



NEW ZEALAND
ARCHAEOLOGICAL
ASSOCIATION

NEW ZEALAND ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION NEWSLETTER



This document is made available by The New Zealand Archaeological Association under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

To view a copy of this license, visit
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>.

THE EVOLUTION OF MAORI WARFARE IN NEW ZEALAND

Roger Duff
Canterbury Museum

Note by author

As an alternative to the formidable task of recapitulating the evolution of Maori warfare in the distinctively ferocious and chronic mode developed in the North Island, as the foyer of the Classic Maori culture, the contributor proposed working inwards from the Chathams and the South Island as "control" zones of respective isolation. In theory pre-Classic cultural traits might be expected to survive in greater degree in these outposts, while the time and mode of the intrusion of Classic Maori warfare in both areas could be more easily documented, from archaeological and traditional evidence in the South Island, and from historical record in the Chathams.

The author posed the problem of reconciling the undoubted maximum development of Polynesian warfare attained in Classic Maori New Zealand, with the inference from the South Island of a long period (ninth to fifteenth century) when warfare left no archaeological traces, and the inference from the Chathams of a brief ? Early Classic intrusion of warfare from New Zealand, following a long traditionally attested peaceful phase, and succeeded in turn by a traditionally alleged and historically attested phase of abandonment of warfare.

The discussion emphasized the limitations of the archaeological record in establishing the presence or absence of warfare. Where the practice of warfare was not reflected in habitations, with earthwork defences; where weapons were of perishable material; where cannibalism and the desecration of enemy bones to make utilitarian artifacts were not an accompaniment; warfare could leave no discernible archaeological trace.

This limitation accepted, the absence of archaeological traces of warfare still implies a lesser incidence of warfare than the opposite situation where field evidence is obvious and widespread. The unreliability of the negative aspect of the archaeological record also justifies calling in the allegations of traditions despite their relative unreliability, particularly for events prior to the traditional New Zealand Heke of the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries.

Subject to these qualifications, it seemed valid to draw certain useful inferences concerning the evolution of warfare in the New Zealand-Chathams area. These preface the summary of the Paper which follows.

1. That warfare was either unknown or on too small a scale to leave any archaeological traces in the South Island from a first settlement period (estimated at the ninth century) to the sixteenth century when it was introduced from the North Island in an early Classic Maori form by Ngati Mamoe, continued in a more developed form by Ngai Tahu in the seventeenth and early eighteenth and, in an accelerated post-Contact form, renewed by Ngati Toa and the Northern allies in the early nineteenth.

A summary of the traditional course of the two later campaigns indicates that fighting tended to fade out at the southern limit of the kumara growing zone near Banks Peninsula. This is reflected in the distribution of the few and small defended habitations on the South Island archaeological map.

2. That, following a tangata whenua phase of unknown length when traditions imply an absence of warfare in the Chathams, small scale warfare was introduced by Rauru and Wheteina, presumably from New Zealand and at a time corresponding with the development of the prototype patu, but was subsequently proscribed and replaced by duelling and a mock-hostile ritual which stopped short of combat. The absence of Moriori warfare from Broughton's discovery in 1791 to the formidable Maori invasion of 1835 is historically attested.
3. The evidence from these outliers infers that warfare in the chronic Classic Maori mode represents a local and presumably late development in the North Island, its development correlated with population pressure consequent largely on the progressive adaptation of kumara cultivation to the New Zealand environment.

As the only food plant with a wide climatic tolerance introduced from Polynesia, the kumara assumed a unique economic importance in New Zealand, as against tropical Polynesian groups where taro and coconut were generally more important. Despite a more favourable climate than the South Island and the Chathams, the North Island still offered only limited zones for intensive kumara cultivation.

Because the clearing of the North Island rain forest with stone tools and fire was a formidable operation, the requirements included not only a locally warm climate, and a well drained soil, but a zone of natural fern or scrub cover as against forest.

This combination of factors was uncommon enough to aggravate tribal competition for arable land to the point of conflict which in time became chronic. Another aspect, relevant to warfare of New Zealand kumara cultivation complex was the one season crop. Therefore the annual kumara harvest provided both the means for a tribe wishing to take the war trail, and no less the incentive for a successful raid. Warfare in New Zealand developed its specific season and its annual rhythm.

If we have to assign a specific reason for the evolution of warfare in the North Island rather than in the South or the Chathams, we can find it in the buildup of population which followed the adaptation of kumara growing to a still marginal environment. If we have to explain the distinctively chronic nature of Classic Maori warfare, we may seek it in the inherent competition for good kumara land and in the one-season crop.

We also have to explain the apparent early absence or lesser incidence of warfare in the Moa-hunter phase of the South Island (and presumably the North) and in the Chathams against the background of tropical Polynesia where we might assume an inherited tradition of small scale warfare and cannibalism, in some groups remaining latent, in others accelerating with population pressure in the Classic Phase. Here we might regard the early New Zealand and Chathams situation as a lapse from the Polynesian tradition, and due to the peculiar situation of reliance on a fishing, fowling and food-gathering economy, where population was small and dispersed, and energies largely absorbed in the seasonal hunting routines.

THE CHATHAM ISLANDS

In our attempted recapitulation the Chathams are important from several points of view.

First, as representing the extreme pole of isolation, the Islands were not subject to frequent canoe migration, with the consequence that elements introduced by any first settlement might survive long enough to remain a continuing theme throughout the cultural succession. A limiting factor in any consideration of warfare was the degree of close relationship progressively established by intermarriage in an absolutely small land area, little more than 175,000 acres. A third determinant, in terms of any correlation of warfare with population pressure, accelerated by the development of agriculture, was a climate which prohibited agriculture.

On grounds of language, material culture, traditions and the geography of the situation, the culture of the Moriori of the Chatham Islands will be regarded as a provincial offshoot of New Zealand.

Summary of traditions

Published Moriori traditions suffer the disadvantage of coming from a single, principal source, Hirawana Tapu as spokesman for older Tohunga, and relayed through Alexander Shand. From these, as in New Zealand, the later migrations are recalled in terms of canoe names and specific incidents, but the Moriori also recalled, more specifically than Maori recounters from the corresponding period of European enquiry, a long-standing Tangata Whenua population of whose arrival all memory was lost. Despite the grossly inflated tally of generations, these latter might be equated with the pre-heke population of New Zealand, who were bearers of an early East Polynesian culture, whose material remains are best isolated in New Zealand Moa-hunter sites. The traditions further convey, chiefly by implication, that warfare was unknown among the Tangata Whenua.

Nor was it known with the first migrant ancestor remembered as such, Kahu. A culture-hero in the sense that he is alleged to have introduced a superior variety of bracken fern, found the island floating so that he joined some places, and separated others, and tried without success to introduce the kumara, Kahu arrived at the time of a number of Tangata Whenua ancestors fixed from five settlements. From his visit derived traditional knowledge of the kumara (Pakamara) so that when the first ships introduced the potato, it was so called. Most significant was the reference to Aropaoa in the first line of his Karakia to cause the kumara to grow, where the name may refer to the northern end of the South Island of New Zealand. The experiment failing, he sailed away, first reciting his Karakia, the sea-tides of Kahu, to send him safely back to Aotea (? North Island), to Hawaiki.

If Kahu is to be regarded as a contemporary of the Heke migration phase of New Zealand, it is interesting that Moriori traditions refer to only one recognizable Heke migrant, recalled in Maori tradition, notably Manaia (Manaii) of the Tokomaru canoe, North Taranaki. The name of Manaia introduces reference to warfare and troubles in Hawaiki which led in due course to the canoe migrations of the Wheteina and Rauru tribes (apparently related hapu of the one tribe) who stayed on as continuing communities.

In brief, the story is that warfare marked by cannibalism, the use of spears and a fighting-adze as weapons, and the sacking of eight pa, broke out in Hawaiki when a Wheteina man murdered his Rauru sweetheart, Rauru prevailing. Wheteina secretly prepared six canoes to escape,

sending two messengers to Hikurangi (Hukurangi) where they were told of the existence of the Chathams (Rekohu). The enemy raiding by sea, they had to leave in winter in two canoes only, Rangimata and Rangihoua. Putting forth "to travel to the bounds of the land, to the bounds of the ocean", they arrived, after remembered hardships, in midwinter.

The Rauru and Wheteina feud was further continued in the Chathams when, within the lifetime of Horopapa of Rauru, his grandson Moe also migrated in the Oropuke canoe. Although Horopapa had enjoined on his grandson the need to cease man-slaying when they reached the "fish" (Chatham Islands), troubles were provoked by the earlier arrived descendants of Wheteina and warfare prevailed for some time. From the prevalence of Patu among artifacts found in the Chathams, one must assume a longer period of warfare than the traditions allege. However, all sources agree that at a particular crisis in inter-tribal warfare, Nunuku Whenua, an ancestor of tangata whenua descent but related also to Rauru and Wheteina, convened the famous gathering at which man-slaying was prohibited. From this time on, allege traditions, quarrels between individuals were settled by duel with the quarter-staff (tupurari) when the contender who first suffered a bruise or bleeding exclaimed, "Yes, you have broken my head", and conceded victory. When personal quarrels also involved their communities, each side went through the motions of assembling a war party or taua (tauu), the tohunga invoking the gods and ancestors and consulting the omens or aitua (eitua). The warriors seized spears ritually preserved on racks in the grounds of the sacred shrines (tuahu). Everything proceeded (as I have seen it among the Ifugao of the Philippines) to a point short of combat.

European discovery, 1791.

Valuable confirmation of this comes from the mock-hostile reception the Moriori gave to Broughton of H.M.S. Chatham in 1791. A young man stamped, in the equivalent of the Maori pukana, rolling his eyes and protruding his tongue. The few spears were passed ceremonially from man to man in the defending crowd. Others picked up driftwood equivalents from the beach. An old man appeared with Patu rolled up in a mat and these, when distributed, were attached, non-functionally, to either end of a short staff. No violence was in fact offered, and Broughton expressed regret that the visitors had opened fire.

Maori invasion, 1835

The Maori invasion in 1835 also offers ironic confirmation of the peaceful habits of the Moriori. Before they decided to invade, the North Taranaki tribes displaced to Wellington Harbour as a result of the acute tribal warfare of the time, learned from the Maori Paki Whara, who had lived at the Chathams, of the fish and fowl food resources of the

group. They heard also of "the inhabitants who are very numerous, but they do not understand how to fight and have no weapons".

There is, furthermore, no record that the Moriori, who then numbered between 1,600 and 2,000, offered any resistance to the formidably armed, battle-hardened, Ngati Tama, Ngati Mutunga and Ati Awa. We might contrast this with the traditional reference to the earlier migrations of the Rauru and Wheteina in no more than three canoes, arriving among a long established population, who were masters of traditional techniques of fishing, fowling and food gathering, and to whom the newcomers could bring no superior economic know-how. Here by contrast was a massive ship-borne invasion in the commandeered brig, Rodney, the first voyage conveying 500 people, two canoes, and 60 tons of potatoes, the second, adding 400 people and seven canoes. The invaders treated them with barbaric contempt, dividing up the land, with the resident Moriori becoming slaves of the newcomers. Nor were they useful slaves for the principal work the Maoris expected of them, the cultivation of potatoes. In the first flush of the invasion the Maoris killed and ate enough - perhaps 200 - to establish their conqueror's right to the land although for many years individuals were subject to arbitrary execution. Within 20 years the unfortunate Moriori were reduced to 212, by 1890 to 35.

The Maoris, for their part, again continued the chronic pattern of inter-tribal tensions then prevalent in New Zealand. Within four years of the landing, two tribal factions were at war, building two large palisaded pa with fighting towers, on either side of the Waitangi stream.

Summary and conclusions

To return to the discussion of the evidence of warfare among the Moriori, the evidence favours the following summary. From first settlement by a section of the Early East Polynesian arrivals from New Zealand there is traditional allegation that warfare was unknown. Tradition alleges that warfare was first introduced with the Rauru and Wheteina migrations, presumably representing an early stage in the evolution of the Classic Maori culture of New Zealand. To this period we might assign the presence of Patu weapons in a prototype form, and traditional reference to the use of spears and the adze as a weapon. There is the historic evidence from the "Chatham" discovery in 1791 and the Maori invasion in 1835, that warfare had become obsolescent, being replaced by a largely ritual commemoration. To this period we might assign the rare bone patu and the few spears recorded by Broughton.

Assuming a circumstantial case for the absence of warfare during most of the centuries of Moriori occupation, can we, against a background of a general incidence of warfare in tropical Polynesian groups, assign any reasons for this situation?

This justifies the postulation of the following environmental determinants.

They were first a climate which, by precluding the establishment of tropical root crops, imposed the necessity for an endless seasonal activity of fishing, fowling and food gathering. Despite the rich seas, lakes, bird forests, fern lands, Karaka groves and off-shore bird islands, the population was caught up in a perpetual struggle to wrest food from a hostile nature. The narrow margin between man and nature in such a situation is illustrated in the expected duty of spirits of the dead, lashed upright on poles facing the sea, or sent to sea burial on raft canoes, to send ashore schools of blackfish and small whales. The inevitable result of such an economy in a cool temperate land without domesticated grazing animals or food crops, is an absolutely small population, remaining in a perpetual state of balance with the native animals (and plants), whose continued survival was regulated by the institution of the Rahu or closed season. Warfare has little relevance in such a situation. Nature, not man, is the enemy.

Subject to the severe limitations of the archaeological field work in the Chathams, it can be safely stated that no defended habitations of the New Zealand pa type occur there, and that the Moriori did not use human bone for artifacts. Without further excavation it would be risky to say that cannibalism was unknown. Evidence for warfare rests primarily on the recovery, not in an archaeological context, of stone (and bone) patu of a type agreeing with prototype Classic forms as found in the South Island and southern region of the North.

There was another determinant imposed by the small size of the group, little more than 175,000 acres. In the course of generations the Moriori became so closely related that particular care had to be taken in avoiding marriages which transgressed a stipulated degree of inbreeding. In such a situation prolonged warfare becomes almost absurd.

These two determinants may be taken to confirm the traditional success of Nunuku-Whenua, as all sources agree, in persuading the descendants of the immigrant Rauru and Wheteina to give up the warfare which they had introduced from Hawaiki, or New Zealand.

THE SOUTH ISLAND

From the Chathams as the most isolated outpost of New Zealand Polynesian culture we move to the less restrictive but still marginal outpost of the South Island. Here we have a vastly larger and more varied environment, but with a climate inhibiting kumara agriculture,

except in a few favoured areas in the north-east, such as the Waimea Plan, Nelson, the Wairau Plain, Marlborough, and pockets on the east coast from the Clarence to Banks Peninsula. In these few favoured areas agriculture was an economic supplement rather than a staple, and the pattern of a fishing, fowling and food-gathering economy marked by dispersed settlement, seasonal nomadism and a small population continued as from Moa-hunter times. It is indeed doubtful if the population in the late eighteenth century represented an increase on the twelfth, which might be regarded as the peak of the Moa-hunter economy. Concentration of population, to a degree in any way comparable with the North Island, was restricted to the Nelson and Wairau Plains, the Kaikoura Peninsula, the Kaiapohia region of the North Canterbury Plain and Banks Peninsula.

Unlike in the Chathams where the postulation of an earlier phase without warfare, and a brief intrusion and subsequent abandonment of warfare, is based in part on tradition, we can fall back for the South Island on inference of the early absence of warfare based on archaeological investigations, concentrating on Moa-hunter sites in particular, and commencing as early as 1847. In brief these have failed to find any evidence of weapons, cannibalism, the use of human bones for artifacts, the defended habitation, or habitation sites capable of defence, from Moa-hunter sites carbon dated from the eighth century (Redcliffs) to the early sixteenth (the Heaphy River in north-west Nelson). This is certainly negative evidence and does not preclude the possibility of sporadic warfare waged with wooden weapons which have left no archaeological trace, which was not accompanied by cannibalism and the desecration of enemy bones, and which required no defended habitation. We are entitled to conclude in particular that New Zealand's distinctive weapon, the Patu, had not reached the South Island in Moa-hunter times, and that warfare was not large scale or chronic.

Moa-hunter sites, though more numerous than in the North Island, exhibit a pattern of dispersed settlement, and a river mouth or sea margin setting which implies a high degree of maritime mobility. Inland sites, in the Waitaki Valley and Central Otago presumably represent the last phase of moa-hunting. Many Moa-hunter sites occur south of the region where kumara agriculture was possible, and those in this region occupied ground situations unfavourable to agriculture. Unless the latter represented outpost camps of yet undiscovered settlements practising agriculture further inland, we might regard the absence of agriculture as a reasonable inference.

Perhaps seven centuries of Moa-hunter occupation are indicated in the following selection of C 14 dates from over 16 South Island east coast sites (quoted in terms of the mean figure) and listed from north

to south:

| | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|
| Wairau Bar | 1025 |
| Redcliffs | 780 to 1460 |
| Woolshed Flat, South Canterbury | 1457 |
| Shag River, N. Otago | 1127 to 1567 |
| Ototara, N. Otago | 1483 |
| Tairua, N. Otago | 1407 |
| Hampden, N. Otago | 1396 to 1412 |
| Waimataitai, N. Otago | 1324 |
| Hawksburn, Central Otago | 1338 to 1538 |
| Pounaweia, S. Otago | 1198 |
| False Island, S. Otago | 1480 |
| Hinahina, S. Otago | 1338 to 1538 |
| Papatowai, S. Otago | 1185 to 1560 |

While some of the terminal dates, based on moa bone carbonate, can be regarded as too recent, we can assume an east coast occupation commencing in the eighth or ninth centuries, continuing in Marlborough-Canterbury until the fifteenth, and in Otago-Southland until the sixteenth. Following the local extinction of the moa, a fishing and fowling economy of Residual Moa-hunter type, would doubtless continue as Trotter has shown for North Otago and Lockerbie for South Otago. For the west coast we have evidence at the Heaphy River of a Moa-hunter community, with obsidian supplied entirely from the Mayor Island source, and occupying a station in the early exploitation of nephrite, surviving to a mean date of 1528.

In terms of the assumption that any early agriculture in New Zealand would be confined to tropical tubers such as taro, and yam, and that kumara, if then imported, required a long experimental period to establish, the South Island east coast represented New Zealand's most favoured area for the exploitation of birds, notably the moa, which survived in great numbers in the savannah landscape of the low rainfall zone east of the Alps. Unlike the Classic Phase record, when harried remnants of North Island tribes crossed Cook Strait to survive, the first Polynesian arrivals came here as of choice. By the twelfth century they had established comparatively large communities from Wairau to South Otago. There is much to support the Cumberland thesis that the Moa-hunters imposed a "robber" economy on the land, harrying moas, swan, and other vulnerable species to a point of extinction, which the later Rahui (or closed season) system might have averted. In particular, the Moa-hunter found an extensive relict rain forest, surviving in low rainfall areas, beyond the climatic optimum in which it came into being, and progressively destroyed it by fire, whether by accident or design.

At this point we might turn to the South Island traditions of the original inhabitants or tangata whenua. Here our great authority is Stack whose interpretation was, however, subject to the fixed idea that all human settlement of New Zealand commenced with the canoes of the traditional heke which, on the basis of one score 20-year generations, was 400 years prior to 1850; on this basis he assigns the earliest tribe in the traditional record, the Waitaha, to an ancestor who arrived in the Arawa canoe. The content of his traditional references about the Waitaha certainly suggests a much greater antiquity. "It was in these times that the country round Invercargill is said to have been submerged, the forests of Canterbury and Otago destroyed by fire, and the moa exterminated." A disguised reference to extinct swan and eagle may be recognised in Stack's Waitaha tradition of the great bird of Tawera (Mount Torlesse) described in habit as an eagle, but named (pouakai) as a swan. In Otago-Southland where there was a tendency for the earlier tangata whenua lineage to be handed down in communities incorporating the survivors of earlier tribes, we have family trees such as that of the Te Mamaru family of Moeraki, tracing Waitaha back to the founding ancestor Rakaihaitu 42 generations prior to 1850 (circa 800 A.D.).

Whether or not Waitaha were a post-heke tribe, succeeding forerunners whose memory is lost, we can grant the existence of tangata whenua bearers of a basically nomadic economy of Moa-hunter type from the ninth to the fifteenth centuries. There is no traditional reference to their cultivation of kumara and a strong archaeological inference that warfare on any systematic scale was unknown.

The only traditional reference to Waitaha warfare relates to the last phase of occupation, just prior to the Ngati-Mamoe invasion (I would correct Stack's estimate of the date from 1550 to 1500). The reference is first to a walled pa extending three miles along the Mairaki Downs, North Canterbury, a pa which Stack did not see himself and of which no archaeological trace is to be found. From this stronghold the chief Tu Te Waimate (from the Rakaia Mouth) is alleged to have sallied forth with a numerous army to punish the robber chieftan Moko who, from a cave near the Waipara Mouth waylaid porters on the trade route carrying mutton birds, dried fish and Cordyline sugar (kauru) from Canterbury north to Kaikoura, whence the return was "forest birds, mats, etc.". In the event the encounter became a duel of champions, Moko striking down Tu, with what we might infer to be a patu.

Despite this solitary reference to warfare, Stack concludes his reference to the tangata whenua occupation as follows. "The Waitaha after a peaceful occupation of what was then known as 'food-abounding island', were obliged to resign possession of it into the hands of

Ngati Mamoe, and were ultimately destroyed or absorbed by them."

INVASIONS FROM NORTH ISLAND

Following an archaeological unknown in the fifteenth century, the Classic Maori culture suddenly appears in sites associated with organized, and traditionally attested, invasions of North Island tribes, namely Ngati Mamoe (1502-1627), and Ngai Tahu (1627 onwards). The material component of the culture of both includes the defended village, houses with excavated floors, cannibalism, intensive nephrite working, field evidence of kumara cultivation, the barbed one piece hook with shank barb, the composite bait-hook with barbed point, the turret comb in bone, the 2 B adze, nephrite amulets such as hei matau and hei tiki weapons of patu type, taiaha and spears. Further research is necessary to establish whether these traits were differentially associated with one or other tribe. For instance, while agriculture is associated traditionally with Ngati Mamoe, field evidence is at present restricted to Ngai Tahu, notably Kaiapohia (1700-1830) and Panau, Banks Peninsula (1820-30).

Ngati Mamoe (1502-1627)

The summary, from traditional sources, of the course of these invasions from the North Island, enables us to visualize both Ngati Mamoe and their successors Ngai Tahu as small and weak tribes, possibly no more than hapu, of larger tribes of ultimate Poverty Bay origin, insecurely perched in Wellington Harbour at the head of a queue with stronger members jostling them from behind. Crossing Cook Strait, of necessity rather than choice, they found themselves in a position to exploit a military vacuum and in due course occupied in succession the whole of the east coast of the South Island. To the Waitaha tangata whenua in particular the descent of Ngati Mamoe must have been almost as overwhelming as to the Moriori the mass invasion of the Taranaki tribes in 1835. The invaders were however small in number and bearers of a relatively early phase of the Classic Maori military technique. The tangata whenua were also aided by a terrain where the Canterbury Plains south of Banks Peninsula represented both a formidable barrier to the movement of war parties and the commencement of a zone where the newcomers could not establish a superior economy. We can assume that south of Banks Peninsula the invasion represented an amalgamation with, rather than a displacement of, the local people. Working from the basis of traditions, which he regarded as unreliable, Stack allows five generations (from 1502-1627, by allowing 25 rather than 20 years to a generation) for the completion of the Ngati Mamoe occupation.

From the point of view of the evolution of warfare, we may regard the Ngati Mamoe incursion as the first military occupation of the South Island supported by traditions, and as the first migration by a tribe bearing a Classic Maori or post-heke culture. No details of the course of the occupation have been handed down and no fortified pa can be assigned to their southward movement, unless possibly some of the Kaikoura Peninsula pa not accounted for in Ngai Tahu tradition.

The identifiable Ngati Mamoe pa, and therefore the oldest identifiable South Island pa represent their response to the Ngai Tahu invasion, traditionally from the first to the last quarter of the seventeenth century. Because ditch and bank defences were exceptional, most relying entirely on palisading, they are difficult to identify. It can still be stated that they were few and small. From the Clarence to the Conway only five can be identified, from the Conway to Banks Peninsula only two.

Ngati Mamoe were not able to occupy the west coast, where Ngati Wairangi, a tribe of west coast North Island origin, occupied, in tiny widely scattered communities, this vast terrain of generally inhospitable rain forest, trading nephrite with Ngati Mamoe through the Waiiau passes in particular.

Ngai Tahu (1627-1827)

Just as Ngati Mamoe as first bearers of the Classic Maori military tradition were able to impose themselves on the more numerous tangata whenua grouped under the tribal name Waitaha, so were Ngai Tahu, also outnumbered, able to apply to Ngati Mamoe the military confidence from a technique representing the Classic Maori tradition a century later. From the tiny beginnings of a small beachhead on Moioio Island in Tory Channel, Ngai Tahu were able over 25 to 50 years to press south along the Marlborough coast on traditionally well documented campaigns as far as Pari Whakatau, south of Amuri Bluff. Here we have a C 14 date for the fall of this pa (1636 ± 60 years) which accords well with the traditional evidence.

The traditional strongholds from which the invasion was launched were the Miramar Peninsula in Wellington Harbour, and Te Mataki Kai Poika (? on the southeast Wairarapa coast). Just prior to the invasion the chief, Tu Te Kawa, having killed the wives of his cousin Tuahuriri, sailed south to Waikakahi near Lake Ellesmere where he lived peacefully with his Ngati relatives. The background to this exodus reveals a state where inter-hapu rivalries were building up to a chronic state of tension, which remained a disruptive feature of Ngai Tahu society until the Te Rauparaha invasions of 1827. In similar fashion, when the

Ngai Tahu advance reached the Wairau the chief Waitai, sailed away to settle among the Ngati Mamoe at Otago Harbour. A later dissident Te Wera also sailed south to establish potentially subversive enclaves among the Ngati Mamoe from Waikouaiti to Stewart Island. The absence of fighting in this infiltration of the zone south of Banks Peninsula is significant.

To resume this summary of the invasion course we return to Pari Whakatau. Following the fall of this last stronghold on the Kaikoura coast the Ngati Mamoe abandoned all North Canterbury except for Banks Peninsula where they held the palisaded Kainga of Parakakariki, Long Bay and the unfortified kainga of Waikakahi, Lake Ellesmere, with the small associated stronghold of Te Puia.

The resumption of the Ngai Tahu campaign was caused by the return overland from Southland to Wairau of two Ngai Tahu tribesmen who had gone south with Waitai to live among Ngati Mamoe. Near Lake Ellesmere they learned that Tu Te Kawa was still alive, the still unsettled blood debt providing a legitimate excuse for resuming hostilities. The war party, so small that it could be carried in a single large canoe, cut from a giant totara in the Wairarapa Valley, represented in the main a section of Ngai Tahu who had stayed in the north, among their Ngati Kahungunu relatives. Prominent among these sons of Tu-Rakau-Tahi in this migration of chiefs (Wharaunga Puraho Nui) was Moki who led the campaign. The Long Bay palisaded kainga was surprised and taken in a dawn attack, and by an overland march from Port Levy Moki surprised the aged tribal enemy Tu Te Kawa in his Waikakahi kainga and killed him. No-one else was killed and, on the arrival of Tu's son Te Rangī Tamau from southern Lake Ellesmere, peace was made.

With the slaying of Tu Te Kawa which took place about 1690, the Ngai Tahu had occupied all of the kumara growing zone of the north-east. There followed a pause of 20 years while the Ngai Tahu consolidated their occupation of the North Canterbury Plain, Banks Peninsula and the southern Plain as far as the Opihi, where a Ngati Mamoe community was assimilated. The outstanding act of consolidation was the establishment by Tu-Rakau-Tahi of Kaiapohia, the large flat-land pa and kainga, near the Ashley Mouth in North Canterbury. Here Ngai Tahu allege that delegates of those amalgamated Ngati Mamoe communities of Otago and Southland travelled north to make formal submissions of peace.

Any legitimate cause for renewing warfare against Ngati Mamoe being now in abeyance, Ngai Tahu turned their attention against Ngati Wairangi of the west coast, where the Ngai Tahu discovery of the Rakaia greenstone passes brought the two tribes into trade and conflict. Because of the enormous logistic difficulties of sending any sufficient war party through

the Alps this ambition took almost one hundred years to effect. After suffering many reverses, Ngai Tahu finally occupied the zone from the Buller south, only in the early nineteenth century, when the Poutini branch of Ngai Tahu succeeded Ngati Wairangi. Despite the traditional claim of an intermittent state of hostility during the whole of the eighteenth century, it is certain that the nephrite trade was maintained between times, although the crescendo of exploitation was the early eighteenth century.

There remained the problem of the independent Ngati Mamoe communities in Otago-Southland. The cumulative effect of local incidents and frictions provided an excuse for the final and decisive campaign by Ngai Tahu, probably in the first half of the eighteenth century. The brothers Kaweriri and Parakiore organised a tauu which divided at the mouth of Waitaki, one wing sweeping along the Otago-Southland coast, the other proceeding up river and driving through Central Otago. The pincers closed near Aparima in the Southland Plain, where at the battle of Teihoka and a final stand further up the Waiau River near to Te Anau the Ngati Mamoe intransigents were broken, dispersing in small groups into the fastnesses of Fiordland to become the "lost tribe" of popular legend. The family encountered by Cook in Dusky Sound in 1773 and the furtive groups seen by the sealers in the early eighteenth century were possibly remnants of the independent Ngati Mamoe.

The nett result when the Ngati Toa and Taranaki allies invaded in 1828, was a purely Ngai Tahu occupation, with a Classic Maori culture of ultimate East Coast (North Island) derivation from the Clarence to Banks Peninsula. In this more favoured economic zone, where intensive kumara cultivation could supplement rich fishing and fowling resources there was a relatively large concentration of population near the Clarence, the Kaikoura Peninsula, the North Canterbury Plain, Banks Peninsula and Lake Ellesmere. Here we might estimate an early 19th century population of from five to ten thousand.

In this setting the tensions inherent in the Classic Maori tribal system continued to produce inter-hapu warfare, notably in the period 1815-30, when all the clans of Banks Peninsula and North Canterbury were in a state of civil war. This both weakened the tribal cohesion, and, more seriously, disrupted the well established system of mutual trade, on which the total economy depended. Most Ngai Tahu pa, which were perhaps four times as numerous as Ngati Mamoe and individually larger, occur in this north-eastern zone of population concentration and conflict. South of Banks Peninsula the tribal composition represented an amalgam of Ngai Tahu, Ngati Mamoe and Waitaha. The truly Classic culture appears only in small and late enclaves near

Otago Harbour and Foveaux Strait, and for the rest represented a slight overlay of Classic on a broad basis of pre-Classic. Except possibly at Temuka the kumara was not grown. Population was smaller probably than in the Moa-hunter phase and settlement was widely dispersed. Perhaps two pa sites represent the total of this southern non-agricultural zone.

Northern Invasion (1828-31)

Again into this military vacuum, which by comparison the South Island represented, the displaced North Island tribes of Ngati Toa, Atiawa, and North Taranaki mounted an overwhelming invasion in 1828. Exploiting their superiority in muskets to obtain a fleet of canoes and a large forced labour force to produce and carry food, the North Island invaders were able to attack in decisive superiority and to sustain one siege (that of Kaiapohia) for six months. In three years the whole of the north-eastern zone was over-run and the inhabitants virtually exterminated.

Once again we note a pattern repeating itself. The invasion spent its force at Banks Peninsula, and the invaders fell back on Wairau and Marlborough Sounds without in this case occupying the conquered territory at all. Against the advice of Te Rauparaha the Ngati Tama chief Te Puoho in 1836 led a war party on foot down the west coast from Golden Bay to the Haast River to take the Murihiku Ngai Tahu from the rear. Making their way by the Haast Pass, Lake Wanaka, the Crown Range and the Kawarau, they came down the Maitai to the Southland Plain to capture the small eel fishing hamlet of Tuturau. Here Tuhawaiki, exploiting the muskets and know-how of an acquaintance with Europeans of over 20 years' standing, moved swiftly from Ruapuke Island in his fleet of whale-boats and double canoes, to kill Te Puoho and capture the whole commando. Joined by the similarly equipped forces of Taiaroa from Otago Harbour, the mobile Southern Ngai Tahu had carried out commando raids on Te Rauparaha as far north as Lake Grassmere and Port Underwood in 1835 and 1838.

References consulted

Chatham Islands:

Duff, Roger, 1947.

The Evolution of Native Culture in New Zealand
Moa-hunters, Morioris, Maoris, Mankind,
Vol. 3, No. 10 and 11.

1956

The Evolution of Polynesian Culture in
New Zealand. N.Z. Science Review, Vol. 14,
pp. 147-151.

- Shand, Alexander, 1894. The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands. Journal Polynesian Society, Volumes 3, Nos. 2 to 7, No. 2.
1911. Ditto, reprinted as Polynesian Society Memoirs, Vol. 2.
- Skinner, H. D., 1923. The Morioris of Chatham Islands, Bishop Museum Memoirs, Vol. 9, No. 1.
- Skinner, H. D. and Brucke, William, 1928. The Morioris, Bishop Museum Memoirs, Vol. 9, No. 5.
- New Zealand
- Duff, Roger, 1950 & 1956. The Moa-hunter Period of Maori Culture, Bulletin No. 1, N.Z. Government Printer, Wellington.
1961. Excavation of House-pits at Pari Whakatau, Claverley, Marlborough. Canterbury Museum Records, Vol. 8, No. 4.
1963. Aspects of the Cultural Succession in Canterbury-Marlborough. Royal Society of N.Z. Transactions, Vol. 1 (N.S.) No. 4.
- Lockerbie, Leslie, 1959. From Moa-hunter to Classic Maori in Southern New Zealand. "Anthropology in the South Seas", New Plymouth, N.Z.
- Scarlett, R. J. Moa and Man in New Zealand. MSS of Paper presented to Melbourne Congress ANZAAS January, 1967.
- Smith, S. Percy 1894. Genealogy of Te Mamaru Family of Moeraki. Journal of Polynesian Society, Vol. 3, No. 1.
- Stack, J. W. 1877. The Traditional History of the South Island Maoris. Transactions N.Z. Institute, Vol. 10.
- Vayda, A. P. 1960. Maori Warfare. Polynesian Society, Maori Monographs, No. 1.
- Wilkes, O. R. and Scarlett, R. J. Excavations of a Moa-hunter site at the Mouth of the Heaphy River. Canterbury Museum Records, Vol. 8, No. 3.