and work alongside each other” (p. 102).

Descriptions of American Indian social systems and rituals by Paula Gunn Allen, a Laguna Indian woman, replicate these traditional Māori models of complementarity. Gunn Allen claims that “women’s rituals and lore center on birth, death, food, householding, and medicine ... all that goes into the maintenance of life over the long term [while m]an’s rituals are concerned with risk, death, and transformation ... all that helps regulate and control change” (Gunn Allen, 1986, p. 82). It could be said, then, that the ritual domain highlights true tradition and iwi power base. Māori social systems had traditionally been founded on ritual that included women-focused world views, and none more so, it could be said, than the essential role they held in maintaining whakapapa. This can be seen when reflecting on Māori cosmological narratives where Papatūānuku, the earth mother, and Hineahuone, the first woman, were considered to have been the centre of substantial feminine roles pre colonisation.

Historically, just as white racist imperialism sabotaged and excluded Native American and black women’s roles and rituals in America, so it came to pass that Māori women were excluded in New Zealand societies. Renowned and accessible histories of the early 20th century, such as those by Gudgeon (1903) and Smith (1907), for example, typically had readers believe that Māori women played a lesser role in traditional society. Māori became overrun by a number of coincidental events that included multitudes of colonisers and missionaries who, it has been well documented, often operated on the basis of “selectivity” leaving out of their records that which might have been considered by Māori to be significant (Hopa, 1966, p. 1). The consequences of this, as Hopa noted, is the dearth of works that present Māori institutions as valid and intelligible working systems. As I document later in this thesis, daily life for Māori women was disrupted as they became caught up in land confiscations and the sabotaging of their rituals while

the newcomers encouraged Māori men to duplicate Christian hierarchical patriarchal rules of domination. Māori women furthermore were degraded and dishonoured by the Christian notions of “proper sexual behaviour” (Gunn Allen, 1986, p. 259), and Māori men increasingly suppressed or altered women’s agency in a number of areas, including their traditional roles in healing and ritual. As the colonisers and missionaries with their discourses of heathenism (and associated attitudes) in relation to Māori progressed acculturation, not only did Māori think carefully about the tribal knowledge they were prepared to part with,<sup>5</sup> but white people thought carefully and often disparagingly about what parts of that knowledge they would record (see Colenso, 1881, p. 93 for example).

In this way, as I show in this thesis, the scale of Māori women in leadership roles and other important positions lessened in line with the dominant white colonial male view of women’s place in society as one subsidiary to man’s. A pamphlet written by Mary Müller in 1869 to New Zealand men attests to the pervasiveness of this viewpoint. Aiming to raise the issue of the right of women to political literacy, Müller wrote in her pamphlet that “Men alone can give us the power to raise [women] above our present degradation” (Stade, 2008, n.p.). Her apparent belief that women’s power relied on the grace of men rather than on women’s efforts to work themselves towards redressing the imbalance is telling. Certainly prominent male researchers and historiographers, despite evidence of the strong involvement of Māori women in Māori society, systematically bankrupted the important part these women played. As Greer (1986) observes, “With a couple of magnificent exceptions, anthropologists in the past have been either actually male, or unsexed as I was by their isolation from women and women’s concerns” (p. xxvii). I consider that Māori women’s roles today continue to be noticeably oppressed, with only a couple of “magnificent exceptions” (Tainui woman Te Rangitopeora is one such) wherein women have traditions recorded about them that position them in substantial leadership roles or in meaningful ways that demonstrate that theirs was and is a place of importance.

### **Study Impetus and Scope**

This thesis, then, is the result of my disappointment over and confusion at the dearth of information in my Tainui whakapapa about the women of noble birth or those who had some

---

<sup>5</sup> Māori learned to be careful because of the incorrect interpretations and assumptions that non-Māori generally relegated to certain practices (see Murphy, 2011, p. 91, for examples).

influence within their hapū. In general, their histories are so sparsely written that in order to get a sense of herstory, one must locate and negotiate multiple pieces of literature. There is a feeling of disadvantage when text about Tainui aligns menfolk in exceptional roles and adventures while many women appear only as names in a whakapapa table (and occasionally they do not even appear there). The main focus of my research therefore has been to realise Tainui women's feats and accomplishments over time and to draw on these in order to highlight their critical importance to the wellbeing and interests of their hapū and iwi. The impetus for this study spanned a period of many years, drawing as it did from my long and profound interest in women's place in myths, legends and oral traditions.

One of the Tainui women I first studied in depth set the tenor of my research focus for this thesis. Her name was Whakaotirangi, and she was a leading priestess and chieftainess. My researching of Tainui oral traditions not only about her but also about the other Tainui women who feature in this thesis, took to heart advice and comments from Bachofen (1973) and Vansina (1985, 2009). I was therefore, for example, exceptionally mindful of reading all that could be found about each woman. As I found during my earlier work on Whakaotirangi, archival summaries and accounts could be located about the same woman, but the information they provided varied. As such, much of my research involved rigorous examination of archival material in both te reo Māori (which I translated or worked with others to do so) and English, and thus took into account primary sources (manuscripts) as well as secondary sources (published). Noting who wrote which version of events about these women, and when, allowed me to scrutinise the variations and similarities across the accounts and texts, which collectively covered the period extending from the mid-19th-century through to the present. I paid close attention to who each narrator was with respect to each version of events and who the listener was. I considered, too, the relationship between the teller and the listener and the benefit that each gained from the information that they were narrating or seeking.

Gaining knowledge of the different positions was an important aspect of my research focus because it allowed me to offer possible explanations for the variations. According to Rawiri Taonui, my initial doctoral supervisor and past head of Aotahi, School of Māori Studies at the University of Canterbury, variations within iwi oral and written accounts include generalisations, assumptions and prejudices that may be based on iwi alliances forged in an attempt to elevate a particular tipuna (personal communication, May 23, 2006). However, I was also interested in



critically examining and discussing to what extent the variations reflected the dominant societal mind-sets and discourses of the times in which the accounts were orally narrated or written down, and in what my findings would say about how and why my Tainui ancestresses have been represented as they are in these narrations.

### **My Tainui Whakapapa and Ancestresses**

Some 36 years ago, just before my eldest son Turi was born for me and my husband, John, my father, Bruce, wrote down my Tainui whakapapa in his typical upper-case handwriting on a scrappy piece of paper (Appendix A). Because John and I went on to have another four children and were busy caring for them, we generally only looked at what Bruce had written when considering if we should give any of the names set down to our children. Ten or so years after Turi's birth, I was excited to find the names that my father had provided were repeated in the book *Tainui* (Kelly, 1949) in a variety of whakapapa tables. The book was a gift to me from my Uncle Les (Dad's brother). However, as I soon discovered, my Tainui ancestresses Hineihi, Hineraku, Pareauru, Kahupeka, Taiarohia, Kurawakaimua, Mataikurawaka, Panirau, Mawake, Wheururangi, Kurawari, Tapuaereinga, Waitururu, Kahutaramoa, Heke-i-te-rangi, Kiringaua, Puakirangi, Rawharangi, Pare-ueta-whiti, Tawai and Kirikino are observed in *Tainui* by little else than their names. Comparatively, there is considerable recording of male achievements. One exception is Whakaotirangi, whose tradition is partly recounted in the book. There is also no mention (apart from in a whakapapa table) in *Tainui* of Rehe Hekina Kenehuru, my great, great, great grandmother, despite the prominence given to her in other sources written during George Grey's governorship of Aotearoa New Zealand in the mid-19th-century (see Chapter Seven of this thesis). As I was later to find, mention of her appears in numerous early Government papers of the time such as *The Journals of the House of Representatives*, Public Petitions Committee documents and early colonial newspapers.

Mindful of the lack of information about my Tainui ancestresses in general and the affairs of Whakaotirangi and Kenehuru in particular, I began to search out other archival mentions of them. What I found made it clear that the accounts, all narrated or written by men, changed over time as they became memorialised in terms of patriarchal scrutiny. The later published accounts of Whakaotirangi, for example, position her as a person immensely inferior in status and influence to the Whakaotirangi depicted in the very early transcriptions of Tainui oral traditions.

Kenehuru came to be seen as a person perhaps afflicted with psychological problems when a more accurate account, as I later explain, would consider her personality and actions in the light of George Grey's sexist and racist actions and attitudes.

### **Implications of Women Silenced**

When writing about the global lack of histories of women as well as the lack of histories about women written by women in the 18th and 19th centuries, Heilbrun (1988, p. 22) recorded Patricia Sparks' 1976 contemplation of "women's autobiographical disabilities". According to Sparks, "[T]he face a man turns to the world ... typically embodies his strength, while the only acceptable models for women involve deception and yielding." As I looked through the whakapapa tables in *Tainui*, I was struck not only by the complexity involved in locating and placing the female genealogy, but also by the strong likelihood that the manner in which herstories of women found in print have generally been recorded is as Sparks claims. The histories of Marama and Ruapūtahanga, for example, provide good illustrations of these assertions. Heilbrun (1989) also drew on commentary from the protagonist, Anne Elliot, in Jane Austen's novel *Persuasion*, written in 1818: "... men have had every advantage of us [women] in telling their story. Education has been theirs in so much higher a degree; the pen has been in their hands. It is difficult for a woman to define her feelings in language which is chiefly made by men to express theirs" (p. 43). Professor of Indigenous Education at the University of Waikato, Linda Tuhiwai Smith (Ngāti Awa, Ngāti Porou) (2012), similarly notes, as do other Indigenous researchers and writers, that history is really about patriarchy and a particular form of power, authority and rule. Each of the women's histories in this thesis and a further 11 that I have researched attest to this statement by Tuhiwai Smith.

Finding and unravelling the oral traditions about the women listed in the whakapapa set down by my father came to be, for me, a commitment spanning many years. I agree, as a result of this work, with Carolyn Heilbrun (1988) when she says, "If I had to emphasize the lack either of narrative or of language to the formation of new women's lives, I would unquestionably emphasize narrative" (p. 43). She goes on to say the problem "is not one of language but of power. And power consists to a large extent in deciding what stories will be told ... male power has made certain stories unthinkable" (pp. 43–44). African American woman thinker and novelist, American Professor Toni Morrison (1992), calls using one's position of power and autonomy to

determine what information and knowledge is suitable for dispersion, production and readership a “dehistoricizing allegory”. In further explaining the meaning she gives to this term, Morrison (1992) states that the process it involves “produces foreclosure rather than disclosure. If difference is made so vast that the civilising process becomes indefinite—taking place across an unspecified infinite amount of time—history [herstory], as a process of becoming, is excluded from the literary encounter” (p. 68). The effect of this exclusion from literature for women—specifically Māori women for the sake of this thesis—where their voice would have highlighted a unique and particular way of relating to their world, has meant instead an overly sustained silence in world histories.

While content in the oral traditions and narrations about Māori ancestresses that emphasise their value and strengths remain elusive amongst the accessible literature, we also need to remember that Aotearoa New Zealand as a nation is still learning to acknowledge and engage with Māori history as authentic and as a liveable reality. That engagement is increasingly occurring as we, as a nation, visit marae and uphold tikanga during pōwhiri, including karanga and tangi where women’s rituals remain intact. Here also we may view carvings of tīpuna wāhine and honour them through various activities. An important function in terms of our engagement with tikanga Māori is storytelling. As Ellis (2004, p. 33) reminds us, the importance of story, including oral traditions, lies in its ability to help us make sense of our world and the world of others. However, these worldviews are, of course, shaped by the stories we can access—or want to access—and by what is told—or not told. The reclamation of the stories that tell of the accomplishments of celebrated Tainui women is therefore not a study for the sake of it; rather, its purpose has been to *contribute* to a more authentic telling and viewing of Māori history/herstory and its place in the past and present shaping of our nation.

### **A Consideration of Some of the Dynamics in Examining and Presenting this History**

With its focus on historiographical records and content, this thesis takes on a variety of sub-disciplines in order to deconstruct and make sense of the relevant textual backgrounds. Among these, and in no particular order of importance, is the study of postcolonial literature. I viewed this as an important topic to engage with considering that the extant text has been written since the colonisation of the landscape, people and their/our histories by British explorers and

scientists. By employing the deconstruction of postcolonial literature in my thesis, discourse about migration and annexation of the Indigenous peoples of New Zealand comes into focus as a relevant aspect of my research. Similarly, British political culture and behaviour in the form of legislation, acts and regulations that were passed by the colonists which served to bypass, ignore and estrange Māori from their land and cultural practices come under scrutiny within this type of enquiry. From these perspectives, cultural psychology, to a certain extent, also is touched upon in terms of how it has been enacted upon tangata whenua where Māori culture and social practices are regulated and expressed by the images and terminologies of the colonisers, and Kenehuru's history provides a good example of this. Canon law and its influence has been a major contributor to the traditions that have been captured in the form of regulation and governing rules put forth by missionaries and church leaders who entered the lands with a particular focus in mind, that of ensuring 'native' souls were saved and that Māori would see the error of their heathen ways. The whole has been brought together through scrutiny and a relationship with mana wahine and Kaupapa Māori theory and methodology. That is, the research and analysis validates Māori women's ways of knowing and making sense of the world. These systems and approaches will be discussed in greater detail in Chapters Two and Three.

### **Summary and Thesis Outline**

In this, the introductory chapter of my thesis, I have provided the rationale for the research presented in it. I have foregrounded my claim that the patriarchal retelling of Tainui oral traditions has altered not only what is known about Tainui women's place (and, probably by extension, the place of Māori women) in pre-colonial Māori society but also reconstituted how these women came to be placed post-colonially. I have set out my personal interests and place in the research, and briefly considered the backdrop of political, cultural, sexual and social discourses that appear to have played a powerful role in relegating and realigning Tainui women's status and social situations across time. These discourses include commentary on the genesis and nature of matriarchal and patriarchal societies and the place of the female in various ideologies and will be discussed in Chapter Two. My central focus, therefore, in the following chapters of this thesis is to compare and contrast the earliest Tainui narratives concerning a selection of Tainui women with the recorded colonial accounts and to follow the successive

retellings of the traditions through to contemporary times. Through this approach, I explore and discuss the inconsistencies and contradictions between the varying generational world views.

I review the national and international literature relevant to my research focus and aim in Chapter Two. I discuss the links between culturally historic documentation and the control of discourse and text, paying particular attention to who controls what we know, how it is controlled and why it is controlled in a particular way. I integrate these tenets with literature that explores discursive discourses of gender, race, racism (discrimination of a people based on their race), colonialism—in terms of the maintenance of British control over Indigenous peoples, and the sexualisation of Māori women.

In Chapter Three, I set out the range of extant theoretical frameworks and methodologies that I drew together in order to study and analyse the pre- and post-colonial narrations and texts concerning Tainui oral traditions and women's place within them. The approach here taken is that of indigenous (mana Māori) womanism, which I consider has allowed me the flexibility to be courageous, outrageous and wilful while at the same time negotiating the complexities of iwi histories with a humble yet activist stance, academic rigour, objectivity and balance.

In Chapters Four through to Six, I respectively present a chronological account of the oral traditions and herstories pertaining to Tainui women: Whakaotirangi and Marama of the waka traditions and Ruapūtahanga of the pre-European era. Chapter Seven which details Kenehuru of the post-colonial era differs from the earlier three chapters. Because Kenehuru's history has been captured by colonial text only, I present instead a biographical narrative about her. In the first three of these substantive chapters, I provide the earliest (mid-19th-century) narrations about each of the women. As explained already, these are considered to be the most authentic accounts because they have the least colonial intervention. The details about Kenehuru have also been chronologically sequenced, derived as they have been from colonial text. After deconstructing and critically analysing the accounts in order to establish any ideological discourses that may lie within the text, I present and similarly analyse the colonial and “conjoint” (Taonui in Prendergrast-Tarena, 2008, p. 30) renditions of the oral traditions.<sup>6</sup> The critical analysis examines the forms the traditions took and the corollary of the convergence between the indigenous

---

<sup>6</sup> Taonui (2005) defines ‘conjoint’ accounts as those that have been written together by Māori and Pākehā (see Prendergrast-Tarena for further discussion of Taonui's thesis in this regard).

accounts and the colonists' capturing of those accounts. Where appropriate, 20th-century Māori accounts are also presented. I proffer a conclusionary section in each chapter, in which I present the political renderings that emerge from the overall analysis. I then represent the ancestresses traditions, realigning them in terms of positions of power and autonomy from the womanist mana wahine stance that I have taken.

In Chapter Eight, the conclusion, I summarise the main findings, conclusionary renderings, and scope for future research.

### **A Note on the Technical Conventions in this Work**

This thesis includes primary early manuscript material and colonial texts that differ in texture from contemporary conventions. In particular, I note the use of the macron, which today identifies the use of a long vowel in Māori text. This was not a practice within the mid-19th-century texts that I consulted. I have sought in this thesis to maintain and preserve the narratives and excerpts that I have quoted; therefore such work has been faithfully presented as I found it.

## **Chapter Two: Literature Review**

Concerned as this thesis is with Tainui women's oral traditions and the dilemma of how they have been maintained, how the women within them have been represented and by whom, this chapter sets out to provide a review of literature that has informed the diversity of renderings in response to these matters. The study itself progressed through a range of contextualising factors that are taken into consideration here. During its early stages, my position was that of critic in terms of how Tainui women's traditions, handed down orally from generation to generation before European colonisation (the establishment of New Zealand as a colony of Britain), have been researched and retold since that time by the men who walked those spaces. I contested the messages that they left behind.

With that initial groundwork set out, I took on the stance of advocate in relation to restorying Tainui women's strengths and powers that were embedded within the women's traditions but then lost or ignored by post-colonial recorders, most of whom were white Victorian, imperialistic men. That is, men from Great Britain whose main intent was supplanting British interests in a new colony. In this, perhaps, there was either a predicament or a deliberate agenda for these recorders who had not previously constructed discourses of strong tribal-women leaders' identity because their own language, culture and knowledge had not formerly represented or encountered women in these roles. Furthermore, those who penned the narratives that they heard had undergone an English education where Victorian colonial methods and tropes took precedence.

My aim is to foreground, through an examination of the literature, the hegemonic structures and practices potentially influencing the maintenance of Tainui women's herstories. The scope of this body of research revealed two paradigms that came to direct my doctoral study. The first required me to examine the nature of the disruption of Tainui women's narratives that led to these women's marginalisation or invisibility in the accounts that we hold today. The second focuses on how that disruption was able to occur. While these paradigms or strands tend to converge, I have set them down in this chapter in two deliberate parts, the content of which I preface momentarily.

I begin the chapter by documenting (Part 1) a variety of literature-based accounts focused on describing and discussing the complexities and threads of oral history, tradition and myth. I consider that this information provides important contextual understanding for the theoretical and narrative accounts that populate this thesis. Collectively, the explanations provided by the respective authors offer a basis for establishing the integral nature of tradition, history and myth in relation to indigenous peoples.

In Part 2, I explore the first of the aforementioned key paradigms. Here, I tease out Western colonisers' assumptions about and attitudes towards indigenous communities, using as my reference point social construction theory. I also overview discursive ontologies embedded within discourses of colonisation, race theory, gender construction, politics, power and knowledge. This literature will show how it was that Māori became colonised and also the implications of *being* colonised, in general, and for the narratives about Tainui women, in particular.

In Part 3 of this chapter, I discuss the second paradigmatic set of concepts and values informing my thesis, those of patriarchy and the social construction of women's stories. This literature highlights resistance, particularly from indigenous women, to marginalisation and appropriation of their minds and bodies. I end the chapter by presenting my primary research question and sub-questions.

## **Part 1: Oral History, Oral Tradition, Myth, Kōrero Tuku Iho**

Linda Shopes, an author and past president of the U.S. Oral History Association, in 2002 described oral history “by only the most generous of definitions ... [as the] early efforts to record firsthand accounts of the past” (p. 2). For Shankar Aswani, Professor of Anthropology at Rhodes University, oral histories are oral evidence provided from “inherited memories” (2000, p. 41). Māori refer to inherited memories as kōrero tuku iho or kupu tuku iho, and in these terms are encapsulated our histories, traditions and myths. Bachofen (1973), through the retelling of important historical events in India, illustrates how significant legends, myths and stories can and have been interpreted over time. He notes that while it is not possible for absolute truth in the retelling of historical events because of inability to verify details and features, or to prove that a



narration is based on actual events or free of the “embroidery” that can sometimes accompany retelling, we ought to take note of the *significance* of the story (p. 199).

Bachofen’s (1973) viewpoint is based on acceptance of myths and fables as expressions and thoughts that have been passed on about single real events of considerable importance. Tainui and Ngā Puhi provide a good example of this in the oral traditions of these iwi regarding twin sisters Reitū and Reipae from Tainui. The compelling substance of the tradition about them is the significance of their marriages and the subsequent children they had together with influential Ngā Puhi chiefs. Their marriages and offspring are intertribally considered important. The unravelling of traditions about the sisters highlights that iwi re-tellers of their histories “embroidered” parts of the material about their journey to Ngā Puhi lands. Thus, while “factual history and traditional fabrication is impossible to determine” (Bachofen, 1973, p. 200), the essential content of the traditions—the significance of the sisters’ geopolitical marriages and children—has been maintained in the stories that exist today.

Contemporary researchers of traditions, histories and myth provide a range of explanations for their authenticity in relation to indigenous peoples. Historians, researchers and indigenous peoples such as Buck (1926), Gunn Allen, (1992), Henige (1988), Malcolm-Buchanan (2008), Murphy (2011), Patton (1999), Robertson (1956, 1957, 1958) and Vansina (1985) agree that oral history, oral tradition and myth support explanations, interpretations and understandings of a people’s histories, including natural phenomenon such as the makeup of their surroundings and indigenous identity. An ongoing observation by these and other writers is that the text, whether written, oral, aural or visual, will be read or heard differently depending on the interest and intention of those consulting it. A brief summary of these listed authors’ research follows.

### **Te Rangi Hīroa (Peter Buck) (1877–1951)**

Te Rangi Hīroa, or Peter Buck as he was also known, was a Māori academic, parliamentarian and anthropologist who wielded considerable authority in his time. He defined tradition as

the handing down of opinion or practices to posterity unwritten. This definition can only apply to a people with a written language. In the case of a people without writing, all information, whether applying to the past, present, or even future, must of necessity be handed down to posterity unwritten if transmitted at all. With the native races, the term tradition has come to be more closely associated with historical narratives that, in the absence of writing, have been orally transmitted ... tradition may be regarded as history derived from an unwritten source. (Buck, 1926, p. 181)

Buck (1926) told of the consequences should those students, whose task it was to retain the ancient traditions, stumble in the recitation. In traditional Māori society, the passing on and retaining of knowledge was taken so seriously that it could mean death through atua intervention if a recitation faltered. Roberton (1957, p. 258) noted also the absolute importance of word perfect recognition. The importance of this level of accuracy can be understood when one considers the naming of the landscape in relation to ancestors and tribal events of significance such as migrations. The birth of children from celebrated lineage and iwi wars are also identified within the literature as central to accurate recitations of traditions. Indeed, the recitation of tradition has been used in New Zealand to account for recompense and recognition by the Crown in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi claims. Buck observes that there has been a substantial decrease in the extent of Māori memory relative to oral tradition as more people became reliant on written records post-colonisation.

### **Paula Gunn Allen (1939–2008)**

Paula Gunn Allen, maintained that oral traditions staved off the complete destruction of the ways of her people, and that it is through woman power that they have been remembered and will empower, still further, future generations of her people: “The Mother, the Grandmother, recognized from earliest times into the present among those peoples of the Americas who kept to the eldest traditions, is celebrated in social structures, architecture, law, custom, and the oral tradition” (Gunn Allen, 1992, p. 11). Tribal narratives are, according to her, tied to a particular point of view—that of the tribe—and to specific ideas connected to the tribe’s ritual traditions. This view from an indigenous woman gives an insightful explanation of unquestionable faith and belief in the power of oral tradition to maintain and strengthen those to whom the traditions belong.

### **David Henige**

David Henige, the founder and editor of the journal *History in Africa*, has written many articles and several books in his role as an historian. In his article titled *Oral, But Oral What? The Nomenclatures of Orality and Their Implications* (1988), Henige argues (as did Tainui historian James Roberton, 1957) that oral traditions are “transmitted over several generations and to some extent [are] the common property of a group of people” (p. 232). These traditions, he says, can be

distinguished from testimony, which is usually referenced by only a few people rather than by the collective.

By seeking out or, to use Henige's term, "ransacking" (p. 232) from various sources every bit of information either directly or indirectly related to the topic of interest (including people, conditions and events), historians can gain a good understanding of the events and meanings embedded in oral traditions and subsequent written literature. Having discussed the historicity of events through reference to the ancient Greek poetry of Homer and the medieval sagas of Icelandic and Anglo-Saxon England (amongst others), Henige concludes that the "how" in these tellings is of more significance to historic documentation than the "when". Therefore, rather than focusing on a window in time, where the emphasis is on aligning specific dates to definite events, he adjures historians to direct their primary attention to the meaning and complexities of each narrative. I have taken this advice, for while I have identified in my thesis canoe traditions, early traditions pre-european contact and post colonisation, my concern is not with attempting to pin point events to dates, rather, it is with the tracking down (the ransacking) of assumptions within traditions about Tainui women that appeared post colonially. Further, from those assumptions and socially constructed perspectives, I generate alternative knowledges about our tīpuna whaea.

### **Vincent Malcolm-Buchanan**

Adding, more recently, to the discussion on oral tradition and oral history, New Zealand academic Vincent Malcolm-Buchanan tracks, in his 2008 article titled *Oral Histories, Mythologies and Indigeneity in Aotearoa-New Zealand*, the significant shift in relation to Māoridom's mythic deities and events from rejection, suppression and oppression (by colonists and sometimes by Māori in an effort to protect those deities and events) to their re-entry into New Zealand politics. Malcolm-Buchanan (2008) identifies myths, which he says originated in ancient pre-literate societies, as "multilayered narratives embedding universal and oftentimes unique focal points, intents and prerogatives" (p. 6). Myths, he continues, are present throughout all histories and societies, where their functions may encompass the cognitive, psychological, spiritual and socio-political agendas of a culture's customs, laws, beliefs and traditions.

Like Gunn Allen (1992), Malcolm-Buchanan (2008) considers that myths espouse a culture's overall lifestyle and wellbeing and so become etched into a people's social, political, economic and religious structures, and eventually are established as an ideology (p. 6). Malcolm-

Buchanan also claims that myths mean different things at different times. They can provide a means of transmitting significant information across generations, they can be used in ritual performances, and they offer a means of entertainment in the form of storytelling (p. 9).

Without doubt, says Malcolm-Buchanan (2008), oral narrators in pre-literate Māori communities were “living repositories of their society’s preceding and contemporary histories. They were, in effect, living, breathing encyclopaedias, dictionaries, interpreters, entertainers and educationalists” (p. 9).<sup>7</sup> Although parts of the tribal narrations attracted different emphases across time and societies, their intrinsic aspects, such as good and evil, sacred and profane, deity and human, hero and trickster, important members of the society, and so on, survived multi-generational transmission. Only with European colonisation, when Pākehā “imperialist interests far exceeded” (p. 10) those of Māori, were oral narratives, traditions and myths partially or wholly hidden in an effort to protect them. By then, however, many tribal traditions had already been relayed and captured on paper by Māori themselves or by missionaries and settlers.

### **Ngāhuia Murphy**

In her Master’s thesis *Te Awa Atua, Te Awa Tapu, Te Awa Wahine: An Examination of Stories, Ceremonies and Practices Regarding Menstruation in the Pre-Colonial Māori World* (2011), Ngāhuia Murphy describes herself, as a Māori woman, treading carefully and conscientiously as she engaged with her tribal histories, housed in incantation, song, chant, proverb and narrative (p. 9). Murphy (2011) claims, after considering patriarchy’s silencing or debunking of women power promoted within oral traditions and narrations, that “power to control stories about ourselves is the power to control our own lives” (p. 17). She also argues that some narratives cannot be understood outside of Māori cultural circles, those pertaining to menstrual blood amongst them (p. 23). Murphy furthermore provides evidence of the selective erasure of Māori histories by Pākehā men (see p. 53). Of particular relevance to my research concerning the traditions of Tainui women, Murphy (2011) cleverly exposes and deconstructs white male rhetoric and silencing and/or reconstructs those parts of oral tradition and narrative that these men did not understand or which challenged their ideologies.

---

<sup>7</sup> An example in support of this claim can be found in Robertson’s (1956) work with the Native Land Courts, the records of which show that iwi land holdings were recognised and upheld through the oral traditions that iwi recited.

## **Michael Quinn Patton**

In his 1999 article documenting his search for an initiation tradition to share with his son when he turned 18, American sociologist and programme evaluator Michael Quinn Patton observes that “[m]yths offer a source of norms against which contemporary life events can be interpreted in the ancient tradition of meaning making” (p. 338). Myths can be considered, he says, as normative accounts because their interpretation of significant events survives from generation to generation. As with Malcolm-Buchanan (2008) and others, such as Prendergast-Tarena (2008), Patton (1999) notes, however, that myths are updated as storytellers “evolve their stories in response to audience critiques and reactions” (p. 350). Therefore, according to Patton, myths are a contemporary form of qualitative inquiry just as they were an ancient form of inquiry and analysis. The viewing of myths as able to be ‘updated’ to reflect an audience’s responses becomes problematic when women’s roles of import in them become superceded in favour of masculinist power and privilege however. The lack or loss of women’s reflections, stories, knowledge and voice within myths can mean a one-sidedness is emphasised and there are many examples of where this has occurred. One such is the story of Rona the moon goddess. While for some, her story preserves a role of feminine empowerment where she took control of her life and became the regulator of tides. Others reflect that Rona was taken up to the moon as punishment for cursing her husband (some say she cursed her children) and there she lives to this day, a prisoner. While one audience may feel uplifted and motivated by Rona as controller of tides, another may have a sense of dominance and subordination by her imprisonment.

## **Jan Vansina**

Jan Vansina is credited as being one of the most prolific contemporary writers on oral traditions (Mahuika, 2012, p. 73) and also perhaps the most influential. An internationally acclaimed anthropologist and historian, born in Belgium, Vansina has written many books and papers pertaining to the study and collection of traditions. His *Oral Traditions in History*, published in 1985, is considered by Mahuika (2012) to be one of the best books in this genre. Vansina (2009), like a number of other commentators, maintains that researchers of history, including oral traditions, should be cognizant of the conditions under which information pertaining to these traditions is gathered. Among the conditions that he cites are multiple links between the researchers and their institutions, the respective biases of these individuals, the audiences for

whom they write, and the frameworks that inform their interpretations (pp. 422–423). He also stresses the need to be mindful of the documentary processes generating the written documentation and the goals of the writers.

Defined by Vansina (1985) and others (see, for example, Buck, 1926; Henige, 1982; Robertson, 1958) as “verbal messages which are reported statements from the past beyond the present generation” (p. 27), oral traditions can transmit important messages and information that may otherwise be lost. Enlarging on this definition, Vansina (1985) stresses “that the message must be oral statements spoken, sung, or called out on musical instruments only ... [and that] there must be transmission by word of mouth over at least a generation” (pp. 27–28). These statements, he continues, constitute public utterances. He furthermore notes that when messages are sung, the melody supports faithful transmission because it acts as a “mnemonic device” (1985, p. 16). Vansina’s enlarged definition has particular relevance for my research, given that Tainui women’s oral traditions are well represented through the songs, chants and poetry they recited (and still recite). Vansina’s theories, ideas and methods in relation to oral traditions also helped frame the terms of reference for my research by enabling me to understand myths, oral traditions and oral history as records of events from tribal memory. They are the cultural knowledges of the iwi from whom the memories descend, and within them are the people’s cultural landscapes and identities.

## **Part 2: Relevant Discourses**

### **Colonisation**

Writer and academic David Spurr (2002) interprets a discourse of colonisation as a “sign of phallic authority, and more specifically as the expression of masculine sexual desire” (pp. 120–121). Colonial conquest and expansion, he argues, “writes itself” as the literal exposure, erection and transgression of the male sex (p. 122). He illustrates this claim with the words of a character in James Joyce’s *Finnegans Wake*, who boasts, “With a slog to square leg, I sent my boundary to Botany Bay and I ran up a score and four of mes while the Yanks were huckling the Empire” (p. 122). The example thus describes an outward and upward geographic expansion, with the prolific sowing of the colonisers’ seed, resulting in the fathering of future generations within the lands to be colonised. In Aotearoa, systemic colonisation had begun by 1840. The New Zealand

Company, the Canterbury Association and the Otago Association migrant schemes, for example, had supported 27,500 people to resettle in New Zealand by 1852 (Wanhalla, 2013, p. 77). The underlying philosophy, at least of the New Zealand Company, was amalgamation of the races (Māori and Pākehā) resulting in the appropriation of Māori lands, systems and voice. Diffenbach in 1843 captured what could be understood to be a typical colonial attitude and intention when writing about racial amalgamation in New Zealand where half-caste children resulted. He considered that it was “an improvement on the [Māori] race” (p. 41). The discourse of colonisation is multifaceted, involving as it does colonial motives of self centredness in the form of power, wealth and glory. “No one” according to Aimé Césaire, founder of the *négritude* (negro-ness) movement in France and teacher and inspirator to Frantz Fanon, “colonizes innocently ... no one colonizes with impunity ... a civilization which justifies colonization—and therefore force—is already a sick civilization” (Césaire, 1972, pp. 17-18). Based on rhetoric of inferior, superior, savage, Christian and cultured, colonisation has, in one way or another, deceived the coloniser to believe in their rights of an often violent and offensive confirmation of their superior right to dominate Indigenous peoples. In terms of the recorders of Tainui history, colonisers were predictably positioned to represent and classify Tainui women and Tainui culture based on their societal positioning.

According to Gunn Allen (1989), the early characterisations of indigenous peoples in writings by male colonialists chronicled the undermining of an indigenous system of complementarity and gynocratic regulation where women’s place in ritual “and the power of femininity” (Gunn Allen, p. 44) had not before then been questioned. The published work from their ‘findings’ informed the yet to arrive colonists, so that when they entered their new countries, they brought with them an adulterated cultural and genderised political agenda that they used in their efforts to control the land and its people. This control included repositioning in colonial narratives the “indigenous feminine”, the fragmentation and dislocation of Māori from their languages, stories and land, the places where those languages and stories reside.

Researcher Gina Colvin (2009) argues that understanding the impact of white colonial hegemony on indigenous societies requires close scrutiny of “the discourse politics” evident in “talk and text” (p. 57). During the 18th-century, European explorers, scientists and naturalists, such as James Cook, Johann Forster, Carl Linnaeus, Johann Blumenbach and Peter Kolb, visited numerous islands in the Atlantic and South Pacific where they observed and then categorised and

classified the indigenous peoples' activities, mannerisms and conduct, including their customs, habits, looks and colour. These men's classifications were based on their sociocultural, political and gendered motivations, principles, understandings and values (see, for example, Gunson, 1987; Ralston, 1987; Rountree, 2000; Schiebinger, 1993), all of which were further influenced, as Wilson (2004) argues, by the underlying intention of their journeys—to colonise and rule. According to Wilson, because the sociopolitical context of that era of exploration was the controlling of lands, research on them focused on identifying and cataloguing their flora and fauna (p. 86), which included the people. The methodologies they used to conduct the research and the interpretations of what they saw were both a reflection of and a contributor to their verbal and written discourses.

A brief account of the writings of one of these early observers provides an example of this claim. Johannes Forster (1729–1798), a German naturalist who sailed with Captain James Cook on the *Resolution* during Cook's second voyage to the Pacific, wrote extensively about indigenous peoples (including Māori) and their practices in his account titled *Observations Made During a Voyage Round the World*, which was published in 1778. Forster's discursive repertoire of words and phrases in relation to Māori (cited in Thomas et al., 1996, pp. xxviii–xxxix) included “degenerate”, “second race”, “first race” (i.e., Caucasians like himself; Sorrenson, 1978, p. 3), “loathsome objects”, “savages” and “one removed above barbarians”. Interestingly, his comments about the “scientific rigour” of his observations strongly suggest that he held himself up as the model of the objective, scientific observer. No one else, he said, undertook the “investigation of truth” in relation to the study of peoples (Thomas et al., 1996 p. xlii). People who had not been trained in this respect therefore wrote from a weaker and tainted view, based on their knowledge from their own highly civilized nations. While Forster acknowledged that he was from the same background, because of his experiences in other islands, he considered that he could write from a more informed perspective.

Considering Forster's position of import as the principal naturalist on Cook's scientific voyage, it seems highly probable that his culturally deficit constructions and philosophies of indigenous peoples' constitutions and customs contributed to the notion of coloniser authority and superiority, which supported a mindset of domination and oppression. According to Thomas et al. (1997, p. xxi), Forster, who hailed from a capitalistic society where male knowledge was privileged, was “preoccupied with power and its abuse” (p. xxi). His society had endowed him



with esteemed attributes such as an education and travel, which in turn entitled him to write (and publish) as he did about Māori societies. After Forster died, his son continued to circulate his renderings, which meant his categorisation of the type of people New Zealand was home to alerted the yet to arrive colonisers what they could expect upon their arrival. White hegemonic discourse of this kind was not uncommon until well into the 20th century (see, for example, Miller, 1958; Thomson, 1859), and its effect, played out in the colonial agenda of conquest in pursuit of land and resource acquisition, was detrimental to Māori societies, women, men and children alike. For Tainui women especially, the capacious early scientific records of local daily life and customs, and the reclassification and disruption to their oral traditions was to have a lasting negative impact.

Aswani (2000) discusses the influenced recordings of indigenous peoples' oral traditions and histories. Having recorded first-hand oral accounts of the history of the Roviana, Saikile, Kalikoqu and Vonavona peoples of the Solomon Islands and compared them with late-19th and early-20th century colonised written forms of those histories, Aswani (2000) concluded that the latter privileged Western military exploits and political practice. Recording of indigenous oral narrative has generally depended, he argues, on the "favouring of static written historical accounts over diachronic indigenous narratives [which] illustrate what Rosaldo (1980, p. 37) calls 'the false dichotomy between internal studies of oral traditions and external studies of written documents'" (p. 39). In the same way, the identity of Tainui women's oral traditions have been subsumed (destroyed) by cultural, gender and world view differences. The variances highlight the complexities of the positioning and sometimes contradictory circumstances between those who have navigated the landscape (missionary, settler, colonist, male) and the particular way traditions have been showcased. Which, at times, emphasises a contempt.

## **Race**

Defining 'race' and 'racist' is important because these signifiers contextualise another position from which I approached my research. Racism has contributed to the invisibilising and marginalisation of Tainui women's herstories through ideological stereotypes of superior/inferior in favour of white over brown skin. Race, as a biological term, categorises people by physical appearance, while socially, cultural alliances and beliefs are considerations. Historically mankind has been categorised within cycles of hierarchical and discriminatory processes where bias and

inequality were the result based on 'science'. We can recognise hierarchical discriminatory practices by remembering Nazi German histories preceding and during the second world war when Jewish people were indiscriminately executed based on their Jewish origin. There are many other examples that illustrate man-made discrimination processes based on 'scientific' findings or, simply, what amounts to nothing more than human cultural differences and a desire to rule. Wetherell and Potter (1992) however argue that taking a racist discourse position involves more than just noting moral and political judgements, it also involves opposing and resisting these characterisations (p. 16). By describing and illustrating the oppressive nature racism has had, and continues to have, on Tainui women, I further stake my claim of a racist agenda in regards to colonisers which also supports my position within this research.

Professor of Anthropology at Virginia Commonwealth University and author Audrey Smedley (2005, 2007), writes that race within Western cultural traditions is a social invention (a smokescreen, as Miles, 1982, puts it). She maintains (as do others see for example Banton, 1967) that the construct of race had its real beginnings in the 18th century. According to English academic Ivan Hannaford, throughout much of European recorded history, the Middle Ages especially, and up until the 17th century, human identity was predicated on religion and language (Hannaford, 1996, p. 191). Based primarily on concerted and aggressive efforts by the English and Americans to harness people into slavery, Europeans invented a race ideology justifying their capture and selling of millions of people from the African continent to work in the plantations of the New World. African peoples were thus positioned as, for example, "uncivilized heathens" (Smedley, 2007, p. 6), as "other than us", whose "markers" included physical features such as skin colour, lip thickness and supposedly smaller cranial size. For white people, the latter ideogenically "proved" that these people had smaller brains and were therefore less intelligent than whites.

Of these features, colour became the main defining characteristic, leading to the broad racial and racist classifications of black people and white people, with gradations of dark skin colour along the spectrum between the two making for a third grouping—coloured people (brown-skinned people). These physically based markers of race became embedded in political and social ideologies, which conflated genetic traits with behaviour characteristics such as laziness, overt sexual tendencies, irrationality and superstition (Smedley, 2007). White was

superior to brown; brown superior to black. The lighter the skin, the more ‘virtuous’ and civilised the person.

These ideological claims—culturally invented, popularized, exaggerated and magnified by whites—legitimated, for them, their superiority over blacks and coloured, in social, spiritual, moral, intellectual and cultural mores and pursuits. Renderings of this ‘natural’ inferiority culminated in the racist ideology wherein white people had the right to ‘own’ darker-skinned people (Smedley, 2003). This honed ideology was then transported across continents and generations by the work of white scholars and scientists who perpetuated and built on the myths of physical and status differences of non-whites. An example is Arthur de Gobineau’s (1853–1855) work, *An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races* (1915), in which he claimed that the Aryan (made up of Germanics, Nordics and Anglo-Saxons) race is the master race.

Racist ideologies, writes academic Robert Miles (1982), distorts social realities by forming a condition of existence that shapes and beds in racist structures, such that racist claims become “facts” sanctioned as truths, thus legitimating and instituting disadvantage (see also Boxer, 2012). Smedley (2007) argues that this institutional disadvantage became inter-generationally perpetuated primarily because of children generally imitating what they see. They accordingly become conditioned by images such as (with respect to the current discussion) of “the high-status racial whites and the low-status races” (p. 8). This conditioning shapes their attitudes and the experiences they have during their lives, so presenting images they bequeath their children. Through this mechanism, says Smedley (2003), the visible physical differences between ethnicities became preserved as the premier insignia of unequal social statuses culminating in colonial hegemonic ideologies of inferior/superior, savage/cultured social differentiations. Indigenous Americans who resisted colonisation and the appropriation of their lands, for example, became established by the colonisers as “savages”, again providing justification for injustice (Smedley, 2007, p. 6).

These key societal positionings (Smedley & Smedley, 2005, p. 21, calls it “ethnic chauvinism”) provided a schema within which the arriving European missionaries and colonisers to Aotearoa New Zealand placed the indigenous people they found there. Their colonial writings show that their learned behaviours and “raced” (racist) attitudes were well developed and coloured by influences that included Biblical, Darwinism, Aryanism, and Enlightenment (see, for example, Belich, 2012; Salmond, 1992; Walker, 1996). Depending on their ideological

proclivities, they positioned Māori along a continuum ranging from disdain and disgust to admiration and liking. However, even the latter was tempered by Eurocentrism, paternalism, evangelism, and patronising condescension.

Essentially, the newcomers “raced”, gendered, and categorised Māori according to their own Western ideological comparisons and constructions of themselves and their histories. Their comparisons revolved around a white Western trajectory of their individual and autonomous views and traditions as opposed to the social and communal lifestyles that existed within Māori societies. These colonised social constructions, according to several commentators, among them Spurr (2002) and Wetherell and Potter (1992), gave no recognition to the oral traditions, histories and myths—the generational knowledge systems—with which Māori maintain(ed) deeply embedded relationships and lifestyles. Spurr (2002) notes that this process, while a case of repression, was more than that. The focus of the colonisers was knowingly on “otherness”, which Spurr states is a classic characteristic of colonisation, where the “cultural other” is under-represented or purposefully hidden by the colonising discourse (p. 128). Masculine logic invisibilises gender relations in the same way, Spurr says, giving rise to multiple “otherness” (as in race + culture + gender) and resulting in agonistic relationships of profound ambivalence between the coloniser and the colonised (read also between Pākehā and Māori, men and women).

## **Gender**

Indigenous women writers, such as Gunn Allen (1986, 1992), Mikaere (1999, 2011), Murphy (2011), Smith, L. (1990), and others, chronicle the undermining of indigenous knowledges of women’s power and importance as the steadfast work of colonising men’s who were greatly threatened by indigenous societies of complementarity where men and women’s roles had supported and reinforced each other, and where women held leadership roles alongside their men. The white colonised women of the colonising men were positioned as subservient to their men and were afforded “no power at all” (Jenkins, 1988, p. 161). Hence, the colonisers, with their gendered balance of power, did not see women, especially indigenous women, as anything more than the property of men. It was within this climate that the written recordings of Māori oral traditions and myths took place.

From the earliest years of European settlement in Aotearoa New Zealand and well into the 20th century, accessible accounts of Tainui iwi history and oral traditions were orated and/or

written by Māori and Pākehā men. Consequently, there is little attribution to Māori women as the tellers or recorders of tradition. Reilly (1995) states that this type of absence of women's voices leads to "gendered histories", where the roles of women are downplayed or overlooked (p. 19). Also, because the recording of early 19th-century oral traditions relied on human note-takers (rather than mechanical recorders), there was propensity for writing down the narratives through a filter of gendered understandings as well as cross-cultural ones. Thus, during the process of narrating and recording oral history, the responses, questions, interpretations and selective compressing of history by both narrator and enquirer would have had an impact on the final recorded outcome. As Portelli (1998) succinctly puts it, the information that is both given and taken depends on what the two parties "do *together* at the moment of their encounter in the interview" (emphasis original, p. 23).

Not surprisingly, then, in her overview of oral history and how it was/is recorded and used, Linda Shopes (2002), like others before her (e.g., Henige, 1982; Robertson, 1956; Simmons, 1976; Vansina, 1985), stresses that the reliability and authenticity of the recording needs to be assessed in terms of who the narrator was, how the person told their narrative and to what extent their account might have been filtered through their social identity, of which gender is an important part. Feelings and tones in the narration can also be filtered through these perspectives or even lost during recordings of the events being relayed (Frisch, 1991). Differences in the way males and females may narrate and record is thus a significant consideration when interpreting written oral traditions.

In this way, Shopes (2002) argues, experiences, histories and traditions are told and retold differently depending on whether the narrator is a man or a woman. She refers to the experiences of feminist historians, who have found that interviewed women tend to date incidents about their life in relation to when their children were born and to other family-orientated proceedings, whereas men are more likely to connect their personal reflections to "public events such as wars, elections and strikes" (p. 7). Vansina (1985) claims that the oral traditions of peoples tend to centre on a limited number of topics—origins, migrations, descent, wars (over land, women and other wealth) and natural catastrophes—underpinned by issues of authority, power and legitimacy, and as such bring "poverty [to] this repertory" (p. 120). Vansina (1985) notes, too, that poetry as an art and as a form of oral tradition makes for another class of commentary where experiences and situations can be expressed. While Tainui women have expressed themselves

and their lives through poetry and waiata, which could be considered their diaries, patriarchal meddling has also regulated these art forms.

It is a moot point, though, as to whether this poverty that Vansina writes about indicates exclusion of women's role and thoughts in any or all of the events recounted in any or all of these narrations. However, work by David Henige (1982) suggests that it might. Having traced the absence of women's voices in historical accounts based on oral testimony, Henige concludes that many of those narrating and recording these events assumed that women had no interest in, or were unconcerned about, political, economic and structural projects. One of my interests in investigating the various tellings of events featuring Tainui women has been to determine and compare the extent to which the narrations and recordings by Māori men and by colonial and post-colonial Pākehā men reflect masculine hegemonies.

Vivien Burr's (1995, 2002) consideration of the meanings and implications of gender, which she considers from within a social constructionism framework, is useful because it "unpacks" and carefully presents the way in which language categorises people in terms of race, gender and socially bestowed identities. Burr (2002) positions gender as a psychological and a social phenomenon. Gender is, she says, "the social significance of sex. It refers to the constellation of characteristics and behaviours which come to be differentially associated with and expected of men and women in a particular society, our notions of masculinity and femininity. Such differences may really exist, or they may be only supposed to exist" (p. 11). Burr (1995) claims that there is virtually no space or aspect of life that is not gendered; it is in these spaces that women (and men) receive important messages about how to behave, both physically and linguistically, in their contact with men (p. 4). These behaviours are based on patriarchal assumptions and structures which take "for granted men's relatively powerful position in the world" (p. 9) and which place women in unequal power positions. For Burr (and others such as Dale Spender; 1985, 1989), this power imbalance is produced and maintained by the patriarchal social environment rather than by any natural phenomenon.

Later in this thesis, I will consider if and how Burr's conclusions regarding gendered hegemony are borne out in the oral narratives about Tainui women recounted by Māori men during the earliest days of European exploration and colonisation of New Zealand. Except for accounts such as these, we cannot readily determine how women were positioned in the oral narratives of pre-European Māori communities. However, glimpses remain in what seem to be

reliable ongoing renderings of narrations stretching back well before European colonisation and held in common by many Māori iwi. One such reference is the indigenous knowledge of the power of primordial Papatūānuku; when she and Ranginui were separated their children developed and so began the creation of life. Tāne Mahuta listened to Papatūānuku, his mother, when he gathered the earth from which the first woman, Hine-ahu-one, was formed (Mikaere, 1999, p. 37). From her union with Tāne Mahuta came Hinefītama, who produced many children, and thus was Māori women's power and importance promoted through the oral traditions and myths from the beginning of time.

If we did have access to the many oral narratives as they were told prior to the arrival of Pākehā, we would have a better benchmark against which to assess the representation and mana of Māori women in these accounts pre- and post-colonially. However, the considerable evidence in the observations about Aotearoa New Zealand and other South Pacific nations of the European men who first came to this part of the world give us a good sense of how they perceived women in general and indigenous (including Māori) women in particular. Providing examples (two of which follow) of these perceptions is useful in terms of foregrounding reasons for the changes in the oral traditions about Tainui women as they were transmitted from Māori to Pākehā.

From their earliest voyages to Aotearoa New Zealand, Pākehā men wrote of the supposed lesser place that Māori women played in the social order of their communities. A quick historical investigation again draws in Johann Forster's (1778) account in *Observations Made During a Voyage Round the World*. Although Forster had only brief opportunity to observe Māori while the *Resolution* was in New Zealand waters, he concluded that "males in barbarous nations look upon the women as their property" and that "New Zealand [sic] fathers and the nearest relations ... assert his right of property and dominion over her" (pp. 259–260). As noted earlier in this chapter, Forster had a propensity for categorising the indigenous peoples he saw throughout the Pacific. The criteria (and their wording) that he used for these categorisations exemplify not only the stance from which he made them—the superiority of white male colonists—but also the uncritical swiftness with which he made them (Thomas, 1996 et al.). Forster's behaviour and attitude highlighted the imperialistic society that he had evolved from.

Another example of gendered attitudes during the early European colonisation of the South Pacific comes from Ralston's (1987) account of the Wesleyan missionary John Thomas, who

was stationed in Tonga in the 1850s. Thomas's outrage at what he considered improper and unwomanly behaviour among Tongan women reflected, says Ralston, "19th century Victorian middle-class notions of womanhood and wifely submissions to husbands" (p. 119). Her account identifies a familiar patriarchal attitude amongst the European explorers, missionaries and colonists who arrived in New Zealand towards women and their place—an attitude learned by girls and boys from a very young age (see also, in this regard, Greer, 1970, p. 120; Gunson, 1987, pp. 147–148).

Adding to this climate of androcacy were presumptions and measurements of intelligence based on race. Just as Māori were declared inferior to Pākehā by the physical anthropologists of the time (see Froman, 1974, p. 4; Thomson, 1859, p. 81) because the smaller heads of Māori denoted a smaller brain, so were women classified and thought to be unfit "to intellectual pursuits" because of their *even smaller* brain (Sayers, 1982), which was caused in part by the fact that they menstruated. Both assumptions and classifications justified, in the colonisers' minds, the exclusion of Māori and women from educational and meaningful engagement in the newly forming colony. Pākehā men pathologised, distorted and misrepresented women as being incapable of achieving higher levels of development; thus women were not present in the hierarchies that dictated and organised the social landscape. And at the same time that women were being denigrated, the patriarchal canon was boosting its own position of power and importance (Burr, 2002). As Burr explains, the colonizing economists, scientists, bureaucrats and statesmen were all men of a certain class. They saw themselves as rational. They dressed appropriately, they kept company with other like-minded males, they strutted, and they naturalised themselves as powerful, so creating a prestigiousness that only other similarly attired and commissioned males might be invited to enter. Māori women—indeed, no women—were or could be part of that company. Victorian imperialist women in particular had been trained to be selfless supporters of men within the domain of domesticity (see for example Mrs Duff Hewett's *A Bride at Fifteen* (Hankin, 1981, p. 223), Greer, 1970, Ralston, 1987).

In her doctoral study *The Soliloquy of Whiteness: Colonial Discourse and New Zealand's Settler Press 1839–1873*, Gina Colvin (2009) skilfully captures the extent of Māori categorisation: "Māori were visually probed, prodded, and sectioned for their hue, cranial proportions, breadth of torso, height of body, and texture of hair, the character of facial expressions, eye colour and muscularity" (p. 26). The political valorisation of the colonisers as



knowledgeable and powerful in all matters, including the representation of Māori women and men in their own oral traditions, thus surfaced and had an impact on later representations.

### **Knowledge and Power**

Drawing on Michel Foucault's research that knowledge "is intimately bound up with power", Burr (1995) argues that "The power to act in particular ways, to claim resources, to control or be controlled depends upon the 'knowledges' currently prevailing in a society. We can exercise power by drawing upon discourses which allow our actions to be represented in an acceptable light" (p. 64). The point Burr makes here is that the "knowledge is power" connection has a close association with domination over others, which evolves into a justification on the part of the dominators to define others. During the era of colonisation of Aotearoa New Zealand, the prevailing or most dominant discourse in New Zealand became that of the colonisers.

The beginnings of this discourse in Aotearoa New Zealand lay in the European explorers' early descriptions of Māori they encountered. These descriptions typically surfaced the realities of the lives of Māori and their cultural, political and belief systems. Superficial notions about peoples or people newly met could be said to be a common human experience, but the mindset of the new arrivals generally remained uncritical and based on an assumption of their superiority over the indigenous people of Aotearoa. For example, Forster (1778), as did other European writers of the time, typically failed to see or acknowledge important Māori knowledges and histories, and how these were transmitted across generations. Here is but one example: "[T]hese islanders having no other than vague traditional reports in lieu of historical records, it is impossible to know any thing [sic] of their origin or migrations" (p. 357). Forster then went on to claim that this assumed lack of knowledge on the part of Māori to their origins presented no "stronger proof of the advantages of [our] civilization ... than results from this total uncertainty, respecting the origin of these nations" (p. 357). Forster was at the forefront of racialising power in New Zealand based on his distortive 18th-century British Empire assumptions and beliefs.

Decades on, the presence of conventions such as these had appeared to solidify in much of the colonists' written observations about Māori into a patronising overview coloured by a self-sanctioned authoritative voice. For example, the ancient rituals, traditions and narratives of Māori were dismissed as belonging "to the infancy of a race" (Thomson, 1859, p. 112) and to a people who had "silly superstition[s]" (Firth, 1890, p. 56). Colonisers declared tōhunga work, which

included their knowledge of oral tradition and myth, to contain “some of the most amusing poems” (Thomson, 1859, p. 115) and “some of the most amusing stories” (p. 118). When prolific collector and writer of Māori oral traditions and histories, John White (1880) explained his work, he said, “Such translations will be given of the Maori exactly as they were repeated by the priests, despite any apparent childishness in them” (p. 2). While White can be commended for repeating only what was disseminated to himself, his conclusion in relation to the childishness of Māori history supports an ideological egalitarian colonial assumption and value that disempowers and distorts tangata whenua histories.

These (from a contemporary viewpoint) derogatory colonial renderings, repeated as they were by apparently cultivated men such as White, highlight an apparent stereotype of Māori practice as childlike, superficial and unintelligent. By objectifying Māori in this way, colonisers constructed themselves as unchild-like and with a depth of intelligence that Māori did not possess—nor could they, unless they embraced the civilised ideals of the coloniser. Research shows that the colonial agenda focused on the racial “inferiority” of the colonised in order to boost European self-image and self-importance (see, for example, Goldberg, 1992, p. xiv; van Dijk, 2013, p. 361), a “tactic”, writes Spurr (2002, p. 124), that enabled the early colonisers especially to use a rhetoric of intellectual superiority, which helped them overcome their “quavering uncertainty” as they encountered and perpetuated their white patriarchy amidst the rigors of settling in a new land already occupied by another people.

In Aotearoa New Zealand, the European colonisers’ increasingly powerful position, aided by factors such as their rapidly growing numbers, the diseases they brought with them to which Māori had little resistance, and their access to technologies which enabled them to appropriate land and food, allowed for an invasion of inferiority and superiority discourses and social, cultural and legal practices in their favour (see Coleman, 2012; King, 2007; Mead, 1997; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). The early explorers and colonisers also had at hand printing and publishing technologies that enabled them to readily produce and widely disseminate their discourses about the Māori population. These included their imperialistic colonising interpretations of Māori histories, oral traditions and myths, re-presented with missionary-embedded tenets of moral decency and worth. The histories Pākehā generally presented back to Māori were done so minus their original profound meanings, such that the intractable representations were effaced by their “meddling” (Spurr, 2002). The effort by Māori to protect

their oral histories was, as Malcolm-Buchanan (2008) argues, a response to this powerful position of surveillance by non-Māori. However, this protection became harder to maintain over time. For example, as I argue later in this thesis, the dominant discourse of the colonisers served to weaken and dull the previously inextricable link between ancient Tainui women and their place in the oral traditions and histories of their iwi. In essence, the ‘interpretive repertoires’ (Wetherell & Potter, 1992) interrupted and eroded future generational transmission about the important role of women in tribal ritual.

### **Part 3: Social Constructions**

#### **Patriarchy**

The extant writings of many Pākehā who arrived in Aotearoa New Zealand during the 18th and 19th centuries came with embedded patriarchal (a word which comes from the Greek *patriarkhēs*, which literally means “rule of the father”) attitudes about women and their place in family and society. A patriarchal society is one in which the father or eldest male is the head of the family and where the inter-generational disbursement of accumulated wealth is made through the male line. Women were thus lesser than men not only within the family but also, by extension, in the governance of society and commerce, and this was the natural order in any society according to patriarchal text. Thus, Māori women became of subservient status to Māori men.

Patriarchal thinking and constructs had been honed in the settlers’ sensibilities through the society’s long adherence to certain religious and other beliefs. Science historian Londa Schiebinger (1993), for example, explains that “This way of thinking, where the male constituted the universal subject and the female a sexual subset, pervaded natural history in the 18th-century. Females across the kingdoms of nature were viewed as primarily sexual beings” (p. 88). From her scrutiny of writings by the crews and other men accompanying Captain James Cook on his 1768–1771, 1772–1775 and 1776–1780 voyages, Kathryn Rountree (1998) found that they negatively categorised Māori women, with that categorisation employing progressively debased terms with each visit to Aotearoa New Zealand. These terms suggested or even stated that Māori women were either sexually available, could be purchased or were morally bankrupt (Wanhalla, 2013). Absent from the discourse are cultural representations of Māori sexuality and marriages

where standards were different but still intricate. The hegemonic ideologies of the colonisers framed an overt and inaccurate description that served to subordinate Māori women. The dominance of white patriarchal influence over Māori women's social and sexual roles controlled women's courage, power and strength—their identity—rendering them silent. Such was the authority of those in control of sexual discourse (based on colonial womanliness), and masculine desire, that examples of Māori women's feminine bearing could not be known.

While most of the available writings expressing such attitudes are those of men, assumptions of women's subordination to men are also evident in the writing of women, indicating the pervasiveness of patriarchal hegemony in colonial Pākehā society (see, for example, Russ, 1984, p. 93; Woolf, 1929/1972, p. 146). Attempts to engage Māori women in meaningful conversation about their oral traditions or other aspects of importance to them rarely occurred, as their voice presumably was deemed to be of far less importance and consequence than the voice of Māori males. Schiebinger's (1993) claim that “what is studied—and what has been neglected—grows out of who is doing the studying, and for what ends” (p. 212) is evident in the dominance of accounts of Māori and their traditions written by Pākehā men or at the behest of Pākehā men. These books either recorded Pākehā observations, or presented Māori men's oral and scribed narrations of their traditions, or contained Māori men's own written recordings of their iwi traditions. The latter two categories generally contained Pākehā-written prefaces and introductions, and Pākehā-annotated commentary on the content, whether presented in reo Māori or English or both.

These commentaries frequently took pains to establish the status and thus credibility of the Māori men who were the source, narrator or scribe of the published traditions by describing them as, amongst other such terms, noted warriors, principal chiefs, notable historians, the authority, and priests. For example, when introducing part of his collection of Māori oral traditions (published in 1880), John White, who arrived in New Zealand in 1835 and settled in the Hokianga, stated, “To give the traditions or translations of such oral history it is intended to use those which have been written by the Maori priests themselves, or from the dictation of such priests, by those of their descendants who had learnt to write” (p. 2). Almost 80 years later, the need to stress the mana of the narrator in order to validate events was still in evidence. J. B. W. Robertson (1956), who was said to be an authority on Māori settlement in the Waikato (Rogers, 1966), advised that “most reliable records are those that were kept by the “trained tohunga” (p.

46). These men, he said, were “specially selected and specially trained for the work and ... the essence of the system was word perfect repetition” (p. 46). Vansina (1985, p. 55), another 30 years on, asked the question, “Was *he* [the author or performer] a “person of memory” who were known also as “encyclopaedic informants” (my italics).

The status of one man relative to another aligns with the hierarchical power structures of patriarchal hegemony. High status brings authority and legitimacy (credibility) to the words and actions of the holder of that status, so reinforcing not only the status but also the power that the words and actions have over members of society. According to historian and academic David Simmons, “Obviously, information from Maori sources is most likely to be of value when the informant is a person of status” (Simmons, 1966, p. 178), and a person of status (read credibility) would not be a woman. Ralston’s (1987) research supports this claim. In her article about gendered histories in the Pacific regions (Tonga, the Cook Islands and Samoa), she wrote that the explorers, traders, naval captains and missionary leaders who were all male, sought out male chiefs or leaders to establish contact and to negotiate with. She goes on to say that none of these foreigners considered the possibility that females were appropriate or likely counterparts for such transactions, and that the visiting men stayed true to their own “political and social practice in their natal societies” (p. 118). Thus, it is not surprising that Pākehā men of the time typically negotiated, spoke, interviewed, and published only Māori men, and Māori men of status at that, so reinforcing the intertwined discourses of patriarchy and gender.

### **The Social Construction of Women’s Stories and Herstories**

According to Flores (2012), to be socially constructed means to have been classified by society. Thus, a person will be classed, raced and gendered by society’s cultural, political and sexual values and understandings, not by one’s own preference. Society, says Flores (2012), allocates what is “normal” and what is not, and this may be based on how one looks and one’s possessions. I consider that the discourses discussed above could be said to provide a framework with the potential to provide understanding of how the stories of my Tainui ancestresses are presented to us today. Any story is a construction born of the society in which it is told. It is therefore my premise, which I explore in this thesis, that the stories of my ancestresses, as we have them at present, are constructions born of a society(ies) dominated by colonial, patriarchal

and male hegemonies, and an interweaving of ideas about and attitudes towards peoples of different sex, race and culture.

When endeavouring, in 1983, to position stories about women of her culture, Alice Walker wrote: “And I thought of how little we have studied any of our ancestors, but how close to zero has been our study of those who were female ... and I have asked myself: Who will secure from neglect and slander those women who have kept our image as black women clean and strong for us?” (pp. 174–175). Walker’s statements as a black American woman replicate in many ways what it is to be a woman, other than white, possibly anywhere in the world. Walker (1983) writes about the influence of losing connections and failure to maintain the common thread. She writes about what happens to one’s stories, one’s history and one’s future when the connections are broken and the models are disallowed or are, as several New Zealand scholars put it, “disappeared from historical memory” (Macdonald, Penfold, & Williams, 1992, p. viii).

Writing from a Western white feminist view, prolific author Carolyn Heilbrun (1988) brings to the fore the “storylessness” of women:

What matters is that lives do not serve as models; only stories do that. And it is a hard thing to make up stories to live by. We can only retell and live by the stories we have read or heard. We live our lives through texts. They may be read, or chanted, or experienced electronically, or come to us, like the murmurings of our mothers, telling us what conventions demand. Whatever their form or medium, these stories have formed us all; they are what we must use to make new fictions, new narratives. (p. 37)

Women writers have long examined and commented on the imposed storylessness of women. Their research assigns the creator of this far-reaching (for the purposes of this study, America, Britain, New Zealand) omission to a patriarchal domination of the literature about them (see, for example, Heilbrun, 1989; hooks, 1982; Mikaere, 2011; Morrison, 1992; Spender, 1985, 1989; Te Awekotuku, 2001; Walker, 1983). Morrison (1992) notes “. . . cultural identities are formed and informed by a nation’s literature” (p. 39). hooks (1982), a black American who was one of the first American feminist theorists to “consider the intersections between racialised and gendered representations” (Fox, 2012, p. 2), stresses that “an accurate picture of women’s status by simply calling attention to the role assigned females under patriarchy” (p. 12) cannot be measured, determined or understood. And later, Heilbrun (1988) claims, “There is no ‘objective’ or universal tone in literature, for however long we have been told there is. There is only the white, middle-class, male tone. But the question is not only one of narrative and tone; it is also

one of language. How can women create stories of women's lives if they have only male language with which to do it?" (p. 40). A discourse critiqued and developed further by women such as Professor of Classics at Cambridge University, Mary Beard (see for example Mary Beard on the silencing of women's voices: <http://decodedpast.com/mary-beard-silencing-womens-voices/7393>).

Mary Jacobus (1979) is cognizant that women enter the white male-dominated educational and written realms with that culture in mind and, Beard's online testimonial, given in 2014 (as above) tends to highlight that this is still the case. Thus, those who write contrary to male language risk alienation: "Women's access to discourse involves submission to phallogentricity, to the masculine and the symbolic: refusal, on the other hand, risks reinscribing the feminine as a yet more marginal madness or nonsense" (p. 10). Barrett (1979) quotes advice given to Virginia Woolf on how she should conduct her writing: "My dear, you are a young woman. You are writing about a book that has been written by a man. Be sympathetic; be tender; flatter, deceive; use all the arts and wiles of our sex. Never let anybody guess that you have a mind of your own" (pp. 59-60). Woolf maintained that women wrote differently from men:

There is the obvious and enormous difference of experience in the first place, but the essential difference lies in the fact not that men describe battles and women the birth of children, but that each sex describes itself ... there rises for consideration the very difficult question of the differences between the man's and the woman's view of what constitutes the importance of any subject. From this spring not only marked differences of plot and incident, but infinite differences in selection, method and style. (Barrett, 1979, p. 71).

For women, according to Heilbrun (1988), these gendered differences in language not only exclude them from the language of males (an important consideration with respect to gendered power-play in a patriarchal society) but sees them restricted by their own language—the "feminine domain of language"—because that language has historically been one of "oppression and confinement" (p. 41). Waugh (1989) notes that gender distinctions serve to bind women's psychology to charm and dependency and men's to fact and objectivity (p. 91). In this way, women's experiences and roles may have been obscured to the point where they have been misrepresented morally, spiritually and sexually (for further insights about the presence of women in the 19<sup>th</sup>-century literary world, see Coleman, 2011).

British Professor of Political Theory Moya Lloyd (2007, p. 21) claims that "[conventional] grammar ... limits what can be thought ... and this is a problem for it impedes the expression of

radical ideas”. There is a need, in this regard, for women, when telling their stories, to negotiate the logistics around the masculinity of both the spoken and written word. For Māori women, in particular, this manoeuvring has dual consequences because not only have our histories primarily been written by men using male language but the traditions have been presented back to us from a white “culturally biased” paradigm using “Pākehā definitions of what counts” as important or “normal” (Johnston, 1998, p. 33). Typically, then, Māori women have been twice colonised (personal communication G. Colvin, , July 10, 2013).

Ani Mikaere (2011), who provides a woman’s perspective from within my own culture and community (Tainui Māori), describes in *Colonising Myths—Māori Realities: He Rukuruku Whakaaro* how Māori women and their stories have also been recreated to provide models that more readily accommodate the colonisers’ mould of patriarchal hierarchy:

The reinterpretation of Māori cosmogony by Pākehā ethnographers such as Elsdon Best and Percy Smith recast the powerful female figures such as Papatūānuku and Hineahuone into passive roles while simultaneously inflating the significance of the male characters ... Their paternalism also coloured their perceptions of the Māori women they found around them (p. 194).

The social construction of Māori women may have had an impact on their ability or lack of opportunity to be active in the telling of Māori histories. For Māori, one means of social construction by early colonisers and missionaries was the judgement (mentioned earlier in this chapter), on the basis of head size, that the mental ability of Māori was inferior to that of the English (Thomson, 1859). The reason why, reported Thomson, Māori had smaller heads than the English, was because their brains had shrunk through generations of lack of exercise in the form of higher thinking (p. 84). Māori therefore had the minds of children and were not able to maintain continuous attention to anything that required ongoing thought. Further to this, Māori were reported to have unclean thoughts and were declared “dirty” (Thomson, 1859, p. 86).

While Māori men were discussed in relative detail, Māori women were all but featureless. However, Thomson (1859) did write about Māori women’s sexuality and marriage. Within the context of this topic, his comment that “Whole sentences are expressed in the large, brilliant, restless eyes of New Zealand women” (p. 177) can only be construed as sexually suggestive. In these ways, Thomson and others such as Elsdon Best (1924) and Walter Gudgeon (1903) socially constructed Māori men to be of much lesser intelligence than the white newcomers to the land



and Māori women as sexually available by their large and restless eyes and the light squeeze of the hand.

This thesis pulls together some of the threads and influences that Flores (2012), Heilbrun (1989), hooks (1982), Mikaere (2011), Morrison (1992), Te Awekotuku (1991, 1989), Walker (1983), and Waugh (1989) discuss with respect to the social construction of women's stories in general and indigenous women's in particular in order to draw attention to a Tainui womanist connection and to iwi models of female reflection. As Moreton-Robinson (2002) points out, "For indigenous women, survival demands expertise in translation, performance and self-presentation" (p. 89). The project of reclaiming the oral traditions of Tainui women for this thesis therefore rests, in part, on the mandate to negotiate the patriarchal power relations and create new translations of embellished and audacious narratives that showcase our ancestresses, so bringing about their preservation but also our own as indigenous women. These manifestations will be based on scrutiny of the work that has been left, such as the oral traditions, waiata, karakia and whakataukī.

During the process of threading and linking influences, I carefully observe a right of reclamation to restory and enliven the narratives, to "write as a woman ... dissolve boundaries, break down 'screens', reject the unified rational ego" (Waugh, 1989, p. 103), and to suit the need and the purpose from a Māori womanist view. This work therefore involves the interrogation (the analysis) of the ontology at work in male-centred political claims and a consideration of the current context in Aotearoa, where the process of colonisation, gender oppression and racist social construction has occurred.

### **Summary and Research Enquiry**

In this chapter, I positioned the literature responsive to my connecting ideas about Māori women, how they are presented within Tainui oral traditions and why it is that they are introduced in that way. The nature of my study requires not only engagement with multiple discourses, including colonial, indigenous, white, Māori, gender, culture, oral tradition, myth, sexualisation and others, but also consultation of many texts, including oral narrative, manuscript and published accounts. During this review of the literature, I identified common opinions on the established theories of the storylessness and gendering of women, and these will be relayed in Chapters Four to Seven of this thesis.

Significantly, while the extant textual resources pertaining to Māori women provide a voluminous database from which to develop research, the colonial texts form a patriarchal canon that is, as the literature reviews shows, deeply problematic because of its censure of Māori women. My thesis therefore seeks to enquire into and analyse the social, political and sexual representation of Tainui women in those texts. Based on the supposition that Tainui ancestresses' political, social and sexual identities need to be recovered and reassembled out of the fragments of information about them in the colonial texts, I also explore the potential for recasting these women as agents in herstories rather than histories. In the following chapter, I describe and discuss the methodological strategies and understandings that informed my collection and scrutiny of the available data.

## **Chapter 3: Research Approach**

### **Theoretical and Methodological Frameworks and Data**

As noted earlier in this thesis, my main motivation for undertaking this research was born from my recognition of the marginal place held by Māori women in general and Tainui women in particular in the written records of the pre-colonial Māori oral narratives that are available to us today. In order to gain what I hoped would be a wider picture of women's participation in historical Māori society, I teased out the information about my pre-colonial Tainui ancestresses evident in written accounts tracing back to those that were first recorded by scribes as they listened to the narratives of kaumātua during European colonisation.

While qualitative research methodology, critical discourse and textual analysis informed the main means of collecting and scrutinising this information, this work was underpinned and directed by various theoretical and methodological frameworks that informed my data collection and scrutiny. Part 1 of this chapter focuses on the former set of frameworks; Part 2 on the latter. The frameworks explored in Part 1 include the socially transformative and interlinked interventions of womanism, feminism, mana wahine and matriarchal societies, juxtaposed with those of patriarchal hierarchal societies. Part 2, then, investigates the analytical terms and processes that have informed the methodological processes for this work.

In the final part of the Chapter, Part 3, I provide a brief description of the materials that formed my dataset and I finish by giving a more detailed account of the process used to analyse that data.

### **Part 1: Theoretical Frameworks**

Following my reading of the literature to inform my research, the frameworks set out in this section emerged as the most relevant for the study into Tainui oral traditions and the place of women within them.

## **Womanist, Womanism and Feminism**

In 1979, African American author Alice Walker coined the term “womanist” in her book *Coming apart*, ascribing its meaning as, amongst other things, the opposite of frivolous girlishness (Walker, 1983, p. xi). A womanist woman is one who is

outrageous, audacious, courageous or [exhibits] willful behaviour . . . [a womanist] loves other women . . . appreciates and prefers women’s culture, women’s emotional flexibility . . . and women’s strength . . . sometimes loves individual men, sexually and/or nonsexually . . . [She is] committed to survival and wholeness of entire people, male and female . . . [She is] not a separatist . . . loves music . . . dance . . . the moon . . . the Spirit . . . love and food and roundness . . . struggle . . . the Folk [and] herself. Regardless. [A] womanist is to feminist as purple to lavender. (pp. xi–xii)

In her discussion of Walker’s conceptualisation, Ogunyemi (2006) argues that to be a womanist is not the same as being a feminist. Feminism and/or feminists cannot be defined by any one category, for just as there are diversities amongst women culturally and socially, so there are political diversities to negotiate (see also Du Plessis & Alice, 1998; Irwin, 1992b). However, these diversities all hold to the fundamental value of freedom for women (Baehr, 2007). It was, according to Baehr, negotiation of the meaning of freedom that led to the formation of diverse feminist groups, including classical liberal feminist, libertarian feminism, equity feminists, cultural libertarian feminists, and others. Layli Phillips (2006) claims that differences also exist among white, black and coloured feminists. She furthermore maintains that “the relationship between Black feminism and womanism is closer than that between womanism and feminism” (p. xxxiv), and that even though the “ingeniously” womanist initiative came from a black woman, anyone (including black and white men) can be a womanist (p. xi). They simply must uphold the kaupapa.

For Ogunyemi (2006), then, a womanist must, “along with her consciousness of sexual issues, . . . incorporate racial, cultural, national, economic, and political considerations into her philosophy” (p. 21). Womanism, writes Phillips (2006), “detests race but loves ethnicity and culture” (p. xxxvi). This positioning is important because black and coloured women have been, and in many ways still are, “at the bottom of every social hierarchy created by man, particularly during the last four centuries of the modern era” (Phillips, 2006, p. xxxix). Furthermore, argues Phillips (2006), black and coloured women are connected to and live their lives within the “primary site of today’s most entrenched social problems” (p. xxxix). A womanist theory,

therefore, while critically aware of ethnicity, acknowledges that people decide for themselves how womanism politics will be negotiated and enacted, and constructively work towards the humanisation of all peoples.

I became aware, while conducting my research, of other terms and conceptualisations that fed into or aligned with the womanist position I pursue. For example, Māori academic Kathie Irwin, writing in 1992b, claimed that the development of theories of Māori feminisms needed to take into account tribal affiliations, language, social class, knowledge of traditional tikanga and other matters (p. 4). Genie Babb, an associate professor in Alaska, similarly wrote in 1997 about responsive feminism in relation to tribal readings (p. 313).

Pressed to summarise how the above body of feminist/womanist theorising translates into the theoretical stance that I take in this study, I would describe it as one embracing a “responsive indigenous tribal womanist” approach. As a woman of Tainui whakapapa, womanist terms and logic suit my commitment to be indigenously politically, socially and mentally astute not only with regard to the current study but also in my day to day life, work and interactions. Throughout my scrutiny of the written accounts of Tainui oral traditions, I strive to be cognisant and understanding of a Māori attitude to and understanding of oral storytelling. This at times means looking for and including relevant and particular motifs, symbols and other cultural expressions that have been erased or minimized in most accounts.

### **Mana Wahine and Kaupapa Māori**

In Aotearoa New Zealand, mana wahine is simultaneously a philosophy, a theory and a methodological term that indigenous women in particular may use, together with Kaupapa Māori, to describe and interpret data from an indigenous women’s perspective (see, for example, Hutchings, 2002; Murphy, 2011; Pihama, 2001). Accordingly, as a research methodology, mana wahine allows for investigation of factors culturally, sexually, politically and socially relevant to Māori women, and it taps into the womanist and womanism conceptualisations presented above.

Babb’s (1997) “responsive feminism” aligns with the tribal feminisms encompassed within mana wahine. Leonie Pihama (2001), Merata Mita (1994) and others explain that mana wahine is an ancient term from Māori society that signifies the power and authority held by Māori women within and across iwi (Murphy, 2011, p. 6). For me, underpinning my research approach with mana wahine theory provided a means of attending to the business of reclaiming Tainui women’s

traditions and knowledges. I also ascribe the use of mana wahine theory as a process to challenge Pākehā power and knowledge based, as they are, on non indigenous research methods and theories which have not only disrupted Māori knowledge systems but also sought to eradicate them (tohunga knowledge, skill and expertise is an example of this).

Interconnected with mana wahine philosophy, theory and methods is Kaupapa Māori theory. I base this affirmation on writings by Bishop (1998), Hutchings (2002), Irwin (1992a), Jenkins and Pihama (2001), Kana and Tamatea (2006), Mikaere (2003, 2011), Murphy (2011), Smith, (1988), and Smith (2006). Specifically, I note that my research is about Māori women's experiences and what is known about them, that the research has been conducted by a Māori researcher, that it is mindful of being culturally relevant, appropriate and safe and that it was undertaken with cultural aspirations in mind. I also note that the research process was motivated, implemented and organised by the understandings and practices of Māori, that it is iwi based in that it is collectivistic and that it pays attention to the importance of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga. I furthermore note that the research involved the development of a supervisory whānau including kaumātua and that the research topic was theorised from a Māori world view. Finally, the research was approached in a Māori way where, when appropriate, it invoked the traditions and customs of a Māori world, including karakia, waiata, mihimihi, sharing kai and wānanga.

Bishop (1998) allows that positioning one's research within a Kaupapa Māori frame promotes an "epistemological version of validity", which means that the approach ensures that what the research community and the supervisory whānau culturally sanction, including the research, text and processes, is valid (p. 199). Likewise, as Pihama (2010) posits, "Kaupapa Māori theory is informed by its indigenous underpinnings and is defined and controlled by Māori" (p. 5). In this way Pākehā history, knowledges and power are challenged on Māori terms and from a Māori perspective. An emphasis on iwi alliance and association has meant that this thesis has been guided by a Kaupapa Māori notion of whānau consultation, discussion and debate to facilitate and guide the shape of the work. Bishop (1998), Irwin (1988, 1992a) and Kana and Tamatea (2006) describe qualities of whānau as aroha (mutuality), co-operation, tolerance, hospitality, respect for ideas and opinions, and collective responsibility. These descriptors, I believe, aptly illustrate the bringing together of this work under the auspices of a supervisory whānau based on whanaungatanga.

Bishop (1998) explains the concept of whanaungatanga (the practice of being whānau; Kana & Tamatea, 2006) as “one of the most fundamental ideas within Maori culture, both as a value and as a social process ... and is constituted in ways determined by the Maori cultural context” (p. 203). As such, the basis of this thesis is framed by a collective whānau contribution and participation approach whereby a collection of knowledges and experiences including those found in manuscripts has helped shape the outcome. Nepe (1991), Pihama (2010) and others (e.g., Bishop, 1998; Irwin, 1992a) concur that Kaupapa Māori is based on the validity of the knowledge taken from the learning, experiences, understandings, worldviews, values and beliefs of ancient times. Hence engagement with whānau thoughts and understandings are very important aspects of Kaupapa Māori research, where kinship ties can inspire shared aims and solidarity, and where the understandings of the past may be shared in confidence. For me, the supervisory whānau was an interested and dynamic support group where those who had been involved from the outset, would meet. Sometimes this was able to occur face to face, sometimes through emails and sometimes through telephone calls. This time together allowed the most recent work on the thesis to be discussed and debated. I travelled to Hamilton at least once each year (over eight years) to meet face to face with my support whānau. One of the outcomes from these meetings was the organisation of several interest groups where helpful advice was given following presentations of the work at that time. Advice such as further literature that might be helpful, or where it was thought there were gaps in the information or the women’s histories.

Post-colonially, patriarchal interests have rarely acknowledged the maintenance of iwi knowledge as a role traditionally cultivated by kuia, who decided when and how knowledge would be shared. Hence, with respect to the aims of my research, I conjectured that a womanist theoretical perspective would interact well with a mana wahine theoretical perspective. The two would complement and support each other. Womanism would provide me with a philosophical stance aligned with my intention to take charge, from a woman’s perspective, of sexual, racial, cultural, economic and political knowledges. Mana wahine theories would give me the tools to do this and would also empower me by allowing me to filter textual analyses through a Tainui woman’s lens and consciousness. Both, I considered, would also permit negotiation and explication of what can be complex and confusingly contradictory patriarchal narratives and records, focused as they tend to be on male thought and prowess where “he” rather than “she” commands the most influential positions. Mana wahine, then, would invest in the

acknowledgement of Māori women's mana and knowledges and their valuable place in our societies.

### **The Nature and Existence of Matriarchal Societies**

While this thesis is not concerned with theorising about the shift from matriarchies to patriarchies, it is important to discuss the bankruptcy and muting of matriarchal and woman lore because it is a position I take within the research. In the same way that Gunn Allen (1986) clarified the roles and responsibilities of Laguna women, this work too will challenge and reposition any notion that women hold power only through child bearing and rearing. It will also provide examples of the traditional view within Māoridom that sacred power holds the potent power of woman to the fore.

Matriarchies, says Göttner-Abendroth (1999, p. 22), are based on societies of kinship that represent a matriclan made up of at least three generations of women consisting of the clan mother, her daughters and granddaughters, and men who are “strictly” related. This practice continued within Māoridom until recent times. In their book *Mau Moko*, Te Awekotuku and Nikora (2007) state that a “vast number” of the kuia (interviewed by late historian Michael King) who wore mau kauae through to the “closing decades of the twentieth century” (p. 86) were raised by their mothers, aunts and grandmothers.

Within the matriclan, biological fatherhood is not socially recognised; rather, a man in a matriarchal society never regards the children of his wife as his own because, as Göttner-Abendroth (1999) explains, they do not share his clan name. Diner (1965) also notes that children within matriclans follow the female line; their father is considered to be unrelated to them, and his possessions are inherited by his uterine clan, the sons and daughters of his sisters (p. 46). This order resonates with Māori women of oral tradition where male children tended to remain with their mother at times of parental separation. Hotu-ā-whio, who lived with his mother Whakaotirangi, provides one such example, as does, more recently, Tāwhiao (the second Māori king), who was raised by his mother's people (O'Connor, 2013).

These customs contrast with those in patriarchal societies, particularly beginning at the medieval era (see Ryan, 2013), where socially constructed power discourses posit that women and their children were the property of their husbands and fathers. Kenehuru, one of the women in this thesis, was of a time when her patriarchal-sanctioned lack of rights and imposed inferior



womanly status was made very clear to her. On her marriage, her land was confiscated, and she became the property of her Pākehā husband, Edward Meurant as demonstrated through her inability to speak to the theft of her lands. Chapter Seven discusses Kenehuru's circumstances in detail. Significant Tainui matriarchal leaders such as Waitohi and her daughter Te Rangitopeora are poorly represented in the tightly 'controlled' pre- and post-colonial texts, whereas Waitohi's brother Te Rauparaha and Te Rangitopeora's cousin Te Rangihaeata are highly acknowledged with respect to their leadership roles.

When researching the composition and customs of matriarchal societies, I drew mainly on the research of four ethnographic historians—Johann Jacob Bachofen, Helen Diner, Heide Göttner-Abendroth, and Paula Gunn Allen. According to Diner (1965, p. vii), Bachofen, a Swiss jurist (1815–1887), was the first male ethnographic historian and researcher to reveal that it was 'mother right' and the feminine that accorded social and religious recognition rather than fatherhood or the male entity. She claims that Bachofen's work differed from that of other male researchers of the time. The reason she gives for this claim is as follows: "There have always been two kinds of research men, prophets and thinkers. Bachofen was both, which made him an unprecedented anthropologist" (1965, p. 28). Diner also applauds his research methods, which she describes as extensive rather than superficially intensive. In a collection of his writings published in the 20th century, we find Bachofen (1973) confidently reporting that in Athens matriarchies were the oldest form of law (p. 158), and that this form was likely a worldwide phenomenon. His work also details how what he called 'mother right' came to be overshadowed by 'father right'.

Helen Diner (her American pseudonym), an Australian writer, historian and feminist, was also known as Bertha Eckstein-Diener (Diener, 2013) or Bertha Diener (1874–1948). Her influential book *Mothers and Amazons: The First Feminine History of Culture* was first published in Germany in 1930 under another of Diner's pseudonyms, Sir Galahad. Like Diner, the third historian informing my views about matriarchal societies, German-born Göttner-Abendroth (1941–), quotes Bachofen's work in her research. Göttner-Abendroth is the founder not only of women's studies in Germany but also of the Institute of Archaeomythology, "an international organization of scholars dedicated to fostering an interdisciplinary approach to cultural research with particular emphasis on the beliefs, rituals, social structure and symbolism of past and present societies" (<http://www.archaeomythology.org/>). Göttner-Abendroth's work

provides a contemporary matriarchal society in order to suggest that female-driven societies of the past were people and value rich, where wealth was distributed to all clan members, where there were no class rulers and where no members of households were excluded, in addition wars and individualistic lifestyles were few. She also notes, from her research into the still practising matriarchal society of the Mosuo, an indigenous non-Chinese people who live within the boundaries of China and who call themselves Nā, that the members of this society have a nondualistic view of the world where neither sex is “inferior to or weaker than the other” (Göttner-Abendroth, 1999, p. 4). She maintains that this worldview is characteristic of most matriarchal societies. Pre-colonial worlds echoed these characteristics (see for example Binney & Chaplin, 2011, pp. 29-32).

Paula Gunn Allen (1939–2008), a prolific writer on Native American (Indian) women and the fourth author whose work I drew from, is a Keres Native American from the Laguna Pueblo in North America. As Gunn Allen explains in one of her essays (Gunn Allen, 1986), the Keres Pueblo people are among the last survivors of the “Mother-Right peoples on the planet” (n.p.). While claiming to be a ‘non-traditional’ Native American, Gunn Allen says she lived as Indian in her upbringing with her parents and grandmother and listened to the stories of Native American peoples in her own home and the homes of others. She stresses that her writing derives from her personal involvement in these communities and from the perspective of a Laguna Indian woman. She also wrote in her essay of the resilience and persistence of Indian tradition and ways of being, arguing that while one may be able to take the Indian out of Indian country, one cannot take the Indian out of the Indian (p. 6). In similar vein, she later observes in the essay that: “It is a testimony, a pictograph, of a contemporary woman’s life which says that while we change as Indian women, as Indian women we endure” (p. 12).

Göttner-Abendroth’s (1999) claim that in matriarchal societies, both past and present, women typically control the means of production is evident in the publications of the three other featured authors. These societies, says Göttner-Abendroth, are generally agriculturally based sites of reciprocity, a point that ties into Bachofen’s (1973) earlier and more theoretical conjecturing where he connects agriculture and human reproduction. He writes that agriculture “is the principle of ordered sexual union. Mother right pertains to them both. Just as the grain of the field emerges from the furrow opened by the plow, so the child issues from the maternal *sporum* (womb) from the ... garden (vagina)” (p. 131). According to Bachofen, the Ancient Romans

formulated the principle that the father is “of no more importance than the plow, than the sower who passes over the tilled field, casting the grain in the opened furrow, and then disappears into oblivion” (1973, p. 132). Matrimony (literally mother marriage), continues Bachofen, is based on the fundamental idea of mother right, *natura verum* (true by nature). The father, he says, exists only *iure civili* (in civil law) (p. 133). Indeed Ryan (2013) notes that “*filius nullius* (the son of nobody)” (p. 35) was the term used for a child when the woman was unmarried. Thus, one can always be certain of who the mother is “even though she has conceived by all and sundry; the father, on the other hand, is only he who is mentioned in the marriage certificate” (p. 132). Bachofen quotes Ancient Greek dramatist Menander in order to emphasise the point that “A mother loves her child more than a father does for she knows it’s her own while he but thinks it is his” (p. 133). The point that a man can never truly know if a child is his is a strong feature of the oral tradition concerning Marama and Hoturoa in Chapter Five of this thesis.

The claim by hooks (1982) that a matriarchal hierarchy “implies the existence of a social order in which women exercise social and political power ... and [are] almost always economically secure” (pp. 72–73) is one evident in the writings of all four featured writers (it is also evident in all four Tainui women’s histories in this study). Diner (1965) argues that communism is, in its socioeconomic sense (collective ownership of property and labour for the benefit of all), “characteristic of the beginning of a matriarchal clan” (p. 48). Göttner-Abendroth (1999) clarifies this point when she writes that matriarchal societies show “patterns of equality [that] are consciously maintained” (p. 2). Here, social rules, evident in rituals of redistribution, dictate the sharing of tribal or clan wealth, such as food, with kin from the same societal groups. Gunn Allen (1986) also emphasises the relevance for women’s power and prestige of the economic distribution of goods (including reciprocal exchange of goods and services) under gynocentrism (matriarchy) because “women are in charge at all points along the distribution network” (p. 41). As Diner (1999) points out, when the practice of private ownership of property first gained currency, it was generally the women who retained the sole rights to land and chattels.

In her 1993 publication *Māori Women and the Vote*, Tania Rei stresses that a select group of rangatira women were accorded responsibility by their iwi as the authority for those iwi. She provides details of their roles and responsibilities in relation to land and as spokeswomen for

their communities.<sup>8</sup> Rei records, for example, that it was Waitohi, the mother of Te Rangitopeora, who was responsible for the establishment of her people in the Horowhenua district (p. 8). She also provides a record of Māori women who fought British troops alongside their men in defence of their lands, women who owned and managed large estates and participated in writing and otherwise supporting petitions to the colonial government concerning that land, and women who were knowledgeable about their iwi lands when the men were not. She writes of Meri Mangakahia, a campaigner for women's suffrage in Aotearoa New Zealand, who claimed that Māori women had always inherited, managed and administered iwi lands (pp. 8–23). When viewed from a womanist world view, the oral traditions in relation to Tainui ancestresses that I describe and discuss in this thesis, show that theirs are herstories showcasing matriarchical societies, agriculturally based and communally owned land titles, and socioeconomic reciprocity. They were also women who exude activist attributes in that they each strove for and achieved social change amongst and for their people.

Diner (1965) and Göttner-Abendroth (1999), like Bachofen before them, argue that matriarchal societies have been the practice for most of human history. They base their claims on investigations of past and existing societies. Diner (1965, p. 26), for example, points out that “goddesses of destiny” determined the rise and fall of many civilisations. These women were “wooed by the living and the dead ... whose fate they decide ... [and that] veneration of woman as a goddess would have been incompatible with making her a slave on earth” (p. 26). According to Diner (1965), Bachofen, through his research encompassing 14 regions, countries and city-states, predicted that proof would be found of matriarchal societies “for a majority of the greater part of the earth, and he was borne out” (p. 27). One point of ‘proof’, she says, are the tombs of many societies, both long past and more recent, which have been uncovered over time. The contents of these tombs, such as symbols and stone images, show ‘mother right’ to be a phenomenon central to the functioning of these societies.

Mother right, a term I have referenced several times in the chapter, was coined by Bachofen in 1861. In a 1973 edition of his work, we find his explanation that the concept underpinning the term “belongs to a cultural period preceding that of the patriarchal system” (p.

---

<sup>8</sup> Iwi likewise assigned authority to rangatira men, with that authority generally being based on hereditary or acts of conquest.

71). Diner (1965) notes that early European missionaries in North America recorded evidence of mother-right populations. One such was Francios Lafitau, who published his findings in 1724. Although hooks (1982) claims that a matriarchal society, black or white, has never existed in United States history, she appears not to have considered the indigenous peoples of North America in her argument. Babb (1997) and Gunn Allen (1986) in particular provide considerable evidence of matriarchal societies amongst Native American societies both before and at the arrival of Europeans. Gunn Allen (1986), for example, writes of the chiefly role and influence that Native American women had in the councils that tribes convened to debate and decide on matters of collective importance. Many women also had the right to speak in men's councils. Native American women thus had the "right to inclusion in public policy decision [as well as] the right to choose whom and whether to marry, the right to bear arms, and the right to choose their extramarital occupations" (Gunn Allen, 1986, p. 37).

Accounts of three of the Tainui women in my research—Whakaotirangi, Marama, and Ruapūtahanga—clearly provide evidence of these types of mother right. Adherence to matriarchal laws and matriarchal cultural histories can also be found in the oral traditions of all three. So powerful was the place of these women in Māori society that the "systemic devaluation" (hooks, 1982, p. 59) of Māori women in the oral narrations and written recordings of white and brown men has not been enough to write out these women's positions.

Another notion central to the premise of matriarchy brought into relief in the writings of my specified authors is that of "woman centred" (Gunn Allen, 1986). Women-centred societies, according to Gunn Allen (1986), are those which value and strive for "peacefulness, harmony, co-operation, health and general prosperity" (p. 29). Even though within "the woman-centered society the matriarch assumes the authoritative role in government and home life" (hooks, 1986, p. 74), this does not necessarily mean the downwards imposition of authority (that is, domination) associated with patriarchy. This claim is supported by Diner's (1965, pp. 45–46) research, which drew on Mathilde and Mathias Vaerting's (1923) work on sex differentiation. They concluded from their studies that what we come to call masculine or feminine traits is the result of whichever gender is dominant in a society. Therefore, what we call feminine traits are simply the characteristics of the subordinated sex and that, by extension, women in a matriarchal society have the same privileges as men in a culture of patriarchal rule. While Diner also found this privileging in her comparison of sex-based characteristics within the context of different

combinations of matriarchal and patriarchal societies (e.g., female characteristics in matriarchies and male characteristics in patriarchies), she argues that these privileges play out differently in the two societies, and it is at this point that we can return to the notion of woman centeredness. Both Bachofen (1973) and Gunn Allen (1986) align woman centeredness with another concept, that of ‘mother right’. They identify mother-right societies as those where women in authority nurture and legitimize systems predicated on social responsibility, and where the people as a whole rather than just a few are nurtured and privileged. Despite the fragmented oral traditions about them, the Tainui women named in this thesis appear to have been women who used their authority to uphold such values.

Diner (1965) observes that marriage, as practised in matriarchal societies demanded “obedience ... of the male as was specified in the marriage contracts of ancient Egypt. He also must remain faithful, while the wife remains unencumbered. She also retains the right of divorce and repudiation” (p. 47). Diner (1965) also points out that even though the wedded state in patriarchal societies generally privileges men, it is still “called *matrimony*, not *patrimony*” (p. 33, italics original), while Bachofen (1973) argues that *paterfamilias* (father marriage, paternal inheritance) is unquestionably a later term to that of matrimony (see Ryan (2013, p. 34) for the declining legal status of the term matrimony from the Middle Ages). Histories recorded by the European colonists of Aotearoa New Zealand show that Māori women, up until their marriage at least, chose their bed partners as frequently as they liked, an occurrence which the above researchers consider to be another marker of mother-right, matriarchal societies.

The functions and structures of matriarchal societies provide important and useful information about Tainui women and their place that disrupts the discursive Eurocentric patriarchal discourses of the oral traditions relating to these women. The male domination of the oral traditions provides a one-sided view of context, content and text. The matriarchal discourses present knowledge of a different system that was valid and influential. Evidence within Māori myths and language tend to support the claim that traditional Māori society was not patriarchal (see, for example, Te Awekotuku, 1991, 1992; Hutchings, 2002; Mikaere, 1999, 2003).

The last three sections in this Part 1 of the chapter highlight a thread between indigenous womanism, womanist, womanism, feminism and matriarchies. The most obvious of these is that they each speak to the feminine and female essence. This particularly resonates with the validation of women’s occupation and agency in all spaces that constitute their communities such

as the political, social, sexual and economic places. Of special interest here is the place that complementarity held for Māori societies in pre-colonial histories where it could be said that both genders strove to work in harmony.

### **Patriarchal Hierarchies**

Canadian Leonard Schein (1977) argues that patriarchy has a foundation that advocates “the oppression of women” (p. 69). Diner’s (1965) position aligns with this claim when she writes that “woman could rise only by the favors of a man and to the extent that she pleased him, and she fell from grace as soon as she lost his favour” (p. 53). American feminist activist, scholar and author John Stoltenberg (1977, p. 75) explains that patriarchal societies uphold the belief that

... men are the arbiters of identity for both males and females, because the cultural norm of human identity is by definition male identity—masculinity. And, under patriarchy, the cultural norm of male identity consists in power, prestige, privilege, and prerogative as over and against the gender class woman. That’s what masculinity is. It isn’t something else.

Women in a patriarchal society whose behaviour is masculine in nature are therefore deemed unnatural and must be returned to their ‘natural’ state. Bachofen (1973), writing about the very early motifs of the Achilles and Dionysus era of Ancient Greek mythology, traces the shift in relationship between the fearless and feared Amazon women fighters and the legendary Greek hero Bellerophon. The motifs portray the defeat of the Amazon women when they confront Bellerophon in battle and their consequent domesticity. The once fearless women now recognize

the higher strength and beauty of the man and gladly inclines to the victorious hero. Weary of her heroic Amazonian grandeur which she can sustain only for a short time, she willingly bows down to the man who gives her back her natural vocation. She realizes that not warfare against man but love and fertility are her calling. Thus she willingly follows him who has redeemed her by his victory ... the maiden would now rather be soft than cruel and brave ... Not battle and murder should prevail between them, but love and marriage, in accordance with woman’s natural vocation. (pp. 130–133)

This episode in mythological history describes a version of restructuring power from a woman-strong and woman-led hierarchy to a man-strong and man-led hierarchy. The passage implies that women have been ‘saved’ from their own power base and should now be grateful for being able to serve men in their ‘higher calling’ as wives and handmaidens.

Within the Aotearoa context, Mikaere (2011, p. 200) says that the traditional natural balance between Māori men and women “has been distorted by the inculcation of the patriarchal values that form the basis of the common law and Christianity”. As with the historically imposed American imperialistic patriarchal system where “American women have been socialized, even brainwashed, to accept a version of American history that was created to uphold and maintain racial imperialism in the form of white supremacy and sexual imperialism in the form of patriarchy” (hooks, 1982, p. 120), so too did Māori men come to engage in “strange new cultural practices ... [where] men are bonding to each other, through patriarchy to give each other participatory rights across Māori and Pākehā culture, in ways which exclude Māori women” (Irwin, 1992b, p. 18).

For Heilbrun (1988), a patriarchal gaze surveys, judges and regulates (p. 84). She argues that narratives of female lives only come to the fore “when women no longer live their lives isolated in the houses and the stories of men” (p. 47). Van Dijk (2013) argues that women can be silenced in many ways, and that the exclusion of their voice in text is a dominant and highly successful means that patriarchal societies use to ensure that silence. I was certainly unsettled by the fact that during my research for this thesis, I could not find one Tainui narrative recorded by women. Rei (1993) provides a more concrete example of patriarchal censorship of Māori women’s voice when she documents the claim made by Rapata Wahawaha (of Ngāti Porou descent and believed to have been born around 1820) that Māori women had always been “nurturers, weavers and cultivators ... [and had] always been excluded from ceremonial duties”. He maintained that Christian doctrine merely served to support this state of affairs. Also telling is his comment in 1891 that “It is only in the last few years that the voices of fanatical women have been heard in the streets of Wellington and Gisborne and other places” (Rei, 1993, p. 32).

Mikaere (2011) claims that patriarchy was the “single most damaging impact of colonisation” on Māori because it involved “the ultimate divide-and-rule tactic” of turning one side of the population (i.e., men) against the other (women) (pp. 207–208). Certainly, in terms of oral traditions about Tainui women, this statement holds true, given that, as I show in this thesis, the male voice and tone, both white and brown, is evident throughout the works about them. The pre-1900 Pākehā published sources included accounts from men of importance such as missionary Reverend James Hamlin; Governor to the colony of New Zealand from 1845 until 1868, George Grey; missionary William Colenso; and prolific historian, John White and others such as



Stephenson Percy Smith and Elsdon Best. Biggs (1966) a Māori scholar himself noted that writers of this era (who were all men) had a scientific and eclectic approach, they recorded, he said a mass of “valuable fact” (p. ix). Thus Biggs credited authenticity to the accounts that we hold to today. These Pākehā men were early collectors who wrote from authentic accounts and narrations. A comparative analysis of those early accounts shows that the writers instituted changes in what they wrote.

### **Post-colonial Theorising**

The term post-colonial refers to the period coming after the end of colonialism (Childs & Williams, 1997, p. 1). While definitions can vary widely about what post-colonialism is, it includes here all that has been affected by colonising forces such as, for example, the exploitation and reconstruction of the indigenous peoples, narratives and land. Post-colonial theorists such as Gayatri Spivak (1988), Homi Bhabha (1996), Frantz Fanon (1961), Edward Said (1978) and others analyse cultural representations of the indigenous by imperialists, and discuss the impacts of these rules of engagement on the landscape. Amongst the discourses they proffer are those that illustrate the dehumanising effects of colonisation as imperialists justify their subordination tactics through the reinvention of systems, environments, protocols and narrative.

Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) writes about the researching back and writing back that is required to recover self from post-colonial renderings and rhetoric. This practice is necessary because, post-colonially, the indigenous (in respect of Tuhiwai Smith’s claim and my thesis, Māori) have continued to be interpreted, imagined, invented and constructed through the filter of imperialist criticism, in ways that marginalise and control. Smith (1999, p. 14) neatly encapsulates these post-colonial renderings as the “convenient invention of Western intellectuals which reinscribes their power to define the world”. She reiterates this point throughout her work; that post-colonial conjecturing is an academic strategy for reauthorizing the exclusion of indigenous peoples by purposefully leaving out indigenous knowledges and concerns (p. 24). She thus evinces no surprise at the suspicion with which indigenous academics have come to view post-colonial accounts and discourse.

Post-colonial texts thus portray discourses, narratives and histories that have been theorized and reordered. Gayatri Spivak (1994, p. 93) in addressing post-colonial processes and writing in relation to her home country says, “One never encounters the testimony of the

women's voice-consciousness". So it is also that post-colonial discourses and representations of Māori in general and Māori women in particular have been depicted to portray the images of the colonial observer. These images showcase Western populations as superior economically, socially, culturally and politically. As a phase of imperialism, post-colonialism politically connects a hegemonic European superiority with an ideological indigenous inferiority. The recovering and reinventing of their histories by indigenous peoples is an important economic, cultural and political process known as de-colonisation. De-colonisation is an emphatic stance that draws a line in the sand and reauthorizes indigenous peoples to reconstitute and re-represent the events that have been shaped by post-colonial misrepresentations. For me, my exploration and analysis of the colonised and post-colonised stories of my Tainui ancestresses is my line in the sand.

## **Part 2: Methodological Frameworks**

### **Qualitative Research**

Patton (2002) explains that qualitative research encompasses three types of data: interviews, observations and documents. Documents, the source of my data, comprise "written materials and other documents" (p. 4), with the latter including, for example, artistic works. McCulloch (2011) defines a document as "a record of an event or process" (p. 249), adding that the various forms of document available today include handwritten, typed, and typeset as well as electronic (i.e., accessed through the internet).

The documents that I sought for my research were *archived historical* documents written in either te reo Māori and/or English and featuring or mentioning *principal* Tainui women. The words in italics deserve clarification at this point. By 'archived', I mean the housing or filing in various recognised depositories, whether large ones such as national libraries or smaller ones, such as those found in regional museums and iwi repositories, of documents containing historical information. The term 'historical' is taken, within the context of this thesis, to mean recorded events relating to both the ancient past and to more modern historical times, such as incidences or phenomena that have occurred within the last two centuries. The term 'principal', as used in relation to Tainui women, singles out those women recorded in the documented Tainui oral

historical narratives who held an evidently prominent place within their iwi of one or more of its hapū.

I used qualitative data analysis to explore the oral traditions about each of these women in a logical and calculated way by chronologically sequencing (i.e., from the canoe traditions through to contemporary times) the information from the accessible manuscripts (primary sources) and publications (secondary sources). This tracing of documentation through time aligns with two of Patton's (2002) markers of qualitative inquiry: historical investigation, "take[s] us, as readers, into the time and place of the observation so that we know what it was like to have been there ... [it] tell[s] a story" (p. 47), whereas "[l]earning to use, study, and understand documents and files is part of the repertoire of skills needed for qualitative inquiry" (p. 295). One other point that Patton makes in relation to conducting qualitative research resonated with me. This is that researcher methodological skills, sensitivity and integrity determine the quality of qualitative data and that useful qualitative findings are generated by researchers with robust methodological skills (e.g., with respect to content analysis), brought about through training, practice and hard work (p. 5). My very personal involvement with the people within the research through whakapapa means that I strove to work with sensitivity and integrity and to ensure these qualities were foremost in the research and the retelling. I also recognized the need for creativity during the re-storying, a matter I will return to later.

### **Textual Analysis**

The work in this research and study is based on "accounts already written down" (Vansina, 1985, p. 113). This is because my original intention with respect to studying traditions about Tainui women was to ascertain their positions in their society from the earliest written records; it was never my intention to interview and garner local, contemporary accounts about them. During conversations that I had with members of Tainui iwi and with Rawiri Taonui in relation to my research interest, several of them claimed that because the oral traditions about the women were extant in the form of easily accessible published material, discussion to be had about them may very well mirror these accounts, and I hoped to avoid that.

The sources I consulted in the first instance for information, therefore, were the handwritten manuscripts of the traditions, which are housed in New Zealand libraries and it was only after I had read these texts that I looked at the published material as a point of comparison.

That comparison quickly made it apparent to me that the published sources could not necessarily hold as the most credible versions of iwi women's traditions. It was at this point that I began a careful and critical analysis of as many of the texts as possible.

Because of a focus on identifying in language instances of social, political and gendered forms of power and domination by one group in society over others, I considered textual analysis an ideal method for gaining understanding of why the oral traditions about Tainui women are portrayed as they are in the available texts. My analysis therefore needed to take into account the historical-social and political contexts of the narratives about each woman. I also needed to provide and consider details about the narrators and/or recorders of the different narratives, for implicit in the social and gender grouping of these individuals is the political and sexual motivations behind their representations (Olesen, 2005). Aware that any conclusions I might draw from my analysis of a potential association between text, discourse and power in the accounts of the Tainui women would be based on my interpretation of the available extant texts, I endeavoured to provide validity for such conclusions through multiple readings of those texts and by provision of a selection of them in the substantive chapters within the body of my work.

With respect to this awareness, I was mindful of Burr's (1995) critique of analysis as a research method. She, as have others (see for example Dines & Humez, 2011; Weninger, 2008) cautioned that an analysis of text or recorded discussion is, or could be, skewed to the political intentions of the analysts. Further, while one person may have a particular view of a specific text, someone else might have a completely different interpretation of it. In similar vein, Vansina (1985) says "it is important to note who the author of the recorded version was" because, depending on the bias of the narrator and recorder and their relationship with, or interest in, the oral tradition being transmitted, the "circumstances of the author will influence the contents of the message" (p. 55). I have provided information of this type about the narrators, scribes and authors of the women's traditions within each of the accounts.

Textual analysis, then, is a method of gathering data where analysis of the text content allows for making sense of the context, culture and environmental information. Proponents of textual analysis such as Australian University Professor Alan McKee, and Norman Fairclough, the emeritus Professor of Linguistics at Lancaster University in the United Kingdom, advocate the use of methods of analysing discourse and text to make sense of our worlds. This is because undertaking careful analysis of text can help with understanding nuances and interpretations of

the text by those who not only recorded the text, but also those who will digest the contents. This is particularly important because, as already noted, the way we read or understand text may differ variably from person to person depending on each individual's view of the world. That is to say that a person's values, life experiences and culture/s may have an impact on how text and discourse may be read and understood over time.

McKee (2002) defines text as something from which meaning may be interpreted from. Text could, therefore, be produced from art, an article, a teeshirt, an ornament or any other item where an understanding may be produced. Further, while an analysis of text may focus on the complexities of selected features, such as who wrote it, their gender and ethnicity, Fairclough (2003) argues too that this method of analysis can just as easily accommodate a corpus of features such as beliefs, attitudes, values and social relations (p. 8). Analysing texts, therefore, enables 'meaning making' which includes the social effects of the texts. In this, my research identifies not only who produced the text, and what may have been the intentions in creating the text, but I also offer *an* interpretation of the text and ascertain the impact that the text may have had and perhaps continues to have on Tainui women, that is, the social effects from ideological messages within the text.

Kellner (2011) advocates such a multiperspectival approach when analysing text because it avoids limitations that "focusing on one dimension of the project to the exclusion of others" might produce (p. 10). My work, therefore, differs from the traditional textual analysis constructs where the focus is solely on the text. Burr (1995), Fairclough (2003), Kellner (2011) and McKee (2003) argue that the limitations of textual analysis methodologies are that the outcome of the analysis has been based solely on the values, experiences and perspectives of the analyst, including the particular social issues that they have opted to discuss and the theories that they have drawn upon, in particular social or/and discourse theories, based again on the analyst's perspective. However, my work aligns with an interconnectedness of critical discourse analysis and textual analysis. Here, I have employed a combination of textual analysis methodologies, including those of narrative analysis, discourse analysis and post-structural analysis. By making use of these methodologies, I have perhaps avoided a one-sidedness such as Kellner in particular alludes to.

I considered the analysis of discourse to be important in my study about Tainui women. This is because just as text is a particular representation of somebody's view of the world, so too

is discourse. Fairclough (2003) argues that “Discourses differ in how social events are represented, what is excluded or included, how abstractly or concretely events are represented, and how more specifically the processes and relations, social actors, time and place of events are represented” (p. 17). In consideration that the text and discourse about Tainui women have been narrated and written by men, who wielded positions of power in their communities, I think there is a need to critically analyse what has been made available. Utilising the womanist mana wahine methodologies that I discussed earlier will highlight my essential woman’s ideas and position. This stance has allowed me to break the discourse down and consider the creation and corroboration of cultural myths and realities, including how cultural texts have been structured to either support or ‘debunk herstories’ within oral tradition.

Burr (1995) argues that rigour in the general reporting of the analytic process employed in one’s research would be of practical help and she considered it important to provide such information (see pp. 182-183). I, therefore, offer the following explanations in relation to my work.

### **Autoethnography**

After considering a number of research frameworks from within which to conduct my discourse analysis of narratives featuring Tainui women, I chose autoethnography. As Reed-Danahay (1997) points out, autoethnography has many definitions, but for the purposes of this thesis, I favoured this one: “... the incorporation of elements of one’s own life experience when writing about others through biography or ethnography” (p. 6). This method of study accordingly utilizes both autobiography (a personal account of one’s own life) and ethnography (a scientific description of the races and cultures of humankind) (Tulloch, 1993, p. 505). Thus, while ethnography focuses on groups of people and their cultures, autoethnography focuses on the researcher/writer’s (Alexander, 2006) positioning and involvement in the ethnographical process (Ellis, Adams, & Bochner, 2011). This feature not only fitted well with how I wanted to position myself with respect to my research but also allowed me to draw in other aligned theoretical perspectives, such as womanism (see above).

As Ellis et al. (2011) explain, the method involved in conducting autoethnographical research “is both process and product” (p. 1). That process and the findings and discussion arising out of it (product) are recounted by the researcher/writer in the first person (“I”, “we”;

Henry, 2010, n.p.). For me, when conducting the research set down in this thesis, the personal was very much connected to the cultural, which is why the following description of the autoethnographical approach particularly appealed to me: “[Autoethnography is] a descriptive narrative of events and activities that unfold within a particular culture and then develops into a reflective analysis of these events and activities to generate new insights and to enhance the researcher’s sensitivity towards the knowledge gained in the process” (Duarte, 2007, p. 2). A reflective analysis and the proffering of new insights of the women’s traditions that this thesis highlights has been given within each of the re-storying components of their chapters. The re-storying has evolved from the cumulative narratives about the events and activities that has established each of the women in their herstories.

### **A Response to Colonising Texts**

Over the last three decades in New Zealand, Māori researchers and academics such as Russell Bishop, Mason Durie, Kathie Irwin, Ani Mikaere, Ngāhuia Te Awekotuku, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Graham Smith, and Ranginui Walker (to name a few), as active participants in both research and Māoridom, and therefore with personal insights and experiences, have had an important impact on how contemporary Māori research about and for Māori is conducted. Their work heralded what could be considered Māori-appropriate frameworks, theories and methodologies—and, from there, discourses—that resonate with Māori as both researcher and researched.

Kaupapa Māori, for example, derives from an anti-colonial agenda in which Māori assert the right to be Māori (Pihama, Cram, & Walker, 2002). The core elements of Kaupapa Māori are self-determination, cultural aspiration, culturally-preferred pedagogy, socioeconomic mediation, extended family structure, and collective philosophy (Pihama et al., 2002, p. 30), all housed within philosophies and ideologies of conscientisation, resistance and transformative praxis (Smith, 1997). Kaupapa Māori is thus bound by Māori cultural and political aspirations and considerations.

As is the case with theories and methodologies born of Kaupapa Māori, theories and methodologies associated with the stance of *mana wahine* are affirming Māori research and writing from positions of power rather than constant reference back to the colonising texts of the past (Colvin, 2009; Smith, L., 1990). Naomi Simmonds (2011) argues that *mana wahine*

methodologies and discourses offer Māori women the means of addressing Māori issues in ways that are culturally and politically meaningful to them. The mana wahine perspective, she writes, “not only challenges ... the dominant hegemony that continues to Other Māori women but, and more importantly, validates ... mātauranga wāhine (Māori women’s knowledges) and subsequently mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledges)” (p.11).

Ani Mikaere (2011) gives an account of how Māori traditionally obtained knowledge under tikanga Māori law, which she identifies as “the first law of Aotearoa” and which implicated women as minders of knowledge (p. 208).<sup>9</sup> Mikaere (2011), Murphy (2011) and Simmonds (2011) each state that Māori pre-colonial social systems of balance were cognisant of mana wāhine/mana tāne complementarity. However, my research relied on narrations and records voiced and captured post-European colonisation by men, where the “responsibility for the text” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 253) positioned them in authoritative and controlling positions. Colonisation did serve to legitimate the power of Māori men. The first colonisers were men. They dealt with men and observed and studied men. The roles played by Māori women were marginalised because of the “ethnocentric and phallogocentric views of these early colonisers” (Smith, L., 1992, p. 48). For me, a mana wahine research position of inquiry had the potential to ‘realign’ the available accounts of Tainui women by offering interpolations or perhaps even discarding aspects of the histories that have until now been written and analysed by men. This research, then, writes back to the colonised patriarchal texts that have maintained a hegemonic disempowerment of Māori women’s place in iwi and hapū affairs.

## **Part 3: Supervisory Whānau and Data**

### **Supervisory/Research Whānau**

With whakapapa creating an inherent interest in Tainui business and affairs, but “physically dislocated from [my] tribal roots by time, space and distance” (Tomlins Jahnke, 2002, p. 507),<sup>10</sup> I have prioritised space and time to meet with Hamilton-based whānau as regularly as possible.

---

<sup>9</sup> Ani Mikaere (2011) identifies tikanga Māori law as “based upon a set of underlying principles that have withstood the test of time: principles such as whakapapa, whanaungatanga, mana, manaakitanga, aroha, wairua and utu” (pp. 254–255).

<sup>10</sup> I live and work in Ōtautahi Christchurch.



These meetings offered me an opportunity to discuss findings, thoughts, prospects and possibilities in relation to the research for this thesis. Consistent with Kaupapa Māori theory, meeting with whānau is important. Indeed, consultation with whānau could be said to be a cultural protocol foundation, as it is here that the handing down and handing on of information and the giving and receiving of those knowledges may be best achieved, set as these processes are in a relaxed and informal whānau atmosphere (Murphy, 2011). My time with whānau on this research kaupapa has been based around fun, information contributions, the sharing of kai, conversations on iwi developments and other like matters, all considerably important and necessary components of the process.

Irwin (1992a) notes the importance of working within the tikanga frame of introduction when meeting new acquaintances, whānau and networks. This approach requires those who already have established relationships with these people and groups to do the introducing. Because of my situation of having been raised and living and working away from my iwi base, I relied on whānau contacts to set up a small network of people for whom my research was interesting and valid. From the inception of my enquiries into Tainui ancestresses, my whanaunga Tonga and June Kelly (June has since passed on—*moe mai rā e te whaea*) took an active interest in the kaupapa. Tonga not only introduced me to people he knew who might be supportive and able to contribute by way of offering alternative and additional thinking, he also, because of our common ancestry through Kenehuru (one of the women in this research), shared private papers in relation to her experiences with the Crown, as well as his father's (Tainui historian Lesley Kelly) papers and musings. Further, we journeyed together to the physical locations of some of the women within this research. Tonga's contributions and his welcoming of discussions around this thesis topic have always been timely and helpful.

As kuia and mentor (Irwin, 1992a), Whaea Ngāpare Hopa posed alternative directions, which were both interesting and diverse, to pursue in order to enrich the understandings about the women in this thesis. Her wisdom and her knowledge about Tainuitanga and her deep thinking about womanly ways of being provided many interesting and stimulating discussions and ideas that have progressed the laying out of this thesis. Her retelling of her life experiences has been an enriching experience in itself, as has the kōrero of Margaret Evans. Her unabashed and honest accounts opened up the possibilities of literature on how men have schooled themselves to believe they are women's maestro and master both in the bedroom and out of it. That literature,

in turn, developed kōrero around the sexual orientations of the colonisers of Aotearoa and the sexualisation of Māori women evident in the records. The impact of that early history in relation to the self-invention of men is pivotal to their ideological colonising approach towards Māori women. These discussions were necessary components of the research journey. They also ensured documentation of relevant literature within this work.

During the preliminary research stages, other whānau members included Mere Skerrett, Rawiri Taonui, Averil Herbert, Macfarlane and Barb Madden. Their reading of initial drafts brought to my attention historical considerations and women's claims and culture to either include or exclude. As part of that research whānau, Gina Colvin and Katie Pickles both negotiated their own experiences with early written and published colonising material and the subsequent interpretations, interruptions and claims that the material held. Their familiarity and counsel regarding similar topics challenged me to think well beyond the women that I had focused on for so long and to look deeper at discourses that aligned with the practice of colonisation.

My involvement in research with a research/supervisory whānau fits comfortably in terms of guidance of tikanga responsibilities, commitments and obligations (Metge, 1990). I was therefore very mindful of doing what I said I would do and, as far as possible, adhering to dates set down for returning work for comment. Bishop (1998) observes that customs regarding whānau contribution include warm and interpersonal interactions, group solidarity associated with members of the whānau being interested in the outcome of the work, a shared responsibility for one another and a cheerful co-operation to progress the results. In different ways—and sometimes at varying times depending on availability to meet—the supervisory whānau gave of themselves in ways that amounted to what Bishop (1998, p. 204) establishes as aroha (meant as mutuality in this situation), awhi (helpfulness), manaaki (hospitality) and tiaki (guidance). Whānau participation has thus been, for me, an ongoing supportive process that also acted as a fairly constant prompt that this research journey was about integrity, mindfulness and care of the knowledge and skill of others.

## **Dataset**

As stated above, the qualitative data used for the purposes of this thesis came almost entirely from oral narratives about Tainui women captured in documentation. McCulloch (2011) notes

that “Documentary research typically makes use of documents produced previously and by others, rather than in the process of the research or by the researcher” (p. 249). The documentation that I used was most likely produced through a process resembling an informal conversational interview where the interviewer may or may not have known beforehand “what will be important [or appropriate] to ask” in terms of the experiences, events and incidents that are significant to the narrator (Patton, 2002, p. 342).

As also stated earlier in this chapter, my dataset included both primary (manuscript) documents and secondary (published) documents. McCulloch (2011) further explains the difference between the two as follows: “Primary documents are produced as a direct record of an event or process by a witness or subject involved in it. Secondary documents ... are formed through an analysis of primary documents to provide an account of the event or process in question” (p. 249). A substantial portion of the documented oral traditions I analysed appear in primary texts, with some of the recordings in them made many years and possibly decades after the retold events took place (see, in this regard, McCulloch, 2011). Comparison of the elements of each narrative across the various primary sources made it possible to determine the extent to which these elements had ‘survived’ across time, and also provided benchmark information against which I could compare the accounts in the secondary published documents.

The events and accounts were narrated and often written down by the Māori men themselves (Aoterangi and Te Whēoro are examples of this), but Pākehā men also scribed them. The later published accounts within my dataset were all taken in one form or another from the primary sources by early Pākehā recorders such as George Grey, Elsdon Best and Percy Smith and by later Māori ethnographers such as Leslie Kelly, Bruce Biggs and Pei Te Hurinui-Jones. McCulloch (2011) refers to renditions of earlier works in secondary published sources as hybrid accounts, while Taonui (cited in Prendergast-Tarena, 2008) calls them conjoint accounts or traditions. That was certainly the case with many of the secondary sources I accessed written as they were jointly by Māori and Pākehā.

Apart from papers in relation to Tainui ancestress Kenehuru, all texts documenting traditions about Tainui women came from New Zealand public and university libraries and the Canterbury University library systems. The Kenehuru papers that I used were accessed from family papers that belong to Tonga Kelly, who, like me, is descended from her. I also investigated historical news texts from a number of settler New Zealand newspapers that were

published between the years 1845 to 1879. These texts are included in the *Papers Past* digital collection housed in the National Library database. I also accessed Meurant's (Kenehuru's husband) diary (1842–1847) and papers of the *Appendices to the Journal of the House of Representatives* (AJHR). The copies of the *original manuscripts* written by early Pākehā settlers and Māori scribes that I procured came from the Macmillan Brown library at Canterbury University, the Auckland War Memorial library in Auckland, the Auckland Public library, the Alexandra Turnbull Library in Wellington and Waikato University library. If material was not available from the library that I primarily worked from (Macmillan Brown), I obtained it through library inter-loan. Two of the manuscripts that I used were available only on microfiche film at the time that I required them—Te Uremutu's (1846) and Te Whēoro's (1871).<sup>11</sup>

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

In consultation with my initial supervisor, Rawiri Taonui, I decided that the main criteria determining which Tainui women I would study for this thesis would be that they were women of obvious influence and that the accessible data about each of them were of a sufficient quantity to enable me to answer my primary research questions. The second consideration is in keeping with that of others who research historical records, such as Heinge (1982), who said, "... it is important to recognise at an early point when a particular line of investigation must be abandoned for lack of sound data" (p. 24). The data sought would range from the earliest narratives recounting waka traditions through to contemporary accounts.

I had initially hoped to study Tainui women for whom I could trace direct-line descent on my whakapapa line. However, on discovering the paucity of information about some of them, I decided to draw as well on information about women who were further removed from that line. Selection criteria at this time also expanded to include individual women related to both Tainui and other iwi, such as those women who had married into Tainui. This inclusion would, I anticipated, bring in narratives from other iwi referencing Tainui-related incidents (such as extraordinary events). That, in turn, would perhaps have the advantage of broadening the amount of accessible information about events featuring the selected women and, if so, help me assess

---

<sup>11</sup> Microfiche film contains photographed duplication of an original piece of work. The contents of the film are viewed through a machine located at libraries.

the credibility and reliability of the accounts of an event across time and documents. The data about Ruapūtahanga sits within this category.

Reflecting further on this opportunity to access both Tainui-based published literature and compare it against accounts external to those of Tainui iwi authors, I concluded that it could make an important contribution to the study. The interwoven and often conflicting trans-iwi traditions about Whakaotirangi, whom I had researched before getting underway with this thesis, provided credence for this conclusion, and so highlighted the importance of gathering *all* sources of Tainui-referenced material in relation to the Tainui women that I eventually selected.

Searches directed me to published secondary material only. The diverse representation of Tainui women across the narrators, scribes and authors of these documents as well as the contrasting iwi perspectives of both the women and the events in which they played a part meant further exploration in an effort to discover the reasons for this diversity and to ascertain which version could be considered ‘typical’. That, in turn, led me to consider the sources of the information and to ask whether they were reliable and how would one recognise if they were not.

These reflections encouraged searches through a selection of unpublished manuscripts that were accessible through Canterbury University’s library systems, particularly the Macmillan Brown library. An inventory of the copied manuscripts that had been written by colonial governor George Grey and which were held at the Macmillan Brown library gave a brief description of what each manuscript contained. As I read through the inventory, I looked up anything that I thought might have some link to what I was looking for, such as a place name, a woman’s name or a man’s name that I had come to learn was associated with the women. In these ways, I accessed the available early texts relating to pioneer Tainui women.

The range of sources in which I found relevant data included manuscripts, publications (including newspapers), waiata, poems, and karakia and miscellaneous web-based and catalogue commentary. As I located and read the relevant information from the various accounts, I noted down the narrative elements and themes emerging from them. I also began to gain an impression of whether I would have sufficient information about a woman to include her in my final selection. Another point of interest in the research was particular phenomena that the women had initiated or were involved in over their life time.

Initially, I found material of interest and with a range of coverage that would have enabled me to report on 11 women. Time and space meant that number had to be re-examined and a more

realistic total of four was selected. In determining how much information was sufficient for the purpose of credible discourse analysis, I worked on the premise of revealing the circumstance that had brought each woman to the attention of the narrators, scribes and authors and then having sufficient sources to trace the various retellings and discourse of that particular tradition. More specifically, I wanted to examine what the pre- and early-colonial iwi members had to say about events, how those events were relayed by the colonists and then how the events were again retold by contemporary iwi members.

During my search for material, I found from time to time that there were several repeats of the same tradition by various authors. Where this was the case, I invariably took the earliest work, supposing it to have had the least colonial intervention. With the late-colonisation<sup>12</sup> sources, I often focused primarily on the work of the most prominent author. For example, in the pre-1900 collection of documents by Pākehā, I looked at Grey's work over Tregear's. I aimed to have at least two narrators, scribes and/or authors from each set so that a comparison could be made. When Whakaotirangi was my focus, for example, I studied what Te Rangihaeata, Aoterangi and Nahe had to say about her. I then studied how Grey, Colenso and White retold her tradition and finally how Kelly, Jones and Biggs came to understand and present her story (herstory).

One of the challenges of the qualitative analysis for this research was to find a way of creatively synthesizing and presenting my findings (Patton, 2002) so that they not only captured the intent of the original narrator but also provided an interesting ongoing and faithful account of each woman's tradition. Māori academic and scholar Bruce Biggs (1966) stated that many Māori were literate and writing their own accounts of the traditions by the time colonisers such as George Grey and Edward Shortland began to collect them (p. 1). Biggs (1966) claimed that Māori wrote as they spoke and the early manuscripts attest to this as there are few punctuation marks such as full stops and other indicators that might identify highlights or points of importance within the recorded narrations.

---

<sup>12</sup> Smith (2006) uses this term rather than post-colonisation, which she considers could be used to inform a strategy of re-inscribing non-indigenous peoples in a way that could lock their knowledge and ways out of historical and other accounts and investigations.

Given that one of my selection criteria was ‘women of note’, I sought out themes denoting “important markers of personal identity” (Tomlins Jahnke, 2002, p. 504). Jan Vansina (1985) and Ranginui Walker (1978) identify one of these ‘markers’ as ‘culture heroes’, a term which I consider befitting of each of the women I eventually selected. I therefore sought out broad themes across each of the women’s traditions. These included their whakapapa and the children they may have had. I also anticipated more singular themes such as the whakataukī, poems, waiata and karakia initiated by the women’s actions, as well the unique events, adventures and activities each woman experienced.

I transcribed Te Uremutu’s and Te Whēoro’s manuscripts after accessing them on microfiche. The newspaper articles in relation to Kenehuru were accessed online via the digitized database published by the National Library and held on the *Papers Past* website. Here I accessed their search engine and typed in words of interest such as Meurant and Kenehuru.

Meurant’s name in particular brought up hundreds of items (over 600). I opened each article by clicking on it and visually scanning the text to see if the information was relevant to the issue of Kenehuru’s land confiscation. Many of the items fell into this category so I isolated an early article that explained the affair and a later one that set out the details of the government argument. I also selected articles that Kenehuru’s situation had surfaced, such as half-caste children and the marital status of Māori women, given their pertinence to her story.

From here, my scrutiny of the documents employed the deconstructive approach (Burr, 1995, p. 164) required of critical discourse analysis. I specifically analysed the accounts for hidden or repressed symbols or representations of Tainui women. This method also helped expose any assumptions made in relation to the oral traditions and highlight use of hegemonic ideology. I bore in mind that my reconstructions of the deconstructed texts would result in an analytic version of the texts based on my justifications. To offset this, I took note of Billig’s advice (1990) to look not only at what is being said but also at what is being rejected (even if only implicitly). In addition, I employed the use of code procedures or recurrent themes during my deconstruction of the texts. These helped me identify coherent sets of statements, phrases and metaphors within and across key discourses within the text and within key discourses across the texts. For example, one code I used was ‘women’s role in ritual karakia’. With each such coding, I identified what was said, or not said, and by whom. Bringing together all such coded instances

provided an overall view of ancient and contemporary Tainui women's role and place in an essential aspect of communal tribal life experiences.

## **Summary**

In this chapter, I set out the research approaches that I employed when (a) selecting and screening the data for this thesis and (b) deconstructing and critically analysing that information. The overall supporting structure of my research is based on notions of colonisation highlighted by race, gender and the knowledge and power social constructions put forth by non-Māori, non-Indigenous. I have therefore discussed my process of engagement with the material within an autoethnographical framework, and I affirmed and explained my reasons for exercising mana wahine, womanist methodologies, where I have observed and researched from a Māori woman's perspective on life. Utilising also Kaupapa Māori methodology meant that I have undertaken the study while observing the maintenance of tikanga Māori, including preserving links and consultation with Tainui whānau, upholding karakia, pono and tika in my work. I have overviewed matriarchal societies, mana wahine and womanism as theoretical constructions where the feminine is observed as worthy and powerful. Post colonial theorising has been employed as a 'researching back' strategy that exposes patriarchal hierarchies and power doctrines particularly during the colonising of indigenous peoples world wide, but specifically the practices that impacted on tangata whenua in Aotearoa New Zealand. Thus I described the propensity and my personal responsiveness to a Tainui tribal recognition of how our ancestresses were politically and socially bound by the contextual circumstances of the times in which their traditions were narrated and scribed. My overall research approach was thus directed towards not only drawing out and assessing the validity and reliability across time of the accounts of each woman included in this thesis, but also identifying patterns in how and why they, both as individuals and as a group, are depicted as they have been.

Qualitative methods allow that I am forthright in acknowledging that political research such as this thesis is not value, socially or politically free. I am influenced by my experiences, values and beliefs. Qualitative methodology, then, based on the coded (analysed) data allows understanding behind behaviors of race, gender and colonisation of Tainui women's voice. Textual analysis has allowed me to explicitly extract from text a number of issues and scenarios that impact on Māori women and to explain why it is that they do have a bearing. It also allows



for research and debate on certain discourses that are held within the patriarchal texts about Māori women. Through the use of the methods and theories explained above, then, the impact of colonising texts and discourses and the implications for the exercise of power is described.

Because the accessible traditions about Tainui ancestresses have been presented, discussed and debated by men, it is their accounts of each woman that I introduce and deconstruct in the following chapters. Descriptions can have critical consequences for those described. As such, my concern in each chapter is on the political, cultural, and social implications of the men's positions for Tainui women in particular and Māori women by implication. And because my interpretations of the oral traditions about each woman are based on the strength of consistency of those accounts that have been preserved, I complete the chapter with a re-storied womanist version of those accounts.

## Chapter Four: Canoe Traditions

### Whakaotirangi

I begin my exploration and analysis of text about Tainui ancestresses with possibly one of the most contested and widely discussed women of the canoe traditions, Whakaotirangi. Comparatively little has been written about her, yet she is said to be an ancestress to several iwi (Belich, 1996; Orbell, 1985, 1991)<sup>13</sup> and a woman of some note to both Tainui (Aoterangi, *c.* 1860; Jones & Biggs, 1995; Kelly, 1949; Te Whēoro, 1871; Te Whiwhi, 1851) and Te Arawa waka (Tarakawa, 1893; Te Rangikaheke, 1849; Te Uremutu, 1846).<sup>14</sup> Colonialism has condensed important women's histories such as hers into fragments with a different focus mostly intended for a different audience, that of the non-indigenous. Within the constraints of writing for an intended audience, the values, beliefs and metaphors from whom the histories evolved are misplaced or lost. Rather than an appreciation and recognition of Tainui women's fundamental connectedness with their iwi, the colonial settler society problematise and disaggregate their histories. Thus Māori women's political and social status are lost, misplaced as they are by male accounts of importance and power.

Pre-colonial Māori Indigenous knowledge affirmed and highlighted women such as Whakaotirangi. Therefore, while the extant Whakaotirangi histories largely link her to several recognised rangatira and the bringing of the kūmara to New Zealand, my focus here is on examining and analysing, from an indigenous womanist perspective, the patriarchal accounts of her role in Tainui tradition. The journey of exploration and analysis of the traditions, sources and findings is settled within the chapter's conclusion, and in my re-storied womanist version of Whakaotirangi's critical association with Tainui waka.

---

<sup>13</sup> Orbell and Belich do not, however, name which waka. Buddle (1851, p. 9), as one of Orbell's (1991) sources, wrote of four canoes associated with Hoturoa; he does not mention Whakaotirangi and five waka. Mair (1923, p. 53), another of Orbell's sources, wrote, "It is noticeable that descendants of each of the five canoe crews aver that this Maori Martha [Whakaotirangi] came in their vessel." Again, the names of the waka are not given, nor does Mair (1923) provide his sources.

<sup>14</sup> Tainui and Te Arawa are credited in some publications as possibly the first waka to arrive in Aotearoa (Robertson, 1966, p. 26).

## What Was Said

### The Early Māori Manuscripts

#### The oral narrative of Te Rangihaeata

Te Whiwhi was a chief from Ngati Raukawa. He was the son of Te Rangitopeora, a high chieftainness of Ngāti Toa and he was also a nephew to Te Rauparaha and Te Rangihaeata, brothers to Te Rangitopeora and high chiefs themselves of Ngati Toa. Te Rangihaeata recited oral traditions to Te Whiwhi which he recorded; hence fragments of Te Whiwhi's recording have In *Genealogies and Traditions*, Matene Te Whiwhi (1851), who wrote from Te Rangihaeata's dictation, captures the words of a karakia that Te Rangihaeata says Whakaotirangi performed when Tainui waka became stuck at Ōtāhuhu. I re-present the karakia below as Te Whiwhi narrated it because it is important to her history.

Ka toia kaore, i paneke, te maunga iho ano mau tonu, kua poua e tetahi wahine a Hoturoa e Maramakikohura, to noa to noa te taea, katahi ka whakatika mai tetahi o nga wahine, a Hoturoa ko Whakaotirangi te ingoa, ka whakahuatia te karakia.

Toia Tainui, Te Arawa,  
Tapotuki ki te moana,<sup>15</sup>  
Ma wai e to, mauna e to, ma whakatau e to,  
Te rango atu ana he tarawai nuku he tarawai rangi.  
Punui a teina nau mai nau mai e Tane ki mikini e Tane  
Koakoa e Tane turuturu haere ana te wai o te hika a Marama Kikohura  
Ma runga o Waihihi tu rukiruki pa nekeneke oioi te toki whana pau ie,  
Ka rewa ki Manukau ka hoe a Tainui,  
Ka u ki Kawhia,  
Ko te Arawa ki Maketu.<sup>16</sup> (Te Whiwhi, 1851, pp. 11–12)

Simmons (1976) translates the karakia thus:

Pull Tainui, Te Arawa  
Reach the water  
For whom is your fixing being pulled?  
For Whakatau you are being pulled.  
The fame spreads,  
A land roller, a sea roller

---

<sup>15</sup> The “ki” on tapotuki, although in the manuscript, appears to be a double up for the word following it.

<sup>16</sup> The spelling and punctuation is as per the manuscript as far as I could interpret.

Near your younger brother. Come oh Tane  
Seek O Tane  
Hold in going the memory of Marama's copulation<sup>17</sup>  
The bewitched flesh of Waihihi  
Stand hard, strike, move gently  
Move the canoe, the adze throw away eh. (p. 170)<sup>18</sup>

My translation of the paragraph preceding the karakia is this: "Although Tainui was pulled, no matter how hard they tried, she would not move but remained stuck as if a mountain, caught there by one of Hoturoa's wives, Maramakikohura; then one of Hoturoa's other wives, Whakaotirangi, remedied the situation by reciting a karakia."

### *Narration summary and context*

Te Rangihaeata reinforces the potency and power of Whakaotirangi in Tainui tradition. Because she is married to the captain of the waka, Hoturoa, she no doubt had an illustrious whakapapa herself, even though Te Rangihaeata does not say this. Patriarchal accounts typically align significant women to men of great note rather than presenting these women as individuals known for their own important contributions. Thus, when Te Rangihaeata says, "... tetahi o nga wahine, a Hoturoa ko Whakaotirangi," he initially places Hoturoa at the centre of attention and Whakaotirangi as Hoturoa's woman, signifying that she belongs to him.

However, Te Rangihaeata represents Whakaotirangi's vast powers in his description of her freeing Tainui waka from its hold. Also, by attributing the most powerful karakia to Whakaotirangi, Te Rangihaeata places her in a revered and seemingly superior position to that of Marama's. It is possible that Marama, and almost certainly Whakaotirangi may have been high priestesses or spiritual leaders—tōhunga in their own right. As such, there may have been a contestable space for power between the two women at the time of this incident, but from the description, Whakaotirangi emerges as the more experienced (she was much older than Marama) and/or the more powerful.

---

<sup>17</sup> Simmons' translation of the line "Koakoa e Tane turuturu haere ana te wai o te hika a Marama Kikohura" to mean "Hold in going the memory of Marama's copulation" needs further interpretation, which will be attempted in the next chapter about Marama.

<sup>18</sup> While Simmons (1976) has not translated as part of the karakia the last three lines of Te Whiwhi's recording, it is presented as above in the manuscript. He continues the translation, thus: "They floated on the Manukau and travelled to Kawhia. The Arawa went to Maketu" (p. 170).

The account thus demonstrates the position of superiority some Māori women held in sacred ritual domains such as tapu and karakia (incantations). For Māori—a people who relied on spiritual guidance in all its complexities and ceremonies in their daily living, for large and small projects alike—karakia and the removal of tapu was a significant aspect of life (Andersen, 1940, p. 514). Whakaotirangi is acknowledged in this narrative as a learned woman in the rituals and art of karakia.

### *Analysis*

As a person of Tainui descent and as a male, Te Rangihaeata is not a neutral teller. His narrative presents both his cultural and masculinist view of events. Socially and politically, Te Rangihaeata credits women's agency through his karakia discourse. He acknowledges Whakaotirangi's (and therefore Māori women's) powers when he emphasises that it is Whakaotirangi who provides the spiritual force to move Tainui waka, which is stuck as solidly as a mountain. Te Rangihaeata's narration reinforces the strength of leading Tainui women; they were influential and important, and they were imbued with mystic powers so potent that they could take control of events.

Even so, Te Rangihaeata's account also normalises women's place as that sanctioned only by the dominion of men. He describes the two women in the narration as the wives of men rather than describing the men as the husbands of the women (this is so through each of the accounts taken for this thesis). This placement presents a subtle reflection of subjugation. In presenting Whakaotirangi and Marama as Hoturoa's wives, Te Rangihaeata reproduces and legitimises the dominant and powerful role of Hoturoa (men). Whakaotirangi's power is made less because she is under Hoturoa's control. Her power is emphasised only after his social position as her husband has been acknowledged. This rendering is a salient example of patriarchal retelling regulating women's place. On the one hand, Te Rangihaeata acknowledges women (Whakaotirangi) for their revered womanly involvement in cultural matters; on the other, he positions them as acquiescent to men (Hoturoa).

### **The written narration of Wirihana Aoterangi**

Aoterangi was a Ngāti Tahinga chief from Raglan. Aoterangi wrote his Tainui account in te reo Māori and George Graham translated and published it in 1923. As one of the earliest recorders of Tainui oral traditions, Aoterangi's work (together with Matene Te Whiwhi) could be considered

the most authentic, with least opportunity of colonist intervention. Wirihana Aoterangi's *Fragments of Ancient Māori History from Kaipara to Kāwhia* (c. 1860) positions Whakaotirangi as the daughter of Memeha-o-te-rangi. Aoterangi did not mention her mother, although others have (see Kelly, 1955, p. 189). When recounting the beginnings of Tainui waka and Whakaotirangi's role with respect to it, Aoterangi wrote:

No Hawaiki Tainui Waka. Nga tangata no raua tenei waka ko Whakaotirangi raua ko Hoturoa. (p. 1)<sup>19</sup>

Ka hoe a Kupe ka tae ki Hawaiki ka korero, kua kite e ia he mautere nui pai, ko nga tangata o reira he ahua atua, ka rongo te tokomaha o runga i Hawaiki ka hiahia kia heke-mai, kaore i tere mai i te oranga o Kupe. Ka tonoa e Whakaotirangi te mauri o Puanga ara te rori o te whare o Uenuku, ki tana matua ki a te Memeha-o-te-rangi ka whakaaetia ka ngarea e ia te tohunga tarai waka a Rata-o-wahieroa . . . (p. 3)

Ko nga ingoa enei o nga tangata o runga i a Tainui (nga mea i mau i a au o aua ingoa). Ko Hoturoa, ko Whakaotirangi, ko Marama hahake, ko Poutukeka, ko Amonga, ko Takahiroa, ko Ngatoroirangi, ko Kea taketake, ko Ruiki-uta, ko Rangi-whakairiao, ko Taikehu, ko Kahu-tuiroa, ko Rakataura, ko Whaene-murutio, ko Kahungunu, ko te tamaiti a Poutukeka, ko Hapopo, me te tamaiti whakamutunga o Whakaotirangi ko Hotu-awhio. (p. 8)

Ko Ngatoroirangi te tohunga o Tainui i reira, nana i karakia, ka puta ko te karakia tenei  
Ka hura tangata uta te tiaki atu ki tangata tai  
Ka hura tangata tai te tiaki atu ki tangata uta  
Pera hoki ra te korepe nui te korepe roa  
Te wahi awa te totoe awa  
Whakamoe tama i araia te awa  
Ko Tu, ko Rongo, ko Tama i araia te awa  
Kauraka tama e uhia  
Tukua atu tama kia puta i waho  
I te tawhangawanga he putanga ariki no Rongo  
Ki te ata tauira mai, ea mai, ea mai, ea mai,  
Ea mai te Tupua mai, ea mai te Tawhito.  
I hara mai koe i whea?  
I te whakaotinuku, i te whakaotirangi  
Whakahotu to manawa,  
Ko taku manawa e Tane ka irihia whano  
Whano haramai te toki haumia  
Hui e Taiki e. (p. 9)

Kati koa ena . . . me timata ake e au i te korero o Whakaotirangi, ko te wahine matamua tenei a Hoturoa, ko ana tamariki tomua ko Poutukeka, i kaumatua mai ano i Hawaiki, i

---

<sup>19</sup> See Appendix B for a scanned copy of the first page of Aoterangi's manuscript.

moe mai ano i ana wahine tokorua i Hawaiki i a Amonga raua ko Takatiroa. Ko te teina te mea i noho ki te whaea, ko Hotuawhio. Ko tenei o ana [Hoturoa] wahine i mahue i te taenga ki Kawhia ka tino moea ko Marama-hahake, koia e mau nei te whakatauki o Tainui, “Tainui maro hahake”, mo te puremu. Ka noho a Hoturoa ma i Maketu, i Paringatai, i Motungaio, i Omiti, i te Puru, i tera taha i te Maika, ara i Kawhia katoa. Ka kimi kainga a Whakaotirangi mona, ka noho ki Pakarikari, ara kei te taha ki Aotea. Ka ngaki i tana mara hei tupunga mo ana kumara i mau mai ai i Hawaiki. Ka wehea ano nga puke tuatahi, ka oti ka puehu, ka whakatumu rarauhe, ka whakawaetorea, ka haratau, ka whakangapipi, ka whakaraurekau, ka potaka, ka heke ki te wa. Katahi te wahine nei ka ngare i te tamaiti kia haere ki te tiki i a Hoturoa, ki te pure i tana mara, ka tae te tamaiti nei ki tana matua, ka mea atu, “i ki mai a Whakaotirangi kia haere atu koe ki a kite koe i a ia, e tata ana te mate”. Ka aroha a Hoturoa haere ana, ka tae atu ki runga ake i te kainga ka titiro iho ki te mara kumara e tupu ana. Ka mea atu te tamaiti “Ko te take tenei i tikina atu ai koe”. Ka tangi te tangata nei ki naga kai o Hawaiki kua mahue atu ra. Ka mutu te tangi, katahi ka heke iho ki te kainga, ka tangi ki te wahine, ka mutu ka ki atu te whaerere tamahutia te mara nei, tenei ano nga puke tuatahi, me te tuarua, te mea ma te tane, me ta te wahine. Ka ka te umu pure, ka tao, ka maoa ka oti te pure. Ka moea ano e Hoturoa i tana whaereere. No te otinga o te hauhake o te mara kumara ka tonoa e Whakaotirangi tana tamaiti a Hotuawhio ki te kawea kumara me tana mokopuna ma Hapopo, kei te Akau nei a Hapopo e noho ana. Ka tae a Hotuawhio ki a Hapopo ka hoatu, kawea ake ki te Angaroa whakato ai, he whenua a te Angaroa ka whakatokia. No te whakatokanga ka tikina he kohatu poua iho, hei mauri mo te mara nei, ka tapa te ingoa o taua kohatu mauri nei ko te Rukuruku a Whakaotirangi. Kei konei ano te waiata whakaatu. E tu nei ano taua kohatu he tara te ingoa, erangi he nonoti a waenganui o te kohatu he purutanga na te ringa-ringa no mua iho. Heoi tena ko te mara a Whakaotirangi i whakatokia ai aua kumara tapa iho te ingoa ko Hawaiki, kati ena whakahaere korero. (pp. 18–19)

Ko Tuirirangi he rangatira no tenei moana no Kawhia, i haere mai ki tenei whaitua ki Aotea, ara he awa kei raro iho o te mara a Whakaotirangi o Hawaiki ko Waitete te ingoa, he tapahi whare hei korewa mo tana kupenga. (p. 38)

### *Narration summary and context*

Aoterangi begins his narrative about Whakaotirangi’s tradition by stating that the waka Tainui belonged to her and to Hoturoa.<sup>20</sup> He states that traditions about Kupe, an important navigator and ancestor, motivated Whakaotirangi, and it was she who inspired the Tainui voyage. Whakaotirangi is positioned as a daughter of the consequential chief, Memeha-o-te-rangi, and as an assertive and confident woman who approached her father. Whakaotirangi received a blessing

---

<sup>20</sup> In the 1923 translated version of Aoterangi’s narrative, which was published after Aoterangi’s death in 1907, George Graham translated this sentence to read, “The persons whose canoe this was were Hotunui and Whaka-oti-rangi” (Graham, 1923, p. 3). In Aoterangi’s narration, Whakaotirangi is named first (showing her importance) while Graham names Hotunui first in his translation.

from him, which suggests he trusted and loved her. The account affirms that Whakaotirangi and her father held superior places as leaders and chiefly people within Tainui oral traditions.

Whakaotirangi was the carrier of taonga on the voyage. She had in her possession the mauri, a term for “life force”, although Williams (2001, p. 197) interprets it as a charm. Graham (1919) calls the mauri an emblem of divine assistance (p. 112). According to Jones and Biggs (1995), it is “the talisman of Rigel, the fastenings of Uenuku’s house” (p. 16). Kelly (1949) describes Uenuku as “a leading chieftain in Hawaiki at the time of the migration” (p. 23). Uenuku and Puanga (Rigel in Orion) (Taonui, 2012, n. p.) are navigational tools (stars, planets and rainbows) that Māori and others used during maritime travel and for important ceremonies such as planting and harvesting crops (see Best, 1931, p. 7). In Aoterangi’s text, Aoterangi appears to use the word mauri as an allegory that stresses the importance of Puanga and Uenuku as the life force for Tainui waka. And so Tainui waka was imbued with its own life force because of the taonga entrusted to Whakaotirangi.

Aoterangi names Whakaotirangi’s children who travelled on Tainui with her: Poutūkeka the eldest son, Hotu-ā-whio the youngest, and her grandson Hāpopo. There were five women (as far as Aoterangi could remember from what he had been told) on board for the voyage. They were Marama and Whakaotirangi (whose husband was Hoturoa), Kea-take-take (whose husband was Ngatoro-i-rangi), and Amonga and Takahi-roa (with their husband Poutūkeka). Whakaotirangi is represented as the older (mātāmua) wife of Hoturoa.

On reaching Kāwhia, Whakaotirangi and Hoturoa separate. He lives with Marama at Maketū, while Whakaotirangi explores the area, eventually settling in a place called Pakarikari by Aotea.<sup>21</sup> Aoterangi gives a detailed account of Whakaotirangi’s work establishing her cultivations at this site. Graham (1923) partially translated what Aoterangi says:

[She] first made the divisions between the mounds ... she made the soil friable and rooted up the bracken fern ... then burned off the vegetation ... she cleared it all over ready for use and made it sheltered with branches of trees then she sloped the ground to distances apart. (p. 7)

The Aotea gardens that Whakaotirangi creates thrive for several reasons. They are placed in an ideal situation, close to a stream called Te Kowiwi, sheltered from the winds (Phillips,

---

<sup>21</sup> Also called Hawaikiiti Bay (Phillips, 1989).



1989) and with soil perfect for growing kūmara.<sup>22</sup> Phillips (1989) suggests the people already living in the area advised Whakaotirangi on the best place to set out her gardens.<sup>23</sup>

The importance of Whakaotirangi's efforts and her knowledge of husbandry is evident in Wilson's (1907) accounts of Māori endeavours to ensure survival of the important tuber (his first account of kūmara cultivation was published in 1866). He noted that because kūmara had initially come from a tropical location, the gardens in Aotearoa were laid out with soil and sand to attract the heat of the sun, and rows of manuka branches (Whakaotirangi used rarauhe or bracken fern) were fixed in the soil to protect the garden from wind (p. 166). For Whakaotirangi, there would have been urgency in establishing gardens producing good crops so that her people could remain settled in an area. This state would doubtless have been preferable to the life of the original inhabitants of the area, who apparently did not grow kūmara or any other crop; rather they lived a nomadic existence and sought food (Phillips, 1989, p. 13). Taro, also planted by Whakaotirangi, was still growing at Hawaikiiti Bay when Phillips wrote his 1989 account of Tainui history.

When it came time to harvest the food crops, Whakaotirangi asked her son, Hotu-ā-whio, to fetch Hoturoa to bless the gardens. He and Hoturoa travelled together to Whakaotirangi's place at Aotea. Hotu-ā-whio had fabricated a tale that his mother was dying to ensure that Hoturoa came back with him. When they arrived at the cultivation, Hoturoa cried at the sight of the huge gardens because they brought back memories of Tainui homelands. After performing a ritual blessing over the cultivation, Hoturoa stayed with Whakaotirangi at Pakarikari.

Whakaotirangi also gains prominence because of the connection between her gardens and the establishment of Tainui land boundaries. The gardens became an important landmark not only in terms of delineating the migrations of Tainui people around the area but also of marking other events. For example, Whakaotirangi's grandson Hāpopo, the son of Poutūkeka, planted his grandmother's kūmara at Angaroa and also Te Akau, so helping disperse the kūmara throughout Tainui lands, while the demise of Kāwhia chief, Tūirirangi, was said to have occurred at the river

---

<sup>22</sup> Dieffenbach in 1843 notes that "the kumera, [sic] of which there are many plantations, thrives very well" (p. 300).

<sup>23</sup> According to Kelly (1949), "... there appears to have been a large aboriginal population" in the area (p. 62). Robertson (1956) considers that Tainui seemed "to have had little or no contact with tangata whenua" (p. 251). In 1962 Robertson reported, "On their arrival at Tamaki the Tainui people found strangers whose origin can only be guessed" (p. 303).

Waitete, “situated northward of Whakaotirangi’s cultivation called Hawaiki” (Graham, 1923, p. 15, see also Aoterangi c. 1860, p. 38). Whakaotirangi’s strategic positioning of her gardens, in a prime location with natural irrigation, shelter and ease of access, resulted in great success for her people. The system of foraging for food that the early European explorers and colonisers found amongst the original people of the area could not support large numbers (see, for example, Forster, cited in Thomas, 1996, p. xxvii; White, 1880, p. 2). Land cultivation and the exchange of seeds and root vegetables therefore provided Tainui with important advantages. Their more settled lifestyle and ready source of food led to larger established populations of Tainui, fuelling what Robertson (1957) calls the “unequivocal ... pattern of expansion of the Tainui influence” (p. 254).

A whakataukī synonymous with Whakaotirangi and the kūmara tradition—“te Rukuruku a Whakaotirangi” (the small basket of Whakaotirangi), noted also by others (see below)—is repeated. While the aphorism aligns Whakaotirangi with memories of her exploits with kūmara, it also signifies the memory of knowledge. A Te Arawa man, Uma-kau-o-ho-mata-kamokamo from Tauranga, asked of Nahe, whose account, recorded in White (1988) is set further on in this chapter:

Do you know all about the “small basket”? and what does “small basket” mean? I ask you these questions because you are, or assume to be, the descendant of the first-born of our original family, and you also presume to rehearse our history. If I had been the first to rehearse our history, as you have been, I might have given our history in a clear and true manner, as I am descended from the elder sister of Whaka-oti-rangi ... Friend, Whaka-oti-rangi was the elder sister of my progenitor, and I still possess her “small basket” [the history of her people from her days to the present], and therefore I, her elder male descendant, am still in possession of that history. (White, 1888, p. 24)

While the questions seemingly are a challenge to Nahe, it is well recorded in Tainui history that those of the Te Arawa and Tainui waka were closely related (see, for example, Jones & Biggs, 1995, p. 16).

### *Analysis*

As with Te Rangihaeata’s text, the construction and presentation of Aoterangi’s account of Whakaotirangi is grounded in male perspective and interpretation. However, Aoterangi hailed from the same culture and background as Whakaotirangi (Tainui), which doubtless affected his

account in terms of his responsibility and accountability for presenting reliable tradition. He would have been aware that his contemporaries would read his account.

Aoterangi establishes Whakaotirangi as a woman of considerable mana in several ways. He names her first when he introduces her as coming from Tainui waka. He aligns her to influential chiefs—her father Memeha-o-te-rangi and her husband, Hoturoa (to whom she is an older wife, *mātāmua*). He acknowledges her as the carrier of the mauri on the waka, as a crew member on board Tainui when she left the homelands, as a mother and grandmother, and as a carrier of the *kūmara* and the cultivator of extensive gardens in the new lands. These events are cultural, social and political signifiers of importance. Except for the construction of Whakaotirangi as Hoturoa's woman and the passive place that relegates her to, Aoterangi clearly identifies Whakaotirangi's supremacy in Tainui tradition.

Aoterangi also confirms Whakaotirangi's procreative powers as a woman (her pre-potent power), and thus the ongoing survival of whakapapa and people's relationship with the land (Gunn Allen, 1992, p. 255). Reflected here is a spiritual connection, in terms of the female sexual and reproductive functions, to Papatūānuku (Murphy, 2011): as a mother and grandmother, Whakaotirangi has passed through this realm. Aoterangi recognises the important place of women in the resettling of new lands, not only in his account of Whakaotirangi but also in his naming of four other women on board Tainui; some accounts do not mention women at all (see, for example, Hamlin, 1842).

Aoterangi represents Whakaotirangi as a horticulturalist of mana and wisdom. The whakataukī that he relays acknowledges that she was responsible for the survival, maintenance and distribution of vast quantities of *kūmara*. Matriarchal lore in which women take responsibility for horticultural systems is prevalent in indigenous pre-colonised world views (see, for example, Bachofen, 1973; Diner, 1965; Göttner-Abendroth, 1999). Without Whakaotirangi's attention to detail, the *kūmara* might not have survived and the gardens not been as immense. If the *kūmara* had not survived the journey, or the first crop failed, there would have been no replacement. Whakaotirangi's connection to the life source that was *kūmara* illustrates the immensity of her endeavours which ensured her people flourished.

The karakia Hoturoa performs at the gardens highlights the system of complementarity between men and women in pre-colonial times. According to Biggs (1987), this system allowed for prominent differences between men and women evident in their coming together and

producing a new achievement. In the Māori sense, gender-based roles did not mean a divisive structure but rather male and female roles supporting each other (see also Edwards, 2002; 1990; Tomlins-Jahnke, 1996). Hence, Whakaotirangi's prowess as a horticulturalist is enhanced by Hoturoa's involvement with the karakia and Hoturoa's karakia is magnified by Whakaotirangi's achievements. Gunn Allen (1992) records from her own culture the fine distinction between the separateness of men's and women's roles and their interdependent nature (p. 82).

Aoterangi's portrayal of Whakaotirangi is furthermore cognizant of her interconnectedness with the supernatural, the natural, and the social life (Gunn Allen, 1992, p. 44) and custom of her people. His presentation accords her the attributes that Gunn Allen (1992) recognizes in "Thought Woman" of the Keres people (p. 15). She is the bringer of agriculture (corn for Thought Woman, kūmara for Whakaotirangi) and the repository of knowledge about and upholder of social systems, religion, ceremony, ritual, power and authority. And she blesses her people with the ability to sustain themselves.

Aoterangi's and Te Rangihaeata's records, as the earliest available Tainui accounts, enmeshed as they were in the same set of social constructions, have much in common. In presenting Whakaotirangi as a Tainui ancestress with powers, their captured narratives make clear that Māori women held places of high social status, spiritual hierarchy (particularly evident in Te Whiwhi's account) and sovereignty amidst a cultural setting of complementarity. Aoterangi's account of Whakaotirangi is, however, the most associated and systematic of any of the tellers', including those of Te Arawa.

### **The written narration of Hoani Nahe**

Hoani Nahe of Ngāti Maru with links to Te Arawa and all the principal Hauraki tribes (Ballara, 1993) was also a politician and a "noted expert" (Simmons, 1976, p. 174) in relation to Tainui tradition. He narrated a Tainui account of history in 1860 and wrote two accounts himself following that. Nahe's accounts have been viewed as a means of comparative analysis against the work of Aoterangi and Te Whiwhi. Hoani Nahe's *Translation of Extract from the History of the Tainui Migration*, published in 1880, provides the following fragments of information in relation to Whakaotirangi.

The people (of Hotunui) lived at Hawaiki; and made a canoe for themselves in which to go and seek for a new land. They made a canoe and called it Tainui, and when she was afloat in the water they put her stores on board. These were the men who came in

her: Hotunui, Hoturoa, Hotuope, Hotupapa, Hotumatapu; but there are names of others who came in Tainui. These are the names of the chief women who came in this canoe: Marama, Whakaotirangi. These women brought seed with them—namely, kumara (sweet potato), and hue (Maori calabash).

Tainui went on and landed at Hea-hea, at Kawhia, where she remained, and is still there to this day. The canoe is a stone, and is called Tainui. The people of Tainui went on shore and stayed there, and planted the seed which they had brought from Hawaiki. Marama and Whakaotirangi (the chief women of Tainui) planted the seed they had (brought with them). Each of these women had two plots of ground planted, one with kumara (sweet potato), and one with hui (calabash). In that plot planted by Marama with kumara, instead of the kumara, pohue (convolvulus) came up, and from the plot of ground planted with the hue seed came up the mawhai (*Sicyos angulatus*). Marama was ashamed because her seed had not produced what she expected. The plots of ground of Whakaotirangi produced the crops which she expected; this made her glad, and in joy she exclaimed, “Well done, the small baskets of seed brought by Whakaotirangi from Hawaiki! You have grown well.” Hence this saying by women who are careful of food, and this is the proverb: “The small basket of Whakaotirangi.” [Te rukuruku a Whakaotirangi]. All the Maori people know these proverbs. (pp. 3–6)

### *Narration summary and context*

Nahe acknowledges two women on board Tainui—Marama and Whakaotirangi. He notes that they brought the seeds for the crop foods, kumara and the hue<sup>24</sup> to the new lands. Nahe comments that while Marama’s seed failed to flourish, Whakaotirangi’s produce grew as she had expected, so eliciting her joy. He also recounts two whakataukī in relation to Whakaotirangi’s tradition and history.

### *Analysis*

Nahe mentions Marama first in his recounting of Tainui tradition, a matter I cover in the chapter about her. Whakaotirangi and Marama are the only women he names. That he does not concern himself with the other women on board highlights his recognition that Whakaotirangi and Marama are chiefly women who have some agency. He does, however, name them after the men that he identifies on board, a pattern set by Te Rangihaeata. Socially, this pattern sets a position of domination, where women are categorised and relegated to second place in the historical retelling (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p. 81). Wetherell and Potter note that power is set through ‘normalization’, which defines what is usual and habitual. Thus, the repeated second place regulation sends a message to readers of women’s place, including the place of substantial

---

<sup>24</sup> As well as a food source, hue were used as containers for carrying water (see Taylor, 1855, p. 378).

women such as Whakaotirangi and Marama, where men of presumably lesser importance on the waka (despite there being no oral traditions about them) are named ahead of them (see also Potter, 1997).

Unlike Te Rangihaeata and Aoterangi, Nahe does not acknowledge Whakaotirangi in noteworthy situations, other than those regarding kūmara and hue. He does not, for example, mention the spiritual mana that the two former men credited to Whakaotirangi. Nor does he write about her in connection with the building of the waka or give any details of her whakapapa that would connect her to a position of leadership. Comparatively, then, this later account by Nahe understates Whakaotirangi's role and position in Tainui tradition.

His exclusion illustrates the beginning of a decline in references to women in previously mentioned important roles. It also allows others (men) to fill those roles previously acknowledged as the domain of women. The lesser agency effectively allowed those writers of Tainui traditions who followed to maintain the pattern of absence, thus normalising the disappearance. Nahe's neglect of Whakaotirangi's import may also have paved the way for the breakdown and loss of traditional matriarchal roles, which I discuss later.

Nevertheless, by recounting Whakaotirangi's cultivations and whakataukī, Nahe maintains connection with a significant feature of her oral tradition. While his descriptions about the seeds and cultivations work to strengthen the importance of this event, they also ideologically characterise women as carers of others. This characterisation is a further social rendering; it is also a political one in that it fosters the notion of women as nurturers rather than adventurers (which Whakaotirangi and Marama were). This text, written as it was post-colonisation, normalises the ideological construction of women as of lesser stature than men, as generally passive characters during events of significance, and as gardeners/carers of others.

## **Pre-1900 Pākehā-Published Sources**

### **The written accounts by George Grey**

George Grey, appointed by the British in 1845 as governor of New Zealand, befriended high-born chiefs and asked them to write manuscripts for him, which he first published in Māori under his own name in his 1853 publication *Ko Nga Moteatea, me nga Hakirara o nga Maori*. The text for this section is an almost direct copy of Te Whiwhi's written account (1851) of Te

Rangitahea's oral narration (see above). Grey, however, omits the reproduction of the karakia in that account. In his later version of the tradition, written in English, Grey (1885) wrote:

... so they determined to drag their canoes over the portage at a place they named Otahuhu, and to launch them again on the vast sheet of salt-water which they had found ... they ... began to drag the Tainui over the isthmus; they hauled away at it in vain, they could not stir it, for one of the wives of Hoturoa, named Marama-kiko-hura, who was unwilling that the tired crews should proceed further on this new expedition, had by her enchantments fixed it so firmly to the earth that no human strength could stir it. So they hauled, they hauled, they excited themselves with cries and cheers, but they hauled in vain, they cried aloud in vain—they could not move it. When their strength was quite exhausted by these efforts, then another of the wives of Hoturoa, more learned in magic and incantations than Marama-kiko-hura, grieved at seeing the exhaustion and distress of her people, rose up and chanted forth an incantation far more powerful than that of Marama-kiko-hura; then at once the canoe glided easily over the carefully-laid skids, and it soon floated securely upon the harbour of Manuka. The willing crews urged on the canoes with their paddles. (pp. 90–91)

#### *Account summary and context*

Grey carefully interprets Te Rangihaeata's narration in relation to the attempts to free Tainui. His descriptions depict a loyal crew who do their utmost to free the waka. He recounts the respective powers of Marama and Whakaotirangi, positioning Whakaotirangi as the more knowledgeable and powerful of the two women.

#### *Analysis*

Although Grey maintains the tradition narrated by Te Rangihaeata that confirms women's agency in ritual powerful karakia, he excludes sections of the karakia which reinforces female agency in relation to Marama. Grey is selective in his introduction of the two women: he names Marama but not Whakaotirangi, referring to her instead as 'another of Hoturoa's wives'. In his 1854 publication, which was written in te reo Māori, Grey writes word for word what Te Whiwhi wrote, until it comes to mentioning Whakaotirangi. He omits her name from that text also, writing instead "ka whaka-tika mai *tetahi o nga wahine a Hoturoa*, ka whakahuatia te karakia" (my italics) (p. 76). In his 1855 English-language publication he translated this as "one of Hoturoa's wives fixed it (the situation); she recited the chant." This is what he writes also in his 1855 English translation publication (see p. 14).<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> A third edition of *Nga Mahi a nga Tupuna*, published in 1928 and edited by H. W. Williams, contains "additional matter from the Grey MSS" (n.p.). Here, information in relation to "*tetahi o nga wahine a Hoturoa*", as dictated by

Grey's omission of Whakaotirangi's name, especially in relation to her recitation of the karakia, is significant for Tainui. The deliberate obscuring of a Tainui ancestress whose name and activities appear in the earlier accounts by Māori illustrates colonial meddling and manipulation of traditional history. Grey could be considered what van Dijk (2013) calls an "elite member" of a powerful social group (p. 356). Elite members have more or less exclusive access to information, such as Grey had. His work allowed him access to the informers, and he was able to pay them. He thus had the power to control or manage what information was dispersed, informed according to his own philosophy and morality. Henige (1982)'s "conspiracy of silence" (p. 73), wherein people and/or events are systematically expunged from historical accounts is pertinent here.

George Grey (1853, 1854, 1855, 1857) befriended high born chiefs and asked them to write manuscripts for him which he first published in Māori under his own name. Grey altered oral traditions by cut-and-pasting between manuscripts from different tribes. In this way, he created new cross-tribal versions of traditions in his main publication which he published in te reo Māori (the Māori language) called *Ko ngā mahinga a ngā tūpuna Māori* (1854). The following year he republished the work in English as *Polynesian mythology and ancient traditional history of the New Zealand race* (1855) making further changes in the translations to satisfy his intended Pākehā audience. Notwithstanding this manipulation, Grey recorded and thereby preserved a substantial amount of manuscript oral tradition that may well have been lost (Sinclair, 2007) through the persistently exploitative patriarchal colonist regime that followed. Grey could be considered to be the most important collector of traditions indeed, "one of the earliest published collections of Maori traditional material ... also the most reliable" (Simmons, 1966, p. 178); such is the large volume of them (personal communication R. Taonui, 2006). Grey's work has been viewed as a comparative analysis device alongside the accounts from the Tainui men mentioned above.

---

Te Rangihaeata, is introduced together with that already presented by Te Arawa and first published by Grey in 1853. (see Grey, 1928, p. 65). Typically, Grey gives no credit to the informants of the material he uses. It is only by matching Grey's publications with original manuscripts that it becomes clear whose work he uses for the particular aspects of the histories he is retelling.



This rendering accords Grey a degree of competency and accuracy in his work, but that depiction is called into question by his manipulation of Te Rangihaeata's account. Simmons (1966) also considers Grey's accounts "the most authoritative" (p. 178), yet Grey disregards the fuller Tainui traditions that tell of Whakaotirangi's power and position in Tainui tradition. The reason for his particular telling of the tradition probably is political in nature because of Grey's relationship and loyalty to his Te Arawa contact, Te Rangikaheke. Te Rangikaheke was said to be a "skilled orator and a man with a profound knowledge of Maori lore and tradition" (Curnow, 1983, p. 5). He had also supplied Grey with some 800 manuscript pages of Māori history and Grey paid Te Rangikaheke for the information that he provided. Thus, it seems that Grey not only neglects an important aspect of Tainui history for apparent political advantage, but also socially diminishes the wider and more powerful role attributed to Whakaotirangi (women) in the earlier Tainui accounts.

### **The written account by William Colenso**

William Colenso, a missionary, wrote *Contributions towards a Better Knowledge of the Māori Race*. While his collection of oral traditions was not as substantial as Grey's, Colenso also helped preserve Māori traditions and knowledge that may otherwise have been lost. His work has been used minimally in this research but again it has served as a comparative analysis tool. Colenso, a missionary, arrived in Aotearoa New Zealand in late 1834. Also a printer by trade, he founded the printing industry in New Zealand (Mackay, 1990), so serving an important role in the newly colonised colony. In his book, published in 1881, *Contributions towards a Better Knowledge of the Māori Race*, he had this to say about Whakaotirangi:

The Thames Maoris ... assert that the kumara was the first brought from "Hawaiki" by the chiefs Hotunui and Hoturoa, in their canoe called Tainui ... the kumara was brought by the lady-wives of those two chiefs, named Marama and Whakaotirangi, together with the *hue* (*Cucurbita* sp.), the *aute* (*Broussonetia papyrifera*), and the *para* (*Marattia salicina*), and, also, the *karaka* ... A portion of this story is so good that it deserves to be fully translated. I therefore, give it.

"When the canoe, Tainui, had been dragged across the portage at Tamaki (near the head of the Hauraki Gulf), -and reached Manukau (on the West Coast), they coasted south to Kawhia; landing there, those two ladies (Marama and Whakaotirangi) proceeded to plant

the various roots they had brought with them from ‘Hawaiki.’ This they did in two separate plantations, at a place called Te Papa-o-karewa in Kawhia; but when those several roots sprung and grew up, they all turned out differently. Of those planted by Marama, the kumara produced a *pobue* (*Convolvulus sepium*), the *bue* produced a *manbai* (*Sicyos angulatus*), the *aute* produced a *whau* (*Entelea arborescens*), and the *para* produced a *borokio*. All the plantings of Marama grew wrong and strangely, and that was owing to her having transgressed with one of her male slaves. But the plantings of Whakaotirangi all came up true to their various sorts, and from them the whole island was subsequently supplied. Hence, too, arose the proverb, which has been handed down to us, -‘Greatly blessed (*or* gladdened) art thou, O food-basket of Whakaotirangi!’ So let all Maoris know, that from the canoe Tainui came her kumaras, her *bues*, her *autes*, and her *paras*, and her *karakas* (which last, sprang from the used skids which her crew had brought away in her), and, also, her *kiores* (rats).” (pp. 41–42)

#### ***Account summary and context***

Colenso names ‘the Thames Maoris’, who are Ngāti Maru, as counsel for this tradition about Whakaotirangi and Marama. (Thames is where Hoani Nahe came from, see earlier in this chapter.) In doing so, he gives readers a sense of authenticity in relation to this particular piece of work. Thames Māori is not only a vague and loose reference but also an impersonal one because it assigns the tradition to a non-specific identity.

Colenso mixes tradition as previously recounted (that of the planting of seeds by Whakaotirangi and Marama) with additional, new information (that two brothers were married to the two women), thus producing a different version of the tradition, which is confusing when compared to the earlier accounts. Colenso’s account points to reconstitution of several other aspects of the tradition about Whakaotirangi and Marama, most particularly in terms of marital status. For example, whereas the Tainui tribal accounts refer to Whakaotirangi and Marama as Hoturoa’s wives, Colenso states that two men, Hoturoa and Hotunui, were married to the two women.<sup>26</sup> Rawiri Taonui (personal communication, May 4, 2009) explains that Tainui Waikato

---

<sup>26</sup> According to Simmons’ (1976) research, Ngāti Maru wrote two accounts about Tainui. It was this Tainui group who used the name Hotunui as an ancestor (p. 174) (see also White, 1888, pp. 31–60). Relatively recent documentation that Tainui made landfall and occupied Whanga-parāoa on the east coast (Bateman, 1997) is a later

iwi name Hoturoa as the captain of Tainui waka, while Tainui Hauraki identify Hotunui as the captain of Tainui. These men are possibly the same people who, over time, came to be referred to independently. Without having these circumstances explained, Colenso's account could be construed as a new version of the tradition relating to the peopling of Tainui waka.

### *Analysis*

Colenso's rearranging of the marital status of Whakaotirangi and Marama is likely to have been influenced by his missionary status. He may have found it difficult (if not impossible) to accept, let alone record in writing, that two women could be married to one man. According to Biggs (1966), most missionaries were unsympathetic to Māori beliefs and social and political practice; their mission was to convert Māori to Christianity, complete with its culturally overlaid mores such as monogamous marriage. As Biggs also observes, this aim meant that they tended to gloss over or ignore details of Māori oral traditions, which they tended to consider "works of the devil" (p. 1).

Colenso makes no reference to Whakaotirangi's importance in Tainui tradition, referring to her as a 'lady', which conjures up an image different to that of a powerful, potent ancient indigenous woman. His description suggests a white paternalistic conception of a lady. He may also, however, have used 'lady-wives' in an effort to acknowledge the women were of high birth, but I consider it a loose attempt to recognise their mana. Calling Marama and Whakaotirangi ladies while aligning them to gardening prowess could be construed as making fun of them rather than allowing their importance as high-born women of Tainui tradition. Colenso's first mention of Whakaotirangi and Marama is as the wives of the two men, a positioning which also diminishes this importance.

Absent from Colenso's version is the account of Tainui waka becoming stuck at Ōtāhuhu. By choosing to leave this incident out of the retelling, Colenso again misses an opportunity to relay the powerful female positions that Whakaotirangi and Marama played with their recitations of potent karakia. This was likely a deliberate ploy on Colenso's part. As Kuni Jenkins (1988, p. 161) points out:

---

regional split of Tainui. Kelly (1949) notes that the name Hotunui is used at times instead of Hoturoa. He says that the Hauraki tribes use the name mistakenly, believing it to be the name of Hoturoa's father. Kelly therefore argues that this claim should be disregarded because it is unreliable (p. 57).

Western civilization, when it arrived in Aotearoa's shore, did not allow its womenfolk any power at all—they were merely chattels in some cases less worthy than the men's horses. What the colonizer found was a land of noble savages narrating ... stories of the wonder of women. Their myths and beliefs had to be reshaped and retold. The missionaries were hell-bent (heaven-bent) on destroying their pagan ways. Hence, in the re-telling of our myths, by Māori male informants to Pākehā male writers who lacked the understanding and significance of Māori cultural beliefs, Māori women find their mana wahine destroyed.

Thus, Colenso's renderings destabilise Tainui women's tradition. He critiques and ironizes women's positions by treating as rhetoric the oral traditions about their influential positions.

Colenso's parting comment, "So let all Maoris know ..." demonstrates an impersonal and detached status that fits his opening comment: "A portion of this story is so good that it deserves to be fully translated. I therefore, give it." The oral tradition is to Colenso nothing more than a story, albeit with some titivation, a *good* story. Colenso, as a member of a socially powerful group (a missionary and a printer), sanctions the tradition as a story fit only for Māori. Further, as a member of the powerful group, he takes the liberty of reconstituting an important piece of Tainui history.

### **The written account by John White**

John White compiled and published a major collection of Māori narratives. He arrived in New Zealand in 1834 and gained the attention of Grey when he sent him several manuscripts in the late 1840's. White was commissioned as an ethnographer and worked on an official Māori history between 1879 and 1889. Bishop H. Williams said White had "mutilated his authorities" (cited in Grey, 1928, p. 199). White was criticised for not being discriminating about his information, accepting quantity over quality, paying informants and cut-and-paste editing (1990a, p. 45). While White can be censured for his deficiencies, the extent of his cut-and-paste editing has been exaggerated. White has divided traditions according to themes such as traditions about Māui or by canoe region but he did not alter traditions, nor did he add new material to them or invent stories as other Pākehā had. White has arranged histories thematically, he softened sexual content and he occasionally mistranslated (Gordon-Burns & Taonui, 2010). In a lecture White gave in 1860, he said, "Nearly all my best tales are tainted with indecency" (O'Leary, nd). White's collection is immense and included material from all the then existing archives plus material he collected from over 300 informants. White, who served as one of the early Wesleyan missionaries in New Zealand, compiled and published a major collection of Māori narratives

called *The Ancient History of the Maori* (1887–1890), which, according to some commentators (see, for example, Reilly, 1989) are the country’s most extensive such collection. White accessed the words of Nahe in his account of Whakaotirangi. Because these are presented above, there is no need to reproduce them again here. While White did not always acknowledge Nahe as the narrator, a systematic working through of the available manuscripts and comparing the information in them makes the origin of the narration obvious.

Rather than editing the oral traditions, White provides a variety of iwi opinions on origins and early histories. He explains this approach thus: “Maori history is a tangled mass, and to unravel it, and introduce anything like order and arrangement would be only to destroy its distinguishing feature” (White, 1856, cited in Hammond, 1924, n.p.). In his 1887–1890 volumes of *The Ancient History of the Maori*, White presents contrasting versions of Te Arawa and Tainui traditions, and in consultation with Nga-ti-Hau of Te Arawa, he writes that Whakaotirangi and Marama were sisters to supreme leaders Hoturoa, Hotu matapu and Hotu ope of Tainui. He does not attempt to explain the different accounts within his publications, which was perhaps wise considering his dependence on Māori to provide him with these, but this lack also contributes to the increasing confusion over the accuracy of various elements of the accounts.

### *Analysis*

As with Grey before him, who largely consulted Rangikaheke, White’s information about Whakaotirangi draws, for the most part, on one source, Nahe.<sup>27</sup> White neglects the earlier accounts telling of Whakaotirangi’s power and spiritual connections as well as the guidance embodied in the vast quantities of kūmara that she produced. This disregard of Whakaotirangi’s earlier traditions means that the most influential aspect of Whakaotirangi in White’s writings is that of a planter and harvester of kūmara. Missing is the broader societal view of her; the details of her important parentage, her female agency during building of Tainui waka and her role in dispersing Tainui peoples over large areas of their new land. This diminution of her history adds to the increasing vagueness in the accounts by the colonists about the extent of Māori women’s positions of power. The deeper political and social existences evident in the earlier accounts have become limited. In essence, by the late 1800s, it seems reasonable to suggest that Tainui

---

<sup>27</sup> Biggs (1966) considered Grey and White’s publications housed “much of the best material” on localised traditions (p. 1).

women's traditions have become truncated through patriarchal antipathy and apathy. Grey's (and White's) observations of indigenous peoples and his progressive patriarchal assimilationist views have likely coloured how he (they) observed and what was documented.

## **Post-1900 Tainui Sources**

### **The published accounts by Leslie G. Kelly**

Leslie G. Kelly published a collection of Tainui traditions in 1949 titled *Tainui: The Story of Hoturoa and His Descendants*. In the preface to this book, Princess Te Puea Herangi acknowledges Kelly's work collecting the traditions.<sup>28</sup> She also notes that the lack of communication between Tainui and Pākehā following the Pākehā land wars and confiscations of Tainui lands advantaged the safe-keeping of Tainui lore. This was because kuia and kaumātua decided not to disclose the traditions to Pākehā because of the sufferings the iwi had experienced at Pākehā hands and the lack of trust they had for them. According to Princess Te Puea, as she was generally known, the absence of Pākehā knowledge about Tainui traditions meant that the cultural and spiritual heritages of these accounts held true in *Tainui* (see Kelly, 1949, p. v).

*Tainui* was one of the first books on Tainui traditions to be published intra-tribally since the earlier outsider colonial books. Fragments of Whakaotirangi's tradition can be found throughout the book. Information about her is therefore not housed in one specific section or chapter. I systematically picked out these pieces of text and have added, where necessary, information or other small edits so that the context of the written piece is clear. Brackets [ ] identify these insertions.

According to them [Tainui authorities] their real reason [for leaving the homeland] was to search for a new home in New Zealand, the existence of which was known to them. (p. 33)

The decision [had] finally been made to leave Hawaiki ... The following is the account of Te 'Tahnua Herangi: "There was an aged priestly woman named Mahurangi (also called Maruanuku) and it was she who directed Rakataura to build a canoe. "Rakataura then asked her: 'Me pewhea te mahi o te waka?' (How shall the canoe be made?). She replied: Me titiro e koe ki te aranga o te marama hou, kia ara a mua, kia ara a muri."

---

<sup>28</sup> Te Puea Herangi was the daughter of Tiahuia, sister to King Mahuta (he was the third king). Te Puea supported her sickly cousin Te Rata (who was Mahuta's son) when he became king. She became known in her own right as a leader of her people and was called Princess Te Puea.

(Look you to the rising of the new moon; make a rising at the front and a rising at the rear.) (p. 34)

... it should be remembered that the forests and things connected therewith, were all highly *tapu* (sacred) to Tane, the forest god, and the taking of some of his property could be accomplished only after the due observance of the correct rites. Ceremonial incantations were repeated and offerings left near the spot, as also were certain articles known to be potent combatants of *tapu*. Of the last mentioned, the menses of a high-born or priestly woman would ensure the immediate flight of any forest gods from the vicinity. (p. 35)

Te Ao-te-rangi in his account says: “The new canoe of Hoturoa was now launched on the waters of the sea and paddled about to test her seaworthiness ... (pp. 38–39)

The following is a list of persons said to have formed the crew of Tainui. Women: Whakaotirangi, Marama, Amonga, Torere, Kahukeke, Takahiroa, Keataketake (Kearoa), Hinewai, Whaenemurutio, Hineihi. When all was ready the people took their places in the canoe ... Behind Taikahu sat Taininihi who carried the *kura*, after which sat Taihaua, Kuiamara, Whakaotirangi, and Marama, and last of all, in the stern, sat Hoturoa. (p. 40)

Te Arawa, continues George Graham, had by this time, also entered the gulf, and at Rangitoto island both canoes met, while the two crews were together at this place, Tamatekapua made advances to Whakaotirangi, the chief wife of Hoturoa, but his action was detected by the Tainui leader, who thereupon gave him a severe beating in which some of the former’s blood was shed. (p. 51)

... preparations were made to drag Tainui across the isthmus to Manukau. Skids were laid and when all was ready the people took up position to haul the canoe, but Tainui refused to move ... it was then disclosed by Ruikiuta that he had detected Marama in an adulterous love affair ... and that it would be unwise to move until the necessary rites had been performed ... after some delay this was done ... [the account does not mention by whom, but according to the context of the text it appears to be Ruikiuta]. (p. 52)

The first act of Hoturoa on arrival was to erect his *tuahu* named Ahurei, after which he ordered the planting of the precious seeds which had been so carefully brought from Hawaiki. Te Tahuna Herangi says: “The people therefore immediately set about preparing cultivation and at the new moon, Te Tapouritanga-o-te-marama, the seeds of the *kumara*, *taro*, and *hue* were planted.”

Shortly after, says Te Aoterangi, Hoturoa left his wife Whakaotirangi, and went to live with Marama-kiko-hura, with the result that Whakaotirangi departed from Maketu and went to Pakarikari, close to the adjacent harbour of Aotea, where she formed a settlement. Whakaotirangi was the principal wife of Hoturoa and by him she had Poutu-keka who had grown to manhood in Hawaiki, and where also he had taken his

two wives Amonga and Takahiroa. The youngest son Hotuawhio lived with his mother and went with her to Pakarikari.

At this place Whakaotirangi prepared her land to grow the *kumara*, which she had personally brought from Hawaiki. She first made the divisions between the mounds after which she made the soil friable and rooted up the fern. She sheltered her cultivation with branches of trees and then sloped the ground in distances apart. Finally, when the time was right, she instructed her son to bring Hoturoa to perform the *pure* or *tapu*-lifting ceremony over her cultivation.

Accordingly, Hotuawhio went to his father and said: “I ki mai a Whakaotirangi kia haere atu koe kia kite koe i a ia; e tata ana te mate.” (Whakaotirangi says for you to come and see her; she is near death.) Hoturoa felt sorry for the way in which he had neglected his first wife, and so returned with Hotuawhio to Pakarikari. When they arrived at a point overlooking the settlement and Hoturoa saw the cultivation he wept at the sight of the food from Hawaiki.

Hotuawhio now said: “Ko te take tenei i tikina atu ai koe.” (This is the reason you were sent for.)

The thoughts of Hoturoa now went back to his far-away homeland and he sang a lament after which he went to the village and wept over Whakaotirangi. His wife then arose and said: “Tamahua te maara nei. Tenei ano nga puke tuatahi me te tuarua, te mea ma te tane me ta te wahine.” (Perform you the ceremony to ensure the fruitfulness of this cultivation. Here is the first hillock and here the second, one for the male, the other for the female.)

So Hoturoa lit a sacred fire and performed the *pure* ceremony. The cultivation was then given the name Hawaiki after which Hoturoa lived on with Whakaotirangi. When the crop had reached maturity Whakaotirangi instructed Hoturoa to take a portion of the *kumara* to Hapopo who had taken up his residence at Te Akau. This he accordingly did and on arrival the *kumara* were taken to a place called Angaroa where they were planted with all ceremony, and at the conclusion of which a stone was erected as a *mauri* or sacred offering. This *mauri* is described as a *tara* or charm known by the name of Moreore. The stone itself was given the name Te Rukuruku o Whakaotirangi (The Small Basket of Whakaotirangi), a reference to the original small number of seed-*kumara* brought by her from Hawaiki. (pp. 63–64)

Genealogical Tables. Grandparents: Tuwhakararo=Apakura. Parents: Tainui=Hine-i-te-pere. Older brother: Taikahu. Older sister: Whakaotinuku. (p. 454)

### ***Account summary and context***

In the foreword to *Tainui*, Kelly lists 17 men who have assisted with material and advice for the production of *Tainui* and he acknowledges but one woman, Princess Te Puea Herangi. It is pertinent to mention this fact because the book, focused as it is on male adventure and discovery,



alludes to womanly intervention in only one or two instances, and is a matter I discuss within the analysis of Kelly's work below.

The information that Kelly provides about Whakaotirangi in his book presents her as a woman of note for Tainui. Kelly links her to recognised rangatira, such as her father, Tainui (although he only does this within a whakapapa table), and her husband Hoturoa. He represents her mother and grandmother, Hine-i-te-pere and Apakura respectively, but also in a whakapapa table only. Although Kelly says that he consulted many texts, including Aoterangi's account, and kaumātua in his retelling of Tainui history, he leaves out significant portions of text that attest to Whakaotirangi's importance. Missing, for example, is the account of Whakaotirangi approaching her father about her desire to travel to the lands of her ancestor Kupe and any discussion about the mauri of Puranga (important Tainui motifs) that she had been given charge of. Instead, Kelly presents Tainui people's journey to the new lands and, once there, within the context of an account that highlights Hoturoa's exploits.

Kelly states that the woman who offered advice on the building of Tainui waka was the aged and priestly woman Māhurangi or Maruanuku. This information came to him from Te Tāhuna Herangi, the father to Te Puea, and so cannot be ignored. It conveys that Māori women had held considerable powers and roles in ritual matters as priestly women. According to Jones and Biggs (1995), Mahurangi's advice appears to signify that the Hawaiki-based ancestors of Tainui had no previous memory of how to build the type of waka needed for this journey. Mahurangi was asked for example how the canoe should be shaped (see p. 18) and she replied that it should be shaped like the new moon.

Kelly's mention of the potent power of menses is likely to have come from Te Puea and is a bold and frank addition to his text given the strictures, at the time of his writing, throughout New Zealand society on matters menstrual. Recent research highlights the tapu and special place of menstrual blood pre-colonisation (see, for example, Murphy, 2011, pp. 53, 82), with Māori men and women alike honouring the strong connection between woman power and the earth. The arrival of the early 1800 missionaries and colonists, however, meant such matters were treated with disgust and silenced. Elsewhere in *Tainui*, Kelly mentions Torere being "visited with her sickness" and so being set ashore (see p. 50), thereby reverting back to a white male-imposed ideology of disease, pollution and oppression about an important womanly event which had not been thought of in these ways by Māori prior to colonisation.

Unlike Aoterangi, Kelly makes no reference to Whakaotirangi's role in building Tainui waka. And despite having seen Aoterangi's manuscript, which states that the canoe belonged to Whakaotirangi and Hoturoa, Kelly writes, "The new canoe of Hoturoa was now launched" (p. 38), thus eliminating her from this powerfully functional position of leadership. Kelly does mention Whakaotirangi first in his list of women who travelled aboard Tainui waka, together with her seating arrangements once on it, thus denoting her position as a central chief woman. This placement on the waka was a particularly important one because it enabled observance of all activities on board. While Kelly may have provided this information in order to illustrate Whakaotirangi's standing, it also allowed that she sat there as the wife of Hoturoa, who captained the waka.

Kelly (see also Graham, 1951) draws readers' attention to the fact that Whakaotirangi was a desirable woman; she may have been a very handsome woman, and she certainly had great mana because of her whakapapa and her marriage to Hoturoa. As Kelly narrates, Tamatekapua's advances to Whakaotirangi when the Tainui and Te Arawa peoples met at what became known as Rangitoto Island led to Hoturoa giving Tamatekapua "a severe beating" (see p. 51), which caused his nose to bleed. In this way, Kelly deals with the Te Arawa claim of Tamatekapua having taken Whakaotirangi from Tainui (see also Rangikaheke, 1849b; Tarakawa, 1893).

Kelly's account also documents Hoturoa's decision to live with Marama, who was his second and much younger wife. Whakaotirangi was an older woman; she had a grown family and was a grandmother to Hāpopo through her oldest son Poutūkeka. However, it was while Hoturoa was with Marama that Whakaotirangi established the kūmara gardens that became synonymous with her name and importance. Here, Kelly not only supports the earlier writings about her significance, dedication and experience but also, like Aoterangi before him, shows how her development of the gardens provides a means of naming and claiming important Tainui land marks and iwi land holdings.

Another significant feature in Kelly's retelling is the place of complementarity—a traditional indigenous reality invisibilised by colonial accounts<sup>29</sup> but now being made visible again by contemporary Māori writers researching this duality in early iwi accounts (see, for

---

<sup>29</sup> For examples of complementarity, see Bachofen (1972) Diner (1965), Göttner-Abendroth (1999) and Gunn Allen (1992).

example, Mikaere, 1999, 2011; Murphy, 2011). In *Tainui*, the relevant text features Whakaotirangi inviting Hoturoa to perform karakia rites over her garden, at which point Kelly specifically mentions the male and female hillocks. This detail is perhaps another Te Puea addition, as it is not captured in any of the earlier accounts. Further research on the significance of the male and female elements within the oral traditions would be worthwhile in terms of supporting discourse around complementarity.

Hoturoa, as traditional Tainui oral tradition dictates, is overwhelmed at the extent of the gardens and Whakaotirangi's work in this regard. The capacity of her effort was such that the tubers and traditions about her spread throughout the area, establishing her primary place as a woman of power and importance within the traditions of the origin of kūmara.

### *Analysis*

Kelly pays some attention to providing a cumulative tradition by naming Whakaotirangi's mother and grandmother, a feature not included in other accounts. However, in ignoring aspects of Aoterangi's text, Kelly maintains notions of men as highly skilled adventurers and conquerors, and women, who are rarely mentioned, as supporting the men in their pursuits.

Kelly's failure to mention an important incident included in Te Rangihaeata's narration, namely the karakia performed by Marama and Whakaotirangi at Ōtāhuhu, further represses the two women's potent woman power and aligns with the dominant white male social constructions where women's behaviours and importance are monitored and silenced. Kelly does give an account of the aged and priestly woman Māhurangi or Maruanuku and her significant instructive role in the building of Tainui waka in Hawaiki. However, in not mentioning the equally important contribution of the karakia at Ōtāhuhu, Kelly seems to attribute womanly power as an attribute exercised in the homelands, not the new lands. His reimaging exemplifies the post-colonial exclusion of Māori women in valuable roles that define their importance in rituals of tribal significance.

Omission of meaningful historical text about women is typical of gendered histories, which reinforce womanly roles as those that accord with patriarchal hierarchical discourses. Failure to narrate the high regard for Whakaotirangi's spiritual and leadership attributes that Te Whiwhi and Aoterangi relate aligns Kelly's renderings more with the colonial patriarchal accounts of Grey and others than with the earlier accounts. This omission by Kelly at a time when Māori men

such as he were writing and publishing their iwi accounts themselves rather than relying on non-Māori to do this was an opportunity for women heroes to be seen and heard within the literature. The contemporary voicelessness of a powerful woman, such as Whakaotirangi, silences that power. That silencing, in turn, shifts the boundaries and norms of women's possibilities, a situation problematic for women in general and, within the context of this thesis, Māori women in particular (see Spender, 1982, Mikaere, 2011).

Kelly does leave intact the account of Whakaotirangi's superb horticultural skills, possibly because this role is one that could be safely portrayed within a patriarchal retelling. Husbandry and its connection with the land and nurturing can be taken within a patriarchal discourse as an appropriate role for a woman, and also, perhaps, as a less powerful association to maintain, given that women influential in karakia and ritual ostensibly present a challenge to hegemonic patriarchal power structures.

### **The published account by Pei Te Hurinui Jones and Bruce Biggs**

Pei Te Hurinui Jones is of Ngāti Maniapoto descent. Te Hurinui-Jones was described by Apirana Ngata as a Māori scholar, he had written numerous articles in both Māori and English, and, after Ngata died, Pei went on to translate the songs that had been collected by him. Te Hurinui-Jones has contributed additional rich material to this study; in particular that of the translations he provides and conversations he has had with the elders which he has recorded in some detail. Jones and Biggs, also of Ngāti Maniapoto descent, provide translations of Tainui traditions as well as conversations with Tainui elders that were recorded in some detail. *Nga iwi o Tainui*, a work that Jones spent considerable time on, was completed and published posthumously in 1995 by Bruce Biggs. As I did with the publication by Kelly, I drew out and analysed the available information about Whakaotirangi in *Nga iwi o Tainui: The Traditional History of the Tainui People*. Kelly's and the Biggs and Jones' accounts are similar in some respects, probably because the three men lived in the Tainui rohe, had the same iwi-related interests and connections and occasionally accessed the same informants. Importantly, both of these publications are valuable resources as the first published from Tainui tribal members. As men however, Kelly and Jones and Biggs have carefully maintained the prevalence for images of fabulous tribal lore that sees men in patriarchal positions of power and glory.

... some people considered leaving that land ... those who decided to leave ... were all related. When Hoturoa's people decided to make a canoe, Whakaotirangi, one of Hoturoa's wives, went to her father, Memeha-o-te-rangi, to get Puranga, a talisman from Uenuku's house. (p. 16)

Te Taahuna Herangi says "I heard these stories from my elders: 'Tainui was a child, who, at birth was formed from the chest to the head, but from the waist down to the feet there was nothing. So it was buried. Not long afterwards a tree sprang up and as that tree grew, all kinds of trees grew at that spot, a real forest. The name of that place was Maunga-roa, in Hawaiki ... the child's name was Tainui.' Hiria Hoete says 'Whakaotirangi ... was a grand-daughter of Tainui.' (p. 18)

"... he [Raka] said to a wise old woman named Maahu-rangi (Maru-a-nuku according to some), 'How should the canoe be built?' Maahu-rangi replied, 'Look at the horns of the new moon, raised in front and back. Let the bow be raised. Let the stern be raised.' [Jones and Biggs relay a karakia recited by Maahu-rangi] (p. 18)

"The names ... of those people [women] who came here on *Tainui*, are the following: Whaka-otirangi (wahine a Hoturoa), Marama-kiko-hura (wahine iti a Hoturoa), Kahu-keke (tamaahine a Hoturoa), Kearoa (wahine a Ngaatoro-i-rangi), Whaene-muru-tio (tuahine o Raka-taaura), Hine-puanga-nui-a-rangi (tuahine o Raka-taaura), Hee-ara (tuahine anoo o Raka-taaura), Amonga (wahine a Pou-tuukeka), Takahi-roa (wahine anoo a Pou-tuukeka), Kahu-tuiroa, Hinewai." (pp. 28, 29)

Tainui reached the headwaters of Taamaki at Whaangai-makau, near Ootaahuhu ... At this point there are many conflicting statements in the traditions. [Jones and Biggs repeat Aoterangi's narration]. (p. 42)

On reaching Kaawhia the first task of the Tainui people was to grow food. Hoturoa went and pointed out the places for plantations and dwelling sites of his people and they began to work on their gardens. The foods they planted, brought from Hawaiki, were kumara (*Ipomoea batatas*), taro (*Colocasis esculentum*) and hue (*Lagenaria* sp.). The kumara had been brought by Whakaotirangi in her basket, hence the saying 'the small food-basket of Whakaotirangi' ... they settled all around Kaawhia. When they reached there Hoturoa left Whakaotirangi, his senior wife, and lived with his junior wife, Marama-of-the-exposed-body ... Whakaotirangi was aging at that time; she and Hoturoa had grandchildren in Hawaiki. One of their children, Pou-tuukeka, had married his wives Te Amonga and Takahi-roa in Hawaiki, and Haapopo was their grandchild when they crossed from Hawaiki. Their youngest child, Hotu-aawhio, stayed with the mother, Whakaotirangi, when Hoturoa left her. (p. 52)

Whakaotirangi lived at Paa-karikari and made her garden there. It was called Hawaiki. She cleared the ground herself and made the planting mounds and strewed them with compost so that her kumara would grow well. When Whakaotirangi's garden work was done she sent her child Hotu-aawhio to fetch his father, Hoturoa. She told her child what to say. Hotu-aawhio went to the father and said, 'Whakaoti told me to get you to go to her before she dies.' Hoturoa felt sorry and went. Arriving above

Whakaotirangi's home he saw the kuumara garden. Hoturoa wept at the sight of the food from Hawaiki. Then the child said, 'This is the real reason you were fetched,' after weeping, Hoturoa went down to the house and wept with Whakaotirangi, and then she said, 'Recite the *pure* ritual for my garden so that it will be fruitful. This mound is the *tama-taane* and that one the *tama-wahine*.' Hoturoa chanted the ritual, the fire was lit, the food cooked, and all was done according to the *pure* ritual. Hoturoa went back to Whakaotirangi and lived with her again. (p. 54)

Te Arawa say that Whakaotirangi was on board their canoe, and was the wife of Tama-te-kapua. Well, the history of Hoturoa and Whakaotirangi and their grandchild born in Hawaiki has been told. Now this is what the elders of Tainui say about Te Arawa's story: Whakaoti-rangi had a younger twin sister named Whakaoti-nuku, and she was the one who married Tama-te-kapua. (p. 54)

The time for harvesting arrived and the kuumara were dug. Hotu-aawhio was sent by his mother to take some as seed to her grandchild Haapopo, who was living at Te Aakau. Hotu-aawhio reached Te Aakau and Haapopo's garden was made there at a place called Anga-roa. Hotu-aawhio also took a stone mauri for Haapopo's garden; it was named The Food-basket-of-Whakaotirangi, and it is still there today. It is a magic stone known as a mauri moo-oreore. (p. 56)

#### ***Account summary and context***

Whereas Aoterangi stated that the preparations for the trip from the homelands began after Whakaotirangi had asked her father for the mauri Puanga (which Jones and Biggs call Puranga), Jones and Biggs credit the instigation of the journey to 'Hoturoa's people'. In explicitly positioning Hoturoa as the leader and organiser of a "social group", they assign Whakaotirangi a passive role as one of his 'people', which is not how Aoterangi positioned her. Jones and Biggs then return to Aoterangi's narration in relation to the mauri, Puranga, which was a crucial motif for Tainui and for Whakaotirangi.

Kaumātua Te Tāhuna Herangi relays Tainui tradition about the ancestor called Tainui, and kaumātua Hiria Hoete connects Tainui to Whakaotirangi by identifying him as her grandfather, thus making an important association between her and an eponymous ancestor. Jones and Biggs provide the same discourse as Kelly in relation to the priestly woman Māhurangi or Maruanuku, when they describe her as a 'wise old woman' who offered advice in the building of Tainui waka. Wise old women (and men) were critical for the handing down of Māori tribal knowledges; their input was essential (Gunn Allen, 1992; Mikaere, 1999; Murphy, 2011) in maintaining tikanga and a connectedness with tradition. Jones and Biggs, as did Kelly, emphasise Māhurangi's important contribution and in doing so identify the importance of seeking advice

from those of experience. Jones and Biggs furthermore reiterate women's fundamental role in ritual karakia through their presentation of Māhurangi's karakia. Provided, too, is the list of women who came on the Tainui waka, with Whakaotirangi again positioned at the forefront, indicating her key position in the affairs of her people.

### *Analysis*

Like Aoterangi, Nahe, and Kelly, Jones and Biggs do not associate Whakaotirangi with the important ritual karakia spoken in response to the waka becoming stuck at Ōtāhuhu. We have read already of women's responsibility for and presence in sacred ceremonies, so the silencing of Whakaotirangi (and Marama) at this celebrated event constitutes a patriarchal social power discussed above. Each of these male writers produced their accounts post-missionary, whose doctrine espoused male deities (father, son and the Holy Ghost). We have seen how their phallic ethos permeated the oral traditions and gradually erased female prominence in the spiritual realm. Mikaere (1999) discusses other post-missionary events where once celebrated and powerful ancestresses, such as Papatūānuku and Hine-ahu-one, have had their identities neutralised also.

Jones and Biggs (as did Kelly) focus on Hoturoa and his leadership role in the apportioning of land for gardens, but they maintain Whakaotirangi's tradition of the bringing of kūmara, which is a constant motif throughout each of the narrations and texts, socially constructed as it is to represent female endeavours of food supply. This discourse has a wider currency in that it reinforces sex-role stereotyping in which Hoturoa (men) set the geographical boundaries (adventure, action, agency and potential power) while women grow the food (domesticated, neutral and passive).

Jones and Biggs introduce the notion that Hoturoa elected to live with Marama because Whakaotirangi was aging, a supposition not previously noted but which could appear as authentic Tainui tradition because of Jones and Biggs, with their well-acclaimed profile in relation to iwi history, having produced it. It could also be taken as reliable because a good portion of their account does follow the earliest documented tradition. Again, Whakaotirangi is positioned as passive, the submissive recipient of Hoturoa's action, and Jones and Biggs embed a sexist message in their representation, that of men abandoning their older wives for younger

women. This addition to her account is not only an ambiguous one but also an imposition on her mana.

The two authors furthermore support and therefore normalise discussion relating to Whakaotirangi's kūmara garden endeavours. But yet again, the discourse elected to reproduce her abilities with horticulture misrepresents the pattern and existence of her power described by the earlier Tainui narrators, Te Whiwhi and Aoterangi.

Jones and Biggs write that Whakaotirangi is of Tainui waka, while Whakaotinuku, who they say is her younger twin sister (Kelly positions her as an older sister in his whakapapa tables; see p. 444), is the ancestress of Te Arawa. It is possible that names became fused or confused over time. Importantly, though, the authors maintain Whakaotirangi's significance with respect to kūmara and its distribution throughout the land, events that became well researched and widely accepted as reliable during the 20th-century (see Best, 1925; Phillips, 1989; Robertson, 1957). Jones and Biggs' citing of whakapapa, the delineation of the extent of Tainui lands through Whakaotirangi's grandson Hāpopo and the distribution of kūmara, and the whakataukī discourse are also all in keeping with the earliest extant accounts of Whakaotirangi's traditions.

As with Kelly's *Tainui*, Jones and Biggs' *Nga iwi o Tainui* provide accounts that can be readily compared with those of the earlier Māori and Pākehā writers. Such a comparison shows that by the time these two publications appear, Whakaotirangi's absolute autonomy in relation to her spiritual attributes and previous experiences with Tainui waka has become socially reconstituted to present her as having no role at worst and being passive at best. Furthermore, Hoturoa's status has now been boosted to that of a dominant and active leader. These positionings are in sharp contrast to the earliest accounts, which present an interrelationship between Hoturoa and Whakaotirangi arising out of their complementary chiefly roles.

As contemporary researchers and scholars within their own Māori communities and with ready opportunity to publish and distribute their writing, Kelly, Jones and Biggs' accounts would have had cogency. Overall, their representation of Whakaotirangi's traditions presents men, rather than women, as having and being celebrated for significantly powerful roles and attributes and lessens the ties of complementarity evident in the earlier accounts.



## Post-1900 Pākehā Sources

### The published account by Walter Gudgeon

Post-1900 Pākehā sources include men such as Walter Gudgeon, Elsdon Best and Stephenson Percy Smith (more usually known as Percy Smith). These men are mid-period writers and their accounts are where the most significant changes to the Tainui accounts occurred. Gudgeon, Best and Smith on invitation from each other were involved as co-founders or editors of the Polynesian Society which was established in 1891. Gudgeon promoted the white superiority regime, supported by comments he is said to have made about iwi differences in genealogies. Gudgeon believed “one correct genealogical sequence would eventually be established once Europeans had shown the fallacies. It would not be done by Maori since we Europeans have the critical faculty” (Ballara and Tapsell, 1996, p.499). Gudgeon wrote and published books under his father’s name, Thomas Wayth Gudgeon. His gendered and racial bias has been noticed in his retelling of Tainui oral tradition. In 1903, Gudgeon, who became a colonial administrator and Land Court judge after migrating to New Zealand from London, published *The Whence of the Maori*. Although he follows in it aspects of Tainui tradition given to him by others, he also tends to transmute the accounts. The following account is an example:

Most important of all the canoes of the final migration is that known as the Tainui ... in this canoe came the Chiefs Hoturoa and Rakataura, who are the ancestors of the confederacy called Waikato ... The leaders of the crew of Tainui were as follows:- Raka-taura was the priest and *Ariki*, Hoturoa was the war captain, and Te Peri, a female Patu-paiarehe (fairy), had authority over the fore part of the canoe, and assumed the functions of *Kapehu*, or presiding genius, whose duty it was not only to direct the course of the canoe, but also to guard against all evil. This semi-supernatural being was, it is said, the sister of one Tainui, who, many generations previously, had been buried at the foot of the tree from which the canoe was made, and so it came to pass that his name was given to the canoe, in recognition of the fact that the tree had been in some measure a *Tipua*. (pp. 55–56)

... her crew endeavoured to drag her over the portage into the Manuka harbour. They, however, failed in their attempt, partly because of the sin of Whakaoti-rangi, and in part because of the incantations of Rakataura ... these two causes combined rendered it beyond all human power to move Tainui overland. They were therefore compelled to follow the coast round the North Cape ... (p. 57)

### *Analysis*

Gudgeon does not name the informers for his rendition of Tainui oral tradition. His account, in normalising male spaces and invisibilising women, is a classic example of the patterns and rituals of power domination. Gudgeon references the important place of Tainui men in his discourse; he notes their roles as ‘chiefs’, ‘ancestors of the confederacy’ and ‘leaders’. He empowers Māori men while simultaneously absenting Māori women from the realm of leadership, power and potent spirituality.

Because Gudgeon was a founder of the Polynesian Society, where he wrote and published many articles about Māori society, his gendered and racist discourse was privileged. His position allowed him not only to erode the oral traditions but also to amplify the progression of erroneous discourse about the lesser place of Māori women. In Gudgeon’s account, the only female power during the voyage of Tainui waka is ascribed to Te Peri, a fairy. While there is evidence about the very real place of patupaiarehe, Māori fairies, in Māori lore (see Orbell, 1995, p. 38), Gudgeon’s rendition is a new discourse in terms of Tainui oral traditions (see those accounts above). In the absence of a balanced female historical presence within the tradition, his addition appears as a fantasy, a mock fable, set there to deride women’s place. Furthermore, his claim that Te Peri is the sister of Tainui (Whakaotirangi’s grandfather), who was buried in the homelands (see Jones & Biggs, 1995), aligns the patupaiarehe discourse with authentic tradition. In essence, Gudgeon takes known Tainui history and contaminates it with detail seemingly of his own devising.

Gudgeon mentions Whakaotirangi only once in his publication and that is when he says she committed a sin, an incident not evident in the earlier accounts about Whakotirangi. In all likelihood, he is confusing Whakaotirangi’s tradition with that of Marama, who is said in most of the accounts about her to have ‘transgressed’ (see Chapter Five). Gudgeon’s use of the word ‘sin’ is particularly interesting. It was first introduced into Tainui history by Mohi Turei in 1888 (this will be further explored in Marama’s chapter). That Whakaotirangi is now depicted as having sinned with no mention of her powerful qualities is problematic. This particular text by Gudgeon, written as it was for an intended non-Māori audience, brings into focus a white Christian male canon of Māori women as sinners from as far back as one of their most significant ancestresses. Use of the word sin has a devaluing effect on Whakaotirangi and her tradition. It implies degeneracy and debasement.

Gudgeon additionally ignores the tradition of the Ōtāhuhu incident and in so doing bypasses the Tainui accounts of the powerful karakia performed by ancestresses. Overall, his transmutation of accounts, his subtle and not so subtle rearranging of them, exemplifies patriarchal domination of what became known and unknown about Māori women and their place as and amongst leaders, tōhunga and spiritual advisors.

### **The published account by Elsdon Best**

Encouraged in his study of Māori history and culture Elsdon Best's writings at times contained "racial and evolutionary assumptions" (Sissons, 1993, p. 40). While interested in Māori stories and waiata, he is said to have had "disrespect for their culture" (Reilly, 1995, p. 23). This had an impact to some extent on the value of some of his work and his accounts of Māori migrations and subsequent stories raised questions of accuracy (Reilly, 1995). Best's work has been minimally used in this study of Tainui oral traditions, but this summary of his work provides an example of earlier claims around genderisation and political intentions. Elsdon Best's writings at times contained "racial and evolutionary assumptions" (Sissons, 1993, p. 40). While interested in Māori stories and waiata, he is said to have had "disrespect for their culture" (Reilly, 1995, p. 23). This had an impact to some extent on the value of some of his work and his accounts of Māori migrations and subsequent stories raised questions of accuracy (Reilly, 1995). Best's work has been minimally used in this study of Tainui oral traditions, but this summary of his work provides an example of earlier claims around genderisation and political intentions. Inspired by Taranaki based Walter Gudgeon, Percy Smith and Edward Tregear Māori, Best progressed his study of Māori history and culture. Each of these authors were accorded the status of "local scholars of Māori" (Sissons, 1993, p. 39) yet each of them, according to my studies, produced transmuted accounts of Tainui traditions that both advanced and informed an ongoing discourse that devalued women's position in the oral traditions.

At the invitation in 1881 of Percy Smith, Best became another scholar involved in the formation of the Polynesian Society. In 1922, on Smith's death, Best presided over the society, thus situating him in an influential position. Of particular interest for this thesis were the studies Best undertook and set out in *Maori Agriculture*. Published in 1925, it focused on the kūmara, an important food source for Māori when they settled in the new lands. Best records the types and names of kūmara in New Zealand. He claimed there were eighty-two varieties (p. 112). He also

documents an ancient Tainui karakia used when planting the tuber, which includes reference to Whakaotirangi and her sister Whakaotinuku. The karakia is possibly similar to one that Hoturoa performed for Whakaotirangi's first garden. According to Karaka Tarawhiti (quoted in Best, 1925), the karakia as worded below originated in the Waikato district:

Papa, papa te whatitiri i runga te rangi	The thunder roars up in the sky
Ko taua tini, ko taua mano	It is the multitudes and the many
te wai raparapa rua	The flashing (of lightening) pit
Ko te wai o Huri-makaka te ekenga o Tutauaraia	It is the time of Huri-makaka and Tutauaraia <sup>30</sup>
5 Miria te kakara ( ) Tai-porohe-nui e maie	5 Miria te kakara. Tai-porohe-nui <sup>31</sup>
Maie te tupua, maie te taniwha	Bring forth the demon, bring forth the prodigy
I haere mai koe i whea?	From whence did you come?
I a Whakaoti nuku, i a Whakaoti rangi	From Whakaotinuku, from Whakaotirangi <sup>32</sup>
Ko to manawa, ko taku manawa	It is your heart, it is my heart
10 E Tane ka irihia	10 Tāne, who has come under the influence
Whanowhano, haramai te toki	Go forth and bring forth the adze
Haumi e!	Bind it together
Hui e!	Bring it together
Taiki e! (p. 95).	Yes it is so! <sup>33</sup>

### *Analysis*

Best's inclusion of this karakia is important in terms of Whakaotirangi's tradition not only because it cites her by name but also because it attests to her absolute woman power. The karakia captures her association with formidable and potent elements such as thunder and lightning and with ability to bring forth substances and phenomena, but neither it nor Best provide any other details of the oral traditions about her. While Best's capturing of karakia, whakataukī, oriori and the like gives some ongoing visibility to significant Māori women, their ancient power remains hidden. Without a consistent rendering of the full oral traditions explaining the story of ancestresses such as Whakaotirangi, the women's names in published recitations and incantations

---

<sup>30</sup> In reference to copulation, fertility and the tapu placed on the kūmara plant while it is growing (G. Cooper, personal communication, April 24, 2009).

<sup>31</sup> Place names in the Raukawa area.

<sup>32</sup> The karakia recorded by Aoterangi (1860) (see above) as recited by Ngatoroirangi when Tainui was still on its voyage has some similarities. The section about Whakaotinuku and Whakaotirangi is mentioned in the karakia and is the same as above: "I hara mai koe i hea? I te whakaotinuku, i te whakaotirangi" (p. 9). Other sections of the karakia differ and were recited when Tainui was in rough weather out at sea.

<sup>33</sup> Interpretation by Garrick Cooper, lecturer at Canterbury University.

become simply names on paper. The karakia, whakataukī and oriori that Māori used (and still use) as part of ritual customary practice served as markers of cultural traditions and tribal history. However, these markers would have been understood within the broader context of iwi oral traditions. Thus, accurate and full knowledge of the oral traditions about Whakaotirangi would have supported maintenance of the ancientness of her tribal history and enhanced Tainui iwi.

### **The published account by Stephenson Percy Smith**

Percy Smith was a scholar and a founder of the Polynesian Society, an organisation concerned with the documenting, publishing and promotion of historical Pacifica accounts. The Society was founded in 1891 and Smith became the first president and long-time editor of the Society (Sorrenson, 1990). Smith was called a “traditionalist scholar” who mostly concerned himself with “establishing an absolute chronology for the main events of Maori pre-history” (Simmons, 1976, p.37) and he was considered to be the leading authority on Māori and Polynesian origins and migrations (Byrnes, 1993). As the founder of the Society that published accounts of Polynesian history, and considering also his role as an editor, he would have held sway as to the presentation of information. In this way Smith had an impact on the transmission of new information such as his theory on the arrival of Māori to New Zealand and his apparent concern for the maintenance of tradition allowed Smith to include information that was not provided for in the original manuscripts. Aspects of what Smith has written have been included within this work, if not as validation for what has been put by others, then for proof of his inventions.

Stephenson Percy Smith was a scholar who settled in Taranaki. Sometime in 1881, Smith invited other writers (such as Gudgeon and Best) to Taranaki to discuss the formation of the Polynesian Society. Smith provides scant information about Whakaotirangi in his publications. A comment that he makes in a text published in a 1907 issue of the *Journal of the Polynesian Society (JPS)*<sup>34</sup> suggests why: “It will be noticed in the above lists [of those who travelled in Tainui waka] how extraordinarily few the women are. But as women did not count for much in Maori times, as a rule, no doubt their names are not considered sufficiently important to be mentioned unless they belonged to some high family” (p. 207).

---

<sup>34</sup> This text was the first published form of one of a number of chapters written by Smith and initially published in various issues of the journal. These were eventually compiled and published in 1910 as *History and Traditions of the Maoris of the West Coast of the North Island of New Zealand, Prior to 1840*.

Smith records the tradition of Tainui migration to and arrival in Aotearoa in various publications. The fragments relevant to Whakaotirangi's tradition follow:

... Hotu-roa, the principal chief and afterwards captain of the 'Tainui', sent his people to the forests to search for a suitable tree ... one was finally selected, at the foot of which, or near to, had been buried the grandfather of Whakaoti-rangi, Hotu-roa's wife, and whose name was Tainui (p. 76) ... they recounted to Hotu-roa all that they had witnessed and heard [in response to the tree for Tainui waka resurrecting itself each evening after being felled the day before] 'we used no *karakias*.' [they said]. 'Then,' said both Hotu-roa and Whakaoti-rangi, 'it is no wonder you failed in your object. Return in the morning to your work ...' The canoe then received the name of 'Tainui,' after Whakaotirangi's grandfather (*JPS*, 1908, Vol. 17, p. 76).

On reaching Kawhia, they performed the ceremony ... The tuā hu, or sacred altar, used by Hotu-roa, captain and chief priest of "Tai-nui", his brother Hotu-nui, and other priests of that canoe ... (p. 48). The first kumaras, brought in the "Tai-nui," were planted by Whakaoti-rangi, Hotu-roa's wife, at a place which they named Hawaiki – again in remembrance of the general name of their ancient home ... The "Tai-nui" canoe arrived ... [at] Kawhia [and] the people ... spread from there all over Waikato (*JPS*, 1909, Vol. 18, p. 48).

[From Tarakawa of Te Arawa]: When they reached the sea-shore, Tama-te-kapua was urging the men who were launching Tainui, to aid in also launching the Arawa ... Tama turned towards them and called out to Hotu-a-whio—who was the son of Hoturoa, captain of the Tainui ... (Smith, 1893, p. 232)

#### *Account summary and context*

Smith positions Hoturoa as the principal person of Tainui and he supports the historical recounting of Tainui waka being named after Whakaotirangi's grandfather. He mentions that both Hoturoa and Whakaotirangi were consulted in relation to the karakia to ensure that the tree which would become Tainui waka remained on the ground (Whakaotirangi's involvement in such a karakia has not been mentioned by Tainui narrators). Smith recognises Whakaotirangi as the planter of kūmara plantations and notes that Tainui people spread throughout Waikato.

In 1893, Smith recorded a narration from Tarakawa of Te Arawa, who placed Whakaotirangi in Te Arawa waka. However, Smith also recognises Hotu-ā-whio, who was her son through Hoturoa of Tainui. Smith does not explain this mix of information in his retelling of the event in 1909, which is confusing. As was the case with his Polynesian Society colleagues, Smith's position as a writer and publisher was an influential and therefore powerful one.

### *Analysis*

The 1907 comment from Smith in relation to Māori societies illustrates psychological racism based on an irrational authoritarian patriarchal attitude and belief, and fostered through socialisation and social learning. Smith displays in his recordings a colonist phenomenon that Wetherell and Potter (1992) term dominative racism, wherein prejudices are expressed explicitly and openly (p. 195). The reason Smith gives for women not being listed on board Tainui waka is a product of “the symbolic and cultural expression of a society [his society] which is systematically organized around the oppression of one group and the dominion of another group” (p. 198).

Smith supports colonial oppression of Māori women and dominion of Māori as a whole; he rhetorically describes how Māori men thought of and treated Māori women. This discursive description by him upholds an ideological justification to exploit and silence Māori women—to disempower and disenfranchise them. Furthermore, his phrase ‘Māori times’ is redolent of social constructions of Māori—as a people of the past whose traditions and mores have little currency in modern times.

Smith also normalises male domination when he presents Whakaotirangi relative to men: as the wife of Hoturoa, the principal chief, and as the granddaughter of Tainui. This construction is further emphasised by his failure to cite her as a high-status ancestress. His account seems to be subjectively organised around his earlier statement about women’s importance. Smith also notes that Tainui people spread out all over Waikato but, in keeping with his invisibility of Māori women, he does not link the expansion of Tainui iwi with the success of Whakaotirangi’s gardens, as the Tainui narrators do. Smith’s social and political renderings highlight his strong adherence to patriarchal colonial rule. His politics of gendering negates the agency of women. Under his pen, they are appendages to men; their role is to defer to and support men. Gudgeon, Best and Smith are all scholars who have used the material of others with little or no acknowledgement within their work as to their sources, including their Māori informants.

### **The published account by James B. W. Robertson**

James Basil Wilkie Robertson studied extensively Tainui and Te Arawa histories. In particular he was interested in the origins of whakapapa, land and the timing of the arrival of waka to New

Zealand. Robertson paid meticulous attention to analysing tribal traditions in an effort to provide “consistent, reliable accounts of historical ancestral validity” (Robertson, 1966, p. 1). Robertson advocated and promoted the importance of comparing and analysing tribal traditions for authority and legitimacy and his works reflect these actions. He considered the system used by Polynesian culture for maintaining oral records to be outstanding. Robertson (1956) declared the collapse of genuine tradition occurred once tōhunga were invalidated and accounts were “passed through” untrained people such as Pākehā and those manipulating genealogical lines in an effort to demonstrate prominence (p. 46). He purports that mutilated genealogies frequently occurred within the Native Land Court as iwi vied for superiority to support their contest to land holdings. His work has been used in this particular research as a trustworthy guidance.

Robertson’s interest within the Tainui rohe and his appreciation of the role of oral tradition as valid history gives legitimacy to his research and findings, especially in relation to documentation and accounts of land occupation. One reason for his interest in Tainui is evident in a statement he makes in support of Princess Te Puea’s suggestion that because “of the isolation of most of the Tainui country... the Tainui traditions ... are preserved in a purer form than some others” (Robertson, 1956, p. 49). Over the course of his research and publications, Robertson provides an in-depth account of the process of maintenance of oral tradition during the journey of Tainui people through, across and in Tainui lands rather than a representation of the individuals involved per se:

The story of the arrival of the canoe shows that a careful search was made for a suitable site for settling. The search covered a large part of Hauraki Gulf, which was found unsuitable, and after a portage across the Tamaki Isthmus, the west coast was explored . . . (Robertson, 1956, p. 45). The wide scope of the Tainui country, covering nearly half of the North Island, is a direct result of the determination of Hoturoa and his crew to find a home where they could live without interference, the fundamental reason for leaving Hawaiki. The Tainui people, of all the migrants, were the most persevering in the pursuit of this aim . . . The Tainui story is essentially a story of pioneering virgin land. Throughout the story can be seen the characteristic feature of the Hawaiki people of keeping a record of their ancestors, and this feature was not lost by the lone wanderers and their descendants belonging to junior branches. (Robertson, 1956, pp. 53–54)

A lesson learned from the Tainui and Te Arawa traditions is that where a section has become separated from the main group in early times, the ability to preserve records has been largely lost. (Robertson, 1966a, p. 202)



Detailed analysis has shown that the Tainui tradition is consistent and has a convincing sequence from the time of arrival of the canoe in New Zealand ... the Tainui people settled at Kawhia, on the west coast, and for about one hundred years lived there as a compact family group ... By this time the population had increased, and the patriarchal control had loosened (1966a, p. 294) ... [Throughout] the Tainui and Te Arawa countries [continuous, consistent and connected narrative] started from the time of arrival of the canoes ... genealogies from Hape appear to be consistent from approximately the time of arrival of Tainui and Te Arawa Canoes (p. 302). Genealogies are a very essential part of Maori history (p. 304).

#### *Account summary and context*

Because Robertson's main interest lay in assessing validation of waka arrivals and iwi expansion, his research names few women. He does not specifically mention Whakaotirangi, but because his contributions to authenticating Tainui early traditions, especially those narrated by Te Whiwhi and Aoterangi, are important to this research, aspects of his work are presented here.

Robertson (1958) championed Tainui traditions and consistency in recording them. He noted especially that while many elements of the historical order and continuity of the traditions could be traced back to the arrival of the canoe in Aotearoa New Zealand, other elements that had come down to the time he was writing were erroneous (1958, p. 43). He confirms that the Tainui genealogies all commence from Hoturoa, and that despite constantly spreading out and converging again, they always feature the same core names and identities (Robertson, 1956, p. 50). He also states that the arrival of Tainui to the new lands was followed by 100 years of peaceful idyllic existence under a patriarchy at Kāwhia, where the people remained in isolation during that time (p. 254). This claim ties in with the fact that his research draws primarily on land court records where colonial lore dictated that land tenure and authority lay with principal men and not women. As such, his interest generally referenced records pertaining to and from men rather than to and from women.

Robertson's argument that Tainui iwi generally were able to pay careful attention to maintaining consistent accounts of who they were and where they had come from is based on the idea that people reciting traditions in groups have opportunity to continuously hear and correct one another whereas memories held by individuals or small groups separated from one another dull or become confused over time. Tainui stayed in close proximity and contact with one another for at least the first 100 years of occupation. For these reasons, it makes sense to see the early accounts of Te Rangihaeata and Aoterangi, which were those with the least colonial

intervention (Te Rangihaeata in particular purposefully had very little to do with Pākehā), as the most faithful presentations of ancient Tainui oral traditions.

Robertson (1957) does not mention the geographical and geopolitical establishment of Tainui descendants throughout inland and coastal Waikato. Instead, he writes of the “unequivocal picture of the pattern of expansion of the Tainui influence” (p. 254). In addition, he (1957, 1958, 1962) and also Phillips (1989) claim that evidence corroborates the abundance of crop food produced in the Tainui area by Tainui iwi who were thus able to settle there rather than live a nomadic existence. This assertion supports earlier discussions about the extent of Whakaotirangi’s cultivations.

Particularly importantly, Robertson (1966) describes in his publications the recording of children’s and grandchildren’s names and documented genealogies that show descendants as “traditional history” (p. 202). He explains that consistency, continuity and historical sequence amongst the kept or known events stem from these, although he tends to ignore women’s names, including consistently significant names such as Whakaotirangi and Marama. In an earlier publication, Robertson (1956) argues that evidence attesting to the reliability and validity of the content of a tradition is that, which over time, reveals an absence of variation in its wording. Burckhardt (1998) agrees with this criterion, stating that the cultural historian should seek traditions that are “constant and characteristic in the beliefs and values of a particular society” and that this approach requires “long and varied reading” (p. 6).

### *Analysis*

Robertson mentions the journey across the Tamaki isthmus, but does not write of the Ōtāhuhu incident. That he does not is, as explained above, typical of his focus on identifying consistency of tradition rather than the details of events. His comment that the expansion of Tainui lands is due to the determination of Hoturoa and his crew to seek new homes gives the impression that women were not equally determined to find safe and appropriate places to live. Thus men, a socially powerful group, are credited with the social control of the environment, with action and discovery, while women, absent within Robertson’s writing, are passive followers, relegated to silence and invisibility. And although Robertson notes that the genealogies were important references for the maintenance of links and connections, women are absent from these. Hence

women's political voice is silent in Robertson's work, including within the genealogies that he sets down.

### **Conclusion: Politics that Emerge**

My aim in this section is to seek out specific patterns of meaning amongst the literary trope that has been the focus of this chapter. In particular, I endeavour to summarise and explain the societal and political practices at play within the rhetorical and ideological discourses presented above. In terms of the scholarly criteria developed by Simmons (1976): each of the scribes or informants mentioned above comes from recognised families and is regarded as knowledgeable. Their narratives were recorded well before 1900 which, according to the work of Simmons (1976), Sorrenson (1978) and Ballara (1998), is a time that can be attributed to the significant alteration of Māori oral traditions through “cut-and-paste editing and outright invention by writers such as Percy Smith, Hoani Te Whatahoro Jury and others” (Gordon-Burns & Taonui, 2011, p. 12).

Analysis of the various accounts of the traditions relating to Whakaotirangi provided in this chapter and consideration of their narrators, scribes and authors reveal a number of threads and patterns that situate her and, by association, Māori women, in substituted places and spaces over time. One such thread is the increasing minimalisation of involvement by women of note in ritual such as potent *karakia*. Whakaotirangi's status (Māori women) becomes ever more controlled by patriarchal over-writing and reproduced text to reflect an ideologically imposed sanction and silencing. From Te Rangihaeata's pre-Christian narration of a supreme and powerful woman, to Gudgeon's 19th-century Christian account of her as a sinner, and finally Robertson's 20th-century invisibility.<sup>35</sup> This imposition lessens control of the content of text, with successive discourse representing Whakaotirangi's primary role as the wife of Hoturoa. Her part in *karakia* and the carrying of significant *taonga* are treated as secondary to this function, or they are lost altogether in the ensuing rhetoric, which highlights instead the story of a woman who is a sustainer of her people through her gardening skills or leaves her nameless, as occurs in Grey's account.

The most obvious pattern in the retellings is that of male authority. Each of the accounts is narrated and scribed by men of varying levels of import, but all could be said to hail from elite

---

<sup>35</sup> To be fair, Robertson's focus was on geographical alignment across time within the traditions. However, he discusses male activity and ignores female.

and powerful social communities. As such, the renditions constitute an all-knowing all-seeing paternal authority over and control of women, including their histories, their present and their futures. These crucial components of social power give voice to ideologies of moral authority, where women are primarily positioned as wives, providers and sinners, whereas earlier they (Whakaotirangi) have been leaders, high priestesses, married to the captain of Tainui, high-born whakapapa, carrier of significant taonga, maintainer of whakapapa, securer of tracts of land, and agents in ritual. These discourses are present in one form or another similarly across the 155 year time span, but they are most noticeably affected within the colonial texts. The colonial discourse presents patterns of assumptions of superiority, and Colenso's text in particular provides an example of this. They provide an obvious pattern of notions of femininity and masculinity and ideologically acceptable practice between the sexes.

This patriarchal ideology essentially reclassifies Whakaotirangi (women) as a woman fitted to the social interests of men; women in powerfully charged roles such as delivering potent karakia have no place in such a construction. Politically, male power and domination of the discourse meant that men's categorisation of women normalised their secondary place and reinforced gendered roles where women's agency and value were undermined and male power relations were reproduced. Particularly noticeable is the part Kelly, Jones and Biggs play in reinforcing colonial renderings of male dominance and hegemony within the later recorded traditions about Whakaotirangi. These men, all Tainui based and influential post-colonial writers, had opportunity to emphasise and focus on women's agency in their discourse, yet they did not, instead aligning themselves with a patriarchy imposed societal place of women. As less credit is given in ensuing accounts to Whakaotirangi's role, more is assigned to men as adventurers, navigators and political advisors. This eventual male domination of the retelling of Whakaotirangi's tradition coupled with the regular magnification of Hoturoa's position (captain of Tainui, husband to two prominent women, delegator of Tainui lands and cultivations, and overseer of protocols) makes for a deliberate moderating of her importance.

The collating of patriarchal Māori, colonial, and colonised Māori representative retellings of Whakaotirangi's oral tradition thus identifies the establishment, particularly post-colonisation, of ever stronger boundaries around female participation in political, spiritual, cultural, and social domains. The male accounts gendered the oral traditions about Whakaotirangi by excluding her, because of her sex, from connection with these important areas. The not so hidden motivation

behind these patriarchal retellings facilitates the removal of Whakaotirangi and, by extension, Māori women from places of higher, more meaningful connections, such as those mentioned above, and socially conditions men and women to believe that these placements are the rightful place of males.

At play, then, are the masculine social assumptions and constructions about appropriate behaviours for and by women (Waylen, 2012, p. 24). But also evident is a self interest amongst male colonisers, generated, in turn, amongst Māori men, and then maintained in the men's own social groupings. This development not only highlights the social construction of power but also the imposition and regulation of what is important to one sector only of a community on other sections. Increasingly missing from the above accounts is the capturing of oral traditions that give legitimacy to the importance of the roles of complementarity where women and men play equally important roles in ritual and leadership that provides support to and for each other.

Also encapsulated in this trajectory are notions of superiority, class and sexism. The colonial writers of the oral traditions instituted words like 'sin' and 'adultery' when talking about Whakaotirangi (Māori women); they do not use these types of words when they discuss Māori men. These discourses situate Māori women within a colonial self-appointed voice of authority and social control where white men took a public and high moral ground (even though some of these same men did not always comply with these mores in private), giving rise to and affirming a moral literacy that dictated how Māori women should or should not interact with men. The missionaries and colonists authorised themselves as teachers and leaders in this respect (Colvin, 2009, p. 313), thereby granting themselves a paternalistic mandate to regulate.

The effects of silencing traditions such as Whakaotirangi's may mean that even contemporary Māori women struggle to find the words to describe their experiences and thoughts using female words because these have been superseded by the male words, thoughts and discourses. Yet, Whakaotirangi has a *herstory* authenticated by whakataukī, karakia and genealogy. A redefinition, retelling and re-storyiing of Whakaotirangi aligned with this authentication and told from an indigenous womanist perspective returns her from voicelessness; it reclaims her cultural identity and her female political, social and spiritual force. The next and final section of this chapter therefore presents my rewriting of Whakaotirangi's extant traditions from that perspective. It reclaims her narrative from a patriarchal canon, evocatively, creatively and unashamedly Restoryed here as a woman's story. In order to restore the themes and symbols

about Whakaotirangi (Gunn Allen, 1992), including the structure of herstory, I took my cues from repeated reviewing and consideration of the existing accounts of the oral traditions about her.

*Ko te rukuruku a Whakaotirangi.*<sup>36</sup>

### **Whakaotirangi Restoryed**

Whakaotirangi, granddaughter of high chief Tainui and daughter of the chieftainess Hineitepere and Memeha-o-te-rangi was born from a matriarchal line of noble leaders and pioneering adventurers. Named in reference to the completion of the heavens, Whakaotirangi had much to live up to and look forward to. Because of her ancestral ties to supreme female chiefs through her mother Hineitepere, she possessed strong woman power, with the ability of prophecy, and a mysterious sacredness, for which she was cautiously respected as a tōhunga.

Whakaotirangi was a seductively handsome woman. She was potently strong with mana and had a wilful character. Her eyes were large and dark, her hair, thick and shiny, fell the length of her back. Her skin was a deep bronze colour, and she had a curvaceous womanly form. Celebrated by men and women alike, she had a luscious and sensual singing voice. Whakaotirangi could perform ritual karakia, she knew her whakapapa from Papatūānuku and Hineahuone, and she was a skilled and gifted horticulturalist. The men of her and other villages vied for her attention whenever they had the chance, and they made the most of those opportunities. Whakaotirangi took many lovers and had many husbands; with her strong character and sense of herself as a spiritual leader, she was well versed in and able to read the foibles of male company.

Whakaotirangi was brought up hearing the stories about her most famous travelling ancestors. Of them, Kupe was the most legendary. She admired his exploits and daring travels to other lands. Whakaotirangi had grown up understanding that when the time was right, she too would leave the homelands in search of new countries for her people.

In accordance with the dictates of matriarchal lore, it was Whakaotirangi's mother, Hineitepere, who sourced a husband that she thought would make a fitting father for her grandchildren, and who would travel well with her daughter to discover future lands. Hoturoa

---

<sup>36</sup> This is the name Whakaotirangi gave to the mauri that she installed at her cultivation at Pākarikari. It means 'the small basket of Whakaotirangi' and is a saying of significance to Tainui which memorialises her importance.

was from an established family of handsome leaders, seamen and cultivators. The islands ariki Kuaotepo was his mother and Auau-ki-te-rangi his father. While preferring a peaceful existence like his mother, Hoturoa had confirmed himself as a warrior many times over. Tainui and Memeha-o-te-rangi agreed to the match.

Whakaotirangi and Hoturoa were married and produced two striking sons, Poutūkeka and Hotu-ā-whio. As the children grew older, Whakaotirangi knew the time to leave the homeland was getting closer. She had already discussed with her mother the appropriate rituals and customs that should be observed, and the tribal council of women had met and agreed to the tree that should be cut for the purpose of fashioning a waka for the voyage. The aged, wise and priestly woman, Māhurangi, was the advisor in the building of the waka, and the canoe-building tohunga, Rata-o-wahieroa, was the director of the men who worked on her.

It was at this time also that Whakaotirangi contemplated having a close female companion who could support her in raising the youngest of her children, Hotu-ā-whio, and her mokopuna, Hāpopo, Poutūkeka's son. She had also been thinking about another wife for Hoturoa because her increasing interest in ancient ritual matters meant that Hoturoa was alone most evenings. She spoke with Hoturoa about the matter of another wife, and he agreed. Whakaotirangi then consulted with the female heads of council. They chose carefully from amongst their people and eventually the young and chiefly Marama was united to the family.

In preparation for the voyage, Memeha-o-te-rangi gave Whakaotirangi a sacred offering, the mauri of Puanga. This was the important mauri that bestowed the waka with its life force, so ensuring a good and prosperous journey and safe navigation to its destination. It was right that Whakaotirangi, as the chief female leader, should be the custodian of this most sacred taonga, and she secured it in a secret place known only to herself. The people, knowing that she held this precious cargo, felt a sense of calm and confidence about the impending journey.

The leaving of the waka from the homelands was timed to coincide with the arrival of Marama's menses. As a chiefly young, strong and fertile woman, there was potent psychic power within the wai o te hika. The absolute sacredness and strength of the water of life, the menstrual blood, was so powerful that it acted as a protector and a mediator between the now and the spiritual world. On the third day of her menses, it was smeared on the prow of the waka according to the same ritual handed down from time immemorial. That this ritual was performed

when the moon and stars were in a certain position in the sky was no coincidence, and the tradition established still further the absolute timeliness of the voyage.

It was considered important by the council of women that the journey begin three days after this event. Memeha-o-te-rangi and Hineitepere together performed the final rituals in preparation for their daughter, grandchildren, son in law and relations to leave the homelands. The great waka was already settled in the water waiting its cargo, but when the people embarked, Marama could see that the waka did not float as well as she ought; she sat too low in the water. Hineitepere called her back to shore, where further work was undertaken. When the waka again entered the water, she was named Tainui in response to her return to land for a final refit. Hoturoa, together with Whakaotirangi and their advisors, captained Tainui expertly. Hoturoa, Whakaotirangi and Marama sat in the stern of the waka where they could observe all the goings on, and Tainui moved through the great oceans without incident.

In due course, Tainui reached an island where they met with their relations from Te Arawa waka, captained by Tamatekapua. He was a dashing warrior and leader, clever and witty, and he had always admired Whakaotirangi. Despite her long marriage to Hoturoa and her aged beauty, Tamatekapua still wanted her for himself. When he thought it was safe to do so, he made blatant advances to her and tried to convince her to come aboard Te Arawa. Hoturoa, long aware of Tamatekapua's amorous intentions towards his wife, paid careful attention to Tamatekapua's movements on the island. The day Tainui was to again set out on her voyage, Whakaotirangi went to a quiet place to meditate with the ancestors and to ask that their course remain true and without incident. Tamatekapua followed Whakaotirangi into the forest, and sat quietly observing her communications with her tīpuna. When he realised that her state was again with this world, he advanced towards her, intent on claiming her as his own. Whakaotirangi was caught off guard when Tamatekapua slipped his arm around her waist and endeavoured to pull her on to himself. Hoturoa, as vigilant as ever when it came to his cousin Tamatekapua, bounded out of the forest and just as Tamatekapua bent forward to kiss Whakaotirangi, Hoturoa lunged at him. The surprise attack meant that Hoturoa gave Tamatekapua a severe beating, bloodying his nose so that the blood ran freely. Tamatekapua always remembered that incidence because the island was called Te Rangitotonga a Tama Te Kapua, the day the blood flowed from Tamatekapua. Even though the island's name was later shortened to Rangitoto, Tainui and Te Arawa descendants are well aware of the island's history.



When Hoturoa and Whakaotirangi arrived back at Tainui, rituals again set the huge waka on her journey. Tainui travelled on smoothly. Her crews were confident and strong, and there was a great sense of security on board. There was adequate water and food, and the crews had intermittent breaks during the journey. Eventually, Tainui arrived at a place that Whakaotirangi named Ōtāhuhu in the Manukau harbour. They rested here for a time, and so Marama ventured overland. When she returned to the waka, the people discovered that Tainui could not be moved because, it was concluded, of Marama's venturing. Whakaotirangi and Marama communed together, and after including Marama in a ritual where the two women expertly interchanged their roles, they performed a tauparapara so powerful that Tainui was able to continue her journey.

The Tainui people arrived at Kāwhia, and it was here that Hoturoa and Whakaotirangi talked about Hoturoa living with Marama at Maketū while she, Whakaotirangi, moved to Pākarikari. It was important that another noble branch of Tainui iwi have its origins at this place, and the younger chiefly Marama, who was pregnant with her first child, was keen to stay at Kāwhia.

Whakaotirangi left some of the kūmara called anu-rangi, the hue and the taro with Hoturoa and moved with her people to Pākarikari, which was close to Aotea. Once she had settled there, she organised a great plantation to be prepared. Like her tīpuna Kupe, who first planted kūmara at Whiria near Opononi in the North, Whakaotirangi was a renowned horticulturalist. She named her garden Angaroa, and at a special place in it, she set down a huge rock which she named "Te rukuruku a Whakaotirangi" as a reminder of her very first garden. In time, the garden burst with bountiful and lush cultivations. Whakaotirangi, together with the older women, beckoned Pani-tinaku, the mother of kūmara and the wife of Rongo-mā-tāne, the atua of cultivated foods, to be present at the ceremony. The people were well rewarded; the produce that grew from Whakaotirangi's gardens became the staple diet for her iwi from that time onwards.

Whakaotirangi and Hoturoa were reunited when she sent her son Hotu-ā-whio to bring him to her to bless the gardens and food so that their people would prosper. Hoturoa was overwhelmed with the foresight of Whakaotirangi; the memories of the gardens that they had left in the homelands were freshened in his mind, and his tangi was long and anguished. Whakaotirangi's grandson Hāpopo had planted his grandmother's kūmara at Te Akau, and so her legacy was transplanted and maintained further afield. Throughout Tainui lands, the people

repeat Whakaotirangi's saying "Te rukuruku a Whakaotirangi" in memory and celebration of their most influential, charismatic and loved priestess.

## Chapter Five: Canoe Traditions

### **Marama**

In this chapter, I analyse the discursive narratives and text that inform the accomplishments and qualities of Marama in Tainui tradition. As with her contemporary Whakaotirangi, my aim is to reclaim, rehabilitate and re-embody the traditions about Marama. I seek to analyse and expose the gendered position that Marama was also relegated to by disrupting patriarchal theories that have eroded the observations of her.

As I discussed in Chapter 4, male-sanctioned privileges have been a central component of the displacement of Māori women. The colonial records that are the main repository of the oral traditions about Marama are problematic because men took the prerogative with regard to the “power of naming, the attributes of sight, insight and intellect” (Olsson, 1989, p. 3). Also evident are Western assumptions and representations about the traditions of ancestresses. As Te Awekotuku (1991) claims, “... no-one can deny that in the last two centuries Maori women have lost, or been deprived of, economic, social, political and spiritual power” (p. 10). Inherited historical terms and conditions that each successive generation of narrators, scribes and authors presented, that they may have been constrained by or adjusted their approach to will be a feature in my analysis of the texts about Marama. I also attempt to describe from a “woman’s sight” the feminine power disallowed by the corpus of male retelling (Bach, Luh, & Schult, 2011, p. 27). Reviewing the poverty and segregated content that is Marama’s tradition from the specified Indigeonous methodologies of mana wahine, Kaupapa Māori only heightens a realisation of the dearth of information that has been delivered by the patriarchal canon. Her marginalisation is here observed and I have critiqued those texts which have lessened her status and positioned her as anything less than a high priestess and authority of her iwi.

Set out similarly to the chapter featuring Whakaotirangi, this chapter charts the origin of sources about Marama. An analysis of the politics that emerged from the oral traditions about her is followed by a summative conclusion and the chapter ends with a restoryed womanist telling of Marama’s significant association with Tainui waka.

## **What Was Said**

### **The Early Māori Manuscripts**

#### **The oral narrative of Te Rangihaeata**

Tainui member Te Rangihaeata related what Potter (1997) calls a focalization with a special kind of category of entitlement (p. 164). While not a witness to actual events, Te Rangihaeata provided vivid descriptions of Marama within Tainui events from narrations passed to him through the culturally traditional practice of orality. Te Rangihaeata's account of the Tainui voyage is one of the earliest from a Māori source, and has been presented already in Whakaotirangi's chapter (see pp. 81–82), so I will not reproduce it here.

Te Rangihaeata does not mention Marama until after Tainui waka reaches the new lands and becomes stuck at Ōtāhuhu.<sup>37</sup> His first description of her is “tetahi wahine a Hoturoa” (one of Hoturoa's wives) (Te Whiwhi, 1851, p. 11). He names Marama (who was known by several names) as Maramakikohura, and while he states that Tainui became stuck because of her (“kua poua e tetahi wahine a Hoturoa e Maramakikohura”—it was held fast [like a mountain] by one of Hoturoa's wives Maramakikohura), he does not say what she had done to cause this event. Te Rangihaeata recounts the karakia, said by Whakaotirangi, that enables Tainui to continue on her journey; Marama is mentioned in it. After this, Te Rangihaeata does not mention Marama again.

#### *Narration summary and context*

As explained in the chapter on Whakaotirangi, Te Rangihaeata illustrates Marama's importance through his description about her. She is married to the captain of the waka, Hoturoa, and therefore is very likely to have had an illustrious whakapapa herself, although this is not stated. Te Rangihaeata represents Marama's vast powers in his narration when describing Tainui being unable to move. He accentuates just how phenomenal her authority is when he says that no matter how hard the crew tried to free the waka, they could not dislodge her: the waka was stuck like a mountain, a metaphor that emphasises the seriousness of the event. Te Rangihaeata is not specific about why Tainui remains stuck, but mention of Marama within the karakia that

---

<sup>37</sup> Ōtāhuhu was also known as Whāngai-makau (Graham, 1919, p. 115).

Whakaotirangi performs to free the vessel hints at the reason, which I discuss below. Te Rangihaeata's account positions Marama as influential and important; his narrative posits that women had abilities with mystic potent powers, such that their strength could control events. Moreover, it was another woman, Whakaotirangi, who took command of the situation and, with even greater powers, regulated the incident.

### *Analysis*

This account socially and politically credits women with awe-inspiring power and authority. Patriarchal accounts typically align significant women to men of great note rather than making them known for their own important contributions. Thus, when Te Rangihaeata says, "... tetahi wahine a Hoturoa ... Maramakikohura", he initially places Hoturoa at the centre of attention, creating the impression that Marama was Hoturoa's woman—that she belongs to him.

Te Rangihaeata's positioning of Marama in the sentence serves to soften her absolute power; as well as being Hoturoa's possession, she has been placed under Hoturoa's control. While the tradition highlights that women held a powerful place of significance and influence in ritual *karakia*, the dominant rendering is that women's place is normalised and is sanctioned only by the dominion of men. On the one hand, then, women (Marama) are acknowledged in this account for their revered womanly involvement in cultural matters, which were potent, but on the other, they are positioned as subservient. The rendering is a salient example of a patriarchal retelling that regulates women's place. Te Rangihaeata affords Marama lesser dominion, even though, as discussed in Chapter 4, what occurred at Ōtāhuhu and Marama's (women's) involvement in ritual was noted as very important.

### **The written narration of Wirihana Aoterangi**

In his manuscript, which he himself wrote, Wirihana Aoterangi (1860) records the events surrounding the first launching of Tainui waka and its arrival in Aotearoa.

Ka tae te waka ki waho ka waiho kia takoto ana, katahi ka taria nga raruraru o nga tangata hekema, no te ritenga o nga tangata o runga, katahi ka whakamanutia ki te wai, ka hoehoea ka titiro atu tera o nga wahine a Hoturoa a Marama Kikohua, "E Hotu e, E Tainui ana to waka ka toia ano ki uta, ka waruhia katahi ano ka whakamanutia ka tino pai rawa" (p. 8) ... [Aoterangi names the crew as per Whakaotirangi, Chapter 4] ka ahu [Tainui waka] ki Otahuhu, ka whakau ki uta ka kite ano e tu mai ana a Rakataura me nga neke ka toia Tainui, kaore a Tainui i tere, te take he hara no Marama-hahake, te toanga o te waka kaore i tere. Ka tu a Marama ka patai he aha te take i kore ai te waka e

tere? Ka mohio a Ruikiuta he hara te pataia nei, i haere tahi mai hoki a Marama raua ko  
 te mokai, ka timata i tenei tau-parapara:  
 Tapatapahau, tapatapahau, kaea e Tangaroa  
 Ma tupua ka kau takawini  
 Ka kau takawana  
 Ki tua o Rehia, ki tua o Reao  
 He kiore kai tahoranui  
 Toia, toia Tainui tapotu ki te moana  
 Ma wai e to?  
 Ma te whakatau e rangona ake ana  
 He tarawa i nuku, he tarawa i rangi  
 Punui teina naumai  
 Naumai ra e Tane  
 Ka kau taua i te wai  
 Ki a matakita koe  
 E te tini e te mano  
 Naku koe i tiki atu, ki te wao nui a Tane  
 Tane mingoi, Tane rangahau,  
 Takoto atu ana te ara ki tatahi  
 Turuturu haere ana,  
 Haere ana te wai o te hika o Marama  
 E takina ana mai e te komuri hau  
 Na runga o Waihihi.  
 Paneke ihu o Waka koia i wharori ai, e  
 I tukua ki roto (pp. 16–17)

... ki Kawhia ka tino moea [Hoturoa] ko Marama-hahake, koia e mau nei te whakatauki  
 o Tainui, “Tainui maro hahake”, mo te puremu. Ka noho a Hoturoa ma i Maketu ...  
 (p. 18)

### *Narration summary and context*

An interpretation of Aoterangi's text is that one of Hoturoa's wives, Marama, observes that the waka does not move well in the water when those who are to voyage in her prepare to leave the home lands. Crew members are paddling, but making little progress. She calls out to Hoturoa, “O Hotu, your canoe is Tainui, but if you take her out of the water and make the outside very smooth she will go much better” (an interpretation by George Graham, 1923, p. 5). After this work is carried out, the Tainui waka goes on her way. Graham (1919) states it is at this point that the people name the waka Tainui (p. 112). When naming the Tainui crew members, Aoterangi calls Marama, ‘Marama hahake’, which differs from what he calls her when she notices Tainui is not sitting correctly in the water. There, he names her ‘Marama Kikohua’. Aoterangi does not explain these differences in her name at this time.

When Tainui and the people in her reach Ōtāhuhu, Aoterangi says that even though the crew are rowing, Tainui will not move. The reason why, he says is, “... te take he hara no Marama-hahake, te toanga o te waka kaore i tere” (p. 16). In his dictionary of the Māori language, Henry Williams (1992), who had come to Aotearoa New Zealand as a missionary in 1823, translated “hara” to mean a “violation”, “sin” or “offence” (p. 36). Later Māori dictionaries records hara as also meaning “to violate tapu” (see, for example, Moorfield, 2011).

In his 1923 interpretation of Aoterangi’s manuscript, Graham records Tainui’s immobility as follows: “... and they proceeded to Otahuhu;<sup>38</sup> here they landed and Tainui was then pulled, [sic] up but she would not move; then they began an incantation to give strength to the party dragging the canoe overland” (p. 6). Aoterangi recorded a whakataukī regarding the incident of Marama and ‘te puremu’ (the infidelity). He wrote “Tainui maro hahake”, which Mead and Grove (2003) later interpreted as “Tainui unseemly and stubborn” (p. 354), so implying that it is her unseemly and stubborn behaviour that has led to Tainui becoming stuck.

Aoterangi’s narration recounts that when Marama stands up to ask why the waka is not going on its way, the Tainui tōhunga, Ruikiuta, stands up in response because he had seen Marama returning to the waka with ‘te mokai’ (the slave). Ruikiuta recites a tauparapara (a karakia similar to that which Te Rangihaeata attributes to Whakaotirangi; see Chapter 4) so that Tainui can continue on her journey. Aoterangi writes that once Tainui reaches Kāwhia, Hoturoa leaves Whakaotirangi and lives instead with Marama-hahaki.

### *Analysis*

Foremost in this narrative text is Marama again being positioned as ‘another’ of Hoturoa’s wives “tera o nga wahine a Hoturoa a Marama Kikohua”. This technique of writing embeds the notion of male ownership of Marama and of women in general. In comparison to men, few women are named within patriarchal texts. Therefore, when a woman is named, as is the case with Marama, she is someone of importance. However, Marama’s positioning as one of Hoturoa’s wives can be seen as a disempowering descriptor that minimalises her importance. Marama’s agency is obscured while Hoturoa’s is expanded. Aoterangi’s rendering presents Marama as a woman of high status but does not credit her standing as an influential woman in her own right.

---

<sup>38</sup> Graham (1919) says this place was called Whangai-makau in former times, in reference to Marama’s people waiting for her return to Tainui waka. It means “the awaiting for one loved” (p. 115).

When Marama is credited with initiating a refit of *Tainui waka*, again as a named ancestress, she is of some consequence. Her role here, however, is socially gendered because the discourse promotes recognition of an ideological practice of womanly matronly care and concern that ensures the wellbeing of others: Marama recognizes that the *waka* needs to ride well in the water so that those on board will be safe. This description is a reminder of an assumed women's role, that of their social responsibility as caregiver to others, rather than as women who are adventurous and keen for action themselves, or as women who have the freedom to embrace both these roles. Implicit is the 'categorisation' of women in a role and as a group that has them aware and mindful of noticing finer details to ensure successful outcomes for the group.

Aoterangi positions Marama as a crew member on board *Tainui*; she is named immediately after Whakaotirangi. Her importance amongst the women is second only to Whakaotirangi's (Hoturoa was named first). Marama's social standing is thus identified. The order of naming the women indicates that in polygamous marriages, there were political positions of power within the family arrangements. This thesis does not deal with this aspect of the oral traditions, but it would be an interesting topic for further research.

Marama's sexual relations with a slave are 'exposed' in Aoterangi's telling, and she is said to have violated *tapu*. That she did so was to have political ramifications for *Tainui*, which are not made clear in Aoterangi's account but which I discuss in more detail later in this chapter. Aoterangi's account strongly implies that *Tainui* would not move at Ōtāhuhu because of a violation of *tapu* by Marama (he *hara*). Ruikiuta's statement that he had seen Marama with a slave infers that Marama has had a sexual relationship with him. The overall intention of the descriptors 'hara', being seen with her slave, and *Tainui waka* becoming immovable purposefully bear testimony to such a relationship.

However, Ruikiuta's *tauparapara* could well allude to Marama (women) having significant powers (that could be used for positive or for negative intent) at menstruation. Marama may have been menstruating. If this was the case, it may have been the power that comes from menstruation that has stayed the *waka*. As is a theme of this thesis menstruation was an important time for Māori women in pre-colonial times, but subsequent colonial renderings of the oral traditions invisibilise this source of womanly power and in turn invisibilise women's agency.

Te Rangihaeata's and Aoterangi's narratives are written in *te reo Māori*; neither men provided an English translation of the *tauparapara*. The two men, from the same culture, the same



waka, and with the same language and understanding, had no need to translate, they knew the significance of what they had said and written. The words, with all their power and potential meaning, sat within the karakia as they had been passed on to Te Rangihaeata and Aoterangi, but this potential was misread by those who followed. Marama's influence at this point is obscured by the interpretations. The eventual English translations maximise the adultery discourse, and present it as the reason for Tainui's immovability.

The recurrent mentioning of the event in Tainui traditions confirms a powerful and prominent occurrence for Tainui and for women. Certainly, Marama is consistently mentioned in the karakia or tauparapara that has been spoken and written about, which tends to support the discourse. In particular, the lines "Turuturu haere ana, Haere ana te wai o te hika o Marama, E takina ana mai e te komuri hau" remain more or less consistent with little variation in the historical narratives. The pre-colonial agency of women during the time of menstruation was accorded more significance than post-colonial. I posit that Te Rangihaeata and Aoterangi had pre-colonial knowledge of the significance of menstrual blood (for information about the significance see Murphy, 2011, p. 75; see also Gunn Allen, 1992, p. 47).

An early translation by Poutawera of a narration that was eventually written down by Te Whetu in 1893 was "Moisture drips from Maruanuku [Marama], caused by the gentle blowing that issue from the fount of trembling love" (Best, 1893, p. 216). John White's translation in 1888 said, "As drips the water from the *mouth* of Marama, caused by/The breeze blown from Wai-hi" (p. 37, my italics). In Kelly, in 1949, without naming his source for his English version, quotes, "The water drips from the person of Marama/It is blown hither and thither by the gentle breeze" (p. 54). George Graham's translation in 1951 is "Dripping now forth/Flowing is the moisture from the body of Marama" (p. 85) and, David Simmons in 1976 presents as translation, "Hold in going the memory of Marama's copulation" (p. 175).

My recent discussions (see p. 54 of this thesis) with women also dispute the patriarchal interpretation of these particular lines. These discussions led to agreement that the reference to Marama in the karakia could be in relation to menstrual blood, and that it was this rather than anything else that was seen dripping from Marama. Ani Mikaere, one of the women who took part in these discussions (personal communication, 23 September 2013), postulates that colonial men had a fear of menstrual blood (refer also Murphy, 2011). Sorrenson (1986), in his edited book *Na to Aroha*, presents Sir Apirana Ngata's correspondence, where he reminds people that

the first to cross the pae of a new whare was a woman, who would smear her hand with the wai of her own hika and wipe it over the surface of the pare at the door entrance (p. 215). That wai of the hika may have meant menstrual blood and, as noted earlier, menstrual blood could be used for good or bad purposes.<sup>39</sup>

Potter (1997) argues that rather than being neutral, historians and others selectively organise historical facts and events into narratives to sustain particular views: “History making is a combination of fact finding and producing narratives that give those facts sense” (p. 169). When considered in this light, the male interpretations possibly undermined the real intent and influence behind the words in the karakia.

Aoterangi has Ruikiuta performing the tauparapara, a karakia, which in Te Rangihaeata’s account is attributed to Whakaotirangi. Aoterangi’s account thus apportions fulsome supernatural power (that could normalise a charged situation) to male energy. Following as it does the narration from Te Rangihaeata, Aoterangi’s account appears as a critique of the aforementioned. Here, while women have the power to create a situation, they are written out of the ability to solve it. Aoterangi also writes that Hoturoa stayed with Marama once they reached Kāwhia. Again, Aoterangi’s male voice places Hoturoa socially and politically in a position of importance, with Marama being constructed as the passive recipient of Hoturoa’s decision to stay with her. The noted whakataukī “Tainui maro hahake” references the ‘puremu’—the ‘unfaithfulness’—of Marama. The whakataukī is interpreted in at least one colonial/post-colonial interpretation as the stubbornness (maro) of Marama of Tainui waka, despite hahake has reference to being naked or unbecoming. While the whakataukī reminds Tainui about their illustrious ancestress, its connotations regarding Marama are more infamous than illustrious in nature.

The renderings of the subtext in Aoterangi’s account indicate not only the social, political and spiritual places that significant Māori women once had but also social, political and spiritual places to which they were being relegated in the patriarchal and colonial retellings of this account. Important situations that could have confirmed women’s power and control are instead undermined. Overall, this account softens Marama’s supreme involvement in the affairs of her

---

<sup>39</sup> Ngata has in his footnotes “*Puedenda muliebra*; literally, the water of her private parts”.

people by obscuring her status so that she is presented as subject to male sanctions—Hoturoa's, her husband's, and Ruikiuta's.

### **The written narration of Hoani Nahe**

Nahe collated iwi histories from the late 1850s. He provided the missionary John White with the account set out below. It appeared in the *Journal of the House of Representatives* in 1880.

Nga wahine ingoa nui o runga i taua waka nei ko Marama raua ko Whakaotirangi. Nga purapura a nga wahine ra i hari mai ai, he kumara, he kakano hue.

... ka hoe tonu i te tahataha o Wharekawa, ka mahue a Marama, tetahi o nga wahine o runga i te waka ra, raua ko tana taurekareka, i uta, ka hoe tonu te waka ra ka u ki Takapuna ... Ka tahi ka hoe mai i Tamaki, a u noa ki Otahuhu, ka to te iwi ra i taua waka kia puta ki tua ki Manuka to noa kaore i taea, te take i kore ai e taea ko Marama kua pa ki taua taurekareka.

Tera te wahine ra raua ko tana taurekareka te haere mai ra rokohanga mai te iwi ra e to ana i taua waka kia puta ki waho ki Manuka, ka eke te wahine ra ki runga ki te waka ka whakaahua i te tau, ko te tau tenei.

Toia Tainui te patu ki te moana,  
Mawai e to?  
Ma te whakarangona  
Atu ki te taha o te rangi  
Tara wai nuku  
He tara wai rangi  
Punia, teina, nau mai  
Nau mai e Taane Koakoa  
E Taane rangahau,  
E Taane takore atu  
Ana te ngaro ki tatahi  
Turuturu haere ana mai  
Te wai o te hika a Marama  
E patua ana mai e te komuri hau  
Na runga o waihi  
Kei reira te iringa o Tainui  
Maiea, ura te ra  
Werowero te ra  
Nga tangata i whakaririka  
Mamau ki te taura  
Mamau ki te taura  
Kia tumatatorohia atu  
Taku tumatatoro  
Hoi hoa, Turukiruki  
Panekeneke Iho o waka  
Turuki turuki, Panekepaneke. (p. 19)

Na Marama taua tau nei, no te toanga o Tainui i Otahuhu i roto i Tamaki.  
Ki ta etahi kii i puta a Tainui ki Manuka. Ki ta etahi kii kaore i puta, ko te take i kore e puta, ko te paenga o Marama ki taua taurereka ia raua i noho atu i Wharekawa i roto i Hauraki. (p. 19)

... ka whakatoria nga purapura a nga wahine o runga ia Tainui, a Marama raua ko Whakaotirangi. Haere ake e wha nga maara a nga wahine ra, kotahi mara kumara a tetahi kotahi maara Hue, kotahi maara kumara me te maara Hue a tetahi.  
Te tupunga ake o te maara kumara a Marama he Pohue, te tupunga ake o te maara Hue, he mawhai. Ka whakama a Marama ki aua maara kahore nei hoki i tika te tupunga ake o nga purapura. (p. 19)

Hoani Nahe's 1880 translation of his own account is almost a replica of what he wrote in Māori, although he did not translate the waiata as above. This is what he said:

These are the names of the chief women who came in this canoe ... These women brought seed with them namely kumara and hue ...

Sailing on, she [Tainui waka] went close by Wharekawa, where Marama (one of the chief women of Tainui) went on shore with her slave. Going on, Tainui landed at Takapuna (North Heads) ... They pulled up the Tamaki River to Otahuhu, where they attempted to pull their canoe across the portage to Manuka; but they were unable to move the canoe. The reason was that Marama, on her journey on shore, had misbehaved [kua pa—had sexual intercourse] with her slave.

As the people were doing all they could to drag the canoe across to Manuka, Marama and her slave came and joined them. The woman, seeing the futile attempts of the people to move the canoe, jumped up on to the deck of the canoe and sang this song, to enable the people to obtain their object:-  
Pull Tainui to the sea;

Who shall drag her? &c. [Nahe does not provide a translation to the song (which has been called a karakia and a tauparapara by Te Rangihacata and Aoterangi respectively)]

The above song was composed by Marama ...<sup>40</sup>

Some say that Tainui was taken across the portage at Tamaki to the West Coast; but others say that she did not cross the portage at Otahuhu, because the people were not

---

<sup>40</sup> Nahe provided a further translation of this line at another time, although it was published in the same volume in 1880. Here, he says, "... it was from the words of the song of the woman that the people knew that she had allowed her slave to come near to her." (p. 6)

able to drag her over, on account of the conduct of Marama with her slave while on her journey overland from Wharekawa. (p. 4).

... Marama and Whakaotirangi (the chief women of Tainui) planted the seed they had (brought with them). Each of these women had two [Nahe says in his Māori script that there were four gardens] plots of ground planted, one with kumara (sweet potato), and one with hue (calabash). In that plot planted by Marama with kumara, instead of the kumara, pohue (convolvulus) came up, and from the plot of ground planted with the hue seed came up the mawhai (*Sicyos angulatus*). Marama was ashamed because her seed had not produced what she expected. (p. 5)

### *Narration summary and context*

The men who travelled on Tainui, according to Nahe, have been named already in Whakaotirangi's chapter (see p. 91, 106, 110), so I have not reproduced them in Nahe's narration here. As usual, their names appear in the text before mention of Marama and Whakaotirangi, whom Nahe describes as the 'chief women'. Nahe records, too, the important seeds the women carried with them from the homelands. He furthermore states, as did other narrators before him, that Marama went ashore with her slave (Nahe calls him a taurekareka, which has other connotations, such as a rascal) when Tainui reached Aotearoa (Nahe says at Wharekawa). Tainui waka then carried on around the coast and became lodged at Ōtāhuhu, where Marama met up with the crew again after travelling over land. While Nahe translates 'kua pā' as 'having misbehaved', it references the fact that Marama had sexual intercourse with her slave.

As stated previously, Tainui waka could not be moved from Ōtāhuhu following this event. Ruikiuta and his recitation of the tauparapara do not feature in this account, and instead of Whakaotirangi freeing Tainui waka through her karakia, as recounted by Te Rangihaeata, it is Marama who does so. Nahe actually identifies the waiata as one that Marama herself composed and then sang. According to Ballara (1993), Nahe's Christian education meant that he could not bring himself to record or write about karakia because he said they were tapu; hence his reference to Marama's 'song'.

Nahe records that Marama and Whakaotirangi each had two plots of ground. One of these was for kumara and the other for the hue. When the growth from Marama's kumara seed appeared, it had changed into climbing clematis.<sup>41</sup> The hue seeds that she planted regrew as

---

<sup>41</sup> Williams (1992) translates pōhue as a name given to several climbing or trailing plants; *Calystegia sepium*, *Clematis*, *Muehlenbeckia complexa*, *Passiflora*, *tetrandra* and a *convolvulus* (p. 287).

māwhai.<sup>42</sup> In another account of the same event in the same publication, Nahe says that Marama also planted aute, which grew into whau, and she planted paraa, which grew into the horo-kio.<sup>43</sup> According to Nahe, these mis-growths caused Marama shame. It is probable that she felt this way because her gardening skills were not as developed as Whakaotirangi's, whose gardens had produced enough to feed all the people (see previous chapter). Author and journalist Hēni Collins (personal communication, 30 September 2013) thinks that Marama did not sufficiently care for the plants once they were planted, or she may have planted the seeds and tubers in a poor site, whereas Whakaotirangi had sourced good grounds. She also thinks Marama felt incompetent and embarrassed by her lack of horticultural knowledge.

### *Analysis*

Nahe presents a gendered social order when he names Marama and Whakaotirangi as crew members only after he names the men on Tainui. Unusually, Nahe places Marama as the first woman, presenting her as more important than Whakaotirangi; all other recorders of this tradition name Whakaotirangi first. Nahe relays the same tradition as his predecessors, but brings in a number of differences that gives the account a certain 'slant'. For example, Nahe emphasises his own interest in the event by more closely aligning the narration to Marama than Whakaotirangi, possibly because Marama eventually lived in the part of Tainui lands where Nahe was from, and so may have held particular significance for him.

The important seeds and tubers that the two women were responsible for are a usual occurrence in all of the texts about this event, so characterizing and thus normalising women's place in terms of ideological social responsibilities, such as tending to crops and horticultural pursuits. Descriptions within the narrations about Marama's crops not turning out as expected and her feeling ashamed are also normalised in Nahe's and the preceding accounts, perhaps as a

---

<sup>42</sup> Williams (1992) calls this *Sicyos angulatus* (p.199).

<sup>43</sup> Williams (1992) says the aute is paper mulberry (*Broussonetia papyrifera*) (p. 23). The whau is a shrub (*Entelea arborescens*) or a tree (*Nothopanax arboretum*) (p. 492). The paraa is a tuber of an edible orchid (*Gastrodia cunninghamii* or *Orthoceras strictum*) (p. 262). The horo-kio is a fern (*Blechnum capense*) similar to the aute (p. 61). Colenso (1865/2001) notes that the "exotic" aute was carefully cultivated annually and used to make head ornaments (p. 17).

motif to warn women of the consequences of lack of knowledge with respect to the proper cultivation of food.

Nahe's detail in relation to Marama going ashore with the taurekareka and travelling over land has geopolitical implications of claiming land. It is an important and valid testimony that later recorders of the tradition present in greater detail and so is dealt with further in this chapter. Nahe's softening of sexual content in his English translation, with Marama 'misbehaving', suggests the influence of his Christian education and a colonial ideology of womanly moral decency, which I suggest Nahe had yielded to, given that John White asked him to produce a Māori history (Ballara, 2012). Nahe would have understood his description would be provided to a white audience, and that the account would need to consider their sensibilities.

That Tainui waka could not be moved following Marama's sexual liaison is represented in patriarchal accounts as a phenomenon based on punishment because of that affair. Yet Nahe's description of Marama's powers to free the waka identifies that she was too powerful an identity to write out of the tradition because of a sexual act. And, in fact, rather than be so ashamed as to hide away, Marama jumps on the waka and begins to sing. She sings a song that she has composed and which mentions what previous interpreters refer to as her copulation "Turuturu haere ana mai./Te wai o te hika a Marama." It does not make sense that Marama would be so quick to vocalise to everyone assembled about behaviour likely to meet with their opprobrium.

My discussions with others (e.g., Hēni Collins personal communication, 30 September 2013) suggest that Marama, who was a young, fertile and, according to some records (see below), handsome woman had sexual urges that could not be fulfilled on board a waka that had probably been at sea for some weeks and by an older man such as Hoturoa, who, with duties to perform, needed to stay with the waka. So when the opportunity presented itself, Marama and her attendant slipped away and indulged themselves. Marama may have felt some remorse in what transpired, given other accounts stating what happened to her but it appears she felt no shame or loss of mana when she climbed on to the waka and sang her song. Rather, it seems that Marama felt great satisfaction and power following her experience while travelling overland; hence her action in response to Tainui being stuck fast.

Earlier in this chapter, I wrote about the prospect of 'te wai o te hika' being a reference to menstrual blood, although admittedly it could also apply to ejaculated semen. However, I think this unlikely given that current research shows the power attributed to menstrual blood in the oral

and early written accounts, and that I could find no reference to power held within ejaculation. Murphy's (2011) research, for example, highlights that menstrual rites and practices offered powerful themes of protection pre- and post-colonially for Māori (p. 107). Menstrual blood, Murphy explains, was seen as a protective agent against the forces of mākutū (p. 107). Essentially, her research into mōteatea and other practices provides strong evidence that there was once a corpus of rites that employed the powers and potency of menstrual blood (p. 108).

Murphy (2011) also expounds in her work of the fear, briefly mentioned above, that men had of coming into contact with menstrual blood because of possibly disturbing atua contained within. However, says Murphy, their fear was not enough to drive them completely away because of the potentiality of greater benefit from it. Māori men tended to respect the state and kept a safe distance. The atua contained within the blood, according to Murphy, was a woman's power. When arguing her thesis, Murphy offers examples of the way menses was used to clear obstructions because the blood protected, purified and banished unwanted influences (p. 109). Pere (personal communication, cited in Murphy, 2011) notes that while men protected women physically, women protected men psychically (p. 111). In Marama's tradition, there are powerful female systems at play, which have been reconstituted by male versions—versions that impose boundaries and limits on potent female power and any representation or discussion of it.

Nahe promotes the idea that Marama sings her song to free the hold that is on Tainui waka. His use of the word 'song' at this point somewhat softens the effect of the ritual and reinforces a gender role when considered alongside other narrations of this event, which state that a karakia or a tauparapara was performed, both of which invoke images of strength, power and dynamism. Despite this subtle sex role stereotyping by Nahe (women sing while men perform tauparapara or karakia), both he and Te Rangihaeata honour Marama's influence in recovering the situation.

## **Pre-1900 Pākehā-Published Sources**

### **The written account by James Hamlin**

The Reverend James Hamlin had travelled to New Zealand in 1826 with instructions to teach weaving to the "Maoris and to assist the spiritual concerns of the Mission as opportunity offered" (Ryburn, 1980, pp. 5-6). Hamlin made his first journey to Waikato in 1834 where he stayed until leaving for Gisborne in 1844 (Ryburn, 1979). Recording those who had travelled on board Tainui, Hamlin (1842) stated that they were "the men of the greatest rank" (p. 262), women did



not feature in this aspect of the tradition. Consequently it could be said that Hamlin had supported the gendering of Tainui oral traditions. His account has been studied in relation to Marama. The Reverend James Hamlin's 1842 record is the earliest written account of Tainui history that I could find. Hamlin makes no reference to Marama; instead, his discourse focuses on men and their discoveries. In relation to the events leading up to and hinting at Marama's tradition, he records the following:

The New Zealanders, in relating their mythology, can give no account of the origin or creation of the heaven and earth, or any of the heavenly bodies ... (p. 254)

It is universally acknowledged that the present inhabitants of New Zealand sprung from these men ... (p. 261). ... but these are the men of greatest rank [Hamlin names 22] ... (p. 262)

How many there were in each of the other canoes, is only known by the persons who consider themselves the immediate descendants of the men who arrived in them. (p. 262)

It has already been observed, that Tainui went round the North Cape to the western coast. What led to such a step is not known. ... The first place they touched at on their way was Cape Colville, in the Thames; and from thence they proceeded to Tamaki and Otahuhu, and would have dragged their canoe over into Manukau had it not have been sacred. (p. 262)

#### *Account summary and context*

Hamlin acknowledges only men as the doers and maintainers of Māori history and future. He attributes Tainui waka's immovability to its sacredness rather than anything else.

#### *Analysis*

Hamlin's patriarchal stake in the text makes explicit his male Christianised orientation. He selects and words his information to bias male importance, and he overviews Māori cosmology from his ideological place of benevolence and all knowingness. His work reads as if there were no women present amongst those who came to the new lands on board Tainui, and any of the other waka, for that matter; he excludes their input, thereby invisibilising them. Because of his work as a missionary, Hamlin may have found it too difficult to narrate the established tradition of Marama having sexual relations with her slave; he writes only of the sacredness of the waka at Ōtāhuhu. His triple status and position as a man, a white colonist *and* as an agent of the church has somehow allowed him an entitlement of reconstruction and censure whereby the power and importance that is Marama is discounted and obscured through the transformation wrought by the

Christian patriarchal canon. The sanitised version of the tradition that he presents not only invisibilises women's important roles but problematises women by absenting them from his retelling.

Socially, Tainui women, through their absence in Hamlin's text, are rendered passive (or even non-) participants in their own histories. They simply do not feature. Hamlin does not simply soften women's involvement, as the later recorded accounts do, but completely obscures women and women's roles. His account provides an excellent first example of colonised archetypal social messaging that normalised a discounting of Māori women's connectedness to their histories and traditions and therefore their importance. Potter (1997) calls authorial ignoring or highlighting of certain aspects of narratives and accounts "gerrymandering" (p. 187). This, he says, is an "immensely powerful system" for creating a version of events designed to accomplish certain outcomes (p. 187).

Hamlin designs his text (texturing text: Fairclough, 2003) to valorise Māori men; he uses such expressions as the 'descendants of men' and the 'men of greatest rank', and he illustrates men's absolute power by stating their willingness to drag Tainui waka over land. We know he is referring to men in this last incident because of his making no mention of women as participants in the expedition. He therefore socially constructs Māori men as the beginning, heart, and purpose of Tainui oral tradition. As a social agent, Hamlin sanctions and valorises those aspects of Tainui history that both resonated with and were functional to him as a missionary, such as the trip Tainui makes around the coast and of where the men populate the island. Hamlin also imbues a tone of patronising benevolence into his narration when he explains the paucity of Māori knowledge about creation.

While Tainui men's accounts (in text) came after Hamlin's publication, Hamlin must have been aware of the fuller tradition about Marama. I think this was the case because the detail that Hamlin provides in his record tends to support the notion that he would have heard the account from Tainui or related iwi, and they would have been unlikely, at this relatively early juncture in the colony's establishment, to have expunged women from the record.

### **The written accounts by George Grey**

In 1854, George Grey published in Māori the account of Tainui becoming stuck at Ōtāhuhu as it was given to him from the diction of Te Rangihaeata by Te Whiwhi.

Katahi ka toia nga waka i Otahuhu ... ko Tainui, ka toia, kaore i paneke, te maunga iho ano, mau tonu, kua poua e tetei wahine a Hoturoa e Marama-kiko-hura, to noa, to noa, te taea, katahi ka whak-tika mai tetei o nga wahine a Hoturoa, ka whakahuatia te karakia.

Toia Tainui

Te Arawa,

Tapotu ki te moana,

&c. &c. &c.

Ka rewa ki Manuka, ka hoe a Tainui ... (pp. 75–76)

Grey omits a full recital of the karakia, recounting only “Toia Tainui Te Arawa Tapotu ki te moana, &c. &c. &c.” (p. 76), so leaving out the important line mentioning Marama.

In another account of the incident, published in 1855, but this time translated into English 1855, Grey says:

... they hauled away at it [Tainui] in vain, they could not stir it; for one of the wives of Hoturoa, named Marama-kiko-hura, who was unwilling that the tired crews should proceed further on this new expedition, had by her enchantments fixed it so firmly to the earth that no human strength could stir it; so they hauled, they hauled, they excited themselves with cries and cheers, but they hauled in vain, they could not move it. When their strength was quite exhausted by these efforts, then another of Hoturoa's wives [an unnamed Whakaotirangi], more learned in magic and incantations than Marama-kiko-hura, grieved at seeing the exhaustion and distress of her people, rose up, and chanted forth an incantation far more powerful than that of Marama-kiko-hura; then at once the canoe glided easily over the carefully-laid skids, and it soon floated securely upon the harbour of Manuka. (p. 145)

#### *Account summary and context*

Grey's 1854 account follows almost identically Te Rangihaeata's narration that Te Whiwhi wrote down in 1851, except that where Te Whiwhi writes “Whakaotirangi”, Grey writes “tetei o nga wahine a Hoturoa”. (For an account of the politics in relation to this omission, see Chapter 4). Grey allows in his 1855 account that Marama's concern for the crew is the reason she uses her power to hold Tainui in place. He then goes on to narrate the power of Whakaotirangi during this incident, as per Te Rangihaeata.

#### *Analysis*

Grey represents the strength of Tainui ancestresses as potent and powerful in his 1855 account. In this, he explicitly refers to their agency in spiritual and ritual matters both with respect to holding Tainui fast and then enabling her release and ability to move freely once more. He follows the pattern of implying women's passivity, however, by aligning both Marama and

Whakaotirangi as his wives, as his property, thus giving the impression that they can only be powerful through him, not by their own volition. Politically, socially and culturally, Grey normalises that what and who women are is because of their men.

While traditions can be retold quite differently, as we have seen with Hamlin's account when seen alongside Nahe's, for example, Grey carefully aligns his text alongside Te Whiwhi's *except* that he does not name the two women. Grey, as a known and credible contributor, surreptitiously establishes a political dispute within his account in this regard. He takes a known Tainui descriptor, that of a significant Tainui ancestress performing a karakia, yet fails to recognise and so record important factors such as her name. According to Potter (1997), "real testimony has contradictions and confusions" (p. 174) but contradictions and confusions stand in contrast to what is ignored or left out. While not altering the discourse about Marama and Whakaotirangi, Grey nevertheless obscures Whakaotirangi's agency within Tainui tradition. And because he does not repeat the karakia that Te Whiwhi wrote down, he also ignores that section of Te Whiwhi's account that tells of Marama's sexual encounter. Thus Grey's conservative patriarchal attitude has allowed him to decide which components of the tradition to exclude and which to include. In this way, Grey grooms the tradition so that the account we are presented with is heroic yet confusing. Why would Marama watch exhausted workers haul unsuccessfully, knowing that she had enchanted the waka so that it cannot move?

### **The written account by William Colenso**

Colenso, missionary (although dismissed from service for adultery with his servant, Ripeka Meretene), founder of the printing industry in New Zealand and "learned writer" according to Rusden (1895, p. 485), authored three volumes on New Zealand history. He published them in 1881 under the title, *Contributions towards a Better Knowledge of the Māori Race*. The text from this body of work relevant to Marama is set out below, although a fuller description that includes Whakaotirangi appears in the chapter that concerns her.

... those two ladies (Marama and Whakaotirangi) proceeded to plant the various roots they had brought with them from 'Hawaiki.' This they did in two separate plantations, at a place called Te Papa-o-karewa in Kawhia; but when those several roots sprung and grew up, they all turned out differently. Of those planted by Marama, the kumara produced a pohue (*Convolvulus sepium*), the hue produced a mawhai (*Sicyos angulatus*), the aute produced a whau (*Entelea arborescens*), and the para produced a horokio. All the plantings of Marama grew wrong and strangely, and that was owing to her having transgressed with one of her male slaves.

### *Account summary and context*

The bones of Colenso's account align with the other available recordings by this time of the planting of the food crops, but he attributes Marama's plants growing oddly to her having transgressed with her slave.

### *Analysis*

Colenso problematizes Marama socially, sexually, politically and culturally. He makes no reference to her importance in Tainui tradition, but instead brings to the public sphere a colonial discourse of the consequences for women who initiate or indulge in sexual encounters, particularly if they are married women. In creating the notion that Marama's garden grew differently because of her having sex with her slave, he not only posits the failure of the crops as her fault but also brings to attention a male "sexual double standard" (Burr, 1998, p. 116), where women's sexuality is watched and categorised by men according to patriarchal and colonial rule. Colenso thus takes the moral high ground in his interpretation of events, as might be expected of a man of the cloth despite his own indiscretion.

Colenso also takes the known tradition of Marama and infuses a part of it with his own personal idiosyncratic Christian view. His use of factual Marama tradition and his own purposeful (I propose) introduced notion of punishment in the form of her plants growing strangely, Colenso organises future readers' minds to know her tradition differently from what had gone before. That Colenso presents her lack of horticultural skill as a punishment (presumably from God) highlights his very patriarchal Christian orientation. Note also that Colenso identifies Marama (and Whakaotirangi) as a lady, a term that is far from neutral in any era and particularly his, colonising as it was. As I noted in the chapter on Whakaotirangi, his use of this term could also be construed as mockery (see p. 96).

### **The written account by John White**

White drew his 1888 account featuring Marama from a Ngati Maru narrative, namely Nahe's. White presented the tradition as follows:

According to the accounts given of Tai-nui, some say she was taken, as here given, across the portage at O-tahuhu into the Manuka Harbour; others say she was not taken into, or by, the Manuka Harbour. These latter assert that the evil of Marama with her slave, after she landed at Whare-kawa, in Hau-raki (Thames), was the reason why the crew could not move the canoe when they attempted to haul her across the portage. (p. 37)

### *Account summary and context*

In White's recording, Tainui cannot be moved because of the 'evil of Marama'.

### *Analysis*

In presenting Marama as evil because of her sexual encounter with her slave, White markedly heightens denigration of Marama. Certainly, Nahe did not record her as such (see above). White's alteration highlights the missionary concept of women whose sexuality and expression of it falls outside the boundaries of Christian-sanctioned marriage as evil. His use of evil in relation to a time-honoured ancestress also vilifies an historical part of Tainui information, because this is not how the earliest narrators discuss her in relation to the pivotal event of Tainui waka being taken overland.

Absent from his socio-sexual discourse and his consequent regulation of Marama is any such regulation of the male who was involved in the event. White's interpretation perhaps also references a male fear of women's untrammelled sexual power over them, and a censuring of Māori women's (if not all women's) sexuality. The denigration of Marama may also have served as a racist conflation with respect to all Māori women, positioning them, within the context of a white patriarchal Christian canon, as lesser because of their assumed sexual promiscuity. This denigration furthermore suggests that the content of the narratives presented an uncomfortable challenge to the attitudes and values of recorders such as White, a discomfort that they relieved through discrediting of 'otherness'.

### **Post-1900 Tainui Sources**

Post-1930 Tainui sources include historian Lesley Kelly and Pei Te Hurinui-Jones which Bruce Biggs' completed and published posthumously. These men inherited the retellings of Tainui tradition from each of the sources mentioned above and they produced their publications with varying degrees of success in terms of their renditions of the available accounts. Kelly's text was one of the first to be written intra-tribally since the earlier outsider colonial books. He had a keen interest in Tainui tribal history and had documented whakapapa (genealogies) from the late 1920's as he travelled throughout the Waikato collecting stories, waiata and memories from the elders there. His work has been used to support and add to the oral traditions in relation to Tainui ancestresses.

### The published account by Leslie G. Kelly

Kelly took his information about Marama during the launching of Tainui from Aoterangi. Kelly's first mention of her is when she notices the waka is not sitting well in the water (see p. 129, this chapter). And, like Aoterangi, Kelly presents her as the second woman crew member. He then continues his account from other sources, including George Graham (see below).

At [Wharekawa] Marama, the second wife of Hoturoa, went on shore with the intention of proceeding overland to Tamaki where she proposed to later join the vessel. ... no mention is made of the *tangata-whenua*, but this part of the country is believed to have been thickly populated, and Marama appears to have been made welcome (p. 51). ... Eventually the canoe reached the source-waters of the river, where, in the vicinity of Otahuhu, they rested to await the arrival of Marama who, it will be remembered, had left the canoe at Wharekawa to continue her journey overland. ... In due course Marama arrived and joined the others of Tainui. Concerning her journey overland ... after landing at Wharekawa, the chieftainess, accompanied by a party of Tini o Toi, crossed the country to Pari-tai-uru, a *pa* about two miles from the present township of Papakura and now part of the Pukekiwiriki reserve. Here Marama was lavishly entertained, and here, also, the ceremonies of *pure* and *uruurumhenua* for the purpose of establishing rights over the land, were performed. After staying some time Marama proceeded on her way and joined Tainui at Whangaimakau. ... skids were laid and when all was ready the people took up position to haul the canoe, but Tainui refused to move. Seeing this Marama remarked: "He aha te take I kore ai te waka e tere?" (For what reason would the canoe not move?). It was then disclosed by Riukiuta that he had detected Marama in an adulterous love affair with a slave, and it was consequently decided that this breach of *tapu* on the part of Marama was the cause of the trouble, and that it would be unwise to move until the necessary rites had been performed to restore to Marama her *mana tapu*. After some delay this was done, but Marama was forever afterwards known as Marama-kiko-hura (Marama-of-the-exposed-flesh) and Marama-hahake (Marama-the-naked). As for her companion in guilt, Te Okaroa, he was put to death for his part in the affair. ... most traditions assert that the man was a slave and one of the *tangata-whenua* (pp. 52–53).

The reference to Marama [in the chant as per Te Rangihaeata, Aoterangi etc.] is generally regarded as a direct reference to her adulterous love-affair, but on the whole the chant appears to be a very old one, in which the name of Marama has been substituted to suit the occasion. [Kelly then repeats what Aoterangi has said in relation to Hoturoa living with Marama at Maketu; see Kelly, 1949, p. 63].

Although Hoturoa had become reconciled with Whakaotirangi, he did not separate from his minor wife Marama-kiko-hura immediately. After the immigrants had been resident in Kawhia for the greater part of a year, states Te Hurinui, Marama-kiko-hura gave birth to a son who was named Tane-nui. The child was regarded with suspicion by Hoturoa, for he remembered the love affair which Marama had indulged in with Te Okaroa at Tamaki, and he consequently did not bestow the affection which he would otherwise have done. Finally, during the absence of Marama who had gone to the sea-

shore to gather shell fish, young Tane-nui because restless and cried for his mother. After some endeavours to pacify the child, Hoturoa finally became angered and vented his spite by giving Tane-nui his *membrum virile* to suckle. This gross insult to her offspring was duly communicated to Marama on her return, with the result that she parted from Hoturoa, and taking her child with her, left the district. Departing from Kawhia ... Marama came north to Tamaki and joined her relatives there ... and finally settled at the pa *Pari-tai-uru* where she became the ancestor of the Nga Marama.

#### *Account summary and context*

Kelly provides a cumulative description of events about Marama that moves from her leaving the home lands through to the establishment of her people through her son in the new lands. His account follows Tainui iwi land interests that resulted from Marama's travel overland with her lover, named here as Te Okaroa. He also writes about how well Marama is looked after and 'lavishly entertained' as she travels across the island. Marama's sexual encounter with her slave is described by Kelly (the event is a distinguishing feature of her tradition), and the severe consequences that follow, with Te Okaroa being put to death.

Kelly's account also illustrates how loved Marama was by her people (they named a hapū after her). He identifies Marama's descendants through her child and gives the reason as to why Marama leaves Hoturoa, which possibly coincided with Hoturoa visiting Whakaotirangi and living with her from then on as stated in earlier accounts. Kelly records that Marama became a renowned ancestress of the Ngā Marama people, and that when she eventually leaves Hoturoa for good, she goes to live amongst these people in their lands.

#### *Analysis*

Kelly distinguishes that Marama was the 'second wife' and 'minor wife' of Hoturoa. He records her as a chieftainess, which is new terminology, considering earlier accounts. Kelly's work props up the earlier rhetorical patriarchal renderings of Marama's importance as being enacted through her husband. Also, as in earlier accounts, his discourse of second wife and minor wife suggests power identities of ruler and ruled, a conceptualization needing further investigation, as I posed earlier.

Geo-politically, Kelly draws on Marama's overland trek to establish important boundaries and community relationships with the people of the land. The level of recognition allocated to Marama's active acquisition of Tainui lands, notably without Hoturoa's governance and regulation, is interesting. It defies the hegemonic patriarchal control of land sequestration. That



Marama claims territorial rights without the need for war or force increases her mana, and may have been a strategy on the part of Tainui because the reports of Marama being lavishly entertained highlight that she was desirable and had great mana not only amongst own people but also amongst other iwi. The good impression she makes on the people at the places she visits and the length of time she stays indicates that she is made very welcome and the trek was a success for her. Certainly, she was welcomed back there when she finally leaves Hoturoa.

A critical marker (Denzin, 1989) of Marama's tradition is the sexual liaison that she engages in and the severity of its consequences—the debasing names that Marama was to live with for the rest of her life and death for Te Okaroa. Denzin (1989, p. 69) claims that only representations of experience can ever be captured, and so it is interesting that Kelly is the first to mention the consequences of the 'adulterous love affair'. Highly likely is the notion that the death was Tainui iwi reactions in response to the notion of disloyalty to Hoturoa rather than because of Marama's sexual engagement with her slave. As I posited earlier, it is probable an opportunity to engage in coitus while Tainui was travelling was very limited, and that the eventual trip overland with her slave provided Marama with opportunity to release powerful sexual urges. However, such was the people's reverence for Hoturoa as their leader that the ultimate price to this transgression was a public death (personal communication H. Collins, 30 September 2013). Explicit in the text is the social messaging of consequence, but with those consequences probably exercised for reasons other than the immorality assumed of and ascribed to Marama in earlier accounts of this tradition.

The fact that Kelly does not write of the other critical marker or distinguishing feature of Marama's tradition—her cultivations—is surprising in some ways yet understandable. Plants not growing as they should probably do not have the same social-narrative allure as great waka being immovable and indiscreet sexual liaisons. However, the omission of these types of detail helps trace what is remembered and what is dropped off in the traditions and, through careful analysis that are mindful of the socio-cultural and political contexts at the time of each retelling, helps us explain why.

Hoturoa's suspicion about the parentage of Marama's baby perfectly highlights what Bachofen (1973) had to say about a man never truly knowing if a child is his or not. The retelling of this particular incidence describes patriarchal power and control of Marama. The perverse violation of her son also constitutes a violation of her. While the action appears to have been

based on a moral authority (Staeheli & Kofman, 2004), the debasing strategy emphasises Hoturoa's (men's) ability to control and rule. The only avenue left open to Marama is to leave her home and the area entirely to keep her child and herself safe.

### **The published accounts by Pei Te Hurinui Jones and Bruce Biggs**

Jones and Biggs' accounts relating to Marama are similar to Kelly's but because there are some subtle differences between the two and Jones and Biggs provide information additional to that given by Kelly, I repeat here what they had to say in relation to Marama.

When the canoe floated, one of Hoturoa's wives, seeing that it was not riding well, called to Hoturoa, 'Hotu', your canoe is *tai-nui*." ... [Jones and Biggs provide a footnote saying "According to Ao-te-rangi it was Marama who said ..."]. Hoturoa sat in the stern and next were his wives Whaka-otirangi and Marama-of-the-exposed-flesh (Marama-the-naked was another name for her). (p. 28)

*Tainui* went from Wai-whakapukuhanga to Whare-kawa, a little further on. At that place the local people revealed that there was another sea to the west. When Marama-kiko-hura heard this she said that she and others would go by land, and meet up again at Oo-taahuhu. *Tainui* reached the headwaters of Taamaki at Whaangai-makau, near Ootaahuhu. There Marama' and the people set down at Whare-kawa were waiting. On their journey Marama' and the others had come to a place called Pari-taiuru (today it is called Hill-of-small-bones and lies between Papa-kura and Huunua). There they were entertained by the local people. There, also, they conducted the ritual for entering new lands. Marama's party were carrying the *Tainui* talismans. They were of stone, and perhaps Korotangi was one of them. At this place were some of Taahuhu-nui's people who have been spoken of as coming across before *Tainui*. Marama' and the others came on and reached Hoturoa at Whaangai-makau. [Jones and Biggs repeat Aoterangi's text in relation to Marama arriving back at the waka, the questioning as to why it would not move, and Riukiuta's conjecture. He names Okaroa as the person Marama had been involved with]. When he [Riu-ki-uta] heard the question he thought something was wrong, that Marama' had misbehaved with one of her party. According to others it was with one of the local people, named Okaroa. With appropriate ritual *Tainui* moved at last and was dragged into Maanuka. [Jones and Biggs provide the "ritual spell" in the same form as that in Aoterangi (pp. 42–43)]. When they reached there [Kaawhia] Hoturoa left Whakaotirangi, his senior wife, and lived with his junior wife, Marama-of-the-exposed-body. (p. 52).

Hoturoa did not think much of Marama-of-the-exposed-body at this time and she was upset about it. She was pregnant and the thought had occurred to Hoturoa that he was not responsible for his junior wife's condition, but that it was the result of her misbehaviour while they were at Taamaki. Marama gave birth to a son who was named Taane-nui (Many-husbands) on account of the talk that she had sinned with a man. It came about that Marama went to the beach to gather seafood. Taane-nui, left behind, did nothing but cry, and after a time Hoturoa, anxious to soothe the child, got up and suckled it with his penis. When Marama came back she heard of Taane-nui's ill-

treatment by Hoturoa. She decided to leave with her child. She and Taane-nui went and lived at Taamaki and never returned. Taane-nui grew up at Taamaki and his descendants were raised there. (p. 54)

#### *Account summary and context*

I have already summarized and discussed much of the content in Jones and Biggs' account, such as the ritual karakia when Marama returns from her trip and Tainui waka not moving. Although presenting details about and positioning Marama in ways given in the earlier accounts, such as Marama being the wife of Hoturoa, Jones and Biggs clearly associate her with place names that identify specific land marks. They also state that Marama carries the sacred emblems acknowledged earlier as having been given to Whakaotirangi by her father, Memeha-o-te-rangi. Marama performs rituals over the lands, and the motif of her liaison with Okaroa is also mentioned, but here Okaora is presented as 'one of the local people', not as a slave. Marama's life at Kāwhia before Hoturoa's abuse of her baby and her decision to return to where she had met Okaroa is also recounted.

#### *Analysis*

The genderised discourse of Marama as the wife of Hoturoa continues. It is worthwhile, however, to be continually mindful of the historical repetitiveness of the messages that are internalised by men and women alike through the highly organised way in which the writing is formulated to cement those messages, such as the obscuring of Marama's agency by writing of her as Hoturoa's possession, and the emphasis, from the outset, on the denigrating versions of Marama's name.

The new pieces of information that Jones and Biggs received from oral sources, such as kaumātua while on the marae, information probably passed to them perhaps because of their close kinship ties, deserves reflection. Both the place names that Jones and Biggs relay and the discourse in relation to rituals and the talismans that Marama has in her possession empower her. There is no mention of why Marama is now in possession of these taonga, and also of the Korotangi, which Jones and Biggs say is a Tainui heirloom (at the time of their writing, Korotangi was housed in the Wellington Museum). However, one interpretation can be drawn from Jones and Biggs' ongoing account, which says that after Marama disembarks, Tainui sails around the coast, indicating that the crew had land in their sight, which is different from both a

safety and psychological points of view to being out at sea, away from land altogether. Whakaotirangi stays on board Tainui when Marama disembarks.

Until this time, Whakaotirangi has carried the sacred emblems that help keep the travellers safe throughout the sea crossing, but now that they have reached the new lands, there is no longer the same imperative to keep them on the waka. The handing over of the taonga would have involved a ritual ceremony, no doubt performed by the women. That Marama heads overland with these emblems, which had been carried on Tainui waka as the mauri for the journey from the homelands, suggests that she is well trusted and cared for by her people. She was going into unknown territory; the mauri would ensure her safe return back to Tainui waka. Jones and Biggs do not identify exactly where this additional information came from, but the fact that they have it and include it suggests that the oral traditions about her continued to be told by her iwi descendants, and that, for them, Marama's importance and her work of claiming land for Tainui, remained relatively undiminished. That said, although Marama's supreme importance as a woman to Tainui iwi is supported by events such as the carrying of the sacred emblems, in other subtle ways, such as those described above, her importance is undermined when the account of her significance becomes subsumed by Hoturoa's, as it does in Kelly's narration.

The same subsuming is evident in the account of Marama's level of authority over the political geography (Staeheli & Kofman, 2004), where Marama has critical decisions to make and rituals to perform. The rituals are important motifs that identify not only the importance of the people who travelled, but also the significance of the claiming of the land for Tainui. Even so, Marama's level of power or source of power is not depicted unconditionally, as exemplified by the outcome of her affair with Te Okaroa. The recurrent motif of Marama taking a lover, and now the implication in the current account that she met him, given his identification as tangata whenua rather than a slave, while travelling overland, provides a brief promotion of her independent self. However, the consequences of that act depict censure for women stepping outside of a set boundary. Hoturoa's mistreatment of Marama's son and her retreat, never to return, to the place where she had her affair illustrate a level of tension and oppression that Marama and her son endured from Hoturoa and possibly others for some time after the event. Thus, women's political, social and sexual boundaries are demarcated by patriarchal conditions, which hold that chiefly men at least may have more than one wife, but the same is not possible for women. It is very likely that these boundaries sought to protect the whakapapa of the union

(see Bachofen, 1973, p. 133, and also Chapter one, p. 53, of this thesis for discourse on this thought).

## **Post-1900 Pākehā Sources**

### **The published accounts by George Graham**

Graham, a Christian and avid writer of Māori histories, contributed to the discussions about Marama through his close work with Māori over many years collecting information on their traditions and beliefs, which he published in the form of papers through the Polynesian Society and in a number of books. Graham published *Tainui* in 1951. Although he collected much of his information for this publication from Maihi te Kapua te Hinaki in 1894, it sits in the post-1900 Pākehā corpus of writers because Graham had an ongoing hand about what was published and what was not in relation to indigenous traditions. This section of the chapter provides accounts about Marama that Graham attributes to two Māori men. Their accounts and my commentary about them are followed by a more detailed analysis with respect to Graham's description.

### **MAIHI TE KAPUA TE HINAKI'S ACCOUNT IN RELATION TO MARAMA, RECORDED 1894, PUBLISHED 1951**

Hinaki was Ngāti Paoa and Ngāti Whatua, which possibly explains why he names Hotunui rather than Hoturoa as the captain of *Tainui* (see earlier chapter).

At Waihihi-Hotunui's wife, Marama, had decided to remain, and to later follow on, with an escort of her attendants overland. She had her reasons. (p. 82)

... Now Rakataura was a *matakite* (a clairvoyant). He that night had a dream. He saw a *manumea* (a red sacred bird), clasped in contest with a *ngarara* (a reptile) at Waihihi. He knew this dream disclosed a *rururaru* (troublous affair) and affecting Marama; and hence the cause of *Tainui*'s men being unable to move the canoe. For from that happening was due the lack of virility (*ngiokore*) of *Tainui*'s menfolk. Their strength was sapped.

... When at last Marama and her party arrived, she asked, "why the canoe was not portaged, and why it did not move?" Rakataura then knew from her manner, and her questioning, that to her was due this trouble. So thereupon, she made known her fault (Ka whakina tona he.) Her misconduct was in fact with her *mokai* (slave man), Te Okaroa, at Waihihi. Many then were the ceremonies gone through to counteract this misdoing—ceremonies of *purenga* (purification) of *whakaboronga* (cleaning) and so on. The erring slave was then sacrificed. His body was hung on a *karaka* tree. ... (p. 84)

Marama divested herself of her garments—wearing only her inferior *marohukahuka* (a frontlet apron). Her right to wear her superior apron (*maropurua*) was forfeited until her husband had forgiven her fault.<sup>44</sup> Marama then mounted the canoe and chanted a *tapatapahau*.<sup>45</sup> [Graham repeats the same chant as given by Aoterangi but starts it at the line “He tarawai-nuku”]. (p. 85)

... On the launching place of Tainui at Manuka, Marama again left her people. She went with her attendants overland to rejoin Tainui at Kawhia. There she came, and was again favoured by Hoturoa. But in her fallen reputation, she was disrespected, and was known by nicknames (*ingoa taunu*)—Maramatahanga, Maramamahaki, or Maramakihura, all names implying lewdness. Marama gave birth to a son at Kawhia. ... Marama also made cultivation at Kawhia. But it did not prosper (*ka huhua kore*), being overgrown with *pohuehue* (a wild convulvulus). For the stain of her misdoing was still with her ...

Now Hotunui had cared well for Tamaroa, the son of Marama, although he looked with disfavour on the child. At last a quarrel arose between Hotu’ and Marama. She considered Hotu’ in many ways had belittled the boy, and ill-treated him. Due to this and the failure of her *kumara* crop, she left Kawhia with her son on her return to Tamaki. There she rejoined Hiaora at Puketutu, Poutukeka at Puketapapa, and others of Tainui at Tamaki. Marama was the ancestress of the Nga Marama, which tribe in after times merged with the Waiohua of Tamaki, and the Ngati Pou (descendants of Poutukeka) in Waikato, and to the southward in Hauraki. (p. 86)

#### ***Account summary and context***

By Rakataura’s vision, the account hints that Marama has had an affair and that it has affected the Tainui crew. She had travelled overland as per earlier accounts. The seriousness of Marama’s conduct results in her taking off her special clothes and the performing of many ceremonies, including those relating to Te Okaroa’s death. Marama rights the situation with a *tapatapahau*, after which she again journeys overland to meet up with her people later. Hinaki says that the lewd names her people give her are in recognition of the event with her slave; he also attributes the poor growth of her cultivations to the affair. Hinaki mentions Marama’s reconnection with those of Tainui who had disembarked and establishes her connections with Ngā Marama.

---

<sup>44</sup> Graham’s footnote says: “*marohukahuka* (or *hukahuka*): A frontlet or apron ornamented with thrums (*hukahuka*). Worn by secondary wives (*wahineiti*)”, as was Marama. The senior wife, as was Whakaotirangi, wore the *marowharanui*.

<sup>45</sup> Graham’s footnote says: *tapatapahau*: This chant by Marama was ex tempore, and adapted to this occasion. It was based on a more ancient formula of Hawaiian origin. Like a sailor’s shanty. It was intended to disperse adverse influences, and bring about strength and unison to the haulers (*kaito*).

### *Analysis*

Hinaki's account problematises Marama's sexual encounter by claiming that it weakens (affects the virility) of the men of Tainui waka, such that they cannot move her. Their disempowered state was likely brought on by the rage, hurt and anger they felt coupled with a sadness that one of their most favoured womenfolk had been sexually involved with someone other than their captain, Hoturoa (personal communication Hēni Collins, 30 September 2013). Socially, then, the event has a negative impact on their emotions and saps their commitment to the task of moving Tainui.

Hinaki says that Marama confesses to what she has done, and the many ritual ceremonies then carried out coupled with the death of Te Okaroa highlight the seriousness of the event. It is interesting that Marama removes her own garments, which could be because of her distressed state at witnessing the death of her lover and viewing him hanging on the tree. Hinaki says that Hoturoa would decide when she could again wear the maropurua, which highlights renderings of patriarchal moral authority and exemplifies a double standard where male infidelity is sanctioned in some circumstances, particularly where chiefly men were concerned. Even though Marama removes her clothes, except for a small apron, she still mounts the waka to perform what Hinaki calls a tapatapahau. And despite Marama being the reason for the waka not moving or perhaps because of it, the release of it from that state also comes from her.

Marama's second overland journey is a new addition to her tradition; she again leaves her people, who are possibly in a state of grief at the events that have occurred due to the sexual affair with Te Okaroa. Marama has possibly felt it best that she leaves for a time. Hinaki says that although Hoturoa initially continues to favour her, Marama is disrespected by her people. The names attributed to her because of her carnal connection with Te Okaroa certainly suggest that loss of respect, if not disdain. The poor state of Marama's cultivation is also attributed here to her liaison.

The singular aspect of Hinaki's account is the extent to which he maximizes the result of Marama's decision to engage in a sexual act with her slave. Not only is Te Okaroa killed, but Marama is divested of clothing designed to inform others of her importance. These extraordinary acts demonstrate how serious extramarital affairs, when initiated by women, were deemed to be by the male tellers and recorders. The descriptions are examples of sexual politics and double standards within the oral tradition where, while Hoturoa is married to two women, there is an

expectation that the women must remain faithful to the one man. The account also shows that Marama is considered to be accountable to everyone on board Tainui, not just Hoturoa. Her actions affect everybody, and thus there is a psychological aspect to the message within the tradition. Her denigrating renaming by the people corresponds to Burr's (1998) discussion of women being watched by men and subject to their scrutiny (p. 115). Marama continues to carry any one of those names today. A patriarchal canon thus continues to send a very strong message about sexual promiscuity when initiated by women, and it highlights an example of the gendered social control of women's sexuality.

Hinaki also brings Hoturoa's ill treatment of Marama's son to the reader's attention, and the wording of this passage strongly implies that the child is not Hoturoa's. Hinaki begins the sentence with how well Hoturoa has looked after the child, which could be a message to Tamaroa's descendants that although their ancestor left the area because of Hoturoa, he was not so badly treated. Marama's decision to return to the lands where she had her relationship with Te Okaroa suggests the vulnerability of her position, especially after her quarrel with her husband about Tamaroa, and her assumed humiliation over the failure of her crops. She may also have been vulnerable when travelling the relatively long distance with her baby son to Ōtāhuhu (personal communication Hēni Collins, 30 September 2013).

However, the journey also marks out her courage and her agency in seeking security and belonging for herself and her son. That she goes back to the lands that connected her to Te Okaroa also tends to illustrate that this was a meaningful place for her. The people she met up with and who joined her as she travelled to Tamaki, and her attribution as the ancestress of the tribe Ngā Marama, which was formed in the area by her descendants, is solid evidence of the love and respect that Marama generated amongst her new family and iwi.

Graham (1927) earlier wrote that following her so-called disgrace, Marama remained on Puketutu Island, where she founded a significant tribe called Ngā Marama. The two scenarios, one of disgrace, the other of founding a significant tribe, do not meld well together. The founding of Ngā Marama in honour of their tipuna is a known history that does not match the connotations that come with the words disgrace and evil, such as powerlessness and incompetence. Simmons (1987) provides a diagram of the area around Puketutu and of Puketutu itself.<sup>46</sup> Despite broad

---

<sup>46</sup> See Simmons (1987, p. 9).



searches, I was unable to find other information about the island or about Marama's links to it. Puketutu Island is not mentioned in any of the previous accounts. In 1920, Graham said that the people of Hauraki were all descendants through-inter marriage of Ngāti Huarere, Ngāti Hako, Ngā Marama, Kahui-ariki and Uri-o-Pou (p. 37). However, even though there were marriages between the hapū groups, there came a time when they skirmished and battled over land and food resources.

A final comment in relation to Hinaki's account is Graham's footnote describing Whakaotirangi and Marama as senior and secondary wife, respectively which has awkward connotations. Such terms recast women as ranked and so appear as extremely political and not conducive to harmonious relations between womenfolk.

### **Explanation by Wiremu Hoterene Taipari (recorded in 1887, published in 1949)**

This account told to Graham by Tukumana Te Taniwha of Ngāti Maru provides an alternative explanation as to why one of the plants that Marama planted, the aute, failed to thrive.

This attempt at acclimatization was, however unsuccessful, due to the adverse climatic conditions, hence the aute gradually died out. At Hauraki, however, it lingered on till the early decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. At Waihihi (Wharekawa) a grove of aute grew, said to have been planted by Maramatahanga, and was known as "Te uru aute o Maramatahanga." A hapū of the Ngati Whanaunga was known as Ngāti Aute. Kiwi Te Aute was a lineal descendant of Marama (also known as Ngati Aute). He died about 1900 AD. This adage of the aute, in Hauraki thriving there unruffled, was symbolic of the comparatively peaceful and prosperous conditions formerly said to have prevailed among the peace loving tribes of Hauraki. (p. 74)

### ***Account summary and context***

According to Te Taniwha, at least one of Marama's plants—the aute—is said to have died from the cold in the new lands. Te Hinaki, in his narrative to Graham (1951), speaks of the gardens overgrown with the pōhuehue, as mentioned above, which Te Hinaki says is a wild convolvulus. Te Taniwha's description of the garden seemingly smothered by this weed supports Nahe's (1880) account. Therefore stress is laid on the climate and condition of the soil rather than on Marama's affair.

### **The published account by Lindsay Buick**

Buick (1911), a historian of New Zealand events, wrote his impressions of Marama's tradition from George Grey's (1854) publication. A paraphrase of what he said suffices here. According to Buick, Marama is an enchantress who has supernatural agency that no human strength can move. He says that the charm of the enchantress could not be broken (p. 19). He follows Grey's lead in not naming Whakaotirangi, and labels her interventions as 'womanly sympathy' for the situation the crew find themselves in. He says this second wife [Whakaotirangi] was "more gifted in the art of magic than her sister" and that she "chanted an incantation so great in virtue that instantly the spell was loosed and the wicked work of a disappointed woman [Marama] undone" (p. 19). Buick narrates that "with a profound faith in her skill as a mistress of magic, the weary crews once more bent themselves to their task" (p. 20).

### ***Analysis***

Buick's renderings are attention-grabbing. He pathologises both Marama and Whakaotirangi in aligning their actions with a discourse of wickedness, enchantment and magic, similar to fairy tales such as Snow White and Rose Red. In doing so, Buick romanticises and trivializes not only the work of Marama and Whakaotirangi within oral tradition but oral traditions themselves. Thus, the ancestors in oral tradition appear as good or evil, and as winners or losers with magical powers depending on their association with what the society of Buick's time assumedly considered righteous. In this way, he adds another tier to male construction of narratives and male spin on what were important cultural experiences. Under Buick's pen, these now appear as almost farcical.

### **The published account by F. Phillips**

Phillips (1985, 1995) had a long and intimate association with Tainui people, and he used Land Court records in his work. In respect to Marama and her affair, Phillips (1995) heads a chapter in his book with the title "The Tragic Story of Marama" (p. 5). He continues:

Marama was one of the women of noble rank who journeyed to New Zealand on *Tainui*. She was the beautiful junior wife of Hoturoa, and seems to have won not only his love but also the affection and regard of the whole crew. ... Marama, fatigued by the voyage, was given leave to travel overland. ... Marama was escorted by a party of her hosts to Paretaiuru ... Here she was entertained in the manner appropriate for a

woman of noble birth and a recent arrival from the homeland whence their ancestors had departed several generations earlier. Such comfort and hospitality were undoubtedly a welcome change for Marama after the dangers and discomforts of a long ocean voyage in a small vessel. Marama exercised her powers to claim mana over the land in the ceremony known as *uruuru whenua*, presumably with the knowledge and approval of the inhabitants. ... while *Tainui* awaited Marama at the head of the Tamaki estuary to make the portage to Manukau, she succumbed to the attraction of a man named Te Okaroa. He is referred to as a slave by Maori historians but was probably a man of standing and influence among his own people, although they seem to have made no effort to assist him when the liaison later led to his death.

... When Marama finally arrived at Tauoma portage, the vessel was still moored offshore, but on her arrival preparations were made to haul it overland to Manukau ... A multitude of local people assembled to watch the event and to assist. When all was ready, the appropriate incantations were made and the people called upon to haul lustily upon ropes secured to the bow and stern of the vessel. However, their efforts were unavailing and the bow of the vessel slipped off the rollers. Marama, who was standing on the bank where she could observe the proceedings, called to ask why the canoe had not moved: 'He aha te take i kore ai te waka e tere?' Riukiuta angrily shouted in reply, 'The fault is yours because of your misconduct with that low-born man Te Okaroa.'

When the people saw that Marama was embarrassed by the accusation, they called upon her to make an answer to it. Then Marama confessed her adultery ... Poor Marama, suddenly torn down in shame and ignominy from the pinnacle to which she had been carried by the affection of her friends and relatives, the adulation and esteem of the *tangatawhenua* and the passion of her romance, was forced to witness the cruel death inflicted upon her young lover ... The elder wives of Hoturoa—Whakaotirangi, Amonga and Takahiroa—seized the opportunity to publicly displace Marama from her place as favourite and abstracted the fine garments that denoted her chiefly rank so that she was left only with the meagre apron worn by slaves and commoners ...

As the anger of Hoturoa and the people abated, the elaborate ceremonies necessary to appease the guardian spirit of the vessel and the *tapu* status of Marama herself were conducted ...

When *Tainui* arrived at Kawhia, Hoturoa and Marama were reconciled and she resumed her place as his favourite wife ... The common people, however, no doubt encouraged by the other wives of Hoturoa, did not restore Marama to the place of esteem she had held among them. They referred to her as Marama hakehake—naked Marama—or Marama kiko-hua—bare-flesh Marama ... The success that attended the gardening efforts of Whakaotirangi so delighted Hoturoa that she was again accepted as favourite wife, and poor Marama was once more relegated to inferior status.

Soon after, Marama was delivered of a son, named Motai. Hoturoa, however, remembered the illicit love affair with Te Okaroa and could not wholly accept that the child was his own. His suspicions led to such a breach of domestic harmony that

Marama finally resolved to leave him and return to the people at Paretaiuru, where her brief romance had flowered. She returned to live among the people of that village and so successfully established her mana that they became known as Ngamarama, a tribe whose domain eventually extended not only over the Papakura district but also over the east coast at Whangamata. From there it extended as far as Tauranga Harbour, where Ngamarama were paramount until displaced by Ngai te Rangi and Ngati Tamatera. (pp. 5–6)

#### *Account summary and context*

Phillips acknowledges the rank of Marama in Tainui tradition and recounts her trip overland with the people who accompanied her. He recounts the voyage from the homelands and Marama's claim to land as she travelled across it. He tells of Te Okaroa and his possible standing within his community and the affair that he and Marama indulged in, together with the recounting of the events when Marama returned to the waka, including Te Okaroa's eventual death. Phillips introduces a vexed Whakaotirangi, Amonga and Takahiroa and their displacement of Marama. He also tells of the names that Marama was forced to bear after the Te Okaroa incident, her gardens growing differently, her eventual return to the lands of Te Okaroa, and the Ngā Marama iwi domain.

#### *Analysis*

The editors of Norman Denzin's (1989) book *Interpretive Biography* argue that the telling of someone's life involves "a good deal of bold assertion and immodest neglect" (p. 5). Phillips relays an oral tradition about Marama that captures some of the lesser known details about her. He does this through his assertion, if not *bold* assertion, that he takes from fitting together the fragmented pieces of the histories that he had grown up hearing and by uncovering related events that previously had not been connected. For instance, Phillips' description of the local people arriving to watch the event of Tainui leaving Tauoma and the use of appropriate incantations to get Tainui moving have not been previously recounted.

Denzin (1989) calls such details "facts" if they are events that are believed to have occurred and "facticities" if the descriptions of the facts connect individuals with their lived experiences (p. 23). In his retelling of Marama's tradition, Phillips uses a mix of facticities with the more widely known aspects of Marama, such as her overland trip and her sexual encounter with Te Okaroa. Phillips, as an outside observer (self-acknowledged Pākehā; see Phillips, 1989, p. ix, and 1995, p. ix) also develops the discussion relating to the Ngā Marama people.

Phillips' pattern of retelling Marama follows the usual course of male censure, although he discusses more widely than do earlier authors the extent of her character and strength. While Phillips describes Marama's sexual liaison with Te Okaroa as a turning point in her life, his use of the word 'tragic' to describe her tradition is telling in terms of the position that he takes. Missing is acknowledgement of the enjoyment she must have had with Te Okaroa; his description strips Marama of the autonomy she exercises through her voluntary participation with her lover. Phillips' account reeks of patriarchal benevolence and a discourse suggestive of women as the weaker sex and who are needful of male protection. He also introduces the notion of women being pitted against one another in general rather than one another's strength and allies.

Phillips calls Marama 'the beautiful junior wife of Hoturoa', which tends to add a romantic tone to the text, although we know that Marama is junior to Whakaotirangi. Phillips' account is the first to introduce the notion that Marama is beautiful. His use of the word beautiful contrasts with how he describes Whakaotirangi, Amonga and Takahiroa. He presents them as the 'older wives' of Hoturoa, implying that because they were older, they could not have been beautiful. He thus introduced the notion that they were jealous of Marama (because of her youth and her beauty) and sets the scene for rendering the three women as embracing the opportunity to publicly humiliate Marama.

This interpretation, which has not been put previously, denigrates the mana of the women, including Marama. Previous accounts of Whakaotirangi in particular highlight that she was a woman of high mana, prestige and character, themselves attributes of a beauty different to that constructed by Phillips' discourse. His description of Whakaotirangi in particular belittles her status. His description of Marama as Hoturoa's 'favourite' wife adds to his jealousy discourse. However, each of the women would have had their unique place and position of importance. They could equally have admired Marama's daring in taking a lover younger than her husband who quite possibly was spent with so many wives to satisfy.

While Phillips attributes to Marama powers to claim mana over the land, he ostensibly writes out her powers and those of Whakaotirangi in ritual matters, as neither woman is connected with the freeing of the waka, despite the emphasis on this incident in the earlier accounts of Te Rangiahaeata and Nahe. Te Okaroa's death coupled with Marama's defrocking

conveys a patriarchal power and control warning to men and women of the inaccessibility of married women.

Phillips' account of Marama's overland journey and her return to her lover's lands is comprehensive in comparison to the other recorded accounts. Because Phillips was a historian keenly interested in Tainui's movements through and around the area where he lived, he appears to be a neutral teller of their history (as opposed, for example, to an iwi member). There is good reason to accept, therefore, aspects about Marama and her travels that he puts forward, as additions to what we already know of her traditions.

### **Conclusion: Politics that Emerge**

This chapter has drawn out the political, sexual and social implications of the male-authored texts in relation to Marama and therefore, by association, Māori women. The social mores of the times in which the traditions were narrated, collected and published focused the male narrators on female despair and deception; Marama's tradition emerges as a caution rather than as acknowledgement of her matriarchal influences on her people. According to the effects of the gendered power in the retelling, Marama is humiliated, punished and discarded for a time by her people. The discourse in the male retellings relays a male sanction, prejudice and right to censor women's behaviour. Marama is upheld in the accounts as a woman who not appropriately demonstrated her female obligations to her husband and her iwi.

Marama initially presents as an ancestress of note in the mid-19th-century Māori accounts. However, the colonial patriarchal canon corroborates and initiates a representation of Marama that contrasts with the narratives of mid-19th-century Tainui men—Te Rangihaeata, Aoterangi and Nahe—in which her potent powers are depicted as accepted womanly agency. The discourse about her in the accounts that follow centres foremost on the politics of paternalism, sexism and moralistic discipline, which over time lead to an overthrow of potent female lead in spiritual power.

Cross-contamination of colonial accounts such as Colenso's meant Marama's tradition (and Whakaotirangi's) became known as a source of derision rather than for the important messages of female agency contained within them. The late-19th-century and early-20th-century colonised accounts selected and sustained the introduced notions of punishment and caution which served and upheld male interests of watchfulness and control of women which meant that their actions

were inhibited, unlike male actions. Thus, a social control of female activity was instituted where women are supervised and their actions judged according to hierarchal patriarchal values, attitudes and often religious perspectives. There is an ideological expectation that women must be obedient to their husbands, but this expectation is different to the constituted roles of Māori and Pākehā men who tend to go unsupervised. The feminine, then, has been politically and sexually subjected and controlled, leaving its powerful and important role in ritual curtailed or extinguished altogether.

With regard to the paternalistic discourse, Colvin (2009) observes that texts “that deploy this rhetorical strategy are characterised by a particularly fine observation of the desirable behaviours and characteristics of the native” (p. 193). She goes on to note that only certain natives are singled out for recognition and praise, which works to serve to themselves (the colonists) how well their strategies of colonisation are working. As an ancestress of some importance to Tainui, Marama was a prime ‘native’ put to paternalistic scrutiny and interpretation: describing her tradition in ways that encouraged others to learn from her ‘immoral’ characteristics seems to be one of the essential components of the male narratives about her.

In keeping with patriarchal tropes, each account positions Marama as subservient and under the dominion, as his wife, of Hoturoa. The texts read that Marama was allocated a status because she was married to Hoturoa and so is always of less importance than him. Examples within the texts include Te Rangihaeata’s ‘tetahi wahine a Hoturoa’, Aoterangi’s ‘tera o nga wahine a Hoturoa’, and Buick’s ‘this second wife’. In all of the accounts that name the Tainui crew, the male members are named ahead of the female crew, serving to relegate and reinforce women’s place as secondary to that of men. Furthermore, in some of the later texts by Christian men such as Hamlin, women are not named at all, rendering them as passive or invisible actors in the oral traditions. Continuously throughout the texts, the male narrators rank women. Marama and Whakaotirangi are variously called first wife, second wife, senior wife, secondary wife and minor wife. These descriptors debase women’s agency, socially constructing them as competitors for men’s attention and preference. Tainui men are therefore valorised because they are not classed in this way. Marama’s tradition also has a male focus on gender and sexual roles based as they are on classist and race ideologies.

The discourse relating to Hoturoa remaining wedded to Marama once they reach Kāwhia is another example of Marama being rendered passive. Marama is posited as a non-agentive recipient of Hoturoa's male intentions rather than charged with her own initiative and mind as a woman. She is represented as following Hoturoa, and her womanly agency is sanctioned only after Hoturoa's is consistently magnified. This softening of Marama's absolute power, subjugates her. Owned by her husband, she is also owned by the men who write about her.

Another ideological construct that emerges from the accounts is Marama's role as a carer of others. She looks out for the interests of the crew by noticing the waka does not sit well in the water, and she carries seeds to grow food that will sustain the people. Much is at stake for Marama, and by extension, women, in these male renderings because of the psychological messages they convey. Marama is accountable to everyone on board Tainui, not just to Hoturoa. The men cannot row the waka because Marama had sex with a man other than Hoturoa. She therefore adversely affected all those on board, an event which is constituted as selfishness on her part because she did not think about others in her quest for fulfilment and satisfaction.

The white Christian canon describes Tainui ancestresses as 'ladies' and 'beautiful'. The rhetorical strategy of this discourse lies in its undertones of well-mannered, polite, high social positioning based on colonial understanding of this. It is a discourse that marginalizes Māori whose different set of notions of what constitutes important ancestresses and beauty is based on mana, whakapapa, engagement with their people and community involvement.

Boundaries and limits are placed on the narrations regarding powers of women in ritual practice. While most of the accounts show women performing potent karakia, the powers they can exercise tend to be minimised, trivialised or invisibilised. For example, the powers held within menstrual blood are hinted at but obscured; Marama sings a song. In regard to the second example, there is a sense of power and legitimacy in a karakia or tauparapara, whereas a waiata tends to downplay the potency of the ritual.

Sexism and moral outrage are a constant theme in the traditions about Marama. She is married to Hoturoa and therefore unable to indulge in a Marama's relationship with anyone else. Hoturoa has at least (in most accounts) two wives. Other lovers, if there were any, are not mentioned. However, this does not mean that he did not have any, but rather that it is not written about by the male writers. Several accounts (see Chapter 4) claim Amonga and Takahiroa as



other of Hoturoa's wives, while others say differently, suggesting they are lovers (see Phillips this chapter).

Marama's tradition has been selective in terms of the patriarchal response and descriptions of it. The storyline involves categorisation of her. For example, Hoturoa appears as a vestal and virtuous man while Marama is presented as wanton and promiscuous. Expectations of how women are to behave are readily apparent in the consequences of Marama taking a lover. White goes so far as to brand her as 'evil', denoting a male-sanctioned judgement of language about and of women. The names depicting lewdness that Marama is called following her affair, is another example of women's sexuality being tightly controlled by the male accounts; I have not come across a tradition that labels men in this way. Marama is also depicted as being divested of her clothing because of her transgression, with her husband determining when she can again wear appropriate clothing, that is, when he deems she has been sufficiently punished. This supports a rhetoric that sanctions men to meter out punishment to womanfolk, including wives, partners and daughters.

Marama's involvement in extramarital coitus with another man is furthermore presented in most of the accounts as the reason why her garden grows weeds. The gardens not prospering represent a serious offence not only because of her people's need for food but also because of Marama's duty of care as a woman for them. An alternative explanation as to why the gardens fail to thrive, that from Te Taniwha, is relegated to a footnote in an issue of the *Journal of the Polynesian Society* edited by George Graham.

These various constructions of gendered mores regarding sexuality could also hold within them, as Burr (1998) states, the assumption that male practice sexually is standard and that female sexual agency is abnormal or defective (p. 112). While the texts suggest, too, that respect from the people towards Marama wanes for some time, it is regained. Her power enables her to free Tainui waka from being stuck as if like a mountain, she claims land for Tainui during her travels over land, and she becomes a revered ancestress of the Ngā Marama tribe of the Hauraki regions. These elements of her tradition present an alternative depiction of a shamed censured woman; she is more a charismatic, strong woman who inspires love and loyalty.

However, all of these achievements in the accounts are coloured by the emphasis on her affair. Marama's womanly power and agency is minimised and/or censored by patriarchal texts about her; she is disciplined, according to the accounts, at the time of her perceived transgressing

of male-imposed sexual boundaries, and remains so in some cases down to the present day because of the degenerative names by which she is still known. Marama's foremost leaving memory from the patriarchal canon, then, is her copulation with a lover, an incident that leads to men of apparent authority debating and constructing, with censorious tone, her tradition as a fable messaging strictures of male-sanctioned moral decency for women.

Despite the liberties taken with restructuring Tainui's tradition about Marama, she continues to have been made an example of because of the affair she became involved in. To participate in affairs, whether they be with slaves, or noble and important men (such as Te Okaroa may have been) was not considered acceptable behaviour for a leader's wife according to the male retellers of tradition. While this is a Tainui tradition about Marama accepted by some, a shifting of the lens a little to the right provides a view of her as another of Tainui's most resourceful, durable and pivotal women. The tradition about her highlights a woman of courage and presence such that a patriarchal tradition of adultery, when overseen in the light of matriarchal traditions, highlights instead a powerful female agent of interconnectedness with her people who was greatly loved. Marama commanded a following large enough to eventually generate a substantial hapū in vast and important tracts of Tainui land in the east coast region.

As I did in Whakaotirangi's chapter, the final section of this chapter presents a rewrite of Marama's published traditions from an indigenous womanist perspective. It follows the same tenets as Whakaotirangi's chapter in that it reclaims Marama's narrative from the patriarchal accounts of her. Again, it does this evocatively, creatively and unashamedly, careful as it is to maintain the cues, theme, symbols and structure of and about herstory.

*Tainui mārō hahake.*<sup>47</sup>

### **Marama Restoryed**

Marama, the high-born handsome daughter of a loving mother and a sometimes badly tempered father enjoyed a free and easy childhood, growing up as she did in their village on the north side of the island amongst their close relations on her mother's side of the family. Marama grew into a wilful young woman, a trait evident even when she was in her early teens. She could climb the island's tallest tree as fast as any of the young men. And her speed and accuracy when she threw

---

<sup>47</sup> I propose this whakataukī is in recognition of the pre-potent powers of Marama and her ability to stay Tainui waka at Ōtāhuhu.

a spear was a source of jealousy amongst several of the other young women and men around her age.

When visitors came to their part of the island, Marama, as with the other young people of the village, would be called on to look after their needs. It was their job to make sure the hue were filled with water and that there was a good supply of kūmara and taro not only to appease the visitors' hunger but also to show a generosity of kinship towards them. It was during one of these hospitality occasions that Marama first met Whakaotirangi. She had heard about this woman—mostly about her chiefly status. She knew, too, that Whakaotirangi and Hoturoa were planning to leave the island and to travel to other lands that their ancestor Kupe had visited. From the time Marama first heard the rumour about the intended trip, she day dreamed about it for weeks. Her father got angry with her when she absent-mindedly burnt the evening meal two days in a row; even her mother chided her one day when she forgot to fill the hue from the stream for the fourth time.

On the day that Whakaotirangi visited, all the women who were mothers in their village and their old tōhunga kuia, Wai-o-taiki, went into the village's prayer hut. No food or water was allowed in there, so Marama knew that she would not need to stay around and take care of the group who had come that day. As intrigued as she was about Whakaotirangi, Marama took off up the beach with other young people to collect some tuangi for their meal that night.

Later that evening, after the sun had gone down, Marama's mother told her about the purpose of Whakaotirangi's visit. Marama should feel very proud, she said, that a decision had been made for her to set off with Whakaotirangi and Hoturoa as a companion to Whakaotirangi and as a wife to Hoturoa. They were building a huge waka and would be heading away on the next high moon to the lands their ancestor, Kupe, had reached.

As swept away as Marama had been when she first heard about the trip that Whakaotirangi and Hoturoa were planning, her mother's words caused her to reflect on how old Hoturoa was. Next to her grandfather and father, he was practically the oldest man she knew. Marama had her eyes on Te Onewa. He was only a few years older than her, and his body was taut and muscled. He had a true and straight eye when he hunted the birds, he could play the flute intimately and he could play her intimately too. In fact, they had cemented their relationship to each other several times already. He was a great lover—inventive. They had even dallied in the swimming hole late at night when nobody else was around. These thoughts flashed through Marama's mind. Her

mother, though, made much of the event, and Marama knew the seriousness of the proposal because all the women had attended the meeting earlier that day. Only very serious issues were discussed in the house of prayer with all the women *and* the old lady of their whānau at the same meeting.

Two weeks later, Marama was gone from her village. She was sat in the waka wearing just her maropurua and a cloak around her shoulders. Her mother had woven into her maropurua a little pocket and placed in it three hue seeds and four small kūmara, to be planted in the new lands. There had been no room for her few treasures that she would like to take with her. But that was just that.

When the voyagers first set off from land, Marama, who had been out on many long sea trips with her father and Te Onewa, noticed that the waka was unwieldy in the water. She called out to Hoturoa that something was not right—that the waka was tainui. It was not sitting in the water as it should. Marama’s skills on the water and with waka were well known, and so the waka was hauled back onto land and more of the outer wood of the huge trunk that was Tainui was carefully scrapped off and pared away. Back in the water, she sped away magnificently under the power and chants of the crew. Those back on shore waited till they could no longer hear the united “tokihi tokihi” and then returned to their villages.

Whakaotirangi was a great woman. Marama admired her wisdom, her beauty and her calmness. Marama noticed that she and Hoturoa determined the course of Tainui and allotted the breaks between the crew for rest and sustenance. She noticed, too, that Hoturoa spent a lot of time with Whakaotirangi and their children and grandchildren. She observed his interest in them and hoped that one day he might give the same attention and have the same concern for their own children. Hoturoa had paid scant attention to her, although she sat in the stern with him and Whakaotirangi. She had, nevertheless, grown fond of Hoturoa, but she felt lonely for Te Onewa.

From her place at the back of the waka, she watched the muscled and sweat-streaked backs of the crew as they pulled through the water. The man second from the front on the right reminded her of Te Onewa. She closed her eyes and dreamt of him; they were down at the swimming pool late at night. An audible murmur escaped her lips. She opened her eyes quickly and looked around. Whakaotirangi was watching her, and Marama knew that she knew.

When land was sighted, Marama’s attention was immediately taken with the beauty of the islands. Everybody was excited and urgent. It was agreed that Marama should set off on foot with

five others to scout the land and bring news back to Whakaotirangi and Hoturoa. Whakaotirangi gave Marama the mauri that she had kept hidden away during the voyage. Bring it back safely, she said, as she passed it over during the ritual. I will see you when you return.

Marama and the scouts covered vast tracts of land. They were welcomed at each village they passed through. On the second night out from the waka, they received a particularly warm welcome from a chiefly woman and her husband who had heard about the great waka moored at the estuary. It was their son, Te Okaroa, who showed Marama and her attendants the special places of the area. That night he sat next to her during the meal, and they together watched the dancing of the men and the women of the village. Te Okaroa joined in one of the dances. Marama admired his vitality and passion, his body, the way he tilted his face towards her, and the challenge in his eyes when he looked at her. Marama accepted the challenge. Her sexual fantasies and passions, repressed for so long during the voyage, conquered her. She had the wildest, most tender night of her life together with Te Okaroa. The voluptuous desires she had so long suppressed, at last were initiated by their stark and naked desires.

It took another two days to meet again with Tainui. News of Marama's night with her lover had gone ahead of her, and the crew, together with Whakaotirangi and Hoturoa, were solemnly packing the waka. They would not, they said, move away from the shore until she had put right what had happened. Marama looked at Whakaotirangi, who nodded silent consent to her. While Marama felt some remorse that the crew were upset at her behaviour, the night with Te Okaroa had been one of absolute pleasure and excitement. The memory of the ecstasy imbued her with the same woman strength she had felt in his arms. Barely touching the sides of the waka, she bounded up on to the deck of Tainui. Her voice flew around the valley and across the beach as she chanted out her karakia so that all would hear it. She wanted the strength in her voice to travel back to Te Okaroa for she knew that one day she would return there.

## Chapter Six: Early Traditions pre-European Contact

### **Ruapūtahanga**

In this chapter, I consider the many twists and turns in the narrated traditions about Ruapūtahanga, who came from Taranaki on the west coast of Te Ika-a-Māui (the North Island). I explore, analyse and explain the archetypal patriarchal power that instilled an entrenched social attitude towards women such as her. One of the dominant features to emerge from the traditions about Ruapūtahanga is her adamant courage and willpower. Yet her story presents, in some ways, as a psychologically and emotionally seditious tradition.

Vansina (1985, p. 65) asserts that “[I]t is impossible to have a ‘tradition’ as evidence. It has to be a tradition actualized through a person and every person actualizes it differently”. The narrations about Ruapūtahanga come from various iwi and Pākehā societies and perspectives across eras. The individual patriarchal narrators, scribes and publishers actualize as many aspects of Ruapūtahanga’s tradition similarly as they do differently. The similarities between iwi groups are the waka, Aotea, the land marks attributed to Ruapūtahanga, and the pronounced genealogical connections. These spaces are politically sound ones, with identifiable markers, such as the places verified on maps and the handed-down whakapapa tables. The differences encompass patriarchal retellings of contest within her family that required Ruapūtahanga to make hard political and social decisions. My critical engagement with the iwi, colonial and colonised texts (see p. 20 for my explanation of a colonised text), and my negotiation of the claims made within them, explores and offers findings and conclusions about the ideological and rhetorical politics relating to women such as Ruapūtahanga. Considering that Māori communities are based on relationships, colonising texts can function to distort and fragment certain associations by the text that they preserve. The post-colonial account about Ruapūtahanga marginalises and excludes her from a more meaningful tradition within Tainui. I end Ruapūtahanga’s chapter by unashamedly re-storying herstory from a womanist perception.

Before beginning my analysis of the texts, however, I consider it necessary to provide a brief history of Tainui expansion because it provides a backdrop to the advent of Ruapūtahanga’s tradition, much of which springs from her marriage. Ruapūtahanga’s marriage presents as a genealogical geo-political move, based on territorial strategies and social power (Staeheli &

Kofman, 2004, Wastl-Walter & Staeheli, 2004).<sup>48</sup> The marriage (according to some) was initiated by Ruapūtahanga herself, and was partially “designed to serve specific ends” (Wastl-Walter & Staeheli, 2004, p. 142), such as the peacemaking partnership it created in later times.

### **Tainui Expansion**

I have drawn this historical information from accounts by James Robertson (1957, 1958, 1962), whom I have already chronicled in this thesis (see Chapter 4). Robertson (1957) writes that in Aotearoa important men married important women from other settlements made up of the voyagers from Hawaiki and their descendants. It was one of these marriages, between Ruapūtahanga, from Taranaki, and Whatihua, from Kāwhia, that was to play a part in the break-up of the Tainui patriarchy (p. 254).

At Kāwhia, a swelling population of Tainui people led to Kākāti (Whatihua’s grandfather) allotting specific areas to his sons and their descendants. This was the first apportioning of Tainui lands. Tāwhao, the elder son, retained Kāwhia, while his step-brother, Tuhinga, was given the south side of the harbour. The boundary line extended well inland over the coastal hills. The next generation of Tainui saw a second allotment of Tainui lands, which may have been an attempt to facilitate harmony between the step-brothers Tūrongo and Whatihua, who had quarrelled throughout their youth. Alternatively, it may have been a deliberate ploy to keep them apart. Tūrongo and Whatihua had always been jealous of each other, but a marked crisis came when Ruapūtahanga, brought from Taranaki to marry Tūrongo, was taken by Whatihua instead.

Whatihua appears in the traditions as egotistical (see below). He built a house bigger than his brother’s, and he had a bigger cultivation.<sup>49</sup> The brothers’ relationship had been bounded by rivalry almost from birth, and it did not lessen as they matured. When Whatihua stole Tūrongo’s bride, Tūrongo formed an inland settlement at Rangiatea, near Otorohanga, and when Tāwhao died, the family began to break up. The reason given for the crisis related to the fact that Tūrongo was the son of the senior wife, but Whatihua was the first-born (Robertson, 1958, p. 45).

---

<sup>48</sup> Gilmartin and Kofman (2004) qualify the term geopolitical to mean “as a form of thought and practice in the acquisition and peopling of imperial settlements’ and knowledge of the world” (p. 113).

<sup>49</sup> Jones and Biggs (1995) say the house was “just to the west of the creek beside the Kaawhia-Aotea road where it turns right at the Aotea foreshore. It is said that the outline of Whatihua’s house can still be seen when the grass dries out in summer” (p. 67).

This story is arguably one of the best known in Tainui tradition, probably because it marks an extremely important turning point for Tainui. The colony that Tūrongo founded at Rangiatea, in the foot-hills of the Rangitoto near Otorohanga, was also essentially Tainui in character, and from it stemmed the tribes, Ngāti-Maniapoto and Ngāti-Raukawa. After the death of the brothers' father, Tāwhao, neither Tūrongo nor Whatihua succeeded him as de facto head of the Tainui family, a position, according to the patriarchal tellers, which had passed through the senior male line from Hoturoa to Tāwhao (1958, p. 46). Later, it seems that the head of the colony at Rangiatea had come to be regarded as the Tainui ariki (1957, p. 254). Some commentators (see, for example, Jones & Biggs, 1995) consider that iwi were living relatively peaceably about the island during these times because pā were not fortified. If they had been, this would have signalled ongoing wars.

## **What Was Said**

### **The Early Māori Manuscripts**

#### **The oral narrative and manuscript of Te Whēoro**

Te Whēoro (1871, 1880) of Ngāti Pou and Ngāti Mahuta of Waikato was an activist in relation to land grievances. He was also a parliamentarian and he was held to have had much mana amongst his people because of his whakapapa, character and intelligence (Scott, 2007). Te Whēoro wrote his manuscript in 1871 which he later translated and published in 1880. His work has been used in this thesis to bring together information about Ruapūtahanga. Te Whēoro records in his manuscript that he was Ngāti Pou of Waikato. Later accounts say he was also a chief of Ngāti Naho and belonged also to Ngāti Hourua, Ngāti Mahuta and Ngāti Hinetu (Te Whēoro, 2011). Te Whēoro (1871) wrote a comparatively comprehensive history about Ruapūtahanga.<sup>50</sup>

Ko Whatihua te tuakana o Tūrongo ka moe a Whatihua i ana wahine tokorua, tana wahine matua ko Ruapūtahanga tana wahine tuarua ko Apakura. Ka hia kai Apakura ki te tuna. Ka haere ta raua tangata ko Whatihua ki te hi tuna kokopu ka ki noa te tangata ra ka kore e hohoro te te kai mai te tunara i roto hoki te tuna i te rua ko hatu e noho ana ka tahi ka hirihiria e te tangatara tana toke, mate kite hiakai o Apakura ki hai te tunara i haere mai ka hirihiri ano te tangata ra, mate ki te hiakainui o Ruapūtahanga, ka

---

<sup>50</sup> The spelling and punctuation is as per Te Whēoro's manuscript. Biggs (1966) notes that some manuscripts written by Māori had few fullstops and commas, and many of the words ran into each other because Māori tended to write how they spoke. Te Whēoro's manuscript is illustrative of this kind of work.



puta mai te tuna ra ki waho i tona rua. Ka kai ki te toke a te tangata ra ka hutia ka eke ki uta. Ka maua ki te kainga ka ho atu e Whatihua te tuna ma Apakura. Ka korero te tangata nana ihi ka mea i hirihiria e au te tuna nei. Mate ki te hiakainui o Apakura ki hai i puta mai ki waho i te rua, mate kite hiakainui o Ruaputahanga ka tahi ka puta mai ka rongo a Ruaputahanga kua hoatu a Whatihua te tuna ma Apakura ka mea A Ruaputahanga na te hirihiringa ki toku ingoa i puta mai ai te tunara hoatu ke ano ma Apakura Ka pouri te wahine nei nei koa kua whanau te tamaiti a Ruaputahanga ko Uenukutihoka. Ka tahi te wahine nei ka haere waha ake te tamaiti kaha na Kawhia te huarahi waiho tia iho te tamaiti i te taha o te moana i Kawhia. Ka tahi a Whatihua ka haere ki te whai rokohanga atu ako te tamaiti e takoto ana waha ake ka kite atu te tangata nei i te wahine ia e haere ana ka karanga atu, e whae e noho mai i kona ki ta taua tamaiti haere tonu te wahine ra me tana kuri ano ka tika na marokopa te haere a te wahine ra me te whai atu ano te tangata nei me te karanga haere, e whae, e noho mai i kona ki hai hoki te wahine ra i tauri mai te kakahu o te wahine ra he po era tau titi tia ai te aroaro ki te otaota ka tae noa ki Tapirimoko ka noho te wahine ra ka tangi me te haere atu ano te tangata nei ka wete kina te tautiti o te wahine ra tapa tonu tia iho tera wahi ko te tautiti o Ruaputahanga ka tata tata atu te tangata nei ki te wahine ra ka tukua te kuri a te wahine ra ki te whaka taki huarahi no na he pari tutonu hoki taua huarahi ka kitea e te kuri a te wahine ra te huarahi ka whaka tika te wahine ra ka haere ka karanga atu ano te tangata nei, e whae noho mai i kona ki ta taua tamaiti kua puta te wahine ra ki tua o te hu. Ka tahi te wahine nei ka karanga atu ki atu ki te tangata ra e pae hoki atu i kona ka mate koe i te whainga mai ki taku hika tau kei ka karanga atu ano te tangata, e whae noho mai i kona ki ta taua tamaiti ka karanga atu ano te wahine nei, e pa, hoki atu i kona katu ngatai o rakei mataniwharau tana haerenga mai o te tai Katikati ana ki te take o te pari ka ngaro te huarahi o te wahe ra i haere ai na tana kupu i karanga ra hoki atu i kona katu ngatai o Rakei Mataniwha haere tonu mai te tai o te moana haere ana te wahine ra hoki mai ana a Whatihua waha ake ano te tamaiti Ka haere te wahine ra ka po hora hia atu te porera tapaiho te ingoa o tera wahi ko Horaporera moe rawa atu i te tane i a te Atiawa ka mate tana kuri ki reira i Kohurutia waiho iho hei take pakanga taua kuri hinga ana te iwi nana taua kuri i patu. Ka whanau nga tamariki a Ruaputahanga ka tata ki te mate kako ki ana tamariki ki te mate au kaua au e tanumia engari me whaka iri au ki runga i te pataka. Ki te marae nei ano tuai ki te puta mai he tangata no nga whenua ki te taka iko taku pane ko koutou tuakana era tangata Ka mate taua wahine kua ruruhitia hoki ka puta mai te teretere o ana tamariki i waiho nei e ia i rongo hoki kua mate to ratou whaea haere tonu mai aua tangata ka ore hoki e mohio era tamariki ko ratou tuakana enei ka ore ano hoki i kite noa haere tonu ano tangata tae tonu ki raro i te pataka o te ruruhi e irira me te titiro ano ana tamariki mo te haerenga tonu tanga o aua tangata ki te wahi tapu ki hai i roa e noho ana ka marere iho te pane o taua ruahine Ka tahi ana tamariki ka mohio ko o ratou tuakana enei kua otira hoki te ki iho e taua ruahine ki te taka iho taku pane ko koutou tuakana ena, hoi ano tangi ana enei Ki era me era ki enei Kona uri ano ena ko Ngatiruanui ko te Atiawa to ratou reo ko te reo o te kuri a Ruaputahanga i kohurutia nei koia tena tona reo to te Atiawa to Ngatiruanui e au kuri naKo te reo, no Waikato ano tenei tupuna a Whatihua. (pp. 10–13)

### *Interpretation*

The text that follows is my translated interpretation of the narration:

Whatihua was the older brother of Tū rongo. Whatihua married two women, the first (matua) was Ruaputahanga [meaning twice the bundle; White, 1888, p. 110] and Apakura was his second.<sup>51</sup>

Apakura wanted some eel, so she and Whatihua went to catch some kokopu, but the fish would not take the bait and stayed in its hole. Whatihua said a charm over the worm bait about how terribly hungry Apakura was but still the eel would not be caught. Whatihua said another charm, and this time he used the name of Ruaputahanga. The eel came back out of its hole; it grabbed the bait and was then flung onto shore. When they got back home Whatihua gave the eel to Apakura, and he talked about the power that was in his charm that caught the eel. Ruaputahanga heard about the charm and that her name had been used to catch the eel but that the eel had then been given to Apakura. Ruaputahanga spoke out about it: “You used a charm with my name which brought the eel out and you gave the eel to Apakura.”

Ruaputahanga had not long before had her son, Uenukutihoka; she became disheartened. She resolved to leave the area with her baby and took the road via Kawhia. Once at Kawhia she left her baby on the seashore. Whatihua had given chase; he found the baby where she had left him, but saw that Ruaputahanga had kept on with her journey. Whatihua called out to her, “Whaea, stay with us.” But Ruaputahanga continued on through Marokopa, and she and her dog kept going. Whatihua called out again, “Whaea, stay here.” But Ruaputahanga did not want any of it. She wore a porera, which she placed on the ground to sleep. She stayed at a place called Tapirimoko and wept. When Whatihua came, she discarded her garment. That place was called Te Tautiti o Ruaputahanga.

Whatihua almost reached Ruaputahanga. She let her dog go ahead to find the trail, and with that she proceeded on the right path. She came down the cliff, and Whatihua called out again to her: “Whaea, stay together with us; me you and our child.” Ruaputahanga was on the other side of the cliff. She called out to Whatihua: “You are better to stay where you are. You will get tired of following my elusive power.” Whatihua called out again to her: “Whaea, stay with us.” Ruaputahanga called out again to Whatihua: “E pa, go back. If you do not, the taniwha of Rakei will be coming at the turn of the tide, from Katikati, and the road will be lost.” No sooner had the words left her lips than the tides of Rakei turned; so too did Ruaputahanga turn, and Whatihua at last gave up and returned to his home with the baby.

---

<sup>51</sup> The word *mātua* translates as “first” (Williams, 2001, p. 195). The translated sentence says, “Ruapūtahanga is his first wife, Apakura is his second wife.”

Ruaputahanga kept on till she reached a place called Horaporera, where she married a man from Te Atiawa. Her dog died there, and she buried it at Kohurutia. The death of the dog was the cause of a war there because the people were responsible [for the dog's death]. Ruaputahanga had children there.

When Ruaputahanga was close to death, she called her children around to come around her and told them, “When I die, do not bury me. Instead, put me on a raised platform on the marae. When the people come, if my head falls down, you will know that these are your relations.” Ruaputahanga grew to be an elderly woman. When she died, her children sheltered her and did as Ruaputahanga had asked. News of her death reached her other children, and they quickly journeyed to their mother's lands. When they ascended to the pataka, Ruaputahanga's head began to tremble. The children knew these were their relations. As they approached closer, her head shook more, and it wasn't long until the elderly woman's head did indeed drop from the raised storehouse at that sacred place. Then Ruaputahanga's children knew for sure that these were their relations. There was much crying and anguish then amongst them all.

Ruaputahanga's descendants are Ngati Ruanui and Te Atiawa, the language also of her dog, who was murdered there. They are the descendants also of Waikato, whose ancestor is Whatihua.

#### *Narration summary and context*

Te Whēoro says that Ruapūtahanga is Whatihua's first wife (some post-1900 writers record her as his second wife; see, for example, Smith, 1908; Sole, 2005; Te Hurinui, 1945). Te Whēoro makes much of the fishing kōrero and the fact that the eel was caught using a charm containing Ruapūtahanga's name, but the eel was then given to Apakura, which made Ruapūtahanga sad. She had not long before this event had her baby, Uenukutuhoka.

Te Whēoro records Ruapūtahanga's dramatic leaving of her marriage with Whatihua and records that she left behind her children to be brought up by their Waikato relatives. Ruapūtahanga became lost on the daring trip, but overcame this and kept going, all the while chased as she was by her husband. White (1888) translates Ruapūtahanga's call back to her husband, “E pa hoki atu i kona ka mate koe i te whaingā mai ki taku hika tau”, as “O father! Return from where you are. You will die if you persist in following my attractive power, which now must be exercised in a distant country” (p. 112).<sup>52</sup> Later, she calls out again to Whatihua, “Katu ngatai o rakei mataniwharau”,<sup>53</sup> which Smith (1908, p. 115) translates to read, “The seas

---

<sup>52</sup> White (1888) uses the words “hika tau” to translate as “attractive power”. The words “hika tau” are more likely in reference to Ruapūtahanga's genitalia, and this is what is being referred to as her “attractive power”. It is likely that this is where the traditions about her great beauty, so well emphasized by the later authors, originated.

<sup>53</sup> Ka tū ngā tai o Rakei, mata taniwha rau.

of Rakei, with the hundred *taniwha* eyes have cut you off”.<sup>54</sup> An explanation of the use of the proverb in modern times is not given. However, based on the *kōrero* it supports, I suggest it is a saying to warn that the circumstances that will follow, prompted as they are by an untenable situation, can never be changed.

Significant, too, is mention of the following places: Tapirimoko, where some sources say Ruapūtahanga received a tattoo (see below); Horaporera, where she married again; and Kohurutia where her dog was killed, an event which caused her to leave the area. Later, the people from this place were defeated in battle. On her death from old age, her Waikato children and her Taranaki children reunited.

### *Analysis*

Te Whēoro does not provide Ruapūtahanga’s tribal history, highlighting that socially and politically her status prior to her marriage was not been deemed important. That Ruapūtahanga married a high chief of Waikato tends to show that she was a person of high lineage herself, but Te Whēoro’s retelling is counting on the status and import of Whatihua in the tradition. Politically, Ruapūtahanga is positioned as the first wife, denoting a position of power and authority (according to colonial texts). The renderings from Te Whēoro’s text present Ruapūtahanga as an independent woman with attitude, and characteristics of strength and power. On being treated less than she should be, these aspects of her character come to the fore and are mapped out through the journey she undertakes. She maintains a dignity that does not tolerate anything less than recognition of her place. The magnitude of the event for Tainui is reflected in the narration of many details of the journey and her leaving her children in Tainui lands. Ruapūtahanga’s marriage to Whatihua enables the creation of her geo-political alliances through her Waikato children. Irrespective of Whatihua’s chiefly position, Ruapūtahanga defies his interference, and after an arduous journey returns to her own lands.

The account by Te Whēoro also illustrates that Whatihua’s perseverance during the events of Ruapūtahanga is primarily because of his overly large ego. The effort that he expends procuring an eel for Apakura shows that he does not give up easily, and that he goes to extremes to have his own way, which is what he does when he uses Ruapūtahanga’s name to catch the eel

---

<sup>54</sup> Smith (1908) says this proverb was still in use at the time he was writing. Te Hurinui (1945) also records the proverb.

because he could not catch it by using Apakura's. I suspect the eel tradition is a motif to portray both women in stereotypical gendered roles of jealousy, thus in some way abrogating Whatihua for his role in the separation of the family. Te Whēoro alludes to Ruapūtahanga being a desirable woman; she remarries and has other children in Taranaki. Ruapūtahanga is also portrayed as having physical ability. She tells her children of an incident that will occur after her death, and thus ensures that her Waikato children will come to know her Taranaki children.

The cultural pre-potent capabilities of women are carried right through this tradition about her. Te Whēoro's account, in providing descriptions of Ruapūtahanga's unwavering, determined and courageous exodus from her marriage, highlights that some Māori women (certainly those in powerful positions) had endurance, courage and decided their own fate.

Te Whēoro again depicts Whatihua's perseverance through his account of Whatihua's steadfast pursuit of Ruapūtahanga, but he cannot match her determination. Ruapūtahanga is resilient and has remarkable stamina. Te Whēoro thus maintains a tradition of a strong and socially motivated woman. Ruapūtahanga was not prepared to stay with her Tainui marriage because Whatihua fell far short of her expectations of him. That there were no iwi repercussions on behalf of Ruapūtahanga from her children staying in Tainui lands appears to signify a political determination to maintain peace in those times.

### **The written unnamed narration of a Ngāti Awa source (in White, 1888)<sup>55</sup>**

Rua-pu-tahanga (the pit not covered) was taken to wife by Whati-hua (break the lever), who had children called 'Tu-rongo (stand and hear) and Ue-nuku (shaking earth), and Tu-whata (stand on the stage) was born last. Sometime after the birth of the one born before Tu-whata, Whati-hua became acquainted with a comely-looking girl, and wondered how he could obtain her as his wife. He considered the matter; and one day he said to his wife, "O mother!" who answered by saying, "What is it, O father?" He answered, "I am going to spear birds," to which proposal the wife assented. She was simple and did not suspect her husband of any deceit towards her; but he had said he was going to spear birds to mislead his wife in regard to his real object ... the bird was this girl ... this girl had her garments all besmeared with horu (red ochre), so that when he went back to his own house he was daubed with the red ochre, which ... was seen on him by his wife ... "I have been discovered by Rua-putahanga," ... From that time she was jealous, which displeased her husband, and he also began from that time to

---

<sup>55</sup> It seemed somewhat unusual to me that Ngāti Awa upheld a tradition about a Ngāti Ruanui woman such as Ruapūtahanga. But the founding ancestor of Te Āti Awa, Awanuiarangi (said to be the product of a spirit ancestor), is also an ancestor of Ngāti Awa, and this could provide an explanation in this regard.

slap and strike her, which caused sorrow to his wife and made her ashamed of his conduct. She made up her mind to leave her husband, and left his home and journeyed towards Kawhia (embraced), on the road leading to Tara-naki (ngaki) (obtain vengeance by charms). But before she had made up her mind to go towards Tara-naki she had felt a love for a chief of that district called Porou (seek without object), as he was famed for his industry and the great quantity of food he kept in his storehouses. When she had got to Kawhia, in company with her dog, Whati-hua discovered that his wife had left him. He sought and found her footprints and followed them. When she had got to Taha-roa (long side) he was at Kawhia; when she had got to Maro-kopa he had arrived at Taha-roa; when she had got to Harihari (a song sung to keep time for all to pull or work in concert) he had arrived at Maro-kopa; when she had arrived at Kiri-te-here (not betrothed) he was at Harihari: then she turned and saw her husband following her, which made her redouble her steps lest he should overtake her. When she had got to the ascent at Hapuku (the codfish) she again turned and looked at her approaching husband. He called and said, “O mother! come back to me. What evil have I done to you that you should forsake me? Come back to our children.” She answered, “Return from where you now are. The waves of Rakei-mata-taniwha-rau (the bald head of the hundred-faced monster) will soon appear.” And the monster appeared, and troubled the sea, so that the surge dashed up the cliffs, which caused Whati-hua to stay his onward progress, and prevented him from passing to where his wife then was, as fear took hold of him because of the monster and the waves; so the woman ascended the cliff in company with her dog, and Whati-hua returned to his home. ... they went along the seashore till they arrived in the home of the Nga-ti-rua-nui Tribe, where she met and went to be the wife of ... Porou (work in ignorance) ... Enough now, but there is more of this history with which I am not acquainted. (White, 1888, pp. 107–109)

### *Narration summary and context*

Ruapūtahanga is discussed as someone ‘simple’ in this account. She also is depicted as being a jealous wife. Marital violence enters the tradition when Whatihua begins to strike and slap her, which, as narrated here, causes her sorrow and makes her feel ashamed of him.

An account of the text on Ruapūtahanga’s journey shows that she first heads to Kāwhia (on the road leading to Taranaki) and then passes through Taharoa, Marokopa, Harihari and Kiri-te-here.<sup>56</sup> She climbs the cliff at Hapuku, walks along the beach at Tapiri-moko, and from there follows her dog up and over another cliff, called Moe-a-toa. She descends to Nuku-hakari.<sup>57</sup> She and her dog continue on to Nga-rara-hae and Tunga-uru-roa, and then along the beach at Wai-kawau. They pass by Koura-whereo, Papa-ia-tai and Papa-rahia, swim the Awa-kino River and

---

<sup>56</sup> Taharoa is named Te Tahāora-a-Ruapūtahanga in Bateman (1997, p. 19).

<sup>57</sup> Smith (1908) says Ruapūtahanga was the first person to have ever taken this pathway of Tapiri-moko and over to Moe-a-toa, the Te Awa source also notes this fact.

walk from Hakere to Mōkau, around the point at Puia and Wai-hi and on to Mou-haka-kino.<sup>58</sup> After swimming a creek there, Ruapūtahanga and her dog continue walking through Tahua, Poutama, Kawau, Karaka-ura, and O-mahu, where they swim across Tonga-porutu and then walk on to Katikati.

They descend Te Horo and continue along the shoreline till they came to Pari-ninihi (said to be a hill), which they carefully walk around.<sup>59</sup> They walk over the flat lands of Parae-roa and on to Papatiki, Whanga-takii and Kuku-riki. They swim the Mimi-tangi-atua, walk along Arapaopao and over the plains of Kaweka. They again swim at Ure-nui, ascend to Pihanga and walk on to O-naero, which is a stream they cross.<sup>60</sup>

From here, Ruapūtahanga and her dog continue on to Wai-au, Wakarau-tawa and Titi-rangi, where they cross the Wai-tara River and also the Wai-o-ngana. The next stage of the journey takes them on to Rewa-tapu, He-nui, Hua-toki and Nga-motu, after which they ascend Tutu and walk along the shoreline until they reach Ngāti Ruanui country.<sup>61</sup>

Many of these place names exist on today's maps. Dowling (2004), for example, presents Taharoa, Marokopa, Harihari, Kiri-te-here, Moe-a-toa, Nuku-hakari, Nga-rara-hae, Tunga-uru-roa, Wai-kawau, Papa-rahia, Awa-kino, Mōkau, Mou-haka-kino, Tonga-porutu, Papatiki, Mimi-tangi-atua, Ure-nui, O-naero, Wai-au, Wai-tara and Wai-o-ngana (pp. 18, 26). After this point, he is unable to locate the other place names of Ruapūtahanga's journey. Edward Meurant in 1843 described the Pari-ninihi crossing Mōkau and on to Kāwhia as "the worst road along the West Coast of the North Island" (Meurant, 1842–1847, diary entry Saturday 29 April 1843).

When the land marks are viewed on a map, it is clear that Ruapūtahanga's flight was a remarkable achievement. Accounts that tell of later expeditions across parts of the territory describe the terrain. The Awakino is reportedly a gorge, and crossings through it are risky and should be attempted only at the lower reaches (Stokes, 1988, p. 34). Ruapūtahanga's crossing at Mou-haka-tino was said by Smith in 1858 to have "water being up to our necks" (cited in Stokes, 1988, p. 96). There were caves at Tonga-porutu, and when the tide was in, travellers had to use

---

<sup>58</sup> Spelt Mohakatino in some publications (see Stokes, 1988, p. 20).

<sup>59</sup> Parinihi (White Cliffs) (Stokes, 1988, p. 36).

<sup>60</sup> Onuero in Stokes (1988).

<sup>61</sup> Jones and Biggs (1995) give a similar but much shortened version of Ruapūtahanga's journey. Sole (2005) does not mention it at all, which suggests that this classic event in Tainui traditions held no importance for him.

tracks on the cliffs around the shoreline. Dieffenbach in 1843 said that the Ure-nui cliffs were about a hundred feet high (p. 39). And food in the area was said to have plentiful, with resources including mussels, eels, birds, crayfish and fish (Stokes, 1988).

### *Analysis*

There is clear evidence that a patriarchal colonial Christian canon had a hand in this rendition of Ruapūtahanga's tradition, if not in the translating, then at least with colonial doctrine in the narration. Discourse such as 'comely looking' and 'oh mother', 'oh father' along with Whatihua wondering how 'the other woman' could become his wife are examples of colonial renderings that also bespeak Christian underpinning, given that the tradition was of a time when more than one wife was common amongst Māori hierarchy.

The renderings illustrate a patriarchal mindset of "male power over female life" (Cooper, 1988, p. *xlii*), which morphs into Ruapūtahanga being problematized as simple and jealous while hinting that Whatihua is a paragon who has a hegemonic right to beat his wife.<sup>62</sup> This rendering imparts an ideological psycho-social message to women and men that Whatihua (men) slapping and striking Ruapūtahanga (womenfolk) is justified (permissible), especially if the woman is simple and jealous.

The full oral tradition of Ruapūtahanga hardly depicts a woman who holds to either characteristic, yet a diminution of her is fully evident. Paradoxically, from a mana wahine womanist position, Whatihua is portrayed in the discourse as an egoist with high and demanding expectations: he wants a comely 'girl', and his wife, who has produced three of their children, should accept his desire for another woman. The narration shows little or no sympathy for, let alone empathy with, his wife (women), Ruapūtahanga: she deserves to be slapped and beaten by her husband, because of the mitigating factors of jealousy and simple-mindedness. And it also appears to staunchly defend his actions of governance over her. His actions exemplify a rhetorical double standard redolent of male privilege. This male violence towards women, not at all evident in Te Whēoro's record (the earliest account), has been codified and remains, as any

---

<sup>62</sup> Ngati Awa in White (1888, p. 106) describes Ruapūtahanga as "simple" because she does not suspect her husband is having an affair. Jones and Biggs (1995) say the account in White came from Te Whēoro's 1871 manuscript (pp.10–30), but there is no record within the manuscript that portrays Ruapūtahanga in this way.



number of demographic measures show, a common practice in twenty-first-century New Zealand.

Ruapūtahanga, ashamed of Whatihua's behaviour, is spurred on to a courageous adventure where she reigns. The lengths that Whatihua goes to retrieve Ruapūtahanga could serve either as a warning to the male canon of female wilfulness or an indication of male ownership. The oral tradition of Ruapūtahanga's exodus, together with the descriptions of the land, evokes a picture of a woman who, with just a dog for companionship, was determined, desperate for liberation and powerful. Ruapūtahanga's tradition in this respect highlights a politically and socially seditious woman, who has a complex but successful departure from a brutal husband.

While White's account makes this agency apparent, it nevertheless presents her agency as problematic for men and discolours her story by presenting men as having the right to physically censure and control women, especially if the women do not fall in with men's wants and desires. One might argue that the account could be seen as an agentic woman not prepared to stay with a violent man, but given the sociocultural mores at play at the time this account was published, the message of male privilege over women was probably little critiqued.

### **Pre-1900 Pākehā-Published Sources**

#### **The written accounts by John White**

White (1888) gives a number of accounts about Ruapūtahanga. The following is from an unnamed Puke-tapu (Taranaki) source. While the account traces similar narrative lines to the accounts already presented, it provides material useful for contrast and corroboration purposes. It also provides an example confirming, as stated earlier, that White mainly reproduced accounts as they were given to him and so did not overly interfere in their content.

This woman Rua-pu-tehanga (sic), who was of the Nga-ti-rua nui people of Taranaki, had heard of the fame of Whati-hua, and went to him at Kawhia and became his wife; but Whati-hua at that time had a wife called Apa-kura (dirge). When Ruapu-tehanga expected to become a mother she asked her husband, Whati-hua, to get some eels for her.

He went but the eels would not take his bait; so he repeated a charm over the bait, in which he used the name of Rua-pu-tehanga. Still, the eels did not bite; so he repeated a charm in which he used the name of Apa-kura, and caught some eels, which he gave to Rua-pu-tehanga, and said, "I repeated a charm, and used the name of Apa-kura, and caught these eels." When Apa-kura heard of this she was angry because the eels were caught by the power of her name, yet were given to Rua-pu-tehanga. Rua-pu-tehanga

was angry at the jealousy shown by Apa-kura: so Rua-pu-tehanga and her dog Rua-hinahina (grey pit) left the settlement, and went on the road leading to Tapiri-moko, and were followed by Whati-hua; but she would not on any account return with him, but went on and took a husband at Mokau. But this husband was a thief; and she left him and went towards Wai-tara, and lived in a pa there called Manu-korihi, the name of which is derived from the korihi (son) of birds which is heard when the first rays of light are seen at dawn of day.

When she first left her husband Whati-hua she had her child with her; but when she took her second husband she left her child at Mokau; and having heard of the fame of Porou, who was noted for making kao (dried kumara), she left the home of her thief-husband, and went to live at another settlement, where she tattooed her thigh, over which she repeated the ceremonies and chanted the hono (bound together): hence the name of that settlement, Horo-hanga (to remove the tapu-sacredness). From thence she went on, and on the road she looked up to heaven; and the name of that place is Whakaahu-rangi (look up into heaven). She went on, and spread her porera mat out: hence the name of that place Hora-porera (porera, spread out).

#### *Account summary and context*

This account says that Ruapūtahanga seeks Whatihua out as a husband, and that although he was already married to Apakura, Ruapūtahanga is considered to be the first wife. In this retelling, it is Apakura who is positioned as jealous and that, because of it, Ruapūtahanga leaves on the journey that eventually takes her back to her homelands. The account depicts Ruapūtahanga receiving a tattoo during her journey and also that she leaves a child at Mokau.

#### *Analysis*

While the narrator is from the same area as Ruapūtahanga's people, it is notable that he attributes textual importance to Tainui-born Whatihua rather than with Ruapūtahanga, as an important Ngāti Ruanui ancestress. This element of the narration follows the pattern of patriarchal governance of cultural discourse where men continue to reproduce a socio-political and cultural order of Māori societies that situates women in trajectories of lower-class stations. It seems unlikely that Ruapūtahanga would have left her husband and children because of another woman's jealousy, but the jealous discourse has already been set through the earlier accounts and cannot easily be glossed over or eliminated from the current rendering. Again, then, this account stigmatizes women as acting in unreasonable ways because of their psychosocial problems, in this case, jealousy. The account neither mentions nor reviews the crucial actions of Whatihua that, in the earlier accounts, lead to Ruapūtahanga leaving him.

The important ingredients of this tradition are the trip back to Ruapūtahanga's home, the leaving of her Tainui children, her marriage and her tattoo. In some cultures, tattooing of women represents a token of maternal nobility (Diner, 1965). The tattoo may represent a marker of the social changes in Ruapūtahanga's life. She was a young woman when she married Whatihua—a ceremonial virgin according to some accounts. Her tattoo may, for her, have been emblematic of her reclamation of her mana and independence as well as a symbol of her strength and maturity (personal communication, H. Phillips, 10 October 2013). It may also have provided her with a visual solace against the anguish of leaving her children.<sup>63</sup>

In respect to Colenso (1865/2001), he states that tattooing of women's legs usually meant the back part of the leg, from heel to calf, and that this was the practice for women of rank. Te Awekotuku and Nikora (2007) explain that the name for thigh tattooing was hope-hope (p. 82). They conclude, from their research, that women's tattooing "enhanced physicality" for some recipients (p. 83), especially during the art of dancing. It also served as a beauty device, and marked women's agency as warriors and as lovers. This explanation of tattooing corresponds with Ruapūtahanga's herstory, where such a decoration not only would have re-engaged and enhanced her dignity, her beauty and her standing, but also provided her with a token of her experiences up to that point, including her fit and active physical abilities as an explorer and navigator of the land as she fled Whatihua.

White (1888) says the place where Ruapūtahanga had the tattoo was thereafter called Horohanga, in tribute to this event (p. 114). Te Whēoro (1871) writes of a place called Tapirimoko, where Ruapūtahanga arrived and rested after leaving Whatihua. Although he does not record that she had a tattoo at that place, it seems a probability, because of the name, which according to White (1888) means "tattooing added" (p. 111), that this was where the tattooing occurred. The tattooed thigh appears to be an important motif in Ruapūtahanga's tradition, if not as an actual event then certainly through the land mark Tapirimoko, because it is mentioned in several accounts of it.

---

<sup>63</sup> Colenso (1865/2001) observes that tattooing was necessary for women especially, as red lips were abhorred. He records that black lips were "considered the perfection of beautiful feminine lips" (p. 19). Te Awekotuku and Nikora's (2007) research corroborates the notion that plain or red lips were not considered "comely" (p. 76) by males or females.

White's account has vestiges of known tradition, such as the marriage, the children and what is now becoming more known, the jealousy, which holds to the 'normalisation theory' of pattern-defining what is usual (Wetherell & Potter, 1992). It also means that the discourse holds to those particular knowledges and thus regulations both within and without the societies that disperse the tradition, so normalising over time the power imbalance that is represented here where Whatihua's actions disempower Ruapūtahanga (and Apakura) as women.

## **Post-1900 Pākehā Sources**

### **The published account by Stephenson Percy Smith**

Smith's (1908, pp. 111–148) account follows those that have gone before but has some elaborations. He titled his account *Ruapu-tahanga's Journey* and took his narration from an unnamed Taranaki source.

... The fame of some distant chief—either male or female—for profuse hospitality, for courage, ability as a cultivator, or other character prized by the Maori, often led to a desire to visit and see such a person. There is a somewhat noticeable instance of this amongst these West Coast tribes, which is one of the stories they are very fond of, and of which there are several versions, the following being principally from my own notes, amplified here and there by one printed by Mr. John White in the "Ancient History of the Maori," and I give it in abbreviated form. It refers to the doings of Ruapu-tahanga, a woman of the Ngati-Rua-nui tribe of Patea.

There was, at this period, a chief of Kawhia named Whatihua ... whose fame as a cultivator had reached far and wide, even unto Ruapu-tahanga, who dwelt with her tribe at Patea. From the accounts which were received, this lady came to the decision to journey to Kawhia with the intention of becoming Whatihua's wife. With a company suited to her rank, she started on her long journey, passing inland by way of Tangarakau and Ohura rivers—branches of the Whanganui—where there are places to this day named after her—one especially, Te Puna-a-Ruapu-tahanga, or the spring of Ruapu'—where by her magic powers she caused a spring to issue from a rock, at a time when her followers were suffering from thirst. On reaching Kawhia she became the wife of Whatihua—the second wife, for he had one already, named Apa-kura, from whom are descended Ngati-Apakura of that place. Ruapu' had a son by Whati-hua, who was named Uenuku-tu-hoka. After a time Whati-hua gave this lady cause for jealousy; so she determined to return to her own people. She started from their home at Kawhia, carrying her child, her dog following her. But for some reason, unexplained, she left the child on the way, and continued on with her dog. Whati-hua, as soon as he heard of the lady's flight, followed in haste to try and persuade her to return. The coast along that part consists of beaches, interrupted by high cliffs which can only be passed at low water. At one of these points the husband came in sight of the runaway, at a place about three miles north of Tirua Point, but could not come near her on account of the tide having risen since she passed. But he tried his best to induce her to return; it

was of no avail however. She replied to him: “*Ka tu nga tai a Rakei, mata-taninaha rau.*” (“The seas of Rakei, with the hundred *taninaha* eyes have cut you off”) which is still used as a proverb. So the husband returned, picking up the child as he went. The story says that Ruapu-tahanga was the first person ever to pass along the path by way of Tapiri-moko, and Moeatoa hills, places a few miles south of Maro-kopa river. She came on her way, and finally reached Mokau, where she was well received by the people there, and after a time married a man named Mokau of that place, from whom (says my informant, an old man of Mokau) the river was named. She had a child by this man, and his descendants are living at Mokau at this day.

After a time Ruapu-tahanga tired of her second husband, and again started on her travels towards her old home. From Waitara river she passed along the old war-trail to the east of Mt. Egmont, and at a place near where the modern town of Stratford is built, she camped for the night. In going to sleep, she laid on her back with her face up to the clear sky, and hence the name of that place and the track itself, Whakaahu-rangi (*whakaahu*, to turn towards; *rangi*, the heavens).

Ruapu-tahanga now reached her old home, where, after a time she married a man of Ngati-Ruanui, named Porou, by whom she had two children, named Wheke and Ngu. As Ruapu-tahanga’s end approached, she said to her sons, “Let my bones after the exhumation be placed in a *whata* or stage, and when your elder brother from Kawhia comes to visit you, as he will do, you will know him by the fall of my skull to the ground.” Her wishes were faithfully carried out by her sons. Years passed, and the prediction of Ruapu-tahanga came true. Uenuku and Kaihamu, in their home at Kawhia had grown to man’s estate, and then the desire to visit their mother, Ruapu-tahanga in her native home, arose. So they started with a considerable party, and finally reached the place where their mother and her husband Porou had lived, but to find them both dead, and their sons Ngu and Wheke the leading people of the village ... The head of Ruapu-tahanga had fallen to the ground; but quite forgetting the significance of this omen, Ngu and Wheke prepared to attack the strangers, and commenced trying to get at them with long spears.<sup>64</sup>

#### ***Account summary and context***

Smith gives Ruapūtahanga’s tribal authority and place and then states that, having heard of Whatihua, she and a retinue of people journey to Tainui lands. That people travelled with her adds strength to discourse of her importance. Smith says that Ruapūtahanga travels inland to Whatihua, which explains why she later follows her dog for part of the trip back around the coast; she had not travelled that route before. Smith allocates ‘magic powers’ to Ruapūtahanga, and says she becomes Whatihua’s second wife. He also repeats the discourse of her jealousy, although he does not say what it is that causes her jealousy. Smith calls Ruapūtahanga a

---

<sup>64</sup> [The rest of Smith’s account tells of an attack by Ruapūtahanga’s Kāwhia sons on her Taranaki sons, but I have not repeated it here because my interest lies in the script that mentions Ruapūtahanga.]

‘runaway’ in his recording, and says that why she became such is that she tired of her second husband, which led to her marrying her third husband, Porou. Smith notes only the most prominent places of her travels, but does relay the tradition of her children recognising one another after Ruapūtahanga’s death.

### *Analysis*

Smith’s opening remark about Māori being fond of certain stories is an unnecessary categorisation that has the effect of reducing the legitimacy of oral traditions in much the same way as Colenso’s comments do in the earlier chapter about Whakaotirangi. Potter (1997) argues that descriptions are never simple and straightforward; they are selective and involve categorisations that are worked up to have the desired effect (p. 160). Smith’s opening comments thus brings a facile reductive complexion to the account of a woman’s story (herstory).

Smith’s account does then go on to describe a woman taking control of the state of marriage with a man of her choosing, and it gives an idea of her high social standing because, as a woman, she takes the initiative and travels, accompanied by a retinue of people, to a man she intends to marry. In addition, the places that Ruapūtahanga passes by or through on her journey are given names in recognition of her great feat. Such naming would have been a fundamental marker of boundary expansion and history making for her iwi. However, the fact that Smith makes explicit Whatihua’s important chiefly qualities from the outset and does not note Ruapūtahanga’s, potentially trivializes her as a husband-seeking woman who is seeking fame and fortune.

Smith, through his informant, allocates magic powers (potent power) to Ruapūtahanga. While colonisers tended to make fun of pre-potent Māori power through a discourse of fairy stories, myth and magic (and there is a strong hint of this in Smith description of Ruapūtahanga’s tradition as ‘a story they [West Coast tribes] are very fond of’, which tends to belittle the significance of the tradition), the retelling of this aspect of Ruapūtahanga’s tradition nevertheless signifies that she was a formidable woman who was involved in ritual practice.

The discourse of jealousy is one that has now taken firm hold in the tradition despite it not being mentioned in the Te Whēoro (Tainui) account. This appears to be a cross-contamination which furthers a male interest in supporting a jealous wife history. Ruapūtahanga’s tradition is essentially ironized by this rhetoric. Given that Ruapūtahanga knew (according to this account)

that Whatihua was married to Apakura, writing Ruapūtahanga off as another jealous wife does not take into account the broader social aspects of her life, such as her social and political standing, which have received little attention thus far in White's account. I suggest that Whatihua, who has a history of egotistical behaviour (according to a womanist view of the traditions), did not treat Ruapūtahanga as well as he might have, that he was neglectful and perhaps uncaring of her as an important wife who had produced Ngāti Ruanui/Tainui children. Ruapūtahanga's exodus from Waikato lands where she left behind her children was a spectacular exit, which highlights her desperation and determination to get away from Whatihua. Ruapūtahanga, in all probability, felt she had been treated well below her position.

### **Post-1900 Māori Sources**

#### **The published account by Māui Pōmare**

Pōmare (Ngāti Mutunga, Ngāti Toa) handed his manuscript of Māori histories to James Cowan before he (Pōmare) left New Zealand in 1929 for California. The material within became the published form in 1934 of *The Legend of the Maori*. From that publication I have extracted the following about Ruapūtahanga, who came from the same area as Pōmare.

Turongo and Whatihua were born at Rangiahua. When they reached man's estate Turongo was made much of by the people and was created their chief. At this time a young chieftainess of the Ngati-Ruanui tribe, famed for her beauty, heard of Turongo, and she came to pay him a visit. When she reached the village she happened to come to Whatihua's house first, and she asked Whatihua, "Where is Turongo?" And Whatihua replied, "I will show you," and he asked her name, and she said, "I am Ruaputahanga." Whatihua said, "Let us go to the village." And when they reached the village Whatihua took her to his home, and there he made her his wife.

When Turongo and his father, Tawhao, heard how Whatihua had deceived Ruaputahanga they were very wroth ... Whatihua, he lived on at Rangiahua with his wives Ruaputahanga and Apakura. He favoured the handsome Ruaputahanga and practically abandoned Apakura. But when Ruaputahanga's son, Uenuku Te Rangihoka, was born, Whatihua returned to Apakura; and this angered Ruaputahanga greatly. She left Rangiahua for her homeland, by way of Marokopa, south of Kawhia, Whatihua pursuing her. When she reached the Moeatoa cliffs the tide was in and the waves were boisterous. They dashed in on the perilous beach track. "Return," cried the woman, "lest thou perish in pursuing me, for the tides of Rakei-mata-taniwha will engulf thee." And so Whatihua returned, and his wife, who had left him for ever, journeyed straight on, with her dog, Ruahinahina; and she arrived at last in the southern land of Taranaki with her own people, Ngati-Ruanui.

### *Account summary and context*

Pōmare notes Tūrongo's popularity amongst the people, and he also records Whatihua's deceitful characteristics. Pōmare writes too of Ruapūtahanga's famous beauty and her status as a chieftainess. Whatihua was fond of Ruapūtahanga until after the birth of their son, when he took more notice of Apakura, and thus Ruapūtahanga returned to her homelands.

### *Analysis*

Pōmare's account is the first that speaks of Ruapūtahanga's famous beauty; until now, this has not been a feature within her tradition (see below for further discussion around beauty, in Te Hurinui's conclusion). Pōmare's account prompts a hierarchical hegemonic discourse of sexual allure and domination, where Whatihua makes Ruapūtahanga his wife after taking her home. The tradition has almost been presented as a rape case, established within male/female power dynamics. Ruapūtahanga was young, a chieftainess and in a strange country, while he, Whatihua, had reached man's estate, knew the territory and controlled the situation. He can be seen as knowing and wily and she as innocent and non-assertive.

There are thus gendered implications here. Whatihua has higher masculine intelligence, power and authority while Ruapūtahanga is ideologically presented as the innocent feminine that has a situation inflicted on her contrary to her intention. There is no retribution toward Whatihua, other than his father and brother being very wroth, reinforcing a hegemonic approach to sexual deviance that oppresses women while highlighting men as dynamic, handsome and powerful. Pōmare's account is demonstrative of the powerful male ruler winning the passive beautiful maiden discourse, strongly reminiscent of the same social imaging held within Eurocentric fairy tales.

Pōmare introduces more explicitly than previously the notion of Whatihua becoming uninterested in Ruapūtahanga following the birth of her second baby. Post-natal conditions can be a time of physical and emotional fragility for some women, and it appears Whatihua has tormented Ruapūtahanga's emotions by his solipsism (a matter addressed in more detail in my commentary on Kelly's account). Nevertheless, this rendition presents Whatihua as a man who uses his wives lasciviously—as sexual objects. Wooed by Ruapūtahanga's famous beauty (sexual allure), he favours her until after the birth of their baby, at which time Whatihua turns his



attentions to Apakura. Ruapūtahanga, from a prestigious family of chiefs and chieftainesses, with possibly little support in Tainui lands (she left the area by herself), quickly distances herself from his insidious behaviour. Pōmare's account, then, centres on the politics of sex and female availability to men. Whatihua is placed as a man of means and distinction, and Ruapūtahanga and Apakura as his possessions. The possession motif is emphasised in his pursuit of her.

### **The published account by Pei Te Hurinui Jones**

Jones' 1945 *Mahinarangi: A Tainui Saga* tells the story of Ruapūtahanga as a mix of tradition and romantic story. His retelling was primarily taken in the main from Tainui elders, with Te Nguha Huirama of Ngāti Tamainupo providing much of the narration. Jones produces an account that is real and vivid; he paints a scene as it might have been observed at the time (Potter, 1997, p. 150). He takes the Tainui facts of Ruapūtahanga's oral tradition and imbues and influences it with descriptors that give the story agency and a believably factual, albeit romantic, entity. It was difficult for me to condense the account because of these factors. I begin relating Jones' (Tainui kaumātua) account with his description of Whatihua's competitive character:

... By these tactics and similar practices Whatihua generally got the advantage over his brother. At last the time came when Turongo could stand this treatment no longer, and he set out from Kawhia and travelled southwards. On his travels, Turongo heard of a famous beauty, a chieftain's daughter, named Ruaputahanga, whose home was at Patea, in South Taranaki ... The young lady was a *uru-kehu*, or of a fair complexion with light-auburn hair.<sup>65</sup> When Turongo saw her he was at once captivated by her beauty. Her charming ways was a by-word among the tribes, and Turongo lost no time in laying siege to her heart. He was a tall and handsome young man; but, for a time, his ardent wooing did not seem to make any impression on the proud chieftain's daughter.

Ruaputahanga was idolised by her people, and the Aotea tribes treated her as a *pūhi*, or as a high-born maiden specially set apart with privileges not ordinarily given to the daughters of the tribal chiefs. Among other reservations specially made for her benefit and pleasure was the setting aside of a bathing-pool in the small lake, called Hitore (this lake lies between Kakaramea and Patea alongside the present railway line), alongside her father's *kainga* at Paranui. In after-times the bathing-pool was known far and wide as *Te Wai-kaukau o Ruaputahanga*, "The Bathing-pool of Ruaputahanga." She also had a carved house specially built and set apart for herself and her companions. The house was called *Mahuru-nui*, "The Deep Contentment."

---

<sup>65</sup> During a ten-month visit to the Waikare area, Bay of Islands, in 1820, Cruise, a ship's commander, wrote that he had seen "a few grown-up persons with red and sandy hair" (Cruise, 1957, p. 208).

On a hot summer's day, Ruaputahanga left her house, Mahurunui, to go and bathe in Hitore Lake. Turongo saw her go, and he secretly followed her. Arriving at her bathing place, the Aotea *puhi* disrobed on the bank above the pool, and carefully placed her beautiful cloak and other garments on the low scrub ... Every now and then she would look towards the southern snow-tipped peak of her ancestral mountain, Taranaki ... she shook her hair loose, her long and glowing auburn tresses ... Ruaputahanga was in the full bloom of young womanhood ... And it was at this moment that Turongo emerged from his hiding place and moving quickly through the low scrub, he presently picked up Ruaputahanga's clothes in his arms ... Turongo had a fleeting glimpse of her burning face ... she quickly took charge of the situation ... she demanded, "What is this you are doing to me?" "It is the love for you that consumes me," said the young Tainui chief in a vibrant voice ... "I have seen your body, and I ask you once again to be my wife." "It is well," said Ruaputahanga, after a long pause, "return to your home and your people, and in due time I and my people will come. Indeed you have seen me in all my nakedness, and I must perforce become your wife!"...

Turongo recounted the happenings on his journey into Taranaki ... Whatihua was an interested listener. When he heard of Ruaputahanga and his brother's description of her beauty, he secretly made up his mind to win her for himself ... He went to the place where Turongo and his followers were busily engaged in preparing a house site, and where the material for the building of it was being collected. When Whatihua saw the ridge-pole which had been selected for Turongo's house and which had been brought down from the forest with much labour, he suggested it should be cut much shorter and the intended house made smaller ... and Turongo was persuaded to his view.

Whatihua, the schemer, was very pleased with himself ... Later on, and during the planting season, again acting on the advice of Whatihua, Turongo denuded his store-houses of all the stored kumara ... for his large *maara* ... Only a small supply of the little tubers were kept for eating until the harvesting of the crop for the visit of the Taranaki people ... Whatihua now concentrated on the building of a big house for himself ... which was completed at the same time as Turongo's ... Whatihua was very careful to conserve his supply of kumara, and he also arranged with his people to collect large supplies of *pipi* (cockles), *paua* ...

Ruaputahanga, accompanied by a large number of attendants, as was befitting her rank and in accordance with the custom of *Te Kawe-wahine*, or The Bridal Taking usage, proceeded to Wanganui and travelled up the river, calling at the many villages of kindred tribes ... Ruaputahanga ... climbed to the summit of the hill. From there she gazed across the ranges to the snow-capped peak of Taranaki; and the sight of her well-beloved mountain made her so home-sick that she wept where she stood. It was on this account that the hill was called "*Tangi-tu-o-Ruaputahanga*" (The Place-where-Ruaputahanga-stood-weeping); abbreviated, the name is given as Tangitu ... Ruahinahina, Ruap□ tahanga's dog, caught a kiwi at this spot [Mahoenui on the Mokau River]. The bird was prepared and put into a *hangi*. [The place was named] Umu-kaimata (the oven-of-uncooked-food) [when the bird was pulled up uncooked, the bird was cooked again]. This place was henceforth known as Tao-rua (the second roasting).

... Ruaputahanga and her people finally arrived at Kawhia at the home of Turongo. By this time, the party accompanying Ruaputahanga and her attendants had been augmented by representatives from the many villages they had passed through, and to Turongo's dismay he found that his new house was much too small to accommodate the visitors ... Hearing of the arrival of the party from Taranaki, Whatihua came over to pay his respects. Feigning to be much concerned over his brother's predicament in acting as host for so large a number, Whatihua suggested that the people should move over to his home ... Whatihua acted the part of the kindly host, and he went out of his way to be the most kind and considerate to Ruaputahanga, and saw to it that she had the best foods ... placed before the Taranaki chieftainess. Whatihua's hospitality was boundless.

When he knew the time was ripe, the wily Whatihua began to press his suit for the hand of Ruaputahanga ... Whatihua became bolder, and day by day he found innumerable opportunities for his subtle lovemaking. Whatihua's persistency the Taranaki lady found most flattering; and, despite the fact Whatihua was already a married man, Ruaputahanga at last agreed to become a second wife to him ... in due course Ruaputahanga became the *wahine-iti* (lesser wife) of Whatihua. Whatihua's other wife was Apakura, who was also a high-born lady.

Some years have passed and Ruaputahanga had now given birth to two sons ... Shortly after the birth of Uenukuterangihoka, Ruaputahanga had asked Whatihua to get her some eels from the Oparau River ... by reciting a special chant taught to him by his senior wife, Apakura, he had caught some very fat and succulent eels. On this occasion Apakura accompanied him to the fishing. Apakura had been very charming of late and Whatihua was delighted to have her company as he set off along the shores of Kawhia Harbour. Away at home, Ruaputahanga became very moody and she was in a melancholy state of mind ... she had also noticed that Apakura had been most attentive to the needs of their husband, and that Whatihua seemed to like it ... Ruaputahanga recalled the tempestuous wooing of Turongo, and she remembered with an uneasy feeling how Whatihua had deceived his brother ... She was jealous of Apakura. [Te Hurinui notes the charm said to catch the eels as per earlier accounts] ...

Some days later [after bickering], Apakura, with scorn in her voice, said: "If it were not for the charm of Apakura—yes, Whatihua asked for fish in my name; he asked for fish 'for Apakura!' your palate would not have been tickled with the tasty eels of Oparau!" Ruaputahanga ... hurriedly gathering her most valued personal ornaments and cloak ... fled from the home of Whatihua [Te Hurinui retells the tradition of Ruaputahanga's escape] ... the proud chieftain's daughter raised her voice and in words that have rung down the ages and become proverbial answered the Tainui chief and said ... [Te Hurinui repeats the proverb of the *hika tau* and translates thus: Return from hence lest ye perish in the pursuit of that which gave you joy in other years!] The distracted man again called out; but, proudly tossing her head as the wind again arose, Ruaputahanga (pointing to the white-crested waves which were now rushing in from the sea) sang out: "Ka tu Nga Tai o Rakeimata Taniwha! Hoki atu i kona; korerotia nga tane a te waewae i kimi ai! E noho ra, e te tau aroha o nga tau maha! Hei kone ra!" (Behold the rising Tides of Rakeimata the Dragon! Return hence and relate the story of a fruitless

pursuit! Remain, O Beloved of the years that have gone; Fare thee well!) With a forlorn and backward wave of her arm, Ruaputahanga turned, and leaping from rock to rock, she was soon lost to view in the rushing spray as the wind rose to a tempest and the angry seas came rushing in in mountainous waves.

For what seemed an eternity Whatihua stood rooted to the spot where he had seen that last glimpse of Ruaputahanga. On the edge of what was now a raging and storm tossed water barrier he peered into the blinding spray oblivious of the storm; and burst into tears of deepest sorrow ... Ruaputahanga [married Mokau] and had a daughter called Te Kuramonehu (the Plume of Sea-spray) ... in remembrance of the incidents of her eventful flight from Kawhia. From Te Kura-monehu are descended Ngati Rora, the most numerous sub-tribe of the Ngati Maniapoto, and also other sub-tribes of the Mokau Valley. After a sojourn of some years with her new husband, Ruaputahanga left him. For what reason she left Mokau we do not know ... she settled down among a branch of her own people and married a man named Te Porou. (pp. 4–26)

### *Account summary and context*

Jones' account gives evidence of the rivalry in which Whatihua held his brother Tūrongo. Ruapūtahanga is described as an important chieftainess, idolised by her people. She is beautiful, with auburn hair. Tūrongo is handsome and a chief's son and he eventually persuades Ruapūtahanga to marry him. Place names are given in connection with Ruapūtahanga's travels to Tainui lands and connections with her people in outlying areas.

Whatihua's rivalry and competitive nature again becomes apparent in the descriptions of the building of the house and gardens, so that when Ruapūtahanga arrives with her people, she thinks that Whatihua will look after her better than Tūrongo will, even though it is Tūrongo who has seen her naked and even though Whatihua is already married, which means that her position will not be as important as Apakura's. The discourse of jealousy is again brought forward, as is Ruapūtahanga's escape back to own lands after giving birth to a daughter to Mokau. Jones does not give details here as per the earlier accounts about the Tainui children meeting with the Taranaki children.

### *Analysis*

Ruapūtahanga's impressive agency as a woman of serious consequence is delivered in this account, which Jones pulled together from a number of important Tainui sources. An outcome of narrative collection such as this is, according to Potter (1997), "a rather loose preliminary category that usefully collects together a range of disparate but important discursive phenomena" (p. 173). From his collection, Jones brings together a romantic recording of Ruapūtahanga's oral

tradition, with timely consequential placement of factual elements and structures of the tradition, some of which have been ‘hard wired’ into Tainui descendants. Ruapūtahanga’s marriage to Whatihua is an example of this as is her escape and the children of the marriage.

Jones’ is a primary account that tells of Ruapūtahanga’s beauty, her auburn hair and her high status. She was, he says, ‘a famous beauty’, a ‘chieftain’s daughter’, a ‘young lady’, ‘uru-kehu (fair complexion)’. She had ‘light-auburn hair’, she had ‘charming ways’, she was a ‘proud chieftain’s daughter’, a ‘puhi’, ‘high-born maiden’, and she had her own specially set-aside bathing pool. The account by Jones about Ruapūtahanga thus presents a fuller picture of her than previously given. It allows us to see her as an agreeable woman because she is beautiful, idolised by her people, and a high-born maiden.

Mimi Thi Nguyen’s (2011, p. 361) research into “the biopower of beauty” explores how the appeal to beauty recruits hearts and minds. Women’s rights are made meaningful through appeal to beauty, she says, and all that it is imagined to promise; the promise, she argues, is a “redemptive promise” (p. 362). The outcome of highlighting beauty, Nguyen (2011, p. 362) continues, is a “heightened attention” that is extended out to other persons or things, such as for example, the descendants of the beautiful woman and the iwi as a whole who may whakapapa, albeit distantly, to her. Encapsulated in the claim of beauty may also lay a measure of moral character that “has a clear geopolitical dimension ... [in that it] also functions to regulate moral character” (Nguyen, 2011, p. 364). The suggestion of one’s ancestress being beautiful is appealing for many reasons, then.

Jones also relays more intimate details about the overland journey than previously recounted. He claims land marks in Ruapūtahanga’s name, which give her right of passage through those areas, and he makes iwi connections as she moves from Pātea towards Kāwhia. Ruapūtahanga’s dog, an important motif in earlier accounts, is again named here. It emphasises Ruapūtahanga’s courage as she set out with only her dog for company and protection when she left Whatihua which contrasts with when she arrived in Kāwhia with a retinue of kinfolk. Jones authenticates Ruapūtahanga’s tradition and adds to the discourse of women as geo-politicians. These political renderings are important ones to take from the tradition. Ruapūtahanga’s notable

overland journey demonstrates her abilities as an explorer and navigator, and illustrates an inner strength of determination and stamina required to successfully reach her destination.<sup>66</sup>

The written accounts indicate that the problems between Whatihua and Ruapūtahanga occurred quite some time after their marriage, given the mention of their children. Jones writes that Apakura and Whatihua spent a lot of time together (this was soon after the birth of one of Ruapūtahanga's children). However, Apakura acts very charmingly to Whatihua, and he quite likes it. They go off fishing together; leaving Ruapūtahanga at home where she becomes 'very moody' and recalls how Tūrongo had been tricked by his brother Whatihua. Unsurprisingly, patriarchal narrative does not explore Whatihua's egotistical manner, nor does it explore the possibility that, with such a manner, he had perhaps tried to consume Ruapūtahanga's independence; rather they tend to trivialize Ruapūtahanga and write of her as a woman who takes on a demanding, difficult personality. Such discourse characterizes women as aberrant and unstable, unlike men who are not portrayed this way. It also implies that such behaviour on the part of a woman sanctions the male 'prerogative' to behave as they want, even if it is likely to bring unhappiness to the women (and children) in their lives.

As with the other accounts of Ruapūtahanga's tradition, Jones' account bespeaks a woman of high pride and boldness. Her daring departure from Kāwhia and the ground she covers over unknown territory highlight these fearless characteristics of hers. According to other narratives, she was the first person to travel to parts of the area she traverses (see the Te Awa narrative and Smith, 1908). But Jones' account still exposes some of the previous conservative patriarchal prejudices about women's involvement in oral tradition. Entwined within his descriptions of her chiefly status and great strength of female character is the lasting impression of Ruapūtahanga having been paid in kind for turning away from her promise of marriage to Tūrongo, and deciding to marry Whatihua instead. The ideological message of self-interest and rejection is reinterpreted in an authoritative romantic cultural history that rationalises self-indulgence and egoistic phenomena.

---

<sup>66</sup> Bateman (1997, p. 19b, 24b) provides a map illustrating the place names and actual locations of Ruapūtahanga's journey.

## **The published account by Leslie G. Kelly**

The following is taken from Kelly's 1949 account in *Tainui*:

As Whatihua and Turongo, the two sons of Tawhao, grew to manhood, great rivalry sprang up between them, occasioned no doubt in the first place by their respective ranks, but later by little tricks and feats of skills as one tried to outdo the other. As a rule Whatihua came out the victor ... Turongo [journeyed to Taranaki where] he met, at Patea, the celebrated beauty Ruaputahanga. This woman possessed that fair complexion known as *urukehu*, and Turongo determined to make her his wife ... (pp. 71–71). [Kelly gives an account similar to that in Te Hurinui above in relation to the deceit that was done to Turongo, so there is no need to repeat it here].

Following the birth of Uenuku-tuhatu, Ruaputahanga again conceived and another son named Uenuku-te-rangi-hoka was born to her. While this child was still an infant Ruaputahanga began to find fault with her husband Whatihua, considering that he was showing a decided preference for Apakura, his second wife. In a fit of jealousy she decided to return to her own people.

So early one morning before the people were astir she strapped her youngest child on her back, and set off. Her flight was soon discovered, however, and Whatihua set out in pursuit, hoping that she might be persuaded to come back. Ruaputahanga was just turning Matatua point when Whatihua came in sight at Kawhia, and hastily burying her baby Uenuku-te-rangi-hoka, neck deep in the sand, she quickly covered the rest of the distance to the harbour-entrance and taking to the water, swam across to Te Maika.

Whatihua came on, but was delayed in order to exhume his small son. He, however, did not abandon the chase, but followed along the coast, and by the time he had reached Marokopa, he was close on the heels of Ruaputahanga. Hastening to the beach at Moeatoa, Ruaputahanga sprang in desperation across the yawning chasm at the base of which surged the incoming tide. By the time Whatihua arrived the inrushing breakers had formed an insurmountable barrier and he was only able to gaze upon his wife as she stood on the other side.

Poised on a rock Ruaputahanga replied to the pleadings of Whatihua in a manner that has been passed down as a proverb. Refusing to return she said [proverb as per Rakei]. Having failed in his purpose, Whatihua left her to continue her journey, and returned slowly to Kawhia. (p. 78)

### ***Account summary and context***

Kelly gives further descriptions of the sibling rivalry between Whatihua and Tūrongo, and his descriptions of Ruapūtahanga accord with those of Jones (1945), thus emphasizing her beauty. Kelly concerns himself only with Ruapūtahanga's Tainui-born children; he does not mention her

daughter to Mokau. Kelly details, as did the other narrators, her escape from Whatihua and the route she took. He also cites proverb as per earlier accounts. Kelly records Ruapūtahanga as Whatihua's first wife.

### *Analysis*

The early descriptions of rivalry between Whatihua and Tūrongo are useful in that the scene is set for the later penultimate contention over Ruapūtahanga. Kelly's illustration shows Whatihua as always outranking Tūrongo, so Whatihua again wanted to prove his superiority when he gains Ruapūtahanga in marriage. A structural model of patriarchal domination throughout the tradition about Ruapūtahanga emerges in this respect; she is always the passive prize of male attentions, which tends to signify that she is secondary in the tradition. Sexuality and power relations have become the main features of patriarchal retellings, an aspect that becomes more obvious with the now embedded (Pōmare, Jones, Kelly) focus on Ruapūtahanga's beauty as opposed to her strengths in other areas, such as mental agility, although later her physical prowess and vigour are showcased as she outdistances Whatihua. However, this feat does not receive the same attention as the beauty.

Again, in Kelly's description, Ruapūtahanga is categorized as having a decided element of jealousy and unreasonableness in her character. She leaves Whatihua in a 'fit' of jealousy. More could have been made of the fact that these events occurred soon after Ruapūtahanga had had her baby, but obviously are not. As such, the texts to date, including Kelly's, reference particular arguments (jealousy) and ignore others (the trauma that can accompany the birth of a child).

Kelly's posit that Apakura was the second wife may be a typical Tainui account, because Te Whēoro also said as much, although Jones (see above) identified Apakura as the first wife. The texts have an ideological representation of Ruapūtahanga (women) as unreasonably and inherently jealous, occasioned in part by their social (in this case within the institution of marriage) rankings relative to one another. Jealousy thus tends to be a focus of her tradition, although Te Whēoro did not write like this about her.

One phenomenon from Ruapūtahanga's tradition that stands out in all accounts, and which even patriarchal, sexist ideology cannot expunge, is her strong sense of herself and her capabilities as she strikes out on her own to forge a better life than the one she has come to have with Whatihua. Ruapūtahanga's (women's) courage, perseverance and audacity evident in the



oral tradition therefore continue in the recordings to come, but these attributes are not explicitly stated in the way her beauty is; her other strengths are implied by her actions. In contrast, Whatihua's (male) activity is celebrated, and Ruapūtahanga's (female) passivity and beauty is preferred. Kelly's abrupt denouement as far as Ruapūtahanga is concerned highlights his interest in Tainui, as Whatihua's history closes his retelling, and he does not return again to her later marriages and family.

### **The published account by Pei Te Hurinui Jones and Bruce Biggs**

Jones took Ruapūtahanga's tradition from Tainui kaumātua, Tūkōrehu-te-ahipū (Ngāti Maniapoto, Ngāti Raukawa, Whanganui and Ngāti Tūwharetoa) in 1934. Jones and Biggs recount Ruapūtahanga's tradition similarly to the preceding accounts, but they present a number of additions and differences, some of which the earlier authors of the earlier accounts partially mention, but which I chose to leave out due to space and word limits. From *Nga Iwi o Tainui* Jones and Biggs (1995, pp. 62–82) record the tradition as follows.

When his [Taawhao, Tainui chief] wives [Puunui-a-te-kore, older wife, and her younger sister, Maru-tee-hiakina] conceived they came back to Kaawhia. When they gave birth Maru-tee-hiakina, the younger sister, bore her child first. Her baby, a boy, was named Whatihua. When Puunui-a-te-kore, the older sister, also gave birth to a boy, he was named Tuurongo. The circumstances of their births remained a matter of contention between them. The mothers probably egged them on. Tuurongo wished to be the senior, because his mother was the first wife. Whatihua would not agree ... When Tuurongo grew up he decided to go travelling. He left Kaawhia, going south and reaching Paatea. There he met a woman, Rua-puu-tahanga ... She was the daughter of Hou-tae-poo and his senior wife Hia-taarere ... Rua-puu-tahanga was beautiful, with light-coloured hair and skin, a ceremonial virgin of the tribes of the *Aotea* canoe. Tuurongo approached Rua-puu-tahanga, the match was discussed, and it was agreed that Rua-puu-tahanga should marry Tuurongo. It was decided that Rua-puu-tahanga would come later, after Tuurongo had returned to his people to build a place in preparation for her arrival with her party ... the news of Rua-puu-tahanga's beauty had reached Whatihua. He decided to take his young brother's woman for himself ... [the tradition of Whatihua's deceit and marriage to Rua-puu-tahanga is that of earlier accounts so there is no need to repeat it here] ...

Whatihua and Rua-puu-tahanga had been living for a long time at Kaawhia when Whatihua took another woman, Apakura, as his second wife.<sup>67</sup> Not long afterwards,

---

<sup>67</sup> Biggs has a footnote about this stating that Jones positioned Apakura as the second wife, thus: "PH [Jones] considers that she [Apakura] may have come to Kaawhia with Maahina-a-rangi but Te Whare Toroa (personal communication) says that Apakura was already Whatihua's wife when he married Rua-puu-tahanga and Pōmare

Rua-puu-tahanga became angry because her husband was so keen on his second wife. One day Apakura had a craving for eel, and Whatihua went to the Place-of-many-eel-weirs to catch a big eel that many people had been after for a long time. Whatihua caught the eel and Apakura had the food she craved. Afterwards Rua-puu-tahanga heard that Whatihua had taken one of the talismans she had brought from Taranaki when he caught the eel. Then her anger quite consumed her. At the time she had borne her second child ... [The chase from Kaawhia, Taharoa, Taumatakanāe, Harihari, Marokopa, Kiri-te-here, Moeaatoa and Te Mimi-o- Rua-puu-tahanga is as set out as previously, but I pick up the tradition again from here.]

Before long she saw Whatihua appear at the end of the beach. A little further on was the sheer cliff that fell abruptly into deep water—a fearful place, and the home of water monsters.<sup>68</sup> In her desperation Rua-puu-tahanga did not hesitate. She cast herself in to cross over, and was thrown by the waves to safety on the other side ... [The rest of Rua-puu-tahanga’s tradition is repeated similarly to earlier accounts. Jones and Biggs note Rua-puu-tahanga’s marriage to Porou and her two children, Wheke and Nguu, but not her death.]

### *Account summary and context*

The cause of the brother’s rivalry, Ruapūtahanga’s virginal status and the description of her attempt to leave Whatihua reference some of the discourses that I analyse further in the renderings below. Jones (who wrote the 1945 Jones account above) notably names Ruapūtahanga as Whatihua’s first wife, whereas in his 1949 account he said she was his second, after Apakura.

### *Analysis*

Jones and Biggs, as did Kelly and others, give the history of contention between the two brothers, Whatihua and Tūrongo, which contextualizes still further their tradition of brotherly belligerence and Whatihua’s ultimate triumph over Tūrongo when he secures Ruapūtahanga as his wife. The tradition is told similarly to earlier accounts, but with attention now paid not only to Ruapūtahanga’s beauty but also to her virginal status, which Nguyen (2011) would possibly attribute to the biopower of beauty (see above) and the absolute allure to men of a sought-after womanly condition. It is no longer sufficient to describe Ruapūtahanga’s beauty through her

---

(1934:22) tends to confirm this when he says that Whatihua favoured the handsome Rua-puu-tahanga and practically abandoned Apakura” (p. 80).

<sup>68</sup> Biggs (1995, p. 82) noted that Jones said there were many sharks at the place when he went there (see in Jones, 1945.)

youth, hair and skin tones, but now the state of her sexuality is disclosed to make her even more appealing.

While Biggs (1960) and others (see, for example, Best, 1924, p. 451; Graham, 1923, p. 38; Grey, 1953, p. 160; Polack, 1838, p. 370) write of the cultural custom of maintaining high chieftainesses or ceremonially dedicated maidens as virginal until either they were married or for other customary occasions, further research is necessary on this idea. Historically, the male retelling of customs and traditions has seen patriarchal ideas about women's participation in their societies accordingly regulated. Historian Berys Heuer wrote in 1969 an article about Māori women's participation in early tribal life. Her work, taken from the available patriarchal accounts, tends to repeat the depictions informed by the cultural and social male gaze. Heuer provides examples of early missionaries and explorers' accounts of high chieftainesses being kept apart from those women who either gave themselves or were given as bed partners to male visitors, but perhaps these important women were not available to Pākehā visitors—maybe they discretely gave of themselves as and when *they* chose (Te Rangitopeora of Ngāti Toa is an example of a woman who did this).

Jones and Biggs mention Ruapūtahanga's parents (the first of the accounts informing this chapter to have done so), which is an important consideration when engaging in research that requires following connections and links. Particularly noticeable from a womanist perspective is that Ruapūtahanga's mother is named. Jones and Biggs note that a Taranaki talisman belonging to Ruapūtahanga was the breaking point for her with regard to her marriage. In this, they provide an interpretation that does not have the same pejorative and dismissive connotations as most of the preceding accounts do with respect to the complexities that are women's.

Jones and Biggs relay a portion of what is a dangerous journey (as do others), but they describe the extent of Ruapūtahanga's desperation to be free. This account, in particular, lends more descriptive renderings to the risks Ruapūtahanga (women) was prepared to make if pressed hard enough, no matter the danger to self. Considering the journey Ruapūtahanga took, her determination and courage reflect a notion that could be worded thus: Better to perish in a pool of sharks than be bound to a solipsistic man.

### **The published account by Tony Sole**

Sole (Ngāti Ruanui and Ngā Ruahine) researched Ngāti Ruanui history in preparation for his iwi Waitangi Tribunal hearings. He then presented his work in *Ngāti Ruanui: A History*, published in 2005. In relation to Ruapūtahanga, Sole has this to say:

[She is] the woman who, of all Ngāti Ruanui, embodies romance and the independence of a free spirit. Ruapūtahanga, a woman of beauty as well as high rank, lived at Te Ramanui, the centre of Ngāti Ruanui at that time ... she descended directly from Turi by two lines ... Tāneroroa [and] Turi-mata-kino the son of Turi and Hinekewa, who was the sister of Hoturoa ... Ruapūtahanga, evidently not impressed with the men in her iwi, sought fresher fields. She had heard of the rangatira Whatihua, a descendent of Hoturoa the ariki of *Tainui* and determined to visit him at Kāwhia. Her party travelled north ... By using her karakia Ruapūtahanga caused water to flow from a rock at the spring which still bears the name Te Puna-a- Ruapūtahanga...

In due course Ruapūtahanga arrived at Kāwhia and, as in all great romances, was attracted to Whatihua, who promptly reciprocated her affection. In due course they were married and produced three children, Uenuku-tūhatu, Uenuku-te-rangihōkā, and a daughter Hinga-kete-manowai [Sole provides a whakapapa table showing this daughter's marriage to Whakaronā maiwaho; see p. 92]. Alas, in time their love lost its fire and the ashes turned cold. This cooling was helped in no small manner by jealousy generated between Ruapūtahanga and Apakura, the first wife of Whatihua. Finally, Ruapūtahanga discovered that Whatihua had used a mauri from Taranaki in order to catch an elusive big eel that Apakura craved. Ruapūtahanga, no longer prepared to contend with a rival for her husband's attentions, decided to return to Ngāti Ruanui, taking her youngest son, Uenuku-te-rangihōkā, and her dog, Ruahinahina, with her. Whatihua, not content to let her leave without protest, pursued her and almost caught her beyond Maketū, near Mātaatua Point. Desperate, Ruapūtahanga scooped a hole in the sand and left her baby there, rushing on to the harbour mouth where she swam to Te Maika headland across Kāwhia Harbour ...

She hurried along the beach to the cliff that fell into the lair of the taniwha Rākei-mata. Fearless, or perhaps so fearful that the taniwha was the lesser of two evils, she plunged in and was carried across. [Sole repeats the proverbs re 'taku hika tau' and 'Raakei-mata-taniwha-rau' as per Jones, 1995]. Ruapūtahanga, in a hurry to escape Whatihua but evidently not in a rush to return to her rohe, remained at Mōkau where she married a man of that name and bore him a daughter, Te Kuramōnehu, from whom are descended Ngāti Rora of Ngāti Maniapoto [as per Jones, 1945] Ruapūtahanga certainly possessed a restless spirit, for she finally decided to return to Ngāti Ruanui, and journeyed along the war trail from Kairoa Pā ...

At last she reached Te Ramanui where she married Porou, and bore him two sons and a daughter.<sup>69</sup> From their children descended the Tāngahoe hapū of Ngāti Tānewai, Ngāti Tūpaea, Hāmua, and Ngāti Hawe. (pp. 91–95) [Sole also gives Te Hurinui's 1945 Tainui version of events (see above).]

### *Account summary and context*

Sole notes Ruapūtahanga's beauty, unrestrained character and noble birth lines. His account follows that of his kinsman Pōmare, which repeats the versions of Smith and that given by White from his unnamed Taranaki source in terms of Ruapūtahanga hearing about Whatihua and travelling overland to him (although Tainui sources say that Tūrongo travelled to her lands). Sole concludes that the reason why Ruapūtahanga journeys to Kāwhia is because she could not find a suitable match amongst her own people. He writes of Ruapūtahanga's use of karakia during her travels and replicates the tradition of her marriage and the birth of her children to the union, although he notes three children while others (see above) name only the two boys. Sole also notes the talisman, the mauri, as per Jones and Biggs's (1995) account, as the final point of conflict in the marriage (whereas others record the use of the women's names to catch eels), and he attributes Ruapūtahanga's unhappiness to her jealousy of Apakura. Sole furthermore recounts the journey, whakataukī and later events as per earlier accounts, although he uses additional contemporary land marks to identify Ruapūtahanga's trail. For example, he notes that the war trail from Kairoa Pā is near present-day Lepperton.

### *Analysis*

While the accounts from the late nineteen-hundred's in relation to the tradition of Ruapūtahanga do not include the discourse of love, beauty, high status and romance, her tradition in Sole's twenty-first century text has tangible forms of all of these social, political and cultural representations that episodically appear as particularly relevant in renderings on women. Sole maintains the motifs of formal contextual truth and significance within his representation of the tradition—those of Ruapūtahanga's high status, her marriage into Tainui, her children, her exodus from Tainui lands and her journey back to Ruanui. His informal representations of beauty and love, however, have thus become consensual motifs, evolved by the later writers of Ruapūtahanga's tradition, and so now fit believably within the story line. It is believable, for

---

<sup>69</sup> Te Hurinui (1945) records the place as Paranui (p. 5).

example, that Ruapūtahanga was beautiful and desirable, that she partnered with an important Tainui chief and had at least two children with him, and that she then went on to marry at least twice more. It makes sense, too, for Sole and his kinsmen, with their social ties to Taranaki history, to write of Ruapūtahanga's famous beauty. Their ancestress has thus been positioned as a famous and sought-after beauty just as Kahungunu of Heretaunga is represented as the most handsome and sought after of men.

Sole relays the *karakia* that Ruapūtahanga is said to have performed in order to produce water for her people. His recognition of this event maintains women's social and cultural position with potent ritual powers and, importantly, brings the event and women's powerful place into the twenty-first century. But Sole still, uncritically, relies on the jealousy motive for Ruapūtahanga's departure, and he says that both women are jealous of each other, which differs to the one woman only jealous of the other depiction in previous accounts. This characterization of the women relays the idea of flawed female personalities rather than social conditions (such as Ruapūtahanga having only recently given birth) or that Whatihua had fuelled the situation with his egotistical antics. Ruapūtahanga's arduous journey home to her own people is again recounted and, importantly, Taranaki descendant connections are made.

### **Conclusion: Politics that Emerge**

The politics that emerge from the renderings of Ruapūtahanga's tradition have an association with land, progeny and hierarchy. Herstory, including her characteristics, has been evidenced through a patriarchal pattern of analysis of her situation and status. Without scrutiny of this trend of power politics with its ideological approach to sex-role stereotyping, Ruapūtahanga could appear as a moody and jealous woman who, simply to have her own way, forsakes her Tainui-born children and her husband.

We can trace in the accounts about Ruapūtahanga a change in the retelling over time. The very early writings do not say of what importance she was. The politics of cultural motifs such as her beauty have evolved to become an extreme beauty, with an extreme youthfulness, and an extremely high status *whakapapa*. This tends to highlight a representation of self-interest in the retelling where we descend from beautiful and gorgeously strong (in every way) women. In addition, that this ancestress married a famous chiefly cultivator who was known far and wide for

his skill, bequeaths a double load of mana to their descendants. Politically, the union aligns wide whānau relationships that became important markers in warring times.

The discourses of love and romance were not mentioned in the late-19th-century accounts of Te Whēoro and the unnamed narratives captured by White and Smith. According to the social and political constructions of their accounts, the union between Whatihua and Ruapūtahanga occurred as a consequence of a social and cultural life that revolved around the ethics of hard work, skill and mana: news of Whatihua's fame (as a cultivator) had reached Ruapūtahanga, and her fame of beauty had reached Tūrongo. Compared with later accounts, these earlier ones present little information about Ruapūtahanga before her marriage to Whatihua, leaving the impression that there was little of consequence in her life before him. It is not until the Pōmare account in 1934 that Ruapūtahanga is represented as other than waiting for Whatihua or someone else to come and make something of her life.

Tainui and, in particular, Ngāti Ruanui tellers and recorders of Ruapūtahanga's herstory have an emotional involvement in their retellings; she is a significant part of their history. Thus we see from early 20th-century iwi accounts representation of her important social circumstances and her famous beauty, which had been heard of far and wide, but which had not been identified, at least in written form, prior to Pōmare. Implicit in the concept of beauty are strategies of power and possible futures, where "the political work of governance is being reconstituted" (Nguyen, 2011, p. 380). That is, that important people descend from such persons.

While it is likely that Ruapūtahanga was a beautiful woman, it is this aspect together with that of the man she marries which tends to be central for the male narrators and recorders, her affections and heart as a woman are not entered into. The variation across eras reveals that the early accounts of Te Whēoro and Te Awa note the importance of the union between Whatihua and Ruapūtahanga and their subsequent separation, while later accounts also focus on her looks, strong body and chiefly status. The rhetorical hegemonic discourse of women's roles in Ruapūtahanga's tradition is that they be beautiful and thus important. Ideologically, they are available to hard-working men of skill and importance to whom the women have their babies and remain faithful.

Ruapūtahanga and Apakura become increasingly represented in the accounts as married, jealous and outdoing each other in their quest to fulfil Whatihua's sexual desires. This rendering belies a hegemonic megalomaniac branding of women as valuable sexual possessions of men.

What use Whatihua was to Ruapūtahanga and Apakura is not similarly discussed. Rather, the women are presented as dangerous rivals to each other, while Whatihua is represented as a chiefly egocentric man of means. Both women were away from their own politically organized groups and lands, ensconced as they were in the heart of Tainui. They were vulnerable to Whatihua's attitudes towards them, but their characters nevertheless evolve to exemplify social mobilizations of a feminine jealousy trait.

Patriarchal retelling of Ruapūtahanga's tradition that reinforces a gendered position in response to a supposed jealousy is not evident in the earliest account but is mentioned in almost every retelling thereafter. This gerrymandering institutes a rhetoric that Ruapūtahanga's (women) character is consumed by a jealous rage or moodiness (to use the word of one account) so severe that she leaves her family because of it, thus disenfranchising women's roles, values and femininity. Each of the accounts states that this event occurred just after the birth of Ruapūtahanga's second baby but ignores any alternative explanation, especially the possibility of her feeling emotionally overwhelmed and undervalued, with no support (apparently) from her own kinswomen. This lack of alternative explanation also pays no heed to women's value as the bearers of children.

None of the male tellers give currency to ideas such as these, nor to the complexity of Ruapūtahanga's situation. We have read of Whatihua's ebullient and solipsistic nature, where he moves between Ruapūtahanga and Apakura for his pleasure at whim or depending on their availability to him (immediate post-birth being one time of unavailability), yet the social message from the masculine is one of censure towards Ruapūtahanga. A male bias further influences the retelling of Ruapūtahanga's tradition through the regularity of reference to her physical attributes, such as her beauty. These types of description are deliberate strategies of containment of male ideas about women, of their objectification through a focus on comeliness. As Peng Hsiao-Yen, author and academic, wrote in 2006 "the features and body of the woman gazed at by the male narrator are turned into a sight-seeing spot fit for men's short visits." (p. 218). Hsiao-Yen was writing about male prejudices and their images of women in stories. Her discription highlights Ruapūtahanga's prejudice also through the male narrator's gaze. In addition, the discourse of men beating women is spoken of as if it is a matter of course, as if it is a usual and right thing to do to women who are described as 'simple', unsuspecting and 'jealous' of husbands who lie and sneak away to indulge in liaisons with other women. The violence towards



Ruapūtahanga (women) is sanctioned by subtle wording within the oral tradition that identifies marital problems within the marriage as stemming from Ruapūtahanga's jealousy rather than anything that Whatihua had done. Women are discriminated by the design of that particular patriarchal rendering. While the violence theme appeared in only one account before disappearing, it serves nevertheless as authorisation for male violence against women, an authority that was not present in the early oral traditions.

Underestimated by the masculine is the high drama that plays out for Ruapūtahanga, a successful tribal feminist. Her story of outrunning, outwitting and outmanoeuvring her husband "transgressed [imposed] gender boundaries" (Fox, 2012, p. 6) and became plundered and then overtaken in the publications by the emphasis on his movements. The portrayal of Ruapūtahanga's stoic determination to be away from Whatihua and Tainui lands showcases her dynamism and strength of character. And the mention of the karakia she performs is a reminder to us of women's roles in ritual karakia and their pre-potent power.

The traditions about Ruapūtahanga from a Tainui perspective ceased once she returned to her own people. Kelly (1949) does, however, continue telling detailed stories of her children and descendants. Jones (1945) fittingly concludes his kōrero about her by explaining that once she married Te Porou, "her subsequent history belong[ed] to the people of Taranaki" (p. 25). Sole (2005) gives additional details, albeit minimal, about where Ruapūtahanga lived and the children she had once she returned to her own lands. In 1987, a third house named Te Kohaarua/The Gift of Ruapūtahanga was opened in Mokau (Stokes, 1988, p. 223), an excellent and welcome tribute to a significant ancestress from a much earlier era who once travelled through that region and whose legacy of (from a womanist mana wahine perspective) indomitable female strength and diversity remains alive by the power of the oral tradition about her.

*Whaka-Ruapūtahanga i a koe!*<sup>70</sup>

### **Ruapūtahanga Restoryed**

Ruapūtahanga occasionally liked to ponder the events of her life as she sat amongst her people. Her husband Porou had not long since died, and it was because of this that she had been mindful

---

<sup>70</sup> Act as though you are Ruapūtahanga! Said to be used when someone is trying to act like the famous Ruapūtahanga, a woman of great beauty and determination. I assume the whakataukī to be one used as an encouragement rather than an admonishment.

to prepare her children for her own death. She wanted her children from Porou to meet her firstborn children, the ones she had been forced to leave in Tainui lands when she had escaped their father, Whatihua.

Ruapūtahanga's contemplations moved to memories of her mother, Hitarere. She had loved the stories Hitarere told her about her kuikui Hinekawa from Tainui and Rongorongo from her own Aotea waka. They were both strong women, her mother said, well known for their huge kūmara cultivations, their powerful karakia and their physical strength. Hinekawa, she went on with a smile, was a huge woman with strong and powerful legs. She was best known for taking long walks through the forests and over mountain passes; she had never been afraid of the dark or of being alone.

Ruapūtahanga liked to think about her kuikui, how brave she was and how powerful her legs must have been. Her own legs weren't big, but they were powerful; they could run along the beach for half a day if she needed them to. Rongorongo, her other kuikui, had been a matakite. She had been able to see things in the future and warn her people about events that were going to happen. It was because of her being able to see that Uenuku did not like her koro Turi that the people had left the homelands and arrived here.

Everyone said that she, Ruapūtahanga, was like this kuikui of hers, but she didn't think so. She thought they said this because she looked different to her cousins and her brother Tongatea. They all had black hair and dark skin, but she had red hair and her skin was much lighter than theirs. She did love the bush, though, and she didn't mind being alone in there. She loved the berries that she found from time to time. From some of the valleys that she visited, she could even hear ripples of laughter travelling up from the pā. Once she heard wailing coming from home, and that's when her strong legs were really tested. She had plunged through the uneven forest floor as if she were running along the smooth beach; nothing altered her speed. When she reached the pā, she learned that the death of her father, Houtaepo, was the cause of the lamentations.

It was soon after his burial that Whatihua turned up at her village. He stayed for a while, but it was clear his intentions were for her. He showed to her mother how adept and vibrant he was in the cultivations, until eventually even Ruapūtahanga came to appreciate his good-natured competitiveness as he vied alongside her own kinsmen for her attention. So they became married,

and Ruapūtahanga eventually followed him back to Kāwhia through the inland route, over the ranges of the island.

Whatihua was a good provider and lover. Their boy Uenuku was well cared for, and he and Rakamāhanga, Whatihua and his first wife Apakura's boy were good friends and adventurers together. Ruapūtahanga was much younger than Apakura, and she sought Apakura's advice on raising her son. Ruapūtahanga was cautious of keeping in check Uenuku's overly competitive nature. She had heard about the lifelong rivalry between her husband and his brother Tūrongo, and she had always been sorry that her boy was not able to meet his cousins because of the rift that it had caused. Uenuku had a tendency to be like his father in that way, and she wanted to temper that part of him.

When Ruapūtahanga was heavily pregnant with her and Whatihua's second child, she spent even more time with Apakura. Apakura would massage her back and legs every night and again first thing in the morning. She would pao to her and croon her to sleep most nights as she stretched and pulled at the aching and thickening muscles in Ruapūtahanga's body.

As Ruapūtahanga's time to birth drew near, Apakura, too tired to get up and retire to her own bed, often fell asleep beside her. Whatihua had talked several times to Apakura about this for he wanted her to return to him at night. He had never before been displaced in this way. He was unaccustomed to the rejection of his importance in the family. His demands of Apakura (and to Ruapūtahanga to relinquish Apakura) became even more strident when he realised the baby's birth had further dislodged him from his rightful place. Apakura had stayed constantly by Ruapūtahanga's side during the weeks leading up to the baby's birth, and she continued to do so for many weeks following. Such was Whatihua's enmity towards both Ruapūtahanga and Apakura that Ruapūtahanga resolved to return home with her baby Uenuku-te-rangihōkā.

Apakura would have liked to have gone back to her people, too, but her age limited her ability to make the journey, and it was also important to her that Rakamāhanga remain in his Tainui lands. She promised Ruapūtahanga that she would take great care of Uenuku-tuhatu and bring him up as a true brother to Rakamāhanga. They waited till they knew that Whatihua was out in the cultivation, at which time Apakura walked with Ruapūtahanga to where the track disappeared into the bush. They cried with each other, said their farewells and then Ruapūtahanga was gone with her baby on her back and her dog running along in front of her. She was thankful for that *kuikui* of hers—that Hinekawa with her strong and powerful legs. Ruapūtahanga could

feel the strength surging through her thighs. She felt assertively strong, and she already knew that she was going to make it back to her own people.

It did not take Whatihua long to realise what had happened when he arrived back at the pā. He had suspected for a while that Ruapūtahanga was thinking of returning home; he had noticed her unreflective, almost sullen eyes. When her dog did not run out to greet him as usual, he hounded Apakura until she told him. He caught Ruapūtahanga's trail at Marokopa, and reasoned with himself that he would catch her at Moeatoa. Whatihua had been blessed with skill and strength in his hands from his kuikui Whakaotirangi, but he had not been blessed with the strong and powerful legs of Hinekawa that Ruapūtahanga had. When he reached Moeatoa, he could see Ruapūtahanga standing stark and alone on the top of the cliff in the sunset. . .

Ruapūtahanga wiped away a tear from her eyes as she lay on her bed thinking about that time way back when she had escaped her husband. It had cost her dearly. Her hands ran over her heavily tattooed thighs as she remembered the faces of her treasured Tainui children that she had left behind. But she had left them to Apakura, and she knew that it would not be long before she would meet them again.

## Chapter Seven: Post-Colonisation

### Rehe Hekina Kenehuru

In this chapter, I bring the re-presentation of Tainui women into a new era—that of my kuikui, Kenehuru, post-colonisation. Her story (herstory) is politically and socially similar to that of her predecessors in that it is bound by patriarchal interpretation, realignment, and psychologically damaging regulation. However, unlike the stories of her antecedents, Kenehuru has been heard only via the coloniser voice; her story is not accessible through an iwi viewpoint.

While the early colonial and post-colonial Māori histories had been drawn on from remnants of oral transmission, Kenehuru's story, at the hands of the coloniser, is available for all to see. It has been brought together, for the purposes of this research, from various newspapers, letters, diaries and government records. For me, her story is a poignant conclusion to the documentation of events about Tainui ancestresses because Kenehuru was my great, great, great grandmother. Concluding this research with an examination of her historically politicized experiences showcases the inequities and injustices perpetuated on Māori women as an hegemonic patriarchal canon continued its control of the feminine not only through the stories the men retold, but also through the legislation they rallied behind. The intersections of the methodological and theoretical structures of womanist *mana wahine* and Kaupapa Māori highlight the radical implications of Kenehuru's *herstory*.

Most of the available sources on Kenehuru's life experiences are newspaper articles, so it was pertinent for me to read Gina Colvin's (2009) doctoral thesis, which discusses colonial discourses of racial formations and ideologies within New Zealand's colonial press archives. Colvin's examination was especially helpful as I considered how best to negotiate, understand and critically analyse the colonial texts. As Colvin (2009) states, and which I found also, very few headlines in the early New Zealand papers provide insight into what an article is about. Rather, four or five different 'stories' sit under the one heading, such as 'Parliamentary'. In order to find what I was searching for, I had to scan each story until I discovered items of interest and relevance.

Kenehuru's herstory includes two pivotal events in her life. The first was her marriage to a Pākehā man, William Edward Meurant (known as Edward), my great, great, great grandfather.

The second concerns her efforts to challenge in the courts the process of government-sanctioned land confiscation from Māori women. Kenehuru's property arrangement with her relatives, organised through the transference of Māori land in 1844, occurred on the cusp of colonial land expansion, which included legislative practices designed to control land purchases in the provinces. This chapter varies somewhat from the earlier three

I begin this chapter with a brief account of Kenehuru's whakapapa and marriage. Also included is information about her husband, Edward, as the sources about him give a sense of Kenehuru's life after she married. I then include and scrutinise accounts documenting the events surrounding the confiscation of a thirty-acre block of land gifted to Kenehuru in 1844 by her relatives and the subsequent on-selling of twenty acres of that land.

### **Kenehuru—Her Whakapapa and Marriage**

Rehe Hekina Kenehuru descended from chiefly lines. Born in 1818, she was the granddaughter of Tawhia-ki-te-rangi and Tawai of Ngāti Mahuta (Kelly, 1949, p. 473). Her father was Te Tuhi o te Rangi, and her mother was Kirikino. Kenehuru's grandfather's first wife was Te Atairangikaahu, which meant Kenehuru was a niece to King Potatau Te Wherowhero (Kelly, 1949, p. 348). Kenehuru's older sister, Maraea Kautawhiti, a woman of rank (Roche, 2013), became known as Maria following her marriage in 1835 to Kāwhia trader, George Thom (*The Tortoise Press*, 2013). Kautawhiti and Thom moved to New South Wales soon after they married. There is little recorded about them. Both died young (Thom at sea and Kautawhiti in 1840), after which two of their children were brought back to New Zealand by Tawhiao, who later became the second Māori king (*The Tortoise Press*, 2013). This event signals the importance of Kenehuru's whakapapa lines.

Kenehuru also had a brother called Te Hiakai, a warrior of note and chief to his people (see Kelly, 1949, pp. 300, 319, 336). While Kelly (1949) writes of the battles that Te Hiakai was involved in, he does not feature Kenehuru in his accounts (and neither does any other recorder of Tainui traditions) except for including her name in his whakapapa tables. Further, Buddle (1851, p. 15) records a lament following the death of Te Hiakai, and the Auckland Art Gallery holds a painting of Kenehuru's father. But of the women in Kenehuru's life—her mother, her grandmothers, her sister and herself—there is no such recognition.

Kenehuru married William Edward Meurant in 1835 and became known as Eliza Meurant in official documents, although Meurant and older family members called her Raiha. The dropping of her own name in favour of Meurant's was a practice that Kenehuru's predecessors had not encountered, and it adds to the difficulty of extracting Kenehuru's history because archives focus on the Meurant name rather than on hers. Spender (1985) argues that the taking of a husband's surname is another practical way of making women invisible.

Kenehuru and Meurant had eight children: Korahi (born the year before their marriage), Albert Augustus (born four months into their marriage), Albert Henry (called Henry), Emma, an unnamed baby boy who died less than two months after his birth, Corah, Selina (called Lena), and Elvira, my great, great grandmother, named after Edward's younger sister who died at the age of five when her clothing accidentally caught fire (see Appendix C for photo of Elivra's family).

Meurant arrived in New Zealand in the early 1800s and worked as a sealer and carpenter. Considerable material chronicling Meurant's life history is available because of his eventual government position of interpreter (he was fluent in te reo Māori), especially in relation to land sales, and bailiff at Russell,<sup>71</sup> which he took up in 1840. His position became one despised by Māori, who had been selling their land independently before the rise of postings such as his. Of the very early colonial forays amongst Māori society, Colvin (2009) states, "It was during this period that official declarations were made, remade, undone and modified, inciting a deep and abiding distrust of the colonial administration, its bureaucracy and officials" (p. 84). When the seat of government moved from Russell to Auckland in 1841, Meurant and Kenehuru moved there also. Thus, Kenehuru left her home town of Kāwhia in 1840 and resided in Parnell, Auckland ("The Case of Mrs Meurant," 1875, p. 4).

Meurant's travel and work was extensive, as evident from his diaries and other sources. He was often away from Auckland for months at a time. In 1843, Kenehuru gave birth to a son in the family home (this was their fifth child) while Meurant was travelling further south, where he was heavily involved in land discussions between Māori and Pākehā. In his diary entry for Sunday 28 May 1843, Meurant wrote that he had received a letter from his wife telling him of the birth.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> Russell at this time was situated five kilometres south of present-day Russell.

<sup>72</sup> Meurant's diaries were donated to the Auckland Library by J. Newman (Auckland City Council, 1889, p. 6).

This child is not recorded in any other family papers. On Friday 7 July 1843, while in Wellington, Meurant wrote in his diary of receiving “a letter from Mr. Forsaith and from my Wife informing me of the death of my youngest Son an infant.” Kenehuru, with her very young family, had had to find some way to get through the birth and then the death of her son with her husband away. She may have had support from elsewhere, but there is no record of this in the correspondence between her and Meurant. Based at Remuera or Parnell as she was, it is unlikely that she had whānau and tribal support systems during these years. By 1846, Kenehuru had given birth to six of her eight children.

### **The Land Case: What Was Said**

The newspaper articles that follow are just a few of the many press stories featuring this case. I chose these because of their representation in terms of setting the historical background of the case and what Kenehuru, her relations and husband experienced during it. The articles come from either the *Daily Southern Cross* or *The New Zealander*, both of which were published in Auckland. According to Colvin (2009), the *Daily Southern Cross* was a “vociferous adversary to the colonial administration” (p. 195), while *The New Zealander* was a newspaper that operated as a mouthpiece for the Crown.

#### **Article 1: *Daily Southern Cross*, 16 September 1848, p. 2**

##### **Native Land Agitation.**

Another case, still more flagrant, may be mentioned. Mr. Meurant, the interpreter, has been married many years to a native female, and has a large family of interesting children. Some of the native connexions of his wife, set apart and gave over of their own free will, a piece of land, as a heritage for the children. During Capt. Fitzroy’s administration Mr. Meurant applied for information, how this deed of gift might be properly ratified. Capt. Fitzroy told him that he needed no Government title, as his children claimed in virtue of his wife, whose relations had an undoubted right to bestow the land upon her and her issue. After Governor Grey’s accession to power, Mr. Meurant, doubtless actuated by a laudable anxiety lest the inheritance of his children should be in any way disturbed by the changes introduced by Governor Grey, applied again for advice how to act, and was told by Governor Grey that he had better obtain a regular deed from the native granters. This was accordingly done. By virtue of a deed, dated April 6, 1846, from Te Taua, or Kawau, Te Hira, his son, and Keni, nephew of Kawau, Te Kenehura [sic], alias Eliza Meurant (cousin to Hira, and niece to Kawau) 30 acres 2 rood 8 perches, were bestowed upon her and her heirs, “to her and their only proper use and behoof for ever.” Notwithstanding this, the Surveyor General, we presume, by the Governors orders, has cut up, and allotted 20 acres of this



land, which is to day offered for public sale!! How are we to account for such extraordinary conduct? Can we form any other conclusion than that the present Government is destitute of any fixed principle of morality, and that its acts are characterised by a rapacity and selfishness the most unblushing? Who can contemplate a Government claiming for itself the character of paternal, seizing upon a portion of the inheritance of an Euronesian family, in order to enrich itself by the sale, without feelings of indignation and contempt. Avarice, however, in this instance will defeat itself; for no one who is acquainted with the history of these particular allotments will be foolhardy enough to purchase, because a moment's reflection will convince any rational man, that by purchasing these allotments, he would be placing himself in collision with the natives who will never quietly submit to the alienation of land so sacredly set apart for the benefit of Meurant's children. In fact, he would infallibly purchase for himself a quarrel with the natives, besides a lawsuit with the injured children.

We have such reliance upon the general good feeling, and honest principle of the community of Auckland, that we believe it is but necessary to state this case fairly, and point out the allotments thus wickedly offered for sale by the Government, to secure an universal sentence of condemnation, and a determination on the part of the public not to be made accomplices to such an injustice, by purchasing either of the allotments Nos. 35, 28, 29 of Section 14, are those we believe, of which Mr. Meurant's children have been despoiled. We do not speak in this matter as the advocates of Mr. Meurant.

As an individual, he has little claim at stake, neither should we be inclined to step forth as the champions of any private cause, but upon public grounds, and in defence of the great principles of justice, and honesty, and to preserve the community from the certain evils of a collision with the natives which such an obvious breach of faith, would tend most certainly bring about, we raise our voice in condemnation of this unrighteous appropriation.

#### *Account summary and context*

The article presents an arbitrary history of Kenehuru's thirty acres of land, gifted to her by her relatives on 20 February 1844. Fitzroy has assured Meurant that because the land is held under native title, there is no need to ratify further the deed of gift, although this was later carried out in 1846 after Governor George Grey came to power. The land was given to Kenehuru so that she could use it to support herself and her family ("The Case of Mrs. Meurant," 1875, p. 5).<sup>73</sup> By the time this article came to press, the governing bodies of the time had been through a process of confiscating all of Kenehuru's land, although later, after much protest, ten acres were allocated back to Meurant, but the remaining twenty were offered up for sale. The writer of the article

---

<sup>73</sup> Some sources have the date as May 1844; see, for example, "Mr. Meurant's Case" (1849).

expresses strong concern about what land confiscations such as this would do to future cross-cultural relationships.

In regard to the term “native title” (which is what Meurant argues for), Colvin (2009) points out that it eventuated with the colonial government’s need to ensure all lands were held under a title (p. 88). Native title would guarantee that certain lands, according to Māori decree, stayed in Māori ownership under the customary rights of Māori to occupy traditional land (Tate, 2003). Kenehuru’s relatives were from a hapū of Ngāti Whatua called Te Taoū, and the land they gifted her was situated at the junction of Epsom and Tamaki Roads (now called Remuera).<sup>74</sup> The gifters were, as the *Daily Southern Cross* article states, Te Taua (also known as Āpihai Te Kawau), paramount Ngāti Whatua chief and uncle to Kenehuru, Te Hira, his son and Kenehuru’s cousin, and Te Kēni, who was Te Kawau’s nephew. These men were described many years later in another document (“The Case of Mrs. Meurant,” 1875, p. 4) as “competent to transfer the land according to Maori custom”, and the transaction had been sanctioned by several “authentic” Māori letters that affirmed Kenehuru had been gifted the land.<sup>75</sup> While documentation shows the land was gifted to her in February 1844, there was talk of it being hers earlier than that. An individual by the name of George Graham, cited as “a well known old settler”, had pointed the area of land out as Mrs Meurant’s in 1843 (“The Case of Mrs. Meurant,” 1875, p. 8).<sup>76</sup> It also appears that Kenehuru and Meurant lived on the land at some point and made many improvements to it (“Luceo Non Uro,” 1850, p. 2).

### *Analysis*

While this article is concerned with principles of moral authority (power) over Grey’s administration and its political confiscation of Māori lands, there are other discursive principles and dilemmas at play within the text. For example, the writer identifies Meurant’s status as a Mr. and an interpreter but categorizes and presents Kenehuru in the first instance as an unnamed and

---

<sup>74</sup> It is highly likely the land was gifted to Kenehuru because of the Waikato protection her Uncle, Te Wherowhero, had offered Te Kawau and his people from Ngā Puhi and Ngāti Pāoa invasions between 1821 – 1841.

<sup>75</sup> See particularly the letter addressed to the governor in 1849 (“The Case of Mrs. Meurant,” 1875, p. 5).

<sup>76</sup> Graham had purchased eighty acres of adjoining land from the chiefs Epiha Patene (known as Jabez Bunting), Te Wetere and Te Hana. The governor (presumably Fitzroy) confiscated twenty acres of the eighty and threatened Graham with taking all of it if he objected (“The Case of Mrs. Meurant,” 1875, p. 8). Fitzroy was governor of New Zealand from 1843 until 1845, when he was recalled to England (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2012).

unplaced 'native female'. This type of writing in the newly forming settler colony demonstrates the racism and gendering evident within the British colonial-imposed political and social systems. The racist and paternalistic hierarchy confirm that Kenehuru (the native female) is *his* wife, that *he* has a large family and that *his* children are interesting. The writer of the text thus establishes a "hierarchy of groups" (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p. 16), where Māori women are classed as native and female (a gendering that, considering earlier writings of rhetorical traits, has negative undertones) while white men are afforded their names, titles and occupations, thereby according them significance and a place in the patriarchal-framed ideological political and social climate (where white and male are important).

The matter of Kenehuru's land claim spurs the writer's argument for 'the rational man' to reflect on the land issue, a discourse upholding the earlier rhetorical organization around patriarchal representation intertwined with the ideology of white supremacy. According to Froman (1977), during the "accommodating" stage of colonialism, the white race (those from Britain) presented an ideology of white supremacy wherein members of that group believed their mental and emotional qualities to be superior to those of all other races (p. 23). The writer positions Meurant as a member of this group, so adding a sense of comradeship, in terms of those who belong and those who do not, to the paternalistic white discourse. This is particularly noticeable when the author writes of the native connections of 'his [Meurant's] wife' and then follows on with a call for the community of Auckland (by which the author probably meant white men) to honour the principles of justice and honesty by banding to avert a confrontation with 'the natives'. Recent armed conflict between the colonial regime and Māori over land was no doubt fresh in the writer's mind, so it is highly likely that he was concerned about further armed conflict. On a surface reading, the writer's arguments could be seen as advocating for the rights of Māori but what he is probably doing is urging white men to stand against the governor's land tactics, which includes taking land from another white man (Meurant), so as to save the white community from 'the certain evils of a collision with the natives'.

As illustrated in the previous chapters of this thesis, each of the Tainui women represented were responsible for claiming lands on behalf of their iwi: Whakaotirangi through her move to Pākarikari and her kūmara cultivations; Marama's naming of the lands on behalf of Tainui during her overland journey throughout Tamaki; and Ruapūtahanga as she travelled the inland route of the North Island from Taranaki to Kāwhia and then along the coast back to Taranaki (see also

Rei, 1993, for discussion on Māori women and their leadership roles in relation to the land). While these three women, through the oral traditions, were instrumental in politically mapping women to the land, the above text about Kenehuru's land highlights her subjugation and exclusion from having any say (publicly at least) in relation to her thirty confiscated acres. Kenehuru is a feminised colonial subject and thus completely dependent on the masculine imperial governorship (Staeheli & Kofman, 2004, p. 11) to discuss, debate and allocate her affairs according to their hegemonic constructions.

**Article 2: *Daily Southern Cross*, 14 October 1848, p. 2**

**Government Land Purchases from Maories.**

We have very frequently pointed out one of the greatest objections to the Government continuing to purchase the native lands – the very reckless manner in which they make their purchases ... There is great excitement existing amongst the natives generally on the never ending subject of the lands rights. They have taken fresh alarm in consequence of the dangerous and judged attempt lately made by the Government to seize upon land belonging to the native wife and her children, of Mr. Meurant, and which had been presented her on her marriage, by some of the influential chiefs of the district. This case and that of Capt. Porter, and McConachie, where the Government have in the first case granted a license for cutting timber off the land, and in the other has dispossessed a European with the view of claiming the land for the Crown – the cases all coming at one time, have raised the fears of the natives afresh, and they are writing letters in all quarters, to ascertain if possible, what the Government really mean by it ... The Government may now back out of the matter by assuring the natives that Mr. Meurant's land shall not be taken; but the natives wish to be informed if any other attempts will be made, or whether the Government are prepared to claim only such land as has been fairly sold to them and no other. Till this question is satisfactorily answered, the native mind will never be at rest.

***Account summary and context***

This article maintains the issue of Kenehuru's land confiscation in the public memory. It also notes the continued uncertainty about and distrust of the ever-increasing number of colonisers and of Māori in relation to government land acquisition.

Despite documents confirming Kenehuru as the true and sole owner of the thirty acres and despite the transaction being “evidenced by a formal English conveyance on the 6<sup>th</sup> April 1847” (“The Case of Mrs. Meurant,” 1875, p. 4), sometime after February 1844, possibly 31 July 1848, the government took the land from her. A letter from the gifters of the land soon after to the government sought to reassure them that the thirty acres was theirs to give, and Governor

FitzRoy earlier had acknowledged the land was given in keeping with Māori title (“The Case of Mrs. Meurant,” 1875, p. 4). Despite the correspondence, the land was not returned to Kenehuru.

The only official explanation I could find for the confiscation came in another newspaper article in late October 1848 (see Article 5 in this chapter) when the incoming Governor in Chief of the Colony of New Zealand, George Grey,<sup>77</sup> purportedly declared that Meurant had too much Remuera land and that he, Grey, would give a Crown grant for a portion of the land on condition that the rest be surrendered to the government.<sup>78</sup> This explanation for the government claim on Kenehuru’s land appears to have been the understanding of the public at the time (see “To the Nations,” 1869, p. 3). Soon after, Grey returned ten of the thirty acres to Meurant and issued a Crown grant for these on 26 September 1848.

### *Analysis*

Disdain in the article towards the colonial government’s ‘very reckless manner in which they make their purchases’ of land in general and had seized Kenehuru’s land in particular is obvious. The writer continues, however, the discursive renderings of patriarchal importance (influential Māori chiefs and white men). In keeping with the colonial patriarchal social and gendered place of women, and especially Māori women, Kenehuru continues to be positioned as ‘the *native* wife and her children, of Mr. Meurant’ (italics mine). The article also proposes that the government’s actions have dispossessed Meurant, not Kenehuru, of the land. Thus, Māori land that was to be held under native title is now under Pākehā ownership (*Mr. Meurant’s land*), but can still be confiscated by the governor, a development suggesting that Meurant’s whiteness is questionable because of his association with Kenehuru, and that his rights, as well as Kenehuru’s, are also subject to political dismissal.

The article assumes and supports white rule when it places the geographical power of the nation in the hands of the colonial government. The ‘natives’, the author writes, concerned by the confiscation of Kenehuru’s land, want to know if the government will do the same with respect to their land. The text suggests opportunity for further colonial land grabs because Māori appear not to be seen as a threat in this regard. They are silent actors in the process, reliant on colonial

---

<sup>77</sup> George Grey became governor of the colony in 1845 (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2012).

<sup>78</sup> Meurant apparently acted as negotiator for almost all Remuera land (“Examination of Land Claims,” 1847, January 2, p. 2).

authorities to advocate for them (“the natives wish to be informed”), and there is also a strong tone of condescension and even ennui in relation to their concerns (there is “great excitement existing amongst the natives generally on the never ending subject of the lands rights”). Māori, never present around the governing table, could only hope to be informed of future land thefts as the white patriarchal control over territory became more defined and urgent. The challenge depicted in the article to the governorship over Kenehuru’s land theft, even though rightful ownership is given as Meurant’s, is thus rendered weak and ineffectual.

**Article 3: *The New Zealander*, 25 August 1849, p. 2**

A memorial was presented yesterday [to the General Legislative Council] from Mr. Edward Meurant, complaining that a great part of (20 acres out of 30) of a piece of land conveyed to him as a marriage portion with his wife—a Maori—had been taken from him by Government, on the plea, it would appear, that when the native woman married, the land became the property of her husband; and, that the Maori title being thus extinguished, and the husband having no Crown Grant, it was liable to be taken as demesne land of the Crown.—The Petitioner urged that if such a principle were adopted, it would be more advantageous for native women, in a temporal point of view, to live in concubinage with Europeans than to marry them, and that the case in fact involved the interests of the whole race of half-caste children, who might on similar grounds be deprived of their maternal heritages. A debate arose on the motion that the Memorial be printed; (it would, we think, have been technically more in place on the question of its *reception*, which had been previously agreed to.) It was contended that if the Council were to enter on the investigation of Mr. Meurant’s land claim, it would be usurping the functions of the Supreme Court; and, moreover, that this memorial was particularly objectionable, as it charged a Government officer (not named) with having taken from a messenger and suppressed, a letter on the subject written by the petitioner. Ultimately the motion for printing the memorial was negatived by a majority (including the Governor’s own vote) of six to four. The numbers on the division would have been equal had the junior of the “Elders” remained of the same mind during the discussion, or known his own mind during the discussion, or known his own mind at the commencement of it; but Mr. Kempthorne, who at first seemed eager to say something in favour of printing the memorial, afterwards judged it meet to take a different course. Silence would sometimes be safety. But tyros in statesmanship do not always appreciate the prudence of only speaking when they have something to say, or understand the practical wisdom of the pithy apothegm, “least said is soonest mended.”

Mr. Barstow subsequently gave notice of his intention to move to-day that the Council should go into Committee on the memorial; but at the suggestion of the Governor, it was agreed that the motion should be restricted to the question of the rights of their [half-caste children] Maori parents—it being understood that the memorial should lie upon the table, to be incidentally referred to if occasion should arise.

### *Account summary and context*

This article captures General Legislative Council discussion relating to the history of Kenehuru's affairs. The text makes clear that once Māori women married Pākehā men, their inheritance transferred to their husbands. The writer also points out that, for Māori women, living with Pākehā men rather than marrying them would be more advantageous in terms of land inheritance for them and any children from the union.

The person who prepared the petition to the Legislative Council on behalf of Meurant for Kenehuru was Hugh Carleton,<sup>79</sup> who was New Zealand's first officially elected Member of Parliament (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2012). He edited *The New Zealander* for a time and in 1848 established the *Anglo-Maori Warder*, the editorial policy of which was strongly opposed to Grey (Silver, 1990). Carleton championed Kenehuru and Meurant's cause for many years, during which he presents as a principled man, stating at one stage, "I shall obtain for women of the Native race what has been so long denied—justice, relief from temptation, and defence" ("Case of Widow Meurant," 1854, p. 221). It was Carleton who contended that "If a native woman marry a European subject of the Queen, her land is confiscated to the Crown; but, if she merely lives in concubinage with a European, all the power in New Zealand cannot touch one acre of that land" ("Case of Widow Meurant," 1854, p. 221).

The article shows, too, the disparate relationship of male power within the Legislative Council at the time, with members voting against one another in relation to the printing of (thereby uncovering to the public) what was considered prejudicial information against the government and its officials. At a meeting of the Legislative Council a few days earlier on 21 August, Grey had used his power to bully council members, warning them of consequences if they chose to print Meurant's petition to the council. The report, published on the third page of the 28 August 1849 edition of the *Daily Southern Cross* newspaper, stated:

The Colonial Secretary must say he was decidedly opposed to the printing of the petition—he could not see what advantage could arise either to the Government or to the individual by its being printed; and it must, of course, be injurious to whatever Government officer was alluded to. The Governor thought if such petitions were allowed to be printed, there would be an end of all security for Government officers—it would be most unfortunate for the public service if they were to countenance such

---

<sup>79</sup> For a full copy of the petition, see Article 5, this chapter.

charges being brought by one Government officer against another. He, for one, would not remain identified with a service in which such a state of things was allowed.

Grey's threat was effective in ensuring the majority of councillors (the earlier report called the Grey supporters "junior of the Elders") voted with him at the conclusion of discussions. Mr. R. Barstow, a member of the government, had re-presented the petition on behalf of Meurant to the General Legislative Council where he "pray[ed] for relief, on behalf of his [Meurant's] wife, a native woman, and their children" ("General Legislative Council," 1849, p. 3). Barstow had been called on by George Grey to be a member of the Legislative Council less than a year earlier (Barstow, 1902, p. 425). Because of this most recent appointment and also because of being invited rather than voted on to the council, Barstow would have been very mindful of his position there. Without much effort or dissension from Barstow, then, Grey had the petition deliberately and scathingly voted against on a number of trumped-up charges (see Article 4 for these).

### *Analysis*

The article blatantly states that the land was conveyed to Meurant as a marriage portion rather than given directly to Kenehuru. This is a politically imposed act because all women marrying in New Zealand now fell under the Victorian law of what was hers prior to marriage became his upon marriage, so rendering wives and any children subject to husbands' economic and social control and therefore highly vulnerable.<sup>80</sup> The implication here, as in the previous articles, is that the government could take customary gifted land from the white husband of a Māori woman (white men could not be gifted Māori land). This taking not only denies cultural politics and traditions (the gift of land to a Māori woman) but also entrenches patriarchal hierarchical practices of power, dishonesty and corruption in response to land acquisition. The concealment of the letter referred to in the article (this was correspondence between Meurant and Te Hira) is a specific case in point.

The in-text discussion relating to the marriage of 'native women' with European men foregrounds what became a dilemma for Māori women after Kenehuru's land confiscation—whether to marry these men or live with them. Hugh Carleton was to ask of his fellow members

---

<sup>80</sup> See Heilbrun (1988, pp. 84–85) for an account of the 1854 publication, *Married Women and the Law*, authored by Barbara Bodichon, who, unmarried herself, set out the legal disabilities and restrictions that married women endured, based on her research of the legislative acts.



of the House of Representatives if this state of affairs was an official premium on immorality. At a meeting in Auckland in 1854 attended by Carleton, another member of the House of Representatives, Henry Sewell, asked why Kenehuru's land had been forfeited on her marriage to Meurant ("Case of Widow Meurant," 1854, p. 223). He stated that the law of England would not have been able to give the power given to Meurant in relation to Kenehuru's land if he were a husband in England.

Bettina Bradbury (1995) argues similarly with respect to Kenehuru's experience, observing that, under English law, Meurant would have been responsible for managing the land but he would not have owned it. Bradbury also notes that under native title, Kenehuru's land should have been left intact for her to manage as she saw fit. The reason for the confiscation of Kenehuru's land was a bogus law, whereby colonial representatives appeared to be using marriages between Māori women and Pākehā men as a means of increasing Crown land holdings: "Those [Māori women] who married Europeans found themselves entangled in the injustices of a legal system that at best gave the husband control over that land during his life and on occasions was used by colonial administrators as a subtle way of enlarging the holding of crown land (p. 45). Kenehuru's circumstances were frequently commented on in the colonial newspapers, and while commentators were often sympathetic to her predicament,<sup>81</sup> there were also instances of women such as Kenehuru being damned if they did marry and damned if they did not. Māori women who cohabited with Pākehā men but declined to marry them because of the repercussions in terms of their land and status as Māori women could be branded in unkind terms. Angela Wanhalla in her 2011 New Zealand research into 1860 sexual violence discusses the differences between how Māori women were treated by the masculine compared with non-Māori women where white women were to be protected (from Māori men) while sexual violence by white men against Māori women who were "rarely described as respectable or virtuous" regularly went unchallenged (p. 79).

---

<sup>81</sup> One correspondent claimed that while he (or she) gave their full assent to "marriages of Europeans with the native women ... [there was] sufficient justification to any one who has children by them in declining to legalize the connexion" ("Correspondence," 1857, p. 3). Another noted, "... she [Kenehuru] had married a European, and, therefore, lost her title" ("Sir George Grey's Princely Charities not Mentioned by 'Anthropos'," 1867, p. 4). And one paper wrote that it was Kenehuru's "misfortune to be wife, not the mistress, of a Government interpreter" ("Auckland," 1879, p. 2).

Finally, the comment on the ‘rights of their Maori parents’ in the article brings into focus the notion of whether parenting by Māori (women) can be construed as a lawful right. For Kenehuru, the comment hints at a displacement of that right because of her gender and race making questionable her ability to parent appropriately. The discourse appears as a strategy by Grey to move the focus from the complicity of government in land theft to a socio-political value-laden consideration of parenting.

**Article 4: *Daily Southern Cross*, 31 August 1849, p. 4**

This article simply reports on the matters addressed during a Legislative Council meeting. It therefore does not comment on the process or on the content of the discussions during it.

**General Legislative Council, Saturday, August 25th, 1849**

Present:- The Governor and all the Members, except General Pitt.

Prayers and Minutes having been read –

Disabilities of Half-Castes

Mr. Barstow rose to move, according to notice, that the council do go into committee to consider certain disabilities under which native women married to Europeans, and the half-caste race, labour. The Attorney-General thought that before acceding to the motion, the council ought to know more particularly what it was proposed they should, when in committee, consider. He thought they should be told what the disabilities were that the half-castes were said to labour under. Mr Barstow said, that thus appealed to by the learned Attorney-General to point out some particular grievance, he felt compelled, as he had scarcely had time to give that attention to the general question which he should have desired, to take a course which otherwise in the face of the almost direct promise he had given yesterday he should not have done, and recur to the petition of Mr. Meurant he then had the honor to present. The hon. Member then went on to say, that it appeared that in certain cases a native woman by intermarriage with an European, would be deprived of property which could not have been interfered with if she had married one of her own tribe—and that the children of such marriages could be debarred from inheritance of property acquired on the side of the mother.

The Governor supposed the hon. Gentleman’s statements were based upon the petition he had presented yesterday?

Mr. Barstow.— They are, in some measure.

The Governor could, perhaps, save some time to the council if he now made a statement to them on the matter that had been brought before them and he would begin by assuring them that in the case alluded to the half-caste children of the petitioner, had always received peculiar advantages—advantages which he could perhaps only in some measure justify by the fact that the father had been so continually about himself in the character of interpreter, that he had taken an unusual interest in his children. After remarking that he believed nothing could be more gratifying to a person who had obloquy attempted to be cast upon him of refuting the charges on

which it was founded, that some shame, if possible, might be cast on persons who did so industriously and incessantly gather together and circulate such charges—can counteract in some degree the violent hostility the Government had encountered, arising from disappointed personal claims and expectations of individuals. He then read a correspondence on the subject between the petitioner and the Colonial Secretary, showing that a piece of land of 14 acres, had been sold or given to Meurant by the native chiefs, Jabez Bunting and Waters —that the right of pre-emption had been applied for over this piece of land, and that ultimately a Crown Grant had been issued for 24 acres, dated September, 18?8 [unable to read the numeral, presume 1848]; and that so far from the Government being liable to a charge of having acted unfairly in this case—on the contrary 10 acres more had been thrown in than he ought, perhaps, to have received.

Mr. Merriman.— Believed there were, in fact, two pieces of land conveyed from the native chiefs—the first one already alluded to, and the second by deed from the chiefs Te Kawau, Te Hira, and Te Keene, dated 6th April, 1847.

The Governor stated, the Government had no knowledge of the other till 1848.

Mr. Merriman.— Here is the deed your Excellency signed by your Excellency's personal interpreter, Henry Clarke.

The Governor.— He is not my personal interpreter. The Government had no knowledge of the deed till long afterwards. Mr. Merriman.— He was Government interpreter, at all events.

The Governor repeated his assertion—and proceeded to say that he must confess that having been repeatedly, and in the most marked manner, thanked by the individual for what he had done for him, he was extremely surprised at the ingratitude shown by the present procedure.

The Colonial Secretary must say that he had always regarded these purchases made by Mr. Meurant, as of a most objectionable nature.

The Surveyor-General contended that the land was a *bona fide* gift. From his knowledge he could bear his Excellency out in his statement of having been thanked by the petitioner for what had been done for him. He then reverted to the charge contained in the petition against a Government officer, taking the allegation as against himself, when he was reminded by Mr. Merriman, that the petition did not say that he was the Government officer. But he (the Surveyor-General) replied, that he had known from circumstances that he alone was pointed at in the charge. He then produced a letter from Te Hira, and had reached its destination.

The Colonial Secretary said he considered this a very disagreeable case.

The Governor said that where a case affecting the interests of the half-castes had come under his notice, he had invariably tried to make as much provision for them, and to give them as much protection as possible, as had been done in this case.

The Surveyor-General thought that as the subject had now been introduced, although at so late a period of the Session, they should not allow the opportunity to pass without expressing their opinion that some provision should be made for half-caste children in land.

The Colonial Secretary was also of opinion that some provision should be made for them— but he thought that it should be made in education—for it was admitted by all the world, that all half-caste children, unless highly educated, imbibed the vices of both races.

The Attorney-General declared himself opposed to legislating on a measure of such great magnitude and importance on the spur of some twenty-five seconds' consideration.

Mr. Kempthorne quite agreed with the Attorney General, that so grave a subject was not a matter for so slight consideration. Mr. Barstow, before the subject was entirely dropped, begged to state to the council that he was extremely sorry that he had presented to them a petition of the entire accuracy of the statements of which he did not now feel quite assured.

The Surveyor-General, seeing the feeling of the council was opposed to passing any resolution, such as he had proposed, at this time, would withdraw his motion, expressing a hope that he had done some good by calling their attention to it. (Hear, hear, from Mr. Kempthorne).

### *Account summary and context*

The note taker of the council meeting relays the discussion around Surveyor-General Hugh Barstow's presentation of Meurant's petition, the taking of the land and the impact of this on the children of the marriage. George Grey (the governor) points to the advantages Meurant has with his job, which allows him to spend time with his children; perhaps Grey is implying this presents him with the advantage of studying his children, given their status as 'half-castes'. Grey says a fourteen-acre parcel of land and a Crown grant to Meurant had given him twenty-four acres altogether for which Meurant should be very happy. He notes that at some time Meurant *had* been happy with these circumstances. The colonial secretary supports Grey in his account of the land allocation. Grey also emphasises that the government seeks to protect children from mixed marriages, while the colonial secretary expresses his interest in the availability of education for such children. Meurant's petition for council consideration of Kenehuru's land is dropped during an apology by Barstow for what he now thinks are inaccuracies within the petition.

There is a backstory to the fourteen acres that Grey brought into the discussion and of which most council members appeared to have no knowledge. In 1844, Meurant bought fourteen acres of property situated on the south side of Tamaki Road, which was across the road from Kenehuru's thirty acres of gifted land. Meurant apparently purchased the land "for valuable consideration" ("The Case of Mrs. Meurant," 1875, p. 4), and an entry in his diary attests to the sale: "Tuesday 28, 1844. I rote [sic] to his Excellency to wave [sic] me the right of preemption [sic] over the land purchased from Epiha Putini and others at the junction of the Manukau and Tamaki road" (Meurant, 1842–1847, n. p.). The deed to the land shows that Meurant bought it from two men —Wetere and Epiha of Te Maungaunga (a hapū of Waikato), and it was signed by them and Te Hana, as the true owners. This land had originally been given to Wetere, Epiha and

Te Hana by Ngāti Whātua sometime earlier, although the exact date is not known (“The Case of Mrs. Meurant,” 1875, p. 4). Meurant details the events relating to the land in the same diary entry as above—Tuesday, 28 January. “This morning Mr. Perry called on me. I apid [sic] £2 on account of Mr. Hall for surveying my land at Remuera and got his receipt” (Meurant, 1842–1847, n. p.). Other of his diary entries tell of fencing the land and other general maintenance and upkeep activities.

By the time the council members, and particularly Grey, finish with him, Barstow has retreated in the face of Grey’s claims. He apologised, saying he no longer believes Meurant. However, several years after this meeting of the General Legislative Council, the *Southern Cross* newspaper of 23 December 1853 publishes a letter from Carleton accusing Grey of neutralising Meurant’s appeal and misrepresenting the facts at the 1849 council meeting (p. 4). Carleton claimed that when Grey upheld the thirty-acre confiscation, he “illegally” reassigned ten of them under the title of “Crown grant” to Kenehuru’s husband, Meurant (“The Case of Mrs. Meurant,” 1875, p. 8).

Carleton continued on by narrating that when Meurant’s case was ‘stifled’ (to use Carleton’s term) in New Zealand, Meurant petitioned Lord Henry Grey in October 1849.<sup>82</sup> Meurant enclosed with his letter to Lord Grey the deed of gift for the thirty acres as well as proof of purchase of the fourteen acres. Despite consistent petitioning, including his letter to Lord Grey in 1849, the issue remained unresolved. Even when directly questioned by Lord Grey, George Grey reiterated that he had given back twenty-four acres of Kenehuru’s land, making out that this was from the thirty-acre initial confiscation, when it was actually only ten of that allotment plus the fourteen acres of the Remuera land purchased by Meurant.

### *Analysis*

George Grey’s personal statement and judgement about Meurant having an unusual interest in his children serves to encourage suspicion that Meurant has ulterior motives. Perhaps it was unusual for a man to take an active interest in his children, but Grey’s apparent insinuation appears to be that if a man did have such an interest, then something untoward was going on. Grey is using his powerful position as head of the council and colony to sway opinion against Meurant through his ungrounded intimations of deceit. Grey says that violent outbursts by people with respect to their

---

<sup>82</sup> Lord Grey (also known as Viscount Howick) was the colonial secretary for New Zealand for a time.

rights to land is something he has to frequently contend with, thereby enlisting sympathy for himself in that position and presenting Meurant as one of these people. Grey then goes on to give a different history of the land in question, which, in confusing the council members, serves to uphold Grey's patron-like goodness and emphasise the supposition of Meurant's dishonesty. The colonial secretary twice refers to Meurant's purchase of property as a disagreeable action, so further discrediting Meurant. This matter is one I pick up on again in my analysis of Article 5.

The events of the land-grab that came out in the council meeting include the government taking, in an apparent climate of confusion, the fourteen acres that Meurant purchased at the *same time* it took Kenehuru's thirty acres, meaning that the government gained forty-four acres of what is now considered Meurant's land. Thus, when Grey claimed to have returned twenty-four acres, another twenty acres still remained in Crown hands. Grey feigned ignorance on the matter, yet Clarke (the interpreter) had ensured the necessary paper work was signed, which Grey would have had to sanction. Grey completely disassociated himself from Clarke, which also serves as an example to other council members of what will happen should they cross him. The surveyor-general, aggrieved by the whole business because it questions his political motives and trustworthiness, supported himself and further discredits Meurant when he says that Grey had repeatedly reported Meurant thanking him for the return of the twenty-four acres.

Grey's politics of benevolence, obvious in his expressed concern for Kenehuru's children ('the half-castes'), emphasises his absolute power and control of the situation. He says he has tried to protect the children, and in fact has done so ('as had been done in this case'). Implicit in his reassurances is the claim that he is properly exercising his responsibilities in relation to the Treaty of Waitangi. However, in reality, his exercise of power, which sees Surveyor-General Barstow withdrawing his motion relating to Meurant's petition, has done more than displace the family from Kenehuru's land; it has also displaced them from their own socio-political territorial power base because they are excluded from having a say or any control over the events imposed on them. At play here is the colonial government's early defining of power, nation, class and gender, or what Mayer (2004) calls the "boundaries of the nation" (p. 165), made up, of a self-serving and dishonest (in this case) governing body over the people, colonist over colonised, Pākehā over Māori, and man over woman and children. The outcome was a system that primarily served the colonising forces while increasingly limiting the rights, including to land, of those further down the socio-political hierarchy.

The surveyor-general's opinion that land provision should be made for half-caste children while the colonial-secretary argues that education would better serve these children brings to light a prejudice hidden within the discourse of social patronal benevolence. Children from mixed racial parenting (called Euronians) are discussed as lesser than non-Māori/Pākehā children, whose mixed blood makes for some obvious deficiency. These powerful all-white men proffer some hope for these children through either provision of land or education. However, the dilemma these children create will not to be discussed that day; time has run out, and the discussion ends.

Colvin-McCluskey's (2008) analysis of an 1843 newspaper article about "raced discourses" (p. 1) highlights that children considered Euronians were, in the opinion of the white journalist, "too often neglected and despised" (p. 5). As Colvin-McCluskey further critiques the article, she makes clear that hidden underneath the expressed welfare concerns for Māori-Pākehā children is colonial anxiety about these children having the legal status not only of "native" children in terms of Te Tiriti o Waitangi *but also* of British subjects (p. 7). Such children could therefore be doubly advantaged during any future distributions of resources, such as land. Anxiety of this kind fed into the colonial regime's often cynical interpretation of the Treaty's articles and its use of terms that problematized and thus helped disenfranchise Māori. So, for example, the writer of the article that Colvin-McCluskey (2008) scrutinises does not mention the third article of the Treaty, which affirms Māori as having the same protection, rights and duties as British subjects. According to Mead (1997), Māori were not consulted during the drafting and writing of the Māori or English version of the Treaty of Waitangi. "No Maori," he writes, "was deemed adequate or appropriate for the task" (p. 102), an attitude characteristic of those which made the provisions of the Treaty with respect to Māori subject to white colonial male hegemonic interpretation and enforcement.

Colvin (2009) argues that the colonist term "native" was "deeply politically connotative" (p. 396). She observes that the term was used in settler newspapers to describe indigenous people in ways that implied "problems, rebels, insurgents, affairs, difficulties, issues, crises" (p. 396), so helping to explain why debate on Kenehuru's case turned to 'problems' relating to the welfare of her children. It is interesting that children such as hers were typically identified as half-caste *native* children rather than half-caste *Pākehā* children. Tainted from very early in the colony's existence by the Māori half of their inheritance, many of these children of Māori and Pākehā

parentage suffered socially, economically and politically. Meurant himself had been investigating the plight of half-caste children from at least as early as 1846, as an entry in his diary on 8 May of that year attests. There are also reports in sources earlier than this, showing us how the colonisers' discourse regarding these children served as a rationale for their political and economic agenda for them, especially with respect to land rights. The plight of Kenehuru and her children is but one example of this.

In 1850, a correspondent to the *Daily Southern Cross*, concerned about Kenehuru's property theft, wondered if the children of such marriages "had the rights belonging to the Maories, or those of the British subjects; or are they outcasts—without rights of any kind?" ("Luceo Non Uro," 1850, p. 2). This would have been a dilemma for Kenehuru's children—should they present themselves as Māori or as Pākehā? When Kenehuru's daughter Emma, who became Emma Crippen, gave evidence in 1875 about the confiscated thirty acres, she was vague about her Māori ancestry, indicating she identified herself as Pākehā. As well as she could remember, she said, her mother belonged to the "Ngatimahuta tribe" ("The Case of Mrs Meurant," 1875, p. 8). Emma likely was a victim of the social stigma and slurs to which Māori children and half-caste children such as she were subjected to and continued to be subjected to for decades to come.<sup>83</sup>

#### **Article 5: *Daily Southern Cross*, 31 August 1849, p. 2**

##### **Mr. Meurant's Case—and the Rights of The Anglo-Maories.**

A question of momentous import is depending in the balance. The charge of dishonesty on the part of Government in the case of Mr. Meurant, preferred by us, and re-echoed by the indignant English press, is poised against the assertion of his Excellency the Governor that he has acted, not only honestly, but with unwanted liberality towards Mr. Meurant; and it now remains for the public to cast the turning weight of their opinion into the proper scale. We are spared the necessity of reiterating all the facts of the alleged case of dishonesty, as they are recapitulated in the Memorial presented by Mr. Meurant to the Legislative Council, and which is copied into our

---

<sup>83</sup> For example, in the 8 May 1878 issue of *The Auckland Weekly*, the "special correspondent" for the paper wrote, "No boy who has ever been educated in English style has turned out well. He has never had the ambition of a great Maori chief, and has never been able to gain the respect of the Maori people. Educated Maoris, they say, attempt to match themselves against Europeans in the pursuits of Europeans, and fail. They are worth little as Europeans or as Maoris" (p. 26).



columns to-day. Taking it for granted that our readers will make themselves masters of these details, we proceed to analyze, and weigh the defence set up by the Governor. After a careful examination of all that he advanced, we cannot detect a single fact that alters, in any material sense, the character of the entire case. On the contrary, we are bold to assert, that a more daring piece of effrontery—a more hazardous because a more transparent piece of deception, we never recollect having witnessed. How the non-official members of Council could have been so easily duped, and have allowed their suspicions to be allayed by the irrelevant statements of his Excellency we cannot imagine. It is plain that they had not taken the trouble to make themselves masters of the facts of the case, or they would not have been so easily misled. Not one of the main points of the case were touched by his Excellency. He only proved that there was a discrepancy between Mr. Meurant's memorial, and Mr. Meurant's correspondence. In the memorial Mr. Meurant complained in terms that could not be misunderstood, of the Government having taken away and sold a portion of the land bestowed by the natives upon his wife and family, but in the correspondence read by his Excellency he applied for a government title to land which he had bought for himself. The Governor with admirable tact, seized hold of this flimsy plea, and upon it based his defence; at all events he succeeded most completely, in confusing the non-official members, for although one or two pointed questions would have laid bare his duplicity, these gentlemen had not the wit to put them. For instance, when the Governor,—who had been arguing from the provisions of the deed of purchase relating to the piece of land Mr. Meurant had bought of Jabez Bunting, and with which the memorial, and consequently the real question at issue, had nothing whatever to do—was reminded by Mr. Merriman that there was *another deed* which conveyed to Mr. Meurant's wife and children a different piece of land. "Oh! (said his Excellency,) the Government knew nothing about the existence of that deed until a copy of it was forwarded by Mr. Meurant." And, when the hon. Member pressed his Excellency again upon the subject, reminding him that the deed was witnessed by his own interpreter, all that he could elicit from the Governor was, the reiterated surly assertion that the Government "knew nothing about it."

Now, the question was not whether the Government knew of the existence of that deed on any particular date, but whether they knew it when they sold a portion of the land it bestowed. Supposing the hon. member Mr. Barstow, had put some such questions as these to his Excellency: By what means, in accordance with the Treaty of Waitangi, is land acquired by the Government before it is offered for public competition? The answer most likely would have been—By purchase from the native owners.

Did your Excellency so purchase that portion of the land alluded to in Mr. Meurant's Memorial, which was sold by auction while Mr. Meurant was absent. The answer to this might have been "yes" or "no", according to the moral attributes of his Excellency's conscience. If he had said "yes," he would be in one sense have been speaking the truth, but in a moral point of view he would have been cloaking the robbery with falsehood. But if even he had managed to clear this difficulty unscathed, yet another query might have been proposed. When you purchased this land, were you aware that it formed part of a piece that had been already bestowed by its proprietors

upon a native female and her family, their relations? This would have been a poser, and would at once have laid bare the iniquity of the whole transaction. But as some of our readers may yet lack a clear apprehension of the case, we will place it before them in few words.

Mr. Meurant bought a piece of land containing about 14 acres, of Jabez Bunting and Wata, for which he paid £13 13s. This the Government has not interfered with. He claimed, not for himself, but for his wife and children, another distinct piece of land containing 30 acres, which was given to them by Te Tawa, Te Keene, and Te Hira. Of this piece the Government have seized and sold the largest part. The Colonial Secretary in backing up the defence of the Governor, insinuated that this latter piece was not bestowed by the natives upon Mrs. Meurant and her children as a free gift, but that it was given in consideration of services rendered by Mr. Meurant to the natives in assisting them to sell their lands. Suppose this was even true, it would not alter the case. The fact of the land having been alienated by the natives for the benefit of Mr. Meurant's family, is incontestible [sic]. Whatever may have been the motive that induced them to do this, it is quite clear that they did it voluntarily, and nothing could warrant the Government in subsequently taking a part of it away.

The Surveyor-General too tried to make it appear, first, that Mr. Meurant's wife was no relation to Tawa, because she came from a different tribe; and secondly, that it was not likely that the natives would give her a piece of land out of the block that had been reserved for themselves, and which they were prohibited from selling to the Europeans. Now this latter argument proves just the contrary. Mr. Meurant's wife would be considered as one of themselves. The natives knew very well that the land bestowed upon her would bring them no return. It was but natural then, that they should prefer giving her a piece out of their own reserve to curtailing their own receipts by abstracting a portion of that which would bring them a price if sold to a European.

But, as we have said above, the 30 acres were bestowed on Mrs. Meurant and her children—whether as a marriage portion, or as a mark of esteem, or in consideration of services rendered by her husband—we care not to prove. No regular deed was executed until April 1847, which, after the usual formula, thus goes on, "To have and to hold the same land and premises unto and to the use of the said Kenehuru, otherwise Eliza Meurant, and her heirs, to her and their only proper use and behoof henceforth and for ever," &c., &c. But we have seen a letter from the old chief Tawa, written some time before the execution of this deed, which runs thus: "Friend Edward, health to you. This is my speech. Listen. The piece of land shown to you by Keene recently, although it is but small, I have appropriated to you, Eliza, and the children, as permanent inheritance for your children for ever. Amen." So the fact of the bestowment of the land is proved beyond a doubt.

Now, then, how come the Government to acquire a right over any portion of this land? Why, thus: When Mr. Meurant applied for a Crown title, his application, it seems, was so worded as apparently to apply only to that piece of land he had bought of the chiefs of another tribe, and not to the 30 acres, though he intended it to apply to both, thinking by a Crown title to make his children's inheritance more secure. When the

Governor, however, found that Mr. Meurant claimed 30 acres in virtue of his wife, besides the 14 acres he had purchased—he raised an outcry.

Eventually, Mr. Meurant was foolish enough to accept a Crown Grant for 24 acres. Not 24 acres out of his wife and children's 30—but 24 acres made up in this way: The piece he had purchased of Jabez Bunting and Wata, 14 acres, and 10 acres out of his wife and children's portion. So that in fact the Government *did acknowledge* that deed of gift to Meurant's wife, *inasmuch as they incorporated 10 acres of the given land in the Crown Grant issued to Meurant*—and which confers upon him and his wife a life interest in the same. Mr. Meurant was doubtless a very foolish man to accept of such a grant, but nobody that knows him will wonder at his being easily worked upon by one so skilful as the Governor. But the question still remains, how did the Government acquire a right to the remaining 20 acres out of the 30. Why thus: It was surveyed, and offered for sale. Mr. Meurant, awaking, we suppose, from his stupor, protested against such an abuse of justice, and we, having discovered the injustice about to be perpetrated upon a native woman and her family, previous to the intended day of sale, and regarding the case not as a personal but as a public grievance,—laid the facts before the community, the consequence of which exposure was, that no bidders could be found. Shortly after, Mr. Meurant went to Sydney. Keene, one of the younger grantees of the land to Mrs. Meurant, and doubtless a more pliable instrument than the old chief, was sent for, and prevailed upon to accept of £14 for his interest in the land, and sign a new conveyance to the Government!—The 20 acres, or a portion of them, were then again put up for sale, and as the protester was this time out of the way, buyers were found. So that in point of fact the Government have not only despoiled a native female and her children of a large portion of property *bona fide* bestowed upon them, but have actually had the baseness to tamper with the natives, and undermine their principles of honor and integrity by seducing them to take payment for land which they had already alienated, and which, as true proprietors thereof, they had clearly as much right to alienate and give away to a country woman and her children, as we have to give away a few copies of this very number of our journal to Mr. Joseph Hume.

However ductile the principles of Keene may have been in thus being guilty of double dealing, the consistency and honor of old Tawa are worthy of record. When the money was taken to him. “O, (said he,) you should not have taken that. Don't bring it to me. I'll have nothing to do with it. Put it by, and give it to Edward (Meurant) when he returns from Port Jackson.”

Well may the Editor of the “British Banner” when he reads this record of the honor of a New Zealand Chief, and the conduct of a New Zealand Governor, exclaim, “It makes me ashamed of my country: I almost wish I were black”! Tawa maintained his integrity to the last. When Meurant returned after the land had been sold,—(for bidders were found the second time)—the old Chief lost no time in exculpating himself. He wrote as follows, “Friend Edward, this is what I have to say. I had nothing to do with this matter. It was the doing of Keene and the Governor.” Such is Meurant's case, and if any one will point out to us a single sentence in the Governor's defence in council sufficient to exonerate him from these damning charges, we will be as ready to publish his acquittal as we are determined to proclaim his guilt. Our contemporary in reference to this subject has said—“On the whole, had we been

sitting in a Jury-box, to determine on the case as it came before the Council, we could not have hesitated for a moment to record as our verdict a full and entire acquittal of the Government, and a censure of the charges as unfounded and a calumnious! As the case came before the Council, an honest man might have returned such a verdict—but as it is now before the public, it is a question whether even the “New Zealander” will venture to acquit the Governor. If he does, may we never see him in a jury-box in any case of ours.

In summing up the matter, we would place before our readers the following points, which we think the case involves, and which, until they are disproved, must, in the estimation of every honest man, brand with injustice and disgrace the proceedings of Government.

That it is not Meurant’s own case; but the case of his wife, a native woman, and involves therefore the rights of the Maories and of their half-caste children.

It matters not whether Meurant’s statements are true or false, their accuracy could no more create, than their fallacy could destroy the claim of his wife, founded as it is upon distinct and separate evidence.

That if the case is—as was asserted by the Governor—one of the weakest that could have been hit upon; so much the better, for it will test the principle more severely.

That the Governor’s plea of ignorance, of the existence of the Deed of gift is no excuse, because the fact of his having in-corporated 10 acres of the land in a deed of his own to Meurant, is evidence to the contrary.

That it is but a shallow artifice for the Governor to complain of the ingratitude of a man who had obtained 10 acres of wife’s land out of 30 acres.

To His Excellency Sir George Grey, K.C.B. Governor-in-Chief of the Colony of New Zealand, and the Hon. The Legislative Council.

The humble petition of Edward Meurant, Sheweth,

That in the month of May 1844, a piece of land, situate at the junction of the Tamaki and Epsom roads, containing 30a. 2r. 8p. , was transferred by the native chiefs Te Tawa, Te Hira, and Te Keene, to their blood-relation Kenehuru, now Eliza Meurant, wife to the petitioner, as a marriage portion, and for the support of her children.

That your petitioner, being desirous that this land should be held by Crown title as well as by Maori right, applied to the Government on the 28th May, 1844, for waiver of pre-emption, and was informed in answer, “that the land in question being held in right of his wife, no purchase or deed of grant from the Crown would be required.”

That on the 6th of April, 1847, it was conveyed from the same parties to Kenehuru by deed, according to British form, at the instance of your petitioner, and by way of a precautionary measure.

That on the 14th October, 1848, His Excellency the Governor-in-Chief called your Petitioner to him, and said, Meurant, you have too much land at Remuera, I will not suffer it, I shall give you a Crown [word missing in text, presume ‘grant’] to a portion of it, on condition of your giving up all claim to the remainder, which I shall take away from you.

That your petitioner carefully explained that the land did not belong to himself, but to his native wife, held by her under native right; but could not induce his Excellency to suffer the whole to be retained.

That the Government proceeded to act upon the intimation that had been thus given to your petitioner, by turning off two tenants who held a portion of that land, paying rent for occupation, and who consequently threatened your petitioner with an action, from which, however, he succeeded in dissuading them.

That your petitioner never did relinquish any claim, either on his own part, or on that of his wife; that he had not the power, even had he been so disposed to give away what belonged, not to himself, but to his wife and children; that no such waiver of claim, even if it had been made, could have affected the rights of his wife, which she steadily refused to resign.

That on the 20th Sept., 1848, a crown grant was issued, conveying 10a. 2r. 8p. of the aforesaid land to himself for life, to his wife for life, and to his children, which was delivered to your petitioner's son on the 10th October 1848; that your petitioner accepted it, viewing it in the light of a collateral security for the portion conveyed, which it would have been unwise to refuse, on account of the uncertainty which prevailed as to the intentions of Government with regard to the land question, and, furthermore, because the deed purported to grant 24a. 3r. 18p. of the allotment alienated by the natives for the maintenance of his wife, whereas, when at a later period he examined into it, he perceived that the grant was in reality for only 10a. 2r. 8p. of the said claim; and, furthermore, through fear of being accused of contumacy towards Government in refusing it, and thereby risking the loss of his appointment as a servant of government, upon which he depended in a great measure for subsistence.

That a portion of the land which had been taken from your petitioner, was put up for sale by government on the 16th September 1848; that a protest against the sale was entered into the name of your petitioner, and that no bidders appeared.

That your petitioner believes that Te Tawa, Te Hira, and Te Keene, could not have been induced to receive money for the said lands whilst he was living in their neighbourhood; but that during his temporary absence from the Colony, (some time between the end of the year 1848, and the beginning 1849,) Te Keene consented, in consideration he believes of about £14, to convey to the Crown his share as tenant [sic] in common of the aforesaid land, notwithstanding that he had previously parted with it by deed in favor of Kenehuru.

That on the 16th September, 1848, a portion of that land was put up for sale, and a purchase made. That on his return to this colony, learning what had taken place, your petitioner wrote to Te Tawa on the subject; that he entrusted the letter to Te Hira, but that it never reached its destination, having been taken from Te Hira by a Government Officer.

That your petitioner afterwards wrote again upon the same subject, and received the following answer:

August 24th, 1849.

Friend—Saluting you,—Tell me the name of the white man who took the letter I gave you for the Tawa when I returned from Port Jackson. From your friend, Edward Meurant.

That your petitioner is unable to reconcile the seizure of land belonging to a native woman, transferred to her according to native custom by her blood-relations, with a faithful carrying out of the engagements entered into by the Queen in the Treaty of Waitangi.

That your petitioner cannot ascertain with certainty the legal grounds upon which the Government must be supposed to have proceeded in seizing the aforesaid lands, but has been told, he knows not with what truth, that it might have been upon the following consideration: That when Kenehuru was married to him, she abandoned her native rights; that, by transfer to herself, the title of the original native owners was extinguished, and that, as the land did not vest in your petitioner, the Government had a right to take possession of it as demesne of the Crown.

That petitioner, upon moral considerations, cannot bring himself to believe, that, when Kenehuru became his wife, she thereby lost the native rights, which had been guaranteed by the treaty, inasmuch as that in such case it would have been more advantageous to her, in a temporal point of view, to have lived with him in concubinage, than to have been married after the rites of a Christian church: neither can he think that the Government, by acting upon such a principle, would prove to the native race, that loss of caste and property were involved by ritual and legitimate alliance with Europeans.

That the case of your petitioner represents the present position of the half-caste race, who will be deprived of the right to enjoy their maternal heritage, and consigned to poverty. Should the proceedings with respect to your petitioner be considered as an authoritative precedent in the future proceedings of Government as affecting the native race.

That your petitioner, aware of the reserve with which it is incumbent on him, as a government officer, to memorialize the Council, prays that no expressions made use of by him may be construed into intentional disrespect, inasmuch as that he had endeavoured to confine himself to a mere and simple statement of his case.

Your petitioner, therefore, prays that your Excellency and the honourable Council should afford him such relief as may seem meet.

And your petitioner shall ever pray, &c.

(Signed) Edward Meurant.

#### ***Account summary and context***

The writer of the article presents arguments from both an editorial and the Government point of view about the land case. He confirms for the newspaper's readers the Government's dishonesty and then, having set the record straight, proceeds to relay events. He also queries the duplicity of

members of the council in their support of Grey over the matter of Kenehuru's confiscated lands. The writer then sets out the complex (as it has become) history of the case, including the steps Meurant took to have the land returned, and proffers an analysis of the case, together with a five-point summary of it at the end of his text. He then reproduces the memorial that Meurant submitted to Grey and the Legislative Council on 24 August 1949.

The article recounts that the Government, in the form of Governor Grey, had seized and sold the largest part of Kenehuru's land—twenty acres—and that Grey's reasons for doing so (his defence) were confirmed by the Colonial Secretary. Grey's first attempt to sell the land was not successful, apparently because the manner in which Grey had acquired the land had attracted considerable public opprobrium ("Case of Widow Meurant," 1854, p. 221). The reports of Grey's deed actually gained worldwide notoriety, with the *Scottish Press*, for example, heading an article "On Colonial Despotism" (*Daily Southern Cross*, 1853, p. 4). Another article informed its readers that the "rascally business" ("The Meurant Case," 1873, p. 2) had "enlisted the sympathy of one of the ablest and most powerful of the London journals" (Legislative Council, 1849, p. 2).

On the second offering for sale (16 September 1848), Kenehuru's twenty acres was purchased 'in-house' sometime after October when Meurant had left for Sydney (he returned in early 1849, see "Departures-Foreign," 1848). The sale went ahead despite earlier correspondence with Kenehuru's relatives confirming that the land was Kenehuru's and that Meurant had, on 28 May 1844, received a statement from Fitzroy that the thirty acres held in right of his wife required no purchase or deed of grant from the Crown ("Mr. Meurant's Case," 1849, p. 2) because it held native title and was given in keeping with Māori custom. Despite this, Grey had that decision overturned during a Legislative Council meeting "by making an incorrect statement of facts, and by diverting attention from the question" of whether Kenehuru had lost her rights to the land when she married Meurant (Carleton, 1853, p. 4).

The purchaser of the land was Andrew Sinclair, who was the second colonial secretary of the colony at that time. Post sale, Grey issued a Crown grant to Sinclair for the land ("Native Land Rights," 1855, p. 3). Sinclair's betrayal of his position, which required him to impartially advise the governor on matters such as land acquisition, was publicly ridiculed. Phrases and words in newspaper articles and letters to editors such as "conduct so disreputable ... and ... sordid" ("Luceo Non Uro," 1850, p. 2) was typical of the expressed sentiment. Interest in the matter of the land sale became so overwhelming that the Government had to return letters it

received on it to their senders with the explanation that the correspondence was “already so voluminous” that letters could no longer be accepted (“Case of Widow Meurant,” 1854, p. 222).

This case was the first of its kind for the colony, and there is evidence to suggest that had the land been returned early on to Kenehuru, other land grabs would have occurred. As it was, publicity about the case, which increased as Meurant, Carleton and others continued to fight against illegal land forfeiture over the following decades, saw a broad segment of colonial society opposed to such procurement of land. Māori, not surprisingly, early expressed alarm at Governor Grey’s actions, calling them “dangerous and judged” attempts to “seize upon land” (“Government Land Purchases from Maories,” 1848, p. 2).

Despite the public outcry, an article in the *Daily Southern Cross* of January 2, 1855 shows the Government attempting to disenfranchise another of Kenehuru’s kinswomen: “We think it right to say that the allotment for sale at Kawhia (38 acres ...) is a case somewhat similar to that of Meurant’s ... It was a gift to a Mrs. Cowell, (a Maori and her children); and the tribe who gave the land have sent a strong remonstrance to the Government to prevent the sale of it” (“Land Sale,” 1855, p. 3). Three days after publication of this announcement, the paper published a notice declaring that the government had withdrawn Mrs Cowell’s allotment from sale (“Maori Lands,” 1855, p. 2).

Newspaper articles published after the confiscation of Kenehuru’s land confirm that its increasingly important location in Auckland made it valuable real estate for the Government. An article in the 12 March 1867 edition of *The Colonist*, for example, lays out for the public the funds and land (mentioned is a portion of Kenehuru’s land) required for completion of a railway link between Auckland and Onehunga (“The Cost of a Small Railway in Auckland,” 1876, p. 7). Another article says the “Meurant estate” was paid £1,552 10s for land taken to complete the railway (“Auckland and Drury Railway Compensation,” 1866, p. 6).<sup>84</sup> Another commentator in 1875 says that at the time of the 1844 gift to Kenehuru by her relatives, the Remuera Road was being formed (“Native Lands Court,” 1875, p. 3) as an important arterial route for Auckland. Four years later, an article in the 19th July, 1879 edition of the *Otago Daily Times* notes that part

---

<sup>84</sup> I understand this payment to have been for a portion of the ten acres of returned land, although the article does not state this.



of Kenehuru's confiscated land had on it "an important railway station and depot" ("Auckland" 1879, p. 2).

When the twenty acres that Governor Grey took from Kenehuru did not sell at the first attempt,<sup>85</sup> government officials tried to buy the land from Kenehuru's relatives who had gifted it to her. Had this cynical attempt succeeded, it would have extinguished the native land title and made the theft appear a legal action. One of the original whānau members, Te Kēni, "yielded to temptation", for which he was paid £14, but the chief Te Kawau and his son, Te Hira, reiterated that the land had been given to Kenehuru as "a marriage portion for the support of her children" ("Case of Widow Meurant," 1854, p. 221). Bradbury (1995) observes that language such as "marriage portion" and "the support of her children" in relation to the land transfer to Kenehuru (p. 46) reveals that English concepts of marriage settlements were already functioning at that time. The payment made to Te Kēni was later admitted to have been of "no force", meaning that although the payment was made, nothing was received in return ("Native Lands Court," 1875, p. 2).

Carleton's appeal to the Colonial Government and the home government for a review of the theft failed. However, ever incensed at the Government's dishonesty, he remained single minded in his efforts to keep the case in the public arena, saying, "The weight of public opinion, when sufficient publicity shall have been given to the question, should alone suffice to ensure success" (Carleton, 1852, p. 2). The steady, ongoing flow of correspondence between Meurant, Carleton, the colonial governors and other government officials is also testament to Carleton's resolve, which no doubt hardened when his and Meurant's missives were opened by officials for whom they were not intended and when those between Meurant and Carleton never reached their destination. As an example of this chicanery, Carleton writes of an incidence that occurred when a letter he wrote to Lord Grey and posted on 16 February 1852 was intercepted (see "*Auckland*", 1853, p. 4). Lord Grey eventually received the letter many months after the events on which it focused. In addition, Carleton's letters to the Government in objection to their behaviour were returned to him unopened. These were deliberate attempts on the part of government to pervert a successful outcome for Kenehuru and Meurant.

---

<sup>85</sup> The land was described as "the residue having been taken by the Government for their own purposes" ("The case of Mrs. Meurant", 1875, p. 8).

In a letter that Carleton wrote to the *Daily Southern Cross* in 1852, he asked its editor to publish a revealing letter that he had written to the Honourable Earl Grey. The original letter to Earl Grey had been banned by George Grey from being printed in the “Blue Book”,<sup>86</sup> which is why Carleton sent it to the newspaper. In the letter, Carleton promised “... so long as I live I will never quit the subject, or relax in my efforts to accomplish the removal of a great wrong to the Maori race” (Carleton, 1852, p. 2). This proclamation turned out to be a particularly bold move for Carleton, because he was ridiculed by fellow MPs and members of the public unsympathetic to his efforts to seek redress for Kenehuru (see, for example, letters and articles in the *New Zealand Herald* of 2 July 1879).

In 1854, Carleton again brought up the land confiscation for discussion during a House of Representatives meeting in Auckland. Carleton stated, “I cannot suffer an official premium upon immorality to exist—a premium held out by the very Government of the country, without denouncing it as a national sin” (“Case of Widow Meurant,” 1854, p. 221). Carleton received no good response from George Grey about Kenehuru’s case, so he forwarded a petition to the Queen in England through George Grey, as was due process. Grey refused to send the petition on to the Queen, so Carleton sent it himself (“Petition to the Queen,” 1875, p. 3). In time, Carleton received a response from her, through her secretary of state, the contents of which I have been unable to discover.

Academic and Historian Angela Wanhalla proffers an alternative motive behind the land confiscation in her book *Matters of the Heart: A History of Interracial Marriage in New Zealand* which was published in 2013. In her summary of Kenehuru/Meurant’s case, Wanhalla presents instead Meurant as calculating around the two pieces of land (the 14 acres and the 30) saying that he claimed they were both a marriage gift. Wanhalla has based her summary of events on an 1875 report written by Francis Fenton. Whilst Wanhalla has identified valid positions that arose from the case, such as the Marriage Act of 1854 and the impact it had on Māori women, there was and is a more profound story to be told based on the many other available accounts.

---

<sup>86</sup> The “Blue Books” detailed statistical information from New Zealand’s early colonial period (1840–1855). They were produced in all colonies of the British Empire to provide imperial officials with the necessary knowledge for good government. They contained information about population, revenue, military, trade, shipping, public works, legislation, civil servants, foreign consuls, land transactions and other such information (Archives New Zealand, 2013).

Wanhalla has based her research on sustaining a case for the ineffectiveness or the repercussions of racial amalgamation. While Wanhalla (2013) seeks to make a point that Meurant “tried to manipulate the system” (p. 67) I think it is clear that the Government of the day behaved with a mendacious and single minded attitude in their efforts to secure land in the new colony for their own purposes. While the kaupapa for my study has a different focus to Wanhalla, we can agree that under colonisation the outcome for Kenehuru was the destabilisation of Māori custom.

### *Analysis*

In frequently presenting the case as being one of Meurant against the Crown, the writer of the article aligns land ownership with males. Except for one instance, Kenehuru is always presented as “Meurant’s wife” or “Mrs Meurant”, and her claim to the land in her own right is not mentioned until well into the article. Even then, the writer talks of the land being gifted to ‘them’ (presumably Kenehuru and her children and Meurant). The statement in the article that the government “acted with unwanted liberality towards Mr. Meurant” is just one of the comments that simultaneously constrain Kenehuru (women) from having any part in the newly forming political systems of the government, while upholding the imposed rights of ‘white men only’ within the arena of land governance and legislation.

Colvin-McCluskey (2008) explains that the “system of registering European land claims and the acquisition of ‘Native’ lands was done in a way that the Crown determined both expeditious and according to the Crown’s best interests” (p. 4). This seemingly concealed agenda, apparent in this article and other sources, doubtless contributed to the complications and concerns relating to Kenehuru’s land. For example, when challenged over the taking of Kenehuru’s land, government officials are said to have accused Meurant of deliberately misleading them by including his own purchase of fourteen acres together with Kenehuru’s thirty acres in his application for waiver of the Crown’s rights of pre-emption. Yet, as the author of Article 5 argues, the manner in which the Government ceded ten acres of the disputed land back to Meurant was an admission by government that it had known about the thirty-acre gift, despite Grey’s avowal that it did not. As further evidence of the Government’s duplicity, the records reveal Meurant’s consistency in providing deeds to both titles, indicating that the fault of misunderstanding was not his but the government’s.

Laying the blame on Meurant provides another example of the uneven distribution and exercise of power amongst Pākehā colonial men. By discrediting Meurant, Governor Grey and his acolytes could obliquely further denigrate the rights of even less powerful members of society, such as Kenehuru and her children, so rendering them ever more vulnerable socially and economically. As land designated for her and her family's use, gifted to her as it was by her relatives, Kenehuru's thirty acres should have been protected for her under the auspices of the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi agreement. This agreement ought to have excluded Pākehā interference. However, as Mead (1997) argues, the Treaty of Waitangi did not have any meaning to racist, land-hungry people because it was a document based on the principles of equity and partnership. The ideology of racism and greed, says Mead, saw domination and power politics, based on the urgent and incessant quest for land, increasingly affect the behaviour of powerful men in positions of influence in the years following signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. It is perhaps not surprising, then, that Grey's breach of the Treaty of Waitangi that Meurant highlights in his memorial, and which the writer of the article also emphasises, had limited persuasive power with respect to returning Kenehuru's land.

Colvin (2009, p. 90) similarly argues that colonial New Zealand had an “intensely fracture[d], ambiguous and largely patchwork political environment”, where Grey's government and prior hegemonic colonial agents organised regulatory mechanisms in their quest for territory. During this process, the status and rights of the Māori nations were often nullified. Hence, areas of gifted land (such as Kenehuru's) as well as land that was desperately wanted and needed (by both Government and Māori) were, in one way or another, spoken for and confiscated by the colonial government.<sup>87</sup> As Colvin points out, the hegemonic influence and organisation of governmental personnel typically excluded Māori from both governance-based debates and discussions (as evidenced in each of the newspaper articles relating to Kenehuru's land), including those focused on land acquisition.

The Government's actions in response to Kenehuru's land also constitute the early genderisation and racist attitude of the configurations of the white patriarchal canon. Gendered

---

<sup>87</sup> The confiscation of Bastion Point in 1978 under the Muldoon governorship is an example of these events occurring in more contemporary times. As is the more recently attempted ancestral land grab of Wi Parata's legacy (Fairfax, 2014).

ramifications of the colonial encounter meant that it was beyond Kenehuru's control to object or act on her own behalf about the sale. Meurant petitioned against the sale of the land to Sinclair immediately on his return from Sydney, through the Legislative Council ("Native Land Court," 1875, p. 5). That the situation waited for Meurant's return confirms the "gendered obedience to colonial custom and authority" (Pickles & Wanhalla, 2010, p. 364), where women's actions, and especially Māori women's, were colonised to inaction and silence.

The previous article presented in this chapter (Article 4) captures Sinclair's opinion—'objectionable' was one of the words he used—of Meurant's purchase of land. He also considered the Meurant case 'very disagreeable'. Yet here was Sinclair purchasing the confiscated land. The hypocrisy and duplicity evident in his actions meant he had much at stake when he responded to criticism of the purchase with a flat denial of the gift of land to Kenehuru from her relatives, spinning instead a story about the land being payment to Meurant for services rendered. The surveyor-general (Barstow) sided with Sinclair when he gave his opinion on the matter, thereby teaming up with him to sideline Kenehuru's property rights and sanction Sinclair's personal land holdings. Collusion of this sort between and among white men of power was also evident in George Grey directing Sinclair to respond publicly to a letter through *The Daily Southern Cross* on 19 October 1853 in reply to one that Carleton had written earlier ("Colonial Secretary," 1853, p. 4). Here, Sinclair writes:

Sir,— With reference to your letter of the 17<sup>th</sup> inst., on the subject of Mrs. Meurant's alleged claim to land at Remuera, I am instructed by his Excellency Sir George Grey to inform you that you have already so unduly occupied large portions of his time, which are required by other and more important subjects, by a most voluminous correspondence upon Mrs. Meurant's case, that it has at last become necessary for his Excellency to decline all further interference in the matter; he has therefore directed me to return you the copy of the letter which you have forwarded to me. I have the honour to be, Sir, Your obedient servant, (Signed) Andrew Sinclair.

By having the letter published in a public forum, Grey probably hoped both to discredit Carleton and, by extension, Kenehuru's case, and to sway public opinion on the matter in his (Grey's) and the government's favour. If so, Grey's tactic again demonstrates the exercising of hegemony for anticipated personal gain. But imposed power often has outcomes different from those that the imposers anticipate. In the case of Kenehuru, the governor's and his supporters' actions, and the publicity they themselves gave to them through measures such as the above

letter, helped garner support against them.<sup>88</sup> However, as I discuss in my conclusion to this chapter, those who denigrated the government for their actions did not necessarily do so for altruistic reasons. In addition, a patriarchal and racist canon prevalent in colonial New Zealand meant that Kenehuru was constructed more as a cause célèbre than a person invisibilised and non-agentic with regard to a matter of such economic and social importance to herself and her children.

Soon after Robert Fitzroy became governor of New Zealand in 1843, he made “a Proclamation declaring the waiver of the Crown’s right of pre-emption over Native lands, excepting, however, Native land north of Tamaki Road” (“The Case of Mrs. Meurant,” 1875, p. 4). The proclamation, made on 26 March 1844, came one month after Kenehuru’s relatives gifted (and officially documented) her the thirty-acre property, a property which now sat outside the

---

<sup>88</sup> Exposure to the Kenehuru/Meurant case carried by the diverse newspapers and articles published in New Zealand over the years of the case’s life evinced considerable sympathy for the family: “The half caste children of Meurant are not allowed to retain their inheritance,” said *The Native Lands* (1848, p. 2), which acknowledged that the land had come from Kenehuru’s and her children’s maternal uncles and so were secured by a formal deed of gift. Another paper expressed concern that the “portion of the inheritance of a Euronesian family” was being tampered with (“Native Land Agitation,” 1848, p. 2). Time and again articles were written about Grey’s and the Legislative Council’s dishonesty (see for example “A Dishonest Government Again Defeated,” 1849, p. 2; “Luceo Non Uro” 1853, p. 3). Readers of *The Daily Southern Cross* were assured that should such an affair have happened in the Hokianga, the natives there would not have tolerated it (“Original Correspondence,” 1848, p. 2). The government of George Grey was considered “sordid and dishonest”, and it was thought that the story of Kenehuru could not be told often enough (“Luceo Non Uro,” 1852, p. 2). Articles noted how the “native *patrimony*” (my italics) was so easily confiscated by Grey’s colonial oppression (*To the Editor of the Nelson Examiner*, 1853, January 14, p. 2). A correspondent to the *Daily Southern Cross* derided the words “Crown Grant”, stating that it would not matter if the land had belonged to the Queen or Mrs. Meurant (“Crown Grant,” 1855, p. 3), the government had no right to confiscate it. In a speech to the House of Representatives in 1876, MP William Swanson—touted as being one of Auckland’s best known and most trusted politicians (“Swanson,” 1902, p. 90)—was quoted as saying Kenehuru’s case was a “matter patent to this house” (“The Meurant Case,” 1876, p. 5).<sup>88</sup> He meant that the governorship had given itself the right to act the way that it had in the matter, an act from which the House should now distance itself. The case was also called the “first irresponsible administration of affairs in Auckland” (“From Our Own Correspondent,” 1879, p. 2). And later land cases were noted as “inferior in weight and thickness to those in the celebrated claims of ... Meurant (*Marlborough Express*, 1882, April, 26, p. 2).

exempted boundary and could therefore never be offered for private sale. Initially, the proclamation seemed a promise kept by the colonial government. During FitzRoy's inaugural speech in 1843 at Government House, which Meurant attended, the new governor assured Māori that the Queen of England wanted Māori to know she had their greatest welfare at heart and that the Government of England would never sanction any oppression towards Māori (Levee, 1843, p. 2). Yet, just two years later, Grey confiscated the land.

One of Carleton's most constant arguments in all the years that he fought on behalf of Kenehuru was that her land was guaranteed to her by treaty (the Treaty of Waitangi). Meurant also could not reconcile the taking of the land with the tenets of the treaty, and given the nature of his work, he would have been well familiar with them. He was also very familiar with property matters in Remuera and its surrounds. Meurant wrote several times in his diary of visiting land in the Remuera area to check boundaries or gather witnesses. An entry in 1847, for example, shows his proactive attempts to procure witnesses who could provide evidence in response to queries and disputes about land: "S. 14<sup>th</sup>. I rode to Remuera in search of witness for Mr. G. Graham to attend the Commissioners Land Claim Court" (Meurant, 1842–1847). But witness explanations did not account for much in the face of a dishonest government, hungry for land. This state of affairs made even more of a mockery of FitzRoy's assurances on land rights during his brief tenure as governor (he was recalled to Britain in 1845, see "Recall of Governor Fitzroy", 1845).

A report on the proceedings of parliament in *The Evening Post* during the latter part of 1875 showed that the issues surrounding Kenehuru's land were still alive: "In answer to questions, Government stated (1) that the case of the widow Meurant was still under consideration" ("Parliament," 1875, p. 2). The fact that it was still alive at this time had much to do with Carleton's continuing efforts to have the government remove the scandal that the Colonial Office had brought upon itself and to put the "matter right" with Kenehuru ("Case of Widow Meurant," 1875, p. 222). And, equally, the colonial officials continued to state their case, as MacCormick did, through newspaper columns if they thought so much as the tip of a finger was pointing at their conduct over the case (see "Meurant's Case," 1875, written by MacCormick in May of that year). Carleton's private papers on Kenehuru's affairs had been impounded by George Grey, although after consistent petitioning he did receive them back. And at one of the court cases, held in 1875, about compensation for the land, George Graham and Emma Meurant,

now Mrs. Crippen, gave their evidence (see “Native Lands Court,” 1875, p. 3; untitled article in the *Daily Southern Daily Cross*, 4 February 1875, p. 2).

Reports elsewhere at the time on the case recorded that the members of the House of Representative could not be certain of how much land Kenehuru had been deprived of, and they did not have the time to find this information out. Nor did they know how much compensation she would be entitled to (“Parliamentary,” 1875, p. 3). This lack of knowledge of the case, considering its history, perpetuates the disregard for Kenehuru, her circumstances and Māori women in general. Herstory had become a site of strategized confusion by the white political strength.

### **Kenehuru Visibilised: The Ongoing Case for Redress and What It Meant for Her**

As stated earlier in this chapter, Kenehuru and Meurant were married in 1835, in Kāwhia. Despite their sociocultural differences, they appear, through Meurant’s diaries, to have been good friends and minded each other. Their three eldest children, Korahi, Albert and Henry, and their last child, Elvira, were born in Kāwhia, which is where Kenehuru was from (“Pre-1839 foreigners in New Zealand,” 2013; family papers, n. d.). Also as stated earlier, Meurant constantly travelled because of his work. The impact of his work and absences on Kenehuru is not mentioned in any of the sources informing this chapter, and therefore can only be imagined.

Once married, Kenehuru lived apart from her tribal base, her turangawaewae, and close kin support where Māori families traditionally worked together to raise their children and undertake other domestic duties. Meurant’s diary does show, though, that he was a consistent writer of letters to Kenehuru while he was absent from the family home. The diary entries also show him as a considerate husband and provider for his family. Meurant’s attentiveness to his family had come to the notice of Governor Grey, who thought that Meurant took “an unusual interest” in them (“General Legislative Council,” 1849, p. 4).

Various contemporary sources suggest that Kenehuru and Meurant encouraged and celebrated their children’s successes and that they enjoyed their family. According to one source, the Meurant family was “a large family of interesting children” (“Native Land Agitation,” 1848, p. 2). One of Kenehuru and Meurant’s daughters apparently had “a very fine [singing] voice” and was asked to sing on occasion (“Mr. Courtney’s Mission in England,” 1891, p. 3). The article



said only that the daughter was “Mrs. S”, but I suspect this was the couple’s sixth child, Lena, who married Charles Stanier (family papers, n. d.). Many newspaper articles of the time (see, for example, untitled article in the *New Zealand Herald*, 17 May, 1877, and “Sporting Notes” in the *Auckland Star*, 1876) mentioned their third child Henry’s<sup>89</sup> involvement in horse training. Henry’s son Edward became a jockey and was reported to have a “well known staying fashion” (“Sporting Notes,” 1876, p. 2). In 1882, the *Thames Star* referred to Meurant Stables in Newmarket, Auckland (“Auckland Echoes,” 1882, p. 1). And then there was Meurant’s Hill, the site for the slaughter house (see below). Behind the family’s successes, although not publicly acknowledged, was Kenehuru—mother, grandmother, wife and carer to husband and a large family of children and grandchildren.

Less than a year after Kenehuru lost her baby son, Meurant wrote in his diaries about the death, in 1844, of their eldest daughter, Korahi, whom they called Kora, although Meurant used the spelling of Corah in his diaries, which is confusing because the daughter who did actually have the name Corah was born in 1846. Corah was the couple’s fifth child, and she went on to marry and have three children of her own. According to Meurant’s diary entries, Kora suffered over sixteen days with terrible pain in her head. She died at around six on the morning of 28 March 1844 in her parents’ arms. Meurant attributed her death to inflammation of the brain, and the family buried her the next day at St. Pauls Church in Parnell. On the morning of the funeral, Meurant had to attend to pressing work: “I returned home and at 2 oclock we took my dear child (Korahi) to the grave. We called on Mrs. Forsaith and then returned to our home of grief sorrow.” The next day Meurant was back at work, leaving Kenehuru to cope with her loss and young family.

Kenehuru had three other young children to care for when Korahi died—Albert, Henry and Emma. Meurant never again mentions Kora’s illness or death or how the family coped after it. For Kenehuru, the death closely followed the birth and then, just two months later, the death of her baby son. Kora had been born in Kenehuru’s native homelands of Kāwhia, possibly with whānau support. Her burial in a Pākehā cemetery, away from that support and also from the custom of taking the child back to her whenua, her origins, must have added to Kenehuru’s anguish. That she and Meurant called on a neighbour on their return from the burial indicates that

---

<sup>89</sup> Henry was also known as Harry as an adult.

they did not have a congregation of supporters to mourn the death of this important first child. With Meurant returning to work the next day, it seems that Kenehuru had to bear the burden of two years of accumulated grief on her own.

It was soon after Kora's death that Kenehuru and Meurant had to deal with the theft of Kenehuru's thirty acres. Meurant at no time writes in his diaries about the government's actions over this land, possibly because others read his diaries (he mentions from time to time sending whole diaries about his work and actions to officials so that he could be paid). Kenehuru and Meurant had to be very careful about what they said and did, especially given (as noted earlier) Meurant's concern that he might lose his position as an interpreter for the government. Although Meurant never gave up his attempts to have the land returned in its entirety, he and Kenehuru were in a compromising situation. A reduction in his pay in 1845 from £150 to £92 per annum ("Thursday, March 13," 1845, p. 3) as the government sought to balance its books<sup>90</sup> not only meant less money to pay the bills and feed the family but also made his job seem less secure. The desire to remain as incognito as possible as well as lack of money probably explains why Meurant never engaged legal counsel but endeavoured to recover Kenehuru's property through correspondence (Meurant v. Keir, May 20 & 23, 1854).

Another concern for the family was that Meurant suffered from debilitating headaches, rendering him incapacitated in bed for four or five days at a time. He notes these episodes throughout his diaries. The recurring headaches would have been another particular distress for the family and even more so after Kora's death and whose symptoms prior to it paralleled her father's. The family's fears were realised when Edward Meurant died in November 1851 at the age of forty-eight at his residence in Parnell.

Kenehuru's land case was still unresolved, of course, at the time of Meurant's death. Notices to the public asking for any claims against Edward Meurant's estate were advertised several times soon after ("Auctioneer and Land Agent," 1851, p. 1). These were followed six months later with sustained and robust advertising in the *Daily Southern Cross* of a mortgagee sale of his goods and property. The public notices stated that the Meurant residence had a fine view of the entrance to the harbour, that it was called Windsor Castle and that it was occupied by

---

<sup>90</sup> Other government workers also had their pay reduced; Edward Shortland was one of these ("Interpreter fees", 1845, p. 3).

Mrs. Meurant. The garden was of a rich soil, the property was well stocked with fruit trees, there were stables, and the house was suitable for a family (“Mr. J. Newman,” 1852, May 8, 14, 15, 19, 25). Further notices for the sale of property in the estate of Meurant were made in 1872, indicating that Kenehuru could not support herself. In response to Meurant and her earlier claim about his deceit with Kenehuru’s land, Wanhalla (2013) appears to be making an argument that he was a wealthy land owner at the time of his death (see p. 65). While Tainui historian and relation to Meurant, Leslie Kelly, records that Meurant acquired various properties during his lifetime in New Zealand, he makes that point that Meurant “had acquired little land”. It is not clear exactly the land that Kenehuru acquired when Meurant died but records seem to indicate she held a house in Parnell (as above), and a small farm at Remuera (likely the ten acres that had been given back to her by the Government as already discussed).<sup>91</sup>

Despite the stress she must have been under, Kenehuru continued to pursue the matter of her lands. Now that her husband had died and the threat of him losing his position was no longer there, she could seek legal counsel. On 23 May 1854, a Mr. Rochfort presented the case to the Supreme Court on behalf of Kenehuru, taking a writ of ejectment from her lands against Mr. Finlay and Mr. Keir, both of whom had purchased portions of the land from Andrew Sinclair (“Meurant v. Keir,” 1854, May 23, p. 2). There were four particular issues that Kenehuru, through her lawyer, wanted to test in court:

1. The power of the Crown to confiscate the lands belonging to the Maori, British subject, —Mrs. Meurant;
2. The authority of Lieutenant-Governor Pitt to issue grants of Crown Lands, in the name and on behalf of Her Majesty.
3. The legality of the Quieting Titles Ordinance, or the grounds that the official members of the Legislative Council, held the respective offices of Attorney-General, Colonial-Secretary, and Colonial-Treasurer, for the *Province of New Ulster* only, and not for the *Colony of New Zealand*, as required by the Act of Parliament 11 Vic. C. 5, and

---

<sup>91</sup> This information is held in Leslie Kelly’s notes on Meurant, p. 6, in G. Scholefield Collection, MS-Papers-0212-24, ATL.

4. The power of such council (even if lawfully constituted to legalize the confiscation of the land belonging to Mrs. Meurant, or to any other British subject. (“Meurant v. Keir,” 1854, December 1)

The court system proved to be as duplicitous and obstructive as the government officials had been prior to Meurant’s death. The court sat only four times a year, and when Kenehuru’s lawyer, Rochfort, who was used to the more flexible court systems in Australia, turned up an hour late for the hearing put aside for it during one of these sittings, the case was dismissed. Resubmission of the case three days later was again dismissed because Rochfort had not signed his name on the back of the writ; rules for this necessity could not, however, be found (“Meurant v. Keir, 1854,” May 26, p. 3). The case would therefore have to wait for the next court sitting in September 1854.

Towards the end of 1854, the *Daily Southern Cross* reported that the case had been denied a court hearing for the seventh time due to delays caused by the so-called “legality of the grant” (“Meurant v. Keir,” 1854, December 1, p. 3). In the meantime, Kenehuru was still required to pay the solicitor and any other fees relating to the case. Throughout this Pākehā-colonial skulduggery, she did have the support of her whanaunga, the original gifters of the land, who turned up to the court after the case’s first dismissal, only to be turned away because the court would not sit as explained above. In 1855 the case had still not proceeded, this time because Kenehuru’s lawyer, Rochfort, was concerned about how the claim had been set out, which was not in the “usual and established forms of pleadings recognised in Courts of Law” (Meurant v. Keir, 1855, February 23, p. 3). Rochfort felt that Kenehuru’s interests might be seriously compromised if the case continued as it was. Throughout 1854 and 1855, the case, now that it had been brought to court, was followed with considerable interest by various individuals and groups in the colony intent on ascertaining if the courts law of England could and should be installed in New Zealand or whether a governor and his council could go on doing as they “chuse” [sic] (“Meurant v. Keir,” 1854, December 1, p. 3).

During the 1860s, there is little mention in the various possible sources of Kenehuru’s case. The decade was marked by the colonial government consolidating its hold on the governance and development of New Zealand, including the colonial quest for land, especially in Taranaki and Waikato. On this Leslie Kelly (see G. Scholefield papers, p. 10) writes of the outbreak of the war in 1863 in the Waikato and Kenehuru remaining in Auckland rather than return to her people.

Her children had been raised in Auckland and so it is understandable perhaps that they may have been reluctant to return to a place where close ties had not been maintained. In response to Kenehuru's land, it is not difficult to see how one Māori woman with "limited native rights" (Colvin, 2009, p. 102) could be so readily undermined and put on hold by men whose affairs were of far more importance according to the colonial balance of power. For Kenehuru, the 1860s appears to have been a time of mortgagee sales and the relinquishing of other assets that she and Meurant had acquired (see for example "Sales by Auction," 1872, p. 4).

However, there were those who endeavoured to pursue Kenehuru's cause. In 1862, John Whiteley, a missionary of the Wesleyan Church (Brazendale, 2012), wrote to George Grey explaining that Meurant was deceased and his financial affairs had been left in a poor state. Possibly Meurant's past as a lay agent for the Wesleyan mission elicited some response of sympathy from Whiteley towards Kenehuru's position, for his letter to George Grey is long and pressing with many references to "His Excellency's" kindness and generosity ("Whiteley," 1862, September 2). A mortgage broker, Whiteley said, had been to Kenehuru's house with papers to take receipt of the land, but instead found that the house and the land it was on were mortgage free, thereby giving Kenehuru and her family a short reprieve. However, Whiteley considered it was only a matter of time before Kenehuru's residence would have to be sold to support the family.

In his letter, Whiteley also thanks George Grey for his 'liberal offer' to give Kenehuru a loan to support Kenehuru, with security on that loan being met by a portion of land left by Meurant. However, Whiteley explains, there is a problem—the property had already been sold. He was hopeful of finding other security from Grey so that his 'very liberal and generous offer' could be taken up (Whiteley, 1862, September 2). It is interesting that Grey, who had treated Kenehuru so badly by taking her land, a theft that was still in effect almost twenty years later, would now offer a loan to the widow, yet still not see fit to compensate her for the illegal confiscation, an action that would have greatly alleviated her financial situation. That he wanted security on the loan suggests his 'leopard's spots' were still intact; if Kenehuru defaulted on loan payments, Grey could claim yet another portion of Meurant family land.

Kenehuru's property and affairs continued to be publicly scrutinised from 1865 until 1877, including in debates about where a new slaughterhouse for the Auckland area might be best situated. For Kenehuru to be witness to these types of discussions, documented at length in the

newspapers and elsewhere, must have been distressing and humiliating. In April 1865, the Auckland Provincial Council concluded that an agreement should be sought from the trustees of Mrs Meurant, as her land presented as the best site for a slaughterhouse (“Provincial Council,” 1865, p. 6).

In June 1872, a notice appeared in the *New Zealand Herald* and the *Auckland Star* stating that, on order of the Supreme Court, two of Meurant’s properties were to be sold, one in Parnell with a house, and the other, which was part of the ten acres left to Kenehuru, in Newmarket. The latter property, the notices’ advised, is situated close to Newmarket Railway and is the property of A. Keir, Esq (“In the Estate of Edward Meurant, Deceased,” 1872, p. 4 and 3 respectively). Within a week, however, this auction was cancelled (see “Public Auction Sales”, 1872, June 24), no doubt a result of public pressure. In October 1873, William Swanson, another MP who pursued compensation for Kenehuru from 1871, moved a motion in the House of Representatives that “effect be given to the report of the Public Petitions Committee in the case of Eliza Meurant” (untitled article in *New Zealand Herald* 22 April, 1878, p. 2). The motion was passed, and politician George Maurice O’Rorke was appointed as the commissioner to “investigate the Meurant [Kenehuru] case”. He almost immediately headed to Manukau aboard the SS *Wellington* to, as the *Auckland Star* reported, “... definitely fix the award in accordance with the resolution of the Assembly.” This act, the newspaper said, would see “One of the dirtiest blots on the history of the settlement of New Zealand ... wiped out” (“Wellington,” 1873, p. 2). For some unknown circumstance, O’Rorke resigned his position the following year, and Henry Hesketh was appointed to act for Kenehuru before Judge Francis Dart Fenton (untitled article in *New Zealand Herald*, 22 April 1878, p. 2). Colonial Secretary J. C. MacCormick was to act for the government, which, despite having resolved to settle the claim in 1873, repeatedly put it on hold for one reason or another.

In 1874, Fenton sent a telegram to the then chief judge of the Native Land Court, Major H. A. Atkinson, stating that reference in Section 109 of the Native Land Act 1873 to a ‘specific’ judge meant that the Meurant (Kenehuru) papers should be sent to him (Atkinson). On 7 December 1874, Atkinson requested that the Kenehuru claim (No. 1323) be investigated and settled. Later that month, an official notice posted in the *Daily Southern Cross* informed the public that Fenton would be holding a court session “to investigate and settle the Claim of Eliza

Meurant (widow), and the Claim of the representatives of Edward Meurant, deceased” in relation to their Remuera land (“Notices,” 1874, p. 1). The court sat and ruled in favour of Kenehuru.

However, on 6 January 1875, MacCormick questioned whether there was, in fact, a claim to be made, as he had been “informed upon very good authority” that the Meurant family had no grounds for compensation (“Parliamentary,” 1875, p. 3). He stated that if any such claim ever existed, it “was satisfied many years ago” and then added that George Grey could verify this fact. MacCormick furthermore said that he had heard Meurant had been “perfectly satisfied” with the arrangements that had been made (“Parliamentary,” 1875, p. 3). The so-called “arrangements” referred to the twenty-four acres that had been returned to Meurant twenty-six years earlier in 1849.

Soon after, Judge Fenton “disposed” of Kenehuru’s case. The reason given was that on the day her case was to be heard, the Supreme Court and the Native Lands Court were both booked out for other cases (“Case Disposed,” 1875, p. 2). But Swanson would not let the matter lie. Time and again at House of Representative sittings (“Parliament,” 1875, p. 3), he asked about the status of Kenehuru’s claim for compensation, reminding members that the government had promised two years earlier to investigate and settle the matter. The answer persistently given was that the report would be before the House “as soon as possible”. In September 1875, the Auckland Provincial Council agreed to pay Kenehuru compensation of £2,088 15s 3d, the amount determined as follows:

Value of 19 ½ acres, being balance of 30 acres, at £150 per acre, £2,622 10s. Against this latter sum is put certain debits due from the estate under the operation of the provisions of the Native Lands Act, amounting to £533 14s 9d., leaving the amount that should be paid to the petitioner at £2,088 15s. 3d. (“Parliamentary,” 1875, September 21, p. 3)

But the funds remained unpaid. MacCormick considered that the government was opening itself up for serious consequences if it agreed to “redress wrongs (if any) made by former Governments” (“Parliamentary,” 1875, p. 3). In October 1875, the General Assembly told Swanson that the government would shortly be prepared to state what course they proposed to take (“The General Assembly,” 1875, p. 6). Nothing happened. It appears that the patriarchal colonial government had heeded MacCormick and were prepared to deny Kenehuru compensation to prevent other claims. In July 1876, in response to yet another question from Swanson, the Hon. Mr. Richardson advised the House that the government had no intention of taking any steps towards settling Kenehuru’s claim (“The General Assembly,” 1876, p. 2). In

1877, Swanson yet again brought the case before Parliament (“Parliamentary,” 1877, p. 2) and was told that the necessary papers to settle would be laid before the solicitor-general. “The law’s delay,” wrote one newspaper columnist, “the carelessness of office, and the unwillingness of successive Ministries to pay money have prevented justice being done” (untitled article in *New Zealand Herald* 1878, p. 2). The “Parliamentary” section of the *Thames Advertiser* (August 1878, p. 3) informed readers that the Meurant claims would be settled at the parliamentary session that day (p. 3). Almost three months on, a notice in the *Thames Advertiser* stated: “In settlement of the claims of Mrs Meurant, £2,088 15s 3d” (“Supplementary Estimates,” 1878, October 30, p. 3). Further reporting on the issue, which was of national interest not only because of the theft of property but also because of the time taken to secure compensation, stated that the funds were to be invested in trust for Mrs Meurant (“Wellington,” *Waikato Times*, 1879).

Correspondents who had followed the case noted the expenses the Meurants had incurred over the many years of keeping the case before the courts: £500 in an effort for compensation, £70 legal expenses for one sitting, and interest estimated to be considerably more than £600 (“The Meurant Case,” 1878, p. 2). The *New Zealand Herald* noted in early July 1879 that the funds had still not been paid to Kenehuru (“Honour to Whom Honour Due”, 1879, p. 2). Not accounted for within these arbitrary calculations was the loss to Kenehuru of land rental and lease of her confiscated property over the thirty-one years since confiscation, and the toll on her and her family of the countless court readings and petitions.

Finally, on 7 December 1879, twenty-eight years after Meurant had died and just five months *after* Kenehuru died (she died on July 12, 1879), newspapers reported that compensation of £2,000 had been “paid over in full of all demands to the trustees, Messrs Swanson, M.H.R., and the Native Minister” (“The Meurant Case,” 1879, p. 3).<sup>92</sup> The government, however, deducted £5 5s duty on the money that would be paid to Kenehuru, and Swanson began a new fight—to have the trustees release the money into Kenehuru’s account (“The Meurant Case,” 1879, p. 5).

---

<sup>92</sup> The money actually went into the coffers of the Public Trustee of New Zealand, a government-appointed corporation set up in 1872 to provide trustee services to people unwilling to use private sources or required by the courts of legislation to do so.



Despite official acknowledgement five years previously that Kenehuru had been wrongly deprived of her land, gaining compensation was a difficult, (purposefully) drawn-out process. Hugh Carleton, who had consistently sought redress for Kenehuru and Meurant, wrote a letter to the editor of the *Thames Star* in April 1878, just before he left New Zealand to live in England. In it, he again set out the essential elements of the crime against Kenehuru and asked the editor if he would take the case up himself, or perhaps he was enquiring if any of the paper's readers might do this (see "The Meurant Case," 1878, p. 2). Carleton had pressed the issue for over thirty years, albeit, according to some of his critics (see, for example, untitled article in *New Zealand Herald*, 22 April, 1878, p. 2; "Honour to Whom Honour is Due," 1879, p. 6), only when it suited him to do so, such as when his party was in opposition to the government.

The case came once more before public attention in 1891 when the Public Trustee of New Zealand,<sup>93</sup> publicly apologised, following scrutiny by a commission set up to investigate its conduct, for its profound mismanagement of estates and its sad history of treatment of Kenehuru and others ("The Public Trust Report," 1891, p. 2). The report advised that no information about estates entrusted into the corporation's care could be extracted from it and that, in some cases, funds had dwindled away to such an extent as to cause suspicion. Because of the office's inability to act with due care and honesty, the colony had absorbed £35,000 of unclaimed funds. The conduct of the corporation was considered not only improper and indefensible but also illegal. In short, beneficiaries of the estates had been treated arbitrarily and cruelly, and hence the apology. It is unclear, however, what impact the corporation's tardiness and eventual apology had on Kenehuru.

---

<sup>93</sup> The Public Trustee Office concerned itself with maintaining and logging funds and property from deceased and other people who may have been considered too unwell to manage their own affairs (see *The Public Trust Report*, 1881). The report states that the office's duties had been carried out in a very irregular manner and that the trust had been in a regular muddle. Grave suspicion about the business capacity of the office and an audit that had been undertaken of the office showed up serious flaws, which included the office requiring excessive charges of clients and not always noting next of kin of deceased of the death of their family member. Consequently, many thousands of pounds and estates that should have been paid to beneficiaries had not been paid. Another discovered illegality was officers purchasing for themselves articles of property of some deceased clients. I assume, because of the public apology that was made to Kenehuru, that the recompense from her lands was tied up in this mismanagement of her funds.

While Kenehuru had fought the battle imposed on her, ending up, in reality, with nothing, others, because of who they were and their alliances, were being compensated for their grievances in a different manner. The incidence of Thomas Henderson is a case in point. He was a parliamentary candidate for the Waitemata electorate in 1876. Mr. J. S. Macfarlane (elected candidate for Waitemata) accused Henderson of being “a Government man” and pointed out to him and the listening congregation that while Kenehuru was languishing waiting for compensation, and her case barely dealt with, Henderson had, around the time of Kenehuru’s confiscation, obtained 5,000 acres of land and £950 for a claim that had already been “fairly settled” in 1846 (see “The General Elections,” 1876, p. 3). As an already experienced politician, Henderson was ably qualified to appease unwelcome attention emanating from the publicity about the case, which he did.

Throughout the long sorry affair, Kenehuru had to cope with the stress of it and also her powerlessness in terms of being able to intervene or progress the inaction of the parliamentarians. Newspaper reports show that on the 19 March 1875, a fire occurred at Ohlson’s tomato sauce factory, situated in St. George’s Bay, Parnell (“Yesterday’s Fires,” 1875, p. 3) and next door to Mrs. Meurant’s two-storey house, which was burnt to the ground, although her furniture was removed but still damaged by the fire. Because of the location (Parnell), the date and the name, Mrs. Meurant was undoubtedly Kenehuru. Mrs. Meurant was reported as having house insurance of £200 but her furniture was not covered (“Destructive Fire,” 1875, p. 2).

The fire was yet another tragic incident for an already overtaxed Kenehuru. At the subsequent inquest into the fire, the factory owner’s losses and insurances were intimately recounted, but Mrs Meurant’s (Kenehuru’s) were not (“Inquest on the Late Fire Parnell,” 1875, p. 3). In addition, there were no follow-up articles to say what happened to Kenehuru in the fire’s aftermath. These omissions provide yet another instance of a very likely gendered disregard for her plight. The loss of her home was apparently seen by the newspaper reporters (male) and the men appointed to carry out the inquest as secondary to a businessman’s loss of plant, machinery and produce.

It is a moot point as to whether disregard is better than disdain, but twice government papers made damning reference to Kenehuru’s mental state. Once Judge Fenton called her a “lunatic” (“The Case of Mrs. Meurant,” 1875, p. 6) and the Public Trust Report also cited instances of officials referring to her similarly. This labelling by men in governance was

damming, belittling and underhand, as they sought to undermine any credibility that Kenehuru may have had as a claimant, which, given the tenor of the times, could be relatively easily perpetrated on a Māori woman. Family records make evident that the long-term stress of her brave efforts to disrupt and challenge white male representation (Pickles & Wanhalla, 2010, p. 371) over thirty-one years affected not only her (and Meurant in his time) but also their children and grandchildren.

It is uncomplicated to perceive how the male colonial view of Kenehuru as a lunatic could be used to portray her as unstable and irrational and therefore deflect attention away from their duplicitous actions when in all probability Kenehuru had, after years of personal loss and the efforts to gain compensation for the theft of her land, a sadness about her that derived from her powerlessness, seen in her reliance on men to keep her case alive. Germaine Greer (2000) states that there is no medical condition called sadness (p. 218); rather, it tends to be known as depression and, for women especially, has been and sometimes still is conflated with ‘madness’. Greer suggests that if it were accepted that women have legitimate reasons for being sad, “they might be spared the stigma of being mad” (p. 221). Greer (2000) also claims that once a woman accepts the label of being mentally ill, she gives up her right to autonomy, loses her self-confidence in her own judgement and her prestige amongst her peers. Kenehuru suffered considerable personal loss and, it would appear, hardship from the time that Meurant died. I believe Kenehuru’s energy was subsumed by constant trauma combined with debasement by the Crown, who wielded its power to silence and exploit her.

### **Conclusion: Politics that Emerge**

As a woman, Rehe Kenehuru was oppressed, demobilized and racialised. She was a victim of powerful destructive colonial political hierarchies, which were merciless both to indigenous people (who lived one and the same with the land) and to their lands. Despite Meurant being a government agent, Kenehuru and her family came to have every reason to distrust government officials, as decisions and declarations about her life and land were dishonourably made, remade and modified but never undone. In his 1958 account of early colonial New Zealand, Miller quotes from an 1840 report from the *Select Committee on New Zealand* when writing about the colonisers’ strategies to procure land:

In this way the Maoris were fitted into the blue-print. The English settlers were to receive the bulk of the land; the Maori chiefs were to receive private properties ‘intermingled with the property of the civilized and industrious whites’; and the ‘inferior’ natives were to become a landless proletariat who would ‘subsist by means of working for wages’. The native reserves, Wakefield stated explicitly, were not designed to support the whole tribe but only ‘the principal native families and their children’. (Miller, 1958, p. 9)

This example of the thinking and discourse about the overall ‘blue print’ of the early colonial mindset provides an insight into how the organisation of Māori land and the place of tangata whenua on her evolved during the early colonising period. Appreciation of the colonial opinion and expectation backdrops the reasons why Kenehuru’s case became complicated and convoluted and why it became *intentionally* (I think) confused, as the government strove to wrest every piece of viable land that they could from tribal authority.

Kenehuru was never an active player within the discussion of her land, even though she held rangatira status over it prior to Grey’s confiscation. Constantly discussed and regulated as a mother of Māori children who were part European, as a native woman, as a wife, cousin and niece, she features by name only in the patriarchal discourse of her husband, male colonial representatives (including the governor), male (apparently) correspondents to newspapers, male newspaper editors, and male barristers. Kenehuru was thus silenced by her husband, the community, the government, the media, and life itself, a typical situation for women in most western and European-colonised countries who, until well into the 20th-century, were excluded from communities where matters that impacted on them were discussed and regulated primarily by men (Greer, 2000). The discourse reduced Kenehuru to a feminised helplessness, as if she were a child, with no right to political participation, while white men debated and discussed her affairs, so leaving her in the hapless position of reliance.

It was also, not surprisingly, uncommon for women of Kenehuru’s era to speak in public (Pickles & Wanhalla, 2010, p. 367). Those women who did want a public voice often wrote and lived their lives under cover, so to speak, as men or used pseudonyms. George Sand, who was born Amandine Lucie Aurore Dupin in 1804, is one such example (Ravenel, 1913, p. 851). Another is Mary Colclough, who wrote letters to newspapers under the pen name of Polly Plum (Dalley & Robertson, 1994, p. 20) rather than risk her true identity. Sally Berry, a clinical director of a women’s therapy clinic, claims that “The silence that surrounds issues of anger, pain, guilt, shame and even love and joy can become an ‘everyday silence’ that inevitably leads to disempowerment, disillusionment and distress” (quoted in Greer, 2000, p. 217). Kenehuru’s

thoughts, feelings, attitudes, values and hopes were rendered null and void by the silence that the norms of the time forced her to live under. Yet Kenehuru was the daughter of a formidable Tainui leader, descended from a strong line of proficient and inspirational chiefly leaders and warriors. In times past, her people would have celebrated her mana and encouraged and applauded her agency.

When writing about women's imposed incapacity in a patriarchal regime, Greer (2000) argues that enforced powerlessness renders women vulnerable to a "whole series of misfortunes" that become unceasingly pressing and oppressive (p. 226). Indeed, over three decades, some eight colonial officials and governmental goal keepers sat in as Crown representatives on court hearings and other official meetings where their white male power permitted them to debate, trivialise, fritter away and persecute the importance and relevance of Kenehuru, her lands, her family and her mana. In this way, the patriarchal canon held true to the imperial ideology of white colonising might.

Although, on a surface reading, Kenehuru's predicament appeared to rally to her men intent on redressing a great wrong, in reality, their efforts were at best a form of patriarchal benevolence that trivialised and marginalised her. Kenehuru was typically presented in the media as a Māori damsel-in-distress (one newspaper article called her a princess), who required saving. (The man-made rules that had been set meant that Kenehuru was unable to save herself in the imposed situation.) However, that saving was carried out by one set of imperial superiors acting in opposition to another set of imperial superiors. Thus, moral benevolence and kindnesses towards Māori women were carried out by men, acting according to agendas that probably had only a modicum of altruism, and with those actions reported in and managed by the media as they continued to maintain the case in the public eye. Despite the blatant theft by the Crown, Kenehuru was left landless and without recompense for the rest of her life.

Kenehuru's case presents as the first episode in New Zealand of a Māori woman being denied her property rights because she married a Pākehā man. Her marriage was caught up in the arguments of the day involving interracial marriage. It was used to effect by the Government of the day to legitimise the theft of Kenehuru's land and breach Crown obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Kenehuru had a double prejudice of power dynamics to contend with in this colonial space. She was Māori and she was a woman, and it was through these social and political spaces that she resisted and protested the hegemonic male-centred formal politics of

authority. Her challenge to the regime of patriarchal privilege made Kenehuru a pioneer of legal history when she, first through her husband and then through the lawyers that she hired, battled the processes and legal situation foisted on her by the theft of her land. Her case established transnational political awareness, and so had a widespread, far reaching effect, not contained to New Zealand. Kenehuru, through her resistance, challenged authority and so perhaps made some contribution to the incipient creation of political awareness and conscientisation of the adverse effects on individuals and society of gendered and racist hegemony. This awareness is one that has brought benefits of greater freedom from such hegemony today. However, it is also one that requires us to go on challenging its occurrence and reoccurrence wherever we find it.

When, in 1879, it came time for George Grey to leave New Zealand, one newspaper columnist wrote:

Doubtless, Sir George Grey's career as Premier will end in a very few days, and it is worthy of remark that one of the last acts of his Government has been to pay two thousand pounds to the widow of Meurant as compensation for the iniquitous robbery perpetrated under his authority more than thirty years ago, the said two thousand pounds having been wrung from him by the indefatigable champion of justice, Mr W. Swanson—to who all honor is due for this long delayed act of justice. ("Local and General," 1879, July 15, p. 2)

It is true that Swanson and other men such as Carleton kept up pressure on the government to redress the significant wrong perpetuated on Kenehuru. However, without Kenehuru's permission and determination over many years to achieve this aim, something her husband had died trying to do, and during which she endured family tragedies, mortgagee sales, the burning of her house, and further personal conflicts, Swanson and others would not have been credited with championing her cause (although note that in calling her 'the widow of Meurant', the emphasis to her is an oblique one). I propose that the significance of the case is that of a strong Māori woman who sought justice against gatherings of very privileged classes of white men. Perhaps without wanting to, and despite the confrontations and repressions that consumed her energy, Kenehuru, a chieftainess according to her whakapapa, a wife and a mother, nevertheless helped bring forward for public scrutiny the actions of colonial self-appointed leaders in governance,

where cronies (to use a term of the time) supported cronies into positions of power and privilege and rubber-stamped without censure.<sup>94</sup>

In the late 1870s, one commentator on the case claimed that government greed and dishonesty over Kenehuru's land could only have been "possible when New Zealand was a "Crown colony of a severe type" ("Local and General," 1879, July 24, p. 2). Kenehuru was one Māori woman manoeuvring amongst decades of seasoned men, primed to assume self-interested positions of power within the fast-moving and often self-serving social and political landscape of a colony far from the possible restraints of its parent country. The opportunities they had to regulate and change the lives of other colonists and, notably, the colonised (Maori), became a force that all but extinguished Kenehuru's rangatiratanga, her Ngāti Mahuta determination.

By the time the compensation funds were released to the trustees, Kenehuru's energy and strength at the age of sixty-one was gone. The story of her fight for recognition of her tribal inheritance, mana, and for social justice offers detailed accounts of a colonial racist and gendered system, embedded in the historical, political and legal treatment of Māori sovereignty by a governance framework that sought to constrain and control. As one correspondent who followed the case said, "It was necessary to get rid of one of the most awkward cases ever brought forward, and the Governor proved too quick-witted for all the non official members" ("Original Correspondence," 1849, p. 3). Hence Grey was able to prolong his predatory government-sanctioned authority and status not only over Kenehuru, her land, her income and her family throughout most of her lifetime but also the lives of her children and grandchildren, who were never able to benefit from the land gifted to them by their ancestors.

The specific patterns of meaning in my great, great, great grandmother's herstory highlight the continuation of the male-centred ideological and suppressive political power regime that the colonial trope installed in the new colony. The monotonous patriarchal control of women that prevented Kenehuru from attending meetings to speak on her own behalf or to have her family members do this is an example of this type of hegemony 'in action'. The destructive forces that Kenehuru endured by the theft of her lands are examples of the extremes taken in order to

---

<sup>94</sup> See, for example, "Thomas Henderson, The General Elections," 1876, p. 3, and Grey's shoulder-tapping of Robert Barstow ("Barstow," 1902, p. 425).

reinforce a regimented self-interested will on the land and on its people. It meant that after Meurant had died, Kenehuru's property was sold under a mortgagee sale, which left her in an even more deprived position.

Representing discrimination and oppression, some members of the political leadership of the colony were also ruthless in their slander of Kenehuru; when she refused to acquiesce, they presented her as a lunatic and much was made of potentially placing her in an asylum. Not discussed (ignored) was the extreme hardship and stigma that evolved in Kenehuru's life as a result of the power differentials that were at play. These involved power violence, not only against Kenehuru but also her husband, Edward Meurant, their children and their wider family.

In the womanist mana wahine rereading of Kenehuru's herstory, hers is one of resistance. She resisted powerful governmental departments, court findings and social stigma in a forced situation, one not of her making. It seems that Kenehuru had little personal support; she was away from her homelands, and she was engaging in a political arena that would have been foreign to her. Yet she had the courage to challenge the rhetorical patriarchal relations of power over race, gender and land.

Thus, although Kenehuru lost forever her tribal inheritance, she lived to see her authority reinstated, even though she could not rejoice for long. Her Ngāti Mahuta mana wahine legacy remained for her children and those following to see and acknowledge. As part of that group, I have wondered why it was that I was not surrounded by the stories and legacies of this more recent wahine toa. This thesis has been my personal journey in search of an answer to questions such as this one. It is with sorrow and with joy that I can now celebrate and bequeath to my tamariki and mokopuna this story of Kenehuru, another of their strong women ancestors, whose courage and determination and whose strengths and mana will endure through the generations.

*Ko Tū-mata-whāiti.*<sup>95</sup>

### **Kenehuru Restoryed**

Rehe was both excited and emotional about her departure from her homelands at Kāwhia. The move promised opportunities for her baby Korahi and her newborn Albert. Her husband, Edward, had arranged the horse to take them to Auckland, and his new position with the colonial governor

---

<sup>95</sup> It is Tū of the small face. In relation to a person who is willing to face the enemy when left alone, such as Kenehuru certainly was willing to do.



meant that they could afford to relocate there. She looked around the pā at Te Papa o Karewa for a final time. She looked at the kūmara gardens that she had been responsible for tending, and the creek that she had bathed in forever. Her mother, Kirikino, her cousins and their children had gathered to say goodbye. They cried and waved to each other until the horse had disappeared over the Te Wharu track. They passed by the urupa where her father, Te Tuhi o te Rangi, and brother, Te Hiakai, lay amongst their relations. She was only three when Te Hiakai had been killed at Okoki, but she had grown up with the stories of his chiefly mana all of her life. She always felt proud when the old people talked about him like that, and especially when they said that she had a spirit that reminded them of him—determined and strong.

It took three weeks for the family to arrive at Remuera. From Te Wharu they had travelled overland to the bay at Aotea. They stayed there with Rehe's cousins for three days before the baby, who had developed a sickness, was deemed by the kuia to be able to continue on the journey. From Aotea the family travelled overland again to Marakowhai and along the beach to Te Papatapu. The weather was perfect and Edward had caught a good store of fish that lasted the next three days. At Whaingaroa, they again stayed with family on Rehe's fathers side. They remained there for two nights and Rehe was pleased to see Korahi playing so easily with her cousins. Rehe and Edward had noticed an uneasy attitude towards their daughter from some of the Māori communities that they had travelled through. Korahi was quite a fair child, resembling Edwards side of the family more than her Ngāti Mahuta side and it had sometimes been awkward. There were no uneasy glances from her family at Whāingaroa however, nor at the other communities that they stopped at; Te Akau, Whangapē, Pokeno, Papakura and Ōtāhuhu. When they finally arrived at Remuera, three weeks from when they had left Kāwhia, they were all tired, hungry and glad the journey was finally over.

It took a couple of months for Rehe and Edward to build their simple hut on the lands that her uncle had set aside for her in Remuera. Edward was frequently away travelling because of his work, but her uncle Apehai and her cousins Te Hira and Te Kēni came over when they were in the area. They helped her with some of the outside work while she cared for the babies. She now had five tamariki, but one of them had died when he was only two months old. She had named him Te Hiakai after her brother. She thought her heart would break when he died, but Kora, Albert, Henry and Emma had thankfully forced her to focus on each day as it came.

When Edward came back from one of his trips, they shifted to a place in Parnell so that the Remuera lands could be leased to a farmer friend. The new house was warmer, but Rehe didn't like living there. She observed that many of the white women never looked at her or spoke to her, and she saw that their children never spoke to her children. She would have preferred to be in Remuera, but three more daughters—Corah, Selina and Elvira—had arrived in the family, and they needed the bigger house with its warmer rooms, especially since Kora was not, for some reason, as healthy as the other children.

*April 4th 1844 Dear diary: My darling girl Korahi died a week ago today. I am bereft. I have nothing to say.*

*May 10th 1847 Dear diary: Edward has been upset for some time by remarks that have been made in his hearing about our lands in Remuera. He thinks that one of the council members, Mr. Andrew Sinclair, has it in for him and is trying to take my land for himself.*

*July 31st 1848 Dear diary: There was a council meeting today, and Edward has said that the land has been taken already. I told him that once they (Governor Grey) hear from my uncle, they will realise the land is Māori land and they won't proceed.*

*August 22nd 1848 Dear diary: The newspaper has been full of letters about what Grey has done, stealing my land. My uncle wrote a letter to the Governor but it has been ignored. They have put my land out for sale.*

*August 24th 1848 Dear diary: I have heard that this is the first time the government have taken Māori lands like they have mine. People are saying it is a test to see if they can get away with it but I think it is a plan by that Sinclair.*

*August 27th 1848 Dear diary: The sale of my land was withdrawn thanks to these pakeha newspapers.*

*September 16th 1848 Dear diary: that upookokohua Grey has put up my land for sale again. I want to go to the council meeting but Edward will not allow it. He might also lose his job.*

*September 26th 1848 Dear diary: Grey has given Edward 10 acres of MY land with a crown grant for them. But we have not heard yet about what is happening with the other 20 acres.*

*November 20th 1848 Dear diary: Edward's sister died in Sydney, he has been there for a week now. He wanted to take the boys but we could not afford it. The Governor sold my Remuera land. I cannot do anything about it. Edward is furious. He is coming home.*

*January 3rd 1849 Dear diary: There is nothing Edward can do about our land. That Sinclair man bought the land and paid the money to Grey. THIEVES. My family cannot come to help us. Their own land is being taken too and they cannot come away because their land will not be there when they go back.*

*November 1851 Dear diary: I have been too exhausted to write my thoughts. My dear Edward died last week. He died trying to get our lands back. I will not give up. I will now get a barrister.*

Rehe was relieved to have the support of her children. Albert, Lena and Corah had been especially involved. They were there when she talked with the councillors Swanson and Carleton and occasionally when a reporter from the newspaper came round. Rehe was devastated to read that she had been reported as being a lunatic, it meant now that when she ventured outside some people spat at her. She stopped going out. Rehe heard about her own people's lands in Kāwhia and up the beautiful Waikato River that had been taken from them. She cried. So many people killed. Her Edward had been part of that whole treaty arrangement; he had thought it would be a good thing for everybody, and that Māori would have more say over their lands. But it had been a worse thing—far better that her people had fought against these white people and kept them out. Over and over again, Rehe asks herself: What will it all lead to? And over and over again, Rehe finds the strength to say, I will never give up. I will not let this pass.

*July 2nd 1879 Dear diary: The money £2,000 has been put into a trust for my mokopuna. That Swanson and Carleton have helped me to the end. I'm too tired of it all to have much to rejoice about, but those upokokohua paid out in the end.*

## Chapter Eight: Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was established in Chapters One and Two. Predominantly, I sought to enquire into the social, political and sexual representation of a selection of Tainui women (my ancestresses) depicted in the available manuscripts and texts, which begin with the traditions narrated orally by Māori kaumātua and recorded verbatim in text by Māori and colonists. I attempted to do this because of the literary conundrum wherein the male establishment produced canonical stories in which the mores for female involvement systematically and technically meant constraint and silence. I sought to recover and reassemble their herstories based on the fragments of information about them in those texts, and I recast the women as agents in the retelling based on my womanist mana wahine perspective.

My re-opening and retelling of these ancestresses' oral traditions meant confronting my own cultural and sexual colonisation. Thus, I began the re-interpretation of their traditions nervously and tentatively, initially using patriarchal controlled language but increasingly striving to reassert a position of feminine power and prominence. As I reviewed the traditions, I looked for patterns of variability, as discussed by Potter and Wetherell (1987), for similarities and consistencies and for features shared across the accounts. I pondered, too, the function and consequence of these features and events, such as Marama's love affair (when no mention is made of men and their polygamous relationships), and I formed a hypothesis about these types of activities—of why it is that the accounts have been presented as they have.

I spent considerable time and effort searching for linguistic evidence of what I hypothesized, but eventually recognized that because the accounts were kept by patriarchal minders, the evidence I sought did not exist. With post-patriarchy perspectives in mind, I unsubscribed from the male-dominated accounts and reconceptualised instead the traditions, formulating the feminine possibilities throughout this process. Thus, during the research for this thesis, I endeavoured to break away from the obtruded feminine silence and to trouble the masculine order of literature and the patriarchal telling of Tainui oral histories.

My research into the traditions and herstories revealed that Māori women's pasts were set within the trope of patriarchal literature where the male perspective has, over time, enjoyed a hegemonic male dominance. Here, from its socio-political positions of control, the masculine

represented Māori women's minds, emotions, values (their identities) and import to their/my people. In my reviewing of the oral traditions from an upfront womanist political lens, I traversed the native male narratives, the white patriarchal colonial and post-colonial accounts, and euro-Māori male texts. The masculine representations of the traditions across time drew on the same corpus of literature that I had access to, although the mid-20th-century accounts produced additional details because of the contact authors such as Leslie Kelly and Pei Te Hurinui-Jones and Bruce Biggs had to kaumātua who provided them with further clarification. However, as I point out in my research, this post-contact material remained influenced (contaminated) by a patriarchal colonial, Christian social and sexual positioning of white women.

The narrations of Tainui women's whakapapa, oral traditions and whakataukī in this thesis originated from amongst the prestigious tellings of chiefly men, captured as they have been by the likes of Wirihana Aoterangi, Te Whēoro, Matene Te Whiwhi and Hoani Nahe. These writers of Tainui tradition provide the earliest and least changed accounts. Te Whiwhi, Aoterangi and Te Whēoro are arguably the most authoritative and dependable providers of information on Tainui oral traditions (Gordon-Burns & Taonui, 2011). These men all hail from prominent iwi and held important positions within their rohe. They have each been introduced as significant chiefs or people carefully selected from amongst the principal men of the tribe.

The European colonisers considered these men, because of their status—their collective agency—as the elite, and so it was their voice that was noted when they recited the oral traditions. In comparison with Tainui men, many of whom are cultural heroes (Hoturoa, for example, along with Whatihua, Tūrongo, Te Hiakai, Te Rauparaha and others), the earliest records of oral traditions about Tainui women accordingly are minimal or non-existent. The shortage of post-colonial written material about Māori women is also dubious. It could be assumed, for example, that the deficiency of legends or traditions recorded about them meant that there were few women with a history worth maintaining.

Relationships were formed between narrators and recorders and the literary elite who included men such as George Grey, John White, Percy Smith and Elsdon Best. These men played a crucial role for they produced a corpus of text that disappeared the feminine. This body of work, taken as it was from selected Māori men, and processed again by Grey's carefully handpicked white men, of whom White is a good example, was a psychological tool; the non-

recording or limited (in the sense of both incomplete and controlled) recording of Māori women's contributions rendered these women as having similarly limited worth.

Key events such as important landmarks, whakapapa and whakataukī were made much of by Māori and white men. This is because the motifs illustrated and corroborated certain views: they reinforced tribal boundaries and important sites, and so brought significant and singular emphases to the traditions. By continually retelling these traditions over generations, Tainui men maintained their collective traditional knowledges and preserved their past about themselves eventually on their terms. However, what this has meant for the women's traditions is that every word of what we know about them has come from a patriarchal canon. This mould progressively censored the power and culture of the feminine on the one hand and progressively glorified the culture of masculinist warrior conquest and progress (claiming land and women) on the other.

This androcentric style meant that only certain women's events evaded the cut, for example Whakaotirangi's kūmara and Marama's love affair. Although the patriarchal accounts of the oral traditions of such women are multiple in their versions and interpretations, the *ngako* (the essence) of each tradition—the relationship to the ancestress and the constants of place and whanaungatanga remain as central. The phallocentric preservation thus provides invaluable insights and knowledges about the women and the times they lived in, but a deeper analysis of the societal and political renderings highlights (from a womanist point of view at least) other significant contextual considerations of our foremothers and foresisters.

For the sake of this thesis, then, European values and gender positioning specifically impacted on who wrote what about Māori women and how it was written. For Tainui women, the gendered histories instituted a duality. On the one hand, Māori men were the informants to Pākehā men, who then published their accounts about Māori women. Māori women can be considered to have been doubly silenced by these hegemonic male-centred contexts, which were repeated by the mid- and later-20th-century males. The analysis of text highlights that what the Pākehā men wrote in their published accounts was based on information from Māori men and their colonial ideologies, interpretations and political agendas—ideologies that largely boasted male supremacy. At the same time as the colonisers were collecting these histories, they were often also denigrating those from whom they took them, a finding that I presented in Chapter Two.

The overall place of this research into Tainui women's history highlights a place that has not been traversed previously. While there has been research conducted into other aspects of oral tradition, such as for example, Adele Fletcher's (2000) research *Religion, gender and rank in Maori society: A study of ritual and social practice in eighteenth and nineteenth-century documentary sources*, Mahika's (2012) *'Kōrero tuku iho': Reconfiguring oral history and oral tradition*, and Ngahuia Murphy's (2011) *Te awa atua, te awa tapu, te awa wahine: An examination of stories, ceremonies and practices regarding menstruation in the pre-colonial Māori world* (amongst others), this thesis has set out to gather in and re-present Tainui women's herstories and their importance in iwi and hapū affairs. Māori epistemologies became distorted and Māori women's voice silenced within the contradictory ethnographic accounts that colonisers and the colonised reproduced. These narrations have not been challenged in this way before. Māori women's voice and place, through this thesis, has become highly politicised and it denounces the historical subjugation of female power. It recovers and re-examines the long-forgotten cultural customs and antecedents. It recognises and revisibilises Tainui women's power and autonomy. It reclaims the power and realisation that Māori women were and are powerful and are redefining our involvement in our world for ourselves.

### **Insights from the Literature**

While not an exhaustive list of narrators, authors, researchers and publishers who were active and are, in part, responsible for the accounts of iwi history that we hold today, I have provided a profile within the substantive chapters of some of those people who have contributed in some way towards the information that I have drawn from. In some cases, only one source of information has been gathered for each of the named narrators and authors. Although this might be considered unusual practice, the heart of this thesis is about the women of Tainui, not the men who preserved their stories. It could be that Māori women refused to be interviewed by the early colonists and missionaries as was the case with the Rundi women in Africa (see Vansina, 2009, p. 437) where they were not meant to know the information even though it was clear that they did. But it would seem unlikely that Māori women who held whakapapa as central to who they were/are would legitimate the silencing of important women from within their whakapapa.

In concluding these explanations about the narrators, scribes and authors of Tainui women's herstories, while Binney (1987) asserted that the telling of history has never been



neutral, that no matter the intentions, the retelling will always be formed by the teller, we can see that the direct impact on the absences in the literature about Tainui women's oral traditions was created and maintained by who narrated, transcribed and published their histories. Pākehā men and women deemed that women's principal concern was to the home, the children and the support of their men folk in their aspirations. The literature shows that the very nature of the early paternalistic hegemonic mindset could not and did not give any credit at all to Māori women's self-determination and essential character. There is enough evidence in the literature to show that, like other cultures, men, Māori and Pākehā alike, have hidden Māori women. The discursive literature on gender, power and knowledge illustrated how men and women have been socially constructed into believing and accepting that a male overview gives credit and sanction to what we may know of early significant Māori women, which is, I surmise, purposely very little.

In Chapter Two, I provided of the literature that which informed my observations and analysis of the text in response to the imposed patriarchy and socially sexist renderings held within Tainui women's histories. It was necessary to present and assess the political hegemonic relationships to power and domination of indigenous women in colonised lands in order to elucidate and understand the impact these established norms have had and continue to have. I also identified in this chapter the first white-male-oriented theories, classist strategies and assumptions (based on scant observations) about Māori women and their place on the landscape—of secondary importance and subservient to their menfolk. These men collaborated with brown men and, over time, the oral traditions came to hold different meanings and intentions than were previously known. The key to this disparity and flawed representation was the locking out of women from the conventions of the male conversations (rhetoric) and the retellings.

I incorporated the findings of my review of relevant literature into Chapters Four to Seven. There I analysed, discussed and provided examples of how contemporary Māori writers perpetuated the ideological colonist discourse that modified and narrowed the involvement of Tainui women in ritual, including karakia. For a society whose tradition depended on oral transmission of knowledges to maintain links of kinship, society, place and instruction, the cultural attitude of a patriarchal canon enforced detrimental social effects on Tainui women. They presented instead a sexual sublimation in which women's roles were presented as inferior

and perhaps even irrelevant in comparison to the roles of their male counterparts. This attitude continues to be maintained in our country today presenting as docility in many Māori women.

### **Findings: Masculinization of the Feminine**

Throughout Chapters Four to Seven, I identified the progressive patterns of patriarchal hierarchy and the ideologically socially constructed place of women. This is an ideology that fraudulently confirms to women and a male authority the myth that the masculine is where the main power base lies. Each male narrator and scribe positioned, in some way, the feminine as inferior to the masculine, yet the fragments of tradition, myth and legend included in their narrations nonetheless points to the pre-potent power of women, including their inherent powerful procreation abilities that accorded them a place of esteem and importance within their iwi.

Among the canoe traditions of Tainui iwi, the stories pertaining to Whakaotirangi and Marama hold particularly important positions in Tainui history. The two women are aligned as women with omnipotent powers. Indeed, their wisdom and knowledge of ritual was called on to neutralise situations of extreme hardship. The debasing, however, of women's knowledge of ritual—a knowledge that produced practical results (e.g., Tainui waka being able to continue on her journey around the coast)—inevitably led to the silencing of women in these highly powerful realms. The collective feminine efficiencies were, then, progressively expunged. Whakaotirangi, a once potent Tainui female figure, became reoriented in one patriarchal account (see Phillips, 1995, in Chapter Five on Marama) as a mean-spirited and jealous woman. She was not presented negatively prior to this. Phillips, as a male and white at that, allows himself the right to present a significant ancestress in a way that implies she had an odious and resentful nature. Phillips is but one of many men who believed they had the right to semantically re-issue and re-evaluate the feminine in the oral traditions as women of inferiority and deviancy, characteristics seldom if ever used by men to describe the male ancestors that they write about. Even Marama's lover, who was put to death, was not written about in disparaging terms.

As my research shows, the masculine brotherhood continued their debauching of women when they wrote about Whakaotirangi's contemporary, Marama. The male focus agitates over a supposed adultery yet credits, with no apparent thought or sense of irony, her husband with having up to four wives (see Phillips, 1995). The phallocentric reporters of Marama's tradition clearly illustrated their abhorrence for a woman who indulges in coitus with another man while

married. She is progressively and insistently discredited in the accounts, while Hoturoa, her husband, is portrayed as a virile and potent male. The male establishment strove to maintain an image of their ideological right to prostitute themselves while psychologically imposing a loathing and disdain towards women who initiated additional lovers.

Whakaotirangi and Marama were both women of adventure and self-determination, from an era, I would argue, of matriarchal overviews. The earliest recorded oral traditions indicate they were women of means who did not depend on a man for their existence. Yet these important characteristics have not been mentioned by the male keepers of their oral traditions. Nor do they explore the possibilities of Hoturoa, as an older man, being unable to fulfil manly duties with his much younger (than him) wife. Rather, the masculine decreed the boundaries for the representation of the sexual, political and social meanings of the feminine based on their own colonising set of values. The contemporary phallic representations privileged perceived male strengths of masculinity, daring and courage, while presenting Marama and Whakaotirangi as overly emotional women with psychological weaknesses. In summary, the importance of Whakaotirangi and Marama in tradition has been recognised in the representations, but their absolute value has been tempered because of the established rhetorical structural orders within which its masculine power must prevail.

Ruapūtahanga's tradition showcases the potential outcome for women who resist the notion of patriarchal control. She, along with Kenehuru, is problematized in the male accounts because of her political subversiveness and resistance of the male hierarchy. Ruapūtahanga, it appears, may also have been a product of matriarchal societies, hence her decision to abandon her overbearing husband. The herstories of Ruapūtahanga and Kenehuru, which exemplify opposition to male control, are effaced by being presented alternatively: as heartless (Ruapūtahanga leaving her children behind—a most unmotherly and unwomanly act) or mad (Kenehuru in pursuing her claim of theft against a patriarchal government). Because the two women's herstories are completely and unsurprisingly monopolized by the male voice, they are available to us only through the language, perspective and bias of males. This means that the representations of meanings and understandings of the women's lives are limited by the lack of astute and inherent feminine knowledge and emotion. These monopolizations should leave us (women) wondering about bringing a female vision and version of other herstories.

Through patriarchal retellings, Ruapūtahanga is eventually presented to us as an embittered, jealous and perhaps monstrous woman, while Whatihua, her husband, is constructed as a hero who scoops up his mother-abandoned child and watches his wife as she forever leaves his life. He returns home with the rescued child (as a hero), although it is Apakura who now mothers the boy; Whatihua did not substitute himself. One can see that the male representation of this particular event sympathises with Whatihua; it relays a single reality—a monocultural “monodimensional” perspective of what occurred (Spender, 1985, p. 62). The point is that we can only know the male perspective because that is what is disseminated to us. Absent from the accounts is a sympathetic view that discusses Ruapūtahanga’s emotions and ongoing dilemmas that her hasty departure created for her, for her iwi, and for her Tainui born children.

Each of the women in this thesis first comes to our attention because of her relationship to a man rather than because of her own influences: Whakaotirangi (although Aoterangi did credit more to Whakaotirangi than this) and Marama through their marriage to Hoturoa, Ruapūtahanga through Whatihua, and through her marriage to Meurant, Kenehuru. Kenehuru’s whakapapa is impressive yet little can be found about her prior to her marriage to Meurant. This type of representation is akin to Western indoctrination where the greatness or otherwise of women resides in whom she marries.

The cultural and historical patriarchal knowledges have prevented women from explaining oral traditions because of the tight male control over them. The reason why men have welded such power over how and who relays the traditions lies with their own hegemonic need to maintain a patriarchal power. As I explained in my research, white men approached elite brown men for their histories. The renditions that were returned from these encounters were interrupted by variations on what they had heard. White men organized their own social circles to function politically and socially within a patriarchal power base and were threatened by the reality of Māori social groups not operating in this way. I propose that in a frantic effort to keep Māori women’s involvement and herstories subverted, white men moved quickly amongst Māori men who had proud histories of their ancestors to relay. From the earliest scribed oral narrations, white men gathered, edited and strategized the accounts they heard to evolve a cultural hierarchy where the power, courage and strength of women (equal to or even beyond that of their menfolk) could not be paraded. The interpretation that Tainui women held a lesser place in tribal politics,

lore and tradition was achieved by the systemic controlling of an androcentric literary canon, and the female submission to the male rhetoric has been noted throughout my research.

### **Addressing the Restorying**

Rewriting ancestresses tradition required that I follow the gendered and generational patriarchal extant text. It was important to me, however, to maintain the key structures of each of the oral traditions that were historically most prominent. In order to do this it meant that I also extracted from these texts the colonial influence that overrode Māori women's place of distinction, which had created a barrier within iwi circles. While the limited phallic text allowed me some possibilities for understanding the women's pasts differently, in order to ensure enough ties to weave together warp and weft so that a fabric of intricacies about Tainui ancestresses' essential histories could be restoryed, it was necessary that I reimagine and realign the recorded pasts with the contemporary womanist mana wahine lens that I have written about in Chapter's One and Two. In this way I incorporated thoughts, fancies and ideas that resonated with my views of establishing connections, whakapapa and *herstory*. I have striven to associate each woman with a particular identity that aligned with courage, strength and the complexities that my imagination has been fired with from the oral traditions that I had read about them. The study of these ancestresses' herstories and rewriting them has been a most humbling experience for me. Notwithstanding, that based on the negligence of their *herstories*; there is a prospect that I may acquire a significant tertiary tohu.

Identifying the position of kaupapa Māori and mana wahine in the research allowed for my very political standpoint of reclaiming and restorying Tainui ancestresses. Including a womanist position to the mix has ensured my purpose of overwriting the patriarchal and often racist commentaries and re-presenting instead the awesomeness of Māori women from a non-colonising framework has been achieved. A fundamental tenet of mana wahine is validating Māori women; the restorying of significant Tainui ancestresses unashamedly highlights the power and importance of women and corroborates this position.

My research and restorying with its core focus on Māori kaupapa and culture including the oppression of Māori women, analysed from a Māori lens, sits well with Kaupapa Māori ethics and commitment where rangatiratanga and Māori empowerment is a desired outcome. Kaupapa Māori methodologies have allowed for considerations and techniques that validate my

Māori philosophy, practice and right to actively promote Māori women's importance and abilities through the restorying/reclaiming process of mana wahine. A crucial consideration for the restorying of the women in this research is my relationship through Tainui whakapapa. I would not for example feel it was my place to write about ancestresses from another iwi. I believe that work would be for those descendants to undertake or arrange for someone else to do so on their behalf.

## **Research Implications**

The phallocentric hierarchy within the recreated traditions completely loses the notion of complementarity and gender balance within Tainui (Māori) society posited by the mid-19th-century rangatira and written about by women such as Rose Pere and Ani Mikaere. Rather, as I have stated also, renderings of moral authority and sanction by the patriarchal corpus eliminated the feminine in powerful meaningful positions and instituted instead a female inferiority status. In this way, men took control of women's agency in ritual and other powerful roles and established their own priorities of appropriation based on their physical strength and biological inheritance rather than on any other attribute.

Problematic, too, in the accounts that we have is the absolute absence of a consciousness of womanly characteristics and experience. F. L. Phillips did attempt to bring such a consciousness into his account about Marama, but the rhetoric he uses to portray this is entirely negative. This absence or slanted depiction perpetuates a socio-ideological misrepresentation of women because the essence of what it is that makes a woman a woman cannot be told in the patriarchal literary retelling. It is therefore lost.

Another consequence of masculine-defined histories is another absence, that of matriarchal, matrilineal text, something that I set out to investigate early in my research (see Chapter One). I could have done more to examine this state but time and word limit meant that I could not achieve this aspect. Suffice to say, however, the loud silence on womanly matters evident in the herstories presented in this thesis makes clear the colonists, missionaries', Māori male and the elite ignoring and depreciation of matriarchal discourses. Matriarchal values stand in contradiction to patriarchal values, where hero ideology *not* heroine is the expected. Hence, the patriarchal repertoire that assumed control recognized and emphasised the characteristics of the generative power of the phallic rather than those of the female yoni. But snippets of inspiration

emanating from the latter did sneak into the colonial texts: Whakaotirangi, for example, and her leadership role, culminating in her deeds being embedded in the occupational status of Tainui people throughout Tainui lands; and Ruapūtahanga as an instigator of her own people's prosperous future through her descendants.

### **Implications for the Future**

As others before me have concluded (Dale Spender, for example), I do not believe effort to claw back positive female models and revive empowering language relative to women's herstories will occur naturally. As I have stated many times in this thesis, the oral traditions recited by the masculine portrayed men in heroic, leadership roles while Māori women comparatively either played secondary, submissive roles or were actively denigrated when depicted as doing otherwise. In short, men portrayed men in priority roles (or assumed they held such roles) while highlighting supposed deficiencies amongst women, and thereby constituting sexist reproduction of the oral traditions.

The invisibility of women and their voice in the oral traditions and the male retellings of them have been normalised. Based on the evidence, it would be right to suggest that women have conformed and become accustomed to their invisibility, accepting it as ordinary and usual. If we are to gain a more complementary/complimentary overview of our important wāhine, including the valued roles they played in our societies, we need to undertake further work that visibilises our ancestresses from the feminine view, using our language rather than that imposed by patriarchal text and worldview. When a greater population of women reopen and re-examine the herstories of their foremothers and foresisters to examine why they have been presented as they have, the places and spaces these women occupied may well be construed differently and a more equitable knowledge stand based on deconstruction of male rhetoric resolve the dearth of information that currently persists.

While women may be nervous—scared even—of a male (muscle mass) backlash (even perhaps from other women also) because women's voice may go beyond the imposed textual boundaries, it is important, I think, that woman's herstories are reset from a women's perspective. In this way the unauthentic male voice, which has been shown to be wholly sexist in its renderings anyway may become dislodged. There is more to be gained than lost from reinterpreting the feminine world and re-organising patriarchal contradictions and meanings. I

imagine a regrouping of interested women where the opportunity to wānanga, to debate, to analyze, to sing, to karakia, to cry, to karanga, to laugh and to marvel over the identities of our ancestresses would offer favourable, safe circumstances to recreate and represent their-stories. I imagine this type of environment would be an uplifting and powerful context within which to construct alternative images of our foremothers and foresisters that redefine the current hegemonic sexist portrayals of their importance on our terms.

## **Future Research**

Because of implications of inferior and superior status, the ideological patriarchal discourse of first and second wives, matāmua, junior and senior would be interesting to investigate further. These discourses are symbolic of a patriarchal view in that positions of power (a male, classist, neoliberal priority) could be seen to have been established by them, but was this actually the case? The hierarchical classist system of this kind does not fit the mould of gender complementarity (such as Māori traditionally observed) where female and male roles supported one another. The ethos of support may have meant an even stronger bond amongst those of the same gender, especially amongst wives of the same man (there would have been a lot to talk about and compare).

While some patriarchal writings present a tension between wives of the same man (see Phillips, 1995, for example), I propose that this type of rhetoric is a man-made diatribe that seeks to denigrate and overtake women's characteristics by positing that women are envious and wary of one another, especially in their competition for men. I think that these ideologies have been patriarchally constructed in order to fuel a masculine ego and to initiate suspicion amongst women for one another as part of the classic hegemonic strategy of 'divide and rule'.

If, as Dale Spender (1985, p. 119) advocates, "... reality is constructed and sustained primarily through talk" (p. 119), and if, as Rich (1979, p. 204) argues, language and naming are power, then we have at hand an understanding of how a patriarchal canon can convince itself and women that the feminine do hold to characteristics of jealousy and envy over men. Further, women will continue to be thought of as "drudges" for men, a sight that Forster (1778, p. 258) said he had witnessed during his brief observation of women during his visit to New Zealand in 1773 and Bests' (1934, p. 93) misguided or intentionally misinterpreted positioning of Māori women when he wrote: "As in most other barbaric lands, we find that women were looked upon



here as being inferior to man”. Forster’s propagation of his patriarchal observations to his British-based readership helped a patriarchal discourse about Māori women take hold. Additional research in which women’s experiences and constructions occupy the redefinitions of their reality from an untrammelled womanist world view may disseminate a new reality—one that patriarchally, because of its gender and in its haste, has missed completely, and one that may contribute to a change in how society views itself as we women step up to exercise our agency of power in order to take control of our own social, economic, political and moral authority.

### **A Final Word**

At the beginning of the journey that became my doctoral thesis, I wondered why it was that I could find little or nothing recorded about women in my whakapapa and yet could find almost the life works of many of the men. Through the critique of male organised text and deconstruction of ideologies, I have come to see the unmistakable pattern—that of women being socioeconomically, politically and sexually constructed into a space of prevailing silence so that the male account can be heard and therefore positioned as true, valid and important.

The significance of this research is that of showing how Tainui women’s oral traditions have been delivered to us problematically by the totalitarian representation. Within that representation, emancipation was unthinkable. But today, these monodimensional, monopolized and monocultural accounts are decoded by more people, male and female, who are actively seeking value systems and world views of tīpuna rather than rely on colonised texts. Decoding in womanist mana wahine terms and methodologies has allowed another view to be told. Elizabeth and Tom Burns wrote in 1973 that ideologies, as a system of imposed beliefs that support authorities of a social (and/or gendered) class do not have the same power to organize behaviour when they are unmasked (p. 14). This research joins the many other efforts, especially over the past 40 or so years, women (and some men) have made to unmask the ideologies that seek to organize or negate, for hegemonic reasons, women’s behaviour, involvement and ways of being and doing in the affairs of their societies. In its unravelling, reinvestigating and redefining of the depictions of Tainui ancestresses in the oral traditions of their iwi, the project that has been this thesis has hopefully secured a clearer understanding of these women’s importance, including their input into rituals and cultural practices. This understanding should also help support our

appreciation of Māori women—wahine toa, mana wahine—and our place in resisting patriarchal masculinist interpretations of *herstories*.

The forest remembers,  
she that walked with nobility  
that passed by in her youth  
and again in old age.  
The forest remembers her,  
she whose spirit remains.

Ko te ngahere ka mahara,  
ki tōna rangatiratanga  
i haere ake i tōna tamarikitanga  
ake anō i tōna kaumātuatanga.  
Ko te ngahere ka mahara,  
nōna te wairua noho tonu ai.<sup>96</sup>

*Ka ora pea i a koe, ka ora koe i au.*<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> Poem written by John Burns, 2006. Translated by Maria Hambrook, Te Aupōuri.

<sup>97</sup> Perhaps I survive because of you, and you survive because of me. Each member of the tribe is essential to the survival of all the others (Mead & Grove, 2001, p. 173).

## Glossary

**Aotearoa** – Indigenous name for New Zealand

**Haka** – posture dance performance

**Hapū** – be pregnant, sub-tribe

**Hineahuone** – the first woman

**Iwi** – tribal nation, collection of families related through a common ancestor, human bone

**Kai** – food, to eat

**Karakia** – chant, incantation

**Karanga** – women's ceremonial call

**Kaupapa Māori** – Māori approach, Māori agenda, Māori principles, Māori ideology

**Kōrero tuku iho** – inherited memories

**Kuia** – elderly woman

**Kuikui** – elderly woman, matriarch

**Kūmara** – sweet potato

**Kupu tuku iho** – oral history

**Mana wahine** – power and authority of Māori women

**Māori** – Indigenous people of Aotearoa, normal, fresh water

**Marae** – open area in front of meeting house

**Mihimihi** – greet, admire, respect, congratulate

**Mokopuna** – grandchild(ren), young generation

**Pākehā** – non-Māori, European people

**Papatūānuku** – earth mother

**Pōwhiri** – to welcome, beckon, wave, invite

**Tangata whenua** – Indigenous people of the land, people born of the whenua, local people

**Tangi** – wail, mourn, weep

**Tauparapara** – incantation, a type of karakia

**Te ao Māori** – the Māori world

**Te reo Māori** – the Māori language

**Te Tiriti o Waitangi** – The Treaty of Waitangi

**Tikanga** – procedure, custom, practice, habit

**Tīpuna/Tipuna** – ancestors/ancestor

**Tīpuna wāhine** – ancestress

**Upōkokohua** – literally boiled head, to curse, cuss, an insulting swear word, a very strong curse

**Wahine purotu** – handsome woman

**Wahine toa** – brave woman

**Waka** - canoe

**Whaea** – mother, aunt, female relative

**Waiata** – to sing

**Wānanga** – learning space, series of discussions, occult science

**Whakapapa** – genealogy, descent lines, to layer

**Whakataukī** – proverb, saying

**Whakatika** – to strengthen, stand up, arise, to correct, solve, fix, rectify

**Whanaunga** – kin, blood relation, relative

## Appendices

### Appendix A: Whakapapa table in Bruce's typical uppercase handwriting

LEADER OF TAINUI CANOE	
HOTUROA	= WHAKATIRANGI
HOTUHOPE	= HINZINI
HOTUMATAPU	= HINGIRAKU
MOTAI	= PARAUURU
UE	= KAHUPOKA
RAKAMAOMAO	= TAIAROHIA
KAKATI	= KURAWAKAIMUA
TAHIANGA	= MATAKURAWAKA
<del>PAUUA</del>	<del>PAUUA</del>
HAUMIA	= MAWAKE
WHATAKAI	= WHURURANGI
WHARE-KERE	= KURAWARI
WHAITA	= TAPUAEREINGA
HUIAO	= WAITURURU
KAHUTARAMOA	= TUMANAWAHOE
HEKE-I-TE-RANGI	= HEKEMARA
MAHUTA	= KIRINGAU
HERATA	= PUAKIRANGI
TAPAKE	= RAWHARANGI
TE PUTU	= PAKE-UTAWITI
TAWHIA-KI-TE-RANGI	= TAWAI
TE TUHI-O-TE-RANGI	= KIROKINO
KENEHURU	= EDWARD MEURANT
ELUIRA IZETTA MEURANT	= JOHN KELLY
OLIVE CLARE KELLY	= JOHN GORDON
ATHOL REGGIE GORDON	= GWYNETH GRIETJW KROYL
REGINALD BRUCE GORDON	= MARIE MYRTLE ANN DYER
DIANE MARGARET GORDON	= JOHN BURNS

**Appendix B: Example from Aoterangi's manuscript.**

Note Aoterangi's naming of Whakaotirangi in the first instance in relation to Tainui waka.

Ancient Maori History  
By Wirihana Aoterangi  
a chief of the Ngatitahingai tribe  
at Whaingaroa (Raglan)

No Hawaiiki Tainui Waka  
Nga tangata no raua tenei waka ko Whakaotirangi  
raua ko Hoturoa o Me timata taku korero i te  
kitetanga o tenei moutere, e nohoia nei e tatou o  
E kua ana e nga Kaumatua, he moe na Kupe ka  
kite i tana atua i a Io, e ki mai ana ki a ia  
haere e koe i te moana nui a Kiwa e tere nei,  
tikina maakatia tetahi whenua, maku e whakaatu ki a koe o  
Te Whenua o nga Turehu, o nga Mamoe o  
Ka maranga a Kupe i te moe, ka eke mai a Kupe  
ki runga i te waka ara ko Aotearoa te ingoa o te waka o  
Ko Turi te hoa, ka tae mai ki te motu nei ka kite he  
mahake nga iwi e noho ana, ara he atua atua te  
atua o nga tangata, ko nga uri o nga tangata raua te  
whenua nei i hii, ana iwi he Mamoe, he Turehu,  
Tahurangi, he Pukepokewai, he Haruamoa,  
he Patuparehe, he Turepe o ko tenei motu tana i kite  
tuatahi, no muri iho ka hae ki tea motu no te taenga  
ki reira ka tapa i te ingoa o te wahi i u atu ai

Reproduced with permission from the Auckland War Memorial Museum.



**Appendix C: My kuikui's family: Elvira Izetta Meurant, her husband John Stuart Kelly and their children**



*Top left: Kate, Sid (Leslie Kelly's father, author of *Tainui*), Mabel, Albert, Ruby*

*Front left: Revell, Wynn, Ona and Olive (my great-grandmother).*

Taken in Auckland approximately 1905.

Of this family Kate and Ruby were unmarried. Ruby was a nurse during the First World War where she served in Egypt, Bagthorpe Military Hospital, Nottingham, England and France (personal communication Tonga Kelly, 24 August, 2014).

## References

### Primary Sources

#### *Manuscripts*

- Aoterangi, W. (c.1860). *Fragments of ancient Maori history: From Kaipara to Kawhia by Wirihana Aoterangi, a chief of Ngatitahinga tribe of Whaingaroa*, collected by John McGregor (MS 8 (AWM)). Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland War Memorial Museum Library.
- G. Scholefield Collection, MS-Papers-0212. Wellington, New Zealand: Alexander Turnbull Library.
- Meurant, E. (1842–1847). *The journal and letters of Edward Meurant* (MS Papers 0188097). Wellington, New Zealand: Alexander Turnbull Library.
- Te Rangikaheke. (1849). *Tupuna: A genealogical account of some of the ancestors* (GNZ MMSS 44). Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland Libraries.
- Te Uremutu. (1846). *Some Arawa legends between 1860–1880* (Polynesian Society Papers MS-Papers-1187-191). Wellington, New Zealand: Alexander Turnbull Library.
- Te Whēoro, W. (1871). *Nga koorero onamata* (NZMSS 712). Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland Libraries.
- Te Whiwhi, M. (1851). *Genealogies and traditions* (Grey Maori Manuscripts GNZ MMSS 77). Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland Libraries.
- White, J. (1888). *Ancient history of the Maori*. Ruaputahanga: Reel 6. Notes for Ancient History of the Maori (MS Papers 75). Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand.

#### *Newspaper Articles*

- A dishonest government again defeated. (1849, December 4). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>
- A queer colonist. (1882, April 26). *Marlborough Express*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>
- Auckland and Drury railway compensation. (1866, March 2). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>



Auckland City Council. (1889, January 11). *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Auctioneer and land agent. (1851, November 25). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Carleton, H. (1852, November 30). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Carleton, H. (1853, December 23). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Colonial secretary. Auckland. (1853, October 19). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Correspondence. (1857, August 25). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Crown grants. (1855, September 18). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Death notice. (1851, November 4). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Deaths. (1879, December 8). *Auckland Star*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Departures-foreign. (1848, October 21). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Destructive fire in Parnell. (1875, March 20). *Auckland Star*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Examination of land claims. (1847, January 2). *New Zealander*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Fairfax. (2014, March 29). Patricia Grace's ancestral land escapes bulldozers. *ONENEWS*. <http://tvnz.co.nz/national-news/patricia-grace-s-ancestral-land-escapes-bulldozers>

From our own correspondent. (1879, July 9). *Otago Daily Times*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

General legislative council. (1849, August 21). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

General legislative council. (1849, August 25, 1849, August 31). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Government land purchases from Maories. (1848, October 14). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Honour to whom honour is due. (1879, July 2). *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

House of Representatives: Questions. (1876, July 27). [Christchurch] *Star*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Inquest on the late fire Parnell. (1875, March 29). *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Interpreter fees. (1845, April 19). *New Zealand Spectator and Cook's Strait Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

In the estate of Edward Meurant, deceased. (1872, June 13). *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Land sale. (1855, January 2). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Legislative Council. (1849, August 28). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Levee. (1843, December 30). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Local and general. (1879, July 15). *Wanganui Chronicle*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Luceo Non Uro. (1850, January 15). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>

Luceo Non Uro. (1852, February 17). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>

Luceo Non Uro. (1853, December 23). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>

Maori lands. (1855, January 5). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Meurant's case. (1875, May 24). *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Meurant v. Keir. (1854, December 1). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Meurant v. Keir. (1854, May 20). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Meurant v. Keir. (1854, May 23). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Meurant v. Keir. (1854, May 26). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Meurant v. Keir. (1855, February 23). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Monday, July 8. (1872, June 17). *Auckland Star*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Mr Courtney's mission in England. (1891, June 18). *Taranaki Herald*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Mr. Meurant's case and the rights of the Anglo-Maoris. (1849, August 31). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Native land agitation. (1848, September 16). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Native land court. (1875, January 5). *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Native land court. (1875, February 2). *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Native land court. (1875, May 22). *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Native land rights. (1855, June 19). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Notices. (1874, December 31). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

O'Connor, T. (2013, July 13). Crossing the Mangatawhiri, *Waikato Times*.

On colonial despotism. (1853, February 4). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Original correspondence. (1848, November 11). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Original correspondence. (1849, August 28). *New Zealander*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Parliament. (1875, September 27). *Evening Post*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Parliamentary. (1875, September 23). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Parliamentary. (1875, September 21). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Parliamentary. (1877, December 5). *Auckland Star*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Parliamentary. (1878, August 22). *Thames Advertiser*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Petition to the Queen. (1875, January 15). *Timaru Herald*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Provincial council. (1865, April 27). *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Public auction sales. (1852, May 25). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Public auction sales. (1872, June 24). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Recall of Governor Fitzroy. (1845, October 04). *New Zealander*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Sale by auction (1872, June 13). *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Samuel Cochrane & Son auctioneers. (1872, June 17). *Auckland Star*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Sir George Grey's princely charities not mentioned by "Anthropos". (1867, December, 23). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Sporting notes. (1876, December 11). *Auckland Star*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Supplementary estimates. (1878, October 30). *Thames Advertiser*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

The cost of a small railway in Auckland. (1867, March 12). *Colonist*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

The Daily Southern Cross. (1875, January 19). *The Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

The General Assembly. (1875, October 1). *Bruce Herald*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

The General Assembly. (1876, July 27). *Otago Daily Times*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

The general elections. (1876, January 11). *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

The Meurant case. (1873, October 1). Parliamentary, *Auckland Star*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

The Meurant case. (1876, August 28). Mr Swanson's Speech, *Auckland Star*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

The Meurant case. (1876, November 1). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

The Meurant case. (1878, April 20). *Thames Star*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

The Meurant case. (1878, May 31). *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

The Meurant case. (1876, August 28). *Auckland Star*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

The Meurant case. (1879, July 2). *Auckland Star*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

The Meurant case. (1879, October 6). *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

The native lands. (1848, September 23). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>

The New Zealander. (1849, August 25). *New Zealander*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>

The New Zealander. (1849, August 28). *New Zealander*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>

The public trust report. (1881, June 26). *Wanganui Herald*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>

The Southern Cross. (1852, February 17). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>

The Southern Cross. (1853, January 14). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>

Thursday, March 13. (1845, April 19). *New Zealand Spectator and Cook's Strait Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

To the editor of the Nelson examiner. (1853, January 14). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

To the nations. (1869, March 9). *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>

Untitled. (1875, February 2). *Auckland Star*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>

Untitled. (1877, March 8). *Auckland Star*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>

Untitled. (1878, April 22). *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>

Wellington. (1873, October 11). *Auckland Star*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>

Wellington. (1879, July 3). *Waikato Times*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>

Wellington special. (1879, July 1). [Christchurch] *Star*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>

Yesterday's fires. (1875, March 20). *Daily Southern Cross*. Retrieved from <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>

## **Secondary Sources**

### ***Theses and Presentations***

Colvin, G. (2009). *The soliloquy of whiteness: Colonial discourse and New Zealand's settler press, 1839–1873*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand.

Grace, P. (2008). *The world where you are*. Paper presented at the 2008 Neustadt Lecture.

Press.

- Hopa-Kuila, Ngapare. (1966). *The rangatira: Chieftainship in traditional Maori society*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oxford, United Kingdom.
- Irwin, K. (1992a). *Maori research methods and processes: An exploration and discussion*. Paper presented at the New Zealand Association for Research in Education/Australian Association for Research in Education Annual Conference, Geelong, Australia.
- Mahuika, N. (2012). *Kōrero tuku iho: Reconfiguring oral history and oral tradition*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Murphy, N. (2011). *Te awa atua, te awa tapu, te awa wahine: An examination of stories, ceremonies and practices regarding menstruation in the pre-colonial Māori world*. Master's thesis, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Nepe, T. (1991). *E hao nei e tēnei reanga: Te toi huarewa tipuna, kaupapa. Māori, an educational intervention*. Master's thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Pihama, L. (2001). *Tihei mauri ora, honouring our voices: Mana wahine as a Kaupapa Māori theoretical framework*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Prendergast-Tarena, E. (2008). *He atua, He tipua, He takata rānei*. Master's thesis, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand.
- Prendergast-Tarena, E. (2008). *He atua, He tipua, He takata rānei*. Master's thesis, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand.
- Smith, G. H. (1997). *The development of Kaupapa Māori theory and praxis*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Auckland., Auckland, New Zealand.
- Tomlins Jahnke, H. (1996). *Whaia te iti Kahurangi: Contemporary perspectives of Maori women educators*. Master's thesis, Massey University, New Plymouth, New Zealand.
- Wilson, S. (2004). *Research as ceremony: Articulating an indigenous research paradigm*. Doctoral dissertation, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.

### **Periodicals**

- Andersen, J. (1940). Maori religion. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 49(196), 511–556.
- Aswani, S. (2000). Changing identities: The ethnohistory of Roviana predatory head-hunting. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 109(1), 39–70.

- Babb, G. (1997). Paula Gunn Allen's grandmothers: Toward a responsive feminist-tribal reading of "Two Old Women". *American Indian Quarterly*, 21(2), 299–320.
- Bach, L., Luh, K., & Schult, U. (2011). "The samenesses and the differences": Representations of Māori femininities and sexualities in Ngahuia Te Awekotuku's short story collections *Tahuri* (1989) and *Ruahine-Mythic Women* (2003). *Women's Studies Journal*, 25(2), 26–42.
- Belich, J. (2012). European ideas about Maori. In *Te Ara, the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*, updated 9 November 2012. Retrieved from [http://www/TeAra.govt.nz/en/european-ideas-about-Maori](http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/european-ideas-about-Maori).
- Best, E. (1893). Te patunga o Ngarara-Huarau. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 2(4), 216.
- Best, E. (1925). Maori agriculture: The cultivated food plants of the natives of New Zealand, with some account of native methods of agriculture, its ritual and origin myths. *Dominion Museum*, 9(9), 47–119.
- Best, E. (1931). Maori agriculture. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 40(157), 1–22.
- Biggs, B. (1987). Counterpoint in Maori culture: A book review. *Pacific Studies*, 10(3), 138–142.
- Billig, M. (1990). Rhetoric of social psychology. In I. P. J. Shotton (Ed.), *Deconstructing social psychology* (pp. 47–59). London, UK: Routledge.
- Binney, J. (1987). Maori oral narratives, Pakeha written texts: Two forms of telling history. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 21(1), 16–28.
- Bishop, R. (1998). Freeing ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research: A Maori approach to creating knowledge. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(2), 199–219.
- Bradbury, B. (1995). From civil death to separate property: Changes in the legal rights of married women in nineteenth-century New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of History*, 29(1), 40–66.
- Buck, P. (1926). The value of tradition in Polynesian society. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 35(139), 181–203.
- Case of widow Meurant (1854, July 13). *New Zealand Parliamentary Debates*, July 13, 220–223.
- Coleman, J. (2012). The "inferior" sex in the dominant race: Feminist subversions or imperial apologies? *Feminist Review*, 102, 62–78. Available online at [www.feminist-review.com](http://www.feminist-review.com).
- Colenso, W. (1881). Contributions towards a better knowledge of the Maori race. *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute*, 14, 41–42.



- Colvin-McCluskey, G. (2008). The historical politics of the New Zealand half-caste. *MAI Review*, 3(Article 7), 1–11.
- Duarte, F. (2007). Using autoethnography in the scholarship of teaching and learning: Reflective practice from the “other side of the mirror”. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 1(2), 1–11.
- Ellis, C., Adams, T., & Bochner, P. (2011). Autoethnography: An overview. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 12(1), 1–18.
- Fox, K. (2012). Matriarchs, moderates and militants: Press representations of indigenous women in Australia and New Zealand. *Intersections: Gender and Sexuality in Asia and the Pacific*, 28, 1–13.
- Gordon-Burns, D., & Taonui, R. (2011). Whakaotirangi: A canoe tradition. *He Pukenga Korero: A Journal of Maori Studies*, 10(2), 10–18.
- Graham, G. (1919). The account of Kupe and Tainui. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 28(110), 111–116.
- Graham, G. (1949). Pare Hauraki-Pare Waikato. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 58(2), 68–76.
- Graham, G. (1951). Tainui. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 60(1), 80–92.
- Gudgeon, W. E. (1903). The whence of the Maori. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 12(45), 57.
- Gunson, N. (1987). Sacred women chiefs and female “headmen” in Polynesian history. *Journal of Pacific History*, 22(3), 139–172.
- Hamlin, J. (1842). On the mythology of New Zealanders. *Tasmanian Journal of Natural Science*, 1, 254–342.
- Henige, D. (1988). Oral, but oral what? The nomenclatures of orality and their implications. *Oral Tradition*, 3(1–2), 229–238.
- Heuer, B. (1969). Maori women in traditional family and tribal life. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 78(4), 448–494.
- Irwin, K. (1988). Maori, feminist, academic. *Sites*, 17(Summer), 30–39.
- Jenkins, J., & Pihama, L. (2001). Matauranga wahine: Teaching Maori women’s knowledge alongside feminism. *Feminism & Psychology*, 11(3), 293–303.

- Jenkins, K., & Matthews, K. (1998). Knowing their place: The political socialisation of Maori women in New Zealand through schooling policy and practice, 1867–1969. *Women's History Review*, 7(1), 85–105.
- Kana, F., & Tamatea, K. (2006). Sharing, listening, learning and developing understandings of kaupapa Māori research by engaging with two Māori communities involved in education. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 12, 9–20.
- Kelly, L. (1955). Cook Islands origin of the Maori. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 64, 180–196.
- Malcolm-Buchanan, V. (2008). Oral histories, mythologies and indigeneity in Aotearoa-New Zealand. *MAI Review*, 1(1), 1–15.
- Mikaere, A. (1999). Colonisation and the imposition of patriarchy: A Ngāti Raukawa woman's perspective. *Te Ūkaipō*, 1, 34–49.
- Mita, M. (1994). Trick or treat: Issues of feminism and post-colonialism in relation to the arts. *Te Pua*, 3(1), 37–41.
- Nahe, H. (1880). History of the Tainui migration. *Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives of New Zealand*, 2(G-8), 3–6.
- Nguyen, M. T. (2011). The biopower of beauty: Humanitarian imperialisms and global feminisms in an age of terror. *Signs*, 36(2), 359–383.
- Patton, M. (1999). Myths as normative frames for qualitative interpretation of life stories. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 5, 338–352.
- Pickles, K., & Wanhalla, A. (2010). Embodying the colonial encounter: Explaining New Zealand's "Grace Darling", Huria Matenga. *Gender & History*, 22(2), 361–381.
- Pihama, L. (2010). Kaupapa Māori theory: Transforming theory in Aotearoa. *He Pukenga Kōrero*, 9(2), 5–14.
- Pihama, L., Cram, F., & Walker, S. (2002). Creating methodological space: A literature review of kaupapa Maori research. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 26(1), 30–43.
- Ralston, C. (1987). Sanctity and power: Gender in Polynesian history. *Journal of Pacific History*, 22(3), 115–122.
- Ravenel, F. (1913). George Sand: A law unto herself. *North American Review*, 198(697), 849–863.

- Reilly, M. (1989). John White: The making of a nineteenth-century writer and collector of Maori tradition. *New Zealand Journal of history*, 23(2), 157–172.
- Reilly, M. (1995). An ambiguous past: Representing Maori history. *New Zealand Journal of History*, 29(1), 19–39.
- Robertson, J. B. W. (1956). Genealogies as a basis for Maori chronology. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 65(1), 45–53.
- Robertson, J. B. W. (1957). The role of tribal tradition in New Zealand prehistory. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 66, 249–263.
- Robertson, J. B. W. (1958). The significance of New Zealand tribal tradition. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 67(1), 39–57.
- Robertson, J. B. W. (1962). The evaluation of Maori tribal tradition as history. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 71(3), 293–309.
- Robertson, J. B. W. (1966). Tradition and history: A plea for methodology in the study of tradition. *Journal of the Whakatane and District Historical Society Incorporated* (Memoir No. 3).
- Rountree, K. (1998). Maori bodies in European eyes: Representations of the Maori body on Cook's voyages. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 107(1), 35–60.
- Rountree, K. (2000). Re-making the Maori female body: Marianne William's mission in the Bay of Islands. *Journal of Polynesian History*, 35(1), 49–66.
- Simmonds, N. (2011). Mana wahine: Decolonising politics. *Women's Studies Journal*, 25(2), 11–25.
- Smedley, A., & Smedley, B. (2005). Race as biology is fiction, racism as a social problem is real: Anthropological and historical perspectives on the social construction of race. *American Psychologist*, 60(1), 16–26.
- Smith, S. P. (1893). The coming of Te Arawa and Tainui. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 2(4), 231–233.
- Smith, S. P. (1907). History and traditions of the Taranaki Coast. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 16(4), 189–208.
- Smith, S. P. (1908). History and traditions of the Taranaki Coast. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 17(3), 111–148.

- Tarakawa, T. (1893). The coming of Te Arawa and Tainui canoes from Hawaiki to New Zealand. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 2, 231–241.
- Te Awekotuku, N. (1989). Ngahuia Te Awekotuku. *Broadsheet*, December/January, 14–19.
- Te Awekotuku, N. (2001). Hinemoa. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 5(1–2), 1–22.
- Te Whēoro, W. (1880). Translation of extract from the history of the migration of Tainui. *Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives*, 2, G-6.
- Te Whetu. (1893). How Ngarara-Huarau was killed. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 2, 215–219.
- Tomlins Jahnke, H. (2002). Towards a secure identity: Maori women and the home-place. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 25(5), 503–513.
- Vansina, J. (2009). Is a journal of method still necessary? *History in Africa*, 36, 421–438.
- Wanhalla, A. (2011). Interracial sexual violence in 1860s New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of History*, 45, 1.
- Waylen, Georgina. (2012). Gender matters in politics. *Political Quarterly*, 83(1), 24–32.
- White, J. (1880). Legendary history of the Maoris. *Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives of New Zealand*, I, G-08, 2–5.

### ***Books and Chapters in Books***

- Bachofen, J. J. (1973). *Myth, religion, and mother right: Selected writings of J. J. Bachofen* (R. Manheim, Trans.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Baehr, Amy R. (2007). Liberal feminism. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (Fall 2012 ed.). Available online at <http://www.science.uva.nl/~seop/archives/fall2008/entries/feminism-liberal/>
- Ballara, A. (1993). Nahe, Hoani. In C. Orange (Ed.), *The dictionary of New Zealand biography* (Vol. 2, pp. 342–344). Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books.
- Ballara, A. (1998). *Iwi*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- Ballara, A., & Tapsell, P. (1996). Tarakawa, Takaanui Hohaia 1852–1919. In C. Orange (Ed.), *The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography* (Vol. 3, pp. 498–500). Auckland, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books.
- Banton, M. (1967). *Race relations*. London, England: Tavistock Publications.
- Barrett, M. (Ed). (1979). *Ideology and cultural production*. London, UK: Croom Helm.

- Bateman, D. (1997). *New Zealand historical atlas*. Auckland, New Zealand: David Bateman.
- Belich, J. (1996). *Making peoples: A history of the New Zealanders*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Bell, D. (1987). Dealing with inequality: Analysing gender relations in Melanesia and beyond. In M. Strathern (Ed.), *The politics of separation* (pp. 112–129). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bell, D. (1993). *Daughters of the dreaming* (2nd ed.). St Leonards, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Best, E. (1924). *Maori religion and mythology*. Wellington, New Zealand: Government Printer.
- Best, E. (1934). *The coming of the Maori*. Wellington, New Zealand: Maori Purposes Fund Board.
- Biggs, B. (1960). *Maori marriage: An essay in reconstruction*. Wellington, New Zealand: The Polynesian Society.
- Binney, J., & Chaplin, G. (2011). *Ngā mōrehu the survivors: The life histories of eight Māori women*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books Ltd.
- Buddle, T. (1851). *The aborigines of New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Williamson and Wilson.
- Buick, T. (1911). *An old New Zealander: Te Rauparaha*. Christchurch, New Zealand: Whitcombe & Tombs.
- Burckhardt, J. (1998). *The Greeks and Greek civilisation* (S. Stern, Trans). London, UK.
- Burns, E., & Burns, T. (Eds.). (1973). *Sociology of literature and drama*: Hammondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Burr, V. (1995). *An introduction to social constructionism*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Burr, V. (1998/2002). *Gender and social psychology*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Byrnes, G. (1993). Smith, Stephenson Percy 1840–1922. In C. Orange (Ed.), *The dictionary of New Zealand biography* (Vol. 2, pp. 470–471). Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books.
- Césaire, A. (1972). *Discourse on colonialism* (Joan Pinkham, Trans). New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Colenso, W. (1865/2001). *On the Maori races of New Zealand*. Christchurch, New Zealand: Kiwi.

- Cooper, J. A. (1988). *A voice from the south*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Cruise, R. (1957). *Journal of a ten months' residence in New Zealand "1820"* (A. G. Bagnall Ed.). Christchurch, New Zealand: Pegasus Press.
- Dalley, B., & Robertson, Y. (1994). *Unsexed women*. Dunedin: New Zealand: University of Otago.
- Denzin, N. (1989). *Interpretive biography*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.). (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dieffenbach, E. (1843). *Travels in New Zealand; with contributions to the geography, geology, botany, and natural history of that colony* (Vol. 1 & 2). London, UK: John Murray.
- Diner, H. (1965). *Mothers and Amazons: The first feminine history of culture* (J. P. Lundin, Trans.). New York, NY: Julian Press.
- Dines, G., & Humez, J. (2011). *Gender, race, and class in media: A critical reader*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dowling, P. (Ed.). (2004). *Reed New Zealand atlas* (3rd ed.). Auckland, New Zealand: Reed.
- Du Plessis, R., & Alice, L. (Ed.). (1998). *Feminist thought in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Edwards, M. (1990). *Mihipeka: Early years*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Edwards, M. (2002). *Mihipeka, call of an elder: Karanga a te kuia*. Wellington, New Zealand: Roger Steele.
- Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Fairclough, M. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. New York: Routledge.
- Firth, J. C. (1890). Nation making: A story of New Zealand. In *New Zealand Electronic Texts Collection* (pp. 52–60). Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University of Wellington.
- Forster, J. (1778). *Observations made during a voyage round the world, on physical geography, natural history, and ethic philosophy*. London, UK: G. Robinson.
- Frisch, M. (1991). *A shared authority: Essays on the craft and meaning of oral and public history*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Froman, R. (1974). *Racism*. New York, NY: Delacorte Press.

- Froman, R. (1977). *Racism*. New York, NY: Delacorte Press.
- Gilmartin, M., & Kofman, E. (2004). Critically feminist geopolitics. In L. Staeheli, E. Kofman, & L. Peake, (Eds.), *Mapping women, making politics: Feminist perspectives on political geography* (pp. 113–125). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gobineau, Arthur, comte de. (1915). *The inequality of the human races*. London, Great Britain: Heinemann.
- Graham, G. (1923). *Fragments of ancient history by Wirihana Aoterangi. Translated by G. Graham*. Auckland, New Zealand: Champtaloup & Edminston.
- Graham, G. (1927). *He kohikohinga o nga whakatuki me nga whakapapa me etahi atu pito o nga matauranga o nehe rawa*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland Institute and Museum Library,
- Greer, G. (1970). *The female eunuch*. London, UK: Granada.
- Greer, G. (1986). *The madwoman's underclothes: Essays and occasional writings*. London, UK: Picador.
- Greer, G. (2000). *The whole woman*. London, UK: Anchor.
- Grey, G. (1853). *Ko nga moteatea, me nga hakirara o nga Maori*. Wellington, New Zealand: Robert Stokes.
- Grey, G. (1854). *Ko nga mahina a nga tupuna Maori: Mythology & traditions of the New Zealanders*. London: George Willis.
- Grey, G. (1855). *Mythology and traditions of the New Zealanders*. Grey collection (MSY-2078). Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland Libraries.
- Grey, G. (1857). *Ko nga whakapepeha me nga whakaauareka a nga tipuna o Aotearoa*. Capetown, South Africa: Saul Solomon.
- Grey, G. (1928). *Nga mahi a nga tupuna*. New Plymouth, New Zealand: Thomas Avery & Sons.
- Gunn Allen, P. (1986). *The sacred hoop: Recovering the feminine in American Indian traditions*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Gunn Allen, P. (1992). *The sacred hoop: Recovering the feminine in American Indian traditions*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Hammond, T. G. (1924). *The story of Aotea*. Christchurch, New Zealand: Lyttelton Times.
- Hankin, C. (Ed.). (1981). *Life in a young colony: Selections from early New Zealand writing*. Christchurch, New Zealand: Whitcoulls.

- Hannaford, I. (1996). *Race: The history of an idea in the West*. Washington, DC: The Woodrow Wilson Center Press.
- Heilbrun, C. (1988). *Writing a woman's life*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Henige, D. (1982). *Oral historiography*. London, UK: Longman.
- Henry, A. (2010). Foreword. In C. Robinson, and Clardy, P (Ed.), *Tedious journeys: Autoethnography by women of color in academe* (pp. ix–xii). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- hooks, b. (1982). *Ain't I a woman: Black women and feminism*. London, UK: Pluto
- Hopa-Kuila, Ngapare (1988). The anthropologist as tribal advocate. Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato.
- Hsiao-Yen, Peng (2006). Colonialism and the predicament of identity: Liu N'ou and Yang Kui as men of the world. In Liao Ping-Hui & David Der-Wei Wang (Eds.), *Taiwan under Japanese colonial rule, 1895-1945* (pp. 210-247). New York, Chichester: Columbia University Press.
- Irwin, K. (1992b). Towards theories of Maori feminism. In R. Du Plessis (Ed.), *Feminist voices: Women's studies text for Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 1–21). Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Jacobus, M. (Ed). (1979). *Women writing and writing about women*. London, UK: Croom Helm in association with Oxford University Women's Studies Committee.
- Jenkins, K. (1988). *Working paper on Māori women and social policy* (Vol. 3). Wellington, New Zealand: Royal Commission on Social Policy.
- Johnston, P. M. (1998). Māori women and the politics of theorising difference. In R. Du Plessis & L. Alice (Eds.), *Feminist thought in Aotearoa New Zealand: Connections and differences* (pp. 29–36). Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, Te Hurinui P. (1945). *Mahinarangi: The moon-glow of the heavens. A Tainui saga*. Hawera, New Zealand: J. C. Ekdahl.
- Jones, Te Hurinui P., & Biggs, B. (1995). *Nga iwi o Tainui*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
- Kellner, D. (2011). Cultural studies, multiculturalism, and media culture. In G. Dines & J. M. Humez (Eds.), *Gender, race, and class in media: A critical reader* (pp. 7-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.



- Kelly, L. (1949). *Tainui: The story of Hoturoa and his descendants*. Wellington, New Zealand: The Polynesian Society.
- King, M. (2007). *The Penguin history of New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Macdonald, C., Penfold, M., & Williams, B. (Eds.). (1992). *The book of New Zealand women: Ko kui mā te kaupapa*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books.
- Mackay, D. (1990). Colenso, William 1811–1899. In C. Orange (Ed.), *The dictionary of New Zealand biography* (Vol. 1, pp. 87–89). Wellington, New Zealand: Allen and Unwin.
- McCulloch, G. (2011). Historical and documentary research in education. In L. M. Cohen Lawrence & K. Morrison (Eds.), *Research methods in education* (pp. 248–225). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mead, H., & Grove, N. (2001). *Ngā pēpeha a ngā tīpuna*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- Mead, M. S. (1997). *Landmarks, bridges and visions: Aspects of Maori culture*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- Metge, J. (1990). *Te Kohao o te ngira: Culture and learning*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Mikaere, A. (2003). *The balance destroyed: Consequences for Maori women of the colonisation of tikanga Maori*. Auckland, New Zealand: The International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education.
- Mikaere, A. (2011). *Colonising myths, Māori realities*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers and Te Tākapu, Te Wānanga o Raukawa.
- Miles, R. (1982). *Racism and migrant labour*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Miller, J. (1958). *Early Victorian New Zealand: A study of racial tension and social attitudes 1839–1852*. Westport, CT: Oxford University Press.
- Moreton-Robinson, A. (2002). *Talkin' up to the white woman: Aboriginal women and feminism*. Brisbane, QLD, Australia: University of Queensland Press.
- Morrison, T. (1992). *Playing in the dark: Whiteness and the literary imagination*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ogunyemi, C. O. (2006). African womanism. In L. Phillips (Ed.), *The womanist reader* (pp. 21–36). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Olsson, S (Ed.). (1989). *Woman-sight: A collection of stories*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Nagare Press.
- Orbell, M. (1985). *The natural world of the Maori*. Auckland, New Zealand: William Collins.
- Orbell, M. (1991). *Hawaiki: A new approach to Maori tradition*. Christchurch, New Zealand: Canterbury University Press.
- Orbell, M. (1995). *The illustrated encyclopaedia of Māori myth and legend*. Christchurch, New Zealand: Canterbury University Press.
- Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pere, R. (1987). To us the dreamers are important. In S. Cox (Ed.), *Public and private worlds: Women in contemporary New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: Allen & Unwin.
- Pere, R. (1994). *Ako: Concepts and learning in the Maori tradition*. Wellington, New Zealand: Te Kohanga Reo National Trust Board.
- Phillips, F. (1989). *Nga tohu a Tainui. Landmarks of Tainui. A geographical record of Tainui traditional history* (Vol. 1). Auckland, New Zealand: Tohu.
- Phillips, F. (1995). *Nga tohu a Tainui: Landmarks of Tainui* (Vol. 2). Auckland, New Zealand: Tohu.
- Phillips, L. (Ed.). (2006). *The womanist reader*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Polack, J. S. (1838). *New Zealand: Being a narrative of travels and adventures*. London, UK: Bentley.
- Pōmare, M. (1934). *Legends of the Maori*. Wellington, New Zealand: Harry H. Tombs Limited.
- Portelli, A. (1998). Oral history as genre. In M. Chamberlain & P. Thompson (Eds.), *Narrative history as genre* (p. 23). Hillsdale, NJ: Transaction.
- Potter, J. (1997). *Representing Reality: Discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. London, UK: Sage.
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Reed-Danahay, D. (Ed.). (1997). *Auto/ethnography: Rewriting the self and the social*. Oxford, UK: Berg.
- Rei, T. (1993). *Māori women and the vote*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.

- Rei, T. (1998). Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Māori women, and the state. In R. A. Du Plessis, (Ed.), *Feminist thought in Aotearoa New Zealand: Connections and differences* (pp. 198–207). Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Rich, A. (1979). *On lies, secrets and silence: Selected prose: 1966–78*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Rusden, W. S. (1895). *History of New Zealand* (Vols. 2 and 3, 2nd ed.). Melbourne, VIC, Australia: Melville, Mullen & Slade.
- Russ, J. (1984). *How to suppress women's writing*. London, UK: Women's Press.
- Ryburn, H. J. (1979). *Te Hemara: James Hamlin 1803–1865. Friend of the Maoris*. Dunedin, New Zealand: H. J. Ryburn.
- Ryburn, H. J. (1980). *James Hamlin*. Dunedin, New Zealand: Presbyterian Historical Society.
- Salmond, A. (1992). *Two worlds: First meetings between Maori and Europeans, 1642--1772*. Honolulu, Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press.
- Sayers, J. (1982). *Biological politics: Feminist and anti-feminist perspectives*. London, UK: Tavistock.
- Schein, L. (1977). All men are misogynists. In J. Snodgrass (Ed.), *For men against sexism: A book of readings* (pp. 69–74). Albion, CA: Times Change Press.
- Schiebinger, L. (1993). *Nature's body: Gender in the making of modern science*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Silver, D. B. (1990). Carleton, Hugh Francis. In C. Orange (Ed.), *The dictionary of New Zealand biography* (Vol. 1, pp. 70–71). Wellington, New Zealand: Allen & Unwin.
- Simmons, D. (1976). *The great New Zealand myth*. Wellington, New Zealand: A. H. & A. W. Reed.
- Simmons, D. (1987). *Maori Auckland*. Auckland, New Zealand: Bush Press.
- Sissons, J. (1993). Best, Elsdon 1856–1931. In C. Orange (Ed.), *The dictionary of New Zealand biography* (Vol. 2). Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books.
- Smith, L. T. (1988). Maori women: Discourses, projects and mana wahine. In S. Middleton & A. Jones (Eds.), *Women and education in Aotearoa* (pp. 28–30). Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams.
- Smith, L. T. (1990). *Mana wahine, mana Maori: A case study/report*. Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland.

- Smith, L. T. (1992). Maori women: Discourses, projects and mana wahine. In S. Middleton (Ed.), *Women and education in Aotearoa* (pp. 33–51). Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London, UK: Zed Books.
- Smith, L. T. (2006). *Mātauranga taketake, traditional knowledge: Indigenous indicators of well-being—perspectives, practices, solutions*. Auckland, New Zealand: Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga.
- Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London, UK: Zed Books Ltd.
- Smith, S. P. (1910). *History and traditions of the Maoris of the west coast, North Island of New Zealand, prior to 1840*. New Plymouth, New Zealand: The Polynesian Society.
- Sole, T. (2005). *Ngāti Ruanui: A history*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.
- Sorrenson, M. (1978). *Some modern Maori myths and legends*. Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland.
- Sorrenson, M. (Ed.). (1986–1988). *Na to hoa aroha: From your dear friend: The correspondence between Sir Apirana Ngata and Sir Peter Buck, 1925–50*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
- Sorrenson, M. (1990). *Maori origins and migrations*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
- Spender, D. (1982). *Women of ideas and what men have done to them: From Aphra Behn to Adirenne Rich*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Spender, D. (1985). *Manmade language* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Spender, D. (1989). *The writing or the sex? Or why you don't have to read women's writing to know it's no good*. New York, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Spurr, D. (2002). *Joyce and the scene of modernity*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
- Staeheli, L., & Kofman, E. (2004). Mapping gender, making politics: Toward feminist political geographies. In L. Staeheli, E. Kofman, & L. Peake L. (Eds.), *Mapping women, making politics: Feminist perspectives on political geography* (pp. 1–13). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Stokes, E. (1988). *Mokau: Maori cultural and historical perspectives*. Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato.
- Stoltenberg, J. (1977). Toward gender justice. In J. Snodgrass (Ed.), *For men against sexism: A book of readings* (pp. 74–83). Albion, CA: Times Change Press.
- Te Awekotuku, N. (1991a). *Mana wahine Maori: Selected writings on Maori women's art, culture and politics*. Auckland, New Zealand: New Women's Press.
- Te Awekotuku, N., & Nikora, L. (2007). *Mau moko: The world of Māori tattoo*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Te Whēoro Te Morehu Maipapa Wiremu. (2011). In *The Encyclopaedia of New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: Government Printer.
- Thomas, N; Guest, H., & Dettelbach, M. (Eds.). (1996). *Observations made during a voyage round the world*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Thomson, A. (1859). *The story of New Zealand: Past and present, savage and civilized* (Vol. 1). Albemarle Street, London: John Murray.
- Tulloch, S. (Ed.). (1993). *Reader's Digest/Oxford complete wordfinder*. London, UK: Readers Digest Association.
- Vaerting, M., & Vaerting, M. (1923). *The dominant sex: A study in the sociology of sex differentiation*. London, UK: George Allen & Unwin.
- Vansina, J. (1985). *Oral traditions in history*. London, UK: James Currey.
- Walker, A. (1983). *In search of our mothers' gardens*. London, UK: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Walker, R. (1978). The relevance of Māori myth and tradition. In M. King (Ed.), *Tihe Mauri Ora: Aspects of Maoritanga*. Auckland, New Zealand: Methuen.
- Walker, S. (1996). *Kia tau te Rangimarie: Kaupapa Maori theory as a resistance against the construction of Maori as the other*. Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland.
- Wanhalla, A. (2013). *Matters of the heart: A history of interracial marriage in New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
- Wastl-Walter, D., & Staeheli, L. (2004). Territory, territoriality, and boundaries. In L. Staeheli, E. Kofman, & L. Peake (Eds.), *Mapping women, making politics: Feminist perspectives on political geography* (pp. 141\_151). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Waugh, P. (1989). *Feminine fictions: Revisiting the postmodern*. London, UK: Routledge.

- Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimization of exploitation*. Hertsfordshire, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- White, J. (1887–1890). *The ancient history of the Maori, his mythology and traditions: 1887–1890*. Wellington, New Zealand: Government Printer.
- Williams, H. (1992). *Dictionary of the Maori language*. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Education.
- Williams, H. (2001). *Dictionary of the Maori language*. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Education.
- Woolf, V. (1929/1972). Women and fiction. In L. Woolf (Ed.), *Collected essays of Virginia Woolf* (Vol. 2, pp. 141–148). London, UK: Chatto and Windus.

### **Websites**

- Alexander, B. (2006). *Autoethnography*. Retrieved from [http://www.rc.usf.edu/~aheindel/Qual\\_6\\_AutoEthnography.htm](http://www.rc.usf.edu/~aheindel/Qual_6_AutoEthnography.htm)
- Archives New Zealand. (2013). *Blue Books: Statistics information 1840–1855*. Retrieved from <http://archives.govt.nz/events/blue-books-statistics-information-1840-1855>
- Ballara, A. (2012). *Te Rangihaeata*. Retrieved from <http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/1t63/te-rangihaeata>
- Barstow, R. C. (1902). *The cyclopedia of New Zealand*. Retrieved from <http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-Cyc02Cycl-t1-body1-d1-d61-d7.html>.
- Boxer, E. (2012, July, 1). Elise Boxer: Religion and politics in the United States. Retrieved from: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M7s\\_lmyPxjQ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M7s_lmyPxjQ)
- Biggs, B. (1966, 22 April 2009). *Maori myths and traditions*. Retrieved from <http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/1966/maori-myths-and-traditions/page-3>
- Birth, deaths and marriages*. Retrieved from <http://www.myheritage.com/site-69398651/hogan>
- Brazendale, G. (2012). Whiteley, John. In *The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*. Te Ara Encyclopedia of New Zealand, updated 2-Apr-2014: <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/biographies/1w20/whiteley-john>
- Diener, B. (2013). Retrieved from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Helen\\_Diner](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Helen_Diner)

- Flores, L. (2012). *What is social construction?* Retrieved from <http://oakes.ucsc.edu/academics/Core%20Course/oakes-core-awards-2012/laura-flores.html>
- Göttner-Abendroth, H. (1999). The structure of matriarchal societies. *ReVision*, 21(3), 31. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hlh&AN=1593472&site=ehost-live>
- McKee, A. (2002). Textual Analysis. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9780857020017.n1>
- Müller, Mary-Ann. (1966). *The Encyclopaedia of New Zealand*. Retrieved from <http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/1966/muller-mary-ann>
- O'Leary, J. (n. d.). *Tableaux of queerness: The ethnographic novels of John White*. Retrieved from <http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-OLeTabl.html>
- Pre-1839 foreigners in New Zealand: Meurant family*. (2013). Retrieved from <https://sites.google.com/site/pre1839settlersinnz/home/notes/meurant-family>
- Roche, T. (2013). *Maraea Kautawhiti Thoms*. Retrieved from <http://www.geni.com/people/Maraea-Kautawhiti/6000000008781522256>
- Rogers, L. (1966). *Ohinemuri Regional History Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.ohinemuri.org.nz/journal/06/foreword.htm>
- Scott, G. (2007). *Te Wheoro, Wiremu Te Moehu Maipapa? 1895*. Retrieved from <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/biographies/1t87/1>
- Shopes, L. (2002). *What is oral history? From the making sense of history matters: The US survey course on the web*. Retrieved from <http://historymatters.gmu.edu/mse/oral/>
- Sinclair, K. (2007). *Grey, George*. Retrieved from <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/biographies/1g21/1>
- Smedley, A. (2007). *The history of the idea of race ... and why it matters*. Retrieved from <http://www.understandinginrace.org/resources/pdf/disease/smedley/.pdf>
- Stade, K. (2008). *Suffragists: Mary Ann Muller and Kate Edger*. Retrieved from <http://www.theprow.org.nz/society/suffragettes/#.UvfNcM7-vws>
- Swanson, W. (1902). The Hon. William Swanson. *The cyclopedia of New Zealand*. Retrieved from <http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-Cyc02Cycl-t1-body1-d1-d7-d2.html>
- Tate, J. (2003). *Pre-Wi Parata: Early native title cases in New Zealand*. Retrieved from <http://www.nzlii.org/nz/journals/WkoLRev/2003/6.html>

- Taylor, R. (1855). *Te Ika a Māui*. Retrieved from  
<http://www.enzb.auckland.ac.nz/document?wid=477&page=0&action=searchresult&target>
- The case of Mrs. Meurant. (1875). *Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives of New Zealand, Session I*, G08. Retrieved from <http://atojs.natlib.govt.nz>
- Van Dijk, T. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis*. Retrieved from  
<http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Critical%20discourse%20analysis.pdf>
- Whiteley, J. (1862, September 2). *Letter to Governor George Grey*. Retrieved from  
[http://www.aucklandcity.govt.nz/dbtw-wpd/msonline/images/manuscripts/GLNZ/PDFs/web\\_GLNZ\\_W34.9.pdf](http://www.aucklandcity.govt.nz/dbtw-wpd/msonline/images/manuscripts/GLNZ/PDFs/web_GLNZ_W34.9.pdf)
- Wilson, J. A. (1907). *The Story of Te Waharoa: Sketches of ancient Maori life and history*. Retrieved from  
<http://www.enzb.auckland.ac.nz/document?wid=832&page=0&action=searchresult&target>