

HAERE MAI ME TUHITUHI HE PUKAPUKA;
MURI IHO KA WHAWHAI AI TĀTOU:
READING TE RANGIKĀHEKE

By Arini May Loader

(Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Whakaue, Te Whānau-a-Apanui)

A thesis presented to the Victoria University of Wellington
in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Māori Studies

Te Kawa a Māui/School of Māori Studies
Te Whare Wānanga o te Ūpoko o te Ika a Māui/
Victoria University of Wellington

December 2008

NGĀ MIHI

Tuatahi, ki ngā kaiwhakarite o te karahipi e kiia nei ko Tū Horomata nō Te Tari o te Toiahurei kei Te Whare Wānanga o te Ūpoko o Te Ika a Māui, me ngā kaiwhakarite o te karahipi e kiia nei ko Philippa rāua ko Morvyn Williams. Ka nui aku mihi ki a koutou mō te pūtea tautoko kia tutuki pai ai tēnei mahi.

Many thanks also to the librarians of the Special Collections Section of Auckland Public Library, particularly Iain Sharp and Kate De Courcy, who supplied photocopies of the manuscripts and were very friendly and helpful. Your assistance was greatly appreciated.

Tuarua, ki taku kaiārahi a Alice Te Punga-Somerville. Nāu anō te mana, te ihi, te wehi kia whakaputa tēnei ki te whaiao, ki te ao mārama nā reira e te kohine o Te Āti Awa, e mihi ana, e mihi ana.

Tēnei hoki te mihi ki a koutou te tokomaha i whakapau kaha ki te whakawhitiwhiti whakaaro, ki te tautohetohe, ki te wānanga, ā, ko koutou tērā te hunga pūkenga, te hunga tauira hoki o taku whānau o Te Herenga Waka.

Tuatoru, ki taku whānau tata, nā koutou hoki tēnei mahi. Ki a kōrua ōku mātua a Hera rāua ko Mikaere, ki a koe hoki taku tino taonga a Te Tāhiwi. Nā koutou anō tēnei mahi, nā taku tāne tata a Hēmi hoki.

Kāti, ka huri ahau ki te koroua a Wiremu Maihi Te Rangikāheke nō Rotorua. E koro, mīharo kē ana ahau ki te titiro i āu pukapuka i ēnei tau, i tēnei ao rerekē. Kei te ora tonu āu pukapuka ake, ake tonu atu.

ABSTRACT

This thesis reads Te Rangikaheke's texts through the editorial, Te Arawa and biographic dimensions of the writer and the texts. Te Rangikaheke was a prolific nineteenth century writer who produced over 800 pages of manuscript material.¹ Although he has enjoyed a moderate amount of scholarly attention, this has tended to focus on attribution, cataloguing and tracing publication, transcription and translating, commentary on authenticity and literary quality and his account of history.

Specifically, the first core chapter explores issues concerning the editing of Te Rangikaheke's manuscripts by Governor George Grey and the effects of Grey's editing decisions on the texts. This chapter explores the nature of the relationship between Grey and Te Rangikaheke, the effects of this relationship on Te Rangikaheke's texts, and what the dualities of Pākehā/Māori and Governor/Native might mean in terms of the texts. Responding to the calls of American Indian Literary Criticism for studies of Indigenous topics to engage deeply with the contexts of iwi and place, the second core chapter looks at Te Rangikaheke as an Arawa writer and explores issues around identity and articulating an Arawa literary history. Finally, a biography of Te Rangikaheke elaborated from previously known and new biographic details combined with a close reading of his name and three of Te Rangikaheke's letters.

Ultimately, it is anticipated that this thesis will forge new pathways into in the study of Wiremu Maihi Te Rangikaheke and his writing, and that these new pathways will clear some much needed space in which a deeper analysis of Te Rangikaheke's writing can be articulated. Furthermore, beyond its focus on a single writer, this thesis extends the scholarship on nineteenth century Māori writing, Māori historical studies, and Māori intellectual history and in this way speaks to a contemporary Indigenous intellectual agenda.

¹ Curnow, Jenifer, 1983. Wiremu Maihi Te Rangikaheke: His Life and Work. Unpublished MA Thesis. University of Auckland.

PREFACE

For the purposes of the ease of reading and in following current written standards for te reo Māori, macrons have been added to all quotes taken from Te Rangikāheke's manuscripts and letters where known. Where the pronunciation is not known macrons have been left off.

This work contains a great deal of content in te reo Māori that has not been translated. A glossary is not included as part of this thesis as it is felt that a bilingual Māori-English reading is preferable over a monolingual Māori or English one and this thesis is also not intended as a beginners guide to te ao Māori. The following dictionaries and websites will, however, be of use to the mono-lingual English reader or to those less familiar with Māori culture and customs:

Moorfield, John C., 2005. *Te Aka: Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index*. Auckland: Pearson Longman.

Ngata, H. M., 1993. *English-Maori Dictionary*. Wellington: Learning Media.

Ryan, P. M., 1997. *The Reed Dictionary of Modern Māori*. Auckland: Reed.

Williams, Herbert W., 1971. *A Dictionary of the Maori Language. 7th Edition*. Wellington: Government Printer.

<http://www.reotupu.co.nz/helicon.vuw.ac.nz/wslivewakareo/default.aspx>

<http://www.maoridictionary.co.nz/index.cfm?dictionaryKeywords=t%C4%81taki&n=>

<http://www.learningmedia.co.nz/nd/index.htm>

ABBREVIATIONS

Manuscripts:

GNZMA	Grey Māori Letters, Auckland Public Library
GNZMMSS	Grey Māori Manuscripts, Auckland Public Library

Niupepa Māori:

TeK	Te Korimako
TeKM	Te Karere Maori
TeWM	Te Waka Maori o Niu Tirani
TeWI	Te Waka o te Iwi
TeW	Te Wananga

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Ngā Mihi</u>	2
<u>Abstract</u>	3
<u>Preface</u>	4
<u>Abbreviations</u>	5
<u>Table of Contents</u>	6
<u>Chapter 1</u>	7
<i>Muri iho, ka kamo ōku kanohi</i> Dreams/Visions/Matakite	
<u>Chapter 2</u>	35
<i>Kotahi anō te tupuna o te tangata Māori</i> Editing Te Rangikāheke's manuscripts; Editing People	
<u>Chapter 3</u>	58
<i>Kātahi ka tuaina a Te Arawa</i> Te Arawa Literary Nationalism	
<u>Chapter 4</u>	75
<i>Tā Te Rangikāheke ko Wiremu Maihi</i> Revisioning Te Rangikāheke – A Biographical Treatment	
<u>Chapter 5</u>	98
<i>Mā ngā uri ki muri nei</i> Conclusion	
<u>References</u>	100

Muri iho, ka kamo ōku kanohi

Dreams/Visions/Matakite

Takoto rawa iho ki te pō e huihui mai ō tātou wairua, kia piri, kia tata mai ki taku kiri...

The words of mōteatea often begin with the originator composing themselves for sleep, drawing close to their ancestors, and mingling with them while moving into an altered state of consciousness. In this state dreams, visions, and passions flow freely to merge with the physical realm which is realised in the creation of the song. I posit that the act of writing an academic thesis is similarly an act that necessitates a process of initial mental and physical preparation, connection with tupuna, and movement to a different space. Before I start work I allow myself the space to dream, to think, to mingle.

On the 27th of August 1850, Wiremu Maihi Te Rangikāheke (Ngāti Rangiwewehi, Ngāti Kererū) lay on his bed thinking about the things which he would be visiting the Governor to discuss. After a while his eyes closed. He saw a group of people whom he could not clearly distinguish as being either Māori or Pākehā walking with a dog. Whichever the case, whether the people walking are Māori or Pākehā, the people tell him that they want to do battle with him. Te Rangikāheke suggests that they discuss the matter first and fight later, but these people instead suggest that a document be written and that they should then fight. The document was written, they do battle, and Te Rangikāheke wins killing both the people and the dog.

The dream continues with Te Rangikāheke coming to the edge of the ocean where some people are on a bridge and others are below it. He sees tables standing there with paper, pens, and inkwells and one of the people tells him to go to a table and write his views on the battle that has just finished and the battle that is about to begin. Te Rangikāheke asks what the cause of this next battle is to which the person replies

Mō ērā kua mate i a koe me te kurī hoki, nā reira ka whakatika hoki ōna whanaunga kia patua rawatia koe hei utu mō ērā atu (GNZMMSS 93:2).

It will be fought over those whom you have killed, together with the dog. The relatives of those people will arise to destroy you, in revenge for their death (1968:10) (Translation by Orbell).

Te Rangikāheke accepts the person's reply and writes his version of the battle while they write theirs. He then asks how many of them will be fighting him to which they reply that if he kills four of them, they will let loose another dog to attack him. They then urge him again to write after which they fight. The dream ends with Te Rangikāheke having killed the first two people of this second group of people in his dream.

After recording his dream thus, Te Rangikāheke continues writing, describing his dream as a vision of the future from the spirit world. He notably remarks on the killing of the dog and on those whom he now refers to as the Pākehā in the first battle

He kurī te mea i patua ai, ā, ko te whakahauhau tēnei o taua kurī i te patunga ai e ahau. Ko ngā Pākehā i patua i te tuatahi, kāore he whakahauhau i ērā; i patua huhua-koretia ērā e au (GNZMMSS 93:3).

Te Rangikāheke explains that he killed the first dog as it had been commanded to attack him but that the people were killed unnecessarily as they had not been commanded to attack him. He then includes the following matakite which directly addresses the Governor

E te Kāwana e,
Ehara i ahau.
Nā tāua tahi
I kawē ki waenga te tahora
Ki reira kukume mai ai
Kii ki-i-a-a! (GNZMMSS 93:3).

Although the language of the Te Rangikāheke's matakite above is both metaphorical and cryptic the underlying message is one of shared accountability, responsibility, and blame. The crux of the matter is that they are both at fault, or dually accountable for something that has happened, or will happen. Additionally, Te Rangikāheke might here be understood to represent the wider Māori community and the Governor transversely the wider Pākehā community in which case the overarching theme is one of racial conflict and the shared accountability to this conflict of both parties.

The importance of writing about these conflicts is a central theme that runs through the dream. Te Rangikāheke relates that the first group of people he does battle with tell him to write before they fight, and the second group of people tell him to write his views on the preceding battle that has just finished as well as the battle that is about to begin. Te Rangikāheke's writing of the battles within his dream is accorded as equal importance as the battles themselves. This relationship between writing and conflict in Te Rangikāheke's dream brings to the fore issues around writing and conflict, and the recording of history.

This emphasis on the writers of history was touched on by Dr. Aroha Harris in her address at He Rau Tumu Kōrero: Māori Historians Symposium 2008 held at Waikato University, where she demonstrated the importance of who tells the story with an Igbo whakataukī:

Until lions have their own historians, tales of the hunt shall always glorify the hunter.

Where Indigenous voices have often been historically silenced by the grand colonial machine, this whakataukī speaks to the importance of oppressed peoples having their own storytellers to tell their stories. Acts of Indigenous storytelling by Indigenous storytellers are crucial in restoring some semblance of counter-balance to the colonial narratives that are fraudulently constructed and perpetuated by those who would wrestle mana from Indigenous Peoples. Orbell notes that Te Rangikāheke '...was far-sighted enough to fear for the future' (1968:8) which, combined with his recording of his dream, suggests that Te Rangikāheke realised the potential importance of his writing in terms

of the grand survival narrative of the Māori. This is particularly significant considering that Te Rangikāheke wrote this letter in 1850 before the balances of power and demographics shifted from Māori to Pākehā, though not altogether surprising given the fact that one estimate has the European population increasing over tenfold from about 2,050 at the beginning of 1840 to 22,108 in 1850 (McLintock 1966:821). Te Rangikāheke's dream suggests that he was aware of the Pākehā population explosion and the resulting power imbalances unfolding on the tangata whenua of Niu Tirenī.¹

Te Rangikāheke's dream also reframes the act of writing. This is illustrated in Te Rangikāheke's dream when he is told to write his views on the battle that has just finished and the other battle that is about to begin. Te Rangikāheke is instructed in his present within the dream to write about the past and the future, of his past battle as well as the one yet to come. Through Te Rangikāheke's adhering to these instructions, the act of writing is shown to transcend time and therefore exist out of time as opposed to physical events that exist in real time. In a slightly surreal way, the very act of my writing this thesis about Te Rangikāheke and his writing is living proof that Te Rangikāheke's writing does indeed transcend time. As his writing at this point in his dream provides an intermediary link between the past and future, so too does Te Rangikāheke's entire known body of written work provide a link between his life and times, and researchers and writers today.

Moreover, even as the central concern of this thesis is reading Te Rangikāheke, I argue that Te Rangikāheke does this work himself in the manuscript mentioned above, in his recording of a dream. He explores his deeper consciousness while simultaneously writing about writing, and writing about conflict within writing about conflict. I posit that through his writing of his dream, Te Rangikāheke produced one reading of himself, one reading of a possible infinity of which this thesis is another.

¹ Interestingly, Te Rangikāheke uses *Niu Tirenī*, a transliteration for *New Zealand* taken from the English language, four times in GNZMA 723 to refer to this land as a country. It was popularly used in the nineteenth century. The name *Aotearoa* more commonly used to denote this land as a country in the present day appears to be a more modern construction. Further study on the use of the name *Aotearoa* lies beyond the scope of this thesis and is an area into which more research is required.

Background

Wiremu Maihi Te Rangikāheke was born in about 1815, when Māori was the predominant language of New Zealand, and died in 1896 (Curnow 1983). He was somewhat of a controversial figure in the early social and political landscape of Niu Tirenī whom D.M. Stafford describes as, ‘one of the more turbulent characters of Te Arawa...’ (1967). He supported the Government in the land wars, was opposed to the Māori Kīngitanga movement, and stood for election in a European constituency where he polled 10 votes of the 616 cast. He was also a skilled Māori orator and leader is now generally acknowledged to have had a profound knowledge of Māori lore and tradition (Stafford 1967).

Another facet of Te Rangikāheke’s life, and the one for which he is remembered most today, is writing. He was literate in the Māori language and was probably taught by Thomas Chapman, who set up the Church of England Mission Station in Rotorua in 1835, and/or his assistants Mr Philley and Mr Morgan (Curnow 1983:13). Curnow attributes 21 entire manuscripts to Te Rangikāheke and a further 17 to which he contributed. She also notes 10 letters and addresses totalling together over 800 pages (1983:37) hence he is now understood as being a prolific writer of his time. These manuscripts encompass such varying aspects of Māori culture as te reo, whakapapa, pakiwaitara, traditional stories and history, political commentary, tikanga, mōteatea/waiata and whakataukī, and letters and addresses (Kerr 2006:79). It should be noted, however, that he was by no means the only Māori writer of his time. Indeed, Māori were not slow to embrace the new Pākehā technology of writing, to subdue it, and master it to meet their needs and requirements.² The bulk of Te Rangikāheke’s impressive writing portfolio emerged against this swelling collective body of nineteenth century Māori writing that was both socially and politically driven. Māori scribes such as Te Whatahoro Jury (Ngāti Kahungunu) recorded Māori traditions as dictated to him by Te Matorohanga (Ngāti Kahungunu) (Parsons 1990:214), and other Māori such as Mātene Te Whiwhi (Ngāti Toarangatira, Ngāti Raukawa) (Kerr 2006:80), Piri Kawau (Te Āti Awa) (Kerr 2006:76), and Hohepa Paraone

² For more on Indigenous Peoples’ subversion of the written word see van Toorn 2006.

(Te Arawa) (Simmons 1966:365) wrote down traditional stories in manuscript form.

Another one of the important early Māori literary phenomenon's was the Niupepa Māori, the 'Māori newspapers' that were published during the second half of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth century. Some 35 periodicals were published by government agencies, the Churches, and Māori who were opposed to government policies and sought to unite the different iwi for political and social reasons (Orbell 2002:9). These niupepa gave Māori the opportunity to publish obituaries, to post public notices such as invitations to hui, to participate in national and international discussion forums, and to generally share and disseminate kōrero.³ Letters to the editor, to friends, relatives, the government, the Queen and others were also being written by Māori many of which are currently held at various libraries around Aotearoa/New Zealand and the world and in private ownership.

Te Rangikāheke was an active participant in this wider literary scene in nineteenth century Aotearoa/New Zealand who, although the bulk of his writing is on Māori traditions, customs, and history, also wrote letters to the Queen, the Governor, other friends and associates, and the niupepa Māori. As well as writing letters across a diverse group of intended recipients, a brief survey of his letters to the niupepa Māori illustrates the diverse matters in which he was interested. These range from securing a shoemaker for Arawa iwi (TeKM 1862), to the opening of a new whare (TeW 1875a), Aotearoa/New Zealand politics (TeW 1875b), and a contemporary land dispute between iwi of Te Arawa and Ngā Puhī (TeWI 1857).

The context from which Te Rangikāheke's writing emerged is thus notable for the great volume of Māori writing that was being produced at the time. Not only were interested people from other, mainly European cultures writing about Māori, Māori were writing about Māori, Pākehā, and other local and international topics of interest and most of this was written and published in their Indigenous language, te reo Māori. This context in which Te Rangikāheke produced his writing contrasts markedly to today when Māori

³ For more commentary on the niupepa Māori see Curnow et.al 2002; Orbell 2002; Paterson 2004; and Curnow et.al 2006.

writers are few and even fewer write in te reo, and telecommunications have superseded many formerly written forms of communication and information dissemination.

An extensive collection of Te Rangikāheke's written work was variously acquired by Sir George Grey, a somewhat larger than life historical figure who shared a professional life with Te Rangikāheke for four years.⁴ Grey, most popularly remembered as an autocratic colonial administrator and Governor-in-Chief of South Australia, New Zealand, and the Cape Colony (South Africa), took it upon himself to learn te reo Māori and about Māori customs and culture out of a sense of duty to the Indigenous Māori people of Aotearoa/New Zealand (Grey 1855:iii-iv). He enlisted the help of various Māori and Pākehā around Niu Tirenī to write about all facets of Māori culture and send these to him. Grey studied the manuscripts he was sent or given to learn te reo Māori and about Māori culture and beliefs. It was in this capacity of assisting Grey that Te Rangikāheke produced the greater part of his writing, in the years 1849-1854 (Curnow 1983:16).

Te Rangikāheke recorded Māori whakataukī, waiata, traditions, beliefs, and customs for Grey and enjoyed an amicable relationship with him through at least the last four years of his first governorship of Niu Tirenī. When Grey took leave of Niu Tirenī to take up the governorship of the Cape Colony, Te Rangikāheke was chosen to deliver Ngāti Whakaue's farewell address on 15 December 1853 (Davis 1955:1, cited in Curnow 1983:21).

After Grey left, Te Rangikāheke's life took other more overtly political and public turns. He was in government employ for nearly 20 years variously holding the positions of Clerk of Works, Clerk at Maketū, Clerk of the Circuit Court and Land Purchase Agent in Rotorua and Maketū (Curnow 1983:24-25). He also figured highly in Arawa politics although his views, particularly his support of government road-making were not always popular (Curnow 1983).

After leading a very public and highly mobile life Te Rangikāheke retired to Mokoia where he lived from 1890 to 1895 and there, according to his

⁴ Belich notes that of all the colonial governors New Zealand has had, Grey looms by far the largest in both history and myth (1996:190).

grandson, became insane (Curnow 1983:31).⁵ In 1895 he was taken to Awahou where he died during the night of 2 February 1896.

The Scope of the Thesis

Of the academic work that pays attention to Te Rangikāheke and his work, none figures more highly than that of Jenifer Curnow. Curnow wrote her 1983 Master of Arts thesis in Māori Studies (University of Auckland) on Te Rangikāheke and his work, and includes in her dissertation a biography, description and attribution of his manuscripts, a discussion of his account of history, and a descriptive inventory of his manuscripts (1983). Two years later Curnow also published a revised and abridged version of her Māori Studies MA Thesis in the *Journal of the Polynesian Society* (1985) and in 1990 wrote the entry for Te Rangikāheke in *The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography* (New Zealand Department of Internal Affairs 1990). The majority of the following summary of the work done thus far on Te Rangikāheke and his manuscripts is taken from Curnow's 1983 thesis.

When Grey departed New Zealand in 1853 to take up his appointment of Governor of the Cape Colony he took the manuscripts he had collected during his first governorship of New Zealand with him and there worked on them with W.H.I. Bleek (Curnow 1983:1). Bleek published a catalogue of Grey's collection in 1858 and attributes ten manuscripts to Te Rangikāheke by name, adding on occasion the description 'a chief of the Rotorua district' or 'a New Zealand chief' (Curnow 1983 1-2). Grey subsequently presented all his library to the South African Public Library at Cape Town and all the New Zealand books and manuscripts were sent there in 1861 (Curnow 1983:2).

After visiting the Cape Town Library in 1906 and proceeding to investigate Grey's Māori manuscript material, H.W. Williams published an article in *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* that describes the contents of Bleek's catalogue (Williams 1906:176-80). As noted by Curnow, Williams

⁵ Te Rangikāheke moved between Rotorua, Auckland, Whāngārei, Mangawhai, Tauranga, and Maketū and possibly visited Wellington, and Waikato before 'retiring' to Mokoia and finally Awahou (Curnow 1983).

draws attention to the 'striking' manuscripts of Te Rangikaheke with their clear writing and admirable punctuation; he pointed out that the prose matter in the appendix to *Nga Moteatea* was mainly derived from Te Rangikaheke and was sparingly edited, although the same material in *Nga Mahinga a nga Tupuna Maori* had been 'freely handled' by Grey (Curnow 1983:2). All the New Zealand matter from Grey's library was returned to New Zealand in 1922-23 and it has since been accessible to the general public.

In her thesis Curnow notes that three kinds of work have been conducted on Te Rangikāheke's manuscripts. She lists these as being attribution, cataloguing and tracing publication, transcription and translation, and commentary on authenticity and literary quality (1983:2). These are each in turn further described below.

Simmons examined the manuscripts to discover the sources of Grey's *Nga Mahi a Nga Tupuna* (1928 edition). He pointed out the contributions of Te Rangikāheke to sections of the published work and concluded that Te Rangikāheke was the author of at least a third of the 198 pages (Curnow 1983:3). Simmons's *Catalogue of the Grey Maori Manuscript Collection in the Auckland Public Library* (1976:413-420) attributes three manuscripts in addition to those already attributed by Bleek (Curnow 1983:3). McRae's *Grey Maori Manuscripts, Descriptive Catalogue* (1981) attributes a further nine manuscripts to Te Rangikāheke (Curnow 1983:3).

Curnow notes that a number of Te Rangikāheke's manuscripts have been transcribed and translated and that Biggs transcribed two entire manuscripts, *Tiki-Tawhito-Ariki* and *Mode of Obtaining a Wife* (1952:183-191; 1970:85-97), most of *Nga Tama a Rangi* (1964:43; 1966:449-50; 1970:1-4; 1980:66-73) and part of Commentary on *Nga Moteatea; The Legend of Hinemoa* in collaboration with Hohepa, Mead, Land, and Cullen (1967:62-73; 1980:43-46) (1983:3). Curnow (1983:3) notes that Biggs also transcribed *Waiata Haka Oriori* from this last manuscript as well (1953:67-7). Orbell transcribed two short but entire manuscripts, *A Dream* and *A Letter* (1968:8-12).

Curnow notes that the authenticity of Te Rangikāheke's account of the origin of the universe and of man was confirmed by Biggs who, in discussing Te Rangikāheke's *Nga Tama a Rangi* concluded that, 'All early accounts from

whatever area or tribe confirm the general validity of the Rangikāheke version' (1966:448, cited in Curnow 1983:3). Although the authenticity of Te Rangikāheke's writing for Grey had been questioned by Smith (1899:257) who claimed that as Te Rangikāheke had never been educated as a priest many Arawa elders considered his work pokanoa or unauthorised, leaving out much detail (Curnow 1983:4). Curnow also notes that Tākanui Tarakawa commented similarly when pointing out the omission of a detail of tribal history (1909:44, cited in Curnow 1983:4). Stafford, however attributes this comment of Tarawaka's to jealousy and he also points to the large amount of evidence Te Rangikāheke gave in the Māori Land Court which showed his 'superior knowledge of things Māori' (1967:362).

As again noted by Curnow (1983:4), in addition to Williams's comments (cited above) some brief commentary has been made on the quality of Te Rangikāheke's writing by Cooper (1851:128) who noted that the manuscript was 'well-written and interesting', Biggs (1952 179-80) who wrote that he 'deserves to be remembered for the quality and quantity of the manuscripts on Maori matters...', and Orbell (1968: 8-9) who, commenting on his literary style, describes him as 'a talented and gifted writer whose work was 'a unique blend of the old and new' (Curnow 1983:4).

Curnow notes that there has been less attention paid to Te Rangikāheke's life but that two of his contemporaries in addition to Cooper refer to him (1983:5). Davis describes him as the speaker chosen to give the farewell address from Te Arawa to Governor Grey (1855:1) and Lady Martin records meeting him in Auckland in 1842-3 (1884:19) and again at the end of 1858 (1884:49).

Curnow also notes that other biographical information is added by Simmons (1966:179) who tells us Te Rangikāheke's iwi and gives a date for his death, 1893 (Curnow 1983:5). Stafford, in his comprehensive history of Te Arawa gives a description of Te Rangikāheke as being a controversial figure, a skilled orator, and a man with a profound knowledge of Māori lore and tradition (1967:361). He also makes a number of references to Te Rangikāheke in his account of Arawa history in the 1860s and 1870s, and refers to a letter which says that Te Rangikāheke was in the Native Office in Auckland (1967:520, cited in Curnow 1983:5).

In the twenty-five years since Curnow's MA research about Te Rangikāheke's life and work first appeared, no other work on his manuscripts or substantial study on his writing has appeared. This thesis draws on and extends Curnow's ground breaking and substantial work but departs from it in the following ways; firstly, this thesis is presented as a holistic work wherein the major themes of the work are woven throughout the entire work, that is, rather than presenting sections that are notable for their differences in tone, methodology, and aims, this thesis makes the relationships between each of the chapters overtly. This concern with relationship is underpinned by the Māori methodology of whakapapa that is employed in this work. Secondly, this thesis anchors itself in the disciplines of Literary Studies and Māori Studies and so is informed by and speaks to current theory and debates in both of these respective disciplines. This multi-disciplinary work is made possible through using whakapapa as a methodology and therefore is also able to move fluidly between the two disciplinary fields of enquiry. Finally, this study is guided by contemporary Indigenous concerns in its method as much as its resulting findings.

What is the significance of this project?

In introducing his eulogy on William Apess (Osage), the Native American literary scholar Robert Warrior lays the foundations of his approach

...through a consideration of his work and the emergent picture of the context in which he did that work, I hope not only to illuminate the life and career of this significant nineteenth-century Native voice, but to show how his life and work speak to a contemporary Native intellectual agenda (2005:2).

This thesis similarly seeks to not only explore who Te Rangikāheke was but to also articulate a relationship between who he was and what he did, and current Māori intellectual aspirations. This is as much a response to calls from kaupapa Māori research methodology theorists for Māori research to be relevant and have value for Māori communities, as it is from wider

Māori/Indigenous theorists such as Linda Tuhiwai-Smith (1999) who calls for all Indigenous research to be relevant and have real value for Indigenous communities. Although Te Rangikāheke's texts were written over one hundred years ago, via close reading and critical exploration of these texts this thesis seeks to illuminate and forge connections between some of the ideas that our ancestors took the time to think up and develop that can help our sovereign Indigenous nations move into the future millennia with confidence. To be clear, this thesis is not a historical work as such – it is part of a larger work in progress in which Indigenous communities seek futures for themselves and their descendents through finding ways of overcoming their respective experiences of colonisation, and reconfiguring existing foundations for future development.

This method of looking to our past to help us through our contemporary issues is nothing new to te ao Māori. As Te Ahukaramū Charles Royal (Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Tama-te-ra, Ngā Puhi) states

Contrary to what some critics may say about the rejuvenation of traditional knowledge ('going backwards'), the revitalisation of traditional knowledge is as much about understanding our future as it is about our past (2005:4).

Royal points out that some critics of Indigenous Peoples' insistence on seeking their traditional knowledge's see this as focussing too much on the past rather than on their more pressing and immediate presents and futures. Indigenous Peoples rather see their traditional knowledge's as being imperative in helping them and their communities in seeking healthy, sustainable futures. This notion is grounded in the confidence that comes from knowing where you come from, the greater legacy of which you are part, and what creative contributions your ancestors made to their communities that might inspire you. Similarly, through this study I hope to draw more critical attention to Te Rangikāheke and his singularly impressive body of work while simultaneously moving to expressly elucidate connections between Te Rangikāheke's work and contemporary Māori concerns.

Whakapapa as a methodological framework

The traditional Māori structure of whakapapa is a framework through which relationships between all known phenomena are able to be articulated. In modern times it is most commonly used to discover and articulate kinship relationships between people. Being bound by relationships allows for diversity within certain logical restraints, and growth within particular socially defined limitations. It is also important to note that whakapapa is not only a tool that tracks origins as it allows both vertical and horizontal movements, through past and present generations and also across them. Metaphorically speaking, whakapapa might therefore be understood as a koru that, from its self-defined centre, progresses circularly outwards running both vertically up and down generations and horizontally across generations. The chapters in this thesis share whakapapa that similarly transcends multifarious generational boundaries and enables discussion to move fluidly between Te Rangikāheke and his work from the nineteenth century on the one hand, and contemporary Indigenous concerns on the other. This mobility inherent in whakapapa, that allows it to move temporally between generations and spatially across generations, is critical to one of the ultimate aims of this study, that is, to speak to a contemporary Indigenous agenda.

In 1998, Charles Royal, delivered his keynote address to Te Oru Rangahau Māori Research and Development Conference at Massey University which introduced a theory that posits whakapapa as a research methodology as developed thus far by the faculty of Te Wānanga-o-Raukawa. Royal offers a synopsis of Te Wānanga o Raukawa's thinking in regards to whakapapa as a research methodology thus far beginning with the notion that

Whakapapa is an analytical tool traditionally employed by Māori to understand the following (not an exhaustive list):

- the nature of phenomena
- the origin of phenomena
- the connections and relationships to other phenomena
- describing trends in phenomena
- locating phenomena
- extrapolating and predicting future phenomena (1998:80-81)

This thesis draws on and extends Royal's work and incorporates the notion of 'whakapapa as a methodology' as the underlying methodological framework upon which the fairly diverse chapters are interrelated to each other and inform each other. The respective natures of Te Rangikāheke and his writing, their origins, relationships to other phenomena, the trends or themes in each, the locating and positioning of each and imagining future possibilities are all explored through the framework of whakapapa.

Royal adds that the central idea of whakapapa is that two phenomena come together to give birth to a third phenomenon or that all phenomena arise from two antecedent, parental phenomena (1998:80). This idea enables me to think about whakapapa as possessing the dual properties of logic and, seemingly paradoxically, creativity. Whereas the process of one phenomenon coming together with another phenomenon to create a new phenomenon is logical, the new phenomenon created does not equal the sum parts of its parental phenomena but is a new creation in and of itself. The chapters of this thesis are similarly organised whereby the antecedent chapter lends multiple strands of DNA to the chapter in question thus laying skeletal foundations from which it can develop in its own independent way. The chapters thereby stretch outwards from their common origin picking up particular strands from the previous chapter/s and developing them further. Their relationships to each other are immutable via their common origin, but they have the freedom to grow and develop the one from the other with the notion that '...all phenomenon come from an organic source and come to be through an organic process' (Royal 1998:80) being foremost; the subsequent chapter is lent strands of understanding by the preceding chapter, but is crucially a new creation in and of itself.

In addition, the notion of whakapapa as a methodological framework is useful in considering the relationships between the chapters in that whakapapa has scope but there are also certain limits to that scope. One of these limitations is that the further removed someone is positioned from a given ancestor or relative, the more tenuous their whakapapa link to that same ancestor or relative. In other words, there exists a continuum from prominent to less prominent lines of whakapapa depending on which line is privileged, and the requisites of the relationship being articulated. The line that this

thesis privileges that follows through the editing of Te Rangikāheke's manuscripts, to Te Rangikāheke's Arawatanga in his manuscripts, to Te Rangikāheke the person enables exploration and discussion of Te Rangikāheke and his work with its wider accompanying requisites. These requisites in this thesis are writing in te reo Māori, in the nineteenth century, in Niu Tirenī, by Wiremu Maihi Te Rangikāheke. Many other possible relationships have the potential to be brought to the fore and explored but there is not the space to articulate these within the confines of this thesis.

As again with whakapapa, certain lines are privileged as they are motivated by a particular issue which in turn has its own accompanying implications. Some past instances of possible motivations for privileging whakapapa have been claims of mana whenua, mana tupuna, and mana motuhake, with their accompanying implications for other whānau members in the whakapapa. This privileging of particular lines over others allows for multiple 'tellings' to be heard and multiple stories to be told and explored, and given different weight and emphasis as the given, often temporally defined, circumstances require.

Accordingly, the focus on editing in chapter 2 takes its impetus from current debates in Māori Studies concerning the quality of Māori language resources and those texts which are held up as exemplars of te reo Māori. As te reo Māori is a critically endangered language, its future survival is heavily dependent on a large quantity of good quality Māori language resources. Historical texts figure largely in current revitalisation attempts as they have been in the past and continue to be held up as examples towards which te reo learning should aim.

Similarly, the focus on iwi literary theory in chapter 3 is motivated by arguments for Māori history to exist exclusively within the tribal conceptual framework coupled with the calls of Native American Literary theorists for studies of Indigenous topics to engage deeply with the contexts of iwi and place (Womack 1999; Justice 2006; Weaver et.al 2006; Womack et.al 2008).⁶ This discussion is timely in the current globalisation environment where strong pushes for amalgamation from the worlds' 'superpowers' are felt the world

⁶ See Keenan 2008.

over. It is unclear where Indigenous Peoples' are positioned on the world stage. What is clear is that many if not all Indigenous Peoples have the voices and the capacity to engage in these larger conversations and to articulate and push for recognition of their tino rangatiratanga.

The fourth chapter privileges the essential yet often perhaps understated whakapapa of a human being, a physical person fixed in time and space without which none of the current, past, or future scholarship on their work would be possible. In a wider overview the line privileged throughout the entire thesis is broadly defined as 'reading Te Rangikāheke', that is, reading Te Rangikāheke's texts, but also reading his life. It is important to remember that the three lines of whakapapa being privileged as chapters in this thesis are not the only possible combinations through which interesting and critical discussions about Te Rangikāheke and his work might be had. They have, however, been privileged in this work with the underlying motivation in mind of how this work might best speak to contemporary Māori concerns of physical, mental, and spiritual tino rangatiratanga. Thus, the final core chapter of this thesis looks to the future. It also reminds us that individual futures are important too; they are important as individual futures combine to make community futures. The lines privileged in whakapapa are never as simple as they may seem and it is equally as important to remember who is not mentioned as who is.

My own concern about the relationships between the chapters arises directly from their diversity: they may present themselves as three randomly selected portions of the Te Rangikāheke pie. The socio-political issues raised in the first chapter around editing as a metaphor for colonisation, for example, constitute a notably different conversation to the second chapter which takes its lead from current literary criticism. The third biographical chapter is different again with Te Rangikāheke the person being the central focus. However, these three chapters do specific work and are integral to this thesis as a whole; they are not interchangeable nor are they replaceable. Whakapapa allows for diversity and moreover expects it; as with the birth of a child produced by their mother and father, the new life is again, not the sum parts of its parents, but is a new creation in and of itself. This creativity inherent in whakapapa, rather than somehow making the idea of whakapapa

less robust and sound as a framework, is essential to its wide ranging potential for expansion and inclusion and invites imagination. The chapters of this thesis share whakapapa, each offering their own individual personalities with their own intelligence, charm, and originality.

Language Issues

Te reo Māori lies at the heart of this thesis; all of Te Rangikāheke's manuscripts read and sighted for this work are written in te reo and there is currently no information available to suggest that Te Rangikāheke ever wrote in English. I nonetheless choose to write this thesis in English. The reasons for my doing so are many and varied and range from the personal, to the critical, to the political. The following is a brief discussion of the language issues that underpin this thesis which is not intended to be a pre-prepared foil to critics of the language choices made in this study, but rather to foreground the language landscape in which this study is located, lending full weight to its many complexities and nuances.

To begin on a personal level, I consider myself to be a competent reader of te reo Māori texts, listener of te reo Māori in its myriad forms, and survival conversationalist, that is, someone who can hold basic conversations in te reo. My journey began as a baby in kapa haka, after which I floundered in high school, to swing full circle at university and study te reo feverishly. But when it came to this thesis I chose to write in English. Where te reo is my Native language, English is my first language; at my current stage of te reo reclamation, I can not write an explorative, critical, theoretical thesis in te reo Māori. Where my knowledge of te reo Māori enables me to critically engage with Te Rangikāheke's texts, my knowledge of English enables me to discuss it. Which is not to say that te reo Māori as a language does not possess the lexical or grammatical tools to do this work, but rather that I am not satisfied that I currently possess the required tools in order to do the work well. Rather than risk this study on Te Rangikāheke and his work being presented in a 'dumbed down' form because my language abilities in te reo do not work in

harmony with my thought processes, the decision was made to write in English.

It is also useful to draw on theory from the discipline of Comparative Literature when discussing the language interface between English and Māori in this thesis that works with Te Rangikāheke's texts in their original language, but uses another language to do the critical work on them. The discipline of Comparative Literature shows us that it is not necessary to work in translation when working with texts across languages and that rather than labouring under translation one language must necessarily be used to write "across" the languages of the texts being studied (Bernheimer 1995, Saussy 2006). Furthermore, both the language of the texts being studied and the language employed in the critical work of this thesis intercept and interact at multiple junctions in often surprising ways that facilitate a complementary relationship. The ultimate result of this language interplay is that readers who have good knowledge of both te reo Māori and te reo Pākehā will enjoy a richer and more nuanced reading of this work than those whose expertise is limited to either one or the other.

This thesis uses a multi-disciplinary approach in order to address some of the current gaps in the biographical and literary study of Wiremu Maihi Te Rangikāheke which draws on both my undergraduate training in English Literature and my post-graduate training in the study of te reo Māori. Being based in Māori Studies, where academics, many of whom have trained in different disciplines converge and collaborate with the culture of a People guiding their shared, assumed philosophies, has allowed me to combine my research interests in te reo Māori and literature and do critical work with Māori text in its original language, te reo Māori. Charles Royal similarly explores what he calls '...the weaving of knowledge and experience across domains of knowledge and the boundaries articulated for disciplines' as one of the three key themes in his paper 'Exploring Indigenous Knowledge' (2005 1-20). Royal argues that this 'knowledge weaving'

...arises from the notion that indigenous knowledge is 'holistic' in the sense that knowledge is interconnected and relational in the same way that all life is interconnected and relational (2005:4).

Royal posits that where all life is connected through relationships with whakapapa, so too is knowledge. The multi-disciplinary approach taken in this thesis is therefore consistent with the underlying methodology of this study, whakapapa, in that whereas the academic disciplines of Māori Studies and English Literature are distinct disciplines in their own right, they also have relationship potential. The potential of this particular aforementioned relationship is one of the disciplinary relationships that is realised in the creation of this thesis.

There are also many politically motivated issues that surround the choice of writing in te reo Māori or English that present themselves differently in accordance with varying spatial and temporal historical contexts. The most central of these concerns to Māori scholars writing in 2008 are the revitalisation efforts currently being expended on te reo Māori. While not demanding that all writers with a good command of te reo Māori write in Māori, the late Dr. Hirini Melbourne advocated that writers with good te reo Māori skills do so in order to increase the chances of survival for the Māori language (1991:130). This issue is more pertinent than ever in 2008 when the continuing survival of te reo Māori as a living language hangs in the balance. My intention is not to disparage the many and varied current te reo Māori revitalisation efforts occurring around Aotearoa/New Zealand and beyond in my writing of this thesis in English, nor is it to create a counter-argument to serve and defend this same choice. I do, however, assert that the issues are complex and that there are more interesting ways to talk about why we write in English that need not be reduced to a straightforward choice depending on whether or not one supports te reo Māori revitalisation.

Firstly, it is important to note that Te Rangikāheke himself is central to the question of whether to write in Māori or English. In one letter he writes with vigour of the trappings of a Pākehā feast (GNZMMSS 723) and in another, he marvels at the generosity of the Governor in giving him four shillings, three figs of tobacco, a Jew's harp, and a pipe (GNZMMSS 45:939). Te Rangikāheke's enthusiasm for things Pākehā is palpable in his writing and furthermore provides a springboard for the discussions presented in this thesis by way of including some shared English language contextual windows into a specifically English cultural frame of reference. This context is invited by the

writer himself in his writing about things Pākehā in te reo Māori. The English language used in this thesis to discuss the Māori language material being studied overlaps with the text at specific entry points of context as offered by the writer. The English language is therefore employed as an extension of Te Rangikāheke's writing in te reo Māori that advances richer readings of the reo Māori texts.

Another consideration that begs discussion in terms of the decision to write this thesis in English is that of readership. Whereas there are many Māori and some Pākehā scholars who are able to read te reo Māori, many can not, and access to this thesis would therefore be restricted to those scholars who can read te reo Māori if this thesis was written entirely in te reo. This in turn raises another point in regards to the complexity of readerships in that having a good command of te reo Māori does not necessarily equate to having the skills required to read a reo Māori thesis. Thus, if this work was written in te reo Māori its readership would be further restricted to scholars who can read te reo, as opposed to all te reo readers.

To expand this concern with readerships even further, I am conscious that as an Indigenous scholar working in Aotearoa/New Zealand in 2008, I am part of a global community of Indigenous scholars whose work both informs and extends my own. One of the realities of working in this global context is the need for a shared idiom and mutual intelligibility. The English language currently serves as this lingua franca of Indigenous literary scholarship between Māori scholars and other members of the global Anglophone Indigenous community and beyond thereby facilitating intellectual conversations across oceans and cultures. This use of English at the expense of our myriad Indigenous languages has enabled me to draw on the work of such notable Native American literary critics as Robert Warrior (Osage) and Craig Womack (Muskogee Creek, Cherokee) amongst a host of other intellectuals from beyond America. In defence of using colonial languages in our work, Simon J. Ortiz (Acoma Pueblo) another prominent Native American literary critic asserts:

While there is valid concern about the gradual loss and diminishment of Indigenous languages throughout the Indigenous hemisphere, there is, on the other hand, the opportunity to make use of English, Spanish, and French languages – and other colonial languages that have been used against us... (Weaver et.al 2006:xiii).

While acknowledging the fears of many Indigenous communities in regards to the ongoing health and vitality of their respective languages, Ortiz argues for Indigenous Peoples to mobilize the colonial languages used against them by the colonisers to meet their own needs and aspirations. Similarly to Te Rangikāheke's tendency to subvert the Pākehā technology of writing to serve his own needs, agenda, or desires, we might today see our use of the English language as being subverted to serve our current Indigenous agendas. This is not to suggest that Te Rangikāheke was the first Indigenous person to do this, nor is it to diminish the very real and alarming states many of our Indigenous languages are currently in and what their loss might mean in terms of cultural integrity and identity. It is however, to acknowledge that Indigenous scholars are part of a global community and have much to learn from each other in our often over-lapping experiences of colonisation and its associated oppression, and to acknowledge that the language we use to express ourselves to each other is often and unapologetically, the colonisers' language.

This further brings me to another very practical point about the use of the English language in this thesis. My supervisor who so helpfully pointed me in the direction of American Indian Literary Criticism, is not functionally bi-literate (her own words) in te reo Māori and English. In the same way that we both read American Indian Literary Criticism in English, so too were our meetings conducted in English. But rather than bemoaning our current lack of high functioning te reo skills, we use English with each other and in wider, globally Indigenous and generally academic forums to our advantage. The English language in this way facilitates a mobility of ideas and conversations between diverse people and Peoples both locally and internationally. This is again not to promote the English language above te reo Māori or any other Indigenous language as being a language inherently capable of expressing

higher, more complex ideas. It is however, to say that at the present time, the English language currently serves as an important medium through which much work can be conceived, worked through, shared, and produced in a local and global context.

Finally, this thesis marks an important departure from a good deal of work that has already been done on nineteenth century Māori writing by such scholars as the late Professor Bruce Biggs and the late Dr Margaret Orbell, which has tended to focus on transcription and translation (Biggs 1952:183-191; 1960:85-97; 1964:43; 1966:449-50; 1970:1-4; 1980:66-73; Orbell 1968:8-12) and instead turns to a critical literary exploration of Te Rangikāheke the man, the writer, and his work.

Drawing on current debates in such diverse disciplines as Māori Studies, Pacific Studies, Indigenous/Native Studies, History and Literature Studies enables me to engage with the texts at a more critical level which means that this thesis therefore could, to borrow from Saussy's *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization* (2006), alternatively be (sub-) titled 'Nineteenth Century Māori Writing in an Age of Globalization'. I contend that where the act of translation can be a one-way street that assists non-reader/speakers in grasping the source material, critical exploration and analysis is the two way street whereby those already proficient in the source text language and those who are not are afforded the opportunity to engage with the texts at a critical level. This specifically applies to the current language situation in Aotearoa/New Zealand where it is safe to assume that the majority if not all Māori reader/speakers have a good understanding of English, but the reverse cannot be assumed to be true.

This work is intended for an academic audience or for those interested in critical discussion of nineteenth century Māori writing and so it is stylistically written with this audience in mind. The English language was again chosen to be the language of this thesis in order that this work might be accessible to its widest intended audience. It is, however, key to note that the many references to tikanga Māori, whakaaro Māori, and other Māori cultural specificities included in this thesis are not explained in detail; this work is in no way intended as a guide book to Māori culture, customs, or people. Rather, it means to build upon and extend current understandings of things Māori from

an essentially Māori viewpoint which takes te ao Māori as its frame of reference and starting point. This is not done with the intention of confusing those less versed in things Māori, but rather of allowing this work to shake loose from the confines of explaining itself where those explanations can be found elsewhere via wānanga and study. Footnotes are provided to ease the search for other such resources to assist the reader who is relatively new to te ao Māori and its accompanying philosophies and beliefs.

The Influence of American Indian Literary Theory

In the same way that whakapapa spirals outward in an ever expanding koru, so too the whakapapa of this thesis finds more whanaunga far across the expanse of Te Moananui-a-Kiwa. Penny van Toorn's *Writing Never Arrives Naked* about Aboriginal non-fiction writing in the nineteenth century (2006) has greatly extended my thinking and theorising in this thesis as has Robert Nicole's *The Word, the Pen, and the Pistol: Literature and Power in Tahiti* (2001). Circling further out across Te Moananui-a-Kiwa is Chadwick Allen's *Blood Narrative: Indigenous Identity in American Indian and Maori Literary and Activist Texts* (2002), a ground-breaking comparative literary and cultural study of post-World War II texts by Māori and Native American writers and activists. This leads me to the work of such American Indian literary critics as Robert Warrior (Osage) (1995; 2005), Craig Womack (Muskogee Creek, Cherokee) (1999; et.al 2008), and Daniel Heath Justice (Cherokee) (2006), which has deeply challenged my thinking in such profoundly and critical ways as to warrant special mention here. Living and working in Aotearoa/New Zealand, it has not been my good fortune as an Indigenous scholar in this country to work in a nation that currently has more than one other Indigenous scholar who works in the field of literary criticism. Needing by necessity to look further a field, my supervisor (the one other university-based Indigenous scholar who works critically with Māori texts) pointed me directly toward the work of Indigenous American literary scholars. This overwhelmingly large body of work (in comparison to what is available in Aotearoa/New Zealand), has affected my work in this thesis in ways which,

though not perhaps apparent in the relatively small amount of citations used in the body of text, runs the length and breadth of this work.

Specifically, one thread of American Indian Literary Theory has been followed, drawn on, and interwoven into the foundations of this thesis, that which calls for literary nationalism in studies of Indigenous texts (Womack 1999; Weaver et.al 2006; Womack et.al 2008). Accordingly, the chapter in this thesis that benefits mostly from this critical 'conversation' and is indeed styled in tandem with the core arguments of this group of Native American theorists, is the chapter on Arawa literary nationalism. In arguing for recognition of the specificities of Indigenous nations, the proponents of Native American literary nationalism advance the calls by wider Indigenous research theorists for more research *about* Indigenous people to be done *by* Indigenous people, with the concerns of Indigenous people guiding the research methodologies. This call speaks to the ultimate struggle of many Indigenous peoples for sovereignty, or in the case of literature, more precisely as Robert Warrior coined the term, 'Intellectual sovereignty' (1995:122). As Craig Womack asserts in his ground-breaking work *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism*

Native literature, and Native literary criticism, written by Native authors, is part of sovereignty: Indian people exercising the right to present images of themselves and to discuss those images (1999:14).

As Te Rangikāheke, an Indigenous Māori man living in Niu Tirenī in the nineteenth century, wrote Indigenous Māori texts, so too do I, an Indigenous Māori scholar in Aotearoa/New Zealand in 2008 undertake to write Indigenous Māori literary criticism of his texts in this thesis. I recognise this work as an act of sovereignty in that I exercise my right to discuss the images of ourselves that Te Rangikāheke presents in his writing. But to be absolutely clear, I do not profess to know the meaning of the word sovereignty; although often employed in Indigenous conversations, it is a word that remains elusive but exciting for the potential it contains. I rather follow the lead of Warrior who states:

If sovereignty is anything, it is a way of life...It is a decision – a decision we make in our minds, in our hearts, in our bodies – to be sovereign and to find out what that means in the process (1995:123).

This thesis in its entirety was written in accordance with the decision I made at the outset to be sovereign, whatsoever that may mean. Being a methodical and creative process has enabled me to push the boundaries against the massive legacy of scholarship that has in the past and often continues to ignore, deny, or argue against Indigenous sovereignty. This process has also created a safe space in which I myself have been free to explore what sovereignty might mean.

The order of the chapters

The order of these chapters poses an opportunity to reconfigure what may be a more conventional Euro-Western approach to a thesis that explores the life and work of a writer, where a biography section appears initially in the thesis as a means of foregrounding later discussions of the writer's work. The biographic exploration offered in this thesis is not intended to provide additional context to the central, more critical work of rehearsing close readings of Te Rangikāheke's texts but is rather one of the three critical readings given in this thesis that explores Te Rangikāheke and his work.

Being a study on an Indigenous writer whose work emerged in a period of rapid and drastic colonial change, I chose to begin the core chapters of this thesis with a chapter that deals mostly with the writer's interactions with the coloniser, the chapter on editing as a metaphor for colonisation (Kotahi anō te tupuna o te tangata Māori...Editing Te Rangikāheke's manuscripts; Editing People). While it was initially tempting for this Māori researcher to simply ignore the issues around colonial encounters rather than draw even more attention to them than has already been given, the decision was made to deal with them in an up-front manner in order to move more thoughtfully on to other equally interesting discussions. To simply not engage in conversations about the coloniser in relation to Indigenous Peoples will not make these

conversations or their legacies disappear, but by engaging thoughtfully with them, Indigenous Peoples might enrich our shared colonial histories by adding our voices to the historically 'heard' ones of the coloniser.

Additionally, whereas we, the tangata whenua of Aotearoa well know that our histories began a long time before colonisation, I suggest that our colonial history must be appropriately dealt with on our terms, by us, if we are to be able to move confidently through our present and into the future. As evidenced by the current social and political challenges we collectively face, we continue to suffer as a People as a result of our colonial history. The decision to begin this thesis with a chapter that examines the effects of George Grey's editing on Te Rangikāheke's manuscripts represents a small metaphoric step toward dealing with our colonial history with the advantage of retrospect, and the privilege of wānanga.

In moving to shift the focus away from Indigenous Peoples as defined by their relationship with the colonial 'Other', the chapter that explores Te Rangikāheke's writing in an iwi context follows the first core chapter discussed above (Kātahi Ka Tuaina a Te Arawa...Te Arawa Literary Nationalism). Te Rangikāheke's Arawatanga in his writing, though certainly with added nuances due to his many and varied colonial encounters, are expressions that are born from an Indigenous centre rather than a colonial one. The movement of the chapters toward this Indigenous centred work has the effect of shifting the focus of this study to lie more on the concerns of Indigenous Peoples in Indigenous paradigms. In this way, this thesis as a whole moves toward privileging Indigenous Peoples' understandings of themselves and their histories, a privileging that is long overdue against the already overloaded masses of scholarship worldwide that privileges the coloniser's voice. Colonial stories are not the only stories Indigenous communities tell – colonial stories are part of our histories and futures but should also be told in context alongside our other shared stories, narratives, histories, and aspirations.

Following on from the chapter that explores Te Rangikāheke's iwi anchored writing, is a chapter that imagines Te Rangikāheke the person (Tā Te Rangikāheke, ko Wiremu Maihi...Revisioning Te Rangikāheke – A Biographical Treatment). Whereas the previous two chapters use

Te Rangikāheke's manuscripts on Māori traditions and history as the main primary source material, this final chapter looks firstly at his name and then at three draft letters he wrote. The use of this different source material marks an important departure in the thesis whereby imaginative and creative energies are loosed and new understandings of who Te Rangikāheke was are envisaged; Te Rangikāheke is imagined through his name and his letters.

This chapter completes the through line from the opening core chapter that looks in a wider sense at one aspect of the relationship between the coloniser and the colonised, to the second core chapter that focuses more narrowly on issues of iwi nationalism, to a final chapter that zeros in on the individual. I argue that not only does this order narrow a wider social perspective, it more importantly re-focuses attention on matters of more central concern to contemporary Indigenous communities. The chapter on re-visioning is placed in the final position in order to remind readers of the power and potential of creativity. Through the work of imagining our pasts in Te Rangikāheke, we might find new ways to imagine our futures that benefit contemporary Indigenous communities in their respective struggles and aspirations for recognition, rights, and tino rangatiratanga. The final chapter is thus intended as a spring board from which Indigenous communities might take advantage of their collective imaginations and creativity thereby advancing their communities beyond conversations centered around the colonial experience.

Additionally, on another more holistic level, the origin of this thesis itself was a forgotten book amongst a box of forgotten books that I accidentally or fatefully happened upon in my parents' garage. This forgotten book, a copy of Sir George Grey's *Nga Mahi a Nga Tupuna* (1928) led to my own personal discovery and study of Te Rangikāheke's manuscripts which in turn sowed the seeds of the chapters that follow. The process of my reading the manuscripts and subsequent development of this thesis was organic; the chapters of this thesis were cultivated from the one garden of manuscripts, that is, three chapters were developed from reading the one set of manuscripts, written by the one author, all intimately connected through whakapapa but with their own individual kinks and personalities. One of the results of this organic development of the work was that, as the individual chapters grew

independently of each other from my reading of the manuscripts, an obvious order of the chapters did not immediately present itself and it was therefore possible to order the chapters in a number of ways that would spark critical kōrero and debate. The order of the chapters to follow has therefore been fixed in a way that I believe offers the most to Indigenous communities in terms of our on-going struggles and vitality thus re-positioning the Indigenous at the centre of the concerns of this thesis in line with Kaupapa Māori research methodologies and Indigenous research methodologies (Tuhiwai-Smith 1999).

One foundation of the work of this thesis is located firmly in the discipline of Māori Studies and another foundation is located in my traditionally based methodological framework of whakapapa. These are the two joint foundations that give me the confidence to dream and also the space to dream in without which this work would not have been possible. As I move into the core work of this thesis, I compose myself in anticipation of a movement into another space in which my own individual explorations of sovereignty might be articulated.

Kotahi anō te tupuna o te tangata Māori

Editing Te Rangikāheke's Manuscripts; Editing People

The whakapapa of this chapter predominantly privileges the horizontal, contemporary relationships that underpin the editing and publishing of Te Rangikāheke's manuscripts. In this way, the line that the whakapapa of this chapter privileges is a horizontal one that moves across Te Rangikāheke's generation rather than through it. The contemporary relationships discussed in the bulk of this chapter are therefore more spatially than temporally shaped; time is less of an issue in these relationships than interactions in a common space. The majority of the discussion that follows is therefore anchored firmly in Te Rangikāheke's lifetime; a lifetime that incidentally spanned the greater part of the nineteenth century.

Te Rangikāheke's relationship with George Grey is first explored through a survey of the prefaces Grey included in his Māori publications. What emerges is a picture of a man who, though changed over time, was also a product of his time in his imperialist/colonialist attitudes in which he appeared to unwaveringly believe. This is followed by an examination of the tuakana/teina dynamic of their relationship, of their whakapapa to each other as articulated in their Māori terms for each other in their writing. In keeping with anchoring the discussion in their contemporary generation, the nineteenth century is then more widely explored in terms of colonial 'naming and claiming', a notion important in discussing nineteenth century colonisation ideas and justifications. The final section of this chapter then shifts, and looks beyond its own close generations to its future descendents; to the effects that Grey's editing had on Te Rangikāheke's manuscripts that we are left with today.

Ultimately, I will argue that Wiremu Maihi Te Rangikāheke exercised his tino rangatiratanga – his right to self-determination – in his writing of his stories. Accordingly I will argue that Sir George Grey then extended his powers of sovereignty and dominion over the original Māori writing in the act of editing. This analysis affords us a new perspective from which to review

the early published writing of Indigenous Māori in which parallels can be drawn between writer and editor, Māori and Pākehā, colonised and coloniser. In this context, the relationship between writer and editor serves as a rich metaphor for colonisation.

Sir George Grey is primarily remembered as a colonial administrator in New Zealand, South Australia, and the Cape Colony and for his long and controversial political life (Kerr 2006:13). The following synopsis of his life provides some background to the complex and multi-sided person Grey was so as to enable a more balanced exploration of his relationship with Te Rangikāheke articulated later in this chapter.

Born in Lisbon in 1812, George Grey was named after his father, Lieutenant Colonel George Grey, who died in battle at the Spanish fortress town of Badajoz a day or two before his birth (Bohan 1998:16). The younger George was raised by his mother Elizabeth Vignoles Grey and then also by whom Bohan calls ‘...a conscientiously affectionate stepfather...’, (1998:16) the baronet Sir John Godfrey Thomas of Wenvoe, Vicar of Wartling and Bodiam, Sussex (Bohan 1998:16).

Grey’s interest in marginalised peoples began while he was in military service with postings in Glasgow and subsequently Ireland where he was appalled by the poverty of the Irish people and misery inflicted on them by their English landlords (Sinclair 1990:160). He subsequently led two expeditions in Western Australia in 1837-39 in the hope of finding a major river giving access to lands suitable for settlement, both of which were ill-planned and badly executed (Sinclair 1990:160). Grey himself was injured by a spear to his hip when his party met a group of Aborigines on their first expedition and had to be brought back to their camp on a pony (Bohan 1998:27-28).

Sinclair notes that it was at this time that Grey became interested in the cultures and government of Indigenous peoples. In 1840 he wrote a report for Lord John Russell, the new secretary of state for the colonies, showing how the amalgamation of two races could be speedily effected (1990:160). Grey was then promoted to captain and appointed resident magistrate at King George Sound (Sinclair 1990:160). He married Eliza Lucy Spencer, the daughter of his predecessor in that office and their one child, a son, was born in 1841 but lived for only five months (Sinclair 1990:160). After returning to

England, Grey was offered and accepted the governorship of South Australia (Sinclair 1990:160) which was a relative success as far as the Australian economy was concerned, but which fell short in his native policy (Sinclair 1990:160-161). The settlers often clashed with the Aborigines and, as Sinclair notes there was much conflict, murder, and theft of stock on both sides (1990:161).

In 1845 Grey was appointed governor of New Zealand where he faced even greater difficulties than in South Australia (Sinclair 1990:161). Grey arrived in New Zealand to find it technically bankrupt (Bohan 1998:68) and the settlers and Māori engaged in violent disputes over land claims (Sinclair 1990:161). It was in this unstable environment that Grey took it upon himself to learn the Māori language. He felt it was his duty to learn the Māori language and about Māori traditions, customs, and culture in order that he might better fulfil his position as Governor-in-Chief of New Zealand (Grey 1855).

To this end Grey owned *Grammar and Vocabulary of the Language of New Zealand* (1820) by Lee and Kendall with input by Hongi Hika and Waikato, *A Grammar of the New Zealand Language* (1842) by the Reverend Robert Maunsell, *A Dictionary of the New Zealand Language, and a Concise Grammar; to which is added a Selection of Colloquial Sentences* (1844) by William Williams, three of the four publications that were available by 1845 that were either in or about te reo Māori and although he did not own the fourth, *A Korao no New Zealand* (1815) by Thomas Kendall, he possessed a work that contained the word list that was originally compiled by the author of that same publication (Kerr 2006:75-76).

As was popular with Pākehā interested in Māori customs, culture, and language at the time, Grey enlisted the assistance of Māori around Aotearoa/New Zealand such as Tamihana Te Rauparaha (Ngāti Toa) and Himiona Te Wehi, to assist him in his studies; Grey had them write in te reo Māori about Māori culture in order for him to build a collection of written materials on which to base his study of Māori language.¹ Grey also received manuscripts from other Pākehā collectors of Māori material such as the

¹ Te Wehi's iwi has not been included as it is currently unknown.

German missionary J. H. F. Wohlers, the Presbyterian missionary James Duncan, and the Reverend Robert Maunsell (Kerr 2006:78). However, Te Rangikāheke is generally acknowledged as being Grey's most important source of Māori manuscript material.

Although Grey did not record much about their relationship, Te Rangikāheke was more forthcoming (Curnow 1983:21).² He wrote the following in a draft letter to Queen Victoria:

He nui anō tana mahi atawhai ki ahau e noho tahi ana hoki au me ia me tōna hoa wahine i roto i tō rāua nei whare. E kai tahi ana hoki mātou i ngā rā katoa o te wiki e kōrero tahi ana, e tākaro tahi ana, e hari tahi ana (GNZMA 723, Part 2:279).

Te Rangikāheke tells the Queen that Grey was very kind to him and that he lived with Grey and his wife in their house. He writes that they ate together everyday of the week, they talked together, enjoyed their time together, and were happy together.³ Te Rangikāheke evidently took pleasure in his work and lifestyle with Grey and his wife and found it satisfying and fulfilling.

Grey provided a house for Te Rangikāheke and his family next to his own family house in Auckland, along with bags of flour, rice and sugar when they arrived, and payment of two shillings and sixpence for a day, fifteen shillings for a week, and three pounds for a month (Curnow 1983:17). As again noted by Curnow (1983:17), in another letter dated 27 August 1850, Te Rangikāheke marvelled at the generosity of the Governor in giving him so many possessions whilst he was in his writing place; four shillings, three figs of tobacco, a Jew's harp, and a pipe

Otirā, i ngā rā noho ai au i roto i tōku whare tuhituhi ka hōmai e ia e whā ngā hereni, e toru tūpeka, kotahi te rōria, kotahi te paipa; ā mīharo ana ahau ki tōna atawhai ki te hōmai noa mai i āna mea māku (GNZMMSS 45, cited in Orbell 1968:12).

² Curnow notes that Grey's diary, which covers the years 1845-83, is a very sketchy document and makes no mention of Te Rangikāheke (1983:21)

³ Curnow translates *e tākaro tahi ana* literally as *we played together* (1983:17)

Te Rangikāheke's use of the word 'mīharo' conveys a sense of wonderment and amazement at the care that Grey showed towards him. Grey is painted in a very favourable light in terms of his relationship with Te Rangikāheke when Te Rangikāheke uses of the word 'atawhai', conveying a sense of caring that extends beyond simple civility and professionalism.

Not surprisingly perhaps, given their evidently warm relationship, Te Rangikāheke not only wrote for Grey, but also taught him in a collaborative manner (Curnow 1983:17). To this end, Curnow notes that Grey wrote comments on Te Rangikāheke's manuscripts which suggests that he was writing notes during or after discussion with Te Rangikāheke.

In one such note ([GNZMMSS] 81:56) Grey wrote above a line, "Otiraa he take pai" said by the writer of this they thought this a just cause' (Curnow 1983:18).

Through ready access to the writer, Grey was able to more thoroughly study the manuscripts he was supplied by Te Rangikāheke than was the case with the majority of his Māori collection. Kerr takes the idea of Te Rangikāheke and Grey working together a step further and imagines what this working relationship might have looked like

The collaboration was close and the image of these two men, antipodal representatives with their own culture and customs, sitting down in Government House, talking together, writing passages of Maori, discussing them, emending them and adding interlinear notes is a powerful one (2006:76).

As indeed the image is powerful, it is also a poignant example of what might be possible when people from different cultures meet and understand each other enough to be able to work amicably, side by side. Te Rangikāheke made great contributions not only to Grey's learning of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga, but also to Grey's Māori publications which have over successive generations proved themselves to be invaluable resources in the study of

Māori language and culture.⁴ Te Rangikāheke ultimately taught Grey about things Māori in a close, collaborative way that greatly advanced his knowledge and proficiency of and in Māori language, traditions, and people.

Te Rangikāheke's and Grey's writing collaboration was, however, relatively short lasting; it only lasted four years between 1849 and 1853 after which Grey left Niu Tirenī to take up his Governorship posting in the Cape Colony taking all the Māori manuscripts with him. Grey worked on his extensive manuscript collection with Dr Wilhelm Bleek, a librarian at Cape Town Library, publishing three Māori books during his term at Cape Town; *Polynesian Mythology* (1855), *Ko nga Whakapepeha me nga Whakaahuareka a nga Tipuna o Aotearoa* (1857), and *Ko nga Waiata Maori* (1857) as well as a catalogue of Grey's material in te reo Māori in 1858.⁵ In 1860 Grey returned to Niu Tirenī to take up his second appointment as Governor of New Zealand. Grey subsequently presented his entire library to the South African Public Library at Cape town, and the valuable New Zealand books and manuscripts were sent there in 1861 where they lay virtually undisturbed for over 40 years (Curnow 1983:2, Williams 1906:175-6).

In 1906 the Reverend H. W. Williams spent time in Cape town, 're-discovered' the manuscripts, and published an article in the Journal of the Polynesian Society entitled *Maori Matter at the Cape of Good Hope: Some Notes on the Grey Collection in the Capetown Library* (1906:175-80). In this article, Williams gives brief background details on the history of Grey's collection, a résumé of his month's work on the collection, and other brief notes on what remained to be done with the collection. Special mention is made of Te Rangikāheke's manuscripts that Williams noted were '...the most striking...' (1906:179) of those he examined and '...whose writing is clear, and punctuation admirable' (1906:179). Almost all the manuscripts were finally returned to Aotearoa/New Zealand in 1922-23 after what Biggs referred to as 'protracted negotiations' (Biggs 1952:177), with the three outstanding items

⁴ Williams (1928) and Ngata (1928) both note that by 1928 Māori was included in the subjects for the BA degree and also that the Academic Board prescribed *Nga Mahi a Nga Tupuna* as a text book for the examination.

⁵ Grey's first Māori publication *Ko nga Moteatea me nga Hakirara o nga Maori* (1853) was published in Wellington, and his second, *Ko nga Mahinga a nga Tupuna Maori* (1854) was published in London

being returned in 1999 (Kerr 2006:83).⁶ The collection is currently held in the Special Collections Section at Auckland Public Library and is accessible by the general public.

Reading Grey

The Māori books Grey published with their significant contributions by Te Rangikāheke form one collection of material that might be analysed comparatively beside Grey's collection of Te Rangikāheke manuscripts. Though they differ in many often wide ways, they share whakapapa that is both rich and diverse. The following analyses of the prefaces Grey included in his Māori publications are explored as much for their lack of acknowledgement to Te Rangikāheke and the many other Māori contributors, as for what other information and insights into Grey they do contain. Inasmuch as Te Rangikāheke can be read through his manuscripts in the Grey collection, so too can Grey be read through his prefaces, and perhaps both of the men in the main text of some of these books. This 'reading between the lines' therefore takes dually into account what is present and what is not, and explores the spaces in between the two.

(i) Nga Moteatea (1853)

Before Grey presented his library at Cape Town, four of Te Rangikāheke's manuscripts were published in 1853 in Wellington as appendices in Grey's *Ko Nga Moteatea Me Nga Hakirara Maori*. But rather than acknowledge any of his Māori sources, Grey fills the greater part of his preface in *Nga Moteatea* with extolling the virtues of the 'fertile in labors, rich in love, apostolic in character' missionaries (1853:i), and explaining why and how he collected what he calls the 'poems' contained in the main body of the

⁶ Interestingly, Grey mentions his desire for this exchange to one day take place in the preface to the 2nd edition of *Polynesian Mythology* (1885); this was not an oversight on his behalf due to the pressing demands of office as Williams (1906:176) points out.

text. The preface concludes with some unpublished remarks about Māori poetry by Maunsell whom Grey describes to as ‘one of our most learned Maori scholars’ (1853:xiii). Maunsell proceeds to belittle Maori poetry deeming it amongst other things ‘abrupt and elliptical to an excess not allowed in English poetry’ (Grey 1853:xiii) while also conceding that ‘these irregularities help much to invest Maori poetry with that shade which none can penetrate without close study of each particular piece’ (Grey 1853:xiii). Maunsell’s overwhelmingly negative view of Maori poetry is illustrated in the final paragraph of the preface that systematically lists the ‘peculiarities’ that Maunsell felt obliged to note as the following

...omissions of the articles ‘ko’ and ‘te’, omissions of ‘ai’, of the pronouns, of such particles as ‘nei’, and of other complementary words, omissions of the nominative case, of the objective, often of the verb, and verbal particles, omissions of the prepositions, changes of one preposition into another, unusual words introduced, and words sometimes inverted – exceedingly wild and abrupt metaphors, and transitions unexpected and rapid’ (Grey 1853:xiv)

Such a list begs the question as to how any native speaker of Māori, let alone a student of the language, was ever able to make any sense at all of Māori poetical forms, but also more importantly highlights Maunsell’s grammatically based frame of reference with which he approached poetry, or more specifically, Māori poetry. Maunsell bases the majority of this part of his assessment of Māori poetry firmly on the rules of grammar, the rules of *Māori grammar* in which he must have considered himself an expert. Indeed, whether or not Maunsell’s understanding of the grammar of te reo Māori was good is beside the point; the main point is that poetry in many if not all languages often breaks the grammatical rules of that language with no dire consequences to speak of. As the above quote shows, Maunsell approaches Māori poetry from a Pākehā-centric corner that sees him rely on a European based understanding of grammar. This moreover sees him defeated at the end where he resorts to calling the metaphors ‘wild’ and the transitions ‘unexpected and rapid’.

Grey avoids acknowledging the original writers of the Māori waiata and prose material contained in this publication in the preface and anywhere else in the book in preference to the righteousness of missionaries, his methods of collection, and Maunsell's unusual assessment of Māori poetry. Rather than being presented as a celebration of Māori waiata, this preface focuses squarely on Pākehā concerns rather than the Māori content contained in the book.

(ii) Nga Mahi a Nga Tupuna (1854)

Grey's second Māori publication *Ko nga Mahinga a nga Tupuna Maori*, which Simmons notes contains material at least a quarter of which is derived from four Te Rangikāheke manuscripts (1966:364), similarly offers no acknowledgement of its Māori sources other than mentioning in the preface that

These traditions were all either written down from the dictation of their principal Chiefs and High Priests, or have been compiled from manuscripts written by Chiefs (Grey 1928:ix)

When Grey recasts the Māori sources in general terms as 'Chiefs and High Priests' he contributes to the effect of de-personalising the texts, removing authorial agency from the Māori writers, and solidifying the texts in the colonially acceptable genre of 'mythology'. Grey's decision regarding authorial acknowledgment satisfied the colonial requirement that Indigenous people's individual identities not exist. Grey's decision, whether intentionally politically motivated or otherwise is inherently political in that Grey exercised his colonial powers over Te Rangikāheke's Indigenous texts thereby negating Te Rangikāheke's tino rangatiratanga. In this act of not acknowledging his sources, Grey effectively edited his sources out of their own texts.

(iii) Polynesian Mythology (1855)

Polynesian Mythology (1855), Grey's third Māori publication, is his English translation of *Nga Mahinga a nga Tupuna Maori* (1854). In the substantial preface to this work, Grey explains amongst other things why and how he set about learning te reo Māori, and how he came to publish some of the material he collected in this and the previous Māori books. He writes:

I soon perceived that I could neither successfully govern, nor hope to conciliate, a numerous and turbulent people, with whose language, manners, customs, religion, and modes of thought I was quite unacquainted (Grey 1855:iii).

In Grey's own words, he deemed it necessary to learn the Māori language and to learn about Māori culture in order to be better equipped in his role as the Governor-in-Chief of New Zealand, governing over both Indigenous Māori and predominantly European settlers. Grey goes on to talk about the problems with enlisting translators noting that information relayed via the medium of a translator is not as personal as the more standard mode of using one language to communicate, that it is '...cumbrous and slow...' (Grey 1855:v), that, being done hurriedly and in as few words as possible was not ideal, and finally that the Natives did not like talking through an interpreter (Grey 1855:v). Having dispensed with the usefulness of translators, Grey reminds us again of what he tells us was his 'duty':

...to make myself acquainted, with the least possible delay, with the language of the New Zealanders, as also with their manners, customs, and prejudices (Grey 1855:v).

From here, Grey describes the difficulties he faced in learning a language that he thought 'a very difficult one to understand thoroughly' (Grey 1855:vi) as it 'varied altogether in form from any of the ancient or modern languages' (Grey 1855:vi) which he knew. He mentions that there was then 'no dictionary of it published...there were no books published in the language

which would enable me to study its construction' (Grey 1855:vi) and that, as he was occupied with the governance of the country, he was left with little time to devote to these matters. In writing about why he felt compelled to learn te reo me ōna tikanga followed by the ensuing difficulties through which he struggled, Grey writes himself into this preface at the expense of the Māori stories contained in the book – it's all about him. This egocentric through line continues throughout the preface.

Furthermore, whereas Grey gives much detail about *why* he collected Māori manuscript material, he is notably vague about exactly *how* he collected this material. He writes:

I worked at this duty in my spare moments in every part of the country I traversed, and during my many voyages from portion to portion of the Islands. I was also always accompanied by natives, and still at every possible interval pursued my inquiries into these subjects (Grey 1855:viii).

Grey does not disclose his methods of acquiring the source material much less who his sources actually were. His focus remains squarely on himself and *his work* in obtaining the source material as per the above quote where Grey writes that he was 'accompanied' by some Māori. Grey marginalises Māori firstly by referring to them in general terms as 'native' and secondly by suggesting that these same 'natives' did not work either with or for him in his use of the word 'accompanied'. Grey avoids mentioning that Māori were largely the actual writers of the manuscripts as well as a much larger body of other Māori writing and in this avoidance he effectively erases their literary achievements which he subsequently published under his own name. Grey further marginalises the Māori sources from whom he obtained his material by not acknowledging any of them by name and instead referring to them as the 'aged and influential chiefs' (Grey 1855:viii) and 'priests' (Grey 1855:viii) who aided him in his collecting.

Grey then discusses his reasons for publishing some of the Māori manuscript material stating that he did not want his hard work to go to waste and not benefit others '...whose duty it may be hereafter to deal with the natives of New Zealand' (1855:ix). Rather than his work being of any benefit

to Māori, Grey intended his work to benefit colonial masters with whom would lay the burden of 'deal[ing] with' the Indigenous people of Aotearoa/New Zealand. This is furthermore underlined by Grey's emphatic statement that he now presents '...to the European reader a translation of the principle portions of their [ie Māori] ancient mythology, and some of their most interesting legends' (1855:x). Although it might be conceded that it was not unreasonable for Grey to intend this publication, being a translation into English, for an English audience, this view assumes that Māori were not literate in the English language and would therefore gain nothing from this publication. It furthermore assumes that Māori, even if they were literate in English, would have no interest in a publication in English concerned with their own traditions. This view is untenable given the expediency and voracity with which Māori took up writing in the nineteenth century.

(iv) Polynesian Mythology. 2nd Edition. (1885)

The second edition of *Polynesian Mythology*, which appeared thirty years after the first, is markedly different to the first edition. The older Grey writes much less with a sense of purpose and more with a sense of reflection if not nostalgia. Grey begins by lamenting the deaths of his 'fellow-labourers and assistants in collecting the materials for the original work, so long ago as the year 1845' (1885:xiii). Interestingly, he also laments the deaths of his Māori friends many of whom he notes were much respected and admired (Grey 1885:xiii). Grey further contends that the feeling between the Māori and Pākehā after the cessation of the land wars of the 1850s and 60s finished has mellowed to a point whereby:

...the Europeans thoroughly appreciated all instances of truly noble courage in the natives who were opposed to them, and loudly expressed their admiration for the men who thus distinguished themselves (1885:xiii).

While Grey implies that Europeans did not recognise any noble courage in Māori before they were engaged in war with them, he goes on to justify this

assumption by proclaiming that they corrected themselves by expressing admiration for some of the Māori. This discourse perpetuates the “noble savage” discourse as expounded by the influential French philosopher Rousseau that was popularly employed by colonising powers in the nineteenth century as a justification for the horrors of colonisation. The general tone that is threaded through this preface follows this “noble savage” line to its inevitable foregone conclusion that the Māori, like many of Grey’s old Pākehā and Māori ‘friends’, will die – the Māori as an anthropological relic.

In keeping with the dire and sad tone of this preface, Grey, no longer the young, idealistic, energetic man he once was, tells us:

Many of the manuscripts were written by natives from the dictation of the most celebrated old chiefs, such as Rangihaeata, Te Rauparaha, Potatau, Te Heuheu, Patuone, Te Taniwha, etc (1885:xiv).

Unusually though, despite being generally acknowledged now as the author of at least 50 of the 198 pages in *Nga Mahinga a nga Tupuna Maori* (Simmons 1966:364), as well as sharing an evidently warm relationship with Grey (Curnow 1983:17), Te Rangikāheke’s name does not figure in this list. I posit that rather than acknowledging the primary Māori sources of the book, this list is included to inflate the importance of the book as the most comprehensive and authoritative book ever published on Māori traditional narratives. This theory is supported by the fact that the names Grey mentions are the names of some of the most prominent rangatira of their time. Where Simmons asserts that ‘Te Wherowhero of Ngāti Mahuta gave Grey *Te Kitenga a Te Kanawa i te Patupaiarahe*’ (1966:367) which most likely refers to Pōtatau Te Wherowhero, the first Māori king, or Pōtatau as given in the list above, there is some doubt as to whether the other rangatira listed above dictated the manuscripts that subsequently found their way into Grey’s possession. Simmons, in his article “The Sources of Sir George Grey’s *Nga Mahi a Nga Tupuna*”, found that together with material from Te Rangikāheke’s manuscripts, Grey also used material from manuscripts written by Mātene Te Whiwhi. Mātene, or Te Whiwhi as he was more commonly known, was the son of Rangitopeora, a prominent rangatira of Ngāti Raukawa and a nephew

of two prominent Ngāti Toarangatira rangatira, Te Rangihaeata and Te Rauparaha. Simmons is unclear as to whether Te Whiwhi dictated traditions from his uncles, or wrote what he was taught by them and others, or simply wrote what he knew of the traditions as he knew them. As for Te Heuheu, Patuone, and Te Taniwha, whereas Te Taniwha may have contributed to written accounts of traditions, these rangatira are not remembered for their writing but for their political and social prominence.

Grey may not have wanted his published work to be associated with such an evidently mobile Māori as Te Rangikāheke was as this might compromise the venerability of the traditions that Grey appears at pains to describe as being 'ancient'. It is improbable that Grey simply forgot to include Te Rangikāheke due both to their close relationship and Grey's fine attention to detail and dedication to hard work. Grey may, however, have been simply overstating the case in naming these particular rangatira as some of his sources but this is difficult to substantiate at this time. This is an area of possible future inquiry that lies beyond the scope of this thesis.

Te Rangikāheke's teina dynamic with Grey

In the draft letter to Queen Victoria previously mentioned Te Rangikāheke writes of his relationship with Grey;

E rite ana tōna atawhai ki au i te atawhai ki tana tamaiti ake, teina ake, whanaunga ake (GNZMA 723, Part 2:279).

He writes of the kindness that Grey shows toward him being the same as that which one would show to their own child, to their younger sibling, or to their close relative.⁷ Te Rangikāheke specifically writes 'teina' meaning 'younger sibling of the same sex' which is clearly distinguished in Māori from 'tuakana' meaning 'older sibling of the same sex'.⁸ From a Māori point of view, the

⁷ Translated by Curnow as 'His kindness to me was like his kindness to his own child, his younger brother, or relation' (1983:17).

⁸ The word 'sibling' includes cousins in te ao Māori, not just one's immediate siblings

implications of this word choice are specific; whakapapa is one of the foundational concepts upon which Māori social structure is built and iwi, hapū and whānau are ordered according to tuakana/teina relationships. The tuakana belongs to an older and more senior line of whakapapa and the teina belongs to a younger and more junior line of whakapapa (Mead 2003b:220). Relatives, family or other kinship groups are defined in this tuakana/teina binary. Te Rangikāheke, in this case, claims the younger 'teina' position for himself and in doing so lowers his social status in deference to Grey.

In another manuscript (GNZMMSS 87) Te Rangikāheke writes that Grey addresses him as 'tama' which literally translates as 'boy' or 'son'. In Te Rangikāheke's written words, the relationship he shared with Grey is mutually defined in Māori kinship terms whereby Grey occupied the tuakana or senior position and Te Rangikāheke occupied the teina or younger position. A parallel metaphor can be drawn from the dynamics of their relationship as articulated by Te Rangikāheke that sees Grey occupying the high-status position of Governor-in-Chief of New Zealand to Te Rangikāheke being a lowly native, and so the binary, interdependent status order between tuakana and teina, coloniser and colonised, oppressor and oppressed is reinforced in their relationship. Te Rangikāheke appears to have agreed to these terms of engagement with Grey and indeed, worked within his teina role to achieve his political and personal objectives.

There is though another way of reading the Māori terminology used to articulate Te Rangikāheke and Grey's relationship which sees the two men locked into a close, familial relationship bound by responsibilities and accountabilities that defy the restraints of time and place; Te Rangikāheke and Grey take whakapapa and extend it beyond birth right to include politically motivated 'foster' relations. Hence when Grey calls Te Rangikāheke 'tama' he assumes some responsibility for him that extends beyond a professional/work based relationship into a whanaungatanga/kinship based relationship. Rather than being simply friends or acquaintances, this kinship dynamic radically altered the terms of their relationship and adds a whole new layer of complexity to it. Where the motivations for constructing and maintaining the dynamics of this relationship were different for each, it seems that both men were ultimately politically driven as was their relationship. This is seen in

Te Rangikāheke's reasons for teaching Grey (Curnow 1983), as well as Grey's reasons for learning te reo Māori and about Māori culture and customs (Grey 1855). Another pertinent example of the enduring whakapapa relationship that transcends time and space, is the fact that Te Rangikāheke wrote to Grey from Mokoia in 1893, some 40 years after first writing for him, asking for his intercession with the government to get him a house at Ōhinemutu (Curnow 1983:31). From Te Rangikāheke's point of view, at least, the tuakana/teina relationship he shared with Grey lasted a long, if not indefinite, time.

It is, however, difficult to tell whether their terms of address for each other can be taken to be a true reflection of the nature of their relationship, especially when one considers that the roles Grey and Te Rangikāheke played were inverted in terms of the aims of their collaboration. Grey wanted to learn the Māori language and customs (Grey 1855:vi, viii;) and Te Rangikāheke wrote and taught him (GNZMA 723, Part 2:277); that is, Grey was the student, and Te Rangikāheke the teacher. The relative status of both Te Rangikāheke and Grey was inverted in terms of Grey's desire to learn Māori language and customs with Te Rangikāheke occupying the elder, tuakana position of teacher and Grey occupying the younger, teina position of student. This can be seen as a subversion of the binary colonial positions of coloniser and colonised whereby the coloniser concedes status without having to openly confess to it, and without perhaps even realising it. Given that Grey himself believed that Indigenous Peoples 'must be freed into civilisation' from their primitive and savage cultures rather than treated as inferiors (Bohan 1998:42), this subversion of roles whereby the native teaches the coloniser runs contrary to his own personal ethos of colonisation. Accordingly, editing Te Rangikāheke out of his texts by not acknowledging him achieved the means by which Grey's intellectual and political dominance and by implication, his assumption of colonial dominance, would be unquestionable.

Colonial discovery and ‘naming and claiming’ ethos

Grey’s editing out of Te Rangikāheke as the original author also has the effect of solidifying the texts’ place on the mantelpiece of European ‘discovery’. Grey takes full credit for the Māori narratives because he was popularly known as the author of the book. Grey lays claim to the ‘discovery’ of the narratives in much the same way as Cook lays claim to the ‘discovery’ of New Zealand even though Polynesian peoples discovered these islands hundreds of years before they did. In this way, the Māori text is validated because Grey ‘discovered’ it rather than because a Māori wrote it.

This view is clearly supported by H. D. Skinner who, in his review of Katherine Luomala’s book *Maui-of-a-thousand-tricks: His Oceanic and European Biographers* calls Grey ‘...the greatest of Maui’s biographers...’ (1950:93-95) even though the Maui story referred to is Te Rangikāheke’s story that was edited and published by Grey. In the same review, Skinner tells us that in her book

Dr. Luomala discusses in detail Grey’s Arawa version of the Maui cycle (1950:93).

Te Rangikāheke’s version of the Maui story is credited to Grey and is worse still referred to as ‘...Grey’s Arawa version...’ as if Grey himself was either of Arawa descent or had some kind of existential claim to Arawa traditions. Te Rangikāheke’s Maui story is attributed to Grey in interesting twists of language such as the ones above that I argue give more credit than is due Grey in terms of the Māori stories he published. Although Grey edited and published a Maui story, he took his source material, in this case his source narrative, directly from one of Te Rangikāheke’s manuscripts.

Additionally, one of the more curious aspects of Skinner’s review is that Te Rangikāheke is mentioned in the second half of the second paragraph after Grey has been loudly praised for his “masterpiece of primitive literature” (Skinner 1950:93). Although Skinner notes that Te Rangikāheke supplied the Maui narrative, a substantial quote from Percy Smith (1899:257) immediately follows that asserts that Te Rangikāheke’s work is incorrect as other Arawa

elders will attest to (1950:93). Skinner answers Smith's criticism by conceding that

...even though the priestly experts are able to correct some minor details, Wiremu's [ie Te Rangikāheke's] story remains an achievement unparalleled in Polynesian literature (Skinner 1950:93).

While acknowledging Te Rangikāheke as the source of Grey's published Maui story, and furthermore praising him for his literary talent and skill, Skinner paradoxically credits Grey for *his story* and for preserving the story. I argue that the authorship of Te Rangikāheke's account is unnecessarily complicated by Skinner who seems to mention Te Rangikāheke's involvement in the production of his own text more as an afterthought than being central to the issue. Although both Te Rangikāheke and Grey are mentioned in relation to the Maui narrative under discussion, the greater emphasis is placed on Grey who is given prominence by way of the language used in relation to this Maui narrative, and also the order in which each man figures in the structure of the paragraph.

Although Te Rangikāheke is acknowledged as being the original author of the Maui account as edited and published by Grey, it is Grey who is given the kudos. In this way, Native writers are effectively side-lined and their contributions to the literary landscape of Aotearoa/New Zealand are not fully realised. Whereas this thesis resists showing Grey more attention than is reasonably warranted by focusing on Te Rangikāheke the writer and exploring Te Rangikāheke using Indigenous methodologies such as whakapapa and Native American Literary Theory, the effects of this historical side-lining are still felt today whereby George Grey is inextricably tied up with Te Rangikāheke's writing. That is, it is very difficult to hold a conversation about Te Rangikāheke or his writing without having to also mention Grey. The coloniser Grey, whether by accident or design, continues to appropriate a Native writing space as his own. Ironically, the necessarily close tuakana/teina dynamic of their collaborative teaching relationship is played out for a potential infinity in the legacy of the resulting publications. Until such time as due acknowledgement is given to Te Rangikāheke for his writing,

Grey will continue to feature prominently in discussions of Te Rangikāheke's work. This Indigenous writer eagerly anticipates the day when Te Rangikāheke's work is central to the discussion and Grey's dominance is no longer felt as acutely as it currently remains.

In discussing Grey's treatment of the prose material mainly derived from Te Rangikāheke that initially appeared as appendices in *Nga Moteatea me nga Hakirara o nga Maori*, Williams points out that although sparingly edited in this publication, '...the same material was very freely handled when transferred to "Nga Mahinga"...' (1906:179). He continues

...a comparison of the latter [ie Nga Mahinga a Nga Tupuna Maori] with the original mss. makes it apparent that the editor allowed himself still further freedom, dislocating his narratives, inserting particles, altering the diction, and in places weaving his narratives in such a way as to necessitate wholesale alterations in proper names (1906:179).

Biggs similarly noted that Grey '...took a great many liberties with the original texts' and furthermore identified three categories in which Grey's editing was found wanting (1952:180). Firstly, Biggs found that Grey rearranged and combined material from several sources to 'fill out' the stories and failed to indicate where this had been done (1952:180). He argues that while some of this rearranging may have been necessary, Te Rangikāheke's long narrative concerning Maui, for example, was quite clear before Grey rearranged the episodes in a more strictly chronological order (1952:181).

Secondly, Biggs asserts that Grey indulged freely in the alteration of the construction of sentences which often made for awkwardness and sometimes obscured the sense (1952:181). Biggs highlights Grey's use of "e tika ana ano ena kupu" to replace the 'crisper' original "he tika ena kupu" which changes the grammatical construction from being more nominal to being more verbal.⁹ As the basic content of the two constructions is the same in each, Grey's substitution comes down to a matter of style rather than better

⁹ For more linguistic analysis of te reo Māori see Bauer, Winifred, 2003. *The Reed Reference Grammar of Māori*. Auckland: Reed.

grammar. Grey evidently made this change to suit what he considered to be a better pace in the narrative.

Biggs also notes that Grey substitutes “Ko te kauae o tona tupuna, o Muri-ranga-whenua, kua riro mai koa i mua atu” for the original, more flowing “Kua riro mai koa i mua atu te kauae o tona tupuna, o Muri-ranga-whenua” (Biggs 1952:181-2). Although both sentences are grammatically correct sentences in te reo Māori, the emphasis shifts from being centered on the verb in Te Rangikāheke’s original, to being focused on the subject in Grey’s edited version. In the context of the greater narrative from which these examples are taken, Te Rangikāheke’s original version progresses the narrative as opposed to Grey’s version that enters more haltingly into it.

Finally, Biggs groups together Grey’s ‘..omission of passages which revealed that the authors were familiar with European culture, and of passages which were evidently considered to be too strong for our cultivated tastes’ (1952:181). In terms of the first criticism, Te Rangikāheke begins his manuscript entitled Tama a Rangi:

E hoa mā, whakarongo mai. Kotahi anō te tupuna o te tangata Māori; Ko Ranginui e tū nei, ko Papatūānuku e takoto nei ki ēnei kōrero (GNZMMSS 43: 893).

Te Rangikāheke categorically states his point that, as far as he is concerned, Māori trace their ancestry back to these two beings and to no one or nothing else. As these two ‘primeval’ parents are always considered a binary pair as the respective father and mother of creation, Te Rangikāheke does not write that there are ‘only two’ ancestors of the Māori as this confuses the issue, or at least confuses it in the Māori language. The inference is that this pairing of Ranginui and Papatūānuku are together considered the ‘one’ ancient ancestor of the Māori.

Te Rangikāheke’s manuscript continues:

Ki tā te Pākehā, ki tōna tikanga, nā te Atua anake te tangata me Rangi me Papa me ngā mea katoa i hanga. Ki ngā tāngata Māori, nā Rangi rāua ko Papa ngā take o mua (GNZMMSS 43: 893).

Te Rangikāheke begins his manuscript by contrasting Māori and Pākehā beliefs regarding the origin of creation. This contrast is emphatically made through the juxtaposition of the adverbial phrases 'Ki tā te Pākehā...' and 'Ki tā ngā tāngata Māori...'. Biggs notes that Grey edited out this and other comments which illustrated Te Rangikāheke's observations of the culture contact situation that was the social and political reality of nineteenth century Aotearoa/New Zealand (Biggs 1952).

One of the effects of this editorial decision is the removal of the narratives from a definitive location in time and the reassignment of them to existence in the vague mists of the distant past. In regards to this, Biggs notes that 'The editor appears to have wished to give the impression that the informants were quite unfamiliar with Europeans and their ways and beliefs' (1952: 179). In this way, Grey edited the manuscripts to align them with colonial discourses that allowed Māori to exist as long as they existed without individuality, 'out of time', and without the native writers possessing self-reflective or critical faculties. Via the process of editing, Grey shaped these texts to fit the established mould of acceptable Indigenous colonial discourse thus rendering the Indigenous author's voice effectively absent while simultaneously fostering 'The Invention of Tradition' in New Zealand, the Pacific, and the globe.¹⁰

In this chapter I have shown that Te Rangikāheke's tino rangatiratanga was violated by Grey via the process of editing and that Te Rangikāheke's texts were edited in accordance with Western colonial ideals. The end result of this colonial editing process is a text that is removed from time and space that was then, and is still now, popularly categorised as mythology. As the Māori author of the texts was not acknowledged, so too are Māori frequently unacknowledged. As the text became the property of the publishing company, so too did other Māori intellectual property become the property of New Zealand. As the Māori were 'alienated' from their texts, so too were they alienated from their lands. It is in this way that the process of editing can be seen as a metaphor for the process of colonisation.

¹⁰ See Obeyesekere (1992) and Sahlins (1995)

This being the case, it is hoped that future editions of Grey's Māori books might be metaphorically returned to their original writers, and published under their own names, whānau, hapū, iwi as the case may be. In terms of accessibility to resources this generation of treaty settlements has it within their reach to publish Te Rangikāheke's and other older Māori writing without need of overbearing colonial interference. With such a dream bearing close on the horizon, it is important to remember that such publications would ideally not presume to harken back and represent 'the Māori in his most pure form' before Western-European influences corrupted us, but would rather present writing as inherently subjective as it is.

Conclusion

Exploring the internal horizontal whakapapa of this chapter, of Te Rangikāheke's writing and George Grey's subsequent editing of it, enables us to think about the relationships between Te Rangikāheke and the world he inhabited in his lifetime. Through his manuscripts, to Grey's Māori books, the generation of colonisation from which both emerged was itself a period of Indigenous and colonial contact, interactions and relationships between the Māori and Pākehā, which ultimately led to war. The dream Te Rangikāheke recorded in 1850 foretold conflict between Māori and Pākehā that is mirrored in the process of him writing and subsequently having his work unacknowledged, his words changed, and his grammar corrected by Grey. Te Rangikāheke's matakite, beginning 'Oh, Governor, it was not just me – It was both of us' (GNZMMSS93:3) (my translation) is a sobering reminder of the complicity of both Te Rangikāheke and Grey in the resulting work they produced. It also reminds us that Indigeneity is triggered by colonisation and that without the one, there is no need for the other; the two are interdependent and inseparable and emerge in a context of initial contact, interaction, and subsequent conflict.

It is also interesting to think of how the history of Aotearoa/New Zealand might have played out if the conflict part of the equation had never eventuated. What would Māori look like? What would Pākehā look like? and

What would we look like together? I suggest that rather than advancing these questions as mere triflings of an idle mind, these questions might be vitally important in helping us, as Indigenous Peoples, imagine our futures. I furthermore suggest that we have only gains to be made if we allow free expression to our creativity in searching out better sovereign futures for our people.

Whereas the structure of the previous chapter privileged the horizontal view of whakapapa bound firmly in a nineteenth century colonial context, the whakapapa of this chapter owes its mobility to a vertical plane. Discussions based in an iwi paradigm recall ancestors and origins, which may be one and the same, and descendency as their primary markers of membership. This vertical movement up in time to tupuna and down in time to descendents is temporally shaped rather than being spatially shaped as the horizontal view of whakapapa. The whanaunga one has the opportunity to meet and know in their lifetime may be restricted today to one, or in exceptional cases five or six generations either upwards or downwards on the scale; older or younger. It is not, however, temporally restricted in the sense that whether one lives to know them or not in person, the vertical scale of whakapapa transcends all time.

After locating myself in this thesis in Aotearoa/New Zealand in 2008, this chapter moves vertically up the whakapapa to Te Rangikāheke in his texts between 1849 and 1853. Te Rangikāheke's assertions of his Arawatanga are explored in his writing after which the beginnings of arguing for Arawa Literary theory are expounded. Moving even further up through the vertical, temporal scale of whakapapa, beyond Te Rangikāheke himself, Te Rangikāheke's concern with origins is explored. Within the iwi paradigm posited in this chapter, whakapapa is used as framework that transcends time to explore the iwi dynamic and ultimately, origins.

In terms of current Indigenous scholarship, this chapter also responds to the calls of American Indian Literary Criticism for studies of Indigenous topics to engage deeply with the contexts of iwi and place. As part of a greater Indigenous project, reclaiming our specificities as iwi, as sovereign nations, as Peoples, is high on the agendas of Indigenous Peoples seeking tino rangatiratanga or sovereignty. Indigenous Peoples have for a long time been calling for national if not global recognition of their sovereign rights, and the call for iwi to be recognised for the entities they are as according to their

Indigenous members is one way in which the struggle continues. As with the first core chapter, the whakapapa of this chapter ultimately finds its overarching point in contemporary Indigenous concerns. Regardless of whether the mobility through the whakapapa framework is one that is vertically or horizontally based, the starting point must by necessity begin with the self and with the present time and ultimately rest again with the self in the present; we have to live with ourselves. This Indigenous centered approach enables this thesis to speak to contemporary Indigenous concerns and thereby link in a very real way to our Indigenous communities.

Whakapapa

It is useful to remember that Māori society is organised according to whānau, hapū, and iwi relationships. These relationships today roughly equate to whānau as including those in the immediate and extended family, hapū as comprising of whānau who share a common eponymous ancestor from which descent is claimed, and iwi being groupings of hapū who also claim descent from an eponymous ancestor. Contrary to Mead's assertion that 'The traditional system of whānau, hapū and iwi has not kept pace with the changing situation.' (2003b:209), I argue that this fundamental Māori societal structure is not static in form, but rather exists in an ever-shifting state of adaptation and is therefore very much in pace with the ever-changing contemporary situation. That is, both the use and relative importance of each grouping has shifted and has the potential to continue to do so.¹ Accordingly being Arawa today is much different to what Te Rangikāheke would have understood as being Arawa in his day. The structure of whānau, hapū, and iwi remains but is mutable enough to suit the needs of its people in different eras, living in different circumstances.

Atop the scale of whānau, hapū, and iwi, Māori identify and relate through traditional migratory waka. According to the surviving traditions, Māori ancestors arrived in Aotearoa/New Zealand from Eastern Polynesia

¹ For an interesting discussion of Māori tribal organisation see Belich 1996:81-99.

some 1100-1200 years ago on ocean voyaging waka (Walker 2004:28). Various traditions state that there were People/s already living here and also that there was a period of voyaging between Aotearoa/New Zealand and Polynesia. This period of voyaging to and fro eventually ceased and Māori adapted and evolved into an independent culture, similar to yet distinctive from their Polynesian ancestors (Walker 2004). Present day iwi claim links to other iwi through shared waka traditions. And so, whānau, hapū, iwi, and waka relationships form a complex, interlaced framework dependent on whakapapa through which Māori identify themselves and their place in the world.

Ko Keita Koa Meaha, tāna ko Kīngi; tā Kīngi ko Te Kahurangi tāna ko Hera; tā Hera, ko Arini; tā Arini ko Tāhiwi.

Tēnei ahau e tū mārō ana.

The above text relates my ancestry from my kuia to my son. It is one line of descent, one strand of my whakapapa that contributes to my understanding of how I came to be and my place in the world I inhabit. Keita Koa identified as Ngāti Whakaue, under Te Arawa waka and on this basis I claim kinship through her to the subject of this study, Te Rangikāheke.

Positioning the researcher in the research

But what does it mean to whakapapa, to have kinship ties to the subject of the study in question? In contrast to what Davidson and Ross call ‘the clinically reductionist Western approach to knowledge, where the concern is with the objective and rational’ (2003:2), I posit that the Māori approach to knowledge is holistic and therefore concerned with relationships. In relating my whakapapa to Te Rangikāheke, I reveal my personal connection to this work. This personal connection comes inextricably loaded with the dual responsibility of upholding the mana of my whānau, and also the mana of the subject of this study, Te Rangikāheke. In relating my whakapapa, I lay bare

the accountability to which I am bound in this work to all people with whom I claim whakapapa and in particular, to all people with whom I share whakapapa with Te Rangikāheke; I am accountable to those nearest and dearest to me, my hapū, my iwi, my tupuna, my uri. Such is the complex, trans-temporal nature of whakapapa. In this way my whakapapa to Te Rangikāheke affords this study greater credibility than might otherwise be given it and simultaneously greater accountability. This approach to scholarship is one which positions te ao Māori at its centre and this, in turn, allows new ways of both viewing and challenging the historically dominant Western paradigms and norms of what we understand today to be 'scholarship'.

And so, I locate myself in my research as a Māori scholar with whakapapa to Te Rangikāheke which comes ready-loaded with cultural accountability: cultural checks and balances. In taking this approach to my research, those who whakapapa to me are positioned to critique my work in specific ways and moreover, it is their responsibility to do so. As the researcher, I am both motivated and encouraged to produce the best work I can bearing always in mind the members of my whānau whose prerogative it is to critique this work. In this way, both the researcher and the 'family critics' work to uphold the mana of our shared whakapapa, our shared ancestry, our future generations. Ultimately I argue that my whakapapa to the subject of this study works to affirm, renew, and strengthen my relationship to the work rather than to detract or damage its credibility.

Another positive outcome that results from the researcher possessing kinship connections to the subject of the research and stating these connections overtly is that the findings in the research can be viewed by the reader in terms of the researcher's personal position in relation to the subject of the research. This approach allows the reader to factor in the researcher's personal position when considering the findings of the research which prods the reader into considering for themselves if and how the relationship between the researcher and the subject of the research affects not only the findings, but also the tone and direction of the research. A more involved reading of the research is called for whereby the reader is directed toward considering

the much wider context surrounding the research, specifically the relationship of the researcher to the research itself.

Te Rangikāheke in his texts

Another layer to be considered here is Te Rangikāheke's locating of himself as the author within his texts. One of the ways he does this in his manuscript entitled *Tupuna* (GNZMMSS 44) is by including himself, his wife, and his son in two of some 35 lines of intersecting whakapapa. This whakapapa shows Arawa lines of descent from six of the most illustrious Arawa ancestors, Tama-te-Kapua, Rangitihī, Pīkiao, Whakaue-Kaipapa, Tuhourangi, and Rangiwewehi (Curnow 1983:87). Te Rangikāheke shows his line of descent from Rangiwewehi which supports his position as a rangatira of rank within Te Arawa:

Ko Rangiwewehi, tāna ko Kererū; tā Kererū ko Pupuru, tāna ko Pake; tā Pake ko Manuwaerorua; tā Manu ko Kahutia, tāna ko Te Rangikāheke ; tā Te Rangikāheke ko Wiremu Maihi; tā Wiremu Maihi ko Hataraka Wiremu (GNZMMSS 44:929).²

Te Rangikāheke also shows the whakapapa of his wife Mere Pinepire Maihi from Pīkiao, another highly ranked rangatira of Te Arawa:

Ko Pīkiao anō, tāna ko Hinekura; tā Hine ko Pīkiaowera, tāna ko Te Ariha; tā Te Ariha ko Toroaapukai; tāna ko Puwhakaoho, tā Puwhakaoho ko Tamaiharoa; tāna Mere Pinepire Maihi; tā Mere ko Hataraka Wiremu (GNZMMSS 44:928).

These examples have the effect of positioning Te Rangikāheke and his wife Mere as rangatira of Te Arawa which is furthermore consolidated by the inclusion of their son Hataraka Wiremu. The inclusion of Hataraka serves the

² Te Rangikāheke refers to himself as Wiremu Maihi, and his father and namesake as Te Rangikāheke (GNZMMSS 44:929).

dual purpose of marking Te Rangikāheke's intimate relationship with Mere, and more importantly of entrenching both Te Rangikāheke and Mere firmly within the framework of Te Arawa tradition. The inclusion of Hataraka shows that they have issue with the underlying assumption being that their genealogical line will continue. This aspect of continuation is central to whakapapa as a living, mutable, positioning framework concerned with relationships. Te Rangikāheke therefore positions himself within the whakapapa of Te Arawa and supports his claim to this position by the inclusion of his wife Mere and, perhaps more crucially, his son Hataraka.

It is important to remember here that even and although Te Rangikāheke includes his whakapapa in his *Tupuna* manuscript, the 'Death of the Author' concept in English Literary Theory as expounded by Roland Barthes (1967), provides another angle on my modern day reading of Te Rangikāheke's work. In the case of the whakapapa discussed above, while Te Rangikāheke writes his person into his texts via his whakapapa, the 'author' Te Rangikāheke remains absent and is moreover further distanced by his referring to himself in the third person. To be clear, I am not suggesting that it is possible to know the author, or more precisely whose voice is speaking in the writing, through the whakapapa as recorded in the manuscript. The whakapapa Te Rangikāheke recorded does, however, firmly anchor his writing within a specifically Arawa frame.

The Arawa Writer

With whakapapa occupying one of the most central conceptual positions in te ao Māori, the significance of Te Rangikāheke using it to show his Arawatanga should not be underestimated. It is not, however, the only way in which Te Rangikāheke expresses his specifically Arawa viewpoint in his writing. A close reading of two of Te Rangikāheke's migration narratives also illustrates Te Rangikāheke's distinct Arawatanga. The main body of his manuscript entitled *Tupuna* (GNZMMSS 44) begins with the relatively well-known story of the famed Arawa ancestor, Tamatekapua, who steals the breadfruit of Uenuku. This leads to an account of the building and subsequent

sailing of the Arawa from the ancient homeland Hawaiki, to Aotearoa/New Zealand. Some of the trials and tribulations of the Arawa migration are recounted including how Tamatekapua tricked Ngatoroirangi from the Tainui waka into travelling on board the Arawa

Ka mahara a Tamatekapua, 'Kāore he tangata mātau mō runga anō i tōku waka, engari pea, nāku te tinihanga ki a Ngatoroirangi, ki te rangatira o runga Tainui.' (GNZMMSS 44:922).

and the narrow escape from Te Korokoro o Te Parata

Heke nei, heke nei te waka rā, ā, ka ngaro te ihu, ka taea te taingawai o te ihu, tango atu ki te taingawai o waenga (GNZMMSS 44:925).

Ka puta ake taua māia [a Ngatoroirangi] ki runga, whakaanga ai i te rangi, whakamārie ai. Ka mutu ērā, ka whakahua i te unu mō tāna waka, arā i te hiki ake (GNZMMSS 44:925).

Ehara, tere ana a Te Arawa i runga, māunu ai. Otirā, māunu rawa ake ki runga, kua poto atu ngā utanga ki te wai, he ouou nei i toe iho ki te waka (GNZMMSS 44:926).

These are two specifically Arawa events concerning the migration of the Arawa waka to Aotearoa/New Zealand (Stafford 1967:1-19). The names Tamatekapua and Ngatoroirangi are Arawa ancestors and the Tainui waka is generally acknowledged above other waka as sharing a close relationship with the Arawa.

Te Rangikāheke further asserts Arawa pre-eminence when he tells us that Te Arawa was the first canoe to be built (1983:90). In his manuscript entitled *Maori Religious Ideas and Observances* he writes:

Kātahi ka tuaina a Te Arawa. Ka hinga i a Parata, i a Wahieroa, i a Ngahue; ko te tokomaha o ngā kaihou. Ka oti, ka rongo mai ētahi, ka haere mai ki te tiki mai i ana tohunga hanga waka. Ka tae atu, ka tuaina, ka oti ko Tainui, ko Mātaatua, ko Matawhaorua, ko Kurahaupo, ko Tokomaru (GNZMMSS 81:59).

Te Rangikāheke writes that Te Arawa was felled and completed and when other people heard about this they came to fetch their canoe building tohunga which led to the construction of the Tainui, Mātaatua, Matawhaorua, Kurahaupo and Tokomaru waka. He tells us that Te Arawa was the first waka to be built which suggests that Te Arawa led the way in terms of the decision to migrate from Hawaiki to Aotearoa.

Te Arawa primacy is further supported by Te Rangikāheke's assertion that Te Arawa was the first waka to make landfall at Whangaparāoa

Tēnā, ko ngā tāngata o runga i a Te Arawa i tae tuatahi mai anō ki Whangaparāoa... (GNZMMSS 44:934).

and also that Te Arawa was the only waka strong enough to return to Hawaiki to seek revenge for the expulsion by the descendents of Uenuku, Toitehuatahi, Tamateaariki, and Māuiipōtiki

Ko Te Arawa anake te waka i whaikaha ki te hoki atu ki Hawaiki, whawhai ai ki te rapu utu mō te pananga mai e ngā uri o Uenuku [rāua] (rātou) ko Toitehuatahi, ko Tamateakairiki, ko Māuiipōtiki. Tēnā ko te mano waka nei. Nōhea i whaikaha ki te hoki atu ki te rapu utu ki Hawaiki mō te pananga mai? (GNZMMSS 44:934).

Te Rangikāheke extols Te Arawa bravery in the face of the other waka who migrated to Aotearoa/New Zealand from Hawaiki. This sense of Arawa pride is also evident in other parts of Te Rangikāheke's writing such as in the following where he claims that the descendents who came on Te Arawa were the source from which all other iwi sprang

Muri iho ka toro haere ki ngā whenua puta noa ki runga, puta noa ki raro. Ko te take o ngā tūpuna i tupu ai ki ngā iwi katoa nō runga i a Te Arawa ko Ngā Puhī nō Te Arawa...ko Ngāti Whātua nō reira anō, ko Ngāti Maru, Ngāti Pāoa nō Te Arawa anō; ko Waikato nō Te Arawa; ko Taranaki nō Te Arawa; ko Ngāti Raukawa nō Te Arawa; Ko Ngāti Kahungunu nō Te Arawa; ko Ngāi Tahu-ki-te-Moana-Pounamu nō Te Arawa anō (GNZMMSS 44:927)

This claim is significant as it privileges Te Arawa as being the font of te ao Māori from which all other iwi descended. Other iwi migration traditions do not support this view, which is not to suggest that contradictions between various accounts mean any one of them is simply untrue. On the face of it, however, Te Rangikāheke inflates the mana of Te Arawa beyond such bounds as would ordinarily be accepted by other iwi.

This leads me to Curnow's final observation in support of Te Rangikāheke's particularly Arawa view of history which concerns his description of land occupation (Curnow 1983:87). Curnow notes that 'The boundaries of Arawa land are defined in *Tupuna* – from Maketū to Whangaparāoa (1983:91).

Ka mate iho a Tamatekapua i reira [i Moehau]. Ko te rohe atu tērā o te wāhi whenua i hōhia e ngā tāngata o runga i a Te Arawa. Kei Whangaparāoa te mutunga mai ki runga (GNZMMSS 44:935).

In Te Rangikāheke's manuscript *Maori Religious Ideas* (GNZMMSS 81), narratives concerning Arawa ancestors' naming and claiming land and retaining land through occupation are also told (Curnow 1983:92-93). Te Rangikāheke thus defines the Arawa space and in doing so, claims an Arawa landscape. This is, of course, not to say that Te Arawa was or ever could be somehow restricted to this space, but rather that Te Arawa exists as a nation in a geographical space, as claimed by its members. Furthermore, I argue that via the naming, claiming, and occupying land narratives Te Rangikāheke recorded, he claims a relationship between Te Arawa and their lands. It is important to remember that according to Māori epistemology, all things have whakapapa; all things, including land, are interconnected in a kinship relationship.

Toward an Arawa Literary Theory

It can be seen in the above examples that via his Arawa-privileging whakapapa, his recording of Arawa narratives, Arawa ancestors, and Arawa events, his assertions of Arawa bravery and status, and his descriptions of Arawa land occupation, Te Rangikāheke firmly positions the narratives contained in GNZMMSS 44 and GNZMMSS 81 in te ao Arawa. This positioning invites specific Arawa accountabilities which I posit invites specifically Arawa criticisms. Following the lead of Native American Literary scholar Craig Womack (Muskogee Creek, Cherokee), while not proposing that Arawa people are the only people who can critically engage with Arawa texts in a meaningful way, I argue that ‘...Native literatures deserve to be judged by their own criteria, in their own terms, not merely in agreements with, or reaction against, European literature and theory’ (1999:242). In writing Arawa whakapapa and narratives, Te Rangikāheke establishes grounds for an Arawa reading of his Arawa texts in order that they might be judged by their own merits as opposed to being judged against other iwi literatures, European literatures, and beyond. Again, I do not support an essentialist view that claims Arawa readings as the only way to read Arawa work, but rather, that Arawa readings offer a more intimate exploration of the texts which can be added to conversations of other readings. Although outside the scope of this thesis this approach suggests the opportunity to read Te Rangikāheke alongside other Arawa scholars and writers.

Furthermore, Te Rangikāheke’s Arawa writing acknowledges its own geographic and cultural specificity which, rather than limiting his writing, provides important points of reference for the reader wherever they may come from and whatever they might bring to their respective readings. Without such specific detail, Indigenous tribe and space is erased the result of which sees the Native removed from their national landscape. Divorcing ‘tribe’ from tribal people advances assimilation and works only to extend colonial powers in their imperial aspirations. Reading Te Rangikāheke’s work with emphasis accorded its Arawa centre returns Te Rangikāheke’s writing to its landscape of origin as expressed in the writing itself, to its Arawa community to which the narratives belong. This is to say that the narratives themselves, do not belong

to Te Rangikāheke, but to his Arawa community in what American Indian Literary scholar N. Scott Momaday (Kiowa) has termed “racial memory” that Womack describes as being about ‘the way narrative shapes communal consciousness: through imagination and storytelling, people in oral cultures reexperience history’ (1999:26). Womack continues:

This concept of ancestral memory relates to nationalism in that sovereignty is an intersection of the political, imaginary, and literary. To exist as a nation, the community needs a perception of nationhood, that is, stories (like the migration account) that help them imagine who they are as a people, how they came to be, and what cultural values they wish to preserve (Womack 1999:26).

Although Te Rangikāheke wrote the whakapapa and narratives discussed in this thesis in a specific time and place, they are communally held stories that bind Arawa people through time and space and speak to an Arawa worldview in an Arawa nation in which the sovereignty of Te Arawa is assumed.

In arguing for Cherokee Literary History, Daniel Heath Justice (Cherokee) further advances the call for studies of Indigenous literatures to engage deeply with iwi and place. He writes:

To focus on Cherokee social history through Cherokee literature, on Cherokee terms, returns the focus to where I believe it belongs: on those ideas and concerns that matter to Cherokees (2006:30).

The notion of Indigenous peoples re-claiming their literary traditions through a new mode of criticism that privileges iwi also clears some much needed space in terms of future iwi directions; the questions might now be asked ‘What are the ideas and concerns that matter to Te Arawa?’ and the ensuing ‘What might contemporary Arawa traditions look like?’ This freeing-up of iwi traditions from being locked in time and space must be sought if Indigenous nations are to thrive as the dynamic and creative nations we know them to be. As Native American scholar Robert Allen Warrior (Osage) notes in his work *Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions*,

To understand what the “real meaning” of traditional revitalization is, then, American Indians must realize that the power of those traditions is not in their formal superiority but in their adaptability to new challenges (1995:93).

Warrior therefore advocates for the value of flexibility rather than a fixed understanding of tradition. Seen in this light, notions of Arawa traditions might be extended from thinking about what they might have been, to include a focus on what they could be. This view frees the writing from being locked into the binary of being classed as one of either traditional or contemporary. There is a real danger of Indigenous Peoples being psychologically and spiritually separated from their traditions by this simple exclusionary binary that seeks to define tradition thereby establishing its boundaries and end points. Taken to its inevitable conclusion, Indigenous Peoples would become so greatly separated from their cultural specificities that they would cease to exist as a community, culturally distinct from other communities. As Native American Literary scholar Tol Foster asserts in his essay *Of One Blood: An Argument for Relations and Regionality in Native American Studies*,

If, as [Daniel Heath] Justice notes in his essay, “[e]mpires can’t survive by acknowledging complexity,” neither can tribal or regional communities, even – especially – in resisting those empires. Anywhere the story is simple, we can be assured that it is incomplete and that some crucial member of the community has been silenced (2008:272).

Indigenous communities are internally complex and also exist in complex relationships to other Indigenous communities, to nation states, and the greater global community. Where simplification of these complexities assists the empire’s rationalisation of itself and its designs, due acknowledgment of iwi complexities, as well as being empowering expressions of self-determination, more importantly aid Indigenous survival.

In expounding what he calls his “regional frame” for tribally specific criticism, Foster further argues that

...it carries with it the radical notion that tribally specific work is necessarily incomplete if it does not have multiple perspectives and voices within it and is even incomplete *if it does not acknowledge voices without as well* (2008:272).

This notion of “multiple perspectives and voices” is particularly attractive in terms of Te Rangikāheke’s writing as it relieves his writing of the burden of being understood as ‘the’ Arawa version of the migration tradition, or worse still, ‘the’ Māori version of the migration traditions. While much more research is needed on Arawa literature, much more Arawa literature itself is also needed, both in order to give more nuanced readings of Arawa literature via multiple perspectives. Similarly to how Luomala states in her work on the Polynesian ancestor Maui that ‘there is no single “true” account of the events in Maui’s career’ (1949:11), there exists multiple accounts, or more specifically stories, each with their ensuing specificities and potential criticisms. Just as multiple Arawa migration narratives might be celebrated as much for their diversity as for their sameness, so too are multiple criticisms invited both from within the sphere of te ao Arawa, and ‘without’, from the dominant Euro-Western world and beyond. A respectful relationship between these ‘internal’ and ‘external’ criticisms must be sought in order to advance the respective criticisms beyond picking out each others real or perceived defects at the expense of new and exciting theorizing.

Te Rangikāheke’s concern with origins

Te Rangikāheke begins his three manuscripts entitled *Nga Tama a Rangi* (GNZMMSS 43), *Tupuna* (GNZMMSS 44), and *Maori Religious Ideas and Observances* (GNZMMSS 81), with narratives that use three different approaches to describe the origins of the world. *Nga Tama a Rangi* begins

E hoa mā, whakarongo mai! Kotahi anō te tupuna o te tangata Māori, ko Ranginui e tū nei, ko Papatūānuku e takoto nei ki ēnei kōrero (GNZMMSS 43:893).

Te Rangikāheke states that according to the beliefs recorded in this manuscript, there is but one ancestor of the Māori; Ranginui who stands above, and Papatūānuku who lies below. *Tupuna* begins with what Curnow describes as ‘...a description of the evolution of the universe expressed in a genealogical chant.’ (1983:225)

Ko te pō, ko te pō, ko te pō tuatahi, ko te pō tuarua, ko te pō tuatoru, ko te pō tuawhā, tuarima, tuaono, tuawhitu, tuawaru, tuaiwa, tuangahuru, tuarau, tuamano, tuatini (GNZMMSS 44:915).

The endless darkness and nights which precede The Nothingness and The Searching until the heavens and finally the world takes form are expressed as the very beginnings of the evolution (or creation) of the world. This brings us to *Maori Religious Ideas and Observances* which, after 52 pages containing *karakia* and *whakapapa*, begins the third major section on accounts of the ancestors with

Nā, tēnei anō te take o te whakatupuranga o te tangata... GNZMMSS 81:53).

Te Rangikāheke writes that what follows is an account of the origin of the human generation. Each of the three aforementioned manuscripts is then, at very the outset, concerned with origins, and in particular the origins of Māori.³

This same concern with origins is seen in Te Rangikāheke’s use of *whakapapa* as mentioned earlier in this chapter, in which Te Rangikāheke shows descent lines from six Arawa ancestors. It can be seen here that the concept of *whakapapa*, the notion of a systematic framework that expresses multiple relationships and relationship positions, extends beyond ancestors and descendents to encompass the entire universe. The underlying theme here is that origins must be expressed in order for a framework to be established in which a person, or indeed, anything else in the universe, can claim a position in; without this position, the person or thing is disconnected from all other matter in this or their own particular world which positions them

³ The origins of Māori was a topic of hot debate in the nineteenth century as discussions by such well-known Niupepa Māori writers as Reweti Kohere attests.

as being somewhere outside the same systems that support and compose their world.

On another, more functional level this 'narrative of origins' prompts other iwi to stake their claims and either support these statements or disagree with them. Accordingly, the establishment of an Arawa centre simultaneously establishes an 'outer' in which other traditions, stories, and texts are positioned. In this way, Te Rangikāheke's assertions of Arawa centrality act as potential catalysts in drawing out other iwi perspectives and knowledge while asserting firm statements regarding their own legitimacy. The well-known whakataukī 'Tā te rangatira tāna kai he kōrero, tā te ware he muhukai' (Mead and Grove 2003a:362) illustrates that discussion, stories, conversation, and debate are held in the highest esteem in Māori society. I suggest that Te Rangikāheke's Arawa-centric writing is one way of instigating on-going discussion at an iwi-to-iwi level. One of the effects of Te Rangikāheke's strong Arawa claims is that they inspire strong responses in the form of counter-narratives from other iwi which in turn contribute to the wider collective discussion. As shown in the whakataukī above, it is the discussion itself that is valued and, as I argue that Te Rangikāheke's Arawa-centric writing might contribute to this discussion in multiple and complex ways.

When considered in this way, it can be seen that Te Rangikāheke's account of history does not necessarily privilege Arawa knowledge but rather offers a starting point and a potential framework for discussion which does not seek to mask its own inherent subjectivity. This neatly illustrates the fundamental difference between Euro-Western and Māori value systems concerning knowledge where the former takes a mechanistic view of the natural universe and assumes that it can be understood and described scientifically, and the latter that takes a holistic view whereby everything in the universe is inextricably related (Marsden 1992:3). While it is possible to read Te Rangikāheke's strong assertions of Arawatanga as being just that, I argue that this does not take into account the holistic Māori worldview and the position of the text within this uniquely Arawa, and on a different level, Māori world.

Another concept that it is helpful to consider here is the previously mentioned cultural accountability. Similarly to the notion of the researcher

being held accountable to the research through whakapapa to the subject (of the research), in including himself, his wife, and his son in his recited whakapapa, Te Rangikāheke offers himself as accountable to his ancestors, his immediate family, and his descendents. His claims of Arawa supremacy are held somewhat in check on account of him 'signing his whakapapa' to these same claims. This induces the reader to pause for thought and reflect upon the possibility that Te Rangikāheke's assertion

...ko ngā tāngata anake o runga i a Te Arawa ngā kānano i ruia ai ki te whenua, ā, toro ana ngā kīwei me ngā pekenga o aua kāwai ki runga, ki raro... (GNZMMSS 44:932)

may be true, that only the people aboard Te Arawa stretched forth over the land and therefore that other iwi, hapū, and whānau claims of superior or at least equal status are unfounded. It is important here to state that this study does not seek to assess Te Rangikāheke's recording of traditions in terms of any real or perceived truth-value. This stance is taken in accordance with the view that the 'truth-value' of the narrative is less important than the potential discussion that the narrative can spark. I argue here that writing which serves to clear an intellectual space in which potentially complex discussion can occur is of more concern than writing whose historical truth-value can be satisfactorily established as the former provides a continuation of discussion. It follows that relationships such as those between the writer and their writing, the writer and their audience, and the writing and the audience are a central concern in ascertaining the terms of engagement in the aforementioned 'conversations' and moreover that these relationships themselves constitute a 'truth-value' in the form of cultural and social accountability.

If we are to accept Te Rangikāheke's account of history as being an accurate representation of communally held Arawa traditions, we must also accept that his account is well-founded. I argue here that traditions are internally validated by the community who possesses them and are therefore incomparable to those held in other communities, that is, Arawa tradition exists independently of other iwi tradition though parts may be fluidly shared as traditions are internally shared by a particular community, Te

Rangikāheke's assertions of Arawa ascendancy must be seen as valid insofar as the Arawa community chooses to perpetuate them. Te Rangikāheke's assertions thus work discursively to entrench Arawa ascendancy.

It is also important to remember that similarly to cultures, traditions do not remain static but change in often dynamic ways both with the communities who perpetuate them, and as these communities direct. As 'The Invention of Tradition' (Obeyesekere 1992; Sahlins 1995) debate in Pacific Studies shows us, 'tradition' only becomes static when it is defined as such, and usually initially at least, by outside influences. This is not to say, however, that Indigenous people themselves are entirely free from the restrictive and often disabling idea of tradition as being fixed in time. But it is to take a stance on the reclamation of the what is understood by the word 'tradition'; who defines it, and to what purposes?

Conclusion

This chapter looks at Te Rangikāheke on his own terms and thereby acknowledges and explores his inherent tino rangatiratanga. From his Arawa whakapapa that he privileges, to the content of his traditional narratives, the iwi claims he makes within these narratives, and the concern with origins in his traditional narratives, what becomes quickly apparent is that one of the ways he specifically understood and articulated himself was Arawa. Rather than this understanding being applied externally by researchers, historians, or governmental agents, it is invited from within by Te Rangikāheke himself. I argue that this is an apposite expression of his 'Intellectual Sovereignty'. Ultimately, this chapter privileges iwi as it supports the calls by Native American Literary theorists for readings of Indigenous writing to engage with iwi and place, with their specificities. Compellingly, it is not contradictory that an iwi-centric approach would also draw such close attention to the individual. It is Te Rangikāheke's negotiation between the iwi and the individual which provides an opportunity to move into a biographical treatment in the next chapter.

Revisioning Te Rangikāheke – A Biographical Treatment

After basing the first core chapter in this thesis on the notion of whakapapa as enabling horizontal mobility then following with the second core chapter on the notion of whakapapa as enabling vertical mobility, this final chapter uses another productive take on the whakapapa framework. This chapter is positioned at the point at which the horizontal and vertical lines cross; it centres itself on the individual but looks outwards both horizontally and vertically, and imaginatively like the metaphor of the koru. Beginning with an exploration on perhaps the most basic starting point of the individual, a person's name, the following discussion moves to the vertical plane of whakapapa. The tupuna from whom Te Rangikāheke descends are noted as is his son, the ultimate expression of the continuance of whakapapa, of legacy through generations and time. A close reading of draft letters Te Rangikāheke wrote to Queen Victoria follows, again centralising the individual Te Rangikāheke as the letter writer. Horizontal mobility is again apparent as Te Rangikāheke writes across his generation to his contemporary, the Queen. The letters themselves, however, take on their own creative and imaginative possibilities thus facilitating the individual's private but simultaneously public thoughts.

In her MA Thesis, Curnow constructs what she calls a brief biography of Te Rangikāheke that is '...presented in chronological order, relaxed where necessary for a coherent account of some particular aspect of his life' (1983:6). Curnow's valuable work maps out Te Rangikāheke's life as events in time based closely within the confines of the time of his birth to the time of his death. The biography presented here is not intended as an expanded or revised version of Curnow's work but rather as a new way of articulating ideas of who Te Rangikāheke was via an exploration of his name and a file containing a selection of draft letters written by him which is held in the Auckland Public Library.

This chapter follows the lead of Native American scholar Rayna Green (Cherokee) whom her fellow Native American scholar Robert Warrior notes produced ‘...an insightful reading of a Frank Matsura photograph of two young Native women on a fainting couch that provides an important example of how to read not only for what can be documented but for what the viewer/reader might see as possible in considering a Native subject’ (2005:xv). Green writes,

In this world he [Frank Matsura] shows us, Indians aren’t weird, heartbroken exiles, or zoo animals for the expositions, endangered species preserved forever in photographic gelatin. Like those girls on the couch, they are changed, but in control (1992:52).

I posit that Te Rangikāheke was likewise in control of his life, in as much as anyone in their time is in control of their life, and furthermore that suggestions that Indigenous peoples were and/or are unable to exercise control over their lives are mythological constructs that assist the colonising power in wresting tino rangatiratanga from the minds of Indigenous Peoples. Again, following Green’s example, this is not to suppose that Te Rangikāheke was able to simply dictate the terms of his own destiny; he was, after all, an Indigenous Māori man living for the greater part of his life under the power and authority of the British Crown in a burgeoning, colonial environment. The ways that Te Rangikāheke reaches through his writing to express his agency, however, demonstrate that Māori survival, much like Indian survival, ‘...was more complex and diverse than most pictures of it would have us imagine (Green 1992:53). Close readings of Te Rangikāheke’s manuscripts suggest that he moved fluidly across many social and political settings which shows that he clearly inhabited his contemporary world and its conditions and did not yearn for a distant, idyllic yesteryear.

Through the two close readings that follow, firstly of Te Rangikāheke’s name and secondly of three draft letters he wrote, I hope to demonstrate and undertake a different kind of biographical project that finds its foundations in the individual, their whakapapa, and their writing. Via this creative process new articulations of who Te Rangikāheke was are explored upon a foundation

that bases itself at the convergence point of te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā which Te Rangikāheke himself inhabited.

What's in a name?

The title of this chapter, ‘...tā Te Rangikāheke ko Wiremu Maihi...’(GNZMMSS 44: 929) is but a small sample taken from a much larger and detailed whakapapa that Te Rangikāheke himself recorded in manuscript form. The man referred to in this thesis as Te Rangikāheke is named in his own recording of his whakapapa as Wiremu Maihi in contrast to his father who is named Te Rangikāheke. It is important to pay attention to names in terms of biography, or rather Māori biography, as names complete the framework of whakapapa; without names for the items between which it illustrates relationships, it ceases to function as whakapapa.

Curnow notes that Te Rangikāheke was, however, known by three variations of his name to three respective groups of people in that ‘He was known as Te Rangikāheke to scholars, as Wiremu or Wi Maihi in tribal concerns, and as William Marsh to Pakehas who shared his official and political life’ (1983:1) though it is not clear to whom Curnow gives the title ‘scholar’ here nor exactly what she considers to be ‘tribal concerns’. Moreover, in addition to these variations on essentially the same three names, a brief scan of the nineteenth century monolingual Māori and bi-lingual Māori-English newspapers reveals even more variation in what he was known as including Wi Maihi Te Rangikāheke (TeWM 1875), Wiremu Maihi Te Rangikāheke (TeK 1883), William Marsh Te Rangikāheke (TeW 1875b), Wiremu Maihi Te Rangikāheke Te Umakau (TeKM 1862), and interestingly, though more likely an editorial oversight than an alias, William Marsh the Rangikāheke (TeW 1875a).

While it is clear many of these names are either variations or deviations of Wiremu Maihi Te Rangikāheke, with ‘Wiremu’ and ‘Maihi’ correspondingly being the te reo Māori transliterations of the English ‘William’ and ‘Marsh’, what remains unclear is where, when, and how Te Rangikāheke received his names Wiremu and Maihi. Both the Māori and English forms of these names

were in common use in nineteenth century Aotearoa/New Zealand, which is a particularly apt example of the culture-contact situation in terms of language. Evidence of this language-contact situation is also illustrated in Te Rangikāheke's whakapapa where transliterated names from English do not appear before Te Rangikāheke's generation (GNZMMSS 44:927-932). This also suggests that Wiremu and Maihi are not ancestral names that were passed down to him, although a more thorough search of his whakapapa would be required in order to substantiate this claim.

In her biography of Te Rangikāheke on the Dictionary of New Zealand Biography (DNZB) website, Jenifer Curnow states that Wiremu Maihi (William Marsh) was Te Rangikāheke's baptismal name (2007). Interestingly, according to the *Anglicans in Waiapu* website (2008), a rangatira from Waikato named Ngakuku also took the name William Marsh upon his baptism in 1839 which suggests that there was an influential William Marsh either in, around, or known to the diocese of Waiapu in the early nineteenth century. However, at the time of this thesis being written, the Anglican church in Aotearoa, New Zealand, and Polynesia (Te Hāhi Mihinare ki Aotearoa, ki Niu Tireni, ki Ngā Moutere o Te Moana Nui a Kiwa) had not responded to requests for confirmation that Te Rangikāheke was baptised or a baptismal record or certificate. Though it seems likely that Te Rangikāheke did convert to the Anglican faith and take a baptismal name, it can presently be neither confirmed nor denied which adds another twist to the mystery, whether real or imagined, of his names.

It is also possible that Te Rangikāheke had other names in his youth that came to be replaced by the names that are retained today. It is common practice for Māori to change and/or add names to existing ones in commemoration of notable or major life-events of which baptismal names would, incidentally, figure. 'Pet names' and other such 'unofficial' names flourish and 'official' names are often only known to a certain group of people who shared that person's life experience at a certain stage in their life. The appearance in one nineteenth-century newspaper of the name Te Umakau (TeKM 1862) supports this argument for the fluidity of Māori names in that it is not found in any other newspaper entry by or about Te Rangikāheke and has not been sighted in any of his manuscripts examined thus far. The name does

not appear in Te Rangikāheke's whakapapa, is not a place name that is commonly known today and has no entry in any current Māori dictionaries. It seems to have appeared out of nowhere and disappeared with equal anonymity.

I posit that this uncertainty around some of Te Rangikāheke's names speaks equally to both the agency of the person in question and their capacity to adapt to their immediate environs. Where so often personal identity is dictated to by external influences such as the community or society in which one lives, the certain freedom one has to dictate the terms of one's name is one of the few vestiges through which an individual person is able to express agency. The individual in question might therefore be afforded more space to adapt and reinvent themselves if the specific details of their name are not known.

An important issue when considering names and naming as a researcher in Aotearoa/New Zealand in 2008 is surnames. These 'last names' or 'family names' are a Euro-Western construct that were imposed on Māori when the registration of Māori births and deaths became compulsory in 1913. Māori often chose the name of a close relative to meet this requirement for a surname and these names became quickly embedded as surnames. Although Te Rangikāheke was born well before the registration of Māori births was compulsory, Te Rangikāheke would have been understood by some people to be his surname which is a very personal marker of what happens when two cultures connect.¹ The same complexity or choice remains today whereby he is often referred to as Te Rangikāheke, but his name Wiremu Maihi Te Rangikāheke is also well-known.

Regardless of what other people knew him as, Te Rangikāheke names himself in his whakapapa as Wiremu Maihi who 'belongs' to Te Rangikāheke. This sense of belonging is crucial as it has the effect of reinforcing Te Rangikāheke's claim to his position within the greater scheme of his whakapapa. There are also certain responsibilities that accompany assertions

¹ The registration of Māori births and deaths did not become compulsory until 1913. Some pre-1913 births were recorded and a few were made in the European system. Registration could not effectively be enforced in the early stages which resulted in a great many births and deaths of Māori people not being registered. The registration of European births and deaths was first required by legislation from 1848 and marriage records from 1854. There are earlier records from 1840, but these are very limited (Gillian Tito, personal communication, 24 June 2008).

of belonging to someone within the framework of whakapapa, upholding the mana of your tupuna to whom you belong comes foremost to mind with whanaunatanga coming a close second. Sitting somewhat paradoxically alongside these aforementioned value systems remains the power and autonomy of the individual as illustrated by the names of the individuals that appear in the whakapapa. It is important to remember here that this reading of whakapapa centres on the Māori language used as in the title of this chapter which would be lost if it was translated into the English language. The sense of 'belonging' discussed here is expressed in the particle *tā* which has no English language equivalent but which marks possession. The fuller whakapapa that Te Rangikāheke gives in GNZMMSS 44 might therefore be understood as expressing

Kererū who belongs to Rangiwewehi, Pupuru who belongs to Kererū, Pake who belongs to Pupuru, Manu-wae-rorua who belongs to Pake, Kahutia who belongs to Manu, Te Rangikāheke who belongs to Kahutia, Wiremu Maihi who belongs to Te Rangikāheke, and Hataraka Wiremu who belongs to Wiremu Maihi (my translation).

Those listed in the whakapapa belong by right of birth to each other and, although the line reads vertically through generations rather than horizontally across generations, the people named are directly and intimately connected. All those named are accountable to each other while simultaneously maintaining the integrity of their line of descendency.

In summary, Te Rangikāheke was known and understood in varying and sometimes overlapping and competing contexts which is illustrated in the multiple names he was known by. I posit that rather than Te Rangikāheke's multiple and sometimes illusive names confusing our understanding of who he was and what he did, they provide a model for understanding the complex relationships he forged and the roles he undertook in terms of his world as he knew and inhabited it. This notion of multiple names is therefore a useful metaphor when exploring the effects of colonial encounters on Indigenous peoples and in particular notions of Indigenous agency. Te Rangikāheke's various names would have assisted him in maintaining discrete psychological

or spiritual boundaries between his sometimes competing identities as an Arawa, a Māori, a writer, and a public servant, as well as assisting him in moving fluidly between his roles through the slippery political and social landscape of colonial Aotearoa/New Zealand.

There are more 'unseens' than 'seens' when it comes to Te Rangikāheke's names which is not to say that an exhaustive search has been made or that it is even possible to make such a search. The illusive nature of Te Rangikāheke's names reinforces the importance of reading Te Rangikāheke's writing in order to sketch out an outline of who Te Rangikāheke was and how he perceived the world.

Revisioning

The following biographic re-vision(-ing) is drawn from a reading of what I have ascertained to be three excerpts of three draft letters written by Te Rangikāheke to Queen Victoria. Interestingly, although these excerpts were archived together in one file, closer inspection reveals three discrete variations in handwriting, and three distinct subjects corresponding to the changes in handwriting style. The same three excerpts fit relatively neatly into a beginning section complete with opening salutation, a mid section, and an ending complete with obligatory signature line which may have something to do with why they were filed together as one document.

Whichever the case, it is my view that the archiving together of these three excerpts affords us a fortuitous opportunity to read Te Rangikāheke across three of the many contexts in which he lived his life. I also contend that these excerpts invite us to consider the physical journeys Te Rangikāheke's writing sometimes took and how these can be seen as a useful metaphor in terms of his life. In his article 'Race and the webs of empire: Aryanism from India to the Pacific', Tony Ballantyne argues that, '...where Sinha has highlighted the interdependence and mutually constitutive nature of metropolitan and colonial histories, we must also pay close attention to the

'horizontal' connections that linked colonies directly together (2001).² Crucial to his argument is '...the strength of the networks that integrated the British empire and the inherent mobility of colonial knowledge' (2001). Where George Grey is a particularly precocious example in that he took four respective Governorships in three separate British colonies, the notion of 'horizontal mobility' is also useful in considering both genre, and the physical mobility of Te Rangikāheke's letters.

Firstly in terms of genre, Te Rangikāheke's letters call for our reading to take into account multiple and overlapping conventions. English writing conventions, nineteenth century Māori writing conventions, and Māori oral forms collide, overlap, and fuse in the letters which encourages a similar 'mobility' be employed in our reading of them. Where a reading that takes its lead from notions of 'vertical' mobility would necessarily privilege either the Māori or the English conventions as the 'metropole', horizontal mobility promotes reading across and through genres without the need for privileging one at the expense of the other.

Secondly, the physical mobility of the letter, destined to bridge distances and people, is an apposite metaphor for Te Rangikāheke's social mobility which is itself illustrated by these letters. The fact that Te Rangikāheke was writing letters to Queen Victoria at all let alone the familial tone with which Te Rangikāheke writes these letters suggests that he had a relationship or some kind of connective ties with her. This cordial relationship Te Rangikāheke fostered with the British Crown and its New Zealand representatives may well have come at the cost of maintaining good relationships with many of his own Arawa kin but which again afforded him the social mobility he evidently desired.

Whereas the mobility to which Te Rangikāheke aspired in his day was perhaps more socially than spatially defined, Māori people in 2008 have more access than ever before to convenient and speedy travel. This is not to suggest, however, that all Māori currently share equal opportunities in terms of social mobility. It is important to recognise the positions of privilege that Māori scholars occupy in stark contrast to the majority of the Indigenous population

² Sinha, Mrinalini, 1998. Britain and the Empire: Toward a New Agenda for Imperial History. *Radical History Review*, 72.

of Aotearoa/New Zealand. Notwithstanding this, the relative ease and logistics of modern modes of travel enabled me to go to Auckland, view Te Rangikāheke's original manuscripts, photocopy them, and treat them in a particular way. In the particular case of this thesis, my modern day Māori mobility facilitated my reading of Te Rangikāheke's manuscripts and my own study of them.

The Letters

The first section is relatively small consisting of one and a third pages of handwritten script that ends abruptly leaving a large gap on the second page. The pagination begins 261 and ends 262. The second letter is the largest of the three and consists of 12 manuscript pages numbered 263 through 274, and the third letter is approximately the same size as the first and consists of 2 manuscript pages numbered 275 through 276.

A note appears in the top left hand corner of the manuscript.

Te Rangī-ka-heke
Drafts of two letters
written to Queen Victoria
May 18 1850
Bleek v.2 14.4 p.72

The manuscript catalogue number GNZMA 723 appears in the top right hand corner, and the final 'stamp of authority' appears on the bottom of the photocopied page and reads

This copy is supplied on the understanding that it is to be used only for private study or research purposes, and that no part may be reproduced in any form without prior written permission of the Auckland Public Library.

These official stamps of archival material belie the vibrant, descriptive language that fills this body of writing, and furthermore raise some vexing

questions as to whose possession these letters currently are in, and to whom they might go in the future. In the case of these particular manuscripts, as an Indigenous Māori scholar living and working in Aotearoa/New Zealand in 2008, my tupuna's letters that were addressed to the Queen are accessible to me via a library that was established by some colonial forefathers and consequently run by an agent, that is, Auckland City Council, of the same yet different Crown to whom these letters are addressed. These same letters have been archived, photocopied, dated, and stamped by this library to whom I have to ask permission to quote my tupuna's writing in this thesis.

Perhaps the most ironic part of this intricate official dance is that the letters from the Native written in their Indigenous language that never reached the 'coloniser' are being held in the coloniser's archives far from where most Native eyes will ever espy them in the same colony in which they were written; these letters eventually reached England, their country of destination, from whence they travelled to the Cape Colony in Africa, to arrive back at their country of origin. They currently rest far from where most people who can read them will ever find them. Having been educated at a Western-style University, it has been my privilege to be able to access, read, and study Te Rangikāheke's letters; my Western-based education has allowed me access beyond the official stamps and regulations. This is but one example of how the elitism that education in Aotearoa/New Zealand further disadvantages the Indigenous Māori of this country and additionally contributes to internal cultural splintering and dysfunction.

Scholars in historical and literary studies have written extensively on how to work with correspondence. One of the more productive lines of inquiry is found in the discussion of a short story by Poe in the book *The Purloined Poe*. Although a full discussion of this theoretical angle lies outside the scope of this thesis, it is worth drawing attention to Lacan's argument which is contained in the book; 'a letter always arrives at its destination' (Muller 1988:53). Critical discussions in the book argue that letters exist in a 'tri-' rather than 'bi-' situation whereby there is the author, the intended recipient, and some other party who wants to get in between and intercept the letter for their own reasons. This theoretical perspective on reading correspondence intended for someone else is clearly pertinent in a

consideration of how to read letters written by Te Rangikāheke and intended for Queen Victoria.

To return to Te Rangikāheke's physical letters, we are reminded that, regardless of the intended recipient of these letters, they came to be part of Grey's library which was transported to South Africa in 1861 where they lay virtually undisturbed until 1922-23 (Biggs 1952:177). The physical journey of Te Rangikāheke's texts from Aotearoa/New Zealand to South Africa only to return to Aotearoa/New Zealand some sixty years after they first left can be seen as a homecoming of somewhat peculiar sorts; these letters, or parts of draft versions of letters that were originally intended for the Queen, were instead sent with the rest of Grey's personal library to Capetown Public Library, after which they eventually returned home to lie in Auckland Public Library where they lay hidden until relatively recently.

A final note concerning all three letters is that Te Rangikāheke writes from a specifically Māori perspective by presenting the two sides under discussion as falling respectively under the terms of either 'Māori' or 'Pākehā'. He includes no other social or ethnic grouping in his discussion and clearly demarcates them as being two discrete groups positioned in a binary relationship. Furthermore, rather than complicating the notions of iwi identity proposed in the chapter on Arawa literary theory in this thesis, this serves to underscore the complexity of Te Rangikāheke's identity politics that allows for multiple strands, layering, and understandings to co-exist in the one person and to be called forward into a position of privilege as the given circumstances may require. This again underlines the agency Te Rangikāheke exercised as he negotiated his colonial world.

Letter 1

In the first letter, Te Rangikāheke recalls an impressive celebration, a hākari, held in honour of the Queen. He writes of the plentiful and good food that was served and mentions in particular the many loaves, cows, plums, and potatoes that were served

E nui ana ngā rohi i pau, e nui ana ngā kau, e nui ana ngā paramu me ngā taewa i taua hākari (GNZMA 723, Part 1:261).

He then describes the women's beautiful dancing and their well suited clothes, and the sparkling metallic colours on the officers' and the Governor's attire:

Koia anō ehara ka turua te mahi o te wahine, te taonga nei a te kākahu hei whakapaipai me te mahi kanikani....Tirohia atu tōna kākahu nei, te kahu āpiha. Ehara uira kau ana te mahi a te paraihe, a te kōura. Haunga anō ia o te Kāwana kākahu te mahi a te hiriwā (GNZMA 723, Part 1:261).

Te Rangikāheke then writes again about the amazing spread laid out before them:

Ka kite mātou i te tini o ngā kai e puranga ana i runga i te tiperoa. Koia anō ehara ka mā, ka pango, ka whero, ka aha, ka aha e! (GNZMA 723, Part 1:262)

I would like to firstly draw attention to the fact that this relatively small section of a draft letter, offers us a vivid, dynamic window into Te Rangikāheke's life that gives full voice to his experience from his unique perspective. Te Rangikāheke's obvious delight and awe with both the food and the dancing are tacit reminders of his Māori cultural determiners which are themselves reminders of the specifically Māori view point of the event being described. Kai and haka in their numerous forms feature strongly in traditional narratives, cultural practices, and day-to-day life as they are central in te ao Māori, in a Māori space, in a Māori existence. Traditional narratives tell of Tānerore, the son of Tamanui-te-rā and Hine-raumati, whose shimmer is reflected in the wiriwiri of modern day haka exponents, and of the womenfolk of Tinirau who performed a haka in the homeland of Hawaiki to elicit a smile from the deceitful Kae. Others tell of the meek brothers Haumia-tiketike and Rongomātāne whom Tāne dug up, made common, and ate. Whakataukī such as 'Nā tō rourou, nā taku rourou, ka ora ai te iwi' are commonly heard at many a Māori gathering where the sharing of food or sustenance features

prominently, as are traditional foods still prepared by the hau kāinga for manuhiri to enjoy. Te Rangikāheke's dual focus on the food and the dancing at the feast he describes in this letter therefore correspond to Māori social preoccupations that are still very much recognised and enjoyed by Māori today.

Another feature of this excerpt that reoccurs throughout much of Te Rangikāheke's writing is the bold line he expressly draws between Māori and Pākehā. He begins by writing of the benevolent hospitality directed specifically toward the Māori who attended the celebration and the large quantity of food that was prepared for them:

Kua kite mātou i tana tino atawhai ki ngā Māori he nui anō tana kai i hōmai ki ngā Māori mō te hākari...(GNZMA 723, Part 1:261)

and also clearly states that this occasion exemplified a Pākehā hākari

Ā muri iho, ko te hākari a te Pākehā (GNZMA 723, Part 1:261).

He goes on to comment on what he must have thought of as being a peculiar aspect of Pākehā women's physicality:

Kei whea rā a te Pākehā kai e takoto ana inā te āhua o tōna uma te iti rawa, ahakoa nunui te wahine, inā tonu te iti o te uma (GNZMA 723, Part 1:261).

before drawing a comparison between material possessions of the Māori and Pākehā

Whakamai tēnā hanga te tangata Māori ki ō hanga, ki ō te Pākehā rawa (GNZMA 723, Part 1:261).

He then ends this letter with his appreciation of the Pākehā foods served and the hospitality demonstrated:

Ko wai hei kōrerorero i ngā kai rau a te Pākehā, he Pākehā, he Pākehā anō kua ai āu tini mahi (GNZMA 723, Part 1:262).

The above excerpts demonstrate that Te Rangikāheke was as aware and as curious of Pākehātanga as amateur ethnologists like George Grey, Elsdon Best, and others were of Māoritanga and moreover that he and other Māori were well prepared to engage in these new experiences, reflect upon them, and draw their own conclusions about them in terms of their own lived realities. Whereas colonial discourses tend to emphasize the novelty of the Native, this letter emphasizes the novelty of the coloniser and shows that Māori were just as interested in the social and material cultures of their colonial counterparts.

Additionally, in the case of Te Rangikāheke and the majority of nineteenth century Māori writers, the greater part of access to their versions of cultural encounters is granted via te reo Māori. This highlights a way in which the loss of te reo Māori adversely affects not only Māori society, but greater Aotearoa/New Zealand society. Te Rangikāheke's letters have much to contribute to the stories that constitute the history of this Pacific country, but are lost on those who do not speak te reo. Bi-lingualism in English and Māori is required in order that the two sides of the partnership on which Aotearoa/New Zealand is founded might be heard.

It is also interesting to consider the relative ease with which Te Rangikāheke is able to compare things Pākehā and things Māori. We are reminded that the boundary between each group was then more pronounced and that theirs was a relationship in its infancy. This letter was written a decade after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, a decade before the land wars that tore apart Waikato and Taranaki began, and I suggest that it offers a glimpse into Te Rangikāheke's generally positive, buoyant outlook on the world in which he lived and his future yet to come. This letter provides us with a snapshot, a brief glance not only into Te Rangikāheke's life, but into the path our greater Māori – Pākehā relationship may have taken if it had been carefully nurtured and mutually sought.

Letter 2

In contrast to the first letter where the focus is a social occasion, this second letter is primarily concerned with politics and Māori and Pākehā relations (Curnow 1983:49). Te Rangikāheke articulates many of the problems facing Māori at the time, and furthermore offers advice to the Queen (and the Governor) on how the 'new nation' might be run more effectively and fairly that both Māori and Pākehā might live in peace and harmony.

Another difference between the first letter and this second one is that the second begins abruptly in mid-sentence and also appears with numbering that does not align with the other pages' overlying numbering. The number seven is written at the top of the first page in brackets which aligns with the number ten found on the third page following this first one. Although these are the only two numbers like this found in the manuscript, they do appear to be in Te Rangikāheke's handwriting. The abrupt beginning and alternate pagination suggests that the first six pages are missing from this letter which, rather than being cause for regret, provides us with another way in which to consider this manuscript, to imagine what happened to these letters as Te Rangikāheke was writing them and after, and why. I argue that it is as important to pay attention to what is present as what is not and therefore has to be imagined. It is through this creative work that we allow ourselves the myriad possibilities that accompany the freedom of imagination, of re-visioning to bear fruit. It is through this work that we allow a part of the full and whole person that is Te Rangikāheke to speak to us in a different way to that which is made possible via archive, record, and historical 'fact'.

A notable feature in terms of the internal structure of this letter in comparison to the first is Te Rangikāheke's use of lists. I contend that Te Rangikāheke used these lists to not only convey information clearly, but to also present his over-arching argument/s in an ordered, coherent manner. Te Rangikāheke includes five lists in this letter the contents of which can be summarised as follows:

1. the various names of the Governor/positions the Governor is seen as occupying/occupies [9 items]

2. the reasons why the Governor is loved by Māori [12 items]
3. the few laws that both Māori and Pākehā must obey under British Law [4 items]
4. things that raise discontent in Māori [13 items]
5. things the Queen should not send to New Zealand [10 items], one that should exercise caution, and one that is fine to send

Te Rangikāheke presents these lists in an astute way that firstly acknowledges the Governor and the respect the Māori have for him before moving into the more critical issues of civil law and order that Te Rangikāheke wants to engage the Governor and the Queen in. He constructs his argument in a methodical way that appeals to the existing sympathies of and/or perceived role of the Governor as the Queen's representative in New Zealand. In this way, Te Rangikāheke first clears and claims a space for engaging with the Queen, then informs her of things Māori that he must have assumed her to either not know or not be sufficiently knowledgeable of, before finally asserting his opinion on what the Queen should and should not give to Māori and/or send to New Zealand.³ Te Rangikāheke corrects the Queen with the central point here being that Te Rangikāheke's 'argument' proves difficult to argue with. The simple fact bears mentioning that Te Rangikāheke's writing exhibits both the debating skills of a successful politician and the social awareness of the most decorous of nineteenth century social and political butterflies.⁴

Furthermore, I hypothesise that the underlying sub-text of Te Rangikāheke's argument as illustrated in these combined lists is his belief in the potential for a thriving bi-cultural society to be forged in nineteenth century New Zealand. Te Rangikāheke evidently envisioned Māori and Pākehā living together in New Zealand as true partners bound under the auspices of Te Tiriti o Waitangi as demonstrated by the following excerpt from this letter. Subsequent to his second list of the reasons why the Governor is loved by Māori he writes:

³ This is dependent on whether Te Rangikāheke's use of the Māori pronoun *mātau* referred specifically to Māori, to another somewhat arbitrary group of people, or collectively to everyone living in Aotearoa/New Zealand at the time.

⁴ For more on Indigenous subversion of the technology of writing see van Toorn 2006.

...me whakanui ngātahi ēnei mea kino e te ture [ngā mea kino ki tā te ngākau Māori me ngā mea kino i whakaritea e te Kāwanatanga o Ingarangi]...me tuku ēnei mea ki roto o te ture kia āta whakawākia kia pai ai, kia tino kotahi ai te Pākehā, te Māori (GNZMA 723, Part 1:264).

Te Rangikāheke then reasons that Māori notions of unacceptable behaviour should be given equal weight as those prepared by the English Government to form the laws of this land in order that both Pākehā and Māori be treated equally and therefore be united under the law. He was of the opinion that most of the issues that gave rise to dispute were beyond Pākehā comprehension but remained strong amongst Māori:

Erangi ko te nuinga o aua tikanga kino nei i tupu ai tēnei mea te pakanga kua ngaro. Otirā ngaro kau ēnā ki te aroaro o ngā Pākehā. Tēnā ki ngā wāhi kāinga o te Māori e noho whakangete tonu ana ki ā rātou whakamāori mō aua ritenga e huna nei e te Pākehā (GNZMA 723, Part 1:265).

and that if Māori were left to independently retain their old customs and beliefs, the result would be fighting and war to which the Pākehā would ignorantly lie prone

Kei waiho ki ngā Māori anō ā rātou ritenga o mua pupuri ai ka tupu anō aua mea hei pakanga mā te Māori. Anā ko reira koutou ngā Pākehā ka horihori tāpapa kau ki runga i aua whawhai nei (GNZMA 723, Part 1:265).

Te Rangikāheke urges the Governor to pass his words on to the Queen and reiterates his earlier point that they should be entered into the judicial system of New Zealand. He adds that these things do, after all, result from the arrogant, conceited side of humankind which I posit appeals to the notion of all humankind being united on a fundamental level:

He whāki atu tēnei nāku ki a koe e Te Kāwana, kia tukua atu ki a Te Kuini ēnei kupu, ā māu e Te Kāwana, mā Te Kuini hoki e tuku ēnei mea ki roto i te whakawākanga o Niu Tireni. Tā te mea hoki ko te take katoa o ēnei mea kua

whākina, i iho nā e au he whānako katoa, arā, he tikanga whakahīhī nā te ngākau o te tangata (GNZMA 723, Part 1:266).

Te Rangikāheke then emphasises the importance of these concepts to Māori by spelling out in plain Māori the severity of the consequences suffered by those who transgressed these:

He ūpoko tangata katoa e motu mō ēnei mea...he kakī tangata te utu, he whenua rānei me tango (GNZMA 723, Part 1:266).

After this, Te Rangikāheke lays out his fifth and final list in this letter which contains items the majority of which he believes the Queen should not send to New Zealand:

Ko ngā pū, paura, matā; ko ngā waipiro; ko ngā Pākehā tohua, tāhae rānei nei; ko ngā kaipuka whawhai, tāhae rānei; ko ngā Pākehā pōrangī, e haurangi nei, arā, ko ngā mea whakatūtūā tāngata, whakamate hoki; ko ngā kararehe kai tangata; ko ngā ngārara neke nei hoki; ko ngā mea e kai nei hoki i ngā kai; ko ngā tarutaru whakapākihi whenua (GNZMA 723:270).

This list includes guns, powder, and bullets, alcohol, man-eating animals, and Pākehā who are not in their right minds and who make slaves of people or kill them. He also warns that those that come to New Zealand upon ships should exercise caution but goes on to write that trading ships and Pākehā traders are fine to send.

Ko ēnā o āu e āta ako atu ki ngā kaipuke e rere mai ana ki tēnei motu kia tūpato rātou, e rere mai ki Niu Tirenī nei. Erangi ko ngā kaipuke me ngā Pākehā e tuku mai ana ko ngā kaipuke utauta taonga mai, ko ngā Pākehā hokohoko taonga hoki; ko ā mātou tēnā e pai atu nei kia tukua mai e koe (GNZMA 723:270).

He finishes this section by asking the Queen not to send destitute Pākehā to New Zealand as they frustrated them because they were living quite well here in Aotearoa/New Zealand.⁵

Tēnā ko te tini o ngā Pākehā tūtūā rawakore nei kua ēnā e tukua mai ki tēnei motu whakapokaikaha i a mātou tā te mea kua noho pai noa iho mātou (GNZMA 723, Part 1:270).

To conclude, the first and second letter are similar in many ways yet also markedly different in others. Both letters are written to Queen Victoria by Te Rangikāheke and both letters separate Māori and Pākehā into two opposite groups whereby the one gives rise to the other in an oppositional relationship. The main difference between the two is in the content and genre where the first letter describes a social occasion but the second letter outlines the imbalanced political relationship as Te Rangikāheke understood it, between Māori and Pākehā in Niu Tirenī in 1850.

Letter 3

In contrast to the previous two letters, the central focus of this letter is commerce and/or commercial enterprise in which Te Rangikāheke was plainly very interested as other correspondence and actions such as his work as a land court assessor attest. Te Rangikāheke writes to the Queen requesting that she send him some goods that he might establish himself as a trader to the Māori.

Te Rangikāheke begins by asking the Queen to agree to him 'lowering himself' to be 'her servant' or to work for her even and although he is a rangatira:

⁵ Again, this is dependent on whether Te Rangikāheke's use of the Māori pronoun *mātou* referred specifically to Māori, to another somewhat arbitrary group of people, or collectively to everyone living in Aotearoa/New Zealand at the time.

He mea atu tēnei nāku ki a koe, kia whakaae mai koe ki ahau hei pononga māu. Ahakoa he rangatira ahau, me whakapononga atu ahau ki a koe (GNZMA 723, Part 1:275).

He follows this with his specific request for her to send him goods that he might trade these to the Māori, to the indigenous people of this land:

He tono atu nāku ki a koe ki ētahi o āu rawa kia hōmai ki ahau māku anō e tiaki i konei. Ko ahau anō hei kaihoko ki ngā Māori o tēnei motu (GNZMA 723, Part 1:275).

It is important to remember that Te Rangikāheke was likely to have been writing to Queen Victoria on equal terms as one partner to another in accordance with Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Although he respectfully addresses her at the beginning of the first letter discussed in this chapter as “kui”, he also registers his rangatira status as mentioned above. It is also important to note that although he seeks to lower himself in deference to the Queen, he gives no indication that his status as rangatira in regards to anyone else either has, will, or might change. It appears that Te Rangikāheke considered himself to be of equal status to Queen Victoria which is further supported by the finer details of his request for goods as outlined below.

Te Rangikāheke asks the Queen to buy or sell him some blankets, packages of fruit, calico, hats/shirts (woolen?/oil skin?), axes as well as things that are inexpensive where she resides, but cost more here in Aotearoa/New Zealand:

Ki te whakaae mai koe, hokona mai ētahi tarengarenga paraikete kia rua rānei, kia kotahi rānei, me ētahi pihi kaone, kareko kiepo, hate puru, toki, hei ngā mea utu ngāwari i kōnā kia tae rawa mai ki konei ka whakanuia ake te utu (GNZMA 723:275).⁶

He then expressly writes that he is not asking her to pay for these goods:

⁶ *Hoko* is difficult to translate into English as it can mean ‘buy’, ‘sell’, ‘trade’, and ‘exchange’

Ehara au i tuhituhi utu ai (GNZMA 723:275).

Te Rangikāheke goes on to describe finer details of Pākehā trading he had witnessed at one particular place where he stayed for a month and where he writes that he would like to go and live and trade. He recounts the details concerning prices that certain goods such as pigs might fetch, the Pākehā he had observed trading in this place, and the profits they might make when dealing in the trade and exchange of such goods:

...kite ana au i ngā Pākehā hoko e tae atu ana ki taua wāhi, e utua ana hoki ngā iāri e waru mō te poaka kotahi, e hokoa ana hoki taua poaka ki te pāuna moni kotahi me ngā hereni e toru i reira rānei inā tae ki te tāone ka tekau mā rua iāri e utua ana ki te poaka kotahi, e riro mai ngā pāuna e rua inā utua atu. Mō te paraike kotahi, kotahi poaka e whitu ko te rīwai te utu mai, mō te hāte kotahi tarautete kotahi rānei, kotahi poaka te utu ngā utu ki te Pākehā, kotahi tekau hereni mā rima mā ono rānei mō te pihi horoi, arā, hopi, kotahi poaka utua atu e waru hereni e toru rānei tāra (GNZMA 723, Part 1:275).

After outlining his supporting information, Te Rangikāheke arrives at the crux of this letter; he proposes that the Queen should send him goods to trade, that he will pay her back for these goods from the profits he makes, and that she should also arrange payment for him for on-selling her goods, and clothing:

...nō konei au i mea atu ai ki a koe kia hōmai he taonga ki ahau hei hoko, ā, me whakahoki utu e ahau ngā mea utu o aua taonga ki a koe i roto i ngā tau katoa, ā, māu anō e whakarite mai he utu ki ahau mō taku mahi hoko i āu mea i roto i ngā tau katoa me ētahi kahu hei mahanatanga ki a mātou (GNZMA 723, Part 1:276).

Te Rangikāheke first lowers himself under the Queen, before describing how profits are being made from trade goods. He then asks the Queen to send him goods for trade, payment for his work as a trader, and clothing. He also adds that he will pay her back for the goods she sends. He expresses his desire to enter into this specific arena of commercial enterprise with his point of difference being that he will trade to Māori. He formulates a scheme in

order to procure the goods needed for trade and makes use of what he must have considered to be an established relationship with the Queen. He reminds her that he taught her ‘brother’, the Governor, and that he is writing to her with this request because his prior work with the Governor has now finished:

Tā te mea kāore he mahi māku e ka oti taku mahi ako i tōu tungāne, i a Te Kāwana, koia au i tuhituhi atu ai kia whakaritea mai e koe he taonga hoko māku ki taua whenua nei (GNZMA 723, Part 1:276).

The content of this letter suggests that Te Rangikāheke had somewhat of an entrepreneurial personality as in it he puts forward his request, supports it with facts and figures, and links in his previous work with the Governor as extra supporting information and perhaps to remind her of their prior, mutually productive working relationships. We are shown another facet of Te Rangikāheke’s understanding of his relationship with the Queen, of his work, and of his future prospects as he saw them, or as he wanted the Queen for whatever reason to see them. This enriches our understanding of him looking as Māori scholars in 2008 toward older articulations of our past.

Conclusion

We are limited in how much we can argue that the subaltern has the capacity to speak across time and space and that we are not interpreting their work via our contemporary assumptions and prejudices. Much like a scientific experiment, we can however build controls into our work as a way of supporting our argument. One of the controls employed in this analysis was paying attention to one text in exploring Te Rangikāheke’s life rather than his complete works. Although close examination suggests they are in fact three letters, they were all written to Queen Victoria by Te Rangikāheke, the handwriting suggests that they were all written around the same time, and they were all filed together.

Reading these excerpts from one manuscript file of letters written by Te Rangikāheke alongside each other facilitates an entry into the world of Te Rangikāheke the man, the Māori, the person. These letters being but one possible entry point, it is important to remember the limitations of this approach while also considering the new understandings made possible by it. One of the dangers in examining letters is that one could be tempted to think that what the writer wrote in their personal correspondence was what they themselves believed to be true. This view, however, is too simplistic and does not lend full weight to the intelligence of the writer. As Penny van Toorn shows in her work on Aboriginal writing in the nineteenth century (2006), Indigenous peoples suffering under colonial rule learnt to subvert the coloniser's technology of writing and encode messages through their writing. Te Rangikāheke and many other Indigenous people the world over similarly subverted the Euro-Western technology of writing frequently using it to serve their own needs, which were known to them, but which we might only guess at, hence one of the uses of imagining.

In this thesis I have explored Te Rangikāheke and his work through the traditional framework of whakapapa. Articulating whakapapa between Indigenous Māori and other Indigenous Peoples is one way in which whakapapa has been employed due to its central concern with relationships. This use of whakapapa has enabled me to draw on the work of American Indian Literary theorists in this study, specifically those concerned with Literary Nationalism. Where whakapapa has enabled me to elucidate relationships between the three core chapters of this contemporary work, it has also been explored within each chapter in other ways; in terms of the tuakana/teina dynamic of Te Rangikāheke and Grey's relationship, Te Rangikāheke's Arawa whakapapa as recorded by him, and finally in the whakapapa of his name.

In chapter two (the introduction being chapter one) I argued that George Grey's editing of Te Rangikāheke's manuscripts is an apposite metaphor for the process of colonisation. Grey was read through the many and varied prefaces he included in his Māori publications and Te Rangikāheke was read through his manuscripts that formed much of the basis for Grey's aforementioned publications. Te Rangikāheke and Grey's shared whakapapa was discussed as was the effects of Grey's editing decisions on Te Rangikāheke's texts.

Chapter three argues for Arawa Literary Nationalism. Te Rangikāheke's whakapapa as recorded by himself in his manuscripts launches the discussion which moves to how Te Rangikāheke positions himself in his texts. The many instances of Arawatanga in Te Rangikāheke's texts are examined as is Te Rangikāheke's concern with origins.

In chapter four re-visionings of who Te Rangikāheke was were sought through firstly exploring the whakapapa of his name and secondly through close readings of three draft letters he wrote to Queen Victoria. Rather than using documentation as the basis for biography, Te Rangikāheke is imagined as he wrote these three very different letters to the Queen.

This imagining returns this thesis to its own beginning, to the exploration and celebration of dreams and potential. Prominent Māori lawyer, writer, researcher, and koro Moana Jackson talked about the relationship between research and dreams in his keynote address to Te Oru Rangahau Māori Research and Development Conference held at Massey University in 1998. He articulated a dream for the contemporary Māori scholar that respects our whakapapa, our dreams, and our spirituality;

That we be brave enough not just to do research which will have a practical application in the world as it is, but rather that we are visionary enough to undertake research that will help our people in a world as it may be. That we be not afraid to dream, and that we accept that if we are spiritual people, and I believe we are, then we understand that the spirit is the base of our dreams. For if we conduct research in a dreamless world then we do not create a vision of hope for our mokopuna (1998:77).

This thesis has not been conducted in a dreamless world. I hope that this study of Wiremu Maihi Te Rangikāheke will contribute not only to our bodies of knowledge, but will also have some “practical application” both in terms of an Indigenous intellectual agenda and the continued elaboration and practice of sovereignty.

References

- Allen, Chadwick, 2002. *Blood Narrative: Indigenous Identity in American Indian and Maori Literary and Activist Texts*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Anglicans in Waiapu. [Internet.] [Retrieved 10 November 2008.] Available from: <http://www.waiapu.anglican.org.nz/>.
- Ballantyne, Tony, 2001. [Electronic Journal.] Race and the webs of empire: Aryanism from India to the Pacific. *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*. 2 (3). [Retrieved 6 November 2008.] Available from: http://muse.jhu.edu/helicon.vuw.ac.nz/journals/journal_of_colonialism_and_colonial_history/v002/2.3ballantyne.html.
- Barthes, Roland, translated by Richard Howard, 1967. [Electronic Journal.] The Death of the Author. *Aspen*. (5 and 6). [Retrieved 13 March 2008.] Available from: <http://www.ubu.com/aspen/aspen5and6/threeEssays.html#barthes>.
- Bauer, Winifred, 1997. *The Reed Reference Grammar of Māori*. Auckland: Reed.
- Belich, James, 1996. *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders From Polynesian Settlement to the End of the Nineteenth Century*. Auckland: Allen Lane/Penguin.
- Biggs, Bruce, 1952. The Translation and Publishing of Maori Material in the Auckland Public Library. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 61:177-191.
- _____ 1960. *Maori Marriage: An Essay in Reconstruction*. Wellington: Reed for The Polynesian Society.
- _____ 1964. The Oral Literature of the Polynesians. *Te Ao Hou*, 49:23-25; 42-47.
- _____ 1966. Maori Myths and Traditions. In *An Encyclopaedia of New Zealand*. 2. Wellington: Government Printer, pp.447-454.
- _____ 1970. Ngaa Tama a Rangi. *Working Papers in Anthropology, Archaeology, Linguistics and Maori Studies*, 15:1-4. Auckland: Department of Anthropology.
- _____ 1980. Ko Maui Tikitiki-o-Taranga. *Paanui 3 o Aakarana*, 65-73.

- Bernheimer, Charles (ed.), 1995. *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bleek, W.H.I., 1858. *The Library of His Excellency Sir George Grey, K.C.B Philology*. London: Trübner and Co.
- Bohan, Edmund, 1998. *To Be A Hero: Sir George Grey 1812-1898*. Auckland: HarperCollins.
- Cooper, G. S., 1851. *Journal of an Expedition Overland From Auckland to Taranaki by way of Rotorua, Taupo, and the West Coast Undertaken in the Summer of 1849-50 by His Excellency, the Governor-in-Chief of New Zealand*. Auckland: Williamson and Wilson.
- Curnow, Jenifer, 1983. *Wiremu Maihi Te Rangikaheke: His Life and Work*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Auckland.
- _____ 1985. Wiremu Maihi Te Rangikāheke : His Life and Work. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 2:97-147.
- _____ 1990. Te Rangikāheke , Wiremu Maihi ? - 1896. In W. H. Oliver (ed.), *The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*, Wellington: Allen Unwin New Zealand and the Department of Internal Affairs, pp.494-495.
- Curnow, Jenifer, Ngapare Hopa, and Jane McRae (eds), 2002. *Rere Atu Taku Manu*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- _____ (eds), 2006. *He Pitopito Kōrero nō te Perehi Māori: Readings From the Māori Language Press*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Davidson, Carl and Philip Voss. *Researching With Maori*. [Internet.] [Retrieved 13 March 2008.] Available from: <http://www.nodoubt.co.nz/pdfs/research/researchmaori.pdf>
- Davis, C. O., 1855. *Maori Mementoes*. Auckland: Williamson and Wilson.
- Foster, Tol, 2008. Of One Blood: An Argument for Relations and Regionality in Native American Literary Studies. In Craig S. Womack, Daniel Heath Justice, and Christopher B. Teuton (eds), *Reasoning Together: The Native Critics Collective*. Norman: Oklahoma University Press, pp.265-302.
- Green, Rayna, 1992. Rosebuds of the Plateau: Frank Matsura and the Fainting Couch Aesthetic. In Lucy R. Lippard (ed.), *Partial Recall*. New York: New Press, pp.46-53.
- Grey, George, 1853. *Ko Nga Moteatea Me Nga Hakirara o Nga Maori*. Wellington: Robert Stokes.

- _____ 1854. *Ko Nga Mahinga a Nga Tupuna Maori*. London: George Willis.
- _____ 1855. *Polynesian Mythology and Ancient Traditional History of the New Zealand Race as Furnished by their Priests and Chiefs*. London: John Murray.
- _____ 1857 (1950). *Ko nga Waiata Maori*. Capetown: Pike's Machine Printing Office.
- _____ 1857 (1950). *Ko nga Whakapepeha me nga Whakaahuareka a nga Tipuna o Aotearoa: Proverbial and Popular Sayings of the Ancestors of the New Zealand Race*. Capetown: Saul Solomon and Co.
- _____ 1885. *Polynesian Mythology and Ancient Traditional History of the New Zealand Race as Furnished by their Priests and Chiefs*. 2nd Edition. Auckland: H. Brett.
- _____ 1906. *Polynesian Mythology and Ancient Traditional History of the New Zealand Race as Furnished by their Priests and Chiefs*. London: Routledge.
- _____ 1928. *Nga Mahi A Nga Tupuna*. Third Edition. New Plymouth: T. Avery.
- Harris, Aroha, 2008. *We Are What We Write*. Unpublished paper presented at He Rau Tumu Kōrero, Hamilton, 30 August 2008.
- Jackson, Moana, 1998. *Research and the Colonisation of Māori Knowledge*. In Te Pūmanawa Hauora (ed.), *Te Oru Rangahau: Maori Research and Development Conference*. pp. 70-77.
- Justice, Daniel Heath, 2006. *Our Fire Survives the Storm: A Cherokee Literary History*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Keenan, Danny, 2008. *Keynote Address*. Unpublished paper presented at He Rau Tumu Kōrero, Hamilton, 30 August 2008.
- Kendall, Thomas, and Samuel Lee with input by Hongi Hika and Waikato, 1820. *A Grammar and Vocabulary of the Language of New Zealand*. London: John Hatchard & Son.
- Kerr, Donald, 2006. *Amassing Treasures for All Times: Sir George Grey, Colonial Bookman and Collector*. Delaware: Oak Knoll Press, and Dunedin: Otago University Press.
- Luomala, Katharine, 1949. *Maui-of-a-thousand-tricks: His Oceanic and European Biographers*. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum Bulletin 198.

- McLintock, A. H. (ed.), 1966. *An Encyclopaedia of N.Z.* Wellington: Government Printer.
- McRae, Phillipa J., 1981. *Grey Maori Manuscripts, Descriptive Catalogue.* Typescript. Auckland: Auckland Public Library.
- Martin, Mary Ann, 1884. *Our Maoris.* London: The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
- Marsden, Maori, 1992. *Kaitiakitanga: A Definitive Introduction to the Holistic World View of the Maori.* Ministry for the Environment discussion paper, Wellington.
- Maunsell, Robert, 1842. *A Grammar of the New Zealand Language.* Auckland: J. Moore.
- Mead, Hirini Moko and Neil Grove, 2003a. *Ngā Pēpeha a ngā Tīpuna.* Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Mead, Hirini Moko, 2003b. *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori Values.* Wellington: Huia.
- Melbourne, Hirini, 1991. Whare Whakairo: Māori 'Literary' Traditions. In Graham McGregor, and Mark Williams (eds), *Dirty Silence: Aspects of Language and Literature in New Zealand: Essays Arising from the University of Waikato Winter Lecture Series, 1990.* Auckland: Oxford University Press, pp.129-141.
- Muller, John P. and William J. Richardson (eds), 1988. *The Purloined Poe: Lacan, Derrida and Psychoanalytic Reading.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- New Zealand Department of Internal Affairs, 1990. *The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography.* Wellington: Allen Unwin New Zealand, Department of Internal Affairs.
- Ngata, A., 1951. Sir Apirana Ngata Memorial Tribute. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 59:277-348.
- Ngata, Apirana, and Pei Te Hurinui Jones, 1959. *Nga Moteatea: He Maramara Rere No Nga Waka Maha.* Wellington: Polynesian Society.
- Nicole, Robert, 2001. *The Word, the Pen, and the Pistol: Literature and Power in Tahiti.* Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Obeyesekere, Gananath, 1992. *The Apotheosis of Captain Cook : European Mythmaking in the Pacific.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Orbell, Margaret, 1968. Two Manuscripts of Te Rangikāheke . *Te Ao Hou*, No. 62:8-12.

- _____ (ed.), 2002. *He Reta Ki Te Maunga: Letters to the Mountain: Māori Letters to the Editor, 1898-1905*. Auckland: Reed.
- Parsons, M. J., 1990. Jury, Hoani Te Whatahoro 1841 – 1923. In W. H. Oliver (ed.), *The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*, Wellington: Allen Unwin New Zealand and the Department of Internal Affairs, pp.214-215.
- Paterson, Lachlan, 2004. *Ngā Reo o ngā Niupepa: Māori Language Newspapers 1855-1863*. Unpublished PhD. thesis, University of Otago.
- Royal, Te Ahukaramū Charles, 1998. Te Ao Mārama – A Research Paradigm. In Te Pūmanawa Hauora (ed.), *Te Oru Rangahau: Maori Research and Development Conference*. pp. 78-86.
- _____ 2005. Exploring Indigenous Knowledge. A paper delivered to a conference entitled 'The Indigenous Knowledges Conference - Reconciling Academic Priorities with Indigenous Realities', Victoria University, Wellington, 25 June 2005.
- Saussy, Haun (ed.), 2006. *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sahlins, Marshall, 1995. How "Natives" Think: About Captain Cook, For Example. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Simmons, David, 1966. The Sources of Sir George Grey's Nga Mahi A Nga Tupuna. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 2:363-369.
- _____ 1976. *The Great New Zealand Myth*. Wellington: Reed.
- Sinclair, Keith, 1990. George Grey 1812-1898. In W. H. Oliver (ed.), *The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*, Wellington: Allen Unwin New Zealand and the Department of Internal Affairs, pp.160-164.
- _____ 1991. *A History of New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Sinha, Mrinalini, 1998. Britain and the Empire: Toward a New Agenda for Imperial History. *Radical History Review*, 72.
- Skinner, H. D., 1950. Reviews: Maui-of-a-thousand-tricks: His Oceanic and European Biographers by Katherine Luomala. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 1:93-95.
- Smith, S. Percy, 1899. *The Tohunga Maori: A Sketch*. In *The Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Institute of New Zealand*. 32:253-270.
- Stafford, D. M., 1967. *Te Arawa: A History of the Arawa People*. Auckland: Reed.

- Tarakawa, Takānui, 1899. The Cave Dwellers at Te Pehu. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 18:44.
- Te Karere Maori or Maori Messenger, 1862. Akarana. 20 Hurae, p.6.
- Te Korimako, 1883. Akarana. 15 Hurae, p.6.
- Te Pūmanawa Hauora (ed.), 1998. *The Proceedings of Te Oru Rangahau; Māori Research and Development Conference 7-9 July 1998*. 2nd Edition. Palmerston North: Massey University.
- Te Rangikāheke , Wiremu Maihi. 1846 (?) -53. GNZMA 723. Drafts of Two Letters Written to Queen Victoria, Mei 18, 1850. Auckland City Libraries. Special Collections.
- _____ 1846 (?) -53. GNZMMSS 43. Tama a Rangi. Auckland City Libraries. Special Collections.
- _____ 1846 (?) -53. GNZMMSS 44. Tupuna; A Genealogical Account of Some of the Ancestors. Auckland City Libraries. Special Collections.
- _____ 1846 (?) -53. GNZMMSS 45. A Letter to the Inhabitants of Hawaiki. Auckland City Libraries. Special Collections.
- _____. 1846 (?) -53. GNZMMSS 81. Maori Religious Ideas and Observances. Auckland City Libraries. Special Collections.
- _____. 1846 (?) -53. GNZMMSS 87. An Account of the Killing of Te Hunga and of the Succeeding Wars Involving Ngaiterangi and Te Arawa and Waikato. Auckland City Libraries. Special Collections.
- _____ 1846 (?) -53. GNZMMSS 93. A Dream of Te Rangikāheke . Auckland City Libraries. Special Collections.
- Te Waka Maori o Niu Tirani, 1875. Poneke. 14 Tihema, p.299.
- Te Waka o te Iwi, 1857. Akarana. Oketopa, p.4.
- Te Wananga, 1875a. Pakowhai. 12 Pepuere, p.21.
- Te Wananga, 1875b. Pakowhai. 14 Hune, p.95.
- Tuhiwai-Smith, Linda, 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- van Toorn, Penny, 2006. *Writing Never Arrives Naked: Early Aboriginal Cultures of Writing in Australia*. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.

- Walker, Ranginui, 2004. *Ka Whawhai Tonu Mātou: Struggle Without End*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Warrior, Robert Allen, 1995. *Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- _____ 2005. *The People and the Word: Reading Native Nonfiction*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Weaver, Jace, Craig S. Womack, and Robert Warrior, 2006. *American Indian Literary Nationalism*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Williams, William, 1844. *A Dictionary of the New Zealand Language and a Concise Grammar; to which is added a Selection of Colloquial Sentences*. Paihia: The Press of the Church Missionary Society.
- Williams, H.W., 1906. Maori Matter at the Cape of Good Hope. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 15:175-180.
- Womack, Craig, 1999. *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Womack, Craig S., Daniel Heath Justice, and Christopher B. Teuton (eds), 2008. *Reasoning Together: The Native Critics Collective*. Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.