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He Ngākau Hou: Te Hāhi Mihinare and the Renegotiation of Mātauranga, c.1800-1992

Hirini Kaa

Abstract

This thesis explores Te Hāhi Mihinare (the Māori Anglican Church) as a site where iwi (tribes) renegotiated their mātauranga, their traditional knowledge and ways of knowing. This thesis asserts that Māori interacted with Christianity through the building of an institution and over the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries used Christianity as a lens with which to critique their own cultural foundations. In studying this process the three concepts of reciprocity, reconciliation and renegotiation have been useful guides. Based on the thinking of my own whānau and iwi these ideas - while not prescriptive - have been ways of approaching the source material. This thesis challenges the notion of ‘Māori and Christianity’, instead asserting that interactions were based on iwi dynamics and were driven by iwi aspirations which often overlapped and occasionally merged. The ‘institution’ is the framing for this study, being a useful site to examine the interaction between iwi over a long time frame. The race-politics within the institution are also looked at, but largely in order to understand the renegotiation process. Iwi were not self-contained, and the worldwide Anglican Church had a tremendous influence on Mihinare. The complex interactions between colonised across this ‘trans-native net’, and the influence of thinking from the metropole is explored. Naturally for an examination of an institution, institutional sources are very important. However this thesis works with underutilised institutional sources such as those in te reo Māori (the Māori language) including the Māori-language newspapers, as well as an insider reading of the records of church gatherings, to find a new understanding of the institution. This thesis contains the stories of Mihinare as they found a new heart, and renegotiated their own worldview.
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Chapter One
He Ngākau Hou?: ‘Conversion’ and
Tribal Christianity

E Te Atua, kua ruia nei
Ō purapura pai:
Homai e koe he ngākau hou,
Kia tupu ake ai

O God, you have planted
Your good seeds
Give me a new heart
And nurture it

The hīmene (hymn) *E Te Atua, Kua Ruia Nei* outlines many of the themes contained in this thesis. This is the first verse of the hīmene written by the Church Missionary Society missionaries William Williams and his nephew Edward Williams, originally set against an English tune. It has been sung by Māori for generations, embraced by Mihinare as part of their identity and understanding, and is a reworking of traditional Māori performance arts.1

The hīmene evolved over time with several different iwi (tribal) tunes coming into existence, and even today Mihinare know instantly where the singer is from depending on whether they lead the Ngāpuhi or Ngāti Porou tune.2 It is also written in the Ngapuhi version of te

---

1 *Mihinare* is a transliteration of the term ‘Missionary’, therefore Te Haahi Mihinare is literally The Missionary Church. *Mihinare* shows the close links between the early establishment of the Church and its sense of identity. This is contrasted by other denominations that carry transliterations of their denominational name. Another variation of the spelling is *Mihingare*.

2 Ngāpuhi is a tribe from the north of the North Island, and Ngāti Porou comes from the eastern part of the island.
re o Māori (the Māori language) using ‘tupu’ instead of the Ngāti Porou version, ‘tipu’. The idea of *He Ngākau Hou* (A New Heart) is a biblical concept that denotes a sense of transformation based on belief. One reading of ‘a new heart’ is based on the concept of ‘conversion’, where Māori adopted a Western version of Christianity and abandoned their culture. Yet the transformative concept of a ‘new heart’ is much more complex, and problematizes what is often described as the act of ‘conversion’, reworking assumptions of both faith and culture – it is both new and old, simultaneously. This thesis explores aspects of the history of Te Hāhi Mihinare, the Māori Anglican Church, as an institution in which iwi renegotiated their mātauranga, their traditional knowledge and ways of knowing. This chapter explores the historiography around the interaction between Māori and Christianity, and the problem of ‘conversion’. It will also examine the nature of a thesis covering both institution and iwi, and some of the problems involved in that process, as well as the impact of knowledge from around the ‘Anglican Empire’. The second half examines the methodology involved, including the use of institutional written sources and the challenge of writing ‘insider’ history as well as the use of te reo Māori.

Māori engagement with Christianity in the historiography has tended to centre on the notion of ‘conversion’ as some type of full and final religious settlement. Perhaps the *locus classicus* of ‘conversion’ in the Christian *corpus* comes from the story of the conversion of Paul on the road to Damascus. In the story Paul, while hunting down Christian converts, was blinded by a vision of Jesus Christ.³ Such a story implies a definitive moment of transformation, where there is instantaneous and irrevocable individual change. However the biblical concept of conversion is more complicated than it may seem. Beverly Roberts Gaventa notes that instead of a ‘systematic doctrine’ of conversion the bible instead has a ‘diversity of imagery’, of ‘Biblical motifs’ that leave room for interpretation.⁴ In fact even Paul’s classic example is not as straightforward as it may seem, because transformation is far from complete. Paul did not “‘leave’ Judaism and “‘join” Christianity’,⁵ instead his

---

⁵ Ibid, p.45.
revelation caused him ‘not to reject but to reinterpret both his past and his future’. Indeed, Gaventa asserts that instead of changing affiliation as such New Testament ‘conversion’ instead calls for ‘a radical change in perspective and behaviour’ often worded as ‘repentance’ and described metaphorically in parable. The theological understanding of ‘conversion’ then is complex and reveals both a continuity and change, and despite the historiographical description was in fact a process and not an event. These understandings have inevitably changed over time, and can now be read in the light of the growth since the 1960s of post-colonial theology and ‘ethno-theological sensitivity’ which has allowed for cultural distinctiveness in the process. For example, Carole Cusack notes that the idea of individual conversion may be inappropriate in some cultures and times because people are ‘not accustomed to regarding themselves as discrete individuals, capable of personal decisions in the area of beliefs and practices.’

Regardless of the complexity of describing the process of religious change in both a community and an individual, this simplistic notion of ‘conversion’ has dominated the historiography concerning Māori and Christianity. In the 1960s Pākehā New Zealand historians began to engage with a new body of historical research the debate around Christianity and Māori came bubbling to the top. The American author Harrison Wright asserted in 1959 that Māori had embraced Christianity due to chaos engendered by culture contact. Wright described this as a process where Māori had been ‘carelessly selecting and adapting’ aspects of the new culture which had in turn ‘destroy[ed] their own self-confidence’ leading to an interestingly-phrased state of ‘mental disorganization’. While in this state of ‘mental disorganisation’ Māori, according to Wright, had no choice but to succumb to the will of the missionaries. A decade later Pākehā academic J.M.R. Owens provided an alternative hypothesis, asserting instead that Māori conversion was due to improved ‘missionary resources and methods’ which again Māori were powerless to resist. This was responded to by the young historian Judith Binney, who argued that the

---

6 Ibid, p.54.
7 Ibid, pp.46-47.
10 Ibid, p.15.
‘breakthrough’ of Christianity came from the intellectual stimulus of new ideas and dissatisfaction with the old, created by exposure to European culture.\textsuperscript{13} Binney’s argument, which over the following years vigorously engaged with Owens’ theory, was the beginning of the idea that Māori agency was the key driver in their engagement with Christianity – that Māori were the architects of their own ‘conversion’. However the debate still centred on the notion that ‘conversion’ – regardless of method – was a fait accompli and once complete Māori could be regarded as a different people. This debate was so influential that even at the beginning of the new millennium Damon Salesa suggested it ‘remains one of the most lively and enlightening in New Zealand historiography.’\textsuperscript{14} The seminal debate had marked ‘conversion’ as a missionary-driven transformation of Māori, which had in turn become a lens in the historiographical view of Māori.

The historical obsession with missionary-driven conversion was centred geographically and chronologically in the landing of Samuel Marsden at Oihi and the nearby first mission station at Rangihoua. It is the origin point for nearly all general histories of Māori and Christianity, usually described as the genesis of the missionary endeavour that would eventually spread out across the country and convert the great homogenous horde of unenlightened Māori. This emphasis on missionary-driven action partly derives from the exclusive use of missionary sources, often themselves sources of propaganda for funders back in England. This use of sources to paint a monochromatic picture of ‘conversion’ is most recently illustrated in \textit{Te Rongopai 1814 Takoto Te Pai: Bicentenary Reflections on Christian Beginnings and developments in Aotearoa New Zealand}, a collection of essays published this year by the Anglican Church as part of the commemoration of the bicentenary of the arrival of Marsden. In Malcolm Falloon’s chapter ‘Christian Rangi: ‘A Brand Plucke\textsuperscript{d} from the Burning’’, Falloon writes about a man the missionaries called Christian Rangi whom they celebrate as the first Māori to be baptised – the ultimate marker of ‘conversion’. Falloon celebrates the extensive missionary archives as ‘a rich source of information about Rangi [that] allow us to at least consider the reasons for his conversion to Christianity. In addition, his conversion narrative sheds light on the way Maori were hearing and understanding the

missionary message, during this early period.'\textsuperscript{15} The assumption that missionaries understood how Māori were ‘hearing and understanding’ their own message is an interesting assumption. Falloon describes how Rangi – apparently 'a displaced rangatira from Whangarei'\textsuperscript{16} – was apparently a ‘remarkable’ example because of ‘his changing attitude towards Māori Tapu’, towards essential Māori values and practices.\textsuperscript{17} Embracing a rather simplistic reading of ‘conversion’ Falloon wonders why Rangi 'should have made such a radical break with his tradition and embraced the new religion brought by the missionaries',\textsuperscript{18} and answers his own question by noting that 'Rangi was different' in that he did not display 'the indifference of Māori and their careless attitudes towards things of the soul'\textsuperscript{19} - the intellectual equivalent of climate-change denial. This difference was undoubtedly the reason in Falloon’s reading of the situation why 'He [Rangi] did not need much persuasion from the missionaries to acknowledge deficiencies in his own culture'.\textsuperscript{20}

Thus the notion of Māori being the subject of ‘conversion’, and ‘conversion’ being the shedding of cultural values and their replacement by Western ones is strong through to this day.

Once ‘converted’ then, Māori could be subsumed. The historiography around Māori who engaged with Christianity post ‘conversion’ submerged them into an institutional substrata resurrected occasionally to be an exotic decorative backdrop. Partly this subsuming of Māori Christianity was a product of the ‘conversion’ discourse which once “completed” relegated Māori Christians to passive participants in denominational histories, to become fodder for the Church-Empire project. The other dynamic that caused Māori Christians to disappear was the inevitable influence of the wider historiography, particularly the discourse around ‘nation building’. In this situation, to paraphrase Nepia Mahuika’s critique of national histories, Māori ‘pasts are often relegated to peripheral subplots of the dominant [Denominational instead of Nation] narrative, or, even worse,
appropriated altogether beyond our recognition and grasp.\textsuperscript{21} The literature on denominational histories is extensive, particularly that focusing on Anglican histories. Biographies, parish histories and Diocesan histories abound, often hagiographic in nature and written by true-believers who were myopically committed to an inevitable Whiggish triumph of Christian history and theology. Māori in these stories became a symbol of the great triumph of the Church, a conversion triumph to be occasionally resurrected as a medal on the chest of the Pākehā denomination. Despite this, some remain lovingly crafted treasures of information, such as Watson Rosevear’s 1960 effort \textit{Waiapu: The Story of a Diocese}.\textsuperscript{22} This book works particularly well because it contains whakapapa from each area, and also because of the heavy influence of iwi on the diocese right from its establishment, post-conversion. In recent years there has been great scholarship led by Allan Davidson and Peter Lineham. Lineham’s work on the Māori response to scripture was a breakthrough in that it recognised the interaction between iwi and denomination.\textsuperscript{23} Davidson’s work is also immense, in particular his recording of iwi engagement with the Anglican denomination through St John’s Theological College\textsuperscript{24}, as well as his editorial work. This work includes the recent (2011) collection of essays on the history of the Diocese of Auckland,\textsuperscript{25} as well as the aforementioned commemoration of the arrival of Marsden.\textsuperscript{26} The challenge of many of these new collections, including a recent history of the Diocese of Waiapu, is that they reflect the difficulties in the wider New Zealand historiography relating to Māori stories. They often struggle to incorporate a Māori or iwi space and when they do they lack a Māori perspective, being over-reliant on missionary and Pākehā institutional sources to try to create a Māori voice. The challenge of writing an iwi perspective is then, to paraphrase Aroha Harris, ‘writing Maori [Christian] history up from under the great weight of New Zealand’.

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{24} Allan Davidson, \textit{Selwyn’s Legacy}, Auckland, 1993.
\end{thebibliography}
Zealand [church] historiography… It is a huge task as New Zealand [church] history has been written into [the church’s] sense of itself.

The historiography assumed that by the twentieth century Māori ‘conversion’ had been completed as an event, and assumed that those Māori who challenged Christianity were in fact religo-political moments and were moved to a different spectrum from orthodox Māori Christians. Māori Christians then disappeared from the historiography. This absence of Māori from the twentieth century historiography was common across various historic fields. Harris notes this broader absence writing that ‘Māori seem to recede into the shadows of the grand narratives for most of the twentieth century, making brief forays back into the limelight on the backs of key individuals… and organisations’. The gap is filled in the early twentieth century by alternative religious movements such as the prophetic movements of Rua Kenana and Tahupotiki Wiremu Ratana, who are mostly portrayed as political and resistance leaders. Later on Māori reappear, as Harris notes ‘as a fully functioning ethnic collective in the 70s, wholly urbanised and unhappy with their urbanisation experiences but with a critical mass of rangatahi willing to take an aggressive stand on land and treaty rights.’ This certainly applied to Māori Christians, who reappear in the 1970s as problematic characters suddenly asserting a demand for tino rangatiratanga (sovereignty), but as side-players in a broad political game.

The historiography concerning Māori Christianity has also struggled to find oxygen in a wider environment that has tended to overlook or even suppress the historical importance of Christianity as a whole. Leading this challenge to the status quo has been the historian John Stenhouse. Stenhouse asserts that since the 1960s there has been an agenda of ‘secularisation’ in New Zealand historical writing led by the historian Keith Sinclair. In this purported agenda Sinclair sought to further his own historiographical objectives through building up the idea of the ‘nation’ as an egalitarian secular paradise, or as Stenhouse

---

28 Harris, p.7.
29 Judith Binney, Gillian Chaplin, Craig Wallace, Mihaia: the prophet Rua Kenana and his community at Maungapohatu, Wellington, 2011.
31 Harris, p.8.
describes ‘the quasi-utopian secular nationalism’ of Sinclair’s efforts. Sinclair had portrayed Christianity as a stumbling block to ‘the nation’, and was particularly harsh on the missionaries, whose ‘ideas were as destructive as bullets’ for Māori. Alongside Sinclair Stenhouse places Eric Olssen, Miles Fairburn and others as evangelists for the historical decline of Christianity in New Zealand based on the assumption that ‘as modernity waxed religion would wane.’ Stenhouse describes a paradox in the portrayal, where historians painted Christianity as both increasingly marginalised and remaining strong as a malign force for conservatism. While Stenhouse’s arguments have some merit, they are also critiqued as being somewhat presentist as a defence of contemporary Christianity. This critique is somewhat ironic because it an argument he himself deploys against ‘left-liberal’ historians in the present day attempting to impose their contemporary values through the historiography. However this argument of Stenhouse’s is neither entirely pessimistic nor merely a rallying cry for the retelling of triumphalist Christian histories. Stenhouse notes the emergence of a more complex perspective allowing religion more space and understanding had appeared during the 1980s and 1990s, with scholars of Māori history and of women and gender leading the way. Tony Ballantyne notes that this process of a new viewing of Māori and Christianity had begun in the late 1960s and early 1970s where Judith Binney, Kerry Howe, and J.M.R. Owens ‘hinted that a New Zealand ethnohistory tradition – sensitive to questions of religion – was emerging in parallel with its Pacific and North American counterparts.’ Ballantyne also supports Stenhouse’s thesis that the New Zealand historiography has paid limited attention to religion, and that ‘race and land have been firmly embedded as the key nodes around which the historiography of nineteenth century

33 Ibid, p.2.
36 Ibid, p.4.
39 Ibid, pp.64-66..
New Zealand is organised.‘ However it could also be argued that despite the secularist conspiracy, religious histories have continued to be written but these histories have done their own damage in subjugating the place of Māori. The challenge remains to find a Māori Christian perspective, and to re-inscribe the historiographical terrain.

When the historiography was not ignoring Māori and Christianity it was generally providing two responses – fight or flight. The “fight” response was to castigate Christianity as a tool used in the deliberate undermining of all things Māori, as an integral part of the colonization project. In this analysis, the ideas of Christianity were often conflated with the work and objectives of the European missionary societies as if the two were coterminous. Missionaries came in for attention as being particularly insidious agents of colonisation, partly because as Cherokee writer William Baldridge notes, ‘they are a target as easy to hit as dirt and just as difficult to eliminate.’ But the power of missionaries as a target lay in what they represented – an aspect of colonisation that aimed to destroy the fundamental understandings that underpinned Māori existence and to replace these with another system. This became a war of ontologies and of epistemologies, where the Western world view attempted to defeat and replace that of the Māori. Ranginui Walker described this process as ‘total colonisation… in that it involved cultural invasion and colonisation of the minds of the invaded as well’ and he described Marsden’s arrival in 1814 as part of ‘the insidious nature of their cultural invasion’. Linda Tuhiwai Smith also describes this as a type of total war with the highest stakes, writing that ‘concepts of spirituality which Christianity attempted to destroy, then to appropriate, and then to claim, are critical sites of resistance for indigenous peoples. The values, attitudes, concepts and language embedded in beliefs about spirituality represent, in many cases, the clearest contrast and mark of difference between indigenous peoples and the West.’

This clash was seen as far more challenging than a political or military war because it could even undermine concepts of gender and sexuality – fundamental aspects of human

---

43 Walker, p.146.
existence. Ani Mikaere described this process as ‘the colonization of the Māori cosmogony’\textsuperscript{46} in which ‘the impact of Christianity on Māori spirituality has been to distort it beyond recognition, infiltrating it with patriarchal values and convincing Māori that such ideals stem from their own tikanga’.\textsuperscript{47} In a powerful argument Mikaere asserts that these patriarchal values were manifested for example by ‘insidious’ ethnographers such as Elsdon Best and S Percy Smith in their creation of the concept of “Io” as a sole male creator-God,\textsuperscript{48} infiltrating the Judeo-Christian God and leading to the suppression of women and to Māori women being ‘femasculated’.\textsuperscript{49} Clive Aspin and Jessica Hutchings apply a similar analysis to the impact of the missionaries on Māori sexuality, and ‘the imposition of various manifestations of the Christian religion, which in turn had a profound impact on Maori sexuality.’\textsuperscript{50} Aspin and Hutching write that ‘pre-colonial Maori society embraced and celebrated sexuality in all its diversity’\textsuperscript{51} but that ‘the imposition of a colonialist view of sexuality has meant that traditional views and understandings of Maori sexuality have become blurred, misinterpreted or lost completely.’\textsuperscript{52} Ranginui Walker paints a very visceral picture of the process by providing the example that ‘the missionaries also attacked the sacred symbols of the tribe by emasculating ancestral carvings of their genitals, an act that portended the cultural and human emasculation to come.’\textsuperscript{53} Thus Christianity – as expressed through Pākehā missionaries – was regarded in some histories as the enemy in a fight to the cultural death.

The ‘flight’ analysis of Māori and Christianity created an intellectual distance between the two, leaving Christianity as an objective tool that Māori could utilise and discard at will. Ann Parsonson offers perhaps the classical example of this phenomenon. Referring to the 1840s, but applied by others to a much broader timeframe, Parsonson describes Christianity as part of a broader dynamic in which Māori would utilise a range of

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid, p.112.
\textsuperscript{48} See for example S. Percy Smith, \textit{The lore of the whare wananga, part 1.}, New Plymouth, 1913, p. vii.
\textsuperscript{49} Mikaere, p.72-78.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid, p.418.
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid, p.421.
\textsuperscript{53} Walker, p.86.
Pākehā innovations in ‘the pursuit of mana’.\(^{54}\) In this internally-fuelled race, various hapū and rangatira would take up Christianity as one of many ‘fresh opportunities for successful competition’, and ‘many communities adopted the externals at least of the Christian faith’.\(^{55}\) This analysis kept Christianity at an intellectual distance from Māori, whose society ‘remained apart, inward-looking, closed, vigorous’,\(^{56}\) and this approach is critiqued by Lyndsay Head because ‘we are asked to think that what looks like Christianity among Maori is actually a form of subversion, serving solely Maori ends.’\(^{57}\) Danny Keenan supports Parsonson’s thesis, asserting that ‘inherent and ancient processes which [Māori] would maintain were not overridden by new factors introduced into the Maori intellectual domain after 1800’,\(^{58}\) and Michael King asserted that Māori would adopt rituals of Christianity often ‘without Maori relinquishing a belief in their own gods’, which he extrapolated to mean that ‘Maori did not so much convert to Christianity as convert Christianity… to their own purposes.’\(^{59}\) A recent example of this approach is the work of Kuni Jenkins and Alison Jones in their 2011 work *He Korero, Words Between Us: First Māori-Pakeha Conversations on Paper.*\(^{60}\) In this book Jenkins and Jones relate the arrival of Marsden and the role of Ruatara, Marsden’s companion and guide. They reason that because Marsden could not speak in te reo Māori and was reliant on Ruatara to interpret his words,\(^{61}\) and because Ruatara had priorities other than Marsden’s, and because of the understandings of tikanga in the welcoming process, then ‘there was no sermon’ – meaning also of course that there could be no ‘conversion’ either.\(^{62}\) This ‘distancing’ analysis is applied continuously becoming, for example, a rationale for the rise of the prophetic movements, transforming them from scripturally-based

---


\(^{55}\) Ibid, p.142.

\(^{56}\) Ibid, p.162.


\(^{61}\) William Williams notes that Marsden was not understood by Māori on his arrival and was dependent on Ruatara to interpret his words, William Williams, *Christianity among the New Zealanders*, London, 1867, pp.13-14.

\(^{62}\) Jenkins and Jones, p.87.
movements into political phenomena, even ‘protest religions’. Lyndsay Head offers a particularly pugnacious response to these analyses. She asserts that under this ‘flight’ view ‘Maori are said to have raided Christianity like a trade store, but the result was unimpaired independence and expanded tradition’ with a result of ‘perpetual innocence if not a thesis of perpetual independence.’ Alongside the lack of impact on Māori comes a paradoxical effect with Māori who did consciously adopt Christianity becoming ‘occasionally demonised but more frequently ignored’ under a ‘historiography that continue to divide Maori into good and (if almost parenthetically) bad.’ Māori were able to use Christianity as an external tool. Those who chose to internalise it were side-lined in this historiography because they were inexplicable, ‘casualties of the neo-orientalist premise of the ‘autonomy’ thesis.’

‘Conversion’ has been used as a simplistic and instantaneous label to describe a very complex and nuanced response by Māori to Christianity. Both the fight and flight responses to Māori and Christianity have many valid precedents, nuances and points of overlap. However they are both overly-polemic and reductionist, reducing a long and complex intellectual process into a series of short sharp encounters on a political and resistance spectrum, dominating the historiographical treatment of Māori and Christianity in both Māori and Pākehā-authored literature. This thesis will take the approach that while allowances must be made for the coercive and corrosive impact of colonization on Māori and iwi, and while Christianity was often utilised as a tool in that project, there is an important aspect where Christianity was utilised by Māori as a tool to continuously re-evaluate their own identity, a site for the renegotiation of mātauranga.
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The baseline for a Māori and iwi intellectual study is mātauranga, the knowledge and epistemology of Māori. Hirini Moko Mead broadly defines mātauranga Māori as ‘Māori knowledge complete with its values and attitudes’, and the Waitangi Tribunal added that it included Māori epistemologies, that ‘Mātauranga Māori’... refers not only to Māori knowledge, but also to the Māori way of knowing. The Tribunal noted that mātauranga Māori is underpinned by key principles including: whanaungatanga (relationships), tapu (sacredness), utu (reciprocity), mana (authority) and kaitiakitanga (guardianship). Te Maire Tau emphasises the importance of epistemology in defining Mātauranga Māori – ‘what it is that underpins and gives point and meaning to Maori knowledge’, and also emphasises that mātauranga is known through language but that ‘language exceeds the text’, and can be read through a range of signs and stimuli. Mātauranga Māori is also aligned to, but sometimes held in contrast with, mātauranga-ā-iwi, or tribal knowledge and epistemologies. Wiremu Docherty describes Mātauranga Māori as the ‘summary of tribal knowledge’ an accretion of mātauranga-ā-iwi, and that ‘each concept is interdependent and each is ‘equal’; that is, one cannot be privileged one over the other.’ Ngāti Porou leader Api Mahuika on the other hand describes a fiercely autonomous tribal knowledge base:

The key to Mātauranga Ngāti Porou is tikanga, or in the English terms, culture. In culture or tikanga we find all those elements that are essential to life, namely, the rules and regulations about norms of behaviour and respect for people and property, rules of lore out of which arises systems of law, moral codes of behaviour and justice, sets of value systems, political and economic systems and religious and spiritual sanctions.
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Most commentators on mātauranga, both the Māori and iwi typologies, allow for dynamism in its development. Whataarangi Winiata starts his view of the evolution of mātauranga from a fairly set point where ‘the values, practices and world-view must be in a constant state of enhancement, enrichment, expansion and broadening, on the condition, or within the context, of a continuity of Matauranga Māori, mai i te ao Māori, from the beginnings of time.’\(^{76}\) In this thinking mātauranga can be added to but the core remains constant. Mead is slightly different in that he allows that elements of contemporary mātauranga are reconstruction, recovering from the losses and impacts of colonisation.\(^{77}\) He also notes that conscious decisions are made as to what is to be retained and what is to be left behind: ‘within the basket of knowledge itself, some ideas are held to be crucial and critical, while other ideas are subject to amendment or better left alone, and there is a wide range of new ideas to select from and to embrace.’ Furthering this idea of transformation, Mead adds that Māori ‘will continue to use, adapt, and incorporate into our lives those portions of the traditional Māori knowledge system that we can use and enjoy today.’\(^{78}\) This process can happen in a range of ways from the higher learning institutions of the land through to cultural expressions such as kapa haka festivals, the practice of traditional (and not-so-traditional) performance art forms. Taiarahia Black describes the national biennial Te Matatini kapa haka festival for example as a site for both the retention and reinforcement but also for the dissemination and rearticulation of mātauranga led by experts from different iwi.\(^{79}\) Mātauranga has core principles, but is in a constant state of evolution.

Instead of being viewed as merely a problem or a tool Christianity was also a space where iwi experts renegotiated mātauranga on behalf of their people, influenced by both internal tribal factors and the external intellectual environment. The concept of ‘cultural change and cultural persistence co-existing’\(^{80}\) has become increasingly important in recent historiography relating to Māori. This trend has come partly from dissatisfaction with the

\(^{77}\) Moko Mead, p.11.
\(^{80}\) Harris, p.4.
‘false dichotomous choice’ between fatal impact and cultural continuity as a result of colonisation. As Michael Stevens notes ‘the danger of simply equating cultural change with cultural loss… is a failure to understand the nature, extent and drivers of cultural alterations, and their place in Maori modernities.’ Indeed the concept of modernity itself has come in for challenge, with Shmuel Eisenstadt proposing the idea of ‘multiple modernities’ as a process of ‘continual constitution and reconstitution of a multiplicity of cultural programs’, and asserting that ‘modernity and Westernization are not identical’. Stevens’ work on Kāi Tahu creating their own space in modernity is reflected in Melissa Matutina Williams’ ground-breaking work on Māori post-war migration. Instead of urbanisation being a process of fatal impact and cultural loss, Williams repositions Māori migration ‘as a lifelong process of cultural connection and negotiation between people and home-places.’ Ngarino Ellis looks at the movement of Māori art traditions in the nineteenth century and asserts that instead of merely being buffeted by the forces of colonisation, ‘different sectors in the Māori art world re-negotiated key concepts within Māori culture, such as tikanga (tradition), tapu (sacredness) and mana (power, authority).’ In her seminal study on Māori social change Iwi, Angela Ballara asserted that ‘the Māori political and social system was always dynamic, continuously modified like its technology in response to such phenomena as environmental change and population expansion’ and that ‘in the changing circumstances of the 19th century Māori adapted their lifestyle and self-conceptualisation as the need arose.’ And in an international indigenous example, Penny Van Toorn upends the question of the impact of literacy on the indigenous peoples of Australia to one of how they ‘acquired, conceptualised, organised and used’ literacy for their own ends. None of these histories ignore the destructive impact of colonisation, nor ascribe a laissez-faire agency to
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indigenous peoples. Instead they mark out the internal perceptions of the people themselves as they renegotiated their identities.

The idea that Christianity could be one of these sites of renegotiation for Māori has been explored to some degree, generally at a macro-level. Partly this has arisen from a growing awareness amongst Pākehā historians of the role and importance of Māori in their own adoption of Christianity in which, according to Raeburn Lange, ‘Maori initiatives were no less significant than the much chronicled deeds of the missionaries from Britain and Europe.’

Tony Ballantyne writing of this process across the Anglican Empire points out the arrival of ‘new interpretations that emphasise indigenous agency and the constructive power of cross-cultural contact’. Ballantyne places this growing awareness among a wider body of literature that recognises the importance of Christianity in British colonisation historiography, and how ‘new scholarship places religion, together with race and gender, at the heart of imperial culture.’

Head challenges historians to grapple more with the implications of Māori Christianity, which in the form of literacy ‘expanded Maori minds as it had those of fifteenth century Europeans, offering intellectual autonomy and a defence against established dogma. Literacy allowed Maori to choose to discard their own official culture as mistaken and self-limiting.’ In this Head follows the same line of thinking as expressed by Te Ahukaramu Charles Royal in which ‘many Maori were released from a previous religious orientation that allowed a new freedom particularly in the transmission of knowledge; encounter with Pakeha showed Maori could step out of their own knowledge system and review it.’

The idea that Māori could use Christianity to critique their own culture is reflected in Native American literature. James Treat writing on the nineteenth-century Santee-Sioux physician Charles Alexander Eastman describes how complex and nuanced the nature was of being simultaneously ‘native and Christian’. Eastman’s experience could not be resolved ‘through clever cultural terminology’, and ‘to label him as “bicultural” and leave it at that is only to mystify the complex internal negotiations he
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engaged in”\textsuperscript{93} and that there may in fact be no ‘problem’ at all because ‘religious and cultural and racial contradictions are socially constructed rationalizations, not self-evident facts.’\textsuperscript{94}

The potential impact of this renegotiation of being Māori and Christian has been displayed by some historians in dramatic ways. Judith Binney posits that the prophet Te Kooti Arikirangi utilised both scriptural and Māori oral knowledge systems in forming his movement.\textsuperscript{95} Head again leads the way though in the application of these possibilities to those practicing a more orthodox version of Christianity. In her work on Wiremu Tamihana and the Kingitanga Head outlines the ‘subversive’ potential of Christianity for Māori in their relations with the colonial state, where instead of being a tool for control it became ‘politically empowering, to the point of sanctioning conflict with the state’.\textsuperscript{96} According to Head Tamihana himself ‘used the intellectual opportunities presented by Christianity to produce a modernised model of Māori political independence’\textsuperscript{97} and by using scripture to critique power relations with the settler state ‘the word of God as the expression of the values of peace and autonomy was the ethical basis of the King Movement’s drive for independence.’\textsuperscript{98} These complex intellectual processes were a far cry from the simplistic and instantaneous ‘conversion’ events that have dominated the historiography.


\textsuperscript{94} Ibid, p.6.


\textsuperscript{96} Head, ‘The Pursuit of Modernity in Maori society’, p.113.

\textsuperscript{97} Head, ‘Wiremu Tamihana and the mana of Christianity’, p.70.

Table 1: The Theoretical Whakapapa (genealogy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panikena Kaa</th>
<th>Matewa Tangaere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Te Rauna Kaa</td>
<td>Henare Tipihenua Kaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiremu Kaa</td>
<td>Hone Kaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hirini Kaa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This thesis is an exploration of the renegotiation of mātauranga through the intellectual framework of Christianity. Three concepts constitute the theoretical model that help shape my understanding of ‘Christianity’, ‘mātauranga’ and the process of ‘renegotiation’. All three concepts originate from my own mātauranga-ā-īwi, and more specifically from my mātauranga-ā-whenua (land and environmental context) and mātauranga-ā-whānau (family knowledge and epistemology). These are not theoretical models in that they are prescriptive, more in that they shape my own personal philosophy and underpin the narrative, analysis and methodology contained in the thesis. The first concept is Aitanga, as developed by my aunty Kuni Jenkins in her PhD thesis ‘Haere tahi taua: An Account of Aitanga in Maori Struggle for Schooling’. Aunty Kuni defines the concept of Aitanga as ‘a set of practices and processes which are played out in meetings between people. At their core, these practices and processes involve reciprocity: a giving and receiving by both parties equally committed to a relationship.’ Through this lens of Aitanga the interaction between Māori and Christianity can be seen therefore as one of reciprocity, where both mātauranga-ā-īwi

100 For this section I suggest it is appropriate to use an intimate, familial form of address because my relationship to the author is at the heart of my analysis.
and the received version of Christianity as presented by the missionaries were transformed over time, renegotiated to meet mutual needs and aspirations. This was not a one-sided nor closed process and Aunty Kuni rejects the simplistic Marxist binary ‘assimilation-and-oppression stories’ because they mute other possibilities.\textsuperscript{102}

The second concept is manifested through the haka \textit{Tihei taruke}. This haka (a collective performance of sacred poetry) was composed in 1900 by the Anglican minita (minister) and Ngāti Porou tohunga (expert in traditional knowledge) the Reverend Mohi Turei. Turei is from the same hapū (subtribe) as my whānau and from the same whenua (land). My understanding of his haka comes from my Uncle Wiremu Kaa, who views the haka as ‘a theological reflection and as a vehicle to explain the juxtaposition that Ngāti Porou had reached in their theological journey, theological evolution and theological development.’\textsuperscript{103} The haka tells both the narrative of the origin and movement of te Hāhi Mihinare amongst our people and attempts to reconcile that with our mātauranga-ā-iwi, and is described by Uncle Wiremu as a ‘template for discussing and locating the diversity of choices that have emerged and continue to emerge about the range of wairua (spirituality) perspectives within Ngāti Porou’. The notion of reconciliation was also important in the context of the internal war we waged in 1865 between various religious expressions, and it ‘strongly suggests that Maori wairua and Christian Spirituality can symbolically co-exist and live harmoniously within a single taruke (crayfish pot).’\textsuperscript{104}

The third and final concept comes through another haka \textit{Te Pārekereke} (table 2) composed by my paternal grandfather, the Anglican minita The Reverend Henare Tipiwhenua Kaa in 1964 to celebrate the arrival of Christianity amongst my people with the return from captivity of Piripi Taumataakura in 1834. The haka tells not only of the arrival of Christianity, but also tells of the arrival of my tīpuna (ancestor) Paikea amongst our people, who brought with him the gift of the seedling kūmara (the sweet potato). My understanding of this haka comes from my father Hone Te Kauru o te Rangi Kaa. His view is that the two arrivals were deliberately juxtaposed in the haka because both brought gifts that represented a new start for our people. According to my father ‘the kūmara is the sacred food which embodies the signs of peace and life. It is the gift that Ngāti Porou speaks of in poetic terms

\begin{enumerate}
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as 'ko taku kūmara hai wai-ū mō Tama - my kūmara is as mother's milk for the child', and 'the arrival of Paikea is seen as an added blessing on the kūmara'. Similarily the arrival of Taumataakura brought the gift of Te Purapura Pai, the Good Seed, the metaphor for the Gospel. Thus the kūmara ‘becomes sacred food, nurture and nourishment for the new Tama, Jesus Christ.’ Through the haka describing these two processes, which my father describes as ‘an integral part of the conscientisation of the Iwi’ the author (my grandfather) and the whole iwi through the performance of the haka are acknowledging the renegotiation of their mātauranga through Christianity and embracing both continuity and change.

Table 2: Te Pārekereke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Te Pārekereke</th>
<th>Welcome to Rangitukia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Haere mai ki Rangitukia’</td>
<td>To the place where Taumatakura planted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ki te kāinga i tiria ai e Taumatākura</td>
<td>The seed of the Gospel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te kākano o te Whakapono</td>
<td>To the home from where the sun radiates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ki te wāhi i ura atu ai te rā</td>
<td>Spreading its light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka horahia te māramatanga</td>
<td>To each and every place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ki tēra wāhi, ki tēra wāhi.</td>
<td>Welcome to the hearth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haere mai ki te wāhi</td>
<td>That is our seed-bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pārekereketia ai tātāu</td>
<td>To Ngāpuketurua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ko Ngāpuke turua tērā</td>
<td>Where Paika inquired of Huturangi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pātai ai Paikea ki a Huturangi</td>
<td>‘Where is everyone?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Kai whea anake te tangata?’</td>
<td>‘They are at Ngāpuketurua planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘E kai Ngāpuketurua kai te whakatakoto</td>
<td>The sacred kumara for Tama’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I te kumara mā Tama’.</td>
<td>‘Come let us go together’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Haramai ka haere tāua’</td>
<td>‘Yes but the pathways are sacred’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘E kai te tapu ngā huarahi’</td>
<td>‘All is well I will clear the way.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Kai te pai māku e waere’</td>
<td>Jesus Christ, the God of Taumatakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nā Ihu Karaiti, te Atua o Taumatākura</td>
<td>Promises the New Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te tino waere atāhua</td>
<td>That ends the eating of human flesh(^{107})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mutu ai te kai i te tangata</td>
<td>That stills the spirit of fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tau ai te mauri ki raro</td>
<td>That allows humanity to sleep in peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I au ai hoki te moe a te koroua</td>
<td>And lets the light shine where it will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I whiti ai te ra-E whiti nei hoki</td>
<td>Its watchword, ‘People may disappear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tona whakatauki, ‘Whatungarongaro</td>
<td>But the Church will be triumphant.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He tangata, toitū ko te Hāhi.’</td>
<td>Therefore, Welcome!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na reira, Hara mai!</td>
<td>Welcome! Welcome!(^{108})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hara mai! Hara mai!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concept of ‘Māori and Christianity’ is something of a misnomer. The ‘Māori’ response to Christianity was as diverse as the people themselves, differing from an iwi right down to an individual level. This thesis is both a ‘Māori’ and an ‘iwi’ history, where iwi is very broadly defined as a group of people with shared mātauranga. Partly this broad definition of iwi is to avoid the hierarchical structure that anthropologists have bestowed on tribal groupings of whānau (family), hapū (subtribe) and iwi (tribe). It is also recognition of diversity within iwi and hapū and even within whānau, when in response to Christianity ‘individuals followed atypical paths at all times, even when their communities as a whole moved in a particular

\(^{107}\) Referring to the end of Kai tangata, the traditional practice eating of human flesh.

and ‘new forms of political and religious association were constantly developing’ – Māori culture was not static. Broadly the thesis will refer to iwi as classical tribal groupings, such as Ngāti Porou or Te Arawa. However these groupings are the tip of an identity iceberg that indicates multiple layers of views and histories waiting to be revealed in the historiographical future.

In some ways ‘Māori’ in the broader historiography can be viewed as a product of ‘the nation’. This is particularly so if the lens is focused on race relations, where Māori became an opponent or obstacle to the nation-building project. This approach was critiqued by the New Oxford History of New Zealand with the editor Giselle Byrnes claiming ‘New Zealand as a distinct place with an historical interpretation that follows no one master narrative and no single plot’. Nepia Mahuika offers the further critique that in these histories of nation ‘our pasts are often relegated to peripheral sub-plots of the dominant national narrative, or, even worse, appropriated altogether beyond our recognition and grasp.’ Even outside of the nation the need to emphasise diversity remains important. The concept of mātauranga-ā-īwi, or locally based knowledge demands that ‘Māori’ be differentiated in order to explore their distinctive responses. Ngāi Tūhoe expert John Rangihau stated that there is ‘no such thing as Maoritanga... each tribe has its own history’, and Wiremu Doherty describes Mātauranga ā-īwi as ‘knowledge specific to an iwi and its rohe.’ However despite this need to acknowledge and identify diversity, and to avoid submerging iwi within the nation, there are also important realities around ‘Māori’ and ‘national’ histories. As Melissa Williams notes although the nation is problematic for Māori it cannot be forgotten and should not be ignored as if it does not exist. Similarly Nepia Mahuika asserts that ‘there is a need to infiltrate and subvert the existing structures and dominant narratives that have constructed the margins to begin with’ which this thesis attempts in some manner by reviewing ‘Māori and Christianity’ through a Māori and
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iwi perspective. Williams also argues that the ‘transportability’ of the iwi, both geographically and intellectually, ‘raises questions about when a tribal history ceases being tribal and becomes Māori, and vice versa.’\textsuperscript{117} So while iwi is crucial, it is not in isolation.

Both ‘iwi’ and ‘Māori’ were shaped and formed by a series of conscious and subliminal intellectual interactions, beneath, within and above both the ‘nation’ and ‘empire’. This was the ‘trans-native’ net. Arini Loader describes the importance of both grounding histories in local mātauranga and ‘casting the net wider’\textsuperscript{118} in order to ‘affirm the multiplicity of our identities as tribal peoples, as Indigenous peoples, and more’\textsuperscript{119} and to ‘challenge ourselves with diverse ideas and theories.’\textsuperscript{120} The concept of looking beyond local and even national concerns has been extensively explored by Tony Ballantyne in his work on ‘Transnationalism’, which he describes as a web of ‘horizontal’ relationships between colonies instead of focusing primarily on the ‘vertical’ relationship to the metropole.\textsuperscript{121} Ballantyne’s approach is not then the view from London, but instead ‘explores the interactions between global forces, imperial linkages and local developments on the ground’\textsuperscript{122} and its strength is that it offers one way past the critique of problematic progressive and insular national histories beyond merely pointing out their faults.\textsuperscript{123} This approach is also utilised by Alice Te Punga Somerville in her work on the Pacific where ‘the nation-state is relegated to one strand of a matrix of relationships within which tāngata whenua operate.’\textsuperscript{124} These calls for looking beyond ‘nation’ and even beyond ‘Māori’ and ‘iwi’ are particularly timely. These calls pose a ‘fundamental challenge to history, a discipline that has produced enabling narratives for so many nations’\textsuperscript{125} and may provide
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welcome relief in a post-settlement environment where iwi will often use their newly repatriated resources to focus on their own stories, to the exclusion of wider narratives.

In the context of this thesis transnationalism and its various iterations is a crucial concept. Although much of Anglican history and development is local in nature and dynamic, it was still strongly influenced by events from the metropole, in this case centred in Lambeth rather than Westminster. This ‘vertical relationship’ between the local church and the ‘centre’ of the Communion evolved and changed over time. For example clergy had been sent here from England regularly, yet they brought with them rapidly changing theology reflecting the developments in the theological schools of Oxbridge in the nineteenth century. There were also very strong ‘horizontal’ connections. The Lambeth conferences, the worldwide gathering of Bishops that shaped policy and doctrine for the Anglican Empire, started because of a ‘crisis’ over polygamy in South Africa and was continually shaped by issues arising in different parts of the ‘Anglican Empire’. Being comprised as these conferences were of Bishops from around the world, these became key nodes in the web and were influenced both ‘horizontally’ and ‘vertically’. So if transnational histories are about colonial and Imperial relationships as opposed to ‘nation-building’ concerns and developments, the Church probably stands as a good example.

This exploration of international linkages is helped by recent historiography concerning the Anglican Empire having undergone a change. According to Rowan Strong in recent times ‘historians of religion and empire have paid more attention to how Christianity has been enculturated in a colonial setting, and to conversion and the role of local agents in this process’ and ‘this perspective has caused a shift of focus away from the missionaries and towards the local communities who received Christianity and adapted it to their own ends’. This shift from a missionary focus to a focus on indigenous Christians – although sadly not universal, particularly in New Zealand – means that a greater focus is able to be given to ‘webs of affiliation and association created by indigenous and colonised communities’. Examples of this new literature that focuses on the ‘native experience’, crucially utilizing ‘native sources’ include Susan Billington Harper, *In the Shadow of the Mahatma*, Grand Rapids, 2000; Lamin Sanneh, ‘The CMS and the African Transformation: Samuel Ajayi Crowther and the Opening of Nigeria’, in Kevin Ward and Brian Stanley eds, *The Church Missionary Society and World Christianity, 1799-1999*, Grand Rapids, 2000; and Bonnie Sue Lewis, *Creating Christian Indians: Native Clergy in the Presbyterian Church*, Norman, 2003.
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Alongside these webs within and beneath Empire, typified by the influence on Māori by the Indian bishop Azariah in the early 1920s, there is also a reappraisal of the intellectual influence exerted by leading Anglican thinkers on the colonised as well as the colonisers. Thinkers such as Henry Venn and Roland Allen had a great impact on Māori and others within the Empire, creating room for agency within an Imperial framework. In referring to literary connections Chadwick Allen refers to ‘trans-indigenous’ connections\(^{130}\) however due to the nature of the relationships I am exploring within the Anglican Empire, I will describe the linkages in this thesis as ‘trans-native’ – a net of relationships between colonised peoples of faith, both in the Anglican Empire and ecumenically, including the intellectual forces that have impacted them.

Just as ‘Māori’ was the cumulative experience of iwi, so ‘Christianity’ was the accretion of denominations. Denominations, in this case the Anglican Church, became a part of the dynamic Māori social structure. This thesis argues that just as ‘the Christian faith never exists except “translated” into a culture’,\(^{131}\) neither is Christianity a generic religious movement. Instead, Christianity is expressed through denominations and traditions, and historically that has meant through the organising principle of an institution – in this case Te Hāhi Mihinare, the Māori Anglican Church. In writing this history as a type of ‘institutional history’ the thesis moves against recent historiographical trends in indigenous histories which have tended to focus on microhistories, or ‘detailed analysis of local situations’.\(^{132}\) An excellent example of the power and importance of this approach is shown by Mellissa Matutina Williams in her 2010 thesis examining the migration of a people to the city.\(^{133}\) By using a microhistorical approach Williams was able to unpack received notions around Māori ‘urbanisation’ and provide an alternative analysis. Such an approach does not ignore context and can be the basis for painting (or repainting) the big historical picture. For example Damon Salesa noted that Judith Binney’s work ‘suggests that colonialism and
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imperialism are best grasped locally.” However, many of these microhistories have benefited from the existence of a corpus of writing that had established the context for the research itself. The topic that this thesis grapples with – a Māori and iwi perspective of the impact of denominational Christianity – I would argue has not been explored in great detail. Therefore it was necessary to look to broaden the scope of the research, covering a lengthy time period (c.1800-1992) and the whole country. It would be hoped that this work could provide the context for future microhistories in various areas of this topic that may well even upend this work through their findings. There has been considerable writing on the history of Māori institutions, with arguably the *magnum opus* of the field being Angela Ballara’s 1998 work *Iwi: the dynamics of Maori tribal organisation from c.1769 to c.1945*, in which she challenged notions around the greatest Māori institutions of all, iwi, and the constant evolution of these social structures. However as with microhistories there has been a move away from institutional histories in recent times, as broad research has enabled the research to deepen. This thesis focuses on the institutional history not as a study of the workings of the institution itself, although that is often unavoidable, but of the institution as a site of focus for exploring the renegotiation of mātauranga as the outworking of Māori interaction with Christianity. But because Christianity comes in cultural and denominational packets, the institution is both unavoidable and important.

One of the weaknesses of Māori institutional histories has been a focus on colonization as an object in itself. Partly this situation has arisen from the sheer importance of race in colonization, and what Danny Keenan refers to as ‘the inescapable context of colonisation’. This thesis convers race extensively, as Mihinare spent a huge amount of time and energy on the search for mana motuhake (self-determination) within a very oppressive institutional environment. The dominant Pākehā part of the institution worked tirelessly on its assimilationist agenda, whatever name was given to it at any one time, and as Harris notes ‘assimilation by any other name is still assimilation’. However this thesis is
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135 Although I hope not.
136 Ballara, *Iwi: the dynamics of Maori tribal organisation from c.1769 to c.1945*.
138 Harris, p.7.
influenced greatly by the recent work of the Māori history collective Te Pouhere Korero.139 One of the themes emerging from their work is ‘writing histories that help Maori people escape the past into which they have found themselves written; the dominant historical discourse which tends to locate Maori history in the context of British colonialism and expansionism’.140 Consequently they have explored various approaches – microhistorical, tribal, literary analysis – that have shifted the discourse from the seeming obsession with politics and race to a focus on Māori agency. This questioning of the focus on colonisation is appearing elsewhere, as Chris Hilliard notes ‘while hardly anything in New Zealand is unconnected with colonization, not everything is adequately explained by its colonial entanglements’141 and Tony Ballantyne asserts that there are more nodes of historiography to history than race and land.142 This approach of decentring race and colonization may seem ironic in a thesis looking at the Anglican Empire, the archetypal outworking of religious colonization. However partly it arises from the decision not to focus on Pākehā Anglican methods and motivations, which would detract from the ‘core messages and meanings’143 coming from the sources, and instead to mention race and colonization as merely another (albeit important) influence on the process of the renegotiation of mātauranga.

The structure of the thesis follows a roughly chronological approach, exploring the significant institutional events as brought to light by both the primary and secondary sources. Chapter two ‘Te Hāhi-ā-Iwi (the Church of the Tribe): Founding a Tribal Church’ outlines the spread of the Anglican Empire from the late seventeenth century, and its eventual dissemination on these shores. It focuses in particular on iwi engagement and experimentation with this new phenomenon, from the early Kaiwhakaako (teachers) and minita (ministers) through to newly developed structures including Hīnota (synods)) and other hui (gatherings). Chapter three ‘Ka Tū He Pihopa (Arise a Bishop): Tribal Church

139 Te Pouhere Korero is a broad collective of Māori colleagues interested in history. Members whose work I have referenced in this chapter include: Harris, Mahuika, Williams, Loader, Te Punga Somerville, and Tau.
140 Harris, pp.24-25.
143 Williams, p.23.
Leadership’ continues this theme of the adaptation of Anglican institutional components into a Māori world view. In particular the chapter focuses on the raising up by iwi of a Māori bishop, and the negotiation required by the iwi leadership not only with the Pākehā gatekeepers but also – and more importantly - amongst each other. Chapter four ‘Te Hāhi Motuhake (the Autonomous Church): Tribe, Race and Power’ explores the limitations of these institutional successes as they came face to face with a racial dynamic, but also how iwi continued to struggle to gain a space for themselves within the church so that they could explore their own spirituality on their own terms. Chapter five ‘He Hāhi Māori (A Māori Church): The Evolution of a Pan-Tribal Church’ examines that intellectual exploration. It begins with a look at theological education, which was both an attempt at assimilation and an exercise in intellectual liberation, utilising both Māori and international concepts. The chapter then examines the leadership of women in the Māori church, where women encountered both Māori and Pākehā cultural assumptions. The chapter then moves into the area of ecumenism in the post-World War Two era, as an increasingly self-determining Māori church attempted to broaden its scope and aspirations to a pan-denominational level. The final chapter, chapter six ‘Ko Rāwiri Te Tangata (David is the ancestor): Shaping the Tribal Text’, utilises the prayer book as a key site of intellectual engagement and negotiation for Mihinare, allowing them to explore and then put into practice deeply held beliefs and understandings.

The focus on institution has also meant an extensive use of institutional sources, which have in turn presented methodological challenges. This thesis is reliant on primary sources from the institution including correspondence and minutes of meetings, as well as published sources especially the Māori language newspapers. To a certain degree institutional sources reflect the bias of the institution itself, written as they are largely by people whose views are in alignment with the organisation. The majority of the sources used were written by Mihinare, especially by minita (ministers) who generally had the time and resources to work on church business. However this subjectivity is not unusual, and as Judith Binney notes ‘the 'telling of history', whether it be oral or written, is not and never has been neutral. It is
always the reflection of the priorities of the narrators and their perceptions of their world.’

In fact the subjectivity of the authors is useful in itself, giving insight into the process of renegotiation from a Mihinare perspective. The reliance on written forms of historical evidence is again somewhat against trend in recent Māori historiography, with recent advances in understanding the importance of oral history and oral tradition in the writing of Māori and iwi history.145 The impact of literacy on Māori was a key part of the process of renegotiation, and so the use of written materials is also insightful for its own sake. The early and extensive use of literacy by Māori, described by Jane McCrae as ‘an exchange between traditions rather than a replacement of them’,146 had a tremendous impact on Mihinare, who were in turn influenced by their missionary colleagues who emphasised the importance of understanding religious writings as part of ‘conversion’ process. The Niupepa Māori (the Māori language newspapers) were an important part of this process and also an important source. Far from being merely reports of events, they were expressions of Māori thought transferred to a new forum, and as Timoti Karetu notes they allowed traditional conversations to be spread far beyond the confines of the marae, the traditional area for debate and discourse.147 In terms of the Mihinare newspapers published by the church from 1899-1932, the use of traditional Māori imagery in the names Te Toa Takitini (a metaphor relating to strength through unity), Te Pīpīwharauroa (The Shining Cuckoo), and Te Kopara (The Bellbird) were processes of negotiation in themselves. Birds for example were seen as spiritual messengers in traditional, pre-Christian, knowledge.148

The use of records of meetings has not been analysed in the literature as extensively as newspapers, but presents some interesting possibilities. Although church meetings generally attempted to follow western process based on a type of Westminster procedure,

148 McRae, p.50.
there was a great deal of variation within this. The records of these meetings were generally taken by one of the Mihinare themselves, and so meeting records are in some ways (often anonymous) interpretations of an organisational meeting. However as with newspapers more can be read into these records than mere subjugation of Māori tikanga (cultural practices). Coming together in hui (gatherings) to discuss topical issues has long been the favoured forum for Māori discourse, with differing levels of formality and different procedures from iwi to iwi. Church meetings can be regarded as merely another type of hui, where people spoke their opinions and discussed issues. Similarly to the situation with newspapers if these records are read with an understanding of tikanga then traditional practices and their adaptation can be seen even through the heavy filter of the minute process. These practices include whaikōrero (traditional rhetoric) and whakapapa (interconnections between speakers) as a constant presence whether the minutes and meetings were conducted in the Māori or English language. This is not to say that minutes are perfect records of events, but they can be valuable sources in their own right beyond the mere data they confer to the researcher. Whether minutes, letters, newspapers or any other form of written medium, these works remain as taonga tuku iho (treasures handed down the generations).

The potential weakness of an institutional history can be the gravitational pull towards the institutional perception of centre, leaving local stories and groups such as women and youth marginalised in the process. Within the Church institution for example there were multiple layers of local stories that cannot be told in this particular project. Of especial importance is the ‘marae’ story of Christianity, where the experience differed greatly from place to place. Jasmine Kaa in her work on Māori women in the Anglican Church in the 1960s noted that ‘Māori women’s involvement in the church has been excluded from the historiography and that recognition of their contribution is still forthcoming.’\textsuperscript{149} Much has been written on women in the Anglican Church in general, including recent biographies\textsuperscript{150} however as Kaa notes ‘in Anglican history when it means

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{149} Jasmine Kaa, ‘Nga wahine i roto i Te Haahi Mihinare: Maori women in the Anglican Church in the 1960s’, MA Thesis, University of Auckland, 2000, p.ii.
\item \textsuperscript{150} See for example Beverley Reeves, \textit{Looking for Mrs Cowie: the life and times of a colonial Bishop’s wife}, Auckland, 2005.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
women it means pakeha women’. Kaa’s work also captures the histories of women who were active at the grass roots of the institution, and as she points out the risk is also that to focus on ‘exceptional’ women in the Church, including ordained women or even clergy spouses, ‘fails to capture women’s involvement at a micro-level, where the real decisions were made’. This absence of gender is particularly noticeable in discourse around the renegotiation of mātauranga, where the perception could arise that only elderly men were involved in the work. As Loader suggests ‘finding the voices of our tupuna wahine [women ancestors] may involve us expanding or shifting our ideas about what constitutes a historical record and where history can be found. It may… be a matter of reading between the lines to reveal taonga which are hidden in plain view in the memories or writing of others.’

This is an insider history. There has been much critique and even criticism in recent decades over the telling of Māori and iwi histories by ‘outsiders’. Partly this critique is based on the methodologies and epistemologies used, which I have already given examples of in relation to ‘Māori and Christianity’. ‘Insider’ history is perhaps best described by Monty Soutar as history written by someone who has ‘access to the heart and soul of the people during the period being researched’. Linda Smith adds that the research must be contextual, that ‘insiders have to live with the consequences of their processes on a day-to-day basis for ever more, and so do their families and communities.’ The voice of the insider is different from the casual observer, where according to Judith Binney ‘the focus of attention is different; the sympathetic identifications are different; the encrustation of meaning around events is different.’ However although the notion of insider history is crucial in the process of ‘decolonizing the methodologies of history’ there is still a need for discipline within these histories. This thesis is subjective and insider but is guided by historical method all the same, negotiating the criteria that ‘the research be evidence and not

151 Jasmine Kaa, p.18.
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153 Loader, p.22.
155 Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples, Dunedin, 1999, p.137.
157 Harris, p.24.
purpose driven, that researchers consult a range of sources and through critical analyses of
those sources represent a particular past in a theoretically sound and unattached way’.158

This thesis is insider in that I am a person with both close connections to my iwi and
to my faith. As a member of the Ngāti Porou iwi my perspective in the thesis is heavily
directed towards that iwi. This is partly because this is the history that I have ‘access to the
heart and soul’ of, therefore I feel best informed when dealing with the sources from that
iwi. The focus on Ngāti Porou is also methodological in that it grounds the work, and gives
it ‘a ‘home’, a ‘place’, a pārekereke’ (seedbed).159 However my insider status is not restricted
to a tribal perspective. I am also a Mihinare, both by whakapapa (descent) and as an
ordained minīta active in Te Hāhi Mihinare. This status gives me insights into the ‘heart and
soul’ of Mihinare across tribes, and even into the Anglican Empire as a whole that an
outsider may not have. Harris calls this connection ‘the whakapapa of experience’160 as a
way of accessing insider knowledge without necessarily holding connections of ‘blood and
bone… the baseline entry to whakapapa’.161 My Mihinare connections take me beyond both
the worlds of iwi and experience to another layer of connection. My connections through Te
Hāhi Mihinare give me insight and connections into other iwi that in some ways transcend
iwi boundaries. I was raised for example among Mihinare from the Northern iwi, including
Ngāpuhi, Te Aupouri, Ngāi Takoto and Ngāti Kahu, and in fact married into the latter. I
count amongst my Mihinare ‘whānau’ people from many iwi, and our ‘whakapapa of faith’
has created ties that stretch back generations. Therefore I feel as an insider I have insights
into the Mihinare experience that at times transcends the boundaries of both iwi and
whakapapa, although such a view is becoming increasingly unfashionable in a Māori post-
settlement world increasingly realigned along strict genealogical lines. This insider status
has also created an internal tension between the disciplinary demands of history and an
unspoken ‘exhortation to maximise the mana (standing) of the iwi or hapū’162 or in this case
of the Hāhi and of the iwi. However at the end of the day I believe the best apologetic –
defence of doctrine - is an unvarnished telling of the stories, letting those both inside and
outside of the church make their own decisions as to its history.

158 Williams, p.36.
159 Hone Kaa, pp.5-6.
160 Harris, p.25.
161 Ibid.
162 Soutar, p.vi.
The use of te reo Māori (Māori language) sources are crucial to this thesis. Partly this is a practical issue, given that nearly all Mihinare business was conducted in the language throughout the nineteenth and well into the twentieth century. In fact it was really only post World War Two that English language sources became common place, and even then much of the activity of the Church from hui through to liturgy was conducted in te reo Māori, and still is today. The language sources also relate to the earlier mentioned ‘Māori perspective’ of this thesis. While much of the historiography on this topic in the past has come from missionary or Pākehā church sources, there is a vast wealth of Māori language sources that have provided much of the primary source for this thesis. Through utilising these sources one gathers a quite different perspective of Māori and Christianity. Although this thesis is written in the English language, I have chosen to include the Māori language quotes in full followed by my interpretation in brackets. I have deliberately used the term ‘interpretation’ rather than ‘translation’ because rather than being a linguistic exercise I have approached an English-language rendering of the sources as an exercise in interpretation. This interpretation seeks to be accurate but acknowledges that ‘Māori culture and traditions are constituted by Māori language and similarly with English’, and ‘the two do not fully translate from one to the other.’ Thus, as with English language quotes and with the thesis in general, it is left to the reader’s interpretation of the material where readers of te reo Māori ‘will enjoy a richer and more nuanced reading of this work than those whose expertise is limited to either one or the other’. I did most of the interpretations myself, with occasional reference to my father or other whānau members. On occasion I found English language ‘translations’ alongside the original sources, however I would review these in the light of what I was interpreting from the reo itself, adjusting as I saw fit. I have also used the macron in the reo in order to be consistent with current best practice, however when quoting primary sources I have not amended original quotes in te reo Māori for spelling nor for macrons, nor have I macronized place names nor people’s names.

I have also conflated terminology at times. ‘Iwi’ for example, means a tribe, a specific unit in Māori society. It can also mean people. I have used it to cover a range of terms from tribal right through to ‘hapū’ or subtribe. Partly this comes from the constantly evolving

163 Hone Kaa, p.10.
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nature of Iwi over the time period of my thesis. So what was once considered a hapū may have become an iwi and at some stage reverted back to hapū. Ecclesiastical terms have also been merged. The Anglican Church loves its titles, including Reverend, Canon, Archdeacon, Dean, and so on. For ease of reading (and because they were often irrelevant to the context) I have streamlined these titles into Minita (Minister) and Pihopa (Bishop). Minita also includes all those in licensed ministry, both lay and ordained. Again, at different stages in this history people changed their status from lay to ordained, even through to bishop.

This thesis then is a longitudinal study of how iwi within a specific institution renegotiated their mātauranga. Guided by the principles of reciprocity, reconciliation and renegotiation and following the stories that the sources have indicated as important, it seeks to understand the processes by which Māori, and in this case Mihinare, engaged with the new knowledge of Christianity in the atmosphere of colonization. The himene E Te Atua, Kuia Ruia Nei was a good example of a new form, of learning to sing a new song that echoes both old and new concepts; of how to live with a new heart.
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165 For a description of this process refer to Ballara. This process continues to be contested, especially in light of contemporary mandate issues generated through Treaty of Waitangi claims, where settlement on an iwi-basis has led to some hapū claiming, and often being denied by others, iwi status.
Chapter 2

Te Hāhi-ā-Iwi: Founding a Tribal Church

The Anglican Church in the nineteenth century could be described as the quintessentially British institution. It was created alongside the formation of a new British post-reformation identity, and was one of the key drivers of that identity. There was no coincidence that as an institution the Anglican Church in Britain both mirrored and shaped the civil institutions alongside it, and was the established Church of the State embedded into constitutional understandings. As it arrived in New Zealand it encountered other understandings, equally embedded into the minds and structures of the people who had shaped it. This ancient body of Māori and before that Pacific mātauranga (knowledge and ways of thinking) was just as rigorous in its application and just as influential, perhaps more so, of the politics and practices of the people around it. This was no theological equivalent of the terra nullius, no unclaimed intellectual space that the Anglican Church would miraculously claim and “convert” into its own image. Instead the arrival of the Anglican Church initiated a process where iwi would negotiate and renegotiate their own ideas and values and mould the Anglican Church to fit their own needs, while adapting themselves to meet some of its needs as well.

The nineteenth-century would be a time when iwi would engage with the Anglican Church, which was itself undergoing constant change both back in England and eventually here in these lands. The Anglican institution itself was far from homogenous, and one of the powerful dynamics at play was the distinct approaches and ideas coming both from those based in England, and those on the ground across the Empire, with great diversity even amongst those in the colonial environment. What was constructed would in part be a physical space. Whether in the construction of Whare Karakia (Church Buildings) or in terms of Pāriha (Parish areas) designated by the iwi themselves, iwi both carved out a space within the Church institution and created new spaces in their own lands and communities.

---

1 Te Hāhi-a-Iwi (the church of the tribe)
for this new faith. More importantly though, iwi created an intellectual space within the institution of the Anglican Church, a space where they could test themselves against a changing environment, a space for the renegotiation of mātauranga.

Political, legal, economic and social institutions by definition were designed to be the bastions of control across the Empire. However they were also places of contestation and engagement at a local and national level. Māori culture was constantly capable of adaptation in the face of changing contexts, and as Angela Ballara asserts ‘the Maori political and social system was always dynamic, continuously modified like its technology in response to such phenomena as environmental change and population expansion...in the changing circumstances of the 19th century Maori adapted their lifestyle and self-conceptualisation as the need arose.’2 A good example was the Rūnanga system of the mid-nineteenth century. Although in some ways an attempt by the Empire to assert control over iwi and to replace existing traditional leadership,3 they were adapted by iwi as a necessary replacement for the individual power of the rangatira until they became as Angela Ballara notes ‘the first institution – nascent tribal governments – of the modern tribes’.4 This was in the face of what Alan Ward describes as a situation of ‘losing control of their own destinies, and being subordinated to the political and economic power of the settlers.’5 This adaptation of institution was not reserved solely for secular institutions, and applied equally to the Anglican Church.

Throughout the nineteenth century and the spread of the British Empire, Anglicans, and especially the evangelicals such as those from the Church Missionary Society viewed the Empire as a divine providence, a gift from God. According to Rowan Strong ‘they applied to the empire their domestic agenda of the Church of England as constituting the moral and social unity of the nation’ and that ‘only this religious basis for social unity, both at home and abroad, had any real chance of permanence in this world.’6 On a macro level
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4 Ballara, pp.287-88.
the Anglican evangelicals who comprised the vast majority of the early missionaries understood ‘the empire was devised within the traditions and life of the Church of England. Until the 1840s, that church maintained and valued its subordinate partnership with the state, which it understood to be an Anglican political community for which it had the religious and moral responsibility.’ The term “Anglican Empire” might then be appropriate, and within this Empire the establishment of institutions that would build and maintain this worldview was a crucial process. However these institutional practices and structures were not as inflexible as might be suspected, and across the Empire they became places of experimentation for both the devolution of power, and the maintenance of control.

One of the leading exponents of this devolution was the Reverend Henry Venn. Born in 1796, Venn was an ordained priest who had tutored at Cambridge. Venn was a disciple of the line of thought begun with the Clapham sect, the anti-slavery movement of evangelical Anglicans led by William Wilberforce. In fact, Wilberforce was a one-time patron of Venn’s, and Venn’s father was one of the founding members of the Sect. This movement became influential among the power-brokers of British society, including Venn’s brother-in-law Sir James Stephen, under-Secretary at Colonial Office in the late 1830s who was in a strategic position to make decisions on the shaping of the political Empire. Venn’s background of ‘evangelical philanthropy’ emphasised both spiritual and social freedom through Christianity, and this would extend to his thinking on the development of the Church as an institution throughout the British Empire. For thirty-two years from 1841 to 1873 as the honorary secretary of the Church Missionary Society Venn was well placed to influence missionary policy across the Empire. Venn developed a model of ecclesiology that prioritised the spread of the Christian message over the construction of ecclesiastical hierarchies. In fact in some ways Venn saw those Church structures as an impediment to this evangelism, noting in 1852 that ‘the proper work of a Missionary Society is the evangelization of the heathen, and not the perfecting of the ecclesiastical framework of a
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7 Ibid, p.284.
Christian community’. This lead to his coining of a phrase ‘the euthanasia of mission’. This ‘euthanasia’ had far-reaching implications. Not only did Venn push for the eventual withdrawal of European missionaries from indigenous communities but also the emergence of a native leadership within the Church. This approach was radical in the context of an Empire that tended to either appropriate or eliminate native leadership in the political sphere. One could only speculate as to how he may have viewed the Kingitanga, for example. Venn saw this handing over of leadership partly in practical in terms of mission, where ‘Christianity could too easily be seen as furthering the interests of the evangelizing nation at the expense of the interests of the one which is being evangelized’\(^9\); which could lead to local resistance to the message itself.

Possibly even more radically Venn also saw the inherent value of native cultures in the development of church, with C. Peter Williams noting ‘there was considerable awareness of the cultural issues and of the dangers of Europeanization’ and Venn, he continued, deserved ‘much respect as an advocate of an enlightened and culturally sensitive policy.’ Williams also noted that Venn was not alone, that ‘the ideal of an indigenous church was accepted by most Protestant and many Catholic missionary thinkers for the greater part of the Victorian era.’\(^11\) In China for example, Venn acknowledged that the strength of the “Chinese culture”\(^12\) was such that the only option was instead of being ‘anglicized’ they should ‘remain native in all respects, except in this, that they had become Christian, Christianity not denationalizing them, but, in them, becoming naturalized’\(^13\). Again Venn was pragmatic as much as idealistic, noting that Chinese might view Christianity as ‘essentially Anglican in its character, and destructive in the influence which it exercises to their national distinctiveness and independence’\(^14\) – thus needing to strip away what might be perceived as “Anglican” characteristics.
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Part of this drive to empower the native people themselves came from the struggle to establish European missionaries in the newly infiltrated parts of the nominal British Empire. In Niger in the 1820s and early 1830s eighteen out of twenty-six white missionaries died in the challenging environment. This led to a search for alternatives and the only workable one seemed to be utilising local leadership. Venn had some nuance in his approach to a ‘native Church’, for example recognising in places like China and India there would have to be truly native-led churches, while in other colonies Europeans could exercise more control. But this wish for a ‘native Church’ was part of a global vision none the less. There was also a reading of Anglican ecclesiology that allowed for such local developments, arising from the reformist protestant heritage of the Anglican Church. Although “Unity” was one of the founding principles of the “new” church, and ecclesiological order had been tied to political stability, there was still room for flexibility. Article 34 of the Elizabethan Church’s foundational Thirty-Nine Articles allowed that the ‘every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, Ceremonies or Rites of the Church’, giving room for local adaptation.

The spread of Christianity to Aotearoa came then in the context of a Church Missionary Society that at a global level understood the need for nurturing native leadership but which at a local level wished to maintain and exercise control over the ‘natives’. George Augustus Selwyn came to New Zealand from England as the first Bishop in 1842 determined to establish an English-style hierarchical Church, which he discussed with Lord Russell, head of the Colonial Office, as early as 1840. Selwyn’s understanding that he had been granted ‘power to mould the institutions of the church from the beginning according to true principles’ led him in 1844 to hold a first Synod that would begin to shape a Church structure to control (and enhance) mission in these lands. By 1857 Selwyn had guided the construction of a constitution that would cement in place a Diocesan and synodical structure that would control the Church for the next 133 years. Venn was critical of these moves by Selwyn as being outside his own vision for mission. Venn expressed concern in 1854 that
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due to the level of control being exerted by European missionaries “‘Maori Christianity can never be aught else than a servile, creeping plant, if prevented from developing itself in the vigorous and healthful actions of Christian ministrations.’”\(^{18}\) In particular, Venn was worried about the establishment of Pâkehâ synods in this country. As C. Peter Williams notes, although ‘synods were the ecclesiologically respectable instruments for making decisions in colonial churches’, they ‘were looked on with the greatest of suspicion by the CMS precisely because they feared the domination of a European, clericalist, High Church caste that would postpone indefinitely the independence of the indigenous church.’\(^{19}\)

These “Native Churches” did not have to be merely political or geographical bodies, they could be intellectual enterprises as well. In South Africa under the leadership of the progressive John Colenso as Bishop of Natal from 1853, the issue of clergy and church leadership had arisen amongst the amakholwa class – Zulu converts to Christianity. Originally this leadership had formed as ‘native agents’ - indigenous evangelists who developed the Christian faith amongst their own people, and from whom the next generation of church leadership would come.\(^{20}\) Colenso engaged with his Zulu flock on many levels, including taking on board their theological understandings that would challenge his own Biblical and theological positions. He established a mission station at Ekhukhanyeni called Bishopstowe, from where a group of Zulu Church leaders could emerge: the ‘Bishopstowe faction’. Abraham Mojalefe Lieta described the mission station as ‘a safe space where Africans could discuss issues of culture and religion without any of the restrictions of colonialism’ noting that he believed ‘the existence of that space must have attracted people to the priesthood. For once, the Church could be seen to be divorced from the shackles of colonialism and imperialism.’\(^{21}\) The Native Church was not merely European missionaries relinquishing control, but was also a product of native aspiration. Venn’s dreams would not be fully realised in the form he foresaw them. On the ground local missionaries and their institutional successors, especially in colonies dominated by settler societies, retained and tightened control over the Church structures. Even the CMS itself

\(^{19}\) C. Peter Williams, *The Ideal of the Self-Governing Church*, p.94.
\(^{21}\) Ibid, p.254.
surrendered, and by the end of the nineteenth century its new policy was for the ‘full integration’ of European and indigenous Christians.²² Within the environment of a seemingly quintessential Imperial and English institution, the “Native Church” could be assumed to have been an outlier or an aberration that with the progression of colonial society would inevitably pass on. Instead, supported by strongly influential thinkers in England and around the globe the rise of the Native Church was itself an inevitability, and this included the Māori Tribal Church.

The early missionaries predicated the expansion of their mission on developing a cohort of Māori Kaiwhakaako²³ who would ideally replicate the ideology of the missionaries themselves. Both the CMS and Wesleyan missionaries followed the evangelical game plan of growing ‘an intelligent and heartfelt Christian faith’ in the people they were working with, building up the skills and tools of both Biblical knowledge and literacy to develop teachers of the faith.²⁴ The more progressive missionaries such as Richard Taylor were effusive on the potential of developing a Māori ministry amongst their own people, noting ‘the Gospel could not have made the progress it did, or have obtained such a permanent hold upon the native mind, had it not been for the agency of the native teachers.’²⁵ Henry Williams began to develop this process early on, sending out local teachers as early as 1831, and others such as William Puckey ‘publicly set apart’ thirteen teachers at Kaitaia and Waimate, presenting each with a written licence.²⁶ These ‘teachers’ had a range of tasks, including teaching literacy, providing instruction on Christian beliefs and providing leadership for new Christian communities that were springing up.²⁷

²² C. Peter Williams, The Ideal of the Self-Governing Church, p.xiv.
²³ The term Kaiwhakaako technically related to Teachers, as opposed to Monita, or Monitors, both CMS terms for early Native ministers. However they also both overlap into the field of the Kairui or Evangelists, who were often far outside of the jurisdiction of the CMS. I will use Kaiwhakaako as an all-encompassing term for these roles because it is used in contemporary Maori language sources.
However, although this was in some ways an empowering process for these leaders and for the iwi themselves this was not the ‘Native Church’ articulated by Venn. This was not designed to be the establishment of a faith freed from the shackles of English ecclesiology and control. Instead, these were to be agents who would be living examples of the power of conversion not only to Christianity but, perhaps as importantly to the missionaries, conversion to English cultural mores and practices which as previously noted the missionaries often conflated with the faith itself. Henry Williams insisted that candidates for baptism (a precursor to becoming a recognised teacher) not only had to gain knowledge in Christianity, but must renounce ‘all heathen superstitions and customs’.28 William Williams acknowledged the impact of Māori teachers and ‘the value of native agency’. However he ascribed this importance primarily due to the language skills of the Kaiwhakaako and that they were ‘able to show [Māori] so much better the falsehood of their superstitions’ being able to say “I have done all these things, and have learnt the evil of them.”.29 The missionaries were not by-and-large as interested in developing a deep Māori faith, as much as a deep English one, based on English concepts and ideas, and dismissive of mātauranga Māori.

Amongst the tribes however the best laid plans of the missionaries for these Kaiwhakaako were transformed by local dynamics and understandings. Broadly speaking, the missionary plans that Kaiwhakaako would become a new type of leader that would essentially undermine or overthrow existing leadership often came to pass. The Kaiwhakaako brought with them new power and authority derived from literacy and the prestige of the new Gospel message.30 This power could be used to challenge local authority, and was particularly effective as traditional leadership was neither secular nor spiritual but a blend of the two. So the existing leadership of the tohunga/rangatira could be challenged effectively and these new leaders often didn’t hesitate to utilise their new power.31

Examples abounded of a contestation in the exercise of this new political power, and Kaiwhakaako struggled to gain and maintain control over their flock. In 1848 Eruera Te Ngahue and Kuhana Te Tahua wrote to Selwyn:

---

Apart from the idea of posting a permanent Pakeha here, we had previously thought about that, but now could you lend your attention to our village. At the present time we are in need of speedy help to pacify the souls of the people, which have been like this since the death of our minister, Te Tutere. Sir, we are sad for our friend Te Tutere. Friend, bishop, the child may not live, its mother died suddenly and there is no other mother to breastfeed it. This is our present situation, never mind those who have already fed. Furthermore, consider the new people, and those who were taking classes to write, for those who have entered into the Church.

The letter gives a sense of the work amongst the people of a shifting political landscape, of how the early embedding of Christianity was far from certain - that the ‘child may not live’ - and required ‘further feeding’. The example gives clear indication that the strategy was contingent on exerting control over the people. This form of contested leadership also derived from the turbulent environment that the Kaiwhakaako had emerged from. The Musket Wars of the early nineteenth-century had created vast political instability, including unprecedented waves of migration. Part of these developments, supported by huge economic change, was the increase in slavery amongst iwi. Many of these evangelists would be both victims and benefactors of this turmoil, allowed by changing circumstances to gain new insights and skills that would be in great demand, including that of literacy.

---
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An alternative reading of the situation though was beyond that of a simplistic conflict between Kaiwhakaako and tohunga in which one would win and the other lose, often re-interpreted into a struggle between “traditional” and “colonised” world-views. The dynamic of the Kaiwhakaako was instead more that of the ‘middleman’. The situation was parallel to that described by John Barker writing of evangelists in Papua, that they were:

neither free agents disseminating their own version of Christianity nor devoted servants slavishly replicating the basic routines and teachings of their missionary masters. They were middlemen whose survival depended equally upon satisfying the demands of the missionaries who paid their salaries and the local peoples who possessed the power to make their lives intolerable. Or, to put this another way, they formed one point of a triangular arrangement with clergy and local villagers within which was generated the localized expression of the Christian religion.\footnote{John Barker, ‘An Outpost in Papua: Anglican Missionaries and Melanesian Teachers among the Maisin, 1902-1934’, in Peggy Brock ed., \textit{Indigenous peoples and Religious Change}, Leiden, 2005, p.81.}

As they arose into a new form of negotiated leadership, the impact of these Kaiwhakaako could only be described as transformational. Spreading out across the land from mission stations these evangelists covered much of the country. From Wiremu Te Tauri in Whanganui, Ihaia Te Ahu in Te Arawa, though to the martyrs Kereopa and Manihera in Tuwharetoa, there are many examples of Kaiwhakaako who have worked their way into the local iwi lore.\footnote{For a good example of this see Sir Kingi Ihaka’s poi in \textit{A New Zealand Prayer Book/He Karakia Mihinare o Aotearoa}, Wellington, 1989, p.154.} There were even Kaiwhakaako who took their evangelism overseas, including one who went to Samoa on a mission trip in the 1850s.\footnote{Marka to G.A. Selwyn, Nov 15 1858, ANG090\|4.01\|22, JKL, Auckland.} The numbers were impressive. According to one “official” count among the CMS alone, in 1834 there were 6 ‘European Missionaries’ and no ‘Native Clergy’ nor ‘Native Agents’ (evangelists). By 1844 this had exploded to 12 European Missionaries and 295 Native Agents, and by 1854 there were 23 European Missionaries, 1 Native Clergy and 440 Native Agents.\footnote{Edward Lake ed., \textit{Church Missionary Atlas}, London, 1873, p.128.} These counts of the evangelists were not exact, and according to one estimate in 1854 there were as many as...
Whatever the count, it can be seen that the infant Māori Church was the product of Māori agency far more than that of Missionary endeavour and control.

The difficulty in counting came from the often turbulent origins of the Kaiwhakaako themselves. Missionaries attempted to retain control over who would lead this new Church, with Joseph Matthews in the far North building his whole mission strategy ‘around the nurturing of teachers for the emerging Māori Church.’ As early as 1834 missionaries established formal pay rates and supplies for those who they sent out, including slates, slate pencils and reading lessons and literacy remained a key part of missionary strategy. In cases where this control could be exerted Barker’s Papua example was particularly apt. But despite this attempt at control, many Kaiwhakaako were either ‘unauthorised’ or had taken advantage of temporary missionary presence in an area to gain some knowledge and then proceeded to develop their own understandings. In the Urewera for example according to Judith Binney ‘Māori Christianity was extensively self-taught’ and as Pākehā missionaries left the area they were replaced by local teachers such as Te Makarini Tanarau and Hamiora Potakurua who took ‘what they learnt from the missionaries [and] shaped with their own hands.’

This Native Evangelism was not confined to Aotearoa. Across the Anglican Empire there were examples of the growth of this indigenous expression of Christianity. In 1839 two Hausa Africans who were ‘recaptives’ (liberated slaves) supported by other recaptives from Sierra Leone took a group to Badagry in Nigeria to spread the Christian message. These evangelists were neither authorised nor supported by the CMS, even though as Lamin Sanneh notes the trip ‘was in a profound sense the logical outcome of the CMS strategy of

---
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taking Christianity to former slaves and ex-captives.’\textsuperscript{46} It would be easy to view these indigenous evangelists as the spearhead of colonization, and it was true in that they brought not only a new religious message to Nigeria, but also a new cultural message stemming from their faith. Sanneh describes this in terms of a challenge to ‘Africanization’, stating that ‘if Africanization meant assimilation into the chiefly caste and political genealogy, with their norms of enslavement and suppression of women, then Christianity combined with antislavery was opposed to it.’\textsuperscript{47}

So the complexity of indigenous evangelists (Kaiwhakaako) was that while they did indeed set out to challenge aspects of the existing cultural, social and political order, it was not to further colonial advantage but because they saw such change as necessary for their own people’s well-being. This nuance even extended to the symbols of colonization, such as the British flag. Guided by a domestic religious agenda Britain had led the way in abolishing the slave trade, and thus with the establishment of the colony in Nigeria led by these indigenous evangelists ‘the British flag was perceived locally by victim populations as a symbol of antislavery rather than as a symbol of the classical empire of the later age.’\textsuperscript{48} All of these dynamics would find parallels here in Aotearoa.

An example of this native agency in the spread and interpretation of Christianity was on display in Taumataakura and his return to Ngāti Porou. Around 1819 the Northern rangatira Hongi Hika had raided Ngāti Porou, causing much devastation and ‘ka hoki atu a Hongi me te tini o te herehere’ (Hongi returned North with a multitude of slaves)\textsuperscript{49} as a labour supply and for other purposes. The following year Pomare and Te Wera Hauraki followed up with further raids from the North and the stories include the siege of Te Whetu Matarau, so called because the Ngāti Porou captives that were thrown off sheer cliffs overlooking present day Te Araroa resembled falling stars. These devastating raids led the various hapū from throughout Ngāti Porou consolidating into two significant fortified pa in
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the Waiapu Valley, Rangitukia and Whakawhitira. In 1823 Pomare and Te Wera Hauraki sought peace with those they had attacked, and Pomare returned to Ngāti Porou with his Ngāti Porou wife Te Rangipaia and established a peace through a traditional process, Te Tatau Pounamu (the Greenstone Doorway of Peace). In the period of peace that followed Waiapu rangatira including the high chief Uenuku travelled to the north, learning and trading as they went. This established the groundwork for the spread of Christianity in the period 1823-1834, and on his deathbed in 1840 Uenuku would say to his people ‘I muri nei kia mau ki te whakapono’ (after I am gone hold fast to the faith).

In 1833 four rangatira from the Waiapu - Rangikatia, Rangiwhakatamatama, Te Rukuata, and Te Kakamara - after a long and chaotic journey arrived in the Bay of Islands. On their arrival ‘nga herehere’ (those captured previously) cried out in joy to see their relatives ‘Hikurangi maunga tu noa, Waiapu wai rere noa’ celebrating their sacred mountain and river that had been lost to them. The four Ngāti Porou were taken to Paihia and looked after by Te Wiremu Karuwha (Henry Williams “of the four eyes”) and Te Wiremu Parata (William Williams “the brother”). At Paihia they were reunited with Piripi Taumataakura, ‘he rangatira no Ngatiporou i riro herehere i a Hongi, kua whakaakona ki nga Karaipiture e te Hahi ki Paihia’ (a chief from Ngāti Porou made captive by Hongi, who had been taught the scriptures by the Church at Paihia).

According to Mohi Turei an expert in Ngāti Porou oral tradition, in late 1833 the boat returned with the four rangatira, Taumataakura and Wiremu Parata. After a short service at Wharekahika (Hicks Bay) Williams and the other Pākehā returned to the north, and on the 1st January 1834, a suspiciously auspicious date, Taumataakura and his fellow Kaiwhakaako began a religious service at Rangitukia. “Service” was an understatement. Taumataakura undertook a conversion experience on a massive scale. Despite the previous interactions with missionaries and Christianity in general, Mohi Turei portrays this day as a new beginning, that Taumataakura’s words about a new God would come to new ears ‘Te Atua hou tenei ko Ihu Karaiti te ingoa’ (this is a new God, named Jesus Christ). This story of
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conversion begins ‘ara te kara o te Kuini hei tohu ma Piripi, mo nga Ratapu ka huti ai hei tohu ki te iwi he Ratapu’ (the colours of the Queen were raised as a sign of Piripi, for the Sabbath Day they hoisted as a sign to the people that this was a ‘Sacred day’). It should be noted that although Turei was very specific about the date of this event, 1st January 1834, a Queen (Victoria) would not sit on the throne for another 3 years. But in the oral tradition it was Victoria who symbolised Empire, including Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

Turei describes Taumataakura spending the next three days preaching and leading prayers, comprised of the Prayer of General Confession from the Book of Common Prayer, and the Lord’s Prayer. The people would join in the prayers, however instead of Amine they would rumble ‘u, u’, which Turei likened to an earthquake. Taumataakura shared a wide range of biblical stories with the people from across the Old and New Testaments, but one is particularly instructive:

Ka tu ano te kauwhau a Piripi, ka timata i nga matenga o Iharaira mo te takahanga i nga Ture a Te Atua tae noa ki te whakarangaromanga o nga Kingi rongonui o Hihona raua ko Oka me te whakamaroketanga a i tetahi pito o Horana. Kai konei ka tohu ia ki te awa o Waiapu tae noa ki te umeretanga a te whanau o Iharaira i whenuku ai a Heriko i horo ai. Whaki katoa te waha o nga mano e whakarongo nei kia Piripi Taumata-a-kura ki te "Umere."

Piripi stood again to preach, beginning with the failure of the Israelites in their transgression of the Laws of God through to the vanquishing of the famed Kings of Sihon and Og and the razing of the lands of Jordan. He then gestured to the Waiapu river and then spoke of the cacophony of the people of Israel as they destroyed Jericho. All the assembled multitude professed belief as they listened to Taumata-a-kura’s stories.

The stories of Sihon and Og were part of the invasion of Caanan and the destruction of the city of Jericho. These stories were part of the story of Moses and his successor Joshua in leading their people to liberation in the promised land, and the destruction of their enemies. One of the key messages of these Biblical stories was that of obedience, that military (and political) success would be guaranteed, but only so long as the people stayed true to and worshiped exclusively the One True God, Yaweh. In the context of a Ngāti Porou people who had gathered together in fear of their enemies returning it is easy to see why such a
message would resonate amongst them, just as similar messages would find welcome audiences in different circumstances throughout the remainder of the century both through the mainstream Churches and through the prophetic movements. It is also possible to see how the Kaiwhakaako could gain influence amongst their people by working from their existing cultural framework.

However Taumataakura did not only bring messages of imminent triumph. He also challenged existing cultural practices. Alongside this gathering where he introduced his message a tangi was being held, with traditional mourning practices.

Ka haehaea ki te kiri o te tangata o te wahine. tarelere ana te toto, nga tohu o te Maori whakaputanga i te aroha. Kai te ki atu nga hoa o Piripi, kaua hei haea te kiri, koi maringi na toto.

Women were lacerating their skin and the blood was flowing, a sign for Maori of the expression of grief. Piripi’s colleagues said to them you must not lacerate your skin, lest you shed blood.

Not only did Taumataakura challenge ancient ontological understandings by bringing a new God who demanded fidelity, but he and his fellow Kaiwhakaako also demanded changes to the outworkings of that theology by upending age-old rituals. This was not the only challenge to existing customs that Taumataakura would bring. Warfare remained a significant cultural practice, and despite the impact he had made with his initial preaching in the Waiapu significant resistance remained to his message of transformation.

Ahakoa kauwhau noa a Taumata-a-kura, kei te "kuku" tonu nga ihu o nga tohunga i ona atua i ana "kite,"ara "matakite" i ona iho tana tangata ra hoki kua matotorutia ki ana mahi, kua ururuatia, kua patiotia. 56

Despite all the preaching of Taumataakura the tohunga were still looking to their gods and prophetic signs, and they were so deeply embedded in their own practices it would be hard to change them.

The warfare of the time had remained constant with Ngāti Porou. The siege of Te Toka-ā-Kūkū near Te Kaha had lasted six months and there had been ongoing skirmishes between
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Ngāti Porou and their Mahia allies on one side and Te Whānau-a-Apanui and their allies including Ngāti Awa on the other. In 1836 Taumataakura took over the leadership of the Ngāti Porou forces and demanded that in order to achieve victory in battle they must first change their warfare practices.  

Ka tu a Taumata-a-kura ka tohu ki nga matua Whakarongo e nga matua e takoto nei, me nga rangatiria me nga toa katoa o te ope. Whakarereana whakarereana rawatia atu nga atua Maori, kia kotahi he Atua mo taua. Apopo koe timata ai ki te mahi i haeretia mai ai e koe. E hinga te tangata i to kokiri, i to parekura ranei, kaua rawa e taona e kainga, kaua rawa e tangohia e koe tetahi mea a to tupapaku, ahakoa he pu, he hamanu, he kakahu, he patu, me etahi mea a te tupapaku o te parekura ranei: kaua rawa e tangohia waiho atu mana e tiki mai ona tupapaku, he mea kanga na te Atua. Ki te rite i a koe e te ope nei ene tohutohu tera pea ka pai te Atua. Ko tenei whawhaitanga hei tohu mo te maungaarongo o tenei pakanga o mua iho o na tipuna mai ra ano, ki te takahia e koe tetahi o enei ture ko koe ano e te tangata e takahi ana i a te Atua i kanga ai, ka kanga ano hoki koe e te Atua.  

When they were gathered he stood before them and he said, “listen to me, all of the chiefs and all of the warriors of this party. Abandon the Maori gods, there shall only be one God for us. Tomorrow we will begin what you came for. If your enemy falls in battle, you must not eat him. You must not remove any articles from the dead, whether it be the gun, the ammunition, the clothes or the weapon or anything else from the bodies or from this battlefield; let them retrieve their own dead, lest you be cursed by God. If you follow these instructions it will be pleasing to God. Let this battle be an example of a new way of conducting the warfare as practised by our ancestors since time immemorial. If one of these laws are transgressed by you, or if there is another who has been cursed by God, then you will also be cursed by God.

Ngāti Porou was victorious in the battle and routed their enemies. But the new customs demanded by Taumataakura were upheld – a profound change to ancient warfare customs so startling that it helped to grow this new faith far and wide, with word spreading as far as the Wairarapa. As Turei wrote ‘enei kupu a Taumata-a-kura te timatanga o te ohonga o te
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whakapono o Ngatiporou’ (these words of Taumata-a-kura were the beginning of the awakening of the faith of Ngāti Porou).

This example of Taumataa kura is a significant departure from the concept of ‘Native Agent’, where European Missionaries would indoctrinate and control Māori who would subvert their own culture in favour of a colonised model. In fact, William Williams had no idea that Taumataa kura was undertaking this work, noting ‘the occasion of the return of these natives was deeply interesting, but it was hardly thought that any good result would follow. Taumataakura, however, began to teach and to preach according to the little light which he possessed’. Instead these incidents display a process of internal debate and change, where tribes would begin to critique their own practices and understandings in light of entirely new understandings they had derived from theological sources including the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer.

Taumataa kura had a significant impact on Ngāti Porou Christianity. Soutar notes that the sense of agency reflected in its origins carried on through the life of the Ngāti Porou Church ‘from the outset, a sense of ownership and custodianship was developed that is still reflected in the Anglican Church today.’ The depth of this understanding did not simply remain at an organisational level; it worked its way into the epistemology of the tribe. The haka ‘Tihei Taruke’ was composed by Turei in 1910, based on an understanding developed over generations around the meaning of the arrival of Christianity into a Ngāti Porou worldview. The haka is in two parts, the first part extoling the four Kaiwhakaako who would follow the initial foray by Taumataakura, Rukuata and the others and spread the message to other parts of Ngāti Porou. The second part Wiremu Kaa explains as ‘a theological reflection and as a vehicle to explain the juxtaposition that Ngati Porou had reached in their theological journey, theological evolution and theological development.’ Although it defies a direct translation into the English language, suffice to say it is a poetic form that expresses the impact of Christianity on Ngāti Porou; displays the sense of agency Ngāti Porou owned over the process; and reconciles the two with the imagery of the tāruke, a pot for catching crayfish in which both the old and the new could co-exist.
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Rangitukia ra te pariha i tukua atu ai nga Kaiwhakaako tokowha.
Ruka ki Reporua
Hohepa ki te Paripari
Kawhia ki Whangakareao.
Apakura ki Whangapirita e!

E i aha tera.
E haramai tonu koe ki roto ki Waiapu kia kite koe
I Tawa Mapua e te paripari Tihei Taruke
I kiia nei e Rerekohu
Hoatu karia ana kauae
Purari paka, kaura mokai. Hei.

As noted previously the Kaiwhakaako had emerged in a turbulent environment often outside of the control of the Missionaries or the newly-emerging settler Church. The missionaries’ evangelical theology could accept a limited form of Māori leadership in the field. However as the Missionary apparatus spread from the North into more remote regions of the country, attempts were made to assert control over ministry amongst the iwi. Puckey’s previously noted licensing of Teachers in the North was both a sign of support and method of control that Lange asserts was an attempt ‘to end the previous practice, in which any teacher went anywhere just as he liked.’63 Soon the Kaiwhakaako were being replaced by a new class of religious leader: the minita.

The term Ordination comes from the Latin *ordinatio* and essentially meant to put into order, to arrange, with an implicit connection to a form of control in that *someone* allocates the order. From its earliest roots the Christian Church (following on from its Jewish roots) had allocated various roles to those in leadership, including episkopos (supervisor) and prebuteros (elder) and diakonos (servant). By the time of the reformation in England, and following on from previous Roman Catholic practice, this had been adapted to Bishop

(episkopos), Priest (prebuteros) and Deacon (diakonos) - a three-fold order of ministry. Many of the missionaries were ordained Priests, and Selwyn of course came out as the first Bishop, who, amongst other roles, was the only person in Anglican understanding who could Ordain people (men) as Deacons and then Priests. Early Anglican post-reformation protestant theology had questioned the mediaeval notion of a sacrificial priesthood focused on the Eucharistic offering and had instead encouraged Priests as preachers and teachers alongside their role in administering the sacraments. While in theory this represented a radical departure from previous practice in many respects clergy (ordained ministers) were still mobile centres of power in communities across Europe, exercising control over their flock on behalf of various secular and religious powers. This paradox between a Biblical theology of servanthood and the maintenance and exercise of power shaped the evolution of the role of clergy. By the eighteenth century clergy in England were often little more than a money-making class with many clergy often non-resident in their parishes, essentially renting them out to other, poorer, clergy. This situation was confronted by the Evangelical revival of the late eighteenth century (including the growth of the Methodist movement under John and Charles Wesley), and the Oxford/Tractarian Movement which renewed the Catholic heritage of the Anglican Church.

A key measure of transformation in the English clergy system was the radical overhaul of theological education. At the beginning of the nineteenth century there was no theological education outside of the elite Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, which meant such education was limited to the privileged few. By the 1830s new establishments had been founded including the CMS Institution at Islington, and by 1833 clergy were able to complete a Licentiate in Theology (LTh) at these new establishments in order to prove to an ordaining Bishop that they had been appropriately trained and were ready for ordination, instead of requiring an Oxbridge degree. Alongside these changes in England went the development across the Empire of twenty two training establishments for the training of settler and indigenous clergy. This new theological training included new
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curriculum elements such as a focus on Scripture. This relatively new emphasis on theological education was so influential that Selwyn made it one of his priorities for his new episcopacy in New Zealand. With all of these factors in play therefore theological education was going to be an important factor in the formation of Māori clergy.

Education had been a key part of Missionary strategy from the first contact with Māori, and Samuel Marsden’s efforts with Māori spanned both this land and his seminary based at Parramatta in Australia, where Ruatara had been seeking to gain new knowledge for his own purposes from as early as 1809. The Missionaries had developed this educational system mainly at Paihia and from 1835 under the leadership of William Williams at Te Waimate. Selwyn was involved in theological education at Te Waimate from 1842 and St John’s College was opened there in 1843 primarily to prepare (Pākehā) candidates for ordination. Alongside this Selwyn established a school for Kaiwhakaako, with a hierarchical teaching structure dependent on the willingness of the Māori students ‘to adopt English habits’ along with the commensurate divesting of ‘Māori’ habits. Selwyn had maintained however that the Te Waimate site was only temporary, and in 1844 relocated St John’s College to Kohimarama on land which the Crown had originally “purchased” from Ngāti Paoa in 1841.

Selwyn’s pedagogy at St John’s College in both locations was, of course, highly Anglocentric and ‘the style of teaching, the text books, and the expectations associated with Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin continued to be considered ‘the norm’. His expectations of ordination candidates were based on what was expected in England, including a requirement for competence in Biblical Greek and Latin and Davidson notes that ‘students were familiarised with a received tradition, with little encouragement to think critically.’ Alongside this curriculum Selwyn also ran an ‘Industrial System’ with a heavy domestic workload for all students, both Māori and Pākehā, to combat ‘indolence and vice’. Not
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everyone was happy with Selwyn’s direction and by 1847 differences over his pedagogical approach, and over a broader suspicion of Selwyn’s allegedly ‘Anglo-Catholic’ leanings, led to the 24 Māori students being withdrawn by the CMS from Kohimarama back to Te Waimate to be under CMS control and out of Selwyn’s reach. This meant Māori were also placed further away from the possibility of ordination by the Bishop.

The push by the CMS under Venn’s leadership for the ‘euthanasia of a mission’ was focused around the ordination of Native clergy at the centre of a native congregation, clergy being the established pattern for leadership in an Anglican setting. Selwyn however, shaped as he was by the newly established standards of the English theological system, insisted on a Western curriculum including competence in the classic Biblical languages of Hebrew or Greek for Māori candidates for ordination, along with other demands that were not only overly onerous for Māori candidates but also highly impractical for them when they would be ministering in Māori communities. The CMS policy under Venn was opposed to Selwyn’s insistence on an Anglocentric curriculum, wishing to avoid any system of training that would remove candidates ‘much beyond the learning and experiences of their culture’, and Venn explicitly opposed Selwyn’s insistence on the biblical languages issue.

This focus on educational qualification of Māori for ordination also obscures a deeper issue over cultural perceptions, where Selwyn and others were also demanding a shift away from Māori cultural values as a prerequisite for Māori ordination, and for the formation of Minita Māori (Māori Ministers). William Leonard Williams, in a fairly direct rebuttal of Venn’s position, argued that ‘this same people [Māori] had, but a very few years before, been living in a state of extreme barbarism’, followed by an assurance that Selwyn supported Māori ordination. The two views were contradictory. While there is some debate as to the level that Selwyn insisted on these standards for Māori, as Jenny Te Paa notes ‘underlying [Selwyn’s] rules, was a sense that while the ordained ministry for Māori
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men was possible, it could and should only be considered after a lengthy preparatory period
where old (Maori) habits had been completely broken and where evidence of newly formed
(Pakeha) habits had been amply demonstrated.'

This challenge to the cultural base of ordination candidates was a far more challenging and potentially damaging restriction than that of mere language acquisition.

Despite such challenges Rota Waitoa, who was from Raukawa, Ngati Maru and Te Arawa,
and had been a student at Octavius Hadfield’s mission at Waikanae and had then become
one of the first students at Selwyn’s new St John’s College in Te Waimate around 1843.
Waitoa seemed to thrive in the St John’s Environment, following Selwyn to Auckland in
1844 and then becoming Selwyn’s travelling companion for the next decade or so, including
accompanying Selwyn to Waitara in 1855. At St John’s Waitoa filled roles as diverse as
Buttery Assistant through to Abraham Scholar and Assistant Master in the associated Māori
Boys School. Waitoa was a favourite of the Pākehā leadership in the Church with Lady
Mary Ann Martin describing him as ‘a broad-shouldered, broad-faced, merry-looking lad,
with something of the African type of features, and much of the warm, generous, trusting
nature of the negro in him.’

With such perceptions in mind and with a long and fruitful relationship with Selwyn, Waitoa became the first Māori to be ordained to the Diaconate at St Paul’s Church in the city in 1853, and the first to be ordained to the Priesthood in 1860.
After his ordination to the Diaconate he was appointed to the mission station at Te
Kawakawa (present-day Te Araroa) in Ngāti Porou.

Given the patronising way in which Waitoa was perceived by his Pākehā associates,
and understanding the educational and formative hoops he was required to jump through
in order to be the first Māori to be ordained, it would be easy to assume that Waitoa’s
encounter with Ngāti Porou would be that of an outsider. Waitoa came from Ngāti Raukawa
into an area that within living memory had been devastated and decimated by raids from
outside iwi. He was also shaped in a system at St John’s College that was highly critical and
often dismissive of a Māori world-view. However the initial response from some locals was
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supportive, even enthusiastic. In preparation for Waitoa’s ordination in May 1853 and placement at Te Kawakawa, discussions were held with some of the local leaders who were supportive of Rota coming from the outside, with the kaumatua Te Kone writing in April:

Kei a koutou te tikanga, kei nga kaumatua, kia tukua mai e koutou a Rota Waitoa ki a matou i runga i te tikanga o ta koutou korero o te rongopai. Ano hoki kua whakaae matou ki nga korero o ta matou pukapuka kia tukua mai e koutou a Rota ki a matou.\(^{87}\)

From you the [Church] elders came the decision that you will send Rota Waitoa to us to fulfil your exhortation of the Gospel. We have also agreed in our letter that you will send Rota to us.

Waitoa’s area of operation was vast, especially challenging considering the limited transport modes of the time. William Williams, first as Archdeacon with oversight of Waitoa and then from 1859 as Bishop, wrote to ‘taku hoa aroha (my loving friend) Rota’ laying out his boundaries from Omaio in the West through to the southern end of the Waiapu Valley in the East, a distance of some 160 kms by modern road and covering both Te Whānau-a-Apanui iwi as well as the majority of Ngāti Porou. William’s instructions also came with the exhortation ‘Otira ka nui te okioki ki runga ki a Te Karaiti i nga wa katoa, kia tika ai te mahi, kei whakawarea koe e Hatana e ona whakararu.’ (but above all abide in Christ at all times, do what is right, and do not be drawn aside by the wiles of Satan)\(^{88}\) – part of a constant reminder from Waitoa’s Pākehā mentors for him to differentiate himself from those who were not so accommodating of Missionary practices and understandings.

Not everyone was so supportive of Waitoa however. In a famous dispute (essentially a conversion story in drag), Waitoa met significant resistance from the local rangatira Iharaira Houkamau. Houkamau had been engaged with the Pākehā Church leadership in Auckland for some time, expressing support for Selwyn and others and seeking support in a trade dispute in 1850, asking that they pray for him and some of the other rangatira of the area.\(^{89}\) However Houkamau struggled to accept Waitoa, with Reweti Kohere\(^{90}\) arguing that

\(^{87}\) Te Kone to Abraham, 19 April 1853, ANG090/4.00/93, JKL, Auckland.
\(^{88}\) William Williams to Rota Waitoa, 17 March 1860, ANG090/6/2, JKL, Auckland.
\(^{89}\) Iharaia Te Houkamou and others to Selwyn, Kissling, and Martin, 26 June 1850, ANG090/4.00/122, JKL, Auckland.
\(^{90}\) Reweti Kohere notes on the Rev Rota Waitoa, 1949, MS-1126, ATL, Wellington.
essentially Houkamau could not accept someone from another iwi coming and exercising authority over his people. In this story Waitoa eventually won Houkamau over, had him baptised and eventually Houkamau displayed his conversion of heart by becoming a bellringer and church sweeper; a humbling experience for a great rangatira and a great symbolic triumph for the settler Church.

While Kohere’s account cannot be doubted, and a transformation of relationships and roles did undoubtedly occur, the situation was beyond the simplistic model of the triumphal colonising Church arriving in the form of a colonised leader and upending the existing order. In fact, Waitoa’s time with the people at Te Kawakawa was more one of continual evolution, in which relationships were tested and retested and Waitoa negotiated a space for himself within the pre-existing leadership of the area. In his letters to Auckland Waitoa would express frustration, noting ‘tenei nga tangata o tenei kainga, etahi e noho ana, etahi e tutu ana’\(^91\) (of the people of this village, some are settled and some are unsettled). In a letter to William Williams in 1856 Waitoa recounts his work three years into his ministry there:

> E taku Matua aroha

> Iti haere nga tangata ki te Hapa Tapu i tenei tau ko te mea iti ai i tahuri nga tangata ki tetahi mahi pohehe he tukua hakari Maori no te riri au ki a ratou ki a whakarereea kahore i whakarongo mai ki taku kupu

> Ko te whare karakia ki Wharekahika, ka oti, ka nui te pai o tona whare karakia, Ko Iharaira Te Houkamau ka nui te mana aroha tetahi ki tetahi e noho ana ia i runga i tona mahi rangatiria me au hoki i runga i tuku mahi. Kaore ia e poka mai ki tuku mahi, kahore hoki au e poka noa ki tana ma hi, erangi ko te uru tahi ta mana I pai ai; ka nui te marama a tuku ngakau i te pai a te mahi o tena rangatiria, o te Houkamau.\(^{92}\)

> *To my loving Father*

> *Few people come to Holy Communion this year because some people have turned to mistaken practices in the form of Maori rites. I am angry at those who have deserted because they do not listen to my words*

---

\(^{91}\) Rota Waitoa to Sarah Selwyn, 24 April 1857, ANG090/4.00/105, JKL, Auckland.

\(^{92}\) Rota Waitoa to William Williams, 24 September 1856, ANG090/6/1, JKL, Auckland.
The Church at Wharekahika (Hicks Bay) is complete, and it is a magnificent Church building. Iharaira te Houkamau and I have the greatest respect for one another, where he works on his chiefly leadership role and I in my role. He does not interfere in my work, and I do not interfere in his work, but our authority is unified in a good way, and I am uplifted by the goodness of the works of the chief, Houkamau.

Waitoa was involved in ongoing negotiation on different fronts. This was far from a case of an instant or even permanent “conversion” from one world-view to another. Instead the people continued to encounter new ideas (including soon a significant challenge from Pai Marire) as well as continuing to grapple with ancient spiritual practices. And far from being subservient, Houkamau continued to practice his rangatiratanga alongside Waitoa’s newly introduced role, so that both could achieve their ends. Waitoa’s work was supported by hapū and kāinga from across the region. Fundraising for everything from Church construction through to stipendiary support for him came from many villages, in some ways being a contest between rangatira and kāinga to see who could express more support, in the age-old pursuit of mana-enhancement. In fact Church erection became not only a contest between villages, but also a way of establishing a new identity or as Hone Kaa writes ‘the churches they built became the pouwhenua, the markers that signified their identity and their ownership’ leading to the Ngāti Porou term ‘he piko, he whare karakia’ (on every bend [of the Waiapu River], a Church).

In 1866 Waitoa was seriously injured falling from his horse. He returned to St John’s College in Auckland where he died. In the same year Henry Venn wrote ‘the great need of the Mission in the past years has been the extension of the Native pastorate’, essentially criticising the slow pace of ordination for Māori and noting that there should have been 50 Māori ordained by that time rather than the 14 in existence. As Allan Davidson notes in delaying the ordination of Waitoa, who was the best chance for Māori ordination at the time
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and therefore delaying all Māori ordination, this ‘prevented Maori from giving clerical leadership at a critical period of their history’\(^96\), the fruits of which were yet to come.

Minita, then, represented a new form of leadership within Māori communities and amongst iwi. Waitoa had shown both the positive and negative side of this transformative leadership. Requiring these leaders to submit to a pedagogy that would attempt to remould them into English cultural mores as well as rejecting the validity of their own cultural understanding creates the perception of a dichotomy between ‘traditional leadership’ and ‘Christian leadership’ where minita would attempt to supplant rangatira and tohunga. This perception is reinforced by a reading of historical Pākehā sources that emphasise the Anglicisation and “conversion” of these new minita, such as Mary Ann Martin asserting that Waitoa ‘had been too well and accurately trained to favour fanciful interpretations’\(^97\) unlike those favoured by the “lesser trained” natives.

There certainly were challenges on this front, as Waitoa showed. Api Mahuika notes that ‘in the new religious milieu, the traditional rangatira were subservient to a Pakeha chief elected to his position by the church hierarchy’, and that regarding both mana and tapu ‘the new priestly tohunga lost both to his adopted church.’\(^98\) However there were two additional factors that require consideration regarding this new form of leadership. Firstly was the fact that Māori culture, as with all cultures, was constantly evolving, and new forms of leadership always emerged to engage with new circumstances. As Monty Soutar writes regarding Ngāti Porou leadership, ‘Leadership in Ngati Porou during the nineteenth century adapted to the changing times introduced by colonisation... Leadership on ceremonial occasions remained with those rangatira with the highest lineage, but in matters of wisdom and business, those most competent to direct the tribal affairs took the lead.’\(^99\)

There was therefore room for many new types of leadership, including minita.

The second factor concerns the assumption that the new form of leadership in the shape of minita was somehow different from the older form of leadership of tohunga and

\(^96\) Ibid, p.214.
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rangatira. Sometimes this could be the case, especially with outsiders such as Waitoa coming into other iwi. However often the new minita came precisely because they were continuing their roles as spiritual guides and leaders for their people, this time under a different name. Many of the earliest Māori clergy were chosen by their people specifically because of their knowledge and skills in this area. Three of the earliest clergy ordained in Ngāti Porou - Mohi Turei, Raniera Kawhia, Hare Tawhaa - had been schooled in traditional practices by the tohunga Ranguia and Mohi Ruatapu in the ancient learning centres of Tapere-nui-a-Whatonga and Rawheoro. There was change and old practices were often abandoned, but there was also a sense of continuity and agency about the changes that they led the people through. It was no coincidence that these newly ordained clergy were the perfect people to guide their iwi through the major metaphysical change occurring about them. As Apirana Ngata noted of Hare Tawhaa, he ‘was probably the most learned of the three. But he closed up like an oyster when he joined the Church.’

Rather than assume this was a type of censorship from his Pākehā overlords in the Church, it is probably more insightful to view this as Tawhaa leading the iwi through a change process, and being selective about what knowledge was to be released. Tawhaa for example continued to follow traditional practices of tapu and noa even after ordination, and Turei continued many of the traditional arts he had learned at the Wananga: composing haka, carving houses and practicing ancient pre-Christian karakia.

Waitoa was soon followed by more and more ordained Māori across the country. In 1855 Riwai Te Ahu of Te Ati Awa in Taranaki was ordained, followed by Kawhia in Ngāti Porou, Heta Tarawhiti in Waikato, Pirimiona Te Karari who worked at St John’s College, and Hohua Te Moanaroa of Ngāti Tipa. Of these, most (with the notable exception of Waitoa) served amongst their own iwi, providing a form of leadership that would be respected for their profound grasp of their own people’s spiritual and temporal needs and knowledge. Even if this rate of ordination was not fast enough for Venn’s satisfaction, it was still a major breakthrough. Ordained clergy were leaders in the Church, with the right to sit on synodical decision-making bodies and being the symbolic equals of all Priests across the
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Anglican Empire regardless of race or racial politics. These ordinations are particularly compelling compared to the Roman Catholic Church, which did not ordain its first Māori until 1944. By the time Selwyn left to return to England and take up the role as Bishop of Lichfield in 1868 eighteen Māori had been ordained: two in the 1850s and sixteen in the 1860s; Selwyn himself had ordained ten of these, and William Williams eight.

The appointment of minita to various iwi was a process of ongoing negotiation. This had been the case from early on during the phase of the Kaiwhakaako, with one example being the leaders in Te Kaha requesting a Pākehā minister be sent to them in 1843, ‘mau te whakaaro, e pai koe ki a Te Kihirini mo konei tukua mai ki te kore koe e pai hei tetahi atu ranei.’ (This is for you to decide, you may approve of Mr Kissling for here, if so send him here, if not, send someone else.) This agency also worked in terms of providing minita with the mandate they needed to resist being controlled by the church hierarchy. A good example was Henare Te Herekau, ordained deacon by Octavius Hadfield in 1872, and who ministered among his own at Moutoa in Ngāti Raukawa and Ngāti Apa. Te Herekau would send scorching letters to Hadfield objecting to various activities in the Church. Some were regarding the way he was treated personally and professionally by other Pākehā clergy ‘tenei etahi kaikauhau, he minita pea no te Tiamana, e ahua whakatete ana, e puhaehae mai ana ki au i tako taenga ki Parewanui’ (there was a preacher, possibly a minister from Germany, who was argumentative and arrogant toward me on my arrival at Parewanui).

But being from the iwi, Te Herekau would also not hesitate to take up the causes of the iwi themselves:

Ratou ko nga Pakeha o Moutoa nei, kia tangohia ta matou whare karakia, kia tangohia hoki te whenua e noho nei matou i Moutoa nei, tae noa atu ki nga eka e 40 i te urupa i Moutoa.

Tuarua, ko te whakaritenga i te minita pakeha hei karakia i nga pakeha kei roto i taua whare, ko te take tenei o te whakaro a nga pakeha kia tangohia e ratou te whare karakia me te whenua i te mea kaore he karauna karati o tenei whenua i a koe i a mātou.
The Pākehā of Moutoa take our Church building, and also take the land on which we live here in Moutoa, as many as 40 acres for the cemetery here in Moutoa.

Secondly, the Pākehā minister organised for a service with the Pākehā in the Church, because the understanding of the Pākehā is that they would take the Church and the land but the thing is that is not part of a Crown grant from us to you.

Another good example of clergy being raised up by their iwi and then exercising a form of leadership was amongst the iwi in Kaiapoi. In 1872 under the guidance of the progressive James West Stack, an advocate of Venn’s theories on indigenous church structures, Teoti Pita Mutu was ordained as Deacon and Stack stepped back from Māori ministry – a true exercise in the ‘euthanasia of mission’.106 The people of Kaiapoi had been pressured to move slightly north to Tauhiwi as an outcome of the Kemp purchases. At Tauhiwi they built St Stephen’s Church with what little timber they had on their reserves, and the kaikarakia (licensed lay leaders) were also the local rangatira Pita Te Hori and his brother Poihipi Te Aorahui, who would provide moral and political leadership including Te Hori chairing the Kaiapoi runaka.107 Te Hori also demanded that the Māori mission across the Christchurch Diocese be based at Kaiapoi and provided the resources to ensure this happened.108 Although the iwi at Kaiapoi would remain highly engaged with the Anglican Church for decades to come, they would also resist merging under Pākehā clerical leadership at the turn of the century109 and would remain an example of iwi agency driven by minita.

The four Waiapu Diocesan Hīnota held between 1861-1865 represented a new phase in both the entrenchment of the Anglican Empire in the Māori world, and the ability of Māori to construct their own identity within that institution. The consecration in Wellington of William Williams as Bishop of Waiapu during the inaugural meeting of General Synod in 1859 created a challenge for Anglican ecclesiology. The meeting legislated ground rules for the establishment of Dioceses throughout the country and in Waiapu these rules had
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consequences possibly unintended by those who laid them out. The rules required the formation of a Hinota (synodical structure) bringing together the Bishop, clergy, and laity, and in Waiapu, which stretched from the East Cape south to Mohaka and west to Tauranga, there were very few Pākehā clergy and laity to take up these roles. The timing of the four Waiapu Hinota was especially difficult for those from the western part of the diocese as they were embroiled from time-to-time in military conflict,¹¹ which was one reason why the Hinota were dominated by those from the Te Tai Rawhiti¹¹¹ region.

The Hinota were in ecclesiastical terms an extension of ministry amongst Māori in the region, becoming another layer on top of that begun by the Kaiwhakaako and continued by the Minita. Lange posits that ‘developments in the Diocese of Waiapu were in tune with the aim of the CMS to create a church based on “native pastorates”’ and that the hinota were ‘a conscious attempt to build a largely Maori church in the eastern region.’¹¹² William Leonard Williams wrote that the Hinota were a natural outcome of church organisation along diocesan lines as well as a method of integrating Māori into the wider church sphere: ‘besides the attempt to organise congregations or groups of congregations under their own pastors, something has also been done here as in other parts of the country towards bringing the Native Church into organic connexion with the synodical system of the Provincial Church.’¹¹³ Bringing Māori into this new system of church governance was viewed as so important that during the spring of 1861 Bishop Williams spent eight weeks visiting various parts of his diocese explaining the functions and importance of hinota, and arranging for the election of lay members.¹¹⁴

The first meeting of Te Hinota o te Pihopatanga o Waiapu (The Synod of the Diocese of Waiapu) was held from 3rd-5th December 1861 at William Williams Waerenga-a-hika mission station northwest of Turanga (Gisborne). The procedure of the Hinota followed directly from the inherited English system very similar in form to the Westminster parliamentary process. One of the first measures passed by the body was the adoption of the
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¹¹⁰ Representatives from the Bay of Plenty iwi only attended the third Hinota in 1864.
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¹¹³ William Leonard Williams, The Progress of the Maori mission work in the Archdeaconry of Waiapu, 28 September 1885, MS-Papers-9466, ATL, Wellington. ‘Connexion’ was both an older spelling of connection and a Methodist-inspired method of church organisation.
standing orders developed by General Synod in 1859.\textsuperscript{115} In this way the Māori participants at the hui adopted a tikanga or set of processes that was outside their expertise and experience, a foreshadowing in some ways of the experience of the early Māori Members of Parliament elected under the Māori Representation Act of 1867. However while due to its antagonistic nature the national Parliament was described as Te Ana o Te Raiona (The Den of Lions),\textsuperscript{116} there were mitigating circumstances with this synodical process. While in the lower house in Wellington there were only four Māori out of over 70 members, the Hinota had an overwhelmingly Māori membership. Aside from the Bishop the only other Pākehā members were his son the Reverend William Leonard Williams and Archdeacon Edward Clarke. The other three clergy were Māori (Rota Waitoa, Raniera Kawhia, and Tamihana Huata) and all seventeen lay delegates were Māori. The entire proceedings of the meeting were in te reo Māori and a motion was moved by Henare Potae and Mohi Turei requiring the newly elected Komiti Tuturu (Standing Committee)\textsuperscript{117} to print some of the important decisions of the General Synod relating to Māori in te reo Māori and to distribute them so that ‘kia ata mohiotia ai e nga tangata maori o nga wahi katoa nga mea kua oti te whakatakoto hei tikanga mo te Hahi’ (the Maori of all places could understand the rules of the Church as laid down).\textsuperscript{118} This motion also indicates the importance those Māori present placed on the new processes, and all they implied, being disseminated and implemented throughout the region.

This new way of conducting business did not always go so smoothly at the first meeting. In one motion Waitoa and Kawhia moved that marriage fees accumulated in the course of ministry be utilised to pay for the cost of printing the proceedings of the Hinota\textsuperscript{119}. It could be assumed that this motion was suggested by one of the Pākehā present, because it was standard practice in other Diocesan synods and it was particularly generous of the two clergy to move the motion as they otherwise would have been the likely beneficiaries of the fees. However an amendment was moved by lay member Henare Potae and seconded by

\textsuperscript{115} Nga mahi a Te Hinota Tuatahi o te Pihapatanga o Waiapu I whakaminea ki Waerenga-a-hika Turanga. I Tihemā 1861. The proceedings of the First Synod of the Diocese of Waiapu. Held at Waerenga-a-hika, Gisborne, 1\textsuperscript{st} December 1861. http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-Wai1861Mahi.html
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fellow lay member (at the time) Turei who moved that instead of going towards the printing costs, the money be distributed to the clergy of the Parishes which would have been much needed income for those concerned. The Bishop put the amendment to the hinota, and all the clergy voted against, including Turei who voted against his own amendment whereas his cousin Rapata Wahawaha voted for it. The amendment was lost and as well as indicating the complicated nature of the process, the move also points to the obedience of the Māori clergy to diocesan imperatives, even at their own expense.

The first Hīnota also crystallised for those present their role in a wider sphere of influence enabled to them through the Anglican institution. There was, for example, an unrelenting emphasis on evangelical efforts throughout all the Hīnota, perhaps unsurprising under the influence of a Church Missionary Society Bishop. The Bishop moved in the first Hīnota, supported by Waitoa, that ‘ka whiwhi nei tatou ki te Rongo pai, kia puta hoki ta tatou koha ki te kawe atu i taua Rongo Pai ki nga iwi e noho ana i te pouri’¹²⁰ (those who receive the gift of the Gospel must fund the taking of the Gospel to those people who reside in darkness). This proposition was followed by the two Pākehā clergy moving that annual collections be made for this purpose.¹²¹ The members of the second Hīnota were so confident in their role as the Christian centre sending the Gospel out to those on the periphery that a motion was passed requiring clergy and lay members of Hīnota to encourage the people of the Church to raise funds ‘hei kawe i te Rongo Pai ki nga tauiwi’ (to send the Gospel to the ‘tauiwi’) probably either in Africa or Melanesia, “tauwi” being a term used throughout the New Testament to refer to gentiles.

The Hīnota made decisions at a regional level that affected the ecclesiastical life of kāinga and hapū on the ground. This was illustrated by the discussion over support for Minita and Kaiwhakaako at the first Hīnota. Waitoa and Wahawaha moved ‘ko nga tangata o nga tini kainga kia whai whakaaro ki o ratou kai whakaako’ (that the people of the various villages should think of their teachers) ‘kia whakatuuturutia te Paraire hei ra mahinga ma nga tangata ki o ratou kai whakaako’ (and set aside Fridays as a day of work

from the people for their teachers). By moving this motion Waitoa and Wahawaha were attempting to direct the energy and organisation of kāinga and hapū from the political distance of the Hīnota. The Hīnota committee on the establishment and support for clergy reported that ‘nga hapu e hiahia ana ki te Minita’ (those hapū who wanted to have a Minister), had to gather £200 with the aim that the endowment would realise £20 per annum to support the Minister. This was a significant investment in resources from hapū for what might be regarded as an optional addition to their lives. Two hundred pounds was a large sum, especially given that the wheat growing industry which many Hīnota members had heavily invested in had collapsed by this time. While some kāinga such as Te Kawakawa, who had enjoyed the ministry of Rota Waitoa for several years had raised over the required amount already, others such as Tokomaru Bay had only raised £8 9s, which made their efforts the following year particularly impressive. Thus the committee pledged a considerable investment of time and human resource. The implications of this motion move beyond the mere recommendation for support from a church body (which in many ways the missionaries had been attempting to do since their arrival), and point instead to the dynamic emergence of a newly established iwi hierarchy making policy for the various hapū they held influence over.

However this was not an entirely unilateral decision-making process, and hapū also brought their local concerns to this wider forum for consideration. One of the roles of the Hīnota was to establish boundaries of Pāriha (parishes), and at the first hinota Archdeacon Clarke and Hakaraia Mahika from Tauranga moved that a committee be created to establish the boundaries of districts from Whangaparaoa in Te Whānau-a-Apanui west to Tauranga, imposing church boundaries on kāinga and hapū. But as noted the impetus for decision making also came from hapū. At the second meeting of Hīnota in 1863 the people of Tokomaru Bay sent a letter ‘kia motuhia matou hei Pariha i runga i te Ture a te Hinota mo te motuhanga i nga Pariha’ (asking for formal recognition as a Parish following the laws of General Synod for the constitution of Parishes). The people of Tokomaru had collected
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£184 2s. 3d. towards ‘te Whangai Minita’ an endowment fund for an ordained minister, close to the £200 required by the Canon and ‘he whakaae hoki na matou ki te ki a te Hinota o tenei Pihopatanga i te tau ka pahure nei, kia waiho te Parairei hei ra mahinga ma matou i te mahi a to matou Minita, kia mama ai tera ki te mahi i ana mahi ake’ (they agreed to abide by the ruling of the previous hinota to set aside Fridays as a day of work for the Minister to support his work). They also asked to establish their own Parish boundaries, ‘kei Waimahuru tetahi pito, kei Anaura tetahi pito’ (from Waimahuru to Anaura Bay). The letter, probably with the guidance of Hinota member Henare Potae, was signed ‘na te Runanga katoa o Tuatini, na te Runanga katoa o te Ariuru, na te Runanga o Tangoiro, na te Runanga o Marahea, na te Runanga o te Pakirikiri, na te Runanga o Anaura’ (from the whole Runanga of Tuatini, from the whole Runanga of Te Ariuru, from the Runanga of Tangoiro, from the Runanga of Marahea, from the Runanga of Te Pakirikiri, and from the Runanga of Anaura). W.B. Baker was appointed magistrate to the area in 1861 and had begun to develop an elaborate system of legal bureaucracy in the area with assessors and wardens, however it is likely that these particular Rūnanga were probably hapū-initiated bodies. Referring to Baker’s intended legal systems, W.H. Oliver noted that ‘what was already there proved strong enough to reshape what was introduced’ and the same could possibly be said of the church. Tokomaru Pāriha was the first to be formally established in the Diocese by the Hinota, and thus the formation of local life within a wider framework was initiated by hapū at kāinga level.

The Diocese was also an area for considerable investment by larger iwi groupings, and this was recognised by all those involved. At the first Hinota a motion was moved by Bishop Williams and Archdeacon Clarke ‘ka mihi tenei Hinota ki te kohikohi a Ngatiporou mo te whangai Pihopa’ (congratulating Ngāti Porou on its efforts in raising funds for the Bishop’s endowment), and Williams referred in his opening charge to the fact that Ngāti Porou and Ngāti Kahungunu between them had raised £700 towards the Diocesan endowment. The newly established Diocese was dependent on the contributions,
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and therefore the goodwill and commitment, of the iwi who in turn raised funds from their constituent hapū.

By 1864 war had come to the region, as Pai Marire and Kingitanga leaders found support in the area. Conflict coming to the east also meant the end of an era for the Hīnota. The third Hīnota of 1864 passed a resolution on the state of the Diocese at the time, especially in the west, and ‘me te inoi atu ano ki a ia me kore ia e pai kia whakakahoretia nga raruraru, kua takina mai nei e o tatou hara ki runga ki a tatou’ (prayed that God may be pleased to end the troubles that our sins have brought upon us).\(^\text{131}\) The resolution rather pointedly ascribes a theology of blame for the political unrest. The fourth Hīnota held in 1865 at Te Kawakawa in Ngāti Porou was a more difficult affair. William Leonard Williams was shocked by the criticism that he and others received on their journey to the meeting, ‘that we should find ourselves treated with very marked incivility on the side of the Maori King’ being met with the words “’E ngaki atu ana a mua; e toto mai ana a muri!’ (The party in front is clearing the way; the party behind is dragging along [the newly-shaped canoe])’ which Williams took as a metaphor for the missionaries being the vanguard for the military forces that were now encroaching.\(^\text{132}\) Such words were precursors to the military action that was to come to the area a few months later.

The conflicts became intensely personal for the Pākehā members of the Hīnota and Diocese. Carl Volkner who had been ordained priest by William Williams alongside Raniera Kawhia at Whareponga in 1862 was executed by Hauhau adherents outside his church at Opotiki in 1865 for spying for the Crown forces. William Williams himself fled Waerenga-ahika in 1865 and it eventually became a site of battle. Williams moved north to Paihia for the duration of the conflict and refused to return permanently to Waerenga-ahika even when asked by Wi Pere and other local rangatira.\(^\text{133}\) Instead he eventually moved to Napier, and the local ministry was left to William Leonard Williams as Archdeacon and the Māori clergy.

\(^{131}\) Nga Mahi A Te Hinota Tuatoru O Te Pihopatanga O Waiapu, I Whakaminea Ki Waerengaahika, Turanga. 2 Maehe, 1864, p.22. The proceedings of the Third Synod of the Diocese of Waiapu. Held at Waerenga-a-hika, Gisborne, 2nd March 1864. [http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-Wai1864Mahi-t1-g1-g2.html](http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-Wai1864Mahi-t1-g1-g2.html)

\(^{132}\) Frederic Wanklyn Williams, pp.194-95.

Raniera Kawhia, Tamihana Huata, Matiaha Pahewa, Mohi Turei, Hare Tawhaa, and Raniera Wiki. Archdeacon Alfred Nesbit Brown, who had attended the third Hīnota in 1864, saw his Māori support in Tauranga dissipate after decades of work due to his support for the British troops on the eve of the battle of Pukehinahina (Gate Pa). Raeburn Lange notes the 1860s conflicts ‘marked a watershed in the history of the Maori churches. Church life was disrupted by warfare in some areas and political tensions everywhere. Many members lapsed from their churches, and others defected to new religious movements inspired by the threats facing the Maori community.’ They also brought into focus the role of the Hīnota in bringing together disparate leaders for a voluntary cause that was overwhelmed by external factors.

In large terms the shift of political and military power arising from the result of the wars of the 1860s meant not only the defeat of the Kingitanga and immediate aspirations for Māori sovereignty, but also a shift within the Church. As Lange notes, ‘increasingly marginalised in politics and the economy, Maori became less central in the churches too. In the rapidly expanding national ecclesiastical structures the change of focus from Maori mission to the evangelisation and pastoral care of Pakeha settlers meant that financial and personnel resources were redirected.’ William Williams’ move to Napier was followed by the transfer in 1869 of the Hawkes Bay region from the large and unwieldy Wellington Diocese into the Waiapu Diocese. With the large number of Pākehā settlers in the new southern part of the Diocese who required both ministry and roles in the governance of the Church, the demographics had changed and ‘the Diocesan Synod would no longer be predominantly Maori.’ The vision for the euthanasia of mission had itself been euthanized.

The experiment of the Waiapu Hīnota as a fully-fledged sharing of power between Māori and Pākehā drew to an end with the resolution of the New Zealand wars. Te Hui No Te Hahi
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Maori (The Native Church Boards), themselves subject to the authority and jurisdiction of the Pākehā Diocesan Synods emerged as a new model that would remain in place in one shape or another until the 1920s. These Hui were valuable spaces for the interaction of Church and iwi, and for the continuing process of shaping the Anglican institution through a Māori understanding. At the 1868 sitting of General Synod, in response to the new needs of their Dioceses, William Williams as Bishop of Waiapu and Octavius Hadfield, whom Selwyn had appointed Archdeacon of Kapiti in March 1849, moved for the establishment of Hui No Te Hāhi Maori. The inaugural meeting of the General Synod in 1859 had allowed for the delegation of managerial (as opposed to policy-setting) powers to local level Archdeaconries and Rural Deanery boards, a necessary response in part due to difficult terrain and challenging communication. The new Hui were seen as growing in parallel to these other forms of devolved management.

The new Hui were similar in structure to the Waiapu Hīnota. The composition was the Bishop or his representative; clergy with responsibility to Māori (both Māori and Pākehā); and at least one lay representative per Māori Pāriha (parish or parochial district). In practice these bodies became strong expressions of a Māori Church partly due to the ubiquity of te reo Māori in Māori communities. Part of the rationale for the establishment of the Hui instead of placing Māori ministry under the care of the Archdeaconries and Rural Deanery boards was the lack of English language proficiency amongst Māori, and the lack of reo knowledge amongst the Pākehā clergy. Part of the enabling General Synod legislation allows that where ‘it is found impracticable by reason of the difference of language and of circumstances to combine both in the same board’ that the Native Church Board would be established.

Roger Hill writes that the Hui were also partly a response to a shift in Pākehā ministry away from the Māori Church towards an increasing settler population. This
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increasing lack of concern for Māori ministry could be seen in the reports on the *Hui* themselves, which over the remainder of the century gained less and less coverage in Church magazines. A comment in 1895 in the Auckland Diocese’s Church Gazette observed ‘to the ordinary English Churchman many of the resolutions might appear almost childish and unnecessary going into too much detail. It must not be forgotten that the Native Church is still in its infancy’\(^{145}\). This was, however, an outsider’s observation that reflected a lack of insight into the gatherings and importance of the *Hui*. The *Hui* were important vehicles for the Māori Church to express itself. Inside the Church, as Earl Howe points out, ‘although, in a structural way, Maori appear assimilated in the Church at this time, there was still a significant expression of the Maori voice, particularly at the Native Church Boards.’\(^{146}\) An insight into the Māori perception of the *Hui* as more than mere tokenistic efforts can be seen in the language of the enabling legislation. While the English language version of the legislation describes the new forums as ‘Native Church Boards’, the te reo Māori translation, which the vast majority of Māori would have followed at the time, describes them as “Hui No Te Hahi Maori”\(^{147}\) literally, ‘Gatherings of the Maori Church’. Māori language sources continue to refer to the Boards in this way and as such bring a different emphasis and importance to their role as the centre of the church, not the advice-rendering periphery.

The *Hui o te Haahi Maori* began life in different ways in different Dioceses. In Waiapu the Turanga *Hui o te Haahi Maori* met for the first time in 1870 in Gisborne, and the Heretaunga *Hui* (covering Hawkes Bay) held its first meeting in 1871.\(^{148}\) In Wellington Diocese the first meeting of the *Hui o te Haahi Maori* was not held until 1901, when representatives gathered from Whanganui, Wairarapa and Otaki-Manawatu.\(^{149}\) The relative lateness of the Wellington *Hui* was a function of the strength of the Superintendence system in the Diocese combined with the episcopate of the missionary Bishop Octavius Hadfield, alongside the relative lack of Māori political pressure from the New Zealand wars in the area.\(^{150}\) The real strength of the boards though was in their development in the Auckland

\(^{145}\) *Church Gazette* (CG), February 1895, pp.24-25.


\(^{147}\) *PGS* 1868, pp.29-31.

\(^{148}\) Morrell, p.84.

\(^{149}\) Ibid, p.122.

\(^{150}\) H.W.Monaghan, *From Age to Age*, Wellington, 1957, p.182.
Diocese where they gave an outlet to the northern tribes and were a forum for the Māori church in Waikato and Taranaki to express both their grievances and their aspirations. The establishment of the *Hui* in Auckland were held up by the death of Archdeacon Henry Williams in 1867 and the delay in appointing Edward Clarke as his replacement. Also, Selwyn had returned to England to take up the See of Lichfield in 1868 ending his time as the first, and last, Bishop of New Zealand. His replacement William Cowie became the first Bishop of Auckland. The first meeting of the Waimate *Hui o te Haahi Maori* was held at Waimate in 1872. Te Waimate was not only the site of the training school for Kaiwhakaako, but according to Hill was a strategic site for Nga Puhi iwi straddling as it did the path between the east coast and west coast portions of their territory. The two *Hui* bodies in the Auckland diocese were Waimate, and the joint Waitemata/Waikato Board which covered the west coast south of Dargaville all the way south including Waikato and Taranaki.

The *Hui* were also an opportunity for Māori in the North to move beyond hapū and kāinga boundaries and concerns and onto a wider stage. The first call for a Māori bishop came from the 1879 meeting of the Waimate *Hui o te Haahi Maori*. Hemi Taitimu, supported by the Minita Renata Tangata laid ‘he kupu tono na te Hahi Maori ki nga kaumatua o te Hahi’ (a motion from the Maori Church to the elders of the Church) ‘kia whakaaroa mai e koutou tenei hiahaia o matou, ara kia whakaturia he Pihopa mo te Hahi Maori’, (that they consider our desire to have appointed a Bishop for the Maori Church). The rationale in the motion was around the amount of work the Bishop of Auckland had been required to carry out for Māori and Pākehā since the days of Selwyn and that the division of work created too large a workload for the lone Bishop. The *Hui* was chaired by Bishop Cowie however there were six Māori clergy and 15 Māori lay present to develop the motion. This motion was supported by the Hauraki/Waikato *Hui* the following year, with the request to that year’s General Synod for ‘kia tu ai tetahi atu Pihopa hei mahi ki te Hahi Maori anake’ (the
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establishment of a Bishop for work solely in the Maori Church). The petition was unsuccessful for a variety of reasons at that stage, however the movement towards a broader form of leadership represented a shift in the thinking of the Māori Church in the north, via the Hui, from the kāinga and hapū level to something more ambitious.

The Hui in the Auckland Diocese did not restrict their aspirations solely to ecclesiastical promotion. The 1902 Hui challenged the loss of te reo in clergy training and formation, passing a motion requesting ‘kia haere tonu te Kura Minita mo te reo Maori ki Te Raukahikatea’ (the continued practice of ministry training using te reo at Te Rau College), the Māori church training establishment in Gisborne. This was in the face of challenges to the ongoing requirement for te reo in clergy training and more and more classes being conducted in English. This challenge to the provision of theological education was a part of what Hill describes as a process where the Hui no te Haahi Maori in the north was a way in which Māori could express their search for self-determination and a means ‘in which they could maintain control over their future.’

However it was the Hui held in 1897 at Te Pourewa at Waipa in the heartland of the Kingitanga movement, that gave an insight in to the iwi-driven nature of the Hui. Three motions were moved by Māori lay and clergy expressing support for the Kingitanga. The first motion asked ‘me whakauru mai te ingoa o te Kingi Maori ki te Inoi mo te Kuini, ki te Inoi ranei mo te Piriniha o Weeri’ (for the insertion of the name of the Maori King into the prayers for the Queen and for the Royal Family). Prayer for the Royal family had been at the heart of the Book of Common Prayer since its inception in Elizabethan England and tied the Church to the Crown. The second motion asserted ‘me tuku te Hahi Maori kia haere noa,
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155 Nga Korero A Te Hui O Te Hahi Maori o nga takiwa O Hauraki, Me Waikato i Te Pihopatanga O Akarana, i Huihui ki Hauraki i a Maehe 8, 1880. The proceedings of the Native Church Board of Hauraki and Waikato on the 8 March 1880. http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-BIMs301Chur.html

156 Nga Mahi a Te Hui Topu o te Hahi Maori o te Pihopatanga o Akarana i Huihui ki Akarana i a Hanuere 25—27, 1902. The Proceedings of the Native Church Board o Auckland meeting in Auckland, January 25-27 1902.


158 Hill, p.7.
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kaati hoki te arahi a te Hahi Matua, i te mea hoki kua pakari te Hahi Maori.’ (the Maori Church continues not only under the direction of the parent Church but as a fully matured Church). This motion was essentially asserting that while the liturgy of the whole church should continue in unity, the Māori side of the Church should be empowered in its self-determination. And perhaps most emblematic of the desire for a new direction in the Church, the final motion asked for a new name for the Māori Church ‘Ko te Hahi Maori motuhake o Niu Tireni’: ‘The Autonomous Maori Church of New Zealand’. What is of particular interest is the movers of the motions were not all particularly aligned towards the Kingitanga movement. Taimona Hapimana was a minita from Ngāti Whakaue at Rotorua; Nikora Tautau was a minita from Ngāti Porou; Mutu Kapa had ties to both Te Aupouri in the north and through his mother had ties to Te Kahui Ariki, the Kingitanga royal line; and Wiremu Matete was a minita from Ngāti Paoa. The previous year Hapimana and Tautau moved that the Hui in Otorohanga celebrate King Mahuta ‘mo tana whakatapunga i te Ratapu i roto o Waikato’ (for his observance of the Sabbath in Waikato). Thus reasonably disparate and outwardly conservative minita as members of the Māori Church establishment were capable of responding to the aspirations of the local iwi. Just to add to the pluralistic politics of Te Haahi Mihinare, the same Hui also passed a motion congratulating Queen Victoria on her reign and expressing best wishes for the upcoming Lambeth conference, the world-wide gathering of Anglican Bishops in England.

This focus on the iwi aspirations found expression in other ways through the Hui. Regional use of language was an issue taken up by the Māori Church in the north in the 1880s. Ihaka Te Tai, who became MHR for Northern Māori in 1884 and who died after contracting food poisoning at an Auckland Diocesan Synod in 1887, led a movement in the northern Hui against the use of other dialects. The Church Gazette report on the Hui held at Paihia March 1882 noted Te Tai’s petition ‘complaining of the alterations in the last edition

http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-Wai1896NgaM.html

of the Maori Prayer Book; in which, it was said, the pure Maori of the Ngapuhi tribe had in many places been changed, for words and expressions unfamiliar to the Maories of the North." This became a substantive issue for the north. In 1883 Te Tai again led a discussion of the revised Prayer Book, ‘finding fault with many passages’, and in 1884 the Hui moved a motion ‘me tuhi atu tenei Hui ki nga kaiwhakamaori i te Rawiri hou kia whakatikaia nga kupu i he’ (to write to the translators of the new Prayer Book to correct the words that are wrong).

Iwi development was a strong subtext for other Hui held across the North Island. Ngāti Porou continued to utilise the Church to consolidate the position and direction of the iwi. In 1911 Frederick Bennett reported in the Māori newspaper Pipiwharauroa on the Hui held at Waiomatatini in Ngāti Porou territory. This was a large event, with over 1200 people present during the day. During the opening service alone, Bishop Averill reported over 200 inside the whare karakia (house of worship) and over 600 outside attempting to join in. The business of the Hui was as usual focused on the operation of the Church, however at the opening of the Hui special concerns were raised ‘I roto i nga powhiri a Ngatiporou e toru nga take i whakaaturia mo tenei Hui’ (in the welcome by Ngati Porou three concerns were laid before the gathering). Firstly of course, the work of the Hui itself, secondly the replacement of the whare karakia (church) that had burned down at Manutuke, and thirdly that consideration be given to the newly established Māori Church girls’ school Hukarere in Napier. Thus through the use of traditional mechanisms the Church gathering was influenced by the needs of the iwi, and Apirana Ngata also guided throughout the course of the Hui as ‘te poutokomanawa’, or facilitator. The Church worship was impressive, with four choirs of forty people, and thirteen Māori were licensed by the Bishop as Kaikarakia (layreaders). However the real work of the gathering involved the fundraising that occurred. In total £742 3s 10d was raised during the 3 day Hui, with the vast bulk of the funds coming from the hapū and kāinga of Ngāti Porou. Waiapu pastorate donated £292
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14s, and Hikurangi pastorate £240, which Ngata divided into £500 for Hukarere school and £150 for the rebuilding of the Church at Manutuke, with the remainder towards the costs of hosting the event. The Waiapu Church Gazette made note of the nature of the koha, which was given in the centre of the marae ‘this way of presenting offerings is a relic of the communistic system of the Maori.’

Looked at another way, it was also a display of the generosity of the various hapū and kāinga and showed their contribution towards and support for both the Church and for the causes espoused by the wider iwi. With much favourable feedback, the Hui had achieved its purposes for both Church and iwi.

Te Arawa were also keen to emphasise their own priorities through the Church. In 1914 the meeting of the Hui brought together the opening of the new whare karakia St Faiths at Ohinemutu and the welcome for the new Bishop of Waiapu William Sedgwick. Over 2000 people were present for the pōwhiri where over fifteen speakers used the traditional opportunity to not only reflect on the occasion but to glorify the hosts Te Arawa. The newspaper Te Kopara, in reflecting on the pan-tribal celebration of Te Arawa, made special mention of the diversity of the iwi present, mentioning fourteen iwi groups from across the North Island and even some from as far away as Rarotonga.

One of the opportunities presented by the Hui was a forum to engage with those iwi that had withdrawn from the life of the Church in the wake of the New Zealand wars. In some areas of the country Te Haahi Mihinare had almost disappeared, as Māori had become disillusioned by the response of the Pākehā Church to the events of the wars. William Williams described the situation as ‘the sad convulsions by which the Maori Church has been torn asunder’, and by and large the settler Church response was to treat those who had left as apostates requiring reconversion. The General Synod in 1883 called for ‘special efforts for the recovery to the faith of those persons of the Maori Church who since the war, have lapsed into indifference or false religion’ Resistance remained high to the Church in many areas, and although Eruera Te Ngara was ordained for Māori ministry in Waitara and
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Taranaki in 1874, Taranaki iwi never sent a representative to the Waitemata/Waikato Hui.\(^{170}\) In fact during most of the 1880s no Māori Anglican services took place north of the Waitotara River in Taranaki due to the influence and resistance of the followers of Tohu Kakahi and Te Whiti-o-Rongomai at Parihaka.\(^{171}\) Bishop Cowie of Auckland hosted King Tawhiao on his return from England in 1884, although Tawhiao reaffirmed his allegiance to the Pai Marire faith.\(^{172}\)

However ministry to the Waikato iwi continued, even if only a shadow of its pre-war self. Heta Tarawhiti had continued his ministry amongst his Ngāti Mahuta people in Waikato throughout the wars, and by 1869 was able to conduct his services most places in Waikato.\(^{173}\) In response to a request by Tawhiao for Māori ministers in 1883, the Hui of 1884 agreed to send to ordained ministers from the north, Wiki Te Paa and Renata Tangata. Although Hill describes the two Northerners as having a rough reception in the area ‘frequently received with suspicion, heaped with insult’\(^{174}\) their relationship with the local people grew over time, and in 1896 the Hui held in Otorahanga congratulated the two Nga Puhi for their ministry in the area.\(^{175}\) The Māori newspaper Te Korimako in 1884 recognised the ministry of the two ‘na Ngapuhi, na Te Rarawa i tuku kia haere ki Waikato, ki te whakatuakana, ki te whakateina te taha Maori i runga i nga tikanga o te aroha o te Atua e whakakotahi nei i te tangata’ (sent from Ngapuhi and Te Rarawa to Waikato to mentor and to serve Maori within the love of God and the unity of the people).\(^{176}\) This ministry in Waikato continued in small ways uninterrupted. Mutu Kapa ministered during the 1940s across the region and would get large crowds at some of his services, however even though
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\(^{176}\) *Te Korimako* 15 May 1884. Volume 5, No. 27, p.3.
he had strong whakapapa ties to the area he continued to struggle in his ministry.\textsuperscript{177} Thus Te Haahi Mihinare brought together ministers from the north and the Kingitanga iwi, within the dynamics and requirements of the iwi, and through the workings of the \textit{Hui}.

It could easily have been expected that the interaction between Māori and the Anglican Church from the beginning of the nineteenth century would have forced Māori into particular patterns of thought and behaviour – of conformity. This was after all one of the broad aims of colonization, and certainly was an aim of many of the Pākehā involved in the Church. Indeed Māori and iwi embraced the Tikanga (values and practices) of the institution, which itself was profoundly embedded into the faith, almost intractably so. From the early establishment of Kaiwhakaako, through to the education and formation process that would produce minita through to Hinota and Hui, iwi adapted their own leadership and structural styles to meet these new ideas. However, while iwi would conform to the shapes of the institution, the intellectual adaptation would be another story. Fundamentally Māori in the nineteenth-century used these new ideas to mould their own Church, reflecting the Anglican ethos but still shaped around their own world view. However they were not unaffected, and as tribe shaped faith, so faith would also shape tribe.

\textsuperscript{177} Mutu Kapa report, 31 December 1944, Maori pastorate reports 1944, S4 Komiti Tumuaki, C/R S11 pastorates, Acc.44, ADA, Auckland.
Chapter 3

Ka Tū He Pīhopa: Tribal Church Leadership

The nineteenth-century had seen the establishment of a settler Anglican Church and its adaptation by iwi. From Kaiwhakaako (evangelists and teachers) through to minita (clergy) and on to structures in the form of Hīnota and Hui, iwi had taken what had been accepted English church practices and had evolved them to meet their own needs and understandings, while simultaneously using this new knowledge to transform their own world-view. Iwi would be guided in this process by several sources. Again, their own world-view with understandings of leadership, of self-determination and of spirituality would set the foundation for change. But they would also encounter and be influenced by new forces, both from other Native Church actions overseas as well as internal Māori dynamics. Partly this would stem from global knowledge systems they were finding increasingly easy to access across the spectrum – from new social sciences to economics to new media – iwi could gain access to new forms of thought less monopolised by the colonists. Nothing would be static in these encounters, as the Pākehā Anglican Church would also be influenced by changes across the Anglican Empire. Even though at the beginning of the new century the colonial Church was deeply entrenched, the shoots were emerging of a new Native contestation for leadership led by a new generation of leaders who were educated in Western ways but still embedded in their own cultures. These new leaders also brought forth a new vision, which took both Māori and the Hāhi from a local and iwi-based position into a new, pan-Māori sphere, but in which iwi would remain the dominant source of Māori authority. The complex interactions that would evolve would find focus on that most singular manifestation of Anglican power – the Bishop.
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1 Ka Tū He Pīhopa (Raising Up a Bishop)
Bishops had been a source of power in the Christian Church since New Testament times, with the position of *episkopos* (overseer) mentioned in the Book of Acts. As with all political structures this role evolved and adapted to its context over time. The arrival of the 16th century English reformation brought with it critique by leading reformation theologians on the role of Bishops, as there had also been on Priests. However unlike much of continental Europe – where the roles were seriously adjusted or abandoned - the three-fold order of ministry (Deacon, Priest, Bishop) was not seriously challenged in England and remained the pathway through which theological and ecclesiastical changes were implemented. Bishops in particular remained sources of political power both in the Church and in wider society, serving as Lords Spiritual alongside the Lords Temporal in the House of Lords. Critique remained of their role in society as they often remained ‘distant figures, garbed in the habiliments of prelacy’ and arguments would continue over their theological role and authority, with the Lambeth Conference of 1888 entrenching the Lambeth-Chicago Quadrilateral agreement reasserting their authority as being derived from the ‘historic episcopate locally adapted’ – a whakapapa handed down from the New Testament.

By the time of the establishment of the settler church in these lands there was continuing discussion over the role of Bishops in the church. Allied with the expansion of the British Empire, the rise of the Oxford (Tractarian) movement that amongst other things renewed the importance of the episcopacy meant that bishops were viewed as crucial for the spiritual well-being of the colonies. In 1841 the Colonial Bishopric’s Fund that would pay for the establishment of episcopal ministry in the colonies was established by the various mission groups. The first to benefit from this fund was Selwyn, who helped establish the trope of the ‘romantic colonial episcopate’. Although Selwyn was in many areas very traditional, even suspected by the CMS missionaries as being neo-Romish, in terms of church governance he was creative and progressive. In 1844, soon after his arrival, he had held a synod with his clergy and at the second synod in 1847 he stated to those gathered
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‘neither will I act without you, nor can you act without me.’⁶ While such consultation may sound practical it was a far cry from the English situation, which Richard Norris described as ‘not infrequently… tainted by prelacy or inordinate individualism, or both’.⁷ By 1857 this had developed to a point where the newly-devised constitution for the Church in New Zealand gave power to a General Synod comprised of three houses: laity, clergy and bishops, where each held a power of veto - an evolution viewed in England as a ‘radical novelty’⁸. This development partly arose from a context where Selwyn was far more dependent on the on-going support of local lay leaders including George Grey and William Martin than the well-endowed church back in England. Although no Māori were directly involved in the establishment of this new constitution, nor initially in the newly-formed General Synod, the model – along with their own world-view - would still influence their understanding of the episcopate in times to come.

The concept of a Native Episcopate was a central tenet of Henry Venn’s ideas on the establishment of a Native Church and the ‘euthanasia of mission’. Venn took for granted the centrality of Bishops in any Anglican establishment. Therefore Bishops were both a potential impediment and central facilitator in the establishment of a Native Church, with Venn asserting in 1864 that ‘if native churches were kept separate with a complete organization of Bishop, priest and Deacon they would exhibit a more firm and rapid development.’⁹ In line with this thinking Venn opposed the establishment of colonial bishops, including Selwyn, on the grounds that ‘missionary bishops’ would lead ‘towards an increase in indigenous dependence rather than the creation of a new sort of independence.’¹⁰ In fact, the CMS policy went so far as to state - regarding the establishment of Native Bishops in India in 1877 - ‘A

⁹ C. Peter Williams, The Ideal of the Self-Governing Church, p.86.
separate Native Church governed by European missionaries... the parent Committee will on no account consent to.’

Opposition to Venn’s thinking was based on theories of race that were being amplified in the growth of Empire. Venn had seen the value and difference in indigenous thinking, and that Native churches would be recognition of ‘the realities of racial and cultural differences’ – not based on “Anglo-Saxon ideas”. However there were two constituencies in each colony that required ministering to – the indigenous followers and the colonists themselves. Of course the obvious solution would have been one episcopacy under which both constituencies could be serviced. In England the integrity of an episcopal see was all-important, with one Bishop for one ecclesiastical geographical area. There may have existed in England the overlapping provinces of York and Canterbury overseen by the two respective Archbishops as Metropolitans, but essentially on the ground the local Bishop was Prince and ruled over all. So precedence dictated that a Native bishop would have spiritual and ecclesiastical power over colonists and natives alike. As can be imagined this was strongly opposed by settlers on the ground, both by laity and by clergy. When Venn wanted local settlers to come under the first native bishop - Bishop Crowther in Niger - the responses from settlers included that ‘to place a “white man” “under a black bishop” would be to degrade the European’. Venn fought back against these ideas, and ‘warned his missionaries that the English found it particularly difficult “to show respect to national peculiarities” that differed from their own’ a ‘defect in cultural lenses’. Aware that such open racism was going to continue to be a stumbling block to a Native episcopacy, Venn was open to English missionary Bishops but with the important qualifier that it was ‘crucial that their first loyalty would be to the culture of the emerging indigenous church rather than to that of the distant mother church.’ This would be a challenge difficult, if not impossible, to overcome.

12 C. Peter Williams, ‘“Not Transplanting”’, p.163.
14 Ibid, p.165.
15 C. Peter Williams, ‘The Church Missionary Society and the Indigenous Church in the second half of the Nineteenth Century: The Defence and Destruction of the Venn Ideals’, p.91.
The challenge for Venn then was to outline a policy that would allow for Native Bishops while also allowing for the establishment of leadership for colonists. This would involve a radical model allowing for overlapping episcopal jurisdictions, in which two bishops could occupy the same space. A precedent existed in Jerusalem that the CMS had latched onto, where Syrian, Armenia and Greek Bishops occupied the same geography but were shepherds to differ ethnic constituencies.\(^{16}\) Venn soon began advocating this model, and again justified this radical innovation on the grounds of efficacy where it was more important to have ‘independent churches’ than ‘ensuring the conventions of territorial episcopacy’,\(^{17}\) challenging the fundamental importance of the episcopal see in Anglicanism while simultaneously searching for a way to uphold the episcopacy itself. Venn was soon pushing for separate expatriate English and Native Churches existing alongside one another, and as C. Peter Williams notes ‘this degree of organisational separation was a consequence of Venn’s growing conviction that the cultural, linguistic, and ethnic differences were virtually unbridgeable.’\(^{18}\) The CMS also noted the model for the Episcopal Church in the United States, where they had appointed a (white) bishop to oversee Native American work whose territory overlapped that of others.\(^{19}\)

As with his wider vision for a Native Church, Venn’s vision developed in England would not prove entirely effective on the ground in the outreaches of the Empire. The CMS missionaries in situ would resist being placed under a native bishop with all of their considerable might. Towards the end of the century the CMS itself was in decline as the colonies evolved their own hierarchy and power centres, including on theological grounds where the by now old-fashioned evangelical views of the CMS clashed with those of the increasingly High-Church bishops. And, practically, the ordination (consecration) of Bishops canonically required the presence of other Bishops. And without the support of the English princes, native princes could not arise.\(^{20}\)

As noted, the first native bishop was the Rev Dr Samuel Ajayi Crowther, ordained at Canterbury Cathedral in 1864 as Missionary Bishop in Western Africa. Crowther was a recaptive, freed from slavery as a child by the British navy and trained by the CMS. One of
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his tutors was Rev G.A.Kissling, who would later be stationed at Te Kawakawa and would for a time be a mentor to Rota Waitoa. An accomplished scholar, Crowther translated the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer into the Yoruba language and was part of the expedition to establish the Church in Niger. Crowther was then, from an English point of view, one of the best options to become a Native Bishop. Crowther’s ordination as Bishop was supported by the high ideals of the humanitarian movement and the Clapham sect, and he was supported by influential people including Henry Labouchere (Secretary of State for the Colonies) and of course, Henry Venn.\textsuperscript{21} In fact, Venn described Crowther’s ordination as a key development in the formation of the “Native African Church”.\textsuperscript{22} As with Native clergy, Crowther was neither simply an agent of the colonisation project nor a sign of resistance to empire. Instead, Crowther both believed in an existing native theology and critiqued native customs, and as Lamin Sanneh noted of him ‘Crowther would not denounce or applaud indigenous institutions and native authorities merely for their being African.’ For example Crowther strongly denounced “African practices” around slavery but was quiet regarding the practice of polygamy.\textsuperscript{23} Unfortunately there was strong opposition to Crowther’s ordination from white missionaries, who would theoretically be placed under Crowther’s leadership.\textsuperscript{24} This opposition quickly manifested into a campaign to undermine Crowther, and he was soon side-lined by a commission into supposed incompetence by his subordinates, driven by local white missionary and trader opposition.\textsuperscript{25} In fact Crowther’s undermining was so successful that he would become a cautionary tale in the Anglican Empire, deemed a failure not only of experiments with the episcopacy but a ‘failure of African leadership’;\textsuperscript{26} and this contributed to the death by the end of the century of Venn’s idea for a Native Episcopate and a Native Church as CMS policy.\textsuperscript{27} But the aspiration would remain for Native people themselves.

\textsuperscript{21} C. Peter Williams, \textit{The Ideal of the Self-Governing Church}, p11.
\textsuperscript{22} C. Peter Williams, \textquote{\textit{“Not Transplanting”}}, p.160.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid, p.192.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid, pp.192-93.
\textsuperscript{27} W.M.Jacob, \textit{The Making of the Anglican Church Worldwide}, London, 1997, p.211.
Iwi aspirations had driven the call for a Pihopa (Māori Bishop) soon after the beginning of the ordination of minita. William Williams retired as Bishop of Waiapu in 1876 and the search to find his replacement took two chaotic years. This sparked discussion among the iwi involved and an 1876 hui in Uawa (Tolaga Bay) asked why there was no Māori bishop, citing the example of Samuel Crowther as precedent for a non-Pākehā bishop.28 This discussion spread across the land, and in 1877 Hemi Matenga Wai-punahau, a rangatira of Ngāti Toa, wrote to the Editor of Te Waka Māori Niupepa:

Te tuatahi o nga mea i whakaakona ki a tatou, ko te Whakapono. Te matauranga ake whakaturia ana etahi hei minita, na ka rua te kau noa atu nga tau e minita ana. Ko te tuarua o nga mea i whakaakona ai tatou ko te Ture, a kihai ano i riro mai nga tikanga katoa o te ture, toia noatia atu etahi hei mema mo te Paremete, hei minita mo te Kawanatanga, hei Kai-whakawa.

Na, he patai tenei naku, he aha i whakanekihia ai etahi o tatou ki nga turanga nunui o te Kawanatanga kahore o te Hahi? Ara, na te aha i mutu mai ai i te minita noaiho ta te Hahi whakatu i etahi o tatou Maori nei? He aha i kore ai e tu te pihopa Maori, kua roa hoki nga motu nei e awhina ana i te Whakapono? Kua tae mai te rongo kei te kimi nga tumuaki o te Hahi Ingarani ki Niu Tirani nei i tetahi pihopa mo te Takiwa o Waiapu hei riwhi mo to tatou kaumatua mo Pihopa Wiremu kua mutu nei, ara kei te kimi mai i roto i a ratou nei minita ano. He aha te waiho ai hei tetahi pihopa Maori tera takiwa? He nui rawa hoki te mahi ki te taha Maori o te Hahi ma te pihopa o reira. Kaua e kiai na te Maoritanga o te tangata i kore ai e to tika hei pihopa. Me he tangata matau, noho pai, ki ta te Karaitipure, koia tena.

Titiro ia na ki Awherika, ara, ki te iwi mangumangu nei, ko tetahi ano o ratou kua tu hei pihopa mo ratou. Na te aha tera i tu ai i kore ai o tatou? Tena e ki te tangata whakaaro puhaehae, "Na te kore e kaha te Pakeha ki te noho i taua whenua i te kaha o te ra i tu ai te tangata whenua hei pihopa mo te Hahi ki reira; na te pai o Niu Tirani i kaiponuhia ai nga Pihopatanga ki a ratou whaka-pakeha anake." Otira kati atu tera whakaaro a te tangata ki a ia ano. Ko te tika e kimihia nei, ko te tika ki tate Karaitipure, ki ta to nga

whenua ke, ko tetahi tikanga ano hoki hei hono rawa i te Pakeha raua ko te Maori.  

First, we were instructed in Christianity, and, having acquired knowledge therein, some of us were made ministers, and have now officiated as ministers for more than twenty years. We were next instructed in the law, and, before we were fully able to master its intricacies, some of us were dragged forward to be made members of Parliament, Ministers of the Government, and Magistrates.

Now, I ask, why are some of us raised to prominent positions in the Government, and not in the Church? In other words, why do the Church appointments with respect to us Maoris abruptly cease when we attain to the position of an ordinary minister? Why is there no Maori bishop, since the Natives of these Islands have for a considerable time past embraced Christianity? A report has reached us that the leaders of the Church of England in New Zealand are on the look-out for a bishop for the Diocese of Waiapu, to take the place of our patriarch Bishop Williams, who has resigned; and that they are looking for him in the ranks of the English clergy. Why, I ask, is not a Maori bishop appointed to that See? For there is a very great deal of work for a bishop of that diocese to do in connection with the Maori portion of the Church. Let it not be said because a man is a Maori he is unfit to be a bishop. If there be a man of understanding and holy life, according to the Scriptures, that is the man.

... Look at Africa, at the Negro race inhabiting that country - their bishop was chosen from among themselves. How is it that they have a bishop of their own race. and we have not? Possibly a man of a jealous nature may say, “Because the Pakehas cannot bear the burning heat of that country a Native bishop is set over the Church there; but the climate of New Zealand being genial and pleasant, the bishoprics are reserved for the Europeans only.” But let that man keep such thoughts to himself. It is the right we are seeking for, the right according to Scripture, and according to the custom in other lands, and a way, also, whereby the union of Pakeha and Maori may be perfected.

Unfortunately in the same edition there was an obituary to the late Rev Matiu Taupaki, who had passed away that same year. Taupaki had been a pupil of the CMS missionary Puckey at Kaitaia, and had gone on be the first minita ordained in the North, his work covering a
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huge area from Whangarei to the North Cape. Taupaki’s eulogy quoted an unnamed Pākehā lay person from the North asserting that Taupaki would have been ‘the only one eligible for the office’ of a Māori bishop as ‘has lately been mooted’.31

Started in the east, this push for a Māori bishop gained momentum, and as noted previously by 1879 the cause was taken up by the Waimate Hui o te Haahi Maori as they continued to exercise their self-determination. They petitioned the church ‘kia whakaaroa mai e koutou tenei hiahia o matou, ara kia whakaturia he Pihopa mo te Hahi Maori’, (to consider our desire to have appointed a Bishop for the Maori Church).32 Again, this was followed the next year by a request to General Synod ‘kia tu ai tetahi atu Pihopa hei mahi ki te Hahi Maori anake’ (the establishment of a Bishop for work solely in the Maori Church).33 The translation sent to General Synod requested ‘that it be desirable that a coadjutor-Bishop should be appointed for the Diocese of Auckland, whose responsibilities should be solely in connection with the Maories of the Diocese.’34 Both of these petitions were rebuffed, with General Synod in 1880 noting:

That the Synod received with much pleasure the Memorial of the Native Church Boards of the Diocese of Auckland for the appointment of a Suffragan Bishop for the Maori portion of the Church in the Diocese, regarding it as a proof of the vitality of that portion of the Church, but that the Synod, looking at the oneness which exists between the English and Maori portions of the Church throughout New Zealand, and hoping that they will be brought yet closer together in worship and Church organisation, considers that the present proposal for the appointment of a Suffragan Bishop would not be desirable, and is unable to comply with the request.35
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General Synod’s attempt to politely smother iwi aspirations for national leadership in the church would not end the call for a Pīhopa Māori. Instead this idea would receive fresh energy as iwi encountered new ideas from new sources. Bishop Vedanayagam Samuel Azariah would be that source. Azariah was bishop of the diocese of Dornakal in south eastern India, and had been ordained bishop in 1912, the first native bishop since Crowther. The Anglican Church in India had discussed the possibility of Indian bishops in the nineteenth century, but had rejected the idea because they would have had oversight over English expatriate clergy and laity. However, as with iwi aspirations the idea of an Indian bishop did not dissipate. Partly the impetus for Azariah’s episcopal ordination came from Bishop Henry Whitehead the (relatively) progressive Bishop of Madras. He saw Azariah as an exercise in evangelism, promoting someone from the lower levels of Indian society as part of a ‘bottom-up strategy for converting India.’ Partly too Azariah’s ordination was a political calculation made, according to Susan Billington Harper, ‘to provide an ecclesiastical answer to nationalist demands’ especially those coming from the Hindu-dominated Indian National Congress. This would echo the pressure soon to be placed on the Anglican Church in this land by the Anglican-dominated Young Māori Party. Azariah’s ordination made waves in Indian politics, and according to Harper his role as the first Indian Anglican Bishop ‘made him a leading representative of the Indian Empire’s loyal subject populations’ drawing him into a web of politics that would soon have Mahatma Ghandi considering Azariah his ‘Enemy Number One.’

It would be very tempting to view Azariah then in a political light, as a leading collaborator (kūpapa) within the eternal game of resistance to Empire. However Azariah was primarily focused on the theological liberation of his people, not merely the political or social. As Harper writes Azariah ‘sought to create an indigenous Indian form of Christianity, not a Christianized form of nationalism.’ Azariah had been raised as the son of a Hindu convert, and had experienced the ‘Iron Control’ of the local missionaries, inspiring him ‘to

37 Ibid, loc.1254 of 6521.
41 Ibid, p.3.
end the paternalistic relationship between Western Missionaries and Indian Christians.\textsuperscript{42} He was an adherent of Venn’s vision for a Native Church, freed from the paternalistic and ineffective domination by English leaders. In particular Azariah focused on the need for financial self-sufficiency for the Indian church, ‘we must buy these missionaries out by paying for the work of the Church ourselves’\textsuperscript{43} and that financial autonomy ‘made clear the difference between a real Church, and a Church which was living merely as a colony of a Western Church.’\textsuperscript{44} Even financially, Azariah’s theological approach was an indigenous one, calling for Christian giving to be based on Hindu cultural practices rather than European ones.\textsuperscript{45}

However Azariah’s sense of freedom was not merely from the shackles of colonial Christianity. Instead Azariah had a much larger vision for freedom of the lower castes of India from their own cultural constraints. Azariah was a Nadar from Tinnevelly, and his rise from a lower caste to a position of power made a strong symbolic statement about using the tools of Empire to overturn the existing social order from within. The vast majority of Azariah’s diocese came from the lower castes of society which not only drove his theology but also provided the means for growth. Through their understanding of Christianity the lower castes saw a way to break free of what they perceived as high-caste Hindu domination, itself an ancient cultural practice. As Harper writes ‘Christianity… appeared to provide for many the most clear and straightforward path out of the demeaning cultural matrix from which the converts wished to escape.’\textsuperscript{46} The fact that this cultural overturning aligned with the British Empire’s own agenda in resisting Indian nationalism, and even furthered the British propaganda that their occupation of India was founded on protection of the weak and powerless, was secondary to Azariah.\textsuperscript{47} He even saw Christianity as a path to freedom for women ‘to give their services to India’ noting ‘there are fifty million outcastes
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in India; they are the backbone of the agricultural life of the country. Where can they find the freedom that will give them their true value? It can come from Christ and Christ alone.”

Interestingly, Azariah rejected some of the cultural trappings of his people even when encouraged by his English mentors. Henry Whitehead’s wife Isabel had found in Azariah a project on which she could lavish her creativity. She had insisted that Azariah wear a turban as part of his episcopal garb. Azariah resisted the Whitehead’s ‘campaign to Orientalize their first Indian Bishop’ understanding as he did that the turban belonged to either the elite Brahmin caste or the poorest of the peasants – and he was neither. Instead, dalits and Christians often preferred Western styles, rejecting Hindu indigenous traditions. According to Harper ‘far from being a weak concession to domineering missionaries, westernization represented a symbolic challenge by long-suppressed lower classes to an oppressive indigenous social order.’ Azariah’s theology then was neither simply that of collaborator with nor resistor to Empire, but something infinitely more complex.

Azariah’s fearless critique was not reserved for his own nation. In 1910 he attended the World Missionary Conference, a large gathering in Edinburgh, Scotland credited as the beginning of the Western Protestant ecumenical movement. He was in a tiny minority, with only 19 out over 1200 delegates coming from non-western ethnicities – even though the conference was largely focusing on what it assumed were non-Western needs. Although not a speaker during the main conference, Azariah was asked to address one of the nightly small gatherings held around the conference itself. Azariah took the opportunity to launch a broadside against missionary practices in other lands. He pointed out to the gathered assemblage of European church leaders and missionaries that there was a ‘great lack of frank intercourse and friendliness’ between European missionaries and local peoples. The locals were never invited to dinner with the missionaries, who in turn never wanted to visit their homes, stating ‘too often you promise us thrones in heaven, but will not offer us chairs in your drawing rooms.’ According to Brian Stanley this was not only a challenge to etiquette but ‘what made Azariah’s audience so desperately uncomfortable was his assertion
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that the real problem lay with a failure of basic Christian spirituality'.\textsuperscript{53} Reports from the time noted that Azariah’s comments were received in ‘an electric silence’, and the first response came from the chair of the evening Lord Reay the former governor of Bombay who replied (no doubt with great indignation) that ‘some of his best friends’ were Indians. There were even threats of boycott and protest by some of the missionaries present.\textsuperscript{54} However Azariah was not without his supporters, and one British missionary friend of his noted the moment as ‘the first shot in the campaign against “missionary imperialism”’.\textsuperscript{55}

Even with his searing critique, Azariah continued to be in demand as a speaker throughout the Anglican Empire. On the 16\textsuperscript{th} June 1923 Azariah was present at the consecration of the war memorial gates at Pakipaki Church near Hastings. He was in the country as a guest speaker at the inaugural New Zealand Church Congress, a gathering from throughout the New Zealand Province focused on mission that had been held in Christchurch the previous month. Azariah then toured the country, speaking at various events and raising money for his own work back in Dornakal. After the consecration a large powhiri was given for him and his host the Bishop of Waiapu from the local hapū onto nearby Houngarea marae and this was covered in the Māori newspaper \textit{Te Toa Takitini}. The report was written in te reo Māori by the local Māori vicar and the editor of the paper the then Reverend Frederick Augustus Bennett. After a welcome with much rhetorical flourish from the local kaumatua Mohi Te Atahikoia, Azariah responded, which Bennett translated into te reo as follows:\textsuperscript{56}

\begin{quote}
Tena koutou e te iwi Maori. Nui atu taku mihi ki a koutou kupu, me ta koutou manaaki i ahau i tenei ra.
\textit{Greetings to the Maori people. Great is my response to your words, and to your hospitality to me this day.}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid, p.124.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid, p.126.
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid, p.128.
\textsuperscript{56} \textit{Te Toa Takitini} (TTT), No. 24, July 1 1923, p.5.
Kei te kaha rawa te pupu ake o te aroha i roto i ahau i te rangi nei i taku kitenga atu i a koutou tikanga mo nga manuhiri.

Great is the burgeoning of love within me this day as I witness your customs in welcoming visitors.

Na tatou tahi ena tu manaaki manuhiri. Pena tonu nga whakahaere a nga iwi o Inia.

Such is our common practice in welcoming visitors. This is similar to the practices of the people of India.

Kei a tatou anake ena tu tikanga kaore i nga iwi pakeha.

Only us and yourselves uphold these customs, the white people do not.

Ko taku kupu ki a koutou, mehemea ka tu tetahi Maori hei Pihopa a muri nei, me whakarite he kakahu Maori he kakahu mona.

My words to you are, if you elevate a Maori as Bishop in the future, arrange a Maori cloak as a robe for them.

Kauaka e whakarereatia nga taonga rangatira a o koutou tipuna.

Do not forsake the chiefly treasures of your ancestors.

Coming as they did from a native bishop Azariah’s words must have been like a ray of sunlight to iwi who had only ever received rejection of their episcopal aspirations. Azariah then continued on his tour, encountering various iwi on his travels. In Auckland he made a large impact on Mihinare from the north. On the 24th June he was present at the ordination to the priesthood of the two Northern minita Wiremu Panapa and Pene Netana at St Mary’s Parnell, where he preached the sermon. Over the next few days he then travelled to various Churches across Auckland including Holy Trinity in Otahuhu, Holy Sepulchre on Khyber Pass, All Saints in Ponsonby, and St Matthews on Hobson Street, sharing his story with the largely Pākehā audiences. These visits were moments of personal inspiration and reflection for Wiremu Panapa, who would later go on to be the second Bishop of Aotearoa. After hearing Azariah speak Panapa wrote:

E kore e mutu te whakamihi a te Pakeha ki tenei tangata. Riro ke ana ma tenei tangata tino kiri mangu e whakatakoto etahi whakaaro marama, akoranga hou hoki, i roto i to ratou reo. Pai ana te whakarongo a te taringa ki nga kupu marama e puta mai ana i roto i tona mangai. Pewhea ra to taua nei
whakaaro to te Maori ki tenei tangata? I raro o tena pewhea ra to taua whakaaro ki ana whai-korero?57

The Pākehā provide endless adulation for this man. It was so easy for this man with very black skin to enlighten and teach new things to the Pākehā in their own language. It was so good for the ears to hear these inspiring words coming from his mouth. What are our thoughts as Māori towards this man? What are our thoughts about what he said?

However it was on the Monday evening (25th) that Azariah would truly make his mark on Te Haahi Mihinare. The Bishop of Auckland had called together clergy and lay leaders of the Māori church in the North, which they labelled a Hinota, presumably called because they had come to attend the ordination the previous day. After an introductory speech by the Pākehā Bishop (which Panapa did not note the contents of), Azariah entered the room, where he was welcomed by Rev Wiremu Keretene on behalf of the clergy and Henare Kingi on behalf of the laity. Panapa then reported:

I te tunga mai o Pihopa Ataria ki te whakahoki i nga mihi mona, neke atu i te haora ia e whakaatu ana i nga ahuatanga o te whakapono ki roto ki nga iwi maha o Inia. Ko tana korero kaha tenei, kia mau te Maori ki tana Maoritanga, me tana ki, ko te mahi ma nga iwi katoa o te ao he mau mai i o ratou nei ahuatanga tuturu ki te aroaro o te Atua hei whakakororia i Tona Ingoa. Na reira ka ki ia heoi ano te mea hei tapaetanga ma te iwi Maori ki te Atua ko tana Maoritanga tuturu. Tino nui te whakamihi o nga mema o te Hinota ki a Pihopa Ataria mo te tika o ana korero, me te maha hoki o nga ako- ranga i roto i tana whai-korero ki te Hahi Maori.58

When Bishop Azariah stood to respond to his welcome, he spoke for longer than an hour on the nature of the faith among the many peoples of India. He spoke most strongly about Māori holding onto their identity, saying it is the work of all nations of the world to bring their own authentic identities before God’s presence to glorify His Name. Therefore, he said, that this is what Māori should offer to God - their 'original' identity. The members of Synod thanked Bishop Azariah greatly for the truth of his words, and the many lessons in his speech to the Māori church.

Azariah’s interaction with the leaders of the Northern Mihinare was to be a driver for change for Māori leadership in the Auckland Diocese. Immediately following his address they moved that ‘kia whakakenanatia tetahi o nga Minita Maori hei tohu whakamaharatanga ki te taenga mai o te Pihopa o Inia ki Akarana’ (one of their Māori ministers be named as Canon as a remembrance of the arrival of the Bishop of India to Auckland). They also moved that ‘me whakatu tetahi Komiti hei whakakapi mo nga Hinotakiwa kua whakakorea nei’ (a Committee be established to replace the regional Synod which had fallen into abeyance). This Committee would be called ‘Te Komiti Tumuaki mo te taha Maori’ (the Standing Committee for the Māori side [of the church]) which they perceived as being the equivalent, even equal, of the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Auckland. Komiti Tumuaki was explicit in stating that its inspiration came from Azariah, with Keretene explaining at their first full meeting:

E ki ana taua Pihopa i te tangata atu o te taonga nei o te whakapono ki tona iwi, ko nga pakeha te rangatira o te mahi. Ko ratou nga kai-awhina, o tira, i tenei wa, ko ratou te rangatira o te mahi, ko nga pakeha nga kai-awhina.

The Bishop explained to us that the treasure of the faith was given to his people by others, and that the Europeans had been in charge of the ministry. His people had been the assistants in the work where nowadays they were in charge of the ministry, and the Europeans are the assistants.

In their following meeting they noted again the influence of Azariah ‘he tauira ki a tatou e te Pihopa a Inia’ (the Bishop of India as a role model for us). Azariah would continue to be a role model for the whole Māori Church, with Komiti Tumuaki committing to raise funds to support his work in Dornakal, and in 1926 Keretene would still introduce Azariah as Komiti Tumuaki’s inspiration ‘Tenei ahau kei te whakamihi ki nga mema kua tae mai nei a ko tenei tikanga i tupu mai ai no te taenga mai o te Pihopa o Inia ki tenei motu.’ (This is my welcome to the members who have arrived here; this cause arose from the visit of the Bishop of India
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to this land).\textsuperscript{64} In the coming battle over the establishment of a Pīhopa Māori there would be constant references to both Azariah as an Indian Bishop and to his work as an inspiration for the future direction of Mihinare. Azariah may not have been a classical resistance leader at the head of a political struggle for independence, but he saw a path for his people that would provide theological liberation that would inevitably lead to a fulfilling political liberation, stating during his 1923 visit: ‘A National Church of India is arising, a Church for which the Indian can live, for which he can die.’\textsuperscript{65} A National Church for Māori was arising as well.

Azariah was hugely influential in renewing Māori calls for a Pīhopa of their own, driving momentum by being a showcase for other native perspectives within the Anglican Empire. There was another external influence that drove the agenda for a Pīhopa, this time from another Māori source. Tahupotiki Wiremu Ratana had led his prophetic movement since his initial revelation on 8\textsuperscript{th} November 1918. From that time Ratana had commenced a healing ministry that eventually spread throughout New Zealand, and he travelled extensively throughout Māori communities, as well as healing the multitudes (both Māori and Pākehā) who descended on his site at present day Ratana Pa, east of Whanganui. At first Ratana was welcomed by Anglican leadership for leading what they saw as a religious revival. On his visit to Waiapu in 1921, Ratana met with Bishop Sedgwick who noted of him ‘he is after something bigger than healing the body. The real purpose of his campaign is to win the Maori from Tohungaism and other like superstitions to which [they] had reverted from the true faith.’\textsuperscript{66} Sedgwick also sent Rev Piri Munro to accompany him on his tour giving Ratana a form of sanction by the Church.\textsuperscript{67} Although not necessarily conforming to Anglican practice, Ratana was working out a new form of Christianity that met the needs of the people and spread the Gospel message far and wide – a Native Church of which Venn may

\textsuperscript{64} Minutes of Komiti Tumuaki of the Diocese of Auckland, 26 June 1926, Maori S.C. Minute Book 1923-1965, S4 Komiti Tumuaki, Acc.49, ADA, Auckland.

\textsuperscript{65} V.S. Azariah, ‘Christ in non-Christian Lands’ in Church of the Province of New Zealand, Report of the first New Zealand Church Congress, Christchurch, May 1923, p.162.

\textsuperscript{66} Waiapu Diocese Year Book 1921, p.29

\textsuperscript{67} Rosevear, p.124.
have approved. However as with Venn’s vision, there was a limit to what would be accepted by the colonial church.

Although Ratana had his supporters from both the Pākehā church hierarchy and from many Māori early on, he also had critics. Rev Reweti Kohere wrote to Te Kopara in 1921 noting ‘I kiia ia e te pakeha he tangata mahi merekara a i panuitia etahi o ana mahi whakamiharo’ (the Pākehā say he is a man of miracles and proclaim some of his miraculous works)... ‘he tokomaha nga minita o te Habi i tautoko i nga mahi a Ratana ... kahore he mahi whakamiharo i kite au.’ (many of the ministers of the Church supported the work of Ratana... I have not seen miraculous works)68 and went on to offer a savage critique of Ratana as a tohunga himself, reflecting Kohere’s involvement in Young Māori Party policy from before the turn of the century. Criticism soon grew of Ratana’s faith, focused around his unique expression of Christianity. On Ratana’s return from his world tour in 1925 the Ratana Church was established. Its founding creedal statements were viewed by many as schismatic, and particular attention was given to the attachment of Nga Anahera Pono (the Holy and faithful Angels) to the Trinitarian doctrine, particularly its use during the sacrament of baptism. Archbishop Averill spoke to a gathering of Mihinare at Rotorua in July 1925 ‘Nui atu taku pouri mo te mahi a Ratana e whakakotititia nei. Kua waiho tenei hei mea wehewehe i waenganui i a koutou i te iwi Maori. Otira kia manawanui koutou’ (Great is my grief because of the works of Ratana that have led (the people) astray. This has created divisions amongst you the Māori people. However you must be of stout heart).69 One could presume that the Pākehā bishops were particularly upset by a movement that they had initially seen as helping to meet their objectives of an assimilated faith moving out into a very different spiritual and political sphere. The Pākehā bishops were so upset that in July 1925 they took the unprecedented step of excommunicating the followers of Ratana, with the North Island bishops issuing a proclamation ‘to our faithful Clergy and people of the Maori race’ that stated the ‘fundamental formula of this so called Church is one in which "the true angels" are associated with the Persons of the Holy Trinity’ used in baptism and other services against common practice’ and that ‘any person who signs the Covenant now put forth by Ratana’s Emissaries is taking the very serious step of excommunicating himself

---

68 Te Kopara, 88, Hune 30, 1921, p.5.
69 TTT, No. 48, 1 July 1925, p.255.
from the Church of Christ’, and furthermore ‘it is not lawful for the Clergy to give to such a person the ministrations of the Church - Holy Communion, Marriage, Burial’. They would not recognise Ratana baptism and justified dividing Māori communities by saying that they were saving the people from ‘being led astray by false and plausible teaching which contradicts the teaching of the New Testament.’

Many Mihinare abided by the demands of the Pākehā Bishops and the June 1925 gathering of Komiti Tumuaki passed a resolution stating ‘ka piri pono tena hui ki nga mea katoa e whakatanga mai e nga Pihopa mo tenei take nui kei waenganui ia taua i te iwi Maori.’ (this gathering will remain faithful to all things published by the bishops on this important issue amongst us the Māori people). This was despite some further brutal edicts following up the excommunication, including one in December of 1925 allowing for Ratana members to be buried in Church cemeteries but noting that clergy were not allowed to use the Rāwiri (Prayer Book) and were to assume that deceased Ratana children were unbaptised. Far from forcing Māori to return to the fold the devastation caused by the Pākehā bishops only made permanent the huge losses faced by the mainstream denominations. From a beginning of one member (Ratana himself) in 1918, by 1926 the Ratana Church had over 11500 followers, including over half of the Māori from the Wellington Diocese. This number would only to continue to grow as Ratana set out his political vision and by 1943 his followers had captured all four Māori seats in Parliament, holding them for over five decades. In the meantime Mihinare leaders could only sit and watch, offering hopeful statements such as that by Rev Keretene in 1926 ‘Kei te koa ao hoki toku ngakau mo te tere o te hoki mai o te nuinga o o tatou iwi i te mahi a Ratana.’ (My heart is joyful for the speedy return of the bulk of our people from the Ratana movement). But the people weren’t returning. Something more was needed.

72 TTT, 53, 1 December 1925, pp.341-342. To this day there are cemeteries in parts of the country still divided by a fence between Ratana and Mihinare sections.
By the 1920s, nearly half a century after the first serious calls for a Pihopa Māori, the time had arrived for this aspiration to bear fruit. Much of the historiography places the drive for a Pihopa with the impact of Ratana,\(^{75}\) and this may have been true in the motivation of the Pākehā Bishops. There was also however an equal if not larger pull by iwi to fulfil their long-held ambitions, driven by a new generation of leadership with a renewed confidence in challenging Pākehā institutions. As with much of the Mihinare story, however, initial progression on major initiatives in the Haahi were dependent on decisions made by Pākehā leadership. At the triennial Dunedin meeting of the General Synod in February 1925, where Rev Hoani Parata was the only Māori member present (representing the Diocese of Dunedin), there was a focus on the issue of the Ratana movement. At the meeting a report was presented by ‘the Select Committee on the present position and problems of the Maori Portion of the Church’, a group comprised of various Pākehā bishops, clergy and laity and whose title spoke volumes on the approach they took. The group reported that ‘in view of the manifest signs of a spiritual awakening amongst the Maori people in different parts, and a growing desire for fuller opportunities for self-expression, it seems desirable that this should be met by giving them a greater measure of responsibility’, noting the emergence of Komiti Tumuaki in the Auckland Diocese and that Waipu Diocese was considering its own developments in this area.\(^{76}\) The select committee, in line with the timeless Anglican obsession with bureaucracy, recommended to General Synod that a Conference be held in Rotorua in June of that same year where a newly appointed Commission comprised of Pākehā members would meet with various Māori clergy. The Commission was given the remit of, amongst other things:

To consider and report upon the growing manifestation of a desire on the part of Maori Christians for a greater degree of self-expression, both in the services of the Church and the control and government of the work of the Church amongst them, and more particularly how to incorporate into the

---


\(^{76}\) PGS 1925, p.123.
work of the Church the best features and characteristics of Maori ideals... representation in the General Synod... and to consider whether it would be advisable to establish the work of the Church amongst the Maoris as a separate entity.77

Word of the hui spread throughout the Māori Church, with Komiti Tumuaki in the North stating the key question was ‘me whakamotuhake ranei he Pihopatanga mo te iwi Maori, kauaka ranei’78 (whether there should be a separate Diocese for the Māori people, or not) but also seeking a more unified, national approach to Māori ministry that could transcend the divide-and-rule approach of the Dioceses: ‘E toru o nga Pihopatanga nei, Akarana, Waiapu, Poneke, rereke te whakahaere tikanga a tetahi a tetahi i roto i te taha Maori, na ko tenei hui he rapu i tetahi tikanga tika e kotahi ai te mahi.’ 79 (In the three Dioceses of Auckland, Waiapu and Wellington there are differing practices in relation to Māori, and this gathering will seek a way to bring these practices into a unified form). This search for a pan-iwi unity for the Māori Church exposes a dynamic where iwi vigorously pursued a national ‘Māori’ identity that could simultaneously transcend (or even subvert) the authority of the Dioceses while maintaining and strengthening their iwi identity. And this new identity would manifest in the form of a Pihopa.

The all-Pākehā commission formed by General Synod in February met on 23-24 June in Rotorua with a delegation of Māori clergy from the three North Island Dioceses,80 with a spread of clergy from most major Mihinare iwi. The conference itself began with an address from Archbishop Averill, who aired both his hopes for the hui and shared his perspectives on the possibilities, including ‘No te taenga mai o Pihopa Ataria o Inia ki Nui Tireni i huri nui ai nga whakaaro kia wehea hoki he Pihopa mo nga Maori. Otira rereke te turanga o Pihopa Ataria....Mehemea ka tu he Pihopa mo nga Maori, kaore he turanga mo ana waewae, engari ka haereere ia i roto i nga rohe o nga Pihopa pakeha.’81 (From the arrival of Bishop Azariah of India to New Zealand there came great change in the thinking around a

80 The Diocese of Waikato was formed in 1928. Until that time Auckland Diocese included both the Waikato and Taranaki regions.
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separate Bishop for Māori... However Bishop Azariah’s position is different. If a Bishop is
elected for Māori, he will not have a place to stand, but he will have to travel about the
districts of the Pākehā Bishops). So from the start Averill pointed to technical challenges
(real or imagined) that would place limitations on the Māori quest for a Pīhopa to lead them
in their wider aspirations for a Māori tribal Church. These challenges were nothing new, and
the issues of overlapping episcopal jurisdictions had always been accompanied by racial
considerations – perhaps the true driver of concerns. Averill also spent a considerable
amount of time justifying the Bishops’ actions with regard to Ratana, and the threat they
represented in his eyes to Mihinare.

After joint discussions the Māori clergy separated and held their own discussion,
where they reported back their decisions for wider consideration. They prefaced their report
with both an aspirational edge ‘in view of the quickened interest of the Maori people in
matters relating to the Church manifested by a desire for a greater degree of control and
management in their Church affairs’ but also noted the need ‘to present a united front in the
face of present difficulties and against evils which confront the Maori people.’ These
‘difficulties’ and ‘evils’ probably included the Ratana faith but also issues such as alcohol
and ‘tohungaism’ – issues which Mihinare consistently returned to. They called for the
unification of Māori ministry across the country, coming under a Pīhopa with Māori
Archdeacons, a synod and a standing committee. There would be a fully fleshed out
structure with Archdeaconry Boards (similar to the old Hui a te Haahi) which would reflect
iwi perspectives, and there would, importantly, be full representation in General Synod.
Funding for the Pīhopatanga (Māori Diocese) would come from Māori themselves, in line
with the thinking pushed by Azariah on his visit. But the decision by the Māori clergy that
would prove most difficult was left to the last:

The Committee feels it to be its duty to inform the Conference that amongst
the Maori Church people there is a very generally expressed desire that the
Bishop at the head of the Mission be a member of the Maori race, but at the
same time, in view of the difficulties which would surround the office of
bishop in the first appointment, the Committee does not wish to stress this

82 PGS 1925, p.449-50.
point, and would welcome the appointment whether the Bishop was a Pakeha or a Maori.83

The timorous tone of the last statement reflected an acute awareness by the Māori clergy of the extremely delicate nature of the race issue for Pākehā and for Māori. The chair of the hui Frederick Bennett was hyper-aware of how difficult this issue would be to broach, both for Pākehā and for Māori Anglican constituencies. In his reflection on the outcomes of the hui in his role as editor of Te Toa Takitini, Bennett reflected Averill’s concerns over the technical challenges of the establishment of the position. He noted that both Māori and Pākehā needed to understand ‘te hohonutanga o nga ture o te ao mo enei tu whakahaere’84 (the complexity of the laws of the [Anglican Empire] around this protocol). He also pointed out the realpolitik of the situation, noting resistance from some of the Dioceses in the South Island (a relatively soft target for him to aim at) ‘Kaore ratou i te whakaae kia wehe mai nga Maori i roto i nga pakeha. Kaore hoki ratou i te tino whakaae kei te kaha te whakaaaro o te iwi Maori nui tonu kia wehea he Pihopatanga motuhake mo ratou.’85 (They didn’t agree to the marking out of a space for Māori within Pākehā. And they are not in complete agreement with the strength of the commitment of all Māori in separating out an autonomous Diocese for themselves.) Bennett would also begin what would become for him a long, arduous (and eventually ironic) struggle to put forward a nuanced argument that a Pākehā could be acceptable in the role of Pihopa.

Kei te whakaae noatu matou me pakeha te Pihopa tuatahi otira i whakaaatu ano matou ki te whakaaaro nui o te iwi me Maori tonu he Pihopa. E te iwi he titiro matou ki nga uuatanga, ki nga taumahatanga o te whakatakoto i nga kaupapa tuatahi o te Pihopatanga hou i mea ai matou me pakeha te Pihopa tuatahi. Noreira ki te tupono he pakeha te Pihopa tuatahi kaua tatou hei awangawanga.86

*we had long agreed that a Pākehā was to be the first Bishop but also argued that the great thought of the people was that a Māori should be the Bishop. People, we saw the difficulty, the great difficulty in making the case for this new Bishopric [that is
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why we are saying it could be a Pākehā as first in the role. Therefore if it happens to be that a Pākehā is the first Bishop, we should not be upset.

From the conference in Rotorua a new commission was established to lay the groundwork for legislation that would be introduced at the special sitting of General Synod later on that year. With the ubiquitously snappy Anglican title of ‘A Commission on Organisation of Church Work Amongst members of the Maori Race and the Episcopal Supervision Thereof’, the usual Pākehā suspects as members, the commission met twice, on 7th August and 2nd September. One of the biggest challenges presented by the proposed new Māori diocese was its geographical boundaries, and the commission came up with the innovative idea of making those boundaries either the Te Aute College Trust lands in Hawkes Bay or a portion of the Bay of Islands, including Paihia – interestingly places where Māori had been both empowered by and controlled by the Missionaries. The other significant point of difference to the commission was that a new member had been introduced to the inner-workings of General Synod – Apirana Ngata.

A special sitting of General Synod was a rare event in the history of the Church, and showed how seriously the Pākehā side of the Church was taking this issue of a Pīhopa. Held in Wellington from 2-3 December 1925, again Hoani Parata was the only Māori member - an important consideration in a body where speaking rights being reserved exclusively for members were viewed as sacrosanct. Averill as Archbishop and President opened proceedings with an address, in which he once again outlined the ‘problem’ of overlapping jurisdiction. He noted that the Lambeth Conferences (the roughly decennial gathering of Bishops from throughout the Anglican Empire) of 1908 and 1920 had allowed this to occur, however with the rider that ‘the principle of one Bishop for one area is the ideal to be aimed at as the best means for securing the unity of all races and nations in the Holy Catholic Church’ – reflecting once again a racial obsession that underlay any technical challenge. Averill posed several questions to the General Synod he saw as key, including around the efficacy and financial stability of the proposed Māori Pihopatanga, noting that the H & W Williams Memorial Trust had offered to provide significant financial support in the medium

term. But again Averill raised the spectre of race, stating ‘thank God, the colour question is not a problem in New Zealand, and, I trust, never will be.’

After much debate General Synod eventually passed ‘A Statute to Provide for Organisation of Church Work Amongst the Members of the Maori Race and the Episcopal Supervision Thereof’ which would establish a fully-fledged Diocese of Aotearoa with a Pihopa, a Hīnota, a standing committee and control over various Māori trust and lands would be transferred to its control. The issue of geographical overlap was worked around by declaring the actual Diocesan boundaries to be that of the Te Aute Trust estate, a tiny area of 7000 acres which Te Whatuiāpiti in the 1850s had gifted for the foundation of the school. However the Bishop of Aotearoa could have jurisdiction in another’s Diocese ‘with the consent in writing’ from that Diocesan Bishop (which could be revoked at any time), and importantly the Pihopa ‘shall have the right to license clergy to exercise the cure of Souls or to hold other ecclesiastical office in respect of the Maori race within his jurisdiction’ and Māori would ‘cease to be under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of the said Diocese’ – the Pihopa would hold control over the minita and laity of his Diocese. This was everything iwi had been asking for, for at least half a century. The new Diocese of Aotearoa came into effect immediately, and the new Pihopa was to be chosen in February of the following year. The process for selection was a special synod of five clergy and five lay, elected by Māori, who would then confer with the Bishops. Three names would be given back to the Māori synod and then one would be chosen. The establishment of a true Native Church had arrived in all its glory, and in the end it all sounded remarkably easy. But the ‘colour question’ was about to become a very large problem indeed.

The new Hīnota of Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa (the Diocese of Aotearoa) met for two days immediately following General Synod. The membership was comprised of the usual minita as well as leading lay people from a variety of iwi including Meihana Durie, Kingi Tahiwi, Hemi Te Paa, Hori Tupaea, Wiremu Kingi and of course Apirana Ngata. The main focus for the Hīnota became the appointment of a new Pihopa, and it immediately became a sticking point. The Pākehā Bishops demanded a Pākehā for the role, and met stiff resistance from
many of the Māori members. As Bennett reported in *Te Toa Takitini* ‘kaore hoki i ngawari tetahi taha me tetahi taha’\(^{91}\) (neither side showed any flexibility) and the hui was adjourned so that the issue could be taken back to the iwi for discussion to be reconvened in April at the ordination of the newly established position of the Bishop of Waikato. This impasse led to a great deal of debate in the Māori world. At the Komiti Tumuaki meeting immediately following the special General Synod, Canon Keretene noted to his people in the north that this was an important issue for the Church not only for its own sake but because ‘whakaaro ai nga iwi Maori ki tenei take nui.\(^{92}\) (tribes were paying great attention to this important issue). This was especially important for Komiti Tumuaki in light of the inroads the Ratana movement had made in the North.

The debate was also pursued vigorously through the pages of the Church newspaper, *Te Toa Takitini*, still edited by Bennett. In February Bennett reported that ‘I mau tonu mai nga Pihopa ki ta ratou na kupu, me pakeha; i mau tonu hoki nga Maori ki ta ratou, me Maori’\(^{93}\) (the Bishops are holding fast to their position that it must be a Pākehā; the Māori are also holding fast to theirs, that it must be a Māori) followed by a letter to the editor declaring ‘He wawata na te Maori no nga tau roa kia whiwhi ki te mana motuhake a katahi ano na te Hahi i whakatutuki: engari ki te whai mai hoki nga pihopa me pakeha he pihopa mo taua, e kore e tino eke ki te kupu motuhake.’\(^{94}\) (It has been a dream of Māori for many years to seek independence, and only then will the Church be complete: but if the Bishops seek a Pākehā to be Bishop for us, that will not fulfil the word “independent”). The letter was signed with the pseudonym ‘Maori Motuhake’ (Independent Māori). Various iwi also held hui on the topic both in and out of Church circles. Bennett’s own people Te Arawa met in April 1926 and after lengthy discussion passed a motion that tried to assuage both sides of the debate: ‘i tika ai ta ratou tohe me Maori tonu hei Pihopa mo ratou. Otira he whakatau tenei, ka piri pono matou ki taua tangata, ahakoa he Pakeha taua Pihopa tuatahi.’\(^{95}\) ([the opposition’s] argument is correct that a Māori should be the Bishop. However, we declare that we will support that person even if it is a Pākehā for our first Bishop).

---
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Bennett was in a difficult position, knowing the wishes of the iwi for a Māori in the role but also understanding how difficult that would be to achieve in the face of Pākehā intransigence. In an editorial in May 1926 Bennett noted that iwi in both the Auckland and Wellington Dioceses had agreed to having a Pākehā as the first Pīhopa and stated that the Pākehā bishops had told him explicitly that at the June conference the previous year if Māori hadn’t agreed to the possibility of a Pākehā in the role, then they wouldn’t have taken the legislation before General Synod. Aside from the brutal realpolitik of the situation, Bennett also argued that a Pākehā would be better in the role due to the complexities of working with the Pākehā Bishops – a position of assumed intellectual inferiority that was unacceptable to many Māori. Bennett basically argued that the ends would justify the means, that the next Pīhopa would definitely be Māori (although that could have been decades away) and that iwi would gain the Church they had been struggling for, asserting ‘Nui noatu nga painga mo tatou ahakoa pakeha te Pihopa’ (there would be many benefits for us even if there was a Pākehā as Bishop) and ‘ahakoa he pakeha te Pihopa e 95 nga painga mo tatou i roto i te 100.’ (even with a Pākehā as Pihopa we would get 95% of what we wanted). Perhaps most inflammatory of all, Bennett presented the Bishops’ position from their side, noting ‘ko ahau o tatou kei te rongo atu i nga hamumu a o tatou Pihopa, notemea e uru atu ana ahau ki roto i etahi o a ratou huihuinga nunui’ (I’ve heard the Bishops’ private discussions, because I’ve been present at their meetings) and ‘E ki pono atu ana kaore ratou e ngawari mai i tenei wa ki te whakatu Maori hei pihopa tuatahi mo tatou.’ (I can truthfully say they are not receptive at the time to a Māori being elevated as the first Bishop for us), finishing with the positively combustible exhortation ‘noreira ka inoi atu ahau ki a koutou katoa e hiahia nei me Maori te pihopa tuatahi mo tatou, tena whakangawaritiria mai o koutou whakaaro me o koutou hiahia mo tenei wa. Me matua ngoki ’ te tamaiti, ka haere tu ai. ka oma ai’ (Therefore I ask all of you who want a Māori as the first Bishop for us, to be flexible in your thinking and in your desires at this time. We must master crawling as a child, and then we can stand, and then we can run!).

The response to Bennett was fierce, and was led by his contemporary the Rev Reweti Kohere. Ngāti Porou had held their hui on the matter in March during the opening of St

Mary’s Church, the potent symbol of Ngāti Porou spirituality that was dedicated to both the returned soldiers from World War One and to the Kaiwhakaako Piripi Taumataakura. Kohere was a prolific speaker and writer, following in the Ngāti Porou polemicist tradition of Mohi Turei, and vigorously asserted the iwi position whenever and wherever necessary. Reporting back on the Ngāti Porou hui Kohere noted that it was gathering from across Te Tai Rawhiti region, whose demand was crystal clear: ‘I tino marama te hiahia o te hui me Maori taua tangata: kaore he tangata kotahi i tautoko i te pakeha’ (it was the clear desire of the gathering that that person should be Māori: there was not one person that supported a Pākehā). However Kohere also took the opportunity to openly attack the Pākehā bishops and their allies, noting ‘Pai atu te ngaronga o te pihopa ratou ko ona hoa pakeha i taua hui kia mahorahora ai te korero’ (It was good that the Bishop [of Waiapu] and his Pākehā friends weren’t present at our gathering because the discussion was free flowing), and taking his criticism even further asserting ‘Na ka tino marama kaore te pakeha e pai hei pihopa mo te Maori kei tute i te tangata ki tawhiti’ (it is well understood that a Pākehā wouldn’t be good as Bishop for the Māori because they have been bullying Māori for a long time). But not content that his point had been made, Kohere concluded with one last, stunning, critique:

Mo to tohutohu kia ngawari te whakaputa i te kupu kei mamae te pihopa me o tatou hoa pakeha. Me tohutohu hoki koe i nga pihopa ratou ko nga pakeha kia ngawari kia kaua e whakahaweia ki te Maori kia kaua e meingatia te Maori hei arawhata pikinga mo te pakeha ki nga turanga numui. Kua nuku atu tenei i te 100 o nga tau e whakahaere ana te pakeha i te Hahi Maori kati kua eke tenei ki te wa e riro ai ma te Maori ano ia e whakahaere.

As to your instruction to be humble in the use of language in case the Bishop and his Pākehā friends are caused pain. You should also instruct the Bishops and the Pākehā to be humble, and not to be contemptuous towards Māori. Don’t use the Māori people as a ladder so that the Pākehā can ascend to a great position. For over 100 years the Pākehā have directed the Māori Church. That is enough - the time has come for Māori to be in charge.

The last blast was focused partly on Bennett’s role as intermediary for the Pākehā bishops in this debate. But Bennett was no patsy. He had been thrust into the role as the commissary to oversee the election of the new Pihopa and was also a close working colleague of the
Bishops - as were many of the Māori clergy. Bennett also had a unique whakapapa, having been chosen as a young boy by the Bishop of Nelson for further theological education and bought up in both worlds.\(^98\) Firstly Bennett counterattacked the Ngāti Porou hui, questioning the presence of outsiders including (most shockingly of all) non-Anglicans. ‘Kei te miharo ahau mo to hiahia kia uru katoa mai nga manu- hiri ki te whiriwhiri i to tatou pihopatanga. He aha te take o te Kato- rika, o te Momona o te Weteriana, o te Ringatu me etahi atu, ki tenei take? Te tikanga ma nga tangata tuturu o te Hahi, ara tangata kua oti te whakau’\(^99\) (I am amazed that you would wish all of your visitors to be a part of the decision making around our Diocese. What have the Catholics, the Mormons, the Methodists, the Ringatu and others have to do with this issue? This is a process for the true people of the Church, in other words those who have been confirmed.) The fact was that the invitation to the opening of the new Church was a wide-spread invitation (partly fulfilling one of the multitude of plans laid by Ngata over many different causes), and the ecumenical participants were merely observers to proceedings. But Bennett also called Kohere out on his pointed language, writing ‘Kei te whakama ahau ki to korero “ kia tohutohu ki nga pihopa… kia kaua e meingatia te Maori hei arawhata pikinga mo te pakeha ki nga turanga nunui. ” He aha te hua wairua e puta mai ki a tatou i ena tu korero?’ (I am ashamed by your words “You should instruct the Bishops… not to use the Māori people as a ladder for the Pākehā to ascend to a great position.” What is the spiritual fruit that will be borne for us from that type of talk?).

From this debate between two high-profile Mihinare leaders we can see that there was far from a consensus on how to resolve the issue. What can also be seen though was that it was a passionate issue from all sides, and also recognition that iwi were fairly unified in their basic understanding that only a Māori could provide the leadership they sought from the position of Pīhopa. What remained constant though, as always, was an immense pressure on Māori caused by loyalty to an institution that demanded obedience, even obedience to racial domination. Ranginui Walker describes the Pākehā Bishops’ position as a ‘racist manifestation of the relationship of Pakeha dominance and Maori subjection within


the Church was a continuance of the order established by Bishop Selwyn.’

Averill himself may have written that ‘the Bishops of course have no objection to a Maori because he is Maori but because no Maori has had sufficient experience as yet to hold the position,’ and ‘inexperience’ remained the official position of the Pākehā Church. This is doubtful. Bennett even went so far as to contradict Averill’s insistence that the 1925 legislation could allow for either a Māori or a Pākehā in the role, stating that he had been told explicitly by the bishops that they had predetermined that there would be a Pākehā first in the role. Based on the experience of the Native Church across the Anglican Empire, and on the continuing roadblocks thrown up by the Bishops, it is difficult to see this rejection of a Māori candidate for Pīhopa ruling over a full Māori diocese as anything but inevitable.

The electoral synod of Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa (the Diocese of Aotearoa) met in Wellington on 5th August 1926 in a final attempt to resolve the issue, and ideally to vote for a new Pīhopa. The delegates, both lay and clergy, lined up along their iwi lines and the debate commenced. Members from Komiti Tumuaki, led by Hemi Te Paa and Canon Keretene, reiterated their stance that they would support a Pākehā in the role as first Pīhopa of Aotearoa, and Panapa, noting the opposition to a Pākehā said ‘otira na ngapuhi tonu te whakatauki nei: — “He ora ano te oma.”’ (from Ngapuhi comes a saying – live to run again). Wiremu Kingi spoke on behalf of Te Arawa and restated their position that they would prefer a Māori but would accept a Pākehā if necessary. Apirana Ngata led the demand for a Māori, noting the impact appointing a Pākehā would have on the Church, ‘ki te tohe tonu nga Pihopa nei ki to takahi i te hiahia tuturu o te iwi Maori. Tera e pakaru te Hahi i roto i a Ngati Porou. (the continual refusal of the bishops tramples on the true wishes of the Māori people. This will break the Church in Ngāti Porou), and he was supported in this concern over the future impact on the Church by his fellow Ngāti Porou, the Rev. Pine Tamahori who noted:
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Kei te pai rawa atu ki ahau a tatou korero e whakaputaputa nei nga whakaaro o tena o tena. Engari kaore i te pai ki ahau te ahua o te patu a nga Pihopa i te hiahia o te iwi Maori... Kua patua mai e te Atipihopa nga whakaaro o nga mema o Akarana. Ki te takahia e tatou te hiahia o te iwi nui tonu ka pehea a ratou whakaaro ki a tatou? He moni tetahi kaupapa nui e tu ai a tatou mahi. Ma te ngawari o nga whakaaro o te iwi ka kitea ai he moni hei whangai i nga mahi. Ki te kino te whakaaro o te iwi ka uaua te kitea o te moni.

\[\textit{it is exceedingly good to me that we share our thoughts on this and that. However it is not good to me that the bishops appear to be attacking the wishes of the Māori people... The Archbishop\textsuperscript{104} has attacked the thoughts of the members from the diocese of Auckland. If we trample on the aspirations of the people, what will they think of us? Money is an important issue in our work. If the thoughts of the people are good we will see the money to support out work. If the people's thoughts are wrong, it will be difficult to see the money.}\]

The biggest challenge to a Pākehā as Pihopa came not only from concerns about the future of the Māori Church, although they were considerable, but from concerns about what it might do to the Māori worldview on which the Mihinare Church was formed. Throughout this debate Māori understood a fundamental cultural difference, a different worldview that underpinned their expression of Anglicanism whereas the Pākehā bishops either refused to recognise such a difference or were completely ignorant of its existence. Ngata began this line of argument by stating the fundamental differences between Māori and Pākehā ‘ma te maori anake ka taea ai te hinengaro o te maori’ (only Māori can meet the thinking of Māori). This was a consistent theme of Ngata’s not only in this sphere but across his many works; from politics to farming, from leadership to the arts, Ngata maintained that a fundamental cultural distinctiveness existed for Māori that must be preserved at all costs. Ngata was far from alone in this thinking, supported in the meeting by layman Kingi Tahiwi from Ngāti Raukawa and Ngāti Whakaue who declared ‘ehara i te mea ma te matauranga pakeha e tino rite ai tenei Pihopatanga, engari ma te matauranga ki te hinengaro me te ahuatanga o te Maori (it is not Pākehā knowledge that is required to create this Māori diocese, but the knowledge, the wisdom and the nature of the Māori). And minita, supposed bastions of

\textsuperscript{104} Averill was also the bishop of Auckland, holding power over Komiti Tumuaki.
Anglican Empire group-think, supported his view with Rev. Temuera Tokoaitua of Otaki utilising deep-seated tribal imagery by adapting the traditional saying:

E rua enei manu he weka tetahi, he karoro tetahi, no te whenua tetahi no te moana tetahi, he pango tetahi, he ma tetahi. Ko te tangi a te weka rereke i te tangi a te karoro. Pena ano te ahua o te maori me te pakeha. Ma te maori ano ka taea paitia ai te hinengaro o te maori.

There are two birds, one is a weka, the other is a gull. One is from the land, one is from the sea. One is black, one is white. The cry of the weka is different from the cry of the gull. Similarly, the nature of the Māori is different from that of the Pākehā. From a Māori will come an appropriate understanding of Māori.

The situation was frustrating to all present, and Hori Tupaea of Ngāti Te Whatuīapiti in the Hawkes Bay vented his frustration with many of the clergy present by offering a radical solution ‘mehemea kaore nga minita maori nei e hiahia ana ki te turanga Pihopa kia riro mai i a ratou kaati e Hika ma hoatu ko Apirana Ngata hei Pihopa mo tatou, kua kore hoki nga minita i pirangi!’ (however if no Māori minister wants to be Bishop when they are asked then my friends we should get Apirana Ngata as a Bishop for us, if no minister wants it!). Apirana Ngata’s response to this suggestion, if any, was unreported.

The Hīnota was in deadlock, and when Ngata and Tupaea moved a motion ‘ko te whakaaro o tenei Hui ko te Pihopa tuatahi mo te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa, hei te Maori.’ (the decision of this meeting is that the first bishop for the Diocese of Aotearoa will be a Māori), it was challenged with an amendment by Hori Tane and Hemi Te Paa, both from the North, stating ‘Ko te whakaaro o tenei Hui ko te Pihopa tuatahi hei te pakeha reo Maori’ (the decision of this meeting is that the first bishop is to be a Pākehā who speaks Māori). Their amendment was defeated, and Ngata’s original motion was reput. The motion for a Māori to be the first Pīhopa was won, but only by nine votes to eight – far from a decisive outcome, and the Hīnota agreed that there was no mandate to progress with either option. The following day the Hīnota met with the Pākehā bishops, and presented a revised proposal, that the Archbishop be placed in charge of the Pihopatanga o Aotearoa, and that a Māori be appointed as Pihopa o Aotearoa under him as suffragan. Essentially the Māori Church would be able to retain its newly gained cake, and be able to eat it too. The Hīnota also
requested that Ngata and Bennett attend the next session of General Synod planned for 1928, where they would present these issues in the ecclesiastical lion’s den.

By the arrival of General Synod in April 1928 the Hīnota Māori plan for an essentially autonomous Pihopa who would report to the Archbishop had effectively been sunk with several synods, including Waiapu, passing motions requesting a Pākehā bishop of Aotearoa with a Māori assistant bishop – a much lesser option for Māori. It is worth noting that in a polite form of protest the Māori members of the Waiapu synod abstained from voting on the measure. Ngata blamed Bennett for shepherding this compromise through, souring an already problematic relationship, but declared ‘our side stands firm’ and was ready for ‘the dust up’ that was to come. The ‘dust up’ was a meeting of the Hīnota Māori for two days prior to the General Synod sitting in Wellington. The Hīnota met from 18-19 April with the usual members plus some new high-profile lay delegates including the Northern Māori MP Tau Henare; Henare Balneavis - who would soon be Ngata’s Private Secretary when he became Minister of Native Affairs; Te Āti Awa leader Hapi Love; and Kai Tahu doctor Edward Ellison. It was a potent display by the political master Ngata who had conducted a lobbying campaign leading up to the meeting and who had gathered together essentially a reunion of the Young Māori Party – Te Aute College alumni and their allies. It was a force to be reckoned with.

As an opening gambit the Hīnota discussed three options which they then sent to the Archbishop for his feedback: their most current proposal for a full Māori Pihopa reporting to the Archbishop; a Pākehā who could speak te reo Māori; and one Māori and one Pākehā bishop working side by side – the latter being the latest Te Arawa proposal. In these proposals the Hīnota was offering a form of compromise, with option one watering down their demands, if only slightly. The Archbishop replied, somewhat predictably, he would only accept option two – a Pākehā who could speak te reo Māori. After further discussion, and with Ngata having pre-prepared the ground, the Hīnota responded ‘te iwi Maori e kotahi tonu ana mo te Maori tonu hei Pihopa’ (the Māori people are still united for a Māori as Bishop). Ngata then had to address General Synod alone, as Bennett had in the
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meantime become a member of General Synod for the Diocese of Waiapu, and was therefore unable to be part of the delegation.

Ngata was, as has been noted, a masterful politician. He had been the first Māori to graduate from a University, and was the first Māori lawyer. He had also been trained for leadership from birth, raised at the feet of Ngāti Porou military leader Rapata Wahawaha. Ngata had been knighted the previous year, and was something of a polymath, with expertise in many fields from farming to the arts, from politics through to the newly formed discipline of anthropology. Ngata’s embrace of anthropology was a reframing of an age-old expression of mana motuhake (self-determination) in a way that he could get across to what he knew was a crucial - but often hostile - Pākehā audience. In Parliament he shared his philosophy:

The people of this country seem to think that because some of the Maoris wear stiff collars - as I do - and now and again appear in top hats, that underneath the top hat and the stiff collar the Maori has altered very much. He has not, and in some of these customs he has varied little, if at all, from his ancestors of hundred or two hundred years ago.\textsuperscript{109}

Ngata delineated his position on the process of change and its impact on Māori. His conceptualisation of layers of change was, on the surface, surprising for such a seemingly conservative politician. It was however a reflection of his personality and his duality, and he lived this philosophy to the fullest. His assertion that a century of colonization had not altered Māori fundamentally would have been an anathema to many, not least his colleagues in Parliament.

It would be easy to get the impression that because the material and outwardly observable aspects of Maori life such as food habits and housing arrangements have changed, other more spiritual things have altered correspondingly and in proportion. Actually there is no correspondence, proportion does not apply, and the psychological factors characteristically Maori exert a persistent influence and supply a racial need.\textsuperscript{110}

\textsuperscript{109} New Zealand Parliamentary Debates, 1931, 230, p.561.

Armed with this belief in cultural continuity, Ngata set out to develop a model of leadership around the concept of the fundamental importance of culture. Ngata's use of the term is probably best described in relation to the concept of tikanga, a culturally-constructed way of doing things. Ngata consciously utilized elements of culture as tools in his work on everything from economic development schemes through to the church to which he was committed. Ngata was not alone in this commitment to retaining a Māori world-view. He was the spearhead of a movement across iwi manifested in the Young Māori Party, a movement to which, even if they didn’t always agree on tactics, Bennett, Kohere, and even Hoani Parata belonged.

And Ngata was indeed committed to the church. From the formation of a Pihopa Māori through to fixing leaking Church roofs, Ngata had an absolute grasp of detail alongside an unsurpassed strategic vision. He had also been the MP for Eastern Māori since 1905 and would become Minister of Native Affairs in December of 1928, meaning he had a command of – and was not at all intimidated by – the parliamentary nature of the General Synod, nor by its members who were the aristocracy of Pākehā New Zealand society.

On Friday 20th April at 3pm the Archbishop allowed Ngata to address the General Synod. Ngata was given twenty minutes to speak to Māori aspirations in the Church which was, as he noted, ‘10 minutes less than the political Parliament allows for the discussion of trifles’. Ngata was also suffering from the flu, and as he stood to face the 70 members of General Synod he decided ‘the pervading characteristic of this body was intellect – and ecclesiastical intellect at that. Taking this in at a glance I decided not to argue with them but to go straight for their hearts.’ Bennett, who had opposed Ngata’s plans all along, wrote his observations of the day in *Te Toa Takitini* and was effusive in his praise of Ngata’s delivery:

---
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Aroha ana te matakitaki atu ki te mangai o te iwi Maori e tu mokemoke mai ana i roto i te kiri pakeha. Otira ngaro ana te aroha i te parekareka o te whakarongo atu ki to tatou mangai e riringi atu ra i nga kupu nunui, i nga kaupapa hononu e rewa ai te ngakau kohatu o te iwi pakeha ki te tangi a te iwi Maori mo tetahi tonu o ratou hei Pihopa.

We sympathetically observed the representative of the Māori people standing alone amidst the Pākehā. However that feeling was dispelled by the delight in listening to our representative as he let flow the great words and the deep understanding that transformed the entombed hearts of the Pākehā as they heard the cry of the Māori people for one of themselves to be Bishop.

Tu rangatira mai ana te taha Maori i nga mahi a Ta Apirana. Ngohengohe ana te ngakau te wairua o te iwi pakeha. Ka mutu tetahi o nga tino whaikorero a Ta Apirana ko taua kauwhau ki te Hinota Tianara. Tera e waiho tenei whaikorero hei taonga tuku iho ki a tatou tamariki i muri i a tatou me tenei kupu apiti: —Na tenei whaikorero a Ta Apirana Ngata i ngawari ai te whakaetanga a te Hinota Tianara ki te inoi a te iwi Maori kia waiho hei tetahi Maori tonu he Pihopa mo ratou

The Māori side were made proud by the work of Sir Apirana. It softened the hearts and the spirits of the Pākehā. This was such a powerful speech, Sir Apirana’s address to the General Synod. We must offer this speech as a treasure to be handed down to our children who will come after us, along with this postscript: this speech by Sir Apirana Ngata was instrumental in gaining acceptance by General Synod of the plea by the Māori people to have a Māori as their Bishop.

In response to Ngata’s presentation General Synod set up a select committee that was to meet overnight and present a new proposal the following day. The committee included Bennett as a Waiapu delegate to General Synod, along with a group of Pākehā bishops, clergy and laity. Their report to General Synod noted that the previous provision for Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa was inoperative, and stated that ‘it is imperative that General Synod should immediately take some steps to bind together the Church of England adherents among the Maori race.’ Ngata’s speech had been so successful that (no doubt with Bennett’s encouragement) the select committee accepted the argument that a Pihopa Māori ‘would be able to understand and help the Maoris in a way that no Pakeha could’. They
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declared however that the position should be that of an assistant bishop, not a full, attempting to mitigate this by noting that even if it wouldn’t unify Māori work in the Church, its effect would be ‘in the spiritual sphere’. The legislation that moved forward was ‘Title A, Canon IV Of Episcopal Supervision of the Maori Race’\(^{116}\) and rescinded the 1925 legislation, effectively wiping out the Hīnota, resources and authority of the Māori Diocese. In its place was established the position of Te Pīhopa o Aotearoa (The Bishop of Aotearoa), the same name as previously but with drastically reduced powers. The new Pīhopa would be suffragan to the Bishop of Waiapu, an assistant in theory completely dependent on the whims and wishes of the Bishop of Waiapu in their leadership of Māori. They could work in other dioceses but only with the permission of the local diocesan bishop – a provision that would prove very problematic in the near future. The right to license minita – a key factor in building the Church on the ground - would be at the discretion of the local diocesan bishop, and instead of a full Māori delegation to General Synod the Pīhopa o Aotearoa could only attend General Synod if he was lucky enough to be voted in as a member on behalf of the Diocese of Waiapu. The bill was eventually passed easily 40-15, with strong support from laity and only the newly-appointed Bishop of Waikato voting against in the house of bishops. The main opposition came from the house of clergy including Archdeacon Simkin - who would soon provide much greater opposition to the position in his role as Bishop of Auckland. There was also, as Te Toa Takitini noted, resistance from English expatriate clergy: ‘ko te apitihana nui i ahu mai i nga Minita ara i nga tangata kaore i whanau ki Nui Tireni kaore hoki e tino mohio ana ki te Maori’ (great opposition came from the clergy, especially those not born in New Zealand who really don’t understand the Māori people).\(^{117}\)

From one perspective this had been a tremendous setback for the Māori Church, and even for Venn’s vision of a Native Church. The new Pīhopa would be a potent symbol for iwi, but they had lost their ability to control resources and make decisions for themselves, and to have a say in General Synod – the structural Haahi motuhake was no more. But Ngata was more optimistic, having secured what he saw as the crucial objective of a Māori in the leadership role for the iwi. Writing to Peter Buck he shared his thoughts:

\(^{116}\) Ibid, pp.415-16.

\(^{117}\) TTT, vol.81, 1 May 1928, p.774.
We asked for a Maori Bishop without any of this paraphernalia, without mana (except the mana whakapapa which to the Maori church-man is the supreme test of a Bishop’s status). We wanted a Maori as the nucleus of a movement and of an eventual organisation that he will create gradually from below – the natural growth rooted in the Maori heart & mind & shaped to suit the characteristics of the people. Truly this ethnology is a fine thing even as applied to the evolution of a Maori Church that takes cognisance of the physical, mental, social & spiritual makeup of the modern Maori – the slightly modified descendant of his tohunga forebears. … We are not worrying a bit about the constitutional position. It is enough that one of our people will be called to this high office and that the responsibility is at last on the race to make good. It was said that the Maoris could not organise. E Tama! Kei hea ra nga toto o te iwi kua ngaro ki te po? Kei hea nga uri o Ngatoroirangi, o Uenuku. Ina tonu ra e ora nei hea hanga ki o ratau ake ringa i ta ratau i wawata. They have been asking us to fashion things after a likeness seen through pakeha eyes – a, i te otinga ka meatia hei kata, hei taunu, They were not the things we wanted, nor were they moulded by our unfettered hands, to any design near our hearts. Engari tenei kua tukua nei – akuanei karangatia ai te manawa, te hinengaro katoa o te iwi hei whakairo.\(^{118}\)

Buck was supportive of Ngata’s optimism, comparing Ngata to the great pre-European conquerors of the Pacific and declaring: ‘not all their victories are to be compared to that of securing a Maori Bishop against that most obstinate of armies, the Anglican Church.’\(^{119}\)

Challenges remained, however. The canon establishing the position required sufficient funding to be found before a Pihopa could be appointed, and work was undertaken amongst the various iwi to raise funds. Komiti Tumuaki met in July and focused on raising funds in the North to support the new position, moving that ‘kia tukua te reo kaha o Te Komiti Tumuaki ki te iwi nui tonu o Te Pihopatanga o Akarana kia kohia tetahi moni hei tahua Awhina mo te Pihopa Maori o Aotearoa’\(^{120}\) (we send out the demand of Komiti Tumuaki to the whole tribe of the Diocese of Auckland to raise funds as an endowment for the Māori Bishop of Aotearoa). Ngata noted that iwi were committing themselves to the new position, with Ngāti Porou guaranteeing £300 per annum for the first five years, the Arawa

\(^{118}\) Ngata to Buck, 6 May 1928, in Sorrenson ed., *Na To Hoa Aroha*, vol 1., pp.87-88.

\(^{119}\) Buck to Ngata, 24 September 1928, in Sorrenson ed., *Na To Hoa Aroha*, vol 1., p.132.

\(^{120}\) Minutes of Komiti Tumuaki of the Diocese of Auckland, 7-9 July 1928, Maori S.C. Minute Book 1923-1965, S4 Komiti Tumuaki, Acc.49, ADA, Auckland.
Trust board committing £250 a year for the same term, and Ngāti Kahungunu raising £125 straight away.\textsuperscript{121} Ngata also noted resistance from the Diocese of Auckland to contribute ‘because the Archbishop is lukewarm & his two Archdeacons Simkin and Hawkins hostile’.\textsuperscript{122} But the iwi were determined to provide the funding from amongst themselves, lining up with Azariah’s vision for a self-supporting Native Church.

The canon also had removed the possibility of iwi choosing their own Pīhopa, even if in consultation with the Pākehā bishops. The new legislation made the appointment dependent on the whim of the Pākehā North island bishops – another example of the Pākehā demand to retain control over the Māori Church. If they were forced to accept a Māori as Pīhopa, then the position would be stripped of authority and they would control the choice. From early on the rumour mill had positioned Bennett as the leading choice for the position. He had, after all, been leading the charge on behalf of the Pākehā bishops in the debate, and he was a well-known quantity to them. Komiti Tumuaki - who had their own potential candidate in their chair Canon Keretene - expressed agnosticism regarding the eventual choice ‘kahore he raruraru ahakoa ko wai te tangata e tohungia hei Pihopa mo Aotearoa’\textsuperscript{123} (there will be no problem regardless of which person is selected as Bishop of Aotearoa). Ngata however had serious misgivings over the possibility of Bennett remarking rather acerbically ‘he [Bennett] does not suit the majority of the Maori communities, firstly because of his pakeha affinities and secondly he has the Arawa weakness of succumbing to pakeha flattery.’\textsuperscript{124} Ngata instead wanted his fellow Ngāti Porou minita Pine Tamahori as Pīhopa, but Tamahori was not known to the Pākehā bishops and Ngata believed he had received a prior omen that Tamahori would not be the Pīhopa.\textsuperscript{125}

Eventually Bennett was chosen to be the first Pihopa o Aotearoa, and was ordained bishop on 2\textsuperscript{nd} December 1928 in Waiaupu Cathedral in Napier. It was time for great celebration amongst iwi. In the north, Komiti Tumuaki reported ‘I whakaputa nui nga kaumatua o Te Rarawa, Te Aupouri me Ngati Kahu i o ratou whakapono mo nga mea katoa

\textsuperscript{121} Ngata to Buck, 1 August 1928, in Sorrenson ed., \textit{Na To Hoa Aroha}, vol 1., pp.124-25.
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e pa ana ki te Pihopa Maori, me te hari nui i te mea kua whakaingoatia te tangata’126 (there was great exclamation from the elders of Te Rarawa, Te Aupouri and Ngāti Kahu in their confidence surrounding the events regarding the Māori Bishop, and great was the joy at the naming of the person for the position) and their greetings to the new Pihopa were verging on ecstatic, proclaiming:

Kia tukua he mihi na tenei hui ki te Rev Pererika Akuhata Peneti mona kua karangatia nei hei kai-timata i te kakahu mo nga Pihopa o Aotearoa; mona i riro hei kai-whakaputa i te whakaaro o nga kaumatua i roto i te 50 tau kua pahure; hei whakaatu ano hoki i te hari nui o enei iwi, me te inoi kia tau ki runga i a ia te maru o Ihowa, hei mea e kaha ai ia ki te arahi i taua iwi Maori.127

*We send the greetings of this gathering to the Reverend Frederick Augustus Bennett who has been called to be the first to be vested [with the symbols of office] as Bishop of Aotearoa; he has become the expression of the planning of the elders for over 50 years; a demonstration of the great joy of these tribes, and the prayers that the protection of God settle on him, strengthening him so that he may lead us, the Māori people*

Finally, as the Church in the North noted, there was a Pihopa Māori in place. The inspiration provided by Crowther and Azariah had manifested in a form of Māori leadership that, while primarily symbolic in administrative terms, was a potent symbol to many iwi. The new Pihopa was part of the thinking that had underpinned the development of te Haahi Mihinare since its conception, an iwi-driven institution summed up by Ngata as ‘a Maori Church different in form and ritual, but retaining all the fundamentals of the Anglican Church.’128

127 Ibid.
The ordination of Pīhopa Frederick Bennett as Pīhopa o Aotearoa in 1928 represented the culmination of a half century of struggle for Mihinare to establish not only an Anglican episcopacy, but one that reflected in some way their own cultural values. It had been an exercise in leadership amongst iwi, and had brought iwi into contact with new ideas and new forces that assisted in the renegotiation of mātauranga. However having one bishop with limited powers was never going to prove satisfactory for Mihinare. There were still strict limits on how they could practice their own expression of faith, and these restrictions were tied to the ownership and exercise of constitutional power in the Church. The second half of the twentieth century became another time of testing, where iwi would utilise the church as a space to develop new ideas around leadership and constitutional ideas, and how to exist as ‘Māori’ in what could often be an oppressive environment with the pressures of assimilation being ever present. New leadership would emerge, both minita and lay people, who would challenge preconceived notions of what the Anglican Church was capable of. These leaders would bring new ideas – constitutional, legal, educational - from wider society to test in the Church, and in turn utilise the Church as a testing ground for society as a whole. In the process of renegotiation iwi would develop new ties to one another and in the crucible of race relations the concept of ‘Māori’ would be strengthened.

Bennett was seen in some Mihinare circles as a controversial choice for the first Pīhopa o Aotearoa. Ngata was not enamoured of him, his doubts about him being compounded by the struggle over the selection of a Māori for the position. Bennett’s first priority was to travel around the country gathering financial and moral support as well as establishing a transformative vision within the limitations of the position. The Pīhopa o Aotearoa had some severe limitations imposed as a result of the demand for a Māori to fill the position, and the appointment as a suffragan to the Bishop of Waiapu meant not only that he was
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theoretically subservient to the (Pākehā) Bishop of Waiapu but also that he could only minister in other Dioceses with the permission of the respective Bishop. However iwi had far greater plans for the position, and such restrictions did not limit the potential of the position.

As noted Bennett’s election to the position had already caused great celebration in te Tai Tokerau and Canon Keretene, speaking on behalf of the Church in the North, placed the election as one of the top two milestones of the Māori Church, exclaiming ‘Ka rua ai enei ra nunui o te motu. Ko tetahi ko te unga mai o te whakapono, ko tetahi ko te whakaaetanga o te wa, kua kaumatua taua te iwi Maori, kua kaumatua hoki to taua whakapono’ (there are two great days across the land. One is the arrival of the Gospel [Christmas 1814] and another is the arrival of the time when we have reached our maturity as the Māori people, and our faith has also matured [12 December 1928’]). This wave of enthusiasm was more than mere rhetoric and was matched by a determination to put flesh on the ecclesiastical bones. Komiti Tumuaki was the Standing Committee for the Māori in the Auckland Diocese and had been established in 1923 inspired by Bishop Azariah. Its establishment had not just been inspired by the personal accomplishments of Azariah, but by his manifestation of what a Native Church could and should aspire to. On his arrival to the meeting of Komiti Tumuaki in March 1929 Bennett was appointed Tumuaki (president) in an ex-officio capacity, thus giving his position an authority far beyond the figurehead envisaged in the 1928 General Synod compromise legislation. Bennett himself also saw the role as far more than a support-figure for the Pākehā Diocesan bishop, and laid out a hugely ambitious vision for not only his own role but also for what would be in effect a new, national, Māori church. After thanking the iwi of the North for their support, he laid out an intellectual and theological challenge for an ecclesiology that would focus more on a Māori world-view. He also outlined an organisational plan to ‘kia whakatoria etahi Atirikona Maori hei mangai mo te Pihopa Maori i tena Takiwa i tena Takiwa’ (establish Māori Archdeacons as representatives for the Māori Bishop in the various regions). The position of Archdeacon played an important role in the Anglican hierarchical obsession, being in effect a minita who carried
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the mana (authority) of the office of the Pīhopa – a “regional manager”. Bennett’s proposal, supported wholeheartedly by Komiti Tumuaki, was in effect the immediate roll-out of a national organisation. To compound this thinking, Bennett’s proposal did not refer specifically to diocesan boundaries but instead reflected iwi and hapū thinking around territories, or ‘takiwā’.

This early push to redefine the Pīhopa o Aotearoa in a Māori framework that would bring about the mana motuhake (self-determination) that had been pushed for during the establishment of the position came as a pleasant surprise to Ngata, who noted that he had ‘met the Clergy and laity of the north… and learnt from them of the excellent impression made in that region regarding the Maori bishopric. The same impression has been made during a recent visit of Fred [Bennett] to Waiapu.’

Ngata further noted that ‘The new Bishop has done well so far on his first round. The people have caught the significance of the Church’s concession and all denominations have acclaimed it’. It was not all plain sailing for Bennett however, and the Māori understanding of “Pīhopa” differed from “Bishop” not only in their aspirations for the position but also in terms of their demands for accountability. At a hui in 1935 iwi took the opportunity to take stock of the position, where, according to Ngata ‘Fred had a severe overhaul from the delegates present led by Ngati-Porou’. This demand for accountability was more than just iwi interplay at work. Support for the position was more than mere rhetoric around self-sufficiency, but instead iwi were putting their money where their faith was. The 1925 legislation for the position would have transferred a substantial portion of the Māori land-holdings to Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa. Instead, and again seemingly out of a sense of vindictiveness, these resources were retained by the Dioceses meaning the Pīhopa o Aotearoa was reliant on the whim of the Dioceses and the commitment of the iwi. Iwi contributed greatly, particularly the cash contributions of the Te Arawa Trust Board and Ngāti Porou through the Ngāti Porou Dairy Company, so those two iwi in particular had a great deal of interest in getting a good return on their
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investment. The crucial relationship between Ngata as the leading Mihinare layperson and Bennett functioned well on a personal level, with Bennett trying to recruit Ngata’s son Henare into the ministry at the end of the war. As a national leader Bennett grew in stature, cementing the role of Pīhopa o Aotearoa in Pākehā consciousness through his attendance at the World Council of Churches and Lambeth Conferences in 1948, and in particular by preaching during the trip at that great icon of imagined English nobility, Westminster Abbey.

The challenge for the positioning of Pīhopa o Aotearoa within the national Anglican structure was exacerbated by the wider economic and social context. The Great Depression had caused pressure on Diocesan finances and the greatest impact of this was felt in the Māori areas of the Church. In the Wellington Diocese a system of Pākehā “Superintendants” had followed on from Bishop Octavius Hadfield’s personal (and somewhat patriarchal) supervision of ministry to Māori. These positions had largely been filled from 1885-1940 by father and then son A.O.Williams and W.G.Williams. However in the financial depression Māori work ‘suffered more from the prevailing depression than perhaps any other department’ in the Diocese and eventually the Superintendent position was abolished and a Māori Mission Committee was established with Māori work largely passing to the hands of Pākehā regional Archdeacons who ‘with all the [presumed] goodwill in the world… cannot give much time to the Maori work.’ A side effect of this though was the establishment in 1944 of six Māori pastorates that reflected both geographical and iwi lines: Wellington, Wairarapa, Rangitikei South-Manawatu, Wainuiaru, Wanganui Rangitikei North, joined later by later Aotea-Kurahaupo, and Rangiatea. Māori in other Dioceses had similar mixed fortunes, remaining low on the priority list. The unfortunately premature death of Canon Hoani Parata in 1928 at the age of only 47 deprived iwi in the Dunedin Diocese of a very important figure. Parata, grandson of Southern Māori MP Tame Parata,
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had been amongst other things a Curate on the island of Gibraltar; European-based fundraiser for the Young Māori Party; chaplain to the Māori Pioneer battalion during World War One; and had been elected by the Diocese as one of their General Synod representatives. His death displayed the fragility of Mihinare leadership that could impact on a Diocesan structure. Even Komiti Tumuaki was in some ways a product of the Depression, with funding for Archdeacon Hawkins as overseer drying up and the Diocese being forced to hand over a measure of power to Canon Keretene and his Committee.

For iwi the church had continuously been a space to seek new ways of existing and thinking, a creative space for reinterpreting ontological meaning. Although this creativity had been restricted in some ways by the race relations dynamics, these dynamics had also performed the function of being a crucible for shaping new directions and understandings. This was nowhere more evident than in the struggle for mana motuhake, or constitutional autonomy. Even though celebratory of the achievements of the new position of Pihopa o Aotearoa, Ngata was conscious of the potential for pushback by reactionary Pākehā elements. He reasoned that Bennett was a great asset in this struggle, writing that Bennett through clever management of relations with the Pākehā church leadership had ‘done well, better than anyone else could have done, in breaking down any prejudices on the pakeha side and in strengthening the goodwill of the pakeha towards the Maori portion of the Church.’ However Ngata was aware also of an ongoing debate in Pākehā church circles, that ‘in pakeha synods and Standing Committees many wise heads were wondering whether the movement was leading to separation or to the promotion of ways attuned to the Maori psychology of spiritual work among the Maori people.’ By the late 1940s Ngata held a great deal of concern for the future of the Māori church, expressing concerns over everything from the increasing need for urban ministry, to theological education, through to the lack of promotional prospects for minita. But most of all Ngata worried about the always constant and seemingly increasing pressures of assimilation, and ‘whether [pakeha leadership in the Church] aims deliberately at the removal of the special organisation which
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the elders of the Church through a century created to meet the needs of the Maori communities."\(^{19}\)

This assimilationist pressure was present across all Dioceses, and it manifested particularly strongly in the Auckland Diocese under the leadership of the English-born Bishop William John Simkin. On his arrival from England Simkin had become the Vicar of Wairoa in the Diocese of Waiapu, and following his time there he held several key positions in the Diocese including Archdeacon of Hawkes Bay before moving to Auckland in 1926. With the heavy Māori populations and influence of iwi in the Diocese, it could be assumed that Simkin would have had much exposure to iwi and perhaps even a measure of appreciation for a Māori world view. However very soon after his ordination as Bishop of Auckland in 1940 Simkin began to impose a new order on Māori in that Diocese. Simkin’s approach to Māori was summarised by his address to his Diocesan synod in 1943, where he asserted that ‘the policy which has been followed, not only in this diocese, but in other dioceses in the province, of regarding Maoris almost as members of another Church, “the Maori Church,” and my ordaining clergy to minister to them only is, in my opinion, open to serious question, I believe the time is approaching – nay, is past - when the ordination of Maoris to Minister to their own people only should cease.’\(^{20}\) To compound his denial of the existence of a distinct Māori church, Simkin noted of the 1882 withdrawal of the Church Missionary Society – advocated by Venn and others - that ‘the withdrawal of the pakeha missionaries was premature’. \(^{21}\) In doing so he ignored over a century of Māori faith formation. This policy led to a gradual escalation of tension, in which Bennett was obstructed in his mission as Pīhopa o Aotearoa by Simkin. In 1946 Bennett conducted a service of confirmation in Te Kao in the far North, and Simkin demanded to know from Keretene the details ‘of which visit he had no knowledge and now requires some explanation.’\(^{22}\)
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Simkin was more than talk, and for Māori in the Auckland Diocese his actions were brutal. In March 1941, nine months into his episcopacy, he attended the meeting of Komiti Tumuaki in Whangārei. On arriving at the meeting Simkin assumed the chair, side-lining Canon Keretene who had been guiding the work of the Komiti for almost two decades to that point. Revealingly, all previous meetings had had the minutes taken in te reo Māori, the language used by those present at the hui. This was the first time in its eighteen year history that the minutes were recorded in English. Simkin, fully supported by his Archdeacon Steele who had been based in the North since 1923, began the meeting by questioning the purpose of its existence, demanding to know ‘what is the constitution of, and the justification for, the Maori Standing Committee and the “Hinota Takiwa” [Regional Synod]? What definition has been given to their authority and powers?’ He also questioned the way in which the hui was conducted, telling the assembled Māori ‘if we are to do any substantial business at our meetings, then it is inevitable that they should be held apart from the people… nothing of moment is lost and much gained by holding our meetings away from the “marae”.’ Simkin also demanded that Māori candidates for ordination come as individuals, ‘and not impelled by the inclinations of their people, as has so often happened in the past. The candidates were best found at an early age, so that they could receive the benefits of training at the Church Secondary Schools’ thus creating more malleable minita less influenced by and less tied to their whānau, hapū and iwi. And finally Simkin outlined his plan for ‘unification of the two races’ by forcing Māori pastorates to come under existing Pākehā parish authority because – according to him - ‘the present differentiation is… contrary to the Will of God.’ It was the last meeting of Komiti Tumuaki for twenty years, and a devastating blow for the Māori church in the North.

Ngata viewed the deteriorating situation partly as being personality-driven, speculating that Simkin had held ‘aspirations for the office’ of Pīhopa o Aotearoa during the establishment struggle and was taking out his frustrations on the people. Among his other talents Ngata was a gifted strategist and he could see the importance of the Church in the North and the potential for Simkin’s actions to have a fatal impact on the aspirations imbued in the office of Te Pīhopa o Aotearoa. In fact Ngata was worried about all of the North Island
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speculating on the potential for what could be described as a Domino-Theory type of situation where the rejection of Bennett in the North could spread to other Dioceses – a prescient parallel to Dwight Eisenhower’s use of the concept to describe the spread of Communism several years later.26 The parallels to the contemporary fear of communism would be used by Ngata in other ways.

By the late 1940s Māori in the Diocese of Waiapu were experimenting with a new form of decision-making amongst themselves, the Hui Tōpū – the Combined Assembly of the Diocese. This form of governance brought together the local Māori pastorates to focus on the various issues of the life of the Church. This hui, although not canonically recognised as such was essentially a Hinota for Māori, moving motions that would impact across the life of the Church from local issues such as housing, Sunday School and stipends through to larger national issues including the newly formed National Council of Churches Māori Section and the affairs of other Dioceses.27 The hui was also able to increase its own remit partly due to the recent appointment of the relatively new Bishop Norman Lesser who had been appointed in 1946 - the fourth diocesan bishop in eight years.28 The 1948 Hui Tōpū was held from 9-11 April at Poho-o-Rawiri marae in Gisborne, and was attended by lay and clergy leadership from iwi across the diocese including Ngāti Porou, Ngāti Kahungunu, Rongowhakaata and Te Arawa.29 It had been called and carefully orchestrated by Ngata himself and was a highly successful hui, with the Southern Cross newspaper noting ‘the conference was regarded as one of the most outstanding in Maori church history’.30

Ngata utilised the hui as a platform to strike against Simkin and the policies of the Auckland Diocese. Ngata had invited Aperehama Kena, who had been Diocesan Māori Missionary responsible for Auckland City from 1940-1948, but who had recently moved to Whanganui, part of the Diocese of Wellington. Safe from possible Auckland retribution,
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Kena stirred up those at the Hui, telling of ‘how licenses of Maori lay-readers had been cancelled and how Maori synods had been abolished.’ 31 The experienced and wily politician Ngata was conducting an investigation, or even perhaps a trial, of Auckland’s policies through the hui and, not incidentally, through the media who reported extensively on the proceedings. Ngata declared to the Hui (and to the gathered media) that ‘an attempt was being made to smother the Maori Church in [Auckland] diocese… it was a matter of deep concern to all. I had heard certain things to the effect that all was not well in the north, but this is the first concrete evidence.’ 32 Following Winston Churchill’s fresh anti-Soviet rhetorical line, powerful in that it not only reflected current international enmity but also evoked repression of freedom and even the use extensive of force through secret police, 33 Ngata began to use the phrase “Iron Curtain” to describe the situation in Auckland. The Auckland Star reported the following Monday ‘The words “Iron Curtain” were used again and again by Sir Apirana Ngata and other leaders of the Maori laity to describe the situation of Maori adherents of the Church of England in the Auckland Diocese’. 34 Ngata the tactician had invited (Lieutenant Colonel, later Sir) James Henare to attend the hui, a powerful figure from the North fresh from commanding the 28th Māori battalion in World War Two. Henare told the press he had come ‘to gauge the feeling and attempt to understand the work of the Maori church there, and he was returning inspired by its spirit and encouraged by its people’ 35 but this was more than a mere morale boosting tour. Henare asserted that the role of Te Pīhopa o Aotearoa should be beefed up to assistant status across all Dioceses. Henare didn’t seem to mind the propaganda value he brought to the proceedings, where ‘amidst applause, Sir Apirana Ngata congratulated Colonel Henare on having emerged from behind the “iron curtain”’. 36

Not content to let the images and speeches speak for themselves, Ngata pressed his attack, emoting to the Auckland newspaper that ‘I am an old man and have lived a long
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time, but this is one of the most pathetic things in connection with our people I have ever
known… we are very disturbed owing to what is happening with our kin in the Church
elsewhere.’ Alongside the appeal to the heart, Ngata also added a very direct challenge to
the Pākehā power-structures everywhere. He noted the increasing numbers of Māori from
the East Coast tribes and from Te Arawa in Auckland and Wellington, ‘and declared that if
those dioceses were unable to undertake their spiritual nourishment then the Waiapu
diocese would have to consider seriously whether it should send someone to look after
them. “Are we going to let them grow up as heathens… just because of artificial diocesan
boundaries. This is a bigger question than bishops and must be tackled.”’

The response from Auckland Diocese was swift and fairly brutal. Only four days
after the report of the Hui came out, and only six days after hui itself, the Diocese had rallied
its response. The Waiapu hui, the response from the Diocese said, painted a ‘distorted
picture of Maori Church life’. Simkin’s Archdeacons brought out Minita Mangatitoki
Cameron (also from the North) to refute Kena’s points, who declared ‘charges that the Maori
clergy are being subordinated, either in practice or in intent, to the pakeha, are calculated to
arouse the anger of my people’. There was a vigorous defence of Simkin himself, with the
Diocese declaring ‘there is no one in the Church of New Zealand who loves the Maori
people more than he does. In his diocese he will tolerate no sign of the colour bar which
some would erect between Maori and pakeha.’ However this was undermined somewhat by
a denial of the cultural existence of Māori, in that ‘there is no such thing as a Maori Church
any more than there is a pakeha Church.’ The attack also returned fire against Ngata
himself by asserting that ‘Sir Apirana Ngata has always sought peace between the two races
in public affairs, and yet he would appear to advocate segregation in spiritual matters.’ To
add to this exchange of political blows however, came a rather disturbing punch below the
belt. Shortly after this incident The Rev Ernest Blackwood Moore, senior cleric in the Diocese
and high-profile vicar of St Matthew’s church on Hobson Street, preached a sermon during a
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regular Sunday service at his church. In his sermon, which again was reported extensively in the press, Blackwood Moore preached on ‘the moral decline of Maoris’, revealing to his congregation among other things that he could prove that Māori were neglecting their young, that he ‘understood there was inbreeding among the Maoris in parts of North Auckland to qualify for the family allowance’ and possibly in reference to Ngata’s recent works decrying ‘the prostitution of a noble race for political ends’. He also, ironically enough, proclaimed the destructive influence of socialism on Māori moral wellbeing.

Māori feeling was riding high. In response to Blackwood Moore’s diatribe an article directly underneath reported on his sermon quoting an unnamed ‘prominent Māori leader’ asserting that Blackwood Moore’s comments ‘proved that the Rev A.B. Kena was right’ and that ‘The Church of England is not sympathetic towards its Maori parishioners.’ Ngata quickly received correspondence from people supporting his stance. His friend, the journalist Eric Ramsden sent a telegram ‘Bullseye Star Post posting clippings good press’ to congratulate him on his successful use of the media in the campaign. Wiremu Panapa, then Vicar in Taupo but from Ngāti Whātua in the North had been a delegate at the Hui Tōpū and had in fact colluded with Ngata in inviting Henare to the hui. He wrote to Ngata saying ‘he nui toku hari i te taenga mai o Himi raua ko Kena hei korero i nga ahua o Te Tai Tokerau’ (great was my joy at the arrival of James Henare and Aperehama Kena to speak on the situation in the North), and Minita Paki Tipene, serving at the time as Whangarei Māori Missioner, wrote to Kena agreeing that great pressure was being exerted on the Māori clergy by the Archdeacons and informing him that ‘tena ra korua ko Himi i whakararurarungia ai nga whakaaro o nga pakeha o te Pihopatanga nei’ (yourself and James Henare have greatly troubled the thinking of the Pākehā in the Diocese). James Henare himself was incensed by the Diocesan response, stating to Ngata ‘needless to say,
the statement has evaded the main issues and is full of inaccurate generalisations’ and, following on from his service during the war declaring ‘the battle is now joined and it is my intention to reply.’

The most poignant response, and a good indication that this was more than some cynical political campaign by Ngata the politician, came from Mrs Eileen Ralls a Pākehā laywoman writing on behalf of herself and her husband. Ralls wrote that Henare had invited them to attend a confirmation service at Motatau, his village northwest of Whangārei. Bishop Simkin was present to conduct the confirmation and following the tradition of Blackwood Moore turned his sermon into literally a bully pulpit experience. Ralls wrote to Ngata in great embarrassment, telling how ‘His Grace [Simkin] chose to speak to the Maori people in an unpleasant manner’ where ‘he said in effect that the church services should be conducted in English and that if the Maori people wished to speak their native tongue in church then they should revert to primitive ways – eg they should not have modern European conveniences such as radios, motor cars etc’. Ralls was especially apologetic in that she saw Simkin was directing his remarks directly at Henare and Canon Keretene ‘who had to sit in silence and listen to the unkind remarks made by His Grace with no opportunity to reply’. Ralls also tied Simkin’s sermon to that of Blackwood Moore, writing to ‘convey our disgust’ at Blackwood Moore’s remarks ‘It is not, we think, cricket to stand and make charges against persons who are not given the opportunity to reply’.

Ngata and Simkin and their allies trading of blows was more meaningful than a game of ecclesiastical thrones. These actions had come at a very important time for Māori in the post-war period when through iconic actions such as the service and sacrifice of the Māori Battalion and through the work of the Māori War Effort Organisation, Ngata and other Māori leaders were striving to ‘enhance [a Māori] sense of citizenship’. But it was also a time when the assimilationist cycle was powering up again, and when ‘in the socio-economic and political interests of the nation, the state’s long term goal was to efficiently

assimilate Māori into the social and economic framework of New Zealand.’

This cycle peaked with the release in 1960 of the Hunn Report and migration to the cities which ‘assumed that assimilation would naturally lead to detribalisation – the result of a process that was completed when Māori attachment to their rural homelands and culture was severed’.

But even from the late 1940s Prime Minister and Minister of Native Affairs Peter Fraser was using the language of ‘full equality’ for Māori, ‘as a goal that could potentially be attained through equal Māori participation in a capitalist economy as individual citizens’.

Thus Simkin’s policies utilising the language of ‘equality’ and declaring that there was only ‘One Church’, instead of being theologically premised was actually merely reflecting the wider assimilationist views of Pākehā society and state.

The Mihinare response to this situation could also be seen in this light, as well as in a continuity of expression of Mihinare aspiration for mana motuhake, for self-determination.

Panapa reflected to Ngata a wider sense of foreboding over the actions of the Church at the time, asking ‘he taenga no te iwi Maori ki te pekanga o nga ara, ka ui kei hea te ara pai?’ (the Māori people have arrived at a crossroads, and are asking where is the right way forward?).

Kena himself shared his thoughts with Ngata in the aftermath, asserted ‘the first step towards stifling or amalgamating or absorbing the maori section of the Church into the pakeha section of the Church has begun’ and noted ‘the thought that our racial characteristics and traditions will be lost in the present trend of happenings in the Auckland Diocese, has inclined us to hit back’. But alongside these political considerations as always there ran a deeper theological line of questioning for Kena, and perhaps for all Mihinare, asking ‘Is God a Pakeha? If He is, then… we Maori clergy must become vicars of Pakeha Churches to worship him in the right way… Since God is a Maori to me… I shall go on worshipping Him as a Maori… until God comes to earth to tell me ‘I am wrong;’ - “He is a
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Pakeha”.\(^{56}\) The fundamental question was not only one of politics, nor of power, but of identity.

The death in 1950 of both Apirana Ngata and Frederick Bennett was a blow to the movement of the Māori church, coming as it did on top of the society-wide move towards more overt assimilationist policies accompanied by mass migration of Māori to the cities. The reasons for the migration range from economic pulls (employment opportunity) to improving health (leading to overpopulation of rural homelands), but as Melissa Williams points out this process of ‘Māori urbanisation’ has tended to ‘become a popular short-hand term for ‘an event that happened’ to a passive and homogenous population of post-war Māori migrants’ where she argues that instead it was a much more complex and diverse process at a local level.\(^{57}\) This situation did not initiate the temporary suspension of Māori struggle and a retrenchment into conservatism, waiting for a resurgence in the urban activist movements of the 1970s as often portrayed in the historiography.\(^{58}\) Instead the Mihinare struggle for self-determination would gain new leadership.

In 1951 Wiremu Panapa was selected by the Pākehā North Island bishops to be the second Pīhopa o Aotearoa, to succeed Bennett. From the northern iwi Ngāti Whātua, Panapa was particularly challenged by Simkin’s “Iron Curtain” policy, unable to minister to his own people in his role as Pīhopa and he consequently often referred to himself as the ‘suffering bishop’.\(^{59}\) This was the time of the establishment of a new generation of “Māori”, pan-tribal organisations, including the Māori Women’s Welfare League, the New Zealand Māori Council and the National Council of Churches Māori Section. Panapa in his role as Pīhopa o Aotearoa was involved in them all, regularly attending conferences and he was present at the inaugural meeting of the Māori Education Foundation in 1961.\(^{60}\) Thus the Anglican Church continued its long held role as the ad hoc State Church. This status was also a
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reflection of the huge numbers of adherents of the Church across both Māori and Pākehā communities, which although steadily declining as a proportion of the population reached a peak of 900,000 adherents in 1966 - 33.7% of the total population. 61

The Māori Church decision-making processes of the time varied from Diocese to Diocese. In Waiapu the experiment with Hui Tōpū continued from Ngata’s era, with annual hui increasing in size and importance throughout the 1950s. The hui held in Waipawa in 1953 had about 1000 attendees and cost £766 (approximately $41,000 in 2014 terms) 62 and by the 1960 hui in Rotorua over 5000 attended. 63 The programmes for the hui were not only discussions of Church affairs, but also a celebration of culture and creativity. By 1960 the hui included a Maori Youth conference, a debutantes’ ball, a parish choir competition, and a kapa haka festival, reflecting not only constitutional but also cultural expression and self-determination. In fact, many of the waiata composed for the Hui Tōpū became kapa haka classics with many still in popular use today, and the competition was often a fierce rivalry between Ngāti Porou and Te Arawa parish groups Ohinemutu, Hikurangi and Waiapu. They were also spaces for debate and reflection, and topics focused on wider social trends in the country. In Ruatoki in 1957 for example the academics Maharaia Winiata and Keith Sinclair were invited to speak on contemporary race relations. 64 These hui were so successful that in 1962 the first ‘All-Aotearoa’ Hui Tōpū was held at Ngaruawahia. Organised by ex-Māori battalion chaplain Wi Huata, the hui not only involved official Mihinare delegations from the whole of Aotearoa, but was assisted by the National Council of Churches Māori Section, bringing an ecumenical perspective to the event. 65 Most of the Pākehā bishops were in attendance as was Ralph Hanan, the Minister of Māori Affairs. Again there was a great expression of cultural creativity, combined with discussion on the future of Māori as a whole. Canon Hamiora (Sam) Rangihui led with a keynote speech that was reported on somewhat breathlessly by the influential Church and People newspaper. In this speech Rangihui laid out the latest iteration of Māori self-determination both within and outside of
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the church. Rangiihu stated ‘there is nothing singular or sinister in the apparent intensification of nationalism among the Maori people’ and that ‘Maoritanga is the action taken to secure provision and satisfaction for that racial personality’. In fact, far from being defensive about Māori identity Rangiihu defined it as a great advantage, lamenting “the community life of the maori was built around the divine... it is an impoverishing thing for the pakeha to be without God’. 66

The situation in the North, however, was less creative. Behind the “Iron Curtain” Komiti Tumuaki had been abolished by Simkin in 1941 and the local Māori pastorates essentially assimilated into their Pākehā neighbours. It was only with a change of Bishop in 1960 that a measure of autonomy was regained by Māori in the Diocese. The new bishop Eric Gowing held a conference with Māori clergy in the Diocese in 1962 at which ‘the Maori members respectfully recommended to the Bishop to reconstitute the Komiti Tumuaki which had not been convened since 26 March 1941.’ The first meeting in 22 years of Komiti Tumuaki was held at Whangārei in February 1963, but a great deal had been lost in the interim. The hui began with tributes to those who had passed since 1941 including Canon Keretene and Pīhopa Bennett, a sad reminder that Māori in the Diocese had not had an official church forum where they could express themselves in a culturally appropriate way. The hui also immediately reconnected to the vision of those that had gone before, moving that the Pīhopa o Aotearoa ‘be invited to make a visitation to the Maori people in the Diocese for a fortnight each year’, a motion that Gowing supported. 67 It was notable how strongly those in attendance had held onto the importance not only of Komiti Tumuaki itself, in abeyance for so long, but also to the various issues that Komiti Tumuaki had promoted. It was also noticeable however that the restarted Komiti Tumuaki was not the same as it had been, with minutes being taken in the English language and the meetings over the next several years being sporadic. It would be some time before Komiti Tumuaki could become again the powerhouse of Mihinare autonomy in the North that it had been before Simkin’s prohibition.

The people of the North had been involved with the Waiapu Hui Tōpū in a small way, and had sent a delegation to the ‘All-Aotearoa’ hui in 1962. In 1960 they began their

---
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own version of this body. The first “Hui Amorangi” was held in Peria, east of Kaitaia, in 1966, with over 1000 people present from as far south as Auckland. The concept of Amorangi was described as being derived from an ancient Māori whakataukī (saying) “Ko te Amorangi ki mua; ko te hapai o ki muri” in which the ‘amorangi’ was an emblem of an atua (god) carried by the tohunga (priest) ahead of a war party. ‘It was regarded as the visible symbol of the presence of God.’

For a part of the Church which had been described as ‘arch-conservative’ it was revealing that they would use ancient Māori concepts to name themselves. Even though the new bishop was relatively more benign, there was still Mihinare resistance to any sign of Pākehā control. At the 1966 hui Gowing said he wanted to hear more from young Māori on the state of Church, to which a local kaumatua replied ‘the Maori Church should be allowed to function in its own way… we are the elders… it is for us to say what should be done.’ By 1969 the Hui Amorangi had gone all out in its political focus, with the overall theme of ‘Racism and the demands of the Gospel’, including guest speaker Mira Szaszy who used the opportunity to oppose the recent New Zealand Māori Council decision to support the forthcoming All Black tour of apartheid South Africa. The hui was also notable because Gowing used the occasion to license the new Pīhopa o Aotearoa Manu Bennett (son of Frederick Bennett) to work in the diocese. However this action - seemingly in keeping with the theme of the hui - was mitigated somewhat by not allowing Bennett to ordain in the Diocese without permission, which was a key function of a Pīhopa and what would have been the building block of a Māori church.

Manu Bennett had been a somewhat outsider choice as Pīhopa in 1968, being picked before several minita who were his senior. The choice was made, as per the 1928 General Synod canon, by the North Island Pākehā bishops all of whom were born in England. In fact, the South Island bishops and the Bishop of Polynesia had to stand outside the door while the others made their decision, in strict accordance with the canon. Perhaps because of his surprise selection Bennett faced some early doubt, including, similarly to his father, that he
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was ‘not Maori enough’. Even Bennett’s ordination as bishop was controversial, as his predecessor Panapa was not allowed by the Pākehā church hierarchy to take part in the “laying on of hands” of his successor. Hone Kaa, Panapa’s chaplain at the service, wrote that Panapa was distraught at his exclusion and ‘throughout the service he did not once participate as he sat hunched in his chair with his cope pulled up over his head. He did not utter a sound and he declined to make his communion.’ However as Kaa notes Bennett quickly gained support across the iwi, partly because ‘subtlety and diplomacy were the hallmarks of [his] Episcopacy.’ As with Panapa, by Bennett’s time the office of Pīhopa o Aotearoa was seen as a national one, in spite of its ecclesiastical limitations. This national status was helped by the growth of ecumenical relations as well as the breaking down of old barriers, and one of Bennett’s first actions only three weeks after his ordination was to visit Ratana Pa for their annual November celebrations and to preach inside Te Temepara Tapu (The Sacred Temple), the centre of the Ratana faith.

Bennett was regularly consulted by the government on issues of the day relating to Māori, and was for example part of a ‘trade and cultural mission’ to Washington D.C. where he blessed the new New Zealand embassy in the presence of US Vice-President Walter Mondale. Domestically Bennett was equally well-received, including maintaining a strong relationship with the Māori Women’s Welfare League where his attendance at national conferences was welcomed as it ‘would give delegates the spiritual guidance they needed.’ The national Māori church was embedded amongst Māori institutions, with the Pīhopa o Aotearoa respected as a national leader - both regardless of constitutional restraints imposed by Pākehā.

Although iwi were respectful of the position of Pīhopa, they did have different expectations than they held of Pākehā bishops. As Ngata had noted time and again Pīhopa were measured against Māori dynamics, being required to perform not only in the Church environment but also on the marae. This demand never decreased over time, and for example in 1980 Kingi Ihaka wrote on behalf of the people of Te Tai Tokerau:
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E tupu ai te mana o te Pihopatanga, me kitea-kanohi te iwi Māori i te Pihopa Maori i runga i o ratou marae, a ratou hui, ehara mo te kotahi haora anake, engari kia kai tahi, kia mole tahi… Kahore te Taitokerau e taonga ki nga minita, ki nga tangata hoki e haere atu ana mo nga karakia anake, ara, mutu ana te karakia, ka ngaro.79

*In order to build the status of the Māori church, the Māori people must see face-to-face the Māori bishop on their marae, in their gathering, not only for an hour, but eating as one with them, sleeping as one with them… the people of the North do not value ministers or people who come for the service alone, and then, after it is complete, disappear.*

However although the Pīhopa o Aotearoa had built a considerable degree of authority amongst iwi and was a national Māori leader, Mihinare were still not satisfied with the position being as it was subservient to the Bishop of Waiapu and entirely dependent on the whims and racial views of the other Pākehā diocesan bishops for its ecclesiastical authority. At the (in)famous Waiapu Hui Tōpū of 1948 James Henare had asserted, supported by Ngāti Porou, that the Pīhopa o Aotearoa should be suffragan to all Diocesan bishops. Henare stated that the Pihopa should be able to minister in all dioceses, even if subservient to the local Pākehā bishop.80 Ngata himself continued to demand not only that a Māori take over from Bennett when the time came, but also that more Māori input be given to the next choice. This would not just be Māori Anglican input either, but a wide-ranging hui-ā-īwi (gathering of the tribes) to discuss the matter.81 Unfortunately as has been noted Ngata and Bennett would both die in 1950, depriving Mihinare of much-needed experienced leadership, and so momentum for change was delayed. However it was not lost in its entirety and the resignation of Panapa in 1968 due to ill health led to another debate amongst Mihinare as to the best path forward. Several options were ventured, including dissatisfaction with the method of selection and a call for an electoral synod process so that Mihinare could select their own candidate. Minita Api Mahuika even proposed a
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geographically-based Māori Diocese (probably in place of the Waiapu Diocese) that would be all inclusive and would test ‘the extent and sincerity of European willingness for integration’. Just as Mihinare aspired to regain the full-diocesan stature they briefly held in 1925, so did the countervailing forces work against that. This time they took the form of Archbishop Norman Lesser, who proclaimed on Panapa’s retirement in 1968 that he looked forward to a time when the Pīhopa o Aotearoa office ‘will fall into abeyance and that a Maori priest will be appointed as a Diocesan Bishop so that the appointment is not consequent upon race, but simply ability to assume the responsibility of office’. Lesser would have known that this was an extremely remote possibility under the diocesan electoral system.

It was not simply the role of a full Pīhopa that Mihinare hoped to recapture but also a voice at General Synod, as they had been briefly granted in 1925. General Synod had always been a key part of the church, sitting atop the diocesan principalities as the most important decision making body in the land. As early as 1901 a motion had been put to General Synod by lay members from Waiapu and Auckland ‘that Maori members of the Church should have direct representation’, a move the General Synod rejected. The 1925 legislation had allowed for a full diocesan representation for Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa, which would have been comprised of the Pīhopa, three minita and four lay delegates, and would have been one delegation out of ten including Polynesia, Melanesia and the newly created Diocese of Waikato. However the legislation allowing for a Māori delegation was rescinded after iwi demanded a Māori as Pīhopa. It was not until 1964, after another round of General Synod commissions, that General Synod would start to include Māori as of right in General Synod. Until this time the Pīhopa o Aotearoa had to be elected as a clergy representative of Waiapu diocese in order to have speaking rights. After the initial proposal once again “technical difficulties” became the reason given for delay, and because apparently ‘the position of Bishop of Aotearoa presented great difficulties’ consultation and wisdom was sought from the Archbishop of Canterbury – who would apparently know something of worth about the New Zealand context. The end result was the 1964 canon bearing the succinct title of ‘A
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Statute to make new provision for the representation of the Maori people in General Synod and for those purposes to amend certain canons. This legislation gave the Pīhopa o Aotearoa ‘a seat as a Bishop in the General Synod, with the right to speak and to vote as a Bishop.’ The situation was still unsatisfactory though to Mihinare. General Synod was a collective representation of Diocesan delegations, bringing together representatives of each Diocese and often voting by houses – bishops, clergy and lay. Now Mihinare had a seat at the table, but only one seat without a supporting delegation – again, a token effort. Real change was demanded.

The 1964 General Synod move to seat the Pīhopa o Aotearoa had come as an act of appeasement after the failure of previous similar motions. As always there was a sense of continuity to Mihinare aspirations for their own Native church. Sometimes this aspiration had been invested in the position of Pīhopa, but it was generally a much wider drive for a fully self-determining Māori church that could give life to a Mihinare faith expression. By the mid-1970s Mihinare had a new vocabulary they could lay over their aspirations, alongside a society-wide push for social transformation reflected in the ‘proliferation of protest movements of the time.’ In 1972 General Synod passed another motion that ‘the office of the Bishop of Aotearoa should be constituted without territorial or any particular Diocesan limitation’ which led to the establishment of what was called the Bishopric of Aotearoa. This body was an advisory council to the Pīhopa, who could amongst other powers recommend future candidates for Pīhopa o Aotearoa. However these candidates would only rank alongside selections made by other Pākehā bishops - who would still select the person. Under the ‘Bishopric’ the Pīhopa o Aotearoa could also minister across dioceses, but again only with the permission of the local bishop. By 1976 the Advisory Council was advocating for direct representation of minita and lay people to General Synod and yet another commission was established to enquire into “the problem”. Although this looked like a classic case of the institution protecting its own status quo, amongst Mihinare the time for radical change was approaching. Mihinare were meeting across the country looking at what options were available to them. One gathering of Mihinare drawing on minita and lay
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leaders from across the country, plotted schism. In October 1975 this group, meeting as an unofficial gathering, discussed the nuclear option of ‘withdrawal from the Province’ and the effective establishment of a new Māori Anglican structure. They drew up fairly detailed plans, including financial self-sufficiency by looking at retired senior minita to serve as bishops so that they could live off their pensions and so they could also command respect as kaumatua. The plans called for four bishops to be established so that they could ordain other bishops when the time came. Acknowledging the radical nature of this proposal, the plotters noted ‘this alternative action or withdrawal must only be used in the extreme situation of failure in our negotiations for new terms of partnership’.  

Fortunately perhaps for General Synod the 1976 Commission, the ‘Provincial Commission on Work amongst the Maori People’ was more effective than previous iterations. The Commission travelled around ‘tribal areas’ throughout the country to hear views on the future of the Māori church, looking at everything including ‘the future role and function of the office of Bishop of Aotearoa’. Submissions to the commission came from wide and far including the Māori Women’s Welfare League and the Association of Maori University Graduates. The latter submission was written by Api Mahuika, who argued forcefully that the current situation was one where the Pīhopa o Aotearoa was known as a ‘“bob-tail” Bishop – one without authority, status and mana’ and if Māori demands were not recognised then Māori could leave the church ‘with a clear conscience’. Iwi also held hui and presented submissions. A gathering of Ngāti Porou, repeating their demands of half a century earlier, presented their proposals through their spokesperson Tame Te Maro. The first proposal, moved by the redoubtable Whaia McClutchie was that ‘kia tono a Ngatiporou kia tukuna te mana motuhake ki te Pihopa o Aotearoa, kia rite ai tona tunga me tona mana ki etahi atu o nga Pihopa o roto i te hahi’ (Ngāti Porou requests that self-determination be given to the Bishop of Aotearoa, to align his office and his authority with that of the other bishops in the church). Their second was that ‘kia taka nga pariha Maori ki raro i te
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Pihopatanga o Aotearoa’ (the Māori parishes be bound under the Bishopric of Aotearoa).93 The Waikato Māori pastorate held a hui on the matter with Manu Bennett and Queen Te Atairangakahu present, and their submission requested direct Māori representation to General Synod as well.94 However not all submissions to the Commission were supportive. Pākehā parishes and individuals also sent in submissions, many of them opposing greater Māori autonomy on grounds ranging from the theologically esoteric through to the assertion that the current system was already excessive and that ‘we [the church] are deliberately maintaining a form of apartheid’.95

Within minita circles, opinion was divided. Similarly to the situation in the 1920s many minita worked closely with the Pākehā hierarchy of the church and due to these ‘long-standing relationships’96 felt divided loyalties between Pihopa Māori and diocese. A proposal from a ‘small part of Wellington Diocese’ that requested ‘a unilateral system’97 was rejected by the collective minita. This ‘small part’, led by leading lay member and visionary Professor Whatarangi Winiata, would soon come back with a far broader, and ultimately more successful, vision. Others were also beginning to think outside of existing models as well, seeking not only parity within a Pākehā system but critiquing the system itself. Hone Kaa, influenced by his recent ecumenical experiences in Asia wrote that Mihinare ‘need to think outside of a ‘Diocesan model’… we have become over dependent on structures that are not of our making and the end result is confusion. Those same structures have split the loyalties of our people so that Aotearoa has become not a cohesive but a disruptive influence’ finishing off with a rhetorical flourish that ‘we are the inheritors of ecclesiastical imperialism’.98
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change were appearing. Kingi Ihaka, ever the composer, observed of the Bishopric that ‘kua tu ke nga tukutuku, kei te ngaro nga poupou’ (the tukutuku are standing, the pillars are missing), indicating that the substance of the organisation was yet to come. And there was broad support for a fully-empowered Māori bishop, with speakers such as Irikau Kingi (Te Arawa), Pokiha Hemana (Te Arawa), Canon Wi Huata (Kahungunu), and Maori Marsden (North) calling for ‘te mana motuhake homai ki a matou’ (give us full self-determination). The structural powerlessness felt by many Mihinare was reflected by Manu Bennett himself when he described his own position as a ‘man of war without guns’. The 1976 Commission was not immune to such response, especially at a time where Māori political activism was becoming increasingly noticed by a Pākehā audience, and with an underlying threat of Māori schism or at least radical action within the church. This was the time of the Māori Land March led by Whina Cooper, of the struggle over the land at Bastion Point and other high profile actions by Māori asserting their rights of self-determination and of sovereignty. Many Mihinare were intimately involved with these movements. For example in 1979 Hone Harawira one of the leaders of He Taua, the group that disrupted the Auckland University engineering students’ racist parody of the haka, on arrest recorded his occupation as Anglican Layreader – not too far from the facts of his work.

The resulting legislation prepared by the Commission came before General Synod in 1978. The suffragan status under which the Pīhopa o Aotearoa had laboured for half a century was lifted. The Pīhopa now came under the overview of the Primate (Archbishop), in line with all the other bishops. The new language was that the Pīhopa was licensed ‘to share with the Bishop of each Diocese the episcopal oversight of the Maori people.’ ‘Sharing’ was the new concept, where General Synod sought to empower the position while at the same time they attempt to safeguard the position of the diocesan bishops – those who, prima facie, had not necessarily needed a great deal of ‘safe-guarding’ from Māori in
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the past. This ‘sharing’ still required the assent of the diocesan bishop for the Pīhopa to minster in their diocese but this assent was now compulsory, with the diocesan bishop being, rather oddly, required to sign a commission for this work. Ordination, one of the most important episcopal functions that selected minita for the church, was also shared, with Pākehā diocesan bishops asking the Pīhopa ‘to share with us in the ordination of Maori priests and deacons and in the appointment of clergy and other staff for Maori work’. The General Synod legislation also empowered Mihinare as a whole, establishing the Aotearoa Council to be in effect a representative synod for Mihinare with minita and lay delegates from each diocese. The stated intent of the Aotearoa Council was ‘to broaden the concept of the Bishopric of Aotearoa and to provide for greater participation by Clergy and laity in that work’. The Aotearoa Council would be the decision making body for the Māori church, and although Pākehā bishops were entitled to attend and speak, they could not vote. Alongside this every diocese was required to establish a ‘Maori Church Komiti’ which the Pīhopa o Aotearoa would be a part of. Finally on a local level after much experimentation and failure over the past 120 years or more, Mihinare at a Diocesan level would have a forum to represent their views and aspirations. The last part of the 1978 legislation ensured Mihinare could finally select their own Pīhopa with an electoral synod when the time came, with General Synod finally taking on board the fact that ‘the Maori people have continuously expressed their desire for greater participation in the election of the Bishop of Aotearoa’. The Aotearoa Council could also appoint representatives to General Synod. As always, the legislation was a compromise, with Mihinare struggling to gain territory and Pākehā yielding a little ground while retaining most of the landscape. The legislation passed for various reasons, one being the emotive plea by the Commission itself that it hoped ‘that in the light of the greater understanding of cultural and racial tensions today, its recommendations will be acceptable to this Synod even if they were not acceptable in the past.’ The whole church was recognising the new context it was facing in society, as well as beginning to own up to its past.
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The establishment of Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa (the Bishopric of Aotearoa) was a cause for great celebration, not only for Mihinare but for much of the Māori world. Methodist leader Rua Rakena noted that the ‘elation and euphoria’ of 1978 ‘was reflected as much in the non-Anglican as Anglican Māori’, and that Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa was ‘seen as an ongoing expression and embodiment of deep Māori hopes and aspirations held in common across denominations’. Manu Bennett however saw his work as being complete and in 1980 announced his forthcoming retirement, which set in motion discussion around the selection of a new Pīhopa. In passing the 1978 legislation most of General Synod had probably assumed that the election process for a new Pīhopa o Aotearoa would be fairly straightforward, albeit fiercely competitive, as it was in the dioceses.

However once again Mihinare had a different framework for viewing this process than the Pākehā envisaged, seeing it instead as an opportunity to utilise Māori practices, as well as realising Māori aspirations. As it had in the past discussion quickly moved from the standard model of a closed Anglican cabal in which only a very limited number of church adherents would be involved in what was quite a secretive process, into a much wider process bringing into play much of the Māori world, incorporating iwi dynamics as well as interdenominational relationships. This thinking was partly driven by the involvement of a group of lay people on the Aotearoa Council who were just beginning to expand the margins of the Māori world and to incorporate Māori tikanga (cultural process) into other previously ultra-conservative mainstream institutions including education and the judiciary. Te Runanga Whaiti (the Executive Committee) of the Aotearoa Council drove the process, and alongside experienced minita the committee included notable Māori leaders such as the leading jurist Judge Edward (Eddie) Taihakurei Durie, appointed in 1980 as Chair of the Waitangi Tribunal; educator Hirini Moko Mead, Professor of Māori Studies at Victoria University; and Professor Whatarangi Winiata, who was in the process of establishing Te Wānanga-o-Raukawa. The executive was determined in the first instance that it didn’t want to replicate a diocesan electoral synod process, which was not seen as conducive to a Māori
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method of selecting leaders.\textsuperscript{109} The executive was conscious though of Pākehā closely observing the first Māori opportunity to select a bishop, and if the legislation was not followed exactly then the selection could well be challenged and even rejected by General Synod.\textsuperscript{110} Therefore although the actual selection process meant a closed electoral synod was required, a compromise was reached where Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa would call a Hui-ā-Iwi (a gathering of tribes) to discuss what they wanted to see in the next Pihopa and to suggest nominees. However the actual selection would still be up to the duly appointed delegates in the closed electoral synod. The hui was a controversial decision viewed from Pākehā Anglican eyes, but as Minita Whakahuihui Vercoe declared ‘if we could agree that the pre-electoral hui was correct in Maori terms, then we should go ahead and make the arrangements!’\textsuperscript{111}

It was decided to hold the hui at Hairini Marae in Tauranga and that ‘the hui is called upon to produce the names of suitable appointees for reference to the electoral synod’.\textsuperscript{112} Everything about the hui reflected Māori thinking, including the venue. The reason for Tauranga was that host iwi Ngāi-Te-Rangi were viewed as not particularly strong in the Anglican denomination, therefore relatively neutral in their support for any one particular candidate. For that reason Nga Puhi, Ngāti Porou and Te Arawa venues were ruled out immediately. Tauranga was also supported because there was a strong Roman Catholic and Ratana population and ecumenical participation was not only encouraged but desired at the hui. In fact, Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa Secretary John Paterson noted that ‘spokesmen for the Ringatu, Ratana and the mainstream Christian denominations asked us to bear in mind that the appointment of a Bishop of Aotearoa held significance for them also, as for the whole of Maoridom.’\textsuperscript{113} The hui was chaired by Sir Hepi Te Heuheu, a devout Roman Catholic, another sign that this was bigger than the Anglican world, and as Hone Kaa noted the hui was attended by Māori ‘from every tribe and denomination’ and ‘Maori identity overrode denominational identity as they came to witness Maori Church history in
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the making’. Seven nominees were forwarded to the electoral synod: four from Ngāti Porou, two from the North, and one from Te Arawa. Hone Kaa was among the nominees, put forward by Te Arawa elders Sir Charles Bennett and Sir John Grace. Kaa recalled the debate being rigorous, flowing as it did from Māori practice, and including questioning his nomination by asking ‘whether or not it was potentially advisable to have a Maori Bishop who was married to a Pakeha.’ The electoral synod elected Whakahuihui Vercoe of Te Arawa to be the fourth Pīhopa o Aotearoa, and he was ordained not in a church building but on Houmaitawhiti Marae in Rotorua in 1981.

The hui was also a good insight into the continuous Mihinare determination to reset the boundaries of Anglican practice until they fit, or at least overlapped, with Māori ideas of best practice. The leading lay Māori thinkers driving the process were, like Ngata before them, experienced with and unafraid of conservative Pākehā systems. They were also a boon to Mihinare because they were neither financially nor ecclesiastically beholden to Pākehā bishops through paid ministry, and therefore could challenge the Pākehā hierarchy of the church without fear of backlash. They also used their new-found insights from the secular world to offer alternatives to Mihinare, coming from outside the usual frames of reference. Edward Durie for example theorised that Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa could occupy a non-geographic space as a Diocese because they were indigenous, differentiating them from other special interest groups in the church and thereby breaking an old argument in the church around the inviolate nature of geographic dioceses used to restrict Mihinare development. Such leading-edge thinking utilising the relatively new ideas around indigeneity would allow Mihinare to move beyond the ‘freedoms’ granted by Pākehā, and soon to challenge the notion of power in the church altogether, based on new ways of understanding old knowledge.

The establishment of Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa in 1978 and the subsequent election of the Pīhopa o Aotearoa by the iwi were significant steps towards achieving the age-old vision of

Mihinare self-determination. Although the Pihopatanga was designated as a ‘Bishopric’ and not a ‘Diocese’ it was very close to the fulfilment of the dreams of 1925, with only a 50 year wait for fruition. However the ongoing quest for self-determination was, it seemed, larger than merely gaining parity with any one particular diocese. Instead, a new word was emerging that would give new life to the movement. That word was ‘biculturalism’.

By the early 1980s Māori activism across New Zealand was increasingly visible to Pākehā society, even if from a Māori perspective it was remarkably consistent in direction. The establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975 had created a new platform for Māori to seek redress of breaches of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and by the early 1980s this was gathering pace. In 1980 Paul Reeves, who had been Bishop of Waiapu and then Bishop of Auckland, became Primate (Archbishop). Reeves had been the first person of Māori descent to be a Pākehā diocesan bishop, although his background was not in the Mihinare church. However Reeves was greatly influenced by his Māori ancestry and very open to ‘the Māori cause’. In the 1984 General Synod he used his Presidential address, a very influential platform at the gathering and for the whole church, to lay out the basis for change in the Anglican Church. Reeves quoted from the recently released Motunui-Waitara claim report which was, powerfully for him, related to his own Taranaki iwi of Te Āti Awa. In his quote Reeves noted the report’s focus on establishing meaning from Te Tiriti outside of narrow legal frameworks, and instead referred to ‘The Spirit of the Treaty.’ And, pointedly for the Church, Reeves noted that the report ‘established the regime not for uni-culturalism but for bi-culturalism’. For a Primate of the Church to use such terms was ground-breaking to say the least.

However it was not only Reeves using these terms. Two of the three members of the tribunal who authored the report, Chief Judge Edward Durie and Sir Graham Latimer, were active members of the Aotearoa Council of Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa. Chief Judge Durie was also a member of that 1984 General Synod representing Mihinare. This Treaty momentum would only continue to grow outside of the Church, finding a whole new level of elevation in 1987 with the New Zealand Māori Council vs Attorney General Case over the
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sale of State Owned Assets, which outlined the new Treaty principles including ‘partnership’ and ‘rangatiratanga’. As Ranginui Walker describes the events, ‘this was a remarkable elevation in the status of the Treaty in a few years from a ‘simple nullity’ to the level of a constitutional instrument in the renegotiation of the relationship between Maori and Pakeha in modern times.’\textsuperscript{120}

Other denominations were following similar lines of thinking. Katorika (Māori Roman Catholics) were becoming very active in the ecumenical movement and were agitating for a Pihopa of their own, supported by their Mihinare comrades,\textsuperscript{121} while the 1983 Methodist Church Conference - their equivalent of General Synod - made a commitment ‘to work toward the formation of a bi-cultural Methodist church in Aotearoa’.\textsuperscript{122} This notion of bi-culturalism was a new challenge for the Anglican Church to ponder, after what had seemed to be for some the achievement of a dream in 1978. One leading Mihinare lay person in particular, a ‘small part of the Wellington Diocese’, was dissatisfied with the status quo and had an ambitious vision for what ‘bi-culturalism’ could become. Professor Whatarangi Winiata of Ngāti Raukawa and Ngāti Marutuahu had been involved with the Māori church since being invited by Bishop Bennett to join the 1978 General Synod Commission on Māori Work that, as Winiata noted, ‘led to the constitutional question’.\textsuperscript{123} By that time Winiata had returned from a long stint in academia in North America, where amongst other influences he had been closely involved with Aotearoa Council member Hirini Mead and his wife June.\textsuperscript{124} On his return he began a twenty-five year culture-revival programme for his iwi entitled Whakatupuranga Rua Mano (Generation 2000) that aimed to ensure that his people would always ‘have a world-view that is Māori’.\textsuperscript{125}

Winiata also seemed not to be a fan of the co-option of bi-culturalism into what was called the ‘taha Maori’ model. In this model Māori assisted Pākehā on their bicultural journey, but, as educational theorist Graham Smith pointed out taha Māori was ‘more about

\textsuperscript{120} Walker, \textit{Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou}, pp.265-66.
\textsuperscript{121} Te Runanga o Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa, Minutes 3-6 October 1985, ANG141/3/5(9), JKL, Auckland.
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the education of the Pākehā than about the education of the Maori’. Instead Winiata had led the establishment of Te Wānanga o Raukawa, the tertiary education provider based in Otaki, to continue separately from Pākehā institutions the exploration of the values underpinning the Whakatupuranga Rua Mano programme. Winiata would be crucial in the next phase of the Mihinare renegotiation of mātauranga.

Winiata was dissatisfied with the 1978 achievements, as spectacular as they seemed to be. He described them as ‘a little step’ and instead advocated for a system of Treaty-based resource-sharing that was far beyond the ambit of that canon. Winiata was a visionary thinker and even found the intellectual space to critique the vision of Apirana Ngata and to update it for a new era. Winiata put a motion to the 1984 General Synod establishing the Bi-Cultural Commission on the Treaty of Waitangi that would, among other things, ‘study the Treaty of Waitangi and consider whether any principles of partnership and bi-cultural development are implied’ and ‘to advise General Synod on ways and means to embody the principles of the Treaty in the legislation, institutions and general life of the Church’. Reeves described the motion as ‘one of the longest motions which has come before General Synod’ but more importantly stated that it ‘is very important. It offers us a chance to explore a relationship which is basic to our country and to our church.’ This became a theme of Winiata’s work in the Church. Not only did he aim to create a radically different power structure across the Church, but also to use this as a model for the development of New Zealand as a whole. After all, went the thinking, if an arguably arch-conservative and influential institution such as the Anglican Church could become bi-cultural, then why not the nation as a whole? Winiata further delineated his thoughts the following year by presenting a paper to the Aotearoa Council entitled ‘Māori Self Determination and The Partnership’. In this paper Winiata made two points: firstly that in relation to New Zealand society ‘more Māori control and self-determination in regard to present and future

---
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Māori circumstances will be beneficial to Aotearoa’; secondly, ‘that the Anglican Church in New Zealand should take steps to increase Māori self-determination through the Bishopric of Aotearoa’.

But this was not just about the gaining and exercise of Pākehā power and resources. Instead it was to be an expression of a Māori world view in which ‘Māori identity and cultural frameworks would be given greater prominence and the strengths of Māoridom including their whanau, hapu and iwi arrangements would be embodied extensively’. Seemingly this was a radical step beyond the works of Ngata, who had seemed content to seek parity within the accepted confines of the state and institution. In some ways a comparison could be made to the differences between African-American civil rights leaders Malcolm X and Martin Luther King Jr., the former who advocated distinct black development and the latter who advocated integration. But the situation was more subtle than that; both leaders had displayed the capability to work within the Pākehā system and to work outside of it. Regardless, such differences in the Mihinare thinking were a case of, as always, simply taking the available space, language and ideas to achieve the age-old aspiration of mana motuhake (self-determination).

Winiata was a leading thinker in, and gave great coherence to, this latest expression of the Mihinare search for self-determination, but he was far from alone. Winiata had support from his own people, Mihinare from across the Wellington Diocese, who advocated that ‘principles of partnership and biculturalism are implied in the Treaty of Waitangi’.133 Across iwi Mihinare were strongly in favour of taking the gains from 1978 to a new level, where partnership and biculturalism could mean not just taking a place amongst the Pākehā dioceses, but becoming an equal partner with Pākehā as a whole. Some advocated activism outside of existing forums. One minita demanded ‘that all members of Te Runanga [Aotearoa Council] demonstrate their solidarity by taking ‘leave of absence’ from their Dioceses; in order that they may challenge “the church” in the Renewal and Growth of the church’.134 Pihopa Vercoe himself was more circumspect, not advocating separation per se but arguing forcefully nevertheless based on an analysis that transcended the restrictions of
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Western theology. Referring to the struggle for self-determination from 1925 to 1978, Vercoe noted;

Since the dominant culture sets the pattern for development, we the Māori have suffered the ideological onslaught. The levels at which we make decisions are everyday battles which we the Māori face in life. This applies not only in church life and worship but on every other plane, whether political, social, economic, education, or health. The immense pressure on Māori aspirations to conform to the dominant culture is ever present today upon the whole of Māoridom.135

There were also those who shared Winiata’s notions of this struggle being wider than the Church itself, and having implications across New Zealand society. The Aotearoa Council passed several resolutions in support of wider expressions of this dynamic across several fields. Partly this was a function of the wide and diverse membership of the Council, including lay people representing a cross section of several fields and interest groups. The Council issued statements of support from issues ranging from the Kohanga Reo movement (immersion language programmes for children); through to the Aotearoa Broadcasting Systems application for the third television channel warrant, (an application masterminded by Winiata himself); through to support for a Wellington based Māori language radio project Nga Kaiwhakapumau i te Reo. But this support for rangatiratanga for Māori as a whole was a two-way process that also influenced church policy. One motion demanded that the Māori Church Schools ‘take measures immediately to introduce the principles of Kohanga reo into the curriculum of their schools’.136 Another such issue was taken to General Synod in 1986 and produced a fairly incredible outcome. The survival of the Māori language, which had long been an important issue for Māori activism, was gaining new life through successful claims to the Waitangi Tribunal over broadcasting issues.137 In 1986 General Synod took up this issue and passed Standing Resolution 31, entitled ‘Inclusion Of Maori Language And Culture In Ordination Training Programmes’. This resolution stated that:
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training for ordination requires Maori language and cultural studies of sufficient rigour, intensity and depth to ensure that candidates for ordination have the capacity to conduct fluently all of the important tikanga karakia [liturgical practices] in Maori, and to be able to perform ably on Marae and in other Maori settings.138

The intent of this resolution, never really followed through with, was that all clergy, both Māori and Pākehā, become competent in te reo Māori. Bishop Simkin would probably have been appalled.

The momentum for significant constitutional change was driving the discussion forward, seemingly inevitably. However there were some Mihinare who had reservations about the direction. Although in the high councils of the Māori church the discussion was robust and well-informed, questions were asked of how much this discussion was filtering down to the “flax roots” of the church. Aotearoa Council member Areta Koopu, who would soon be President of the Māori Women’s Welfare League, questioned ‘whether members of the Council take adequate messages back to those people’139, and kaumātua Minita Taki Marsden expressed concern over the depth of the debate, noting ‘that the receptivity for such prophetic material at flax roots level is currently not sufficiently high to allow it to receive reasoned debate.’140 Alongside these and similar concerns over the depth of support for proposed changes, concern was also shared over whether the discussion had become too structural, and not enough about issues of faith and theology. Pīhopa Whakahuihui, although a staunch advocate of structural overhaul, from time to time reframed the discussion to a reflection on motivation and understanding. At one point he ‘reminded the Council that the Gospel partnership led directly to the Cross and from the Cross to the experience of the Resurrection. He urged members to claim the Gospel for themselves in their own lives before trying to convince others.’141 Vercoe also asked the same question from a Māori perspective, noting ‘many of us would agree that planning decisions are
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mainly based on one set of values, Pakeha values. This puts an added responsibility upon the Māori to look deeply into himself and the ideas involved in the planning and decision-making process." There were also those who questioned the direction from a more literal reading of scripture, with Ramari Joseph asking her fellow Aotearoa Council members ‘are we seeking the kingdom of heaven or are we seeking power?’, and Hapai Winiata following a similar line, being recorded as stating that ‘partnership, in his view, is a God given gift. He is concerned at the direction some people in the Bishopric seemed to be going. He does not want the church to be divided. He wants his grandchildren to be able to stand tall in two cultures.’ Thus, as with the events of the 1920s, Mihinare were not always homogenous on issues of self-determination, instead it was an evolution of thought across an intellectual spectrum.

By the 1980s the discussion were also less grouped along iwi lines, with more diversity within iwi understandings. Partly this may have resulted from increasing migration, where theological and intellectual diversity was disseminated amongst Māori regardless of iwi origin. However iwi (and all its iterations) remained important in Mihinare thinking. Pihopa Vercoe framed iwi, or ‘tribalism’, as the building block of the new Māori church that would arise from constitutional change and named it ‘one of the most potent strengths within Māoridom’. Vercoe asserted that in the current church structures on the ground ‘Māori congregations are being asked to conform to a pakeha system of community’ whereas ‘we as a church have failed to see that the community already exists with the Māori tribal and inter-tribal systems.’ Referring back through the history of Mihinare, he declared ‘all early Māori pastorates were begun and maintained within that Māori, social, political and economic structure. Church life was established within the fabric of the tribal life-style and norms. The Church community became part and parcel of the tribal community.’

---
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Vercoe, like most Mihinare, had a deep understanding of his history. The precedents established by early minita like Rota Waitoa and others was an ingrained part of the whakapapa of the Māori church, and would continue to guide them in their actions heading into the future. Based on these understandings, as well as his social analysis, Vercoe continued that the future of the church would be a return to the tribe, noting ‘one suspects there is a gradual return to this old system amongst Māori church people today, which affects all our main-line denominations’ and even tying modern activism to this dynamic, asserting ‘one also may assume that within the hearts and minds of the young Māori radicals and intellectuals there is this desire to recover their own spirituality from their basic tribal roots.’

Others brought their particular iwi focus to the discussion arguing for the centrality of iwi in the debate, rather than the generic ‘Māori’ often implied in bi-culturalism. Api Mahuika followed Vercoe’s line in arguing that the present system on the ground had failed ‘because strength of Ngāti Porou is whanau based; a rohe [parish] system assumes and presumes that it can change the Ngāti Porou concept of whanau parochialism.’ Mahuika essentially argued for an iwi-based Church that would be an expression of iwi understandings. He proposed Ngāti Porou worship forms, removing ‘the long standing tradition of praying in translation’, asserting that a Ngāti Porou worship form ‘does not mean a heretical or Schismatic status... Those who think so are still of a colonial mentality.’ There were even those on the Mihinare spectrum who saw the opportunity of structural overhaul as an opportunity to examine the fundamentals of being Māori and Christian. Waho Tibble of Ngāti Porou was a good example, noting proudly the history of Ngāti Porou Christianity but enquiring as to the possibility of resurrecting pre-contact forms of worship, noting for example that while traditional art forms had been lost and resurrected ‘engari ko nga karakia tuturu kaore i whakaarangia’ (however traditional forms of worship have not been). It would be these challenges of the renewed search for an “authentic” Māori and iwi identity, led ironically enough by ground-breaking institutions such as Te Wānanga o Raukawa, that would prove the major intellectual challenge for the post-constitutional Māori church.
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In the meantime structural change was close as the new constitutional form began to take shape. The ‘Bi-Cultural Commission of the Anglican Church on the Treaty of Waitangi’ established by Winiata’s motion in 1984 began its work by seeking submissions from around the church. Mihinare established a working group, including the Roman Catholic Manuka Henare, which would draft submissions to the Commission. At the group’s hui in September 1985¹⁴⁸ Whatarangi Winiata began by noting that to date the Commission was ‘lacking practical submissions on how the church can change its ways’, stressing the need for this hui to come up with practical solutions. The group was, as could be expected, clear on the importance of Te Tiriti o Waitangi with Professor Hirini Mead suggesting that the church ‘should commit itself first to the treaty of Waitangi and thus proclaim the principles inherent in the treaty such as tino rangatiratanga’ with Henare following this up by asking ‘whether the Treaty of Waitangi could be entrenched within the constitutional documents of the Anglican Church’.

Discussion then turned to the practical constitutional options in front of them. Pīhopa Vercoe, perhaps naturally enough from a bishop’s perspective, advocated for a diocesan structure for Mihinare arguing cautiously ‘that using those steps familiar to the pakeha such as the diocesan structure would help so that we could then build up ministry, move to develop further Episcopal ministry and make those changes while the body is being built up.’ However the formidable kuia Vera Morgan, one of the founders of the Ngāti Poneke Young Māori Club, called instead for some “blue-sky thinking” asking ‘in the case of the Bishopric being in charge with no partners to hamper us – what would we do to make the best provision for our people?’ George Connor, the experienced Pākehā minita, wondered whether it was not a question of ‘asking for one diocese alongside seven others, but where one structure equals the seven’ and the discussion began to turn away from the existing paradigm of revising General Synod and instead to a much more radical overhaul. New ideas began to flow around establishing a separate Māori body that would work alongside, but be separate from the dioceses and General Synod, with Henare noting they would be in a tuakana/teina (elder/younger) relationships ‘where the tuakana is quite clearly
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the Māori’. Thus the discussion had rapidly moved from revising existing structures to a complete overhaul of relationships.

There was even discussion of what would be effectively complete withdrawal from the Church with Vercoe noting ‘that we really cannot hide our wish to have complete autonomy’ and that ‘if General Synod is not able to adapt and adopt these principles, then the bishopric should withdraw and build on what we have as Māori Anglicans.’ Winiata followed this idea by noting that ‘the Bishopric is in a very strong position and could in fact state that it will write its own constitution’ – a complete separation. Interestingly when it came to a discussion around the theology of these developments it was led by the Roman Catholic, with Henare pointing out ‘that criticism on the grounds of theology for such developments as being separatist do not stand so long as the Pihopatanga is clear on its own theological base. The rest of the Church will simply have to go along with it.’ Mihinare put forward a radical proposal that effectively withdrew Māori from General Synod and proposed that ‘based on article II of the Treaty and the promise of ‘tino rangatiratanga; the setting up of the Aotearoa Runanga as an equal partner with the General Synod’. The proposal also sought to define the place of Pākehā instead of accepting them as the default, declaring the need to set out ‘for the Church a clear understanding of the concepts of ‘tangata whenua’ and ‘manuhiri’”

The Bi-Cultural Commission brought out a widely-circulated discussion paper in 1986 entitled ‘Te Kaupapa Tikanga Rua’ (The Issue of Bi-Culturalism), the title giving a fairly good indication of the direction in which they would head. The report defined biculturalism as ‘the theory that it is beneficial for two cultures to exist within one nation’ and noted that within the Church ‘bi-cultural development means taking steps to ensure that the Gospel of Christ takes root in, and is expressed through two different cultural forms within the one provincial or national Church’. The Principle of Partnership was defined by the Commission as meaning ‘that each cultural group or person is accorded the same dignity in Christ, make their distinctive contribution to the common life of the Church and
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each encourages and supports the other.\footnote{Ibid, pp.33-34.} There was however some fairly searching critique in the paper. The Commission questioned the theology of Bi-Culturalism, asking whether it was ‘Secular humanitarian or Christian?’ without necessarily coming up with an answer, and also asserting that ‘there are dangers in separate ethnic ecclesiastical structures... How far down the road of ethnic ecclesiastical separation can we go without denying the reconciling Gospel of Christ?’\footnote{Ibid, pp.35-37.} There was also an interesting opinion from Commission member (and Roman Catholic) Tipene O’Reagan who cautioned the whole Church to consider their motivation in this process:

> there is a an increasing tendency to fuel the move towards biculturalism in the Church with guilt by association, to make each tiny step on the path to inclusion of the Waitangi principles in the life of the Church an act of penance for the evils of colonialism and a century of rapacious sin by the power culture – much of it Anglican. Now I happen to think that that is an inappropriate basis for developing a more fruitful bicultural society and even less so for a fruitfully bicultural church... Guilt is too blunt an instrument to carve that new house the Commission has set itself upon\footnote{Tipene O’Reagan, ‘Another View’, in \textit{Te Kaupapa Tikanga Rua: Report of the Bi-Cultural Commission of the Anglican Church on the Treaty of Waitangi}, Wellington, 1986, pp.47-48.}

This was an important thought from one of the leaders of Ngāi Tahu, who only that year had lodged their historical claim with the Waitangi Tribunal.

Having done as asked and investigated the issues of partnership and bi-culturalism, the Commission returned to General Synod in 1986. They offered three models for general consideration. The first was that presented by Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa, establishing a separate body from General Synod; the second gave Māori and Pākehā equal power in General Synod; and the third allowed either side veto over ‘partnership and bi-cultural development issues’ – whatever they might be.\footnote{Te Kaupapa Tikanga Rua, pp.31-32.} General Synod responded by immediately giving full power of ‘episcopal care and oversight of Maori people throughout the Province’ to the Pīhopa o Aotearoa, who no longer required a commission from diocesan bishops.\footnote{PGS, 1986, pp.116-17.} The meeting also established Te Rōpū Whakatika i te Pouhere o te Hāhi Mihinare – The
Provincial Bicultural Commission on the Review of the Constitution, that would look at ways to revise the 1857 Constitution of the Church to include ‘the principles of partnership and bi-cultural development’.156 This Commission (which included Winiata) released its interim report in 1989 to be considered by all parties, which was in effect a draft constitution entrenching bi-culturalism and partnership principles.

However in 1990 General Synod met for its regularly scheduled biennial meeting in Fiji. Until that point the discussion had been fairly much exclusively focused on Māori and Pākehā relations in New Zealand. The Fiji meeting brought the realisation that ‘Polynesia had not been recognised as a distinct cultural entity’157 and had been treated as a missionary outpost of the New Zealand Church. This led to the discussion on the wider constitution being deferred for that meeting and instead focused on Polynesia, who were granted full diocesan status.158 The place of Polynesia in the new arrangements became a large factor for consideration, and the Commission included that into its thinking based on submissions received. A special session of General Synod was held in November 1990, very similar to that of 1925, where the future of the Church was decided. At this meeting a draft constitution was presented and considered. It was then brought back to the next General Synod in 1992 to be adopted which the then Archbishop Brian Davis called ‘the most momentous Synod since the first Constitution in 1857 provided the structural blueprint for the Church of the Province of New Zealand’.159 Te Pouhere O Te Hahi Mihinare Ki Aotearoa Ki Niu Tireni, Ki Nga Moutere O Te Moana Nui A Kiwa (The Constitution Of The Anglican Church In Aotearoa, New Zealand And Polynesia) was a radical overhaul of the constitutional arrangements of the Anglican Church in these islands. The seven Pākehā dioceses remained intact alongside Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa but under General Synod there were now a collective ‘Tikanga’ - a culturally-based restructuring of the Church. The key clause to implement this read:
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i raro i nga tikanga mahi ngatahi, tikanga rua hoki, ko te Hahi me matua… whakatau i ana take i runga ano i nga tikanga, tikanga Pākehā hoki (ara, nga ropu a-Iwi, te reo, nga ture, nga kaupapa me te whakahaere) o ia tikanga

the principles of partnership and bicultural development require the Church to… organise its affairs within each of the tikanga (social organisations, language, laws, principles, and procedure) of each partner

It appeared as if finally Mihinare had achieved the long-sought aspiration for mana motuhake (self-determination), with the ability to determine their own path utilising their own cultural values. Jenny Te Paa described the constitution as a choice ‘to move Pakeha Anglicans from being mono-cultural, dominant majority partners to becoming bi-cultural, equal partners (with a minority partner) in the Anglican Church’.

Challenges remained, however. After the meeting in Fiji the issue of how to recognise Polynesia was now a substantial one. By November 1990 it was so large that the draft constitution had been amended to include not just two but now three ‘Tikanga’ – Tikanga Māori, Tikanga Pākehā, and Tikanga Pasefika. This posed serious challenges for Māori, with Hone Kaa summing up the thinking as ‘it is difficult to understand how the Anglican Church can claim to have a Treaty of Waitangi based Constitution and yet manage to have three distinct cultural perspectives within that Constitution’. In fact serious consideration was given to the realpolitik of including a third Tikanga into bi-cultural arrangements, with some Māori seeing ‘this move on the part of Pakeha as a means of thwarting Maori ambitions for shared power’ by diluting the bi-cultural relationship. Some Pākehā on the other hand demanded the inclusion of Polynesia as a precondition for agreeing to the new constitution, with the rather nebulous (and unconsidered) ‘multiculturalism’ being seen as preferred to the potentially more confrontational ‘biculturalism’. There was also, of course, criticism of the new constitution as being...
Anglican Priest Christopher Tremewan questioned the ‘endorsement of racial division as an organising principle’ suggesting that it was a confluence of ‘political and economic crisis in New Zealand in the mid-1980s... As the nation was establishing its historic guilt with respect to Maori, it could be expected that the Church, for which guilt is a core business, would also respond’ with the drive for this guilt stemming from a combination of anti-racism movements, activism and indigeneism. Tremewan also argued that the neo-liberal political climate of the time required the creation of elites to create the perception of partnership, and that the 1992 constitution was a case of traditional leadership joining Pākehā cultural intellectuals and lawyers to create new elite, and that ‘this elite strategy permeated the Anglican Church, a core social mechanism of the conservative Maori elite’.

Regardless of the criticisms of the 1992 constitution, it had proved to be a major milestone for Mihinare. They now had almost complete constitutional freedom within the Church to give life to their own expression of faith and it was a great time of celebration and of planning for the future as a truly ‘Māori’ church. The reality would be though that independence was not what it seemed. A generation of leadership was exhausted from its constant struggles and would find it difficult, if not impossible, to break out of a mode of permanent revolution and into new ‘post-settlement’ thinking. The 1992 constitutional revision brought only limited resource-sharing with it and the vast majority of minita on the ground would remain unpaid, working alongside the dioceses with their regiments of professional and well-resourced clergy. In the wider ‘Māori’ world, particularly in Māori academia, intellectual pressures were building alongside the Church that would challenge the notion of ‘Māori Christianity’ in any form. This, combined with decreasing participation in Church life meant that the Mihinare ‘victory’ was not as recognised as it would have been in the past. Regardless of all these factors though, it was a breakthrough for Mihinare. They had worked among themselves as iwi and, based on their mātauranga, had developed a vision that had come to fruition.

---
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Chapter 5
He Hāhi Māori: The Evolution of a Pan-Tribal Church

The struggle for ecclesiastical emancipation in the post-war era had proven successful for Mihinare. By the end of the century they had gained long-sought for mana motuhake, (self-determination), and were in full constitutional parity with Pākehā. However alongside the post-war struggle for political power went another struggle for intellectual emancipation. What, after all would it profit Mihinare to gain the political world and yet lose their intellectual soul? This struggle would come in three areas: theological education and theological expression, which had its roots going back into the nineteenth century; the expression of that education and thinking through forms of ministry; and the expansion of this thought and practice into the Māori ecumenical movement. Although these struggles would all be driven to one degree or another by iwi dynamics and iwi knowledge, they would also become a space where a new way of thinking would emerge – a pan-iwi even pan-hāhi expression of faith: a truly Māori church.

Education was a key tool used by Selwyn and the Church Missionary Society (CMS) in the formation and control of Māori minita. The struggles that Rota Waitoa had undergone in order to become the first Māori to be ordained were replicated by other Māori candidates for ordination. The patronising attitude of Selwyn who viewed Māori ‘like the children still in infancy, requiring not only maintenance but also guidance and control’ was reflected in the curriculum and pedagogy offered by St John’s College in Auckland. However the CMS division with Selwyn over issues of ecclesiology came to a head for Māori when in 1847 they withdrew their students back to Waimate in the North to resume their own minita training.
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1 He Hāhi Māori (A Māori Church)
programme. Then in 1853 St John’s had a crisis of its own when the college was closed due to ‘evil practices being prevalent under some of the English students’ and the ‘innocent Māori’ were sent home. The ‘evil practices’ were not the patronising pedagogical practices of the college, but instead what was either an “outbreak” of homosexuality led by some of Selwyn’s English expatriate students, or sexual abuse of the Māori students; at the time the former possibility seemed more upsetting to the Church authorities than the latter.3 The closure of the College was also an opportunity for the fledgling settler institution to restart the college without Māori, and St John’s was re-established in 1853 as ‘English Collegiate Institution’, leading to little Māori involvement for the next 70 years.4

The Anglican Church also provided education for Māori minita outside of St John’s. In 1854 William Williams as bishop of Waiapu had established a training school at Waerenga-a-hika just out of Gisborne on land gifted by Te Whānau-a-Taupara.5 However in 1865 Pai Marire forces and followers moved into the area, soon followed by government forces and Ngāti Porou troops led by Mokena Kohere who occupied and fortified the school and laid siege to the Pai Marire position.6 The school was badly damaged and William Williams moved the diocesan headquarters to the relative safety of Napier. Following this, and alongside the consolidation of political and military gains made by the settler state, in 1866 the CMS decided to make selection and training of Māori clergy a priority, and established a Board to fund this training.7 By 1882 the CMS had decided to withdraw its support from New Zealand so it could concentrate on other parts of the Empire and handed its land holdings over to New Zealand Mission Trust Board, who in turn decided to focus its support on William Leonard Williams’ burgeoning new training facility in Gisborne, Te Rau Kahikatea.8
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3 Allan Davidson, Selwyn’s Legacy, Auckland, 1993, p.79.
4 Davidson, Selwyn’s Legacy, p.79.
Te Rau Kahikatea\(^9\) was on the surface similar to St John’s College (SJC), in that it was established by the settler Church, funded by the CMS and used largely Pākehā pedagogy and curricula. It could also be viewed as a bottleneck, where in order to become minita Māori were required to enter its doors and come out transformed in some way with the staff being the gatekeepers. However there were significant differences from a Māori perspective. Firstly, William Leonard Williams was a different type of teacher from the SJC staff, fluent in the language and ideas of Māori after having had long years of close contact with Māori Minita, especially those from Ngāti Porou including Mohi Turei, Hare Tawhaa and Raniera Kawhia.\(^{10}\) This flowed through into the pedagogy with all of the instruction at Te Rau Kahikatea in the nineteenth century being in te reo Māori, with many common text books translated into te reo for the benefit of the students. Use of language was an important point, where the English curriculum had been adapted for the benefit of Māori students, rather than the students adapted to meet the curriculum which had been the case at St John’s College. The staff at Te Rau Kahikatea would continue to be understanding of a Māori worldview, including the next principal Herbert William Williams who took over from his father Leonard when he became Bishop, and tutors including minita Reweti Kohere and Pine Tamahori. Te Rau Kahikatea also fostered other initiatives including the publication of the Māori church newspaper *Te Pīpīwharauroa* played a vital role in disseminating Māori religious and political views, and which by 1910 had a print run of around 1000 per edition.\(^{11}\)

Te Rau Kahikatea also brought together minita from across different iwi to train together and by 1887 there were 20 students preparing for ordination.\(^{12}\) These candidates came from many iwi including Kahi Harawira from Te Aupouri, Taimona Hapimana from Ngāti Whakaue, Hemi Huata from Ngāti Kahungunu, and Mutu Kapa from Te Aupouri and Maniapoto – a wide spread across iwi.\(^{13}\) Even though the candidates were being pulled from
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\(^9\) Te Rau Kahikatea was also known as Te Rau College. See George Connor, ‘Whāia te Atuatanga: theological education, text books, Te Rau College, cultures and contexts’, MA Thesis – Massey, 2012, p.30. The name Te Rau Kahikatea literally means a stand of native White Pine trees, and is a metaphorical allusion to an abundance of resources, or wealth.

\(^{10}\) 2472 William Leonard Williams Maori Notes 1865, ATL, Wellington.

\(^{11}\) Davidson, *Selwyn’s Legacy*, p.135.


\(^{13}\) Ibid, p.152.
their local whānau and hapū context Te Rau Kahikatea became a relatively safe space for Māori to grow as minita, and the students became what Api Mahuika described as ‘new religious tohunga’ - respected in the communities they eventually went to.\footnote{A. Mahuika, ‘Leadership: Inherited and Achieved’, in M. King ed., \textit{Te Ao Hurihuri}, Auckland, 1991, p.59.} Although Māori had come together to train at St John’s College, there they had been subject to immense assimilationist pressures. Now there was to be a period of consolidation for \textit{Mihinare} as a new, nationwide, entity, with George Connor asserting that ‘the former students of Te Rau College became the main-stay of te Hāhi Mihingare for the next fifty years. They laid the foundation for a church that would be led by Māori, ministered to by Māori, in a Māori context’\footnote{Connor, pp.107-108.} and that Te Rau Kahikatea became ‘a crucial element… in the creation of a truly Māori segment of the Anglican Church’.\footnote{Ibid, p.5.}

However by the turn of the century the constant assimilationist pressures within the Church were cycling up again and Te Rau Kahikatea became a target. Even though Māori theological education had been largely ignored by the Church since the closure of St John’s College in 1853, by 1901 General Synod had turned its attention back to Te Rau requiring that teaching be undertaken in English, a significant reversal of pedagogical practice.\footnote{Ibid, p.77.} By the end of World War One Te Rau Kahikatea was closed. Partly this closure was ascribed to the financial difficulties of the New Zealand Mission Trust Board.\footnote{Rosevear, p.163.} However the closure must be seen in the context of a broader discourse around the demand for Māori to become merged into mainstream education. Waiapu Diocese declared in 1918 that ‘our Maoris, by sharing their student life with the English students, and by fellowship with them, would gain that wider outlook, bigger vision and broader education so necessary in their ministrations to the more progressive Maoris’.\footnote{Waiapu Year Book 1918, p.29.} The closure was even over the strenuous objection of members of the Young Māori Party such as Reweti Kohere, and Dr. Wi Repa who passed a motion ‘condemning the precipitate step taken by the bishops’.\footnote{Reweti T. Kohere, \textit{The Story of a Maori Chief}, Auckland, 1949, p.97.} George Connor asserts that the closure was part of a larger agenda, ‘a desire on behalf of the Pakeha
Church to control all things Maori, an agenda of assimilation of Maori in a “united nation and Church”’. This assimilation would take the form of a resurgent St John’s College.

The New Zealand Missions Trust Board (NZMTB) had undertaken the unilateral and seemingly arbitrary decision to move minita training from the culturally safe space of Te Rau Kahikatea to the hostile environment of St John’s College. In 1923 Te Rau was closed and the students transferred to Auckland. As part of the deal the NZMTB agreed to pay the St John’s College Trust Board £350 per annum for 20 years to place up to 10 Māori students per year, and to pay for a tutor for the Māori students on top of that. This funding was required in spite of the college being established explicitly for the education of Pākehā and Māori, as if Māori were now an additional extra. The change for Māori students was significant. As Jenny Te Paa notes the Māori students moved from ‘an essentially Maori environment… to an essentially Pakeha environment’ where they now had no families, no community integration, and no use of their own language except among themselves. From early on the NZMTB asserted a need for discipline amongst Māori students, with an implied assumption that they were ill-disciplined in the first place. Far from the leadership of the relatively understanding Williams whānau, the College Warden Arthur Payne asserted assimilationist policies including actively discouraging the use of te reo Māori amongst the students. This was another instance of the settler Church following the lead of wider social pressures in New Zealand society, in this instance by lining up with the wider schooling system in the suppression of te reo Māori.

This suppression of te reo at the college was in spite of the strenuous efforts by Apirana Ngata and others to keep a Māori identity alive. In 1947, with Ngata’s support, the Waiapu Diocesan Maori Mission Committee wrote to ask about the possibility of a Māori tutor for the Māori students and about the teaching of the reo. The response from the college was as brutal as it was predictable – that ‘a special tutor for Maori students might encourage
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undesirable racial distinctions in the College’ and that ‘it was doubted whether tuition in the Maori language was a proper function of a theological college.’ Māori participation in the life of the college pre-war was at a low across the board. From a high of 10 students in 1925 the numbers dropped right down, averaging only two Māori students a year from 1928-1940 despite the NZMTB still being required to fund the ten places. This situation continued for Māori at the college right up until the 1960s, and as Jenny Te Paa writes life was difficult at the College and ‘Maori students could often do no more than make the task of being at St John’s College an exercise in survival, rather than being an opportunity for growth, professionally or personally.’ Māori were far from victims though, and even in the interwar years Māori continued to succeed at the college, including Te Anga (Dan) Kaa from Ngāti Porou, Mangatitoki Cameron from Te Rarawa and Te Aupouri, and Wiremu Panapa all completed their LTh.

However even though iwi aspirations were strongly challenged by the whims and vicissitudes of the Pākehā side of the Church, iwi had never been content to wait upon them and were constantly looking for alternatives that would better meet their needs. Frederick Bennett himself, in one of his first acts as Pīhopa, laid out to Komiti Tumuaki the concerns of Mihinare at the actions taking place at St John’s College:

Kia kaha koutou ki te titiro mai i etahi tangata mo te turanga Minita. Kanui te awangawanga o te whakaaro mo nga tamariki Maori e kura mai nei i te Kareti o Hoani i Akarana. Ehara i te mea kei nga akoranga te he, engari ko te mea ie kitea ana, ko te kaha rawa o te whakapakeha o nga tamariki e puta mai ana i reira, me te kuare ki te whakahaire i nga karakia Maori. Na reira ka hoki au te whakaaro ki Te Rau Kahikatea, otira ko te waahi pai rawa ko Te Aute Kareti.

You must be strong in seeking people to be ordained as clergy. Great is the distress at the thought of our young Māori who are coming to be educated at the College of St John’s in Auckland. It is not that the students are wrong, but the thing is as I see it, the power of the assimilation of our young people coming out of there, and their inability to conduct worship in a Māori form. Therefore I

28 Plane-Te Paa, p.90.
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return to the vision of Te Rau Kahikatea, indeed to the great place of Te Aute College.

In 1934 Bennett and the Bishop of Waipu Herbert Williams (who had followed his father and grandfather as diocesan bishop) established a Divinity Department at Te Aute College which ran alongside the existing agricultural and matriculation departments.\(^{31}\) Seemingly not satisfied that this initiative was enough, in 1935 Bennett called for the establishment of ‘a Maori Theological College separate from St John’s’.\(^{32}\) The Te Aute department was very successful and by 1936 there were sixteen Māori students studying theology there, compared with only two at SJC. However the death of Williams in 1937, the coming of the war and the rise of the Auckland assimilationist Bishop Simkin would mean the end of the Te Aute experiment.\(^{33}\)

Changes in theological education as well as the entire ministry and mission of the church were naturally influenced by wider social and political trends in society. However there were specific foci for these changes in the shape of key intellectual developments, in this case within the academic discipline of theology. As the work of Venn had shown in the nineteenth century, church policy could be shaped (or rejected) based on key thinkers and their ideas being disseminated throughout the Anglican Empire, and throughout Christianity in general. By the beginning of the twentieth century the ideas of the missiologist Roland Allen had become important, stemming from Venn in that they allowed for cultural diversity and the building of a Native church. Allen questioned the role of colonisation in the spread of Christianity, and the notion of ‘Western civilisation’ underpinning Christianity.\(^{34}\) Allen, an experienced missionary himself based primarily in China, questioned the idea that churches established throughout the world should be seen in some ways as less mature than the Western churches that propagated them, and cited the New Testament example of Paul who upon establishing new Churches around the
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Mediterranean believed that they were ‘complete churches’ immediately, with no aspect of central control needed nor required from the originating base.\textsuperscript{35} This was of course in stark contrast to existing models where the Empire would maintain control and exercise paternal influence over the ‘new’ churches, and in this he went further than Venn’s ideals had allowed for. Allen also asserted a ‘radical religious anthropology’ which stated that the ‘cultural state carries no prior moral entitlement or disqualification’\textsuperscript{36} for salvation, and that ‘salvation was not by cultural osmosis’.\textsuperscript{37}

However as was the case in the nineteenth century, theological developments were not solely dependent on Western thinkers and local Native ideas arose across the globe. Venn’s nineteenth-century ideals of the ‘three selves’ – ‘self-government, self-support, self-propagation’ – were limiting in that they could never be fully accomplished in comparison to the millennia-old Western churches, making local Native churches effectively ‘Peter Pan’ churches that could never really mature as long as they remained tied to Western apron strings.\textsuperscript{38} Instead, in the first half of the twentieth century across the Anglican Empire change came inspired by three forces: anthropological thought ‘which gradually revealed the relativity and contextuality of all cultures’; the maturation of ‘younger churches’ free from missionary control; and later, nationalism in the Third World.\textsuperscript{39} Venn’s ‘Three-self’ model added a fourth self - ‘self-theologizing’.\textsuperscript{40}

This self-theologizing – Natives gaining new insights into their own engagement with Christianity – started in the 1920s and 30s in India and Asia. Bishop Azariah had been a key exponent of this school of thought, perhaps best manifested in his cathedral he had constructed in Dornakal. The Cathedral Church of the Epiphany used influences from the Hindu, Buddhist, Muslim and Christian traditions. This included a series of twelve pillars representing the twelve apostles of Christ that each incorporated the imagery of the lotus flower, representing purity in both Hindu and Buddhist traditions; datura, representing death in Hindu understanding; and the shoot of the banana tree, representing new life.\textsuperscript{41}

\footnotesize
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\textsuperscript{37} Ibid, p.ix.
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\textsuperscript{40} Ibid, p.451-52.
\textsuperscript{41} Susan Billington Harper, \textit{In the Shadow of the Mahatma}, Grand Rapids, 2000, p.262.
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This self-theologizing dynamic also played out strongly in China, alongside the massive political and social identity change manifested in the struggle between the nationalist and communist forces. By the 1920s the ‘pen-se’ (‘native Chinese’) Christian movement in China was pushing a form of nationalist Christianity ‘of the Chinese people’. 42 Similarly to the role played by the Te Toa Takitini church newspaper in the Māori world, the Christian magazine The National Literature Association Monthly was a key vehicle in the 1920s for fostering Chinese Christian debate in the local vernacular. A leading writer for the magazine was C.Y. Cheng, who had been the Chinese delegate alongside Azariah at the 1910 World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh. In 1925 Cheng wrote an article in the magazine entitled ‘Discussing an Indigenous Church’, in which he called for the development of an ‘indigenous church’ which in his thinking would allow ‘the various activities of Christianity [to] be fused with the customs, environment, history and thought of the East… deeply infused in the hearts of people with cultural roots that have been formed over thousands of years’. It would also be a politically autonomous church, in which ‘indigenization means responsibility taken by Chinese Christians for all of their Church affairs.’ 43 Cheng also called for the use of Chinese cultural traditions in religious practice, but not just on a superficial ritual level, asserting ‘the integration of East and West could not be achieved by such methods as merely regurgitating the liturgy developed by the Western churches, relocating Western customs and conditions intact to China, or evangelical injections of Western beliefs’. 44 Cheng was part of a surge of Asian and Indian Christian leaders and thinkers pushing for ecclesiastical, and possibly more importantly, theological, autonomy.

The impact of this thinking in the form of Azariah’s visit to New Zealand and his influence on iwi has been explored. But Azariah was not a one-off influence. The dissemination of new ideas such as anthropology, so influential on Ngata and his cohort, had enabled a new way of expressing what had been age-old iwi aspirations to take shape within the Church. Bennett himself, far from the sycophantic or indoctrinated model of thinking he might be portrayed as, was, like Cheng and others of his era actually a proponent of the assertion of a Māori world-view as a way to understand and portray

44 Ibid, p.326.
Christianity. One of Bennett’s first visits after his ordination as Pīhopa was to the North where after an enthusiastic reception he laid out his vision for Aotearoa and for the people in the North. In particular he focused on a Māori (and iwi) expression of Anglicanism, selectively retaining the parts he saw as important and adapting others, focusing on amongst other things ecclesiastical aesthetics:

He wa tenei i tika ana kia whakahoutia nga mahi whakapaipai a o koutou tupuna, ara te whakairo, te tai, me te taniko. He taonga pai rawa enei ki roto i nga whare karakia kia kanui a paitia ai enei mea o to taua Maoritanga, hei mea ano hoki e mau ai te wairua Maori i roto i nga whakapaipai o o tatou Whare Karakia. Hei timatanga atu ma koutou, he mea pai te hoatu i enei mea ki nga wahi tapu o o koutou Whare Karakia a ma te wa e whakaoti he whare katoa.45

This is the time to renew the decorative arts of your ancestors, namely the carving, the colours and the embroidery. These are great treasures in the church buildings, and these are the things that greatly enhance our identity as Māori, as things that retain our Māori spirituality within the symbolism of our church buildings. This is a beginning for you, a good thing to apply to the sacred spaces of your church buildings as you come to complete them.

Bennett himself had led the construction of St Faith’s Church at Ohinemutu in Rotorua at the turn of the century, a seminal example of the weaving of Māori understanding into an Anglican temple. For Bennett as Pīhopa to be so explicit in his exhortation to the people of the North, those who had been most heavily influenced by the dreary puritanical aesthetics of the CMS, was a significant intellectual moment. Bennett was also conscious to maintain his links to the Asian influences of the Māori Church, and in 1938 he spent several months in India after attending the Missionary Conference at Tambaram, including being present for the consecration of Azariah’s cathedral in 1939.46

As noted, far from being alone in these inculturative endeavours Bennett was part of a cohort based around Young Māori Party alumni, those who wished to be both Anglican and Māori in their fullest sense. Ngata’s favourite minita, and his preferred candidate for

Pīhopa o Aotearoa, had been Pine Tamahori whose merging of iwi knowledge and Christian expression was unsurpassed. Tamahori’s praxis included leading a faith ‘revival’ movement in the Waiapu valley in the 1930s based on ancient Ngāti Porou epistemology, where in Ngata’s words his ministry ‘led to the revival of the haka and waiata and recovery of the literary culture of the tribe’. Tamahori even took these practices to the far North as a type of cultural missionary.\textsuperscript{47} Ngata himself utilised an anthropological framework to articulate a new theology, emphasising that such theology must be derived from a Māori worldview rather than merely adjusting a Pākehā theology. Ngata noted that the Christian churches as a whole needed to look out ‘from the pa... with a Maori mind, a Maori heart and a Maori back-ground’ and that in the future faith would need to be based on ‘Maori services, Maori clergy, Maori language, Maori ways and Maori Christianity’ concluding that ‘I don’t think Heaven will be very much upset that the Pākehā system and style hasn’t been rigidly adhered to.’\textsuperscript{48}

Mihinare, in fact, were ever ready to challenge what they perceived as degrading theology. In 1948 St John’s College student Kingi Ihaka led a short campaign against a textbook in use at the college. The 1930 text entitled ‘A history of the modern church from 1500 to the present day’ was written by the then Archbishop of Brisbane William Wand. Ihaka wrote to Māori Land Court Judge Harold Carr\textsuperscript{49} to protest against the book. His complaints included that in the section on Māori, Wand wrote that missionaries had been sent to ‘teach a low and degraded type of humanity to understand the arts of civilisation’, and that the name Hauhau derived from the noise of ‘barking like a dog’, when ‘hauhau has no connection with a dog’. Ihaka further declared ‘I only read the passage this evening and I am determined to ‘squash’ Dr. Wand and his wild statements. My blood simply boiled when I read this and as a matter of fact although he is a bishop of the church, we the students, would like to write to him to give him a piece of our minds.’\textsuperscript{50} Carr, slightly bemused, wrote to Ngata stating ‘I must ‘pass the buck’ this is beyond me... can you do anything to assist

\textsuperscript{48} Apirana Ngata to Dan Kaa, c.1945, 191 - Papers re Maori church affairs 1944-1948, MS-Papers-6919-0396, ATL, Wellington.
\textsuperscript{49} Carr was the first Māori to hold a seat on the Land Court and was an influential lay figure in the Māori church.
\textsuperscript{50} Kingi Ihaka to Judge Carr, 1 April 1948, 192 - Papers re Maori church affairs 1944-1948, MS-Papers-6919-0397, ATL, Wellington.
this earnest young man.' Even though only a brief episode the example displays how Mihinare theological thought was not a new development; it just waited on Pākehā to learn of its existence.

To greater or lesser extents these movements from New Zealand to Asia and elsewhere around the globe had been tied to wider political and social developments in their lands. They were also nothing new as the Native Churches around the globe had from their establishment consistently asserted their own identities in the face of colonisation. However in the post World War Two era new frameworks began that would not only assert the Native Church agenda, but would also register significantly on the theological radar of the Western churches. Riding a wave of nationalism in the ‘Third World’, new ‘theologies of liberation…evolved in protest against the inability in Western church and missionary circles, both Catholic and Protestant, to grapple with the problems of systemic injustice.’ Starting off with the East-West Capitalism/Communism dichotomy, this ‘liberation theology’ soon evolved into a North-South discussion, where ‘the poor’ (standing in for all the marginalised), became theology’s ‘new hermeneutical locus’. Liberation theology was not synonymous with Marxism, instead it used Marxism selectively and critically, utilising Marxist analysis ‘as an instrument of critique rather than in a prescriptive way.’ Liberation theologies were diverse, covering everything from the classical South American expression through to feminist, black, South African and Asian. Probably most importantly of all for Māori these new theologies, starting with the Roman Catholics in the post-Vatican II atmosphere, but certainly applicable to the Anglican Empire, were key in the process theologian Leonardo Boff named “ecclesiogenesis” – reinventing the church on a local level. In this case the ‘local’ was the Māori church.

This process of interweaving local understandings with Christian traditions and scholarship became known among theologians as ‘inculturation’. Missiologist David Bosch points out that by the time of colonial expansion ‘Western Christians were unconscious of
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the fact that their theology was culturally conditioned; they simply assumed that it was supracultural and universally valid’.\textsuperscript{57} The idea of inculturation arose alongside the development of liberation theologies, and, promulgated by Jesuits theologians became the radical thought that ‘the Christian faith never exists except “translated” into a culture.’\textsuperscript{58} According to this thinking existing forms of Christianity had merely been ‘European translations’, and the time had come to recognise that other ‘translations’ were equally valid. However as Bosch noted there was also a ‘critical dimension’ to inculturation, where this new understanding could also critique the culture it was inspired by, because ‘the faith and its cultural expression… are never completely coterminous’.\textsuperscript{59} Bosch also pointed out that the inculturation process would never be complete because due to cultures never being static nor theology complete ‘inculturation remains a tentative and continuing process’.\textsuperscript{60}

The idea of inculturation found fertile, pre-prepared ground amongst indigenous Christians. The post 1960s activism in North America saw the rise of the ‘red power’ movement, an indigenous expression of wider struggles for freedom and justice. According to indigenous scholar James Treat the mainstream churches played an important part in this movement, and ‘the formation of the native Christian caucuses is an important dimension of contemporary native activism that has been almost completely overlooked by academic scholars.’\textsuperscript{61} One of the greatest thinkers behind this movement for indigenous liberation theology was Yankton Sioux scholar Vine Deloria Jr, himself the son and grandson of Episcopalian (Anglican) priests. Deloria’s early books including \textit{Custer Died for Your Sins} and \textit{God is Red} coincided with the rise of the red power movement.\textsuperscript{62} Deloria’s work not only provided intellectual fuel for indigenous Christians to engage with social activism, but also provided an alternative perspective in that that Deloria was one of the first authors to ‘mount a sustained critique of the liberation theology movement’ because of its unquestioning foundation on Western epistemology.\textsuperscript{63} Within the Episcopalian (Anglican)
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Church in the US these works were beginning to be noticed, and would lead to a new generation of indigenous writers and thinkers including George Tinker (Osage/Cherokee) and Bishop Steve Charleston (Choctaw), who would create strong relationships with Mihinare leading to the formation of the Anglican Indigenous Network in the 1990s.

In the Māori world this new theological discourse led to the sounding of new voices and the testing of new language. From the mid-1960s Methodist minita Ruawai Rakena became a leading exponent in testing this new approach in a Māori context. In his 1971 seminal work ‘The Maori Response to the Gospel’ Rakena led a charge in challenging the Pākehā side of the Christian Churches around the issue of inculturation. Citing the historical work of Judith Binney and Alan Ward, Rakena noted ‘the ‘demythologizing’ of our history now in process’, and the influence of post-colonial and liberation movements noting ‘rapid social and revolutionary changes are all about us’ demanding ‘nothing less than structural re-thinking from the bottom up, if the Maori is to realize his selfhood and make the response of which he is capable.’ Rakena’s call for change from the Pākehā side of the Methodist church was applicable to all Christian churches in New Zealand, but perhaps more important than demands for structural change was his call for the development of an authentic Māori theology, noting that ‘very little in our Maori Mission may pass as an authentic “Maori” response to the Gospel’, and that ‘even perhaps more damaging is the false assumption, conscious or unconscious, that a response to the Gospel can only be valid if it is expressed in a form consistent with those of the Pakeha’. It might be opportune to tie new critiques such as Rakena’s to the nascent political movements of the era, but as the activist movements were in many ways simply a new expression of an old practice, so was this new theology in many ways just a new expression of continuous Māori aspirations.

Within the relatively conservative Mihinare world change was also coming. Wider Anglican theological debate had for some time been led by overseas developments with little local, let alone Māori, input. By the 1960s while the Presbyterians were busy having their watershed moment with the heresy trial of Lloyd Geering who had challenged
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theological assumptions but also represented liberal change, the Anglicans remained in a relative theological hibernation. Mihinare were being influenced in various circles including a growing awareness of overseas literature on liberation theology. This new theological expression would be vividly portrayed in the process of developing a new prayer book (discussed in chapter six), in the Māori ecumenical movement, as well as manifesting in structural adjustments in the wider Church (as seen in chapter four). However if this was a theological revolution then there were also, inevitably, reactionary forces at work. Partly these took shape in the charismatic movement which became influential in the Anglican Church in the 1960s, developing linkages to the American Pentecostal moments. A new form of English evangelists had been spreading out across the world from the second half of the nineteenth century, led by those such as the Keswick movement of the late 1850s, an English precursor to the turn of the century American Pentecostal movement. The spread of these movements across the world, described by C. Peter Williams as ‘a new age of Imperialist mission’, also came to New Zealand in the hope that ‘the voice of our brethren from home may help to rouse our people from the spiritual drowsiness which is fast spreading over our land’. By 1976 General Synod reported that up to half the Pākehā clergy in Auckland Diocese were either involved with or open to the charismatic movement. Although the extremist-conservative American linkages of the movement would open up in future years, in the early years the movement would include those such as the liturgically conservative Edward Prebble at St Paul’s in Symonds Street, and could embrace liberal social activists as well as theological conservatives.

By the 1970s the mainstream acknowledgement of, if not necessarily agreement with, liberation theologies led to significant changes in the teaching practices at St John’s College. The appointment in 1965 of the Reverend George Armstrong as lecturer in systematic
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theology was a watershed moment. Armstrong was a disciple of the new liberation theologies and provided leadership to other like-minded staff and students, including attending the 1968 traditional Good Friday procession armed with placards “Make Love not War”, “Christ Died for Viet Congs”, and “Christ Died for LBJ”. Armstrong would continue to provide leadership in this area for decades, including leading protestors (and some college students) onto Rugby Park in Hamilton during the 1981 Springbok Tour protest where Armstrong himself held the large cross in the middle of the group occupying the field. This action even led to an attempted fire-bombing of the College in retaliation. By the 1980s the shift at the College was pronounced, with a move from a closed all-male ‘seminonastic’ community including silence and strict dress code, to women students being admitted by the 1970s, and the first women staff starting in 1984.

Although Te Pīhopa o Aotearoa had been a member of the Board of Governors of the College since 1943, there was still relatively little Māori input into decision making. Māori students at the College had been agitating for change publicly for some time with troublesome students such as Api Mahuika in the 1950s and Hone Kaa in the 1960s pressing for the inclusion of te reo Māori into the curriculum as well as the use of more Māori understandings in the overall teaching. From the 1960s the College responded to this pressure by inviting Dr Joan Metge to take introductory classes on “Māori culture” followed by Matiu Te Hau, and in 1968 Kingi Ihaka demanded that all ordination candidates who wished to work with Māori, including Pākehā students, be able to speak in te reo Māori. However Māori still struggled to find a secure life at the College, and the Māori aspiration for the College as a site of cultural construction continued to have its highs and lows. The appointment of experienced Ngāti Porou priest John Tamahori as Māori lecturer in the early 1970s was another example of the struggle for Māori at the College to find their own space to be creative, as he was forced to work with an often uncooperative or even obstructive Pākehā constituency. It would not be until 1990, alongside the huge constitutional overhaul of the Church that St John’s would become fully responsive to the aspirations of Māori at the
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College. This involved the reestablishment of an old name and an even older vision in the establishment onsite at Meadowbank of ‘the theological training institute of Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa’: Te Rau Kahikatea.\footnote{Plane-Te Paa, p.135.}

Innovations in theology and the flow on impact on education still needed expression on the ground in order to be truly transformative. As the experience of the first minita Rota Waitoa had shown in the 1860s, the transition from educational experience to delivery was shaped by the context on the ground – hapū and iwi understandings became the new theology. That delivery was also dependent on the resources available. The early Kaiwhakaako (teachers and evangelists) sent out by the missionaries were supported in various ways, and by 1834 the pay rates for men were a hardware article every six months and a blanket annually, and for women six hardware articles or a garment to the value.\footnote{Lila Hamilton, ‘Christianity among the Maoris: The Maoris and the Church Missionary Society’s Mission, 1814–1868’, PhD thesis, University of Otago, 1970, p.100.} However such “pay” was rare and the CMS told Selwyn early on that while it could pay missionaries, it would not pay for minita who were forced to rely on the iwi they ministered to for support.\footnote{Earl Howe, Anglican Ministry Amongst Maori 1883-1913, Research paper Diploma in Maori Development, Massey University, 1991, p.11.} By the time stipends were offered to Māori the pattern had become one of Māori being paid significantly lower rates than Pākehā clergy, and by the 1880s minita were paid £50 per annum, with half coming from the NZMTB, while the CMS Pākehā range was a fully-funded £150–£450.\footnote{Ibid, p.24.} The CMS had developed the idea that minita could be more self-supporting than Pākehā clergy, ‘cultivating the soil in order to support their families’,\footnote{Morrell, p.123.} but the actual effect of the decision was to force minita into poverty and by the turn of the century even Pākehā bishops were worried about poverty among the minita.\footnote{Howe, p.25.} By 1901 General Synod could no longer ignore this state of affairs because the low rate might ‘discourage the better educated Maoris from offering themselves for Holy Orders’.\footnote{PGS, 1901, pp.111-114.} This situation continued into the twentieth century.

Professional minita in the Auckland Diocese were funded from a range of sources. The
largest source was the NZMTB (the beneficiary of the CMS lands) and the General Trust Board (another church trust) but they were also supported by funds as diverse as the Heemi Matenga bequest, the Birkenhead Sunday School, the Diocesan High School and St Aidan’s Church in Remuera. However the rate was still significantly below that of Pākehā clergy, and minita such as Wiremu Panapa were forced to live frugally including making their own candles from rendered-down fat. By the arrival of the Great Depression minita stipends which had been growing were cut substantially, an extremely difficult proposition for minita many of whom had large families to care for. Even after the war minita had a difficult job. Little support was given to minita from dioceses and, for example, Poihipi Kohere who had been in service since 1906 was forced to use horses and taxis to travel around his parish because the dioceses would not help him pay for car repairs.

Regardless of the issues around pay, by the end of the war there existed a rural, professional minita class that would soon face change. Wiremu Panapa had been appointed Māori Missioner to the Auckland Anglican Māori Mission in 1932 but his was in many ways modelling a rural ministry in an urban setting. After the war however migration to the cities quickly began to gain pace and by 1948 ‘the urgent need for the provision of spiritual leadership among those people who were cut off from tribal influences was regarded as one of the major problems’ faced by the Māori church. By 1962 migration to Christchurch for work and for trade-training schemes was such that the Diocese appointed Te Anga Te Hihi (Dan) Kaa as the first Māori Missioner. Kaa’s vast working area also included the Dunedin Diocese and his substandard church housing in Christchurch was thought by church authorities to be ‘appropriate’ for a Māori. After Kaa’s untimely death in 1965 he was succeeded by a line of minita coming to Christchurch from North Island iwi, including Ngāti Porou, Ngāti Kahu, Nga Puhi, Te Arawa. These minita connected to their own people who had migrated to the city and in some respects recreated iwi loyalties they had left
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behind in the country. Although the minita largely came from the North Island there was significant Ngāi Tahu input, including that of the Ellison whānau. The Diocese created a Komiti Matua (Council for Maori Work) ‘to co-ordinate the hostels, clubs, education and counselling’ needs of Māori in the city, and a Māori Parish Centre was established in Phillipstwon as a meeting place for both church and secular Māori groups including the St John’s Maori Club, the District Maori Council, the Otautahi Maori Committee, the Maori Women’s Welfare League, the Te Aowera Culture Club, and the Maori Warden’s Association. Thus the church became a centre in an urban setting around which Māori could gather and develop their identity in a new context. At the same time in Auckland and Wellington the church was the focus of similar ‘voluntary associations’, defined by Ranginui Walker as key to ‘the successful adjustment of the Maori to urban life’. Other denominations were undertaking a similar push into the cities, with the Katorika (Māori Roman Catholic) community building Te Unga Waka in Epsom as a ‘Centre’ for Catholic Māori in Auckland. Kingi Ihaka was appointed Auckland Māori Missioner in 1967 and in 1969 the mission became based at Holy Sepulchre Church on Khyber Pass, and the attached hall was named Tātai Hono Marae – meaning the bringing together of familial ties. This expansion of new forms of ministry even spread to new Māori communities in Australia, and in 1984 Ihaka was appointed chaplain for Māori in Sydney.

Even though the church did respond in various ways to the growing urban context, across denominations there was struggle to engage with the newly migrated population. As Allan Davidson notes ‘Maori Christianity has its roots in rural communities and had great difficulty transferring its work, often lacking in resources, to urban centres, where denominational division, geographical fragmentation and social dislocation worked against the churches’ village style of ministry.’ This was not a total collapse, and as Melissa William’s notes in the case of Hokianga Katorika moving to Auckland there was still a great
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amount of community involvement based around the denomination. However engagement with denominations was decreasing, as Pieter Hendrik De Bres pointed out in his 1960s anthropological survey of an urban community. In his study De Bres noted that ‘the overall picture suggests that participation of the local Maori in church activities is very limited’ – which would have obvious implications for the future. Although most Māori in the community belonged to a particular denomination by birth and by whānau, limited numbers chose to participate in that denomination’s formal activities in an urban setting. Although there were a multitude of reasons for the lack of engagement in the cities with denominations, partly it showed the model of one or two professional minita per city was not necessarily working for the changing times.

These changing times included the way minita were trained. The ordination of Rota Waitoa as first minita in 1853 had established a precedent where candidates were taken out of their cultural and geographical context, trained and indoctrinated, and then sent to a people as an agent of change. Although the nature of this training had fluctuated over the decades, the model of a minita sent as an agent of “the Church” separate from the iwi and their culture remained the ideal in many Pākehā minds. However his model of the ‘clergyman-priest, enshrined in a privileged and central position’ also had its challengers. From Henry Venn in the mid-nineteenth century through to Roland Allen in the early twentieth, there had been church leaders and thinkers who opposed replicating the English parish system around the Anglican Empire and instead advocated for minita who were more grounded in their context. Venn in fact promoted paying low salaries to Native minita so as not to create divisions between pastor and people. By the early 1970s the system of putting ordination candidates through the ‘mono-cultural educational offering’ at St John’s College and then struggling to support them financially was beginning to greatly wear on the Mihinare community, and fewer and fewer candidates were coming forward for ordination. The challenge was exacerbated by the urban migration phenomenon, where previously strong rural communities had been drained of their people and financial
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resources, and where urban communities had not yet coalesced enough to provide a new pool of resources to fund stipends – if they ever in fact could.\textsuperscript{105} By the mid-1970s a new model had begun to emerge in the Mihinare world where minita would be identified by their own iwi and then trained and supported locally before and after ordination. In part this development was tied to a world-wide trend experimenting with non-stipendiary ministry including contextual ministry and training.\textsuperscript{106} However it was soon taken on board by the Māori church in the Waipu Diocese, with Bishop Paul Reeves and Pihopa Manu Bennett leading the charge, supported by the senior minita Whakahuihui Vercoe. Under this experimental new system minita were identified by their iwi and then ordained, working as a team in newly established, tribally-based rohe (areas).\textsuperscript{107}

In some respects this system was not as radical as it sounded. For decades Kai Karakia, or lay minita, had been performing many of the ministry functions of ordained minita on a non-stipendiary basis. As Adrienne Puckey notes ‘in rural communities the status of kai-karakia was barely distinguishable from ordained clergy’.\textsuperscript{108} This new ‘Supplementary ministry’ system allowed these minita be ordained in order to celebrate the sacrament of Holy Communion, and numbers of them soared.\textsuperscript{109} Furthermore low pay rates and the need for support from the local iwi had always ensured that in the Māori world there was not the division between ordained minita and the people of the church as there was in the Pākehā world: the “teaching” church and the “learning” church’ overlapped much more. The innovations in forms of ministry did not stop there. As with many of the developments in the Māori church, what had been taken as an opportunity coming from an external source had gone through a cultural filter to become more amenable to a Māori world view. This adaptation came about partly from being renamed. Concern had been expressed in Mihinare circles over the terms “Supplementary Ministry” or “Auxiliary Ministry” on the basis that it implied an inferior ministry to the traditional stipendiary
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form. Professor Hirini Moko Mead suggested the term Minita-ā-Iwi which gained fairly immediate currency and has remained in use ever since. The genius of the term was that it could be read in multiple ways, both as being ministry sourced from iwi and ministry to iwi. This defined a new form of ministry, deliberately distinct from the aloof Priest model intended for minita since Rota Waitoa. It was also as Hone Kaa noted a move from ‘individual’ ministry to a community derived ministry, and as Bosch put succinctly, a situation where ‘the padre become compadre’. It also reinforced the importance of iwi as the basis of Mihinare ministry, itself the primary delivery mechanism for theology on the ground.

Training would also be delivered amongst the iwi. The Presbyterian Church had started Te Wānanga-a-Rangi in Whakatane in 1962 to provide Presbyterian training without separation from Māori students’ home environments, however it was acknowledged that it soon became overtaken by ‘Scottish training for the ministry’ – their western standard form of theological education. Mihinare were desperate to avoid that model, as well as to avoid St John’s where on completion the Māori students ‘return to the Maori world and church and relearn and reinterpret and work out again all that theology and knowledge’. Instead Pīhopa Vercoe outlined the differences of the ministry of the Minita-ā-Iwi:

The tribal unit as mentioned previously is the key – the community of support and encouragement. The method and techniques of teaching and communicating, and the environment where this training is carried out. The whole process of selection, training, teaching and learning are done within the environs of the community of the candidates, both Church and Tribe, which as mentioned previously should be one and the same community.
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After 1978 the constitutional freedom gained by Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa enabled the Minita-ā-Iwi ministry model spread out across the whole country. Mihinare were aware of the risks involved in the Minita-ā-Iwi programme, being as it was a programme that might result in cohorts of under-skilled, under-equipped minita. Mihinare also realised that without the resources to support stipendiary ministry it had little choice. By 1982 only 6 Māori students had been through St John’s College in the previous decade, where over 60 Māori minita had been ordained through the Minita-ā-Iwi programme. In order to address this imbalance in 1982 Hone Kaa was appointed Ministry Educator, charged with delivering theological education to Minita-ā-Iwi across Aotearoa. The delivery was marae-based with a strong focus on iwi and a considerable amount of the programme was delivered in te reo Māori. There was also a strong focus on social justice issues and awareness-raising. After Kaa finished in 1986 a series of regional Enablers were appointed to carry on the work across Aotearoa. The Minita-ā-Iwi innovation in ministry was here to stay.

The ministry of Māori women also evolved based on new, ‘Māori’ understandings. The Anglican Empire had excluded women from ordination since its establishment, along with most other mainstream Western denominations. Very few women had been represented on the various decision making bodies of the Church, with women being allowed to be representatives on General Synod from 1922 but the first representative only being elected in 1972. Hera Munro was elected to Waiapu Diocesan Synod in 1922 but after serving one term was the last woman representative until 1958 and the first Māori woman was not appointed to the Auckland Diocesan Synod until 1974. The situation for women across the board was challenging in terms of representation on the decision making bodies of the church and the options for Māori women were even fewer. However women, both Māori and Pākehā, found other ways of meeting their aspirations in the church. This was often through the construction of nationwide and pan-iwi organisations in which they could
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express themselves and influence church direction. Some of these bodies would be highly successful platforms for the expression of faith and the construction and critique of culture.

The WCTU (Woman's Christian Temperance Union) formed in New Zealand in 1885 after a visit from an evangelist from the US branch of the organisation. The WCTU made strong early connections with Māori with the first Māori unions being formed in 1894, and Māori women signed the voter-franchise petitions of the 1890s. The WCTU itself was a progressive movement for the time, not only advocating for equality in voting but also arguing for gender pay equity, deploiring ‘the spirit of militarism sometimes inculcated into the young’, and even arguing ‘that in view of all the hardships annually imposed upon many innocent children by the condition of illegitimacy... it is high time that all such legal disqualifications were removed’. However, as can be gathered by its name the WCTU was not a secular institution and had many ties to mainstream churches, both through overlapping membership and through common issues they supported. The first Māori convention of the WCTU was held in 1911 at Pakipaki in the Hawkes Bay, which not coincidentally happened to be a Mihinare stronghold. The conference speakers were predominantly Mihinare including the principal of Hukarere Māori Girls School, the Mihinare school based in Napier. The conference also showed the close ties between the Māori side of the WCTU and the Young Māori Party – itself based on Mihinare membership - and they passed resolutions supporting Young Māori Party policies including a resolution to ‘discourage tohungaism’.

At the conference Hera Munro was appointed General Organiser responsible for local Māori Unions. Hera Munro (nee Stirling) was from Kai Tahu and had originally been an officer in Te Ope Whakaora (The Salvation Army). However in 1904 she became an Anglican deaconess and was soon married to the minita Piri Munro. She was heavily involved in the work of both the Māori church and the WCTU as well as attending
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conferences and supporting the work of the Young Māori Party.\textsuperscript{127} The WCTU appointed other organisers for Māori, and by 1912 Rebecca Smith for example had organised 44 Māori Unions north of Auckland with over 600 members.\textsuperscript{128} Although progressive in many areas, the WCTU was of its time. The pledge upholding the values of the movement which members were required to sign on joining had an extra requirement for Māori members: ‘He Whakae tenei naku kia kaua ahau e kai tupeka, e inu ranei i tetahi mea e haurangi ai te tangata, kia kaua hoki ahau e whakae ki te ta moko. Ma te Atua ahau e Awhina’ translated by the Union as ‘I agree by this pledge not to smoke tobacco, not to drink any beverages that are intoxicating, and also not accept being tattooed. May God help me.’\textsuperscript{129}

Where the WCTU was in many ways progressive for its time, the Mothers’ Union movement was decidedly less so. Formed in England by Mary Sumner in 1876, the Mother’s Union quickly became an Anglican lynch pin not only in England but across the Empire. For the newly emerging middle class in Victorian England ‘evangelism emphasised the importance of the well-ordered home organised by the modest, educated, virtuous mother’, and this included an outward expression of philanthropy.\textsuperscript{130} This philanthropy, expressed through overseas mission and domestic mission, developed a focus on what came to be known as ‘the Christian home’. This, as Dana Robert describes ‘was a material as well as a moral and a spiritual construct’.\textsuperscript{131} The arrival of these ideals in New Zealand found a welcome reception. James Belich describes the period of 1880s-1930s as a time of crusade for ‘moral harmony’\textsuperscript{132} in which people like Truby King, the founder in 1907 of the Plunket Society, was the ‘arch-prophet of moral evangelism’. Through Plunket King emphasised the ‘collectivised and racialised ‘cult of domesticity’” in which ‘Mothers were the basic cells of the cult of coral reef of Race and Empire’.\textsuperscript{133} The Mothers’ Union was an excellent pram to transport this type of ideology. Established in Christchurch in 1886, the New Zealand branch aimed:
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To awaken in all mother’s a sense of their great responsibility as mothers in the training of their boys and girls who will be the future fathers and mothers of New Zealand; and to organise in every place a band of mothers who will unite in prayer, and seek by their own example to lead their families in purity and holiness of life.\textsuperscript{134}

The organisation was quickly absorbed into the church hierarchy with the Dominion Presidents largely being sourced from the pool of Archbishop’s wives, with an exception being the appointment of Hoani Parata’s widow Margaret as President in 1949.\textsuperscript{135} The first Māori branch was formed in 1933, and by 1939 there were 33 Māori branches in the Auckland Diocese, compared with 58 Pākehā.\textsuperscript{136} The Mothers’ Union would find its real strength in the north. Although it had Māori branches all through the country, in most places it was quickly replaced in Māori favour by the advent of the Māori Women’s Welfare League in 1951. Jasmine Kaa suggests that Māori support for the Mothers’ Union was not strong across the country and that Māori women ‘generally found the environment of the Mothers’ Union unfavourable and did not join in huge numbers.’\textsuperscript{137} One reason for this was that some Māori women did not necessarily agree with the conservative stances taken by the organisation on moral issues. As late as the 1960s the Union threatened to disband in protest against any weakening of the church’s stance on divorce, which they saw as a threat to the ‘Christian home’.\textsuperscript{138} Mihinare women in the Waikato broke away from the Mother’s Union over this issue with Ngarohi Kaa explaining they left ‘so we can have our say, not them have a say for us’.\textsuperscript{139} Another reason for the general lack of support was that Māori had struggled to find their voice at a national or diocesan level in the Mothers’ Union. By 1969 Molly Hotene of Ngāti Haua was the sole Māori representative on the Dominion Council, and she experienced frustration, including that the council ‘were divided as to whether a Maori
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representative should even be included in the Executive of the new organisation'. That year a new organisation the AAW (Association of Anglican Women) was established as an umbrella group for women in the church. The AAW was more inclusive of Māori, and from its foundation ‘provided for the Bishopric of Aotearoa to be represented on an equal footing with the eight dioceses of the Province’ reflecting recent constitutional developments. However Māori involvement in the AAW was never high. Partly this was due to the huge support for the Māori Women’s Welfare League, and in the North the Mothers’ Union continued to be a strong base for Mihinare women.

The Māori Women’s Welfare League was a product of both state policy and Māori women’s aspiration to organise their own affairs. In the post war era the drive for assimilation, or ‘integration’ as it had become known drove government policy in relation to Māori. The state, through the Department of Māori Affairs, saw a gap in existing women’s organisations in terms of their ability to reach out to the majority of Māori women. So the League was planned out both by the Welfare Officers of the Department and by Māori women themselves. As it was designed it would in some ways be ‘agent of integration’, facilitating the dissemination of state ideals into Māori whānau. But it would also resist this dynamic from time to time, because ‘its ideas of womanhood were always prefaced with ideas about Maorihood’ including staunch advocacy for te reo Māori and a long struggle against racism. Thanks in part to the significant resources and support from the Department by the time of its launch it was already a substantial organisation, with 187 branches around the country including 2503 financial members, and another 30 branches pending. The League constitution was wide ranging, describing the League as ‘non-sectarian’ as well as ‘non-political’, and chief welfare officer Rangi Royal urged the women to put aside the divisions of ‘tribe, creed and politics’.
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terms of not being aligned to any one denomination, it was strongly sectarian in terms of a
consensus around the role of Christianity in their work and in the lives of Māori whānau.
The League was predicated primarily around the role of the Māori woman in the life of the
home and the raising of a family. Partly this was seen as a way to inculcate Pākehā values
into Māori homes as part of a drive towards ‘integration’. However apart from generic
Pākehā values, this can also be seen as an evangelistic tool for making Māori homes
‘Christian homes’ similarly to that envisaged by the Mother’s Union and other such
organisations. This motivation can certainly be read into the objectives of the state. At the
first conference Grace Ross, Minister in Charge of the Welfare of Women and Children,
implied the delegates ‘if every mother teaches her children the principles of Christian
family life surely a better race will come forward’\(^{148}\) and at the first Dominion conference a
few months later the Minister of Māori Affairs Ernest Corbett proclaimed ‘The Mother is the
first in the spiritual strength of family life’ and asked the delegates to ‘cultivate the
spirituality which is to a greater degree embedded in the heart of the family.’\(^{149}\) Although
New Zealand was nominally a secular state this was still a time when ‘Christian values’
were seen as an essential part of the social fabric, as displayed by 1954’s ‘Marzengarb
Report’ on ‘moral delinquency’ that called for among other things the need for ‘family
religion.’\(^{150}\)

The League’s founding national President Whina Cooper was a staunch Katorika
from the Hokianga, and the members of the movement were drawn from Mihinare, Ratana,
Methodist and other Māori faiths. This was reflected in the remits of the conferences. The
first 1952 conference adopted a policy reinforcing the notion of the Christian home,
demanding that ‘every effort be made to train our Maori children in the fundamentals of
Christianity, first in the home, to be followed up in Sunday School, Bible Class and Church
membership.’\(^{151}\) The League would also regularly pass remits that could have come straight
from the pages of Diocesan reports, echoing issues that were being pursued in most
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denominations of the time. These included moral issues such as calling for ‘stricter censorship of radio, serials, films, comics and certain types of magazines’, as well making alcohol a significant issue including ‘that greater effort be made to combat the evil of drinking among our Maori people.’ Rather than ‘non-sectarian’ a better description of the League may have been ‘non-denominational’. In 1954 the Rarawa District Council’s objectives included ‘to educate ourselves in the care and bringing up of our own children morally and spiritually’ and the visit that year of League secretary Mira Petricevich (later Szaszy, a committed Mihinare) was celebrated by a ‘Divine Service in the Wainui Church of Ahipara’ where attendance included ‘Elders of the Rarawa tribe’ as well as ‘Leaders of the Church of England. Leaders of the Ratana Youth Movement and members of the branches.’ This influence of religion on the League would carry on into the modern era. The 1969 conference for example passed a resolution on the moral impact of the newish medium of television: ‘the television medium could also dwell on the spiritual needs of the child also the educational, social and cultural. Dwelling on the spiritual first.’ However as always the focus was distinctly Māori, and the second part of the remit declared ‘there is a definite resistance to using non-whites, Maoris in particular, in commercial television.’ The issue of abortion was strongly debated, with a 1969 remit that ‘this organisation [the league] is firmly opposed to any legislation designed to liberalize abortion in New Zealand’ with delegates replying ‘The Lord Giveth, the Lord Taketh away’ and ‘To me that is just plain murder’. Even by the 1980s the League was still discussing the issue of abortion, although in a more understanding framework.

The League was by and large far more successful in attracting and maintaining the support of Māori women than the Mother’s Union, regardless of denomination. Kaa posits this to ‘the differing cultural perspectives that each organisation represented’ noting that
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'the Mother’s Union operated under strict regulations that were culturally unacceptable to Maori women. The Union’s isolation of women due to their marital status and promotion of a mono-cultural philosophy conflicted with the League’s embrace of all Maori women and its promotion of Maori values.' However although the League was very successful in being a space where Māori women could explore their own aspirations, including their faith, the Churches still had a special role and place for many of them. It was as Vera Rakena described: ‘the church is straight from your heart. The League was for your learning and benefit.’

As noted, ordination in the Anglican Empire had been strictly men-only since its establishment, similarly to most other mainstream Christian denominations. There had been sporadic attempts at finding a place for formal women’s ministry although unlike with the Roman Catholics religious orders for women (nuns) were few and far between. Anglican women had usually found organised expression either through various movements such as the Mother’s Union or local expressions such as an altar guild. By the late nineteenth century an experiment had begun with Deaconesses. Despite the name and the fact that the ministry in the community was essentially identical, the church denied any relationship to that of Deacons, and women were excluded from membership in the threefold order of Deacons, Priests and Bishops. Hera Munro had been an example of Māori involvement in the early experiment with Deaconesses however the movement faded and was not revived until the 1960s. By that time the role of women in society at large was undergoing fundamental change and this was reflected in the Churches beginning to take seriously the possibility of women being ordained. In 1970 General Synod agreed to women being ordained as Deacons, a position generally regarded theologically as that of a servant – so men could see women in this role. Pressure was mounting however for women to be ordained as priests, and this was more controversial because priests were perceived in Anglican ecclesiology as having a leadership role in the church and in the community. In an unsurprising move General Synod established a commission to investigate the possibilities. The commission was mandated to explore issues of theology, doctrine and scripture and amongst other
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things ‘biological facts’ and ‘psychological considerations’. Inquiry was also to be made into international understandings because there was, as always, the wish to conform with the rest of the Anglican Empire or as the synod put it ‘concern over the unity of the Anglican Communion’. Finally the necessary legislation was passed in 1976 and the first Pākehā women were ordained as priests in the Auckland and Waiapu dioceses in 1977.

In the Māori church meanwhile discussion over the ordination of women took a more culturally-focused turn. Puti Murray from Te Aupōuri was the first Māori woman ordained as deacon in 1975. However the role of Priest was perceived as being more problematic, and as with Pākehā an extensive debate ensued. At a national gathering of minita held soon after General Synod approved women’s ordination to the Priesthood a resolution was passed that ‘this Clergy School and Conference can find no doctrinal objection to such ordination’, opening the way in theory for Māori women to be ordained as priests. However the debate amongst Mihinare quickly centred around different iwi understandings of the roles of women, and how this might be impacted by women’s ordination to the Priesthood. In theory at least some iwi were more receptive to public expressions of women’s leadership than others. Ngāti Porou for example had many pre-contact traditions of women’s leadership including the majority of the senior hapū of Ngāti Porou being named after women. This was reflected in the comments at the 1976 minita gathering by Ngāti Porou minita Hone Kaa, who in responding to objections by some senior minita clergy ‘on cultural as well as spiritual grounds’ declared ‘we should not use cultural customs which largely have been set up by men as barriers.’ In Te Arawa however discussion centred around the role that Priests had especially in relation to ministry on the marae where they would be required to stand and speak on the marae atea (the ceremonial debating space), even if in the context of worship.

Such debates were valuable because they created spaces for critique of existing cultural practices where these might have previously been taken for granted. The debates
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were also instructive because while they were held partly out of concern for the reception that women priests might receive in the community, they also had a strong focus on the impact that such changes might have on existing tikanga (customs) – that it might in fact transform iwi practices.\textsuperscript{166} The general position of the Māori church became one of support for women’s ordination to the priesthood, alongside the demand that ‘due recognition of various tribal situations be taken into account.’\textsuperscript{167} This became the general rule, with widespread ordination but limited practice in some areas. The famous St Faiths church at Ohinemutu in Rotorua, for example, only allowed women priests to celebrate Holy Communion in 2006. Interestingly Puti Murray’s ordination was delayed on account of the assumption by some senior mīnīta of ‘cultural barriers’ amongst her own people. At a gathering with her people to clarify the situation, the elders and the Ratana minister who was chairing the meeting said they had no concerns at all and were wondering how soon the ordination could take place so that they could prepare the marae.\textsuperscript{168} On 11\textsuperscript{th} June 1978 at Potahi marae in Te Kao Puti Murray became the first Māori woman to be ordained as Priest.

The combination of ecclesiastical emancipation and new theological language amongst Mihinare in the post-war period found its most unified expression in the ecumenical movement. Not only would this be an opportunity for expression as a national Māori church, but also to develop even broader connections that would be both pan-iwi \textit{and} “pan-haahi”. One of the first tests of this new drive towards a unified “Māori” ecumenism came with the revision of the Paipera – the Māori Bible. The first complete bible translation had finally been completed by a mixture of Anglican and Methodist translators in 1868, and this version had been incorporated across all religious traditions in various forms.\textsuperscript{169} However revision had been ongoing, from Robert Maunsell’s rather disastrous 1887 edition\textsuperscript{170} through to Herbert Williams’ 1925 version which had many typographical errors. In order to revise
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this latest edition the publishers, the British and Foreign Bible Society, assembled a group of experts in te reo Māori to do corrections but who instead called for a more complete revision of the text. In 1946 the Māori Bible Revision Committee was established. Membership came from across the churches, being comprised of Presbyterian John Laughton, Urewera missionary and colleague of Rua Kenana as chair; Pihopa Bennett; Eru Te Tuhi, Superintendent of the Methodist Maori Mission; former inspector of Native Schools William Bird; Mihinare parish priests Dan Kaa and Wiremu Panapa; Pei Te Hurinui Jones as an expert on ‘the Tainui dialect’; and Apirana Ngata. The revision work was divided between the members who came together for a week at a time to compare revisions and settle debates. Held around the country these revision hui were significant events open for interested people to come and have their input. The Auckland hui for example was held at the town hall preceded by a civic reception hosted by the mayor.

Ngata’s involvement took the project from a “back-room” academic exercise into a fully-fledged attempt to unify diverse streams of iwi religious tradition. The entire project from revision to typing to publication, between 1946 and its completion in 1950, raised some £2497.17.9 ($174000 in 2014 terms). As expected the bulk of the funding (£1626) came from both local and central Anglican, Methodist and Presbyterian churches, including the first donation coming from the Wellington-based Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club. The Mormon church and the Baptist church, both outside of usual mainstream consideration, gave £352 – a substantial contribution. However outside of these usual suspects, Ngata produced results that would have been unlikely under a Pākehā-driven project. King Koroki gave a personal contribution, alongside one from the Tainui Trust Board, and most significantly of all the Ringatū church gave a substantial donation to the project. The Ringatū, the followers of Te Kooti Te Arikirangi, had been outside of the consideration of
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the Pākehā churches since their inception, and it was Ngata’s vision for a unified Māoridom that drew groups such as them and the Mormons into the project.176

The project was not without its controversies. The change to the “original” Northern language used by the missionaries was, as always, a point of objection, particularly from the North. The by-then kaumatua Wiremu Keretene wrote to the committee ‘I have just concluded my lament over the passing of the dialect of our fathers: so let it be, you and I can at least give it a decent burial’.177 But Panapa, a keen supporter of the project, dismissed these as ‘rather worn objection(s)’.178 The revision of the Paipera was partly an exercise in the ability of Mihinare to recover their ownership of language and culture, as they now had the opportunity for the first time to directly control their own expression of faith, to, as Panapa put it ‘try and put back into the Maori Bible something of the sweet musical tone and cadence, rhythm and poetry of the Maori language.’179 Such a statement could be seen as a criticism of the exclusion of Māori from such processes previously, and even Laughton noted that work by ‘a competent Committee almost entirely Maori is quite a different matter’ from that of the Pākehā missionaries.180

Ngata’s work on the Paipera revision reflected his larger vision for a unified Māoridom, at least in terms of faith. It had been Ngata who had driven the broader ecumenical discussion around the establishment of Te Pīhopa o Aotearoa, and he was pleasantly surprised to see Bennett embrace this reading of the position as being wider than a mere Anglican potentate. Ngata placed a great deal of weight on his ecumenical vision in its potential to unify Māori. He focused in particular on the Ringatū movement, a real force amongst the eastern iwi and for Ngata a potent reminder of historical division. He wrote to Peter Buck immediately after Bennett’s ordination as Pīhopa ‘the race just now is in a very receptive frame of mind. The Ringatus, a strong factor on this side, are prepared to arrive at a modus vivendi with the mihinare. Their coming together should simplify many things.’181
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It was not that Ngata was some sort of ecumenical imperialist, seeking to bind all faiths under one episcopal ring. Instead he saw the impact of the Ringatū as being transformative for Mihinare and for Bennett ‘because it will present to him the successful overlaying of Maori forms on the pakeha liturgy, that never captured the imagination of the Maori. Eventually I hope to see him offering modifications that will adapt the Anglican liturgy to the genius of the race.’ Ngata continually pressed for broader ecumenical involvement across the board, pushing for Anglican hui to be opened to a wider input regardless of denomination. In fact at times Ngata seemed almost agnostic when it came to denominations, viewing actions and opportunities through iwi eyes, demanding that the ‘iwi have the chance to express themselves’ in church fora. Ngata was not completely open, however, and still held out against the Ratana movement perhaps understandably in light of their political differences. But overall Ngata saw the immense possibilities of an ecumenical movement as an agent of change across iwi, as part of his grand scheme for Māori.

The post-war growth in ecumenism was a wave in Pākehā as well as in Māori society. There had always been elements of ecumenical fraternising, and in the inter-war years this had found organisational shape in the broad ‘moral evangelism’ coalition but had also been present in the work of the WCTU, the YMCA, the YWCA, the Student Christian Movement and the Bible Society. By 1941 this ecumenical movement took the shape of the National Council of Churches (NCC), bringing together mainstream protestant denominations. Within the Pākehā Anglican hierarchy there was broad support for the NCC, with Archbishop West-Watson being a staunch supporter while Auckland’s Bishop Simkin opposed its existence due to the fact that, as Colin Brown surmises, he ‘held rigid views about church order with more tenacity than theological learning and acumen’. The Pākehā ecumenical growth was itself driven in turn, as was often the case, by international developments. The World Missionary Conference in 1910, the site of Azariah’s provocation,
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led to further developments until in 1948 the World Council of Churches (WCC) was founded in Amsterdam. For Pākehā Christians in New Zealand the WCC represented a new opening up, as the WCC ‘bought new contacts, new ideas, a sense of belonging to a world church’. The two official New Zealand representatives at the Amsterdam launch were Archbishop West-Watson and, representing Māori, Pīhopa Bennett.

Māori institutional support for ecumenism took shape during the 1945 NCC Conference on Christian Order which, in a fervour of post-war idealism, sought to establish a ‘Christian New Zealand’. During the conference a paper was presented on ‘Christian Order and the Maori People’ co-authored by Bennett and focusing on urban dislocation, Christianity as community integrating force, welfare issues, educational opportunities, land claim issues and access to alcohol. This paper and conference led in turn in 1947 to the establishment of the National Council of Churches Māori Section. The ‘Māori Section’ focused initially at least on what were perceived as the important moral issues of the time. Led by Bennett, who had long been involved in the temperance movement, the Māori Section from early on provided support for prohibition movements and urged Māori ‘to exercise the vote remembering the awful evils of the drink traffic and the irreparable damage that always accompanies it.’ The Māori Section also supported the Kingitanga in the alcohol-free ‘King Country Pact’ and even led the foundation of a short-lived Māori Christian Temperance Society.

In parallel with their contemporary organisation the Māori Women’s Welfare League the Māori Section focused on a broad range of issues impacting on Māori. From the mid-1950s they supported more use of te reo Māori in broadcasting and education, and in 1955 they took up the management of Whanaungatanga Hostel for Māori trade trainees in Rotorua from the Department of Labour.

While it might be imagined that the Māori Section would be a brown clone of the NCC itself, on the issue of race the Māori Section took a strong and differentiated line. The
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1945 paper *Christian Order* was, similarly to other works of its time and following in the footsteps of Ngata’s *Price of Citizenship* tract,²⁹⁵ both a critique of Pākehā-Māori race relations in New Zealand as well as outlining what it perceived as Māori ‘responsibilities’ based on the perception that Māori needed to uphold their side of the equation. In 1950 the Māori Section came out with strong support for Ngāti Whatua over the invasion and destruction of the pa at Orakei,²⁹⁶ and by the early 1950s they were engaging with academics such as Maharaia Winiata and Joan Metge who presented papers on race relations and urbanisation.²⁹⁷ In 1961 the Hunn Report was published, the climax of recent government Māori policy that was according to Aroha Harris ‘the single most important mid-twentieth century document on Maori relations with the State’.²⁹⁸ The report became historically ‘notorious’²⁹⁹ for its assimilationist urges, and became a focal point of activism for the Māori ecumenical movement. The Māori Synod of the Presbyterian Church led the way, publishing a damning critique of Hunn’s report including stating that Māori should have the right to determine their own development;³⁰⁰ that assumptions of home ownership equating to turangawaewae as a foundation for Māori urbanisation were ‘unacceptable’; and that ‘the fundamental basis of Maori life is the tribe, not the family’ with the concomitant statement that ‘tribal rights should be respected’ and not replaced by ‘the Maori people as a whole’.³⁰¹ Even though the Presbyterians pushed for iwi identity to remain pre-eminent it was ironically enough a unified ‘Māori’ voice that would give weight to those aspirations. The NCC Māori Section joined in, noting that although Hunn himself was ‘a trusted and wise leader in his task’³⁰² he didn’t understand importance of land to Māori and his proposals could result in a ‘complete loss of [Maori] identity’.³⁰³

In the 1960s and 70s there was a discernable increase in stridency from the Māori Section as they pushed on political issues. Again this was not particularly new thinking, but instead a new means of expression was available to Māori as liberation theologies made
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their way into the theological academic mainstream, creating an intellectual space for Māori political and cultural concerns to be expressed through the church. This new theological understanding was helped by the increase in direct contact between Māori and international liberation theologians, especially those from Asia following in the intellectual footsteps of Azariah. Facilitated by the Māori Section a group of Māori Minita including Dan Kaa spent time at an Indonesian Seminary in 1960 and then disseminated their transformative experience through the magazine *Te Ao Hou*,204 and Sri Lankan theologian and ecumenist DT Niles would regularly engage with Māori Church leaders in New Zealand.205 Inspired by these changes and contacts, the Māori Section began talking more openly about structural racism, with academic Hugh Kawharu presenting a paper on the topic and the Māori Section objecting to the 1976 All Black tour of apartheid South Africa. Alongside these external political actions the Māori Section, driven by the vision of Methodist leader Rua Rakena, began to push for a greater involvement in the New Zealand ecumenical movement instead of being regarded as a type of sub-committee of the NCC.206 These demands for political autonomy went alongside Māori movements within individual churches for more voice and control including the establishment of Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa in 1978.

This post-war push for ecumenical unity was more than some mere administrative enterprise. Mainstream churches had been working since the late 1930s on variations of Church Union and by 1964 the Joint Commission on Church Union brought Anglicans together with Methodists, Presbyterians and other protestant denominations to seriously study becoming a unified church. By 1972 the ‘Plan for Union’ had been developed as a blueprint for unification, and in an indicative referendum that year a majority of Anglicans voted in favour of this plan.207 However although Māori had been included in the consultation phase, there was little support for Church Union from Māori. The NCC Māori Section came out with a stinging critique that ‘The Plan’ ‘had first gone a long way towards creating a pakeha church for pakehas’.208 Mihinare debated The Plan extensively within their own forums and, as always, had a variety of opinions on the matter, often along iwi lines. In one hui Te Pūrā Panapa from the north came out against Church Union stating that he could
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not ‘leave kaumatua – the things they accepted and upheld’ and was supported by his northern compatriot Kingi Ihaka who argued ‘if I forget my Anglican kawa and Maori kawa I am nobody’. On the other side Ngāti Porou Minita John Tamahori noted that he was in favour of Church Union while of his colleagues from the North ‘perhaps they are arch-conservatives but there is nothing wrong in this’, and his Ngāti Porou relation Hone Kaa stridently argued that ‘Anglicanism equals imperialism’ and that he looked ‘forward to [Church Union] for growth of maturity amongst our people’.209 The two Ngāti Porou minita had echoed the thoughts of Apirana Ngata, that repository of Ngāti Porou aspiration, who had wished in the 1940s that ‘a National Maori Church would be the ideal, but I think the chances of securing such a body extremely remote.’210

In 1976 The Plan was shelved after being rejected by the Anglican General Synod. By the late 1960s however even the Roman Catholics were drawn into Māori ecumenical movement, and Ratana and Ringatū were invited as observers.211 However it would be neither theology nor ecclesiology that would open up the potential of the ecumenical movement, but instead it would be urban migration. As Māori migrated to the cities in mass waves by the 1960s, the old denominational divisions reinforced by iwi traditions fell away. ‘Mixed marriages’ between denominations began to appear, alongside Māori not being able to find a convenient or appropriate worship place for their existing denomination, so experimentation would begin.212

In the meantime however the NCC Māori Section continued to increase its involvement in ways that would come to be seen as increasingly politicised, but again were often just new expressions of old hopes, even as ways of ‘self-theologizing’. In 1979 the Māori Section established Te Roopu Tomokia (The Spearhead Group) as a research and advocacy unit on Māori land and justice issues and appointed young Māori lawyer Pauline Kingi as director.213 In doing this the Māori ecumenical movement deliberately inserted
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themselves directly into raging political debates around land that were merging into a wider debate around Māori sovereignty. Kingi’s work went alongside the increasingly overt politicisation of the Roman Catholic Church led by Manuka Henare of the Catholic Secretariat for Mission, Justice and Development, who was leading the way in merging Māori political thought with a new expression of Māori theology to support that work.214

This new theology would find expression in actions such as a call on Māori Christians to support Hirini Moko Mead’s call for a ‘Rāhui’ – a temporary ritual prohibition – on rugby contacts with South Africa. The Māori Section described this as a Christian expression of ‘personal sacrifice and self denial’215 thus plaiting together the political, theological and cultural strands that had previously not been publicly woven together, at least in Pākehā consciousness. By 1980 the Roman Catholics had been admitted as full members to the Māori Section. In 1982 the ‘Māori Section’ changed its name to represent its new self-understanding and became Te Runanga Whakawhanaunga i Nga Haahi – a title which they refused to translate into English.216 The Māori ecumenical movement did struggle, having to struggle to gain oxygen alongside autonomy movements within individual denominations,217 but it also had its highlights. At the Treaty of Waitangi commemorations in 1983 Sir James Henare called for a nationwide Māori hui to discuss the place of the Treaty, and this was held the following year in September at Ngāruawahia. The hui was primarily facilitated by Te Runanga Whakawhanaunga i Nga Haahi heading a coalition which included the New Zealand Māori Council, the Māori Women’s Welfare League, Māori members of parliament and the Race Relations Conciliator. The purpose of the hui was ‘to bring together collective opinions from Māori people, to talk about and seek points of healing and reconciliation, in regard to the Treaty of Waitangi.’218 Resolutions from the gathering included backdating Treaty claims to 1840 and having a greater role for Māori
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women in decision making.²¹⁹ It was possibly the high-water mark for the Māori ecumenical involvement in bringing together a unified Māori political consciousness.

Māori ecumenical developments in the 1980s were again strongly influenced by international influences, this time without the filter of the Pākehā churches. International guests were brought to raise Māori political and theological consciousness including in 1980 a ‘Symposium on Māori Theology and Māori Social Analysis’ with guest speakers Philippe Franchette of Mauritius and Sister Mary Mananaz from the Philippines.²²⁰ Franchette was a Roman Catholic priest whose social analysis was derived from being a disciple of Brazilian educator and philosopher Paolo Freire. Not only ideas but also funding was coming from international sources. Te Roopu Tomokia, the political action arm of the Māori churches was funded largely by the World Council of Churches bodies the Urban Rural Mission and the Programme to Combat Racism (PCR).²²¹ The PCR was the target of conservative criticism within churches, and had been ‘charged with supporting terrorists and communism’ for its support of the then-banned African National Congress.²²² The PCR along with the Christian Conference of Asia, the Asian region of the World Council of Churches, continued to fund Māori church political causes, including giving US$5000 from their Young Political Detainees Fund to defend the Waitangi Action Committee in 1981.²²³ Māori were also actively sent to and involved in the international ecumenical cause, including then Pīhopa o Aotearoa Whakahuihui Vercoe being a member of the WCC Central Committee; Hone Kaa as a member of the WCC PCR; and other younger Minita including Wally Te Ua and Te Kitohi Pikaahu being sent for theological exposure to parts of Asia. Now Māori had the capacity and freedom to realise their international and ecumenical aspirations they took full advantage of it, and it shaped their political and theological awareness as a result.
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The ecumenical movement had enabled iwi to take their renegotiation a step beyond the constraints of Anglicanism, and to find new inspirations and new ways of engaging with a wider intellectual world. Through institutional vehicles such as the Māori Section of the Māori Council of Churches through to Te Runanga Whakawhanaunga i Nga Haahi, and even through the trans-native networks of the global ecumenical movement, Mihinare were able to find new ways in which to negotiate their own understandings. Alongside this had come the women’s movements, peaking within the church with the ordination of women to the priesthood, even if maintaining structural gender inequalities in many other respects, reinforced by particular iwi readings of mātauranga. These intellectual changes had been both fomented and suffocated in the Anglican educational system, where Māori struggled to find room to express themselves and their own mātauranga was constantly undervalued and undermined. Almost in spite of the educational system leading thinkers were produced who could develop new solutions such as the minita-ā-iwi system, a hybrid of both mātauranga-ā-iwi and centuries-old Anglican and Western Christian practice. The result of these changes, the cumulative layers of thought and stimulus combined with the massive social changes for iwi in the post-war era led to the formation of a new dynamic in Te Hāhi Mihinare. By the end of the twentieth century, while mātauranga-ā-iwi remained the base for Mihinare thought, it had become in many respects He Hāhi Māori – a pan tribal, pan-denominational church.
Chapter Six

Ko Rāwiri Te Tangata: Shaping the Tribal Text

For Anglicans the prayer book was the greatest single expression of their faith. For Mihinare this would be a site of renegotiation, firstly with the missionary authors who were in turn shaped by Anglican Empire dynamics, and then by themselves as they strove to create new expressions of their faith. Indeed for Mihinare the prayer book was the single greatest example of the renegotiation of mātauranga. Primarily the prayer book was a site of intellectual development. Anglican doctrine had always been a slightly nebulous concept, open to reinterpretation as it journeyed the via media (middle road) between protestant and Catholic traditions. The prayer book incorporated the concept of Lex Orandi Lex Credendi, that the law of prayer is the law of faith. In other words, what Anglicans pray is the best indication of what they believe and of the thought processes that created that belief. So from the earliest translation of the Book of Common Prayer into te reo Māori the prayer book was an attempt to articulate the intellectual forces driving Mihinare. The prayer book was also a site of the renegotiation of iwi identity, where iwi would assert their own values and at times discover new ones, continuously changing in the process. And the prayer book was another front in the continuous struggle by Mihinare for mana motuhake (self-determination) a site where Mihinare strove to transform gains on the constitutional battlefield into ownership on the intellectual one. The prayer book was also a site for the testing of new forms of leadership, where minita in particular were forced to find a space between the demands of their iwi and the immense forces of the Anglican Empire.

The protestant religious reformation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was a complex dynamic that spread across Europe in a multitude of ways. In England a key marker in the reformation was the work of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury during the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI and burnt at the stake in 1556 under Mary I. Cranmer made many contributions to English religious life, but perhaps his most important

1 Ko Rāwiri Te Tangata (David is the ancestor)
was the development of the Book of Common Prayer (BCP). The BCP was a collection of religious services written for different purposes ranging from baptism to Holy Communion through to the commination – a threat of divine vengeance – and was intended to be a complete resource and guide for English religious life. The BCP was not finalised until 1662, and although many hands were involved in the revisions and much political and intellectual water had flowed under the bridge (including Cromwell’s interregnum), much of Cranmer’s imprint remained. Cranmer’s genius had been a compromise between traditional and reformed liturgy, utilising elements from the various historical Roman Catholic orders of service alongside new innovations in theological thinking. For example in the Holy Communion Cranmer rejected transubstantiation (the physical transformation of the bread and wine) but still had a blessing of the elements to be set apart for holy use, and a focus on memorial instead of the sacrifice of the mass. There would however be ongoing disputes over the nature of this ritual, partly due to the opacity of Cranmer’s intentions as read through the liturgy. There was some criticism of Cranmer for this language with for example Gordon Jeanes noting ‘at times [Cranmer’s] language resembles a kind of verbal incense that offers an attractive religious haze but no clarity of meaning’ but that ‘this ambiguity served the purpose of obscuring his radical theology.’

Aside from serving worship functions, the BCP was also a tool for social formation in a nation struggling to find a new, reformed identity. The BCP, and the thinking it enshrined, was the compulsory standard for religious life from 1662 until at least the 1820s across England regardless of personal theological inclination. Unlike continental Europe where there was often a focus on preaching and education in protestant lands, Jeanes notes that alongside reading of scripture in English and the teaching of the catechism as part of services ‘Cranmer seems to have expected that the services of themselves would form people in the faith’ and that would in turn lead to the formation of a reformed-protestant Christian people and society. Jeremy Gregory argues that even though the elite continued to use religion as a form of social control, the BCP also became in England a focus of
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3 Ibid, p.29.
community life with communities, including non-conformists, finding focus through baptisms, godparents, funerals, weddings and other rituals.4

The arrival of George Augustus Selwyn as the new Bishop of New Zealand in 1842 brought some of the controversies that had afflicted the Church back in England, particularly around the use of the liturgy. Selwyn’s arrival was during a time of great change for the Anglican Empire, with the Oxford or Tractarian Movement pressing for the reclamation of selected pre-reformation traditions and understandings, such as a more visual and ritualised approach to worship. Alongside that the Cambridge Movement sought amongst other things new Church architecture that would support a more ritualised theology. Selwyn was suspected by the CMS workers of being influenced by these movements, which were in many respects anathemata to their evangelical theology. Some of these differences were political as much as theological, as Selwyn and the CMS began a struggle to influence the growing Church. Theologically the divisions were significant. Many of the early CMS missionaries had come from an English theological scene that was quite different from the one that had formed Selwyn. Things got to the point where at one stage Selwyn’s male pattern baldness was mistaken for a tonsure – a sure sign of the papists at work. However in liturgical terms there was largely agreement, and in the 1857 founding constitution of the church in this country (an exclusively Pākehā affair) the Book of Common Prayer was enshrined as one of the fundamental, unalterable, provisions.5

By the nineteenth century as the Anglican Empire spread out across the world, the BCP remained a focus for the religious component of colonisation. The Church Missionary Society that established the mission in this land on behalf of the Church of England was strongly evangelical, and along with stressing the importance of the Bible the CMS ‘added the value of the liturgy, which was so much valued by Evangelical clergy as the basis of Evangelical orthodoxy.’6 The Anglican missionary societies had based their theological

---

understanding on the primacy of personal conversion. In order to facilitate this personal understanding the societies had been translating both scripture and the prayer book into the vernacular (the local language) since their inception. In 1728 due to the absence of English volunteers the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge (SPCK)\(^7\) sent Lutheran Missionaries to Madras, and attempted to enforce the use of the BCP translated into Tamil.\(^8\) This first effort at being “cross-cultural” didn’t end well, with all of the volunteers dying. However despite the setbacks the translation of the prayer book was seen as crucial, and was a priority for the CMS on its arrival in New Zealand.

The process of translating this prayer-doctrine was always going to be more problematic than a mere technical undertaking, especially in the context of local cultural understandings and the ever-shifting theological sands of the Anglican Empire. Partly the issue of translation was tied to that of literacy in general. From its inception in this country, the Māori reception of literacy generally had been nothing short of stupendous. From the political to the theological Māori demand for the written word and for teachers was initially insatiable, and this was a key factor in the growth of Christian missions. The impact of this literacy was manifold. In some respects literacy was destructive, becoming a tool for the worst aspects of colonisation enabling domination, control and even disempowerment. Kuni Jenkins asserts that the pedagogy around literacy was designed so that Māori would become ‘uncritical, mystified, passive readers with a non-empowered view of their changing world’\(^9\) and that while literacy should have been empowering often under the missionaries it was not, summarising ‘while it held various promises, Māori print literacy was of greater benefit to the colonisers.’\(^10\) However literacy was also empowering, gifting Māori insight into the new world that was emerging around them, as well as enabling self-critique. Although Jenkins pointed out some of the negatives of the process, she also allowed for early books to be embraced by iwi, and to be ‘read as an expression of cultural urgency on the part of Māori.’\(^11\) Lyndsay Head goes even further, ascribing to literacy a transformative intellectual

\(^7\) The SPCK was the first Anglican missionary society, founded in 1698.
\(^10\) Ibid, p.40.
power in which ‘literacy expanded Maori minds as it had those of fifteenth century Europeans, offering intellectual autonomy and a defence against established dogma. Literacy allowed Maori to choose to discard their own official culture as mistaken and self-limiting.’\(^\text{12}\) This was not just a generic literacy that the missionaries were inculcating. Tony Ballantyne notes that exposure to religious literature stimulated thought to the point where by the 1860s from Ringatū through to the Kīngitanga ‘indigenous leaders were articulating a diverse array of new identities and political agendas.’\(^\text{13}\)

The translation process itself was heavily dependent on the cultural values and insights of the translators, in the case the workers of the CMS. Thomas Kendall was one of the earliest translators and his almost-existential struggle to ‘cross the beach’ and enter the imagination and knowledge systems of people he had come to know and respect\(^\text{14}\) was an enlightened model for the time. This process of cultural exchange was a challenging intellectual task especially in the arena of theology, where concepts were rendered through cultural filters and political expediency until they became, as Jenkins describes, ‘words between us’.\(^\text{15}\) The personal characteristics of the translators were also influential, and they were often strong personalities, as would be expected from people who had come halfway around the world to change another people. William Colenso for example, was fired for acting above his editorial station and Robert Maunsell although a gifted linguist was described as ‘obsessive.’\(^\text{16}\) However even though this was a process of cultural exchange, many of the translators tended to view Māori language and culture as inherently inferior to their western worldview, and Māori were not included in the primary translation tasks. Peter Lineham partly ascribes the struggles over translation to ‘the failure to allow the Maori to participate in and own the task of translation and of the continued paternalism of the Maori mission of the Church of England.’\(^\text{17}\)

That is not to say that Māori had no input into the translations. There was much informal and indirect feeding into the works by Māori. Mohi Turei, the Ngāti Porou tohunga

\(^\text{15}\) Jenkins Jones, pp.126-9.
\(^\text{16}\) Lineham, ‘To Make a People of the Book’, p.162.
\(^\text{17}\) Ibid, p.169.
and ordained minita was called friend of Sir William Martin and Bishop William Williams, both of whom had a large hand in translation work.\textsuperscript{18} William’s son William Leonard Williams held extensive correspondence with Turei and other knowledgeable Māori, exchanging ideas as well as gossip and church information. In the lead up to his work on revising the Rāwiri in 1865 Williams gathered a book of, broadly speaking, Māori theological concepts from sources including Turei, Hare Tawhaa and other Ngāti Porou intellectual luminaries.\textsuperscript{19} The experienced translator Robert Maunsell wrote an essay on ‘Maori poetry’ as a guide to composing hymns.\textsuperscript{20} Although ostensibly used to assist in the grammatical construction of hymns, and occasionally dismissive of Māori thought processes, it contains a wide range of genres and concepts which Maunsell discusses at some length. Such encounters, even if viewed as early ethnography as opposed to theological engagement, influenced the translators’ views and choice of not just language but concept. The Gambian historian and missiologist Lamin Sanneh, wrote ‘language is the intimate, articulate expression of culture, and so close are the two that language can be said to be synonymous with culture, which it suffuses and embodies... Missionary adaptation of the vernacular, therefore, was tantamount to adopting indigenous cultural criteria for the message, a piece of radical indigenization far greater than the standard portrayal of mission as western cultural imperialism.’\textsuperscript{21}

Powerful as it was, literacy was dependent on and facilitated by the production and dissemination of books,\textsuperscript{22} and the Book of Common Prayer was to be the primary vehicle for missionary literacy endeavours. Phil Parkinson asserts that the BCP was crucial in the CMS approach in New Zealand and similarly to England, was to be ‘the foundation of the Protestant religious experience.’\textsuperscript{23} This protestant-wide approach worked initially at least, with the early Methodist Missions utilising the BCP as the foundation for their liturgy until
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1894.\textsuperscript{24} The BCP was so important, in fact, that Parkinson asserts its pre-eminence of the Prayer Book in the corpus of Church printed literature, and indeed in early Māori literature in general. Tying the BCP to the roll-out of the colonial state, Parkinson writes that ‘the Book of Common Prayer, expressive of the liturgy of the colonial power, was arguably more important for the converted Māori than were the Scriptures, for it was used as the quotidian text.’\textsuperscript{25} This is an interesting assertion, for in most historiography it is the Scriptures that are focused on as the source of social and cultural change for Māori, not a denominational text. This is not to say that it was some sort of competition between scripture and prayer book. The BCP was sourced from scripture, and in some respects was the application of scripture for specific circumstances. However the BCP did consciously shape scripture none-the-less, shaping it to meet specific theological ambitions, and the two texts were separate. Parkinson supports his assertion around relative importance partly from the scale of the dissemination of the prayer books noting that including revisions and adaptations, the BCP was ‘the most widely circulated text available to Maori during the nineteenth century’,\textsuperscript{26} and suggested that it is the basis of much of the early spread of literacy and Christianity from Māori to Māori.\textsuperscript{27}

The earliest experiments at the prayer book were begun in 1820 and in 1830 William Yate had begun the translation of excerpts and by 1833 had printed a short run in Sydney. Yate had taken up the task because William Williams, who could be described as the authoritative translator, had already begun translating the New Testament from Greek into Māori.\textsuperscript{28} However Yate was soon sent back to England in disgrace and Puckey and William Williams took up the work of translating the prayer book. A short version comprised of the morning and evening services and a selection of hymns was printed in 1839, an abridged and revised version of Yate’s work. This ‘Small Prayer Book’ of 1839, which soon became known as Te Rāwiri, quickly became a huge hit and by 1842 up to 47000 copies in various bibliographical guises had been printed and distributed across Aotearoa\textsuperscript{29} - a huge number
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considering the total Māori population was estimated to be around 80000 at the time.\textsuperscript{30} Despite this immense effort however Selwyn on his arrival in 1842 expressed dissatisfaction with these early editions. Partly this was due to the influence of William Colenso who had, according to Parkinson, overextended his editorial discretion with this work and had consequently fallen out with both the CMS and Selwyn’s people.\textsuperscript{31} Selwyn wanted to quell competition between William Williams’ and Robert Maunsell’s newly published duelling dictionaries, and aiming for a more efficient and ordered translation process all round, in 1844 he formed what became known as the Translation Syndicate. This group gathered together the best Pākehā translators at the CMS station at Waimate and included among others Selwyn himself, Williams, and Maunsell. The Syndicate set new standards for Māori grammar, agreeing to a standardised orthography for their work including the use of the letters ‘ng’ and ‘wh’. The priority for their work was a revision of the prayer book, over the competing claims of revising the New Testament or completing the Old.\textsuperscript{32} By 1846 new versions of the Prayer Book were being produced by the syndicate, with Selwyn taking personal responsibility for their publication\textsuperscript{33} and by 1852 the first full version, including psalter and scripture readings, was published. Printing of the full Māori prayer book became such a large task that by the 1852 edition a run of 15000 copies were printed by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge in London. The Bible Society had printed large runs of the Māori Bible however it was required to be non-denominational so SPCK took over the BCP printing in London on an ongoing basis, up to the last print in 1951.\textsuperscript{34} The early books were distributed through St John’s College in Meadowbank, which had taken over some printing duties itself and had been the seat of Anglican education since its establishment by Selwyn in 1843. Most of the books were distributed through the various mission stations around the country, with some areas such as the north and east coast being recipients of particularly large amounts. However Māori from Orakei and Okahu bay (and


\textsuperscript{31} Parkinson, “A Language Peculiar to the Word of God”, p.35.

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid, p.38.

\textsuperscript{33} Lineham, ‘To Make a People of the Book’, p.161.

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid, p.161.
occasionally further afield) would come and personally take away small amounts.\textsuperscript{35} Although a significant logistical exercise, this was not a financially profitable one, and nearly all Māori print runs in the nineteenth century lost money and had to be subsidised by either Church or State.\textsuperscript{36} However print them they did.

The rendering of the early versions into Māori followed the structure of the Book of Common Prayer and used the prism of the relatively conservative theology of the CMS translators. Often the language choices of the Rāwiri were more conservative than that of Te Paipera Tapu (the Holy Bible). Peter Wensor points to a more conservative approach in the Rāwiri translation than was used in the translation of the bible, which he posits was used in order to ensure ecclesiastical order.\textsuperscript{37} This argument has merit in the context of prayer-doctrine, where even the rubrics (instructions) in the English version could lead to lasting theological debates across Anglicanism, whereas scripture was less prescriptive and more open to interpretation. In terms of the language, Wensor points for example to the use of the word ‘tohunga’ for ‘priest’ in the Genesis chapter of the Old Testament. This term would have held obvious connotations for Māori, tying the biblical concept to ancient Māori schools of ontological expertise. The Rāwiri however only allowed for the far more mundane transliterations of ‘Piriti’ for priest and ‘Minita’ for minister.\textsuperscript{38} It was not necessarily a case of the Paipera translators being less conservative overall however, and indeed they were often the same people. In an 1860s revision of the Paipera for example William Martin objects to the wording that in Acts 3 ‘the word karakia, especially in connection with a narrative of a bodily cure, may suggest too Maori a notion’.\textsuperscript{39} The Rāwiri conservatism was likely a product of the importance of that text as a key measure of control in the ecclesiastical Empire.

This is not to say that the early translations were slavish, and indeed there was room for contextual innovation. Annual State Services had been included in the BCP from 1662 onwards for ‘days of national significance’, including the defeat of Guy Fawkes’ ‘Papist’s
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Conspiracy’ of 1605, the execution of Charles I and the return of Charles II. According to Charles Hefling by including these prayers ‘the Church of England declared itself to be a national church, different from the state in idea but not in extent.’\(^{40}\) The idea that religion could be separate from government would have been a novel idea to Māori, whose world view fused the secular and the spiritual, and so the inclusion of prayers for state was almost a given. On a more regular basis the daily morning and evening services within the book contained two short prayers, one for the reigning King or Queen and one for the Royal family. Apart from anything else these prayers were a daily reminder of the inherent interconnection between state and church, with the monarch as defender of the faith and from the 1662 edition the State prayers had been one of very few parts of the English prayer book where there had been constant variation, replacing names as monarchs changed. From 1839-1844 the early editions of the Rāwiri reflected this church-state relationship by inserting daily prayers not for the English Royal family but for Ko te Inoinga mo nga Rangatira Maori (Prayers for Maori Chiefs) and Ko te Inoinga mo te Wanau o nga Rangatira Maori (Prayers for the Families of the Maori Chiefs).\(^{41}\) In some ways this process was natural enough, predating as it did the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the recognition by iwi of the role of the Crown. It is also significant that although the early prayers could never name the multitude of rangatira involved, for each hapū or iwi reciting these prayers the role of their own rangatira was reinforced and transformed through this process, with the tapu nature of rangatira being subtly redefined by the prayer-doctrine of the Rāwiri.


\(^{41}\) Ko te Pukapuka o Nga Inoinga 1840, Early Maori Imprint Project, MS-Papers-6763-6, ATL, Wellington.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Prayers for the Māori Chiefs</th>
<th>Prayers for the Queen’s Majesty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>KO TE INOINGA MO NGA RANGATIRA MAORI</td>
<td>PRAYERS FOR THE MĀORI CHIEFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E Ihowa to matou Matua i te rangi, kaha rawa, e noho iho ana i runga rawa, te kingi o nga kingi, te Ariki o nga Ariki, te Kawana o nga piriniha, e kite iho ana koe i runga i tou torona i te tangata katoa e noho ana i te wenua; E tino inoi atu ana matou ki a koe titiro atawhai mai ki nga rangatira maori; a kia wakakahangia ki tou Wairua Tapu, kia rongo ai ratou ki tau pai, kia haere ai ou haerenga; Ho mai taki mahatia ki a ratou nga homaitanga a te rangi; ho mai ki a ratou he ora, he taonga, he oranga roa i tenei ao; wakakahangia ratou kia peia ai kia wati ai o ratou hoa riri katoa; a a te mutunga hoki o te oranga i konei, kia wiwi ratou ki te haringa mutunga kore, mo to Ihu Karaiti to matou Ariki. Amine.</td>
<td>LORD, our heavenly Father, the high and mighty, King of kings, Lord of lords, the only Ruler of princes, who dost from thy throne behold all the dwellers upon earth; Most heartily we beseech thee with thy favour to behold our Māori chiefs; and so replenish them with the grace of thy Holy Spirit, that they may always incline to thy will, and walk in thy way. Endue them plenteously with heavenly gifts; grant them in health and wealth long to live; strengthen them that they may vanquish and overcome all their enemies; and finally, after this life, they may attain everlasting joy and felicity; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>HE INOI MO TE KUINI.</td>
<td>A PRAYER FOR THE QUEEN’S MAJESTY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E IHOWA, e to matou Matua i te rangi, kei runga noa atu, he nui noa atu koe, ko koe te Kingi o nga kingi, te Ariki o nga ariki, me te tino Kawana o nga rangatira, e titiro iho ana ko i runga i to torona ki nga tangata katoa o te whenua; Tenei matou te tohe atu nei, kia tirohia atawhaitia mai to tatou Rangatira pai,a Kuini WIKITORIA; whakakiia ia ki te kaha o tou Wairua Tapu, kia anga tonu ai ia ki tau e pai ai, kia haere ai i to huarahi; Whakanoehoa nga mea papai o te rangi ki roto ki a ia; homai ki a ia he pai, he oranga roa i tenei ao; whakakahangia ia, kia kore ai ona hoa riri katoa i a ia; a, a te mutunga o te noho i konei, kia whihi ia ki te haringa mutunga kore; ko Ihu Karaiti nei hoki to matou Ariki. Amine.</td>
<td>LORD, our heavenly Father, the high and mighty, King of kings, Lord of lords, the only Ruler of princes, who dost from thy throne behold all the dwellers upon earth; Most heartily we beseech thee with thy favour to behold our most gracious Sovereign Lady, Queen ELIZABETH; and so replenish her with the grace of thy Holy Spirit, that she may always incline to thy will, and walk in thy way. Endue her plenteously with heavenly gifts; grant her in health and wealth long to live; strengthen her that she may vanquish and overcome all her enemies; and finally, after this life, she may attain everlasting joy and felicity; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These evolving iwi and Imperial intellectual forces continued to shape important texts such as the Rāwiri. After the work of the Waimate syndicate was competed in 1852 the next major revision of the text began in 1868. Undertaken primarily by William Leonard Williams and his father William Williams, the work was reviewed by Selwyn, Maunsell and Martin. Selwyn had departed that year to become Bishop of Lichfield in England but had kept in touch with the project through regular correspondence. Partly the revision arose as a product of the continuous refinement of Māori grammar in general, as the orthography became more systematic based on an ever-widening corpus of Māori literature. Leonard Williams was a gifted linguist, and as has previously been noted had immersed himself in the Māori language gaining insights from his lengthy interaction with Māori experts. As well as amending basic spelling and grammatical errors, he spent time updating the vocabulary to match new understandings. The word Kāinga for example had been the equivalent of a pā or village, the earliest local ecclesiastical unit. In the revision this was replaced with Pāriha or parish, the newly-established form of the local ecclesiastical structure in the Māori Church. Another example was in the Holy Communion service where the transliterations for Piriniha (prince) and Kawana (governor) were conflated to the term rangatira, indicating a new understanding of roles and authorities. The written language had also evolved to incorporate influences from iwi outside of the north where the original written language had been formulated. There was continuous discussion between father and son over the use of local dialects, where William Williams would occasionally provide a ‘Waikato’ or ‘East Cape’ (Ngāti Porou) term that he thought would be more suitable.

This combination of linguistic skill, theological standpoint and iwi variation came together in various ways. At one point William Williams made the comment ‘I doubt much the propriety of Tau Tama (Your Son). It implies an agency by God by which Jesus was produced.’ The use of the determiner ‘tāu’ modified the noun Tama (Son) to create the effect where - as Williams noted – it could be implied that the Son (Jesus Christ) was inferior to, or a product of, God (the Father). To the evangelical Williams this would have been a heretical
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understanding of the Trinitarian God, where the three parts were separate but equal. The senior Williams was also critical of Cranmerian prose, describing the original English of the BCP as beset by ‘wearisome wordiness’ and noting that ‘the [Prayer Book] in Maori is as longwinded as the [Prayer Book] in English’. Partly this criticism is due to William Williams’ own tastes, and there had long been criticism of the 1662 version as verging on the boring.44 However Williams’ demands for succinctness also display some of his more unfortunate views of Māori in general. While attempting to reduce and refine his son’s attempts in one section, he noted ‘If you want those simple people (Maori) to take in your meaning, you must not deluge them with words.’

However it was in the two sacramental liturgies where new theologies and cultural understandings would collide and merge. As has been noted by the middle of the Nineteenth century theology in England was undergoing rapid change. The Book of Common Prayer had been the legally required standard for English liturgy since 1662 and this had been enforced in a number of ways. However this did not stop movement, and by the 1830s Roman Catholic emaciation was the most visible symbol of religious change. The Tractarians were English Anglicans who pushed for change but still insisted during that early period in retaining the BCP as a baseline for liturgy. It was the next generation, the ‘ritualists’ or ‘ceremonialists’ who began to push outside of BCP practice, especially in the delivery of services which were tightly prescribed through the rubrics contained in the service orders.45 These rubrics contained everything from the dress to be worn by the officiating minister to posture (stand, kneel) to what was to be placed on the altar at a service. At a Communion service for example the rubrics stated that ‘the Table at the Communion time having a fair white linen cloth upon it... the Priest standing at the north side of the Table... the people kneeling.’46 Such prescriptions not only enforced a reformed theological outlook but excluded others – specifically there was no allowance for the “smells and bells” of Roman Catholic practice. The Ritualists began to push new liturgical innovations beginning with basics such as candles on the altar. Although such innovations may seem mundane today, Nigel Yates argues that they were in fact the expression of a

46 The Book of Common Prayer, p.165.
much more fundamental change in doctrine and theology. The Ritualists believed that through these old expressions based on new theological understandings, ‘the Church of England could gradually recover in its worship the symbolism of the Catholic doctrines which, they believed, it had never wholly rejected.’ These developments were not only long-standing pre-Reformation understandings, but also ‘had both a theological and a psychological base’ in that some Anglicans were seeking to rediscover old traditions in the uncertain times of the Industrial revolution. These developments met stiff resistance in a society that was still ‘overwhelmingly anti-Catholic.’ Things went so far that in 1874 the Archbishop of Canterbury with the support of many leading English politicians had the Public Worship Regulation Act passed by parliament, which led to the imprisonment of non-conforming Anglican clergy.

Such ideas rapidly spread here, and Selwyn had already been suspected of supporting these movements by the evangelical CMS who were strongly opposed to anything that might be remotely Roman Catholic in nature. There was some truth to this, in that Selwyn’s colonial Gothic churches reflected this newly emerging theology and became very influential on the practice and understanding of Holy Communion in this country. In 1875 an English priest Hubert Carlyon came to New Zealand and was appointed to Kaiapoi in the Christchurch Diocese. Carlyon had been educated at Cambridge University, a hotbed of Ritualists, and on his arrival here began practising some of their innovations. He was soon challenged and although found ‘to be within Anglican comprehensiveness’ by the sympathetic Bishop Harper, the following year he was tried in an ecclesiastical court charged with ‘holding doctrine contrary to the Church of England, using wafers, elevating the chalice, and adopting the eastward position’. Carlyon was found guilty, suspended and returned to England in 1877. Carlyon was however merely ahead of his time. Selwyn had had altars installed against the Eastern wall of the his newly constructed Churches which forced the priest to celebrate facing the eastern wall (Ad orientem), where the BCP had
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demanded that the table (altar) ‘shall stand in the body of the Church, or in the Chancel’ and the Priest was to stand or kneel to the north side of it. This repositioning, along with vestments, incense, wafer bread, the mixed chalice and lit candles, was one of the marks of the Ritualists, later described as Anglo-Catholics.\textsuperscript{53}

The movement where evolving Anglican theology met dynamic iwi understandings created a site of renegotiation. Iwi had consistently adapted liturgical practices to meet their own understandings, while at the same time adapting their own practices to fit the requirements of the new knowledge. By the 1870s for example debates were raging in Pākehā circles over whether the BCP content should be spoken, chanted, or sung, depending on an interpretation of the rubrics allowing people to either “read” or “say” the words. During the debate however it was pointed out that Māori had always practiced a form of chant within the liturgy, adapting English practice to meet ancient performance customs.\textsuperscript{54}

The whare karakia (church building) as the house for the delivery of liturgy, had long been a site of renegotiation between iwi and missionary. The proposal for a new whare karakia at Manutuke in 1848 quickly escalated into competing understandings around the place of whakairo (carvings). The master carver Raharuhi Rukupo of Rongowhakaata had begun preparing carvings for the interior of the Church, but was strongly opposed in this by William Williams. In the Māori historiography dealing with ‘colonisation’ perhaps the strongest image of the arrival and imposition of a new value system is that of the missionaries as representatives of that value system implementing the emasculation of whakairo. Ranginui Walker in his seminal work “Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou” (Struggle without End) refers to Pākehā missionaries, as ‘the advance party of cultural invasion. Their immediate goal was to replace the spiritual beliefs of the Maori with their own.”\textsuperscript{55} He reinforces this with an evocative metaphor ‘the missionaries also attacked the sacred symbols of the tribe by emasculating ancestral carvings of their genitals, an act that portended the cultural and human emasculation to come.”\textsuperscript{56} However Richard Sundt argues that this was not necessarily the case with the Manutuke church. Instead Sundt argues that Williams ‘as a strict evangelical, was committed to upholding the Mosaic proscription
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against graven images’ and that ‘however repugnant the indigenous style of sculpture was for most New Zealand missionaries, their principal reason for prohibiting such carvings from churches was grounded in canon law and godly commandment (the second). Regardless of how Māori depicted their ancestors, such imagery would have remained unacceptable to CMS clerics on the assumption that any figure, particularly a three-dimensional one, might lead to idolatry.’  

This is not to let Williams off the hook for his intolerance of Māori understandings per se, of which he gave many examples. It is instead a case displaying the complexity of the process of renegotiating understandings, where the knowledge of the colonisers was as fluid and subject to change as that of the iwi with whom they were interacting.

This situation where English theological change was reflected in the liturgy found something of a perfect storm in the 1868 revision of the Rāwiri, coming as it did near the peak of the clash between ‘Ritualists’ and ‘Traditionalists’. In England in 1867 for example the traditionalist Church Association launched a fund of £50,000 to assist ‘aggrieved parishioners’ to undertake suits against ritualist clergy. William Leonard had been educated at Oxford University, and so had been shaped by very different forces than those that had formed his evangelical father some decades earlier. He saw the Rāwiri revision as an opportunity to insert many new ideas found in the ritualist movement into the liturgy. These changes were more important than mere transformation of form or wording. The ritualist movement was primarily concerned with changing doctrine that would be expressed through liturgy, as opposed to merely being concerned with change of form. So the changing stance and actions of the Priest for example were primarily about the change in the peoples’ relationship to God and the Priest’s role in that as intercessor than merely superficial performance issues. These changes to the Rāwiri were also fundamentally important in that they ran contrary to ‘the fundamental provisions of the constitution’ as laid out in 1857, where the Anglican Church in New Zealand was supposedly based on the immutability of the liturgy as one of the key foundations of the Church. With regard to this issue there were always going to be language challenges in translating the key text of the
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Book of Common Prayer into other languages, including the selection of key words and phrases. However the early translators had largely held to the Cranmerian approach to reformed protestant theology, appreciating his theological approach especially regarding the sacraments of baptism and communion. The new revision not only set out to correct the text, taking advantage of developments in grammar and dialect, but also under Leonard Williams’ intellectual leadership set out to revise the underlying theology of the text in line with contemporary Ritualist dogma, thereby constructing a realignment of Mihinare theology and practice, and creating a conscious divergence from existing Pākehā understandings as expressed through the prayer book.

The two sacramental services of baptism and Holy Communion were particularly important for Anglicans from a number of standpoints. In the formation of his theology over Holy Communion Cranmer, in line with the Continental reformed churches, had moved away from the ‘real objective presence of Christ in the Eucharist’, or transubstantiation. In line with the via media (middle of the road) approach of reformation Anglicanism, a halfway measure was adopted where the understanding instead became that of ‘a doctrine of the real partaking of the body and blood in the Eucharist’ – the sacramental transformation came through use, rather than in an objective manner. However although the via media concept was strong Cranmer was more aligned with the reformed protestant movement of the Continent, and so the language of his prayers (and those that followed) had shied away from the use of ‘sacramental’ language per se. Similarly with baptism, the idea of the transformation of water into a spiritually cleansing agent was roughly halfway between a memorial of Jesus’ baptism in the Jordan and the Roman Catholic concept of ‘Holy Water’. Cranmer had used the term ‘mystical’ to find a nebulous halfway point that was not a true transformation but was at the same time more than a mere memoriam. Cranmer had used the term ‘mystical’ as a substitute for the more Roman Catholic-leaning concept of ‘sacrament’, which was included in places but was not necessarily central to the text.

In the original translation of the Prayer of Consecration of Water at Baptism (Table 4) the Waimate syndicate - dominated as it was by evangelical theology – had translated Cranmer’s phrase ‘sanctify this Water to the mystical washing away of sin’ into
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‘whakatapua tenei Wai hei horoi whakawairua i te hara’ (sanctify this Water for the spiritual washing of sin). William Williams argued that Whakawairua was the best translation for Mystical, a fascinating choice in that Wairua was the Māori concept for spirit and Tapu was an ancient Māori concept for sacred – utilising and co-opting deeply loaded terms for the renegotiation of mātauranga. Such choices by Williams et al could be seen as the diminishment of iwi knowledge through a process of co-option and adaptation. However another view is that Williams chose to use the terms that would connect Māori spirituality with Christian fundamentals, fusing the two together. In the process of revision however, Leonard Williams chose another intellectual pathway with the words ‘whakatapua tenei Wai hei Hakarameta mo te horoi i te hara’ (sanctify this Water as a Sacrament for the washing of sin). Leonard had done two things through this choice. By deliberately incorporating the term ‘Hakarameta’ (Sacrament) – even capitalising it as a proper noun – he had set out to transform Mihinare theology by aligning it with the intellectual understandings of the ritualist movement. Secondly he had removed the word ‘Whakawairua’ and so in a limited way had disconnected Māori from their own intellectual traditions and had instead substituted an external understanding. This is not to say that William Williams was the champion of Māori understandings, nor was Leonard entirely ignorant. It was more that in the constantly changing English and European theological tides the Māori waka had been forced to find a new course. William Williams objected strongly to this change, and noted the absence of Hakarameta from the English text proclaiming that its insertion ‘gives it a popish aspect’, but was overruled.
Table 4: Prayer of Consecration of Water at Baptism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1858 version</th>
<th>1883 version</th>
<th>BCP version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E TE Atua Kaha rawa ora tonu, he muru i o matou hara i heke ai he wai toto i te kaokao tapu o Ihu Karaiti o tau Tamaiti e arohaina nuitia ana e koe; nana hoki i whakahau ana akonga, kia haere ki te whakaako i nga iwi katoa, ki te iriiri hoki i a ratou, i runga i te Ingoa o te Matua, o te Tamaiti, o te Wairua Tapu; Whakarangona mai nga inoi a tenei whakaminengenga au; <strong>whakatapua tenei Wai hei horoi whakawairua i te hara;</strong> a tukua mai ki <strong>tenei Tamaiti</strong> ka iriiria nei ki tenei Wai, kia whiwhi ki tau atawhai nui, kia noho tonu hoki i roto i au tamariki whakapono i whiriwhiria e koe; ko Ihu Karaiti hoki to matou Ariki. <em>Amine.</em></td>
<td>E TE Atua Kaha rawa ora tonu, he muru i o matou hara i heke ai he wai, he toto, i te kaokao tapu o tau Tama aroha, o Ihu Karaiti; i whakahaua hoki e ia ana akonga kia haere ki te whakaako i nga iwi katoa, ki te iriiri hoki i a ratou i runga i te Ingoa o te Matua, o te Tama, o te Wairua Tapu; Whakarangona mai nga inoi a tenei whakaminengenga au; <strong>whakatapua tenei Wai hei Hakarameta mo te horoi i te hara;</strong> tukua mai hoki ki <strong>tenei tamaiti</strong>, ka iriiria nei ki tenei Wai, kia whiwhi ki nga hua o tau atawhai, kia noho tonu hoki i roto i au tamariki whakapono i whiriwhiria e koe; ko Ihu Karaiti hoki to matou Ariki. <em>Amine.</em></td>
<td>Almighty, everliving God, whose most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, for the forgiveness of our sins, did shed out of his most precious side both water and blood; and gave commandment to his disciples, that they should go teach all nations, and baptize them In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Regard, we beseech thee, the supplications of thy congregation; <strong>sanctify this Water to the mystical washing away of sin,</strong> and grant that <strong>this Child,</strong> now to be baptized therein, may receive the fullness of thy grace, and ever remain in the number of thy faithful and elect children; through Jesus Christ our Lord.<em>Amen.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly the original translation of the prayer The Exhortation at Holy Communion (Table 5) had attempted to strictly follow Cranmerian theology. Cranmer had described a process where those who partook of Holy Communion had ‘spiritually’ eaten the flesh and drunk the blood of Christ. Williams the elder and his colleagues had inserted the term ‘Whakawairua’ to describe this process and to disassociate this from the objective eating of the flesh as practiced by the Roman Catholics. However Leonard’s revision removed the word whakawairua and instead wrote ‘Ko reira hoki tatou kai ai i te kikokiko o te Karaiti, inu ai i tona toto i roto i o tatou ngakau’ (therefore we who eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood in our hearts). Removing the mitigation of ‘whakawairua’ and instead substituting ‘i roto i o tatou ngakau’ (in our hearts) at the end was a subtle departure from the more
literal translation of Cranmer’s words, and was one step closer to the ritualist theology which was in turn degrees closer to the concept of transubstantiation and a move away from the reformed idea of memorial. William Williams strongly objected to these changes. He recognised that in this part the Book of Common Prayer was ‘strongly sacramenterian’ but noted that the correct terms ‘must be carefully emphasised to guard against the popish doctrine’, and insisted that ‘spiritually to eat flesh is different’ – distinguishing from the objective consumption of the body and blood. There were other factors influencing the senior Williams’ thoughts. He had been in the country for a long time by then and his experiences and interactions with iwi were significantly different from his son’s. During Williams’ early years he had seen first-hand many examples of Kai Tangata, the ancient custom of the consumption of human flesh.\textsuperscript{62} This practice that had essentially disappeared by the time his son had commenced his own ministry. Williams senior then was intimately aware of the deep connection between Holy Communion and the ancient religious practice of kai tangata, of the profound connotations that could be invoked by the wording involved in the service order. Aware of the power of language to give form to cultural ideas, Williams senior asserted that ‘I still believe that whakawairua is a word that must be recognised in the language’. In his final comment on this wording he declared ‘Maori gods ate the wairua o te kai but I would earnestly oppose the proposed rendering which is clearly more carnal than the Maori idea.’ In this statement William’s was at the confluence of evolving western theology, of cultural change and of the deep understanding William’s held of iwi epistemology. Williams understood the power of iwi intellectual and ontological values and imagery, and the need to merge this with Holy Communion, itself the most meaningful ritual of Anglicanism. His attempt to find the common margins between reformed protestant theology and Māori understandings, even if ultimately unsuccessful, was an illustration of the complexity of the process of renegotiation of mātauranga not only from the iwi perspective, but from all sides.

\textbf{Table 5: The Exhortation at Holy Communion}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1858 version</th>
<th>1883 version</th>
<th>BCP version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ko reira hoki tatou</td>
<td>Ko reira hoki tatou</td>
<td>for then we</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The revision project was significant and the final version was not printed until 1878 and revised again slightly for misprints in 1883. Apart from minor changes made by William Leonard Williams himself around 1905 it remained the version of use until the final Rāwiri printing of 1951, and was extremely popular, with 27500 copies printed in various runs over the next 30 years. The revised Rāwiri would remain the most important expression of Mihinare prayer-doctrine, and remained the sole official daily manifestation of Mihinare doctrine until the publication of the New Zealand Prayer Book in 1989. The revision of the Rāwiri was a complex process, giving great insight into the process of renegotiation. The fact that leading Pākehā clerics felt they could alter the Māori text when the English was sacrosanct was also insightful as to their perceptions of the relative place of iwi in the church. It was possibly not coincidental that such a major revision took place in the aftermath of the New Zealand Wars, which became a period when colonisation became entrenched and military resistance faltered. Within the church the potential for early mana motuhake (self-determination) in the form of the Waiapu Hinota had delayed by Pākehā. So the revision could be viewed as an exercise in liturgical and intellectual domination by Pākehā Anglican leadership, where Māori were mere subjects in the grand theological experiment being played out across the Empire. However as happened elsewhere in the story, iwi were in fact a the same time crafting their own understandings of the situation. It could be argued that far from disadvantaging iwi through the revision process, it was in fact strengthening their position. As could be seen through the church-building process, the focus of the ritualists on the power of image was much more in alignment with iwi practices.
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than the severe aesthetics of the reformed protestants. This would continue to be the case for decades to come, where iwi would construct churches with powerful cultural imagery as an expression of ancient intellectual forces. So the insertion of ritualist dogma into the prayer book was not necessarily a negative for iwi, and could well have be seen a realignment that suited their aspirations.

The translators themselves were often surprised by the iwi response to both the prayer book and the bible. There were the seemingly obligatory semi-miraculous responses such as that reported by Henry Williams in 1833 when 200 or more Māori who he believed had never encountered Pākehā previously could recite the hymns and prayer book responses with gusto, indicating the ability of Māori to teach and this new prayer-doctrine effectively. However the responses were often different from those the translators were expecting. George Maunsell reported on a trip to the Wairarapa where he came across an iwi who no longer utilised the prayer book but instead utilised what he described as Hauhau prayers (prayer-doctrine). They took the name hauhau to come from Exodus 16 “Ko ahau nei ano ahau nei” I am what I am, and they observed the Sabbath and accepted Old testament but ignored the new as irrelevant, for example Paul’s travels ‘of which they spoke contemptuously’. On William Williams first full visit to Ngāti Porou in 1837, he lead a service of worship. When he came to the first hymn his attempt to lead was met with a puzzling lack of response so he stopped. One of the local Kaiwhakaako restarted the hymn in a style the iwi themselves had developed that utilised the same words but that also utilised a more indigenous method that paralleled the chanting of mōteatea (traditional chants). Williams was taken aback by both the power of the singing in the new style but also by how fast the adaptation had taken place in the absence of missionary control. This spread of written knowledge also surprised Robert Maunsell. On one of his journeys he fully expected to give his congregation new knowledge, treating them as a kind of biblical and intellectual terra nullis. Instead he noted that ‘to my surprise as soon as the service was over
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they remarked that I had mulled about Esther and gave the history accurately.’

Literacy had become a powerful tool by which the Kaiwhakaako could spread new knowledge rapidly and far from the control of missionaries iwi could adapt this to suit their own understandings and context.

This renegotiation extended to the naming of the text itself. The official title included various translations of the English title, primarily based around ‘Te Pukapuka o Nga Inoi’ (The Book of Prayers). However from as early as 1840 - not long after the first printing of the first widely distributed edition - the name ‘Rāwiri’ was being applied to all versions of the prayer book. The Rāwiri of the title is an allusion to the psalmist David, the Old Testament King, who was credited with the authorship of many of the psalms. The psalms themselves were some of the earliest pieces translated and were also an important part of the working of the prayer book daily offices (morning and evening services) and therefore an important part of the whole text. Hone Kaa offers an explanation for the transference of the naming on to the text based on the Māori worldview and understanding of ‘texts’ such as these. In this worldview traditional composition of important oral works was never anonymous. In fact, the authorship was crucial and ‘acknowledgement of authorship gave you authority to use their words and keep them alive. This authorship was tied to composition, which was seen as a gift from the gods and inherently tapu, and therefore the accuracy of repetition was all-important and inaccuracy could result in a breach of tapu.’ In this context then, and where Cranmer was not an obvious object of such attention, ‘Rāwiri’ was an obvious title for the text from a Māori perspective.

Iwi demand for the Rāwiri was great. One by-product of literacy was a Māori love for letter writing, and requests for Rawiri soon came flooding in, along with those for scripture, hymnals, almanacs and other tools of the prayer-doctrine. Rawiri Tawanga wrote to Selwyn from Kaikohe in 1846 pleading that ‘He ruarua nga tangata, nga wahine e u nei ano ki te whakapono ki a Ihu Karaiti, to tatou Ariki. Ki te kite e koe te ra e haere mai ai koe, me haere mai me tetahi Rawiri’ (few men and women are keeping strong in the faith of Jesus
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Christ. Please see that on the day when you come, bring [me] a Prayer book). There were a multitude of similar pleases for the texts to Selwyn and the other translators. This plea for prayer books was more than just for the resource itself. It was also part of a control mechanism on behalf of the writer where books, especially in the early phase, meant a measure of authority due to the demand for literacy as a goal in itself. Piharo wrote to Selwyn in 1847 asking ‘Homai e pa, ka pukapuka ki a matou ke mai... Kahora a matou pukapuka, no tetahi ahi ka pukapuka’ (Father, send us some books... We have no books, some villages have books) again both as a request for the texts but also to improve his own comparative advantage. These requests were continuous, and even as late as the 1860s Kaka wrote to Selwyn requesting 12 Rāwiri as there was ‘kotahi tonu te rawiri, ka ngangare ki te Rawiri kotahi me tetehi tepara me tetehi pukapuka reta Maori’ (only one prayer book, and there were quarrels over the one copy of the prayer book and the one table and one book in Maori).

As noted in Chapter Two Te Hui No Te Hahi Maori (The Native Church Boards) were forums for iwi to assert their own agendas within a wider institution that was constantly seeking to marginalise them. This expression extended to the Rāwiri, where the Hui consistently expressed a sense of ownership over the text in a variety of ways. Sometimes the Hui dealt with the mechanics of the situation, such as in January 1877 when the Hui in Kaitaia demanded ‘Ka pau nei nga Rawiri tawhito, he kupu tenei na te Hui ki nga Kai perehi Rawiri kia tere te whakaputa mai i nga pukapuka’ (the stocks of the old prayer book are becoming exhausted, and this Board requests the printers (publishers) to get a move on in distributing the new edition). The 1884 Board meeting at Paihia asked the publishers to ‘kia whakapiria nga Atikara e toru tekau ma iwa ina mahia houtia he Rawiri’ (insert the 39 Articles of religion into the new Rawiri), as this had not been common practice. Consequently, the 1890 edition was the first to include the Articles. There were also constant
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calls for ‘Kia whakamaoritia mai etahi atu Himene’\textsuperscript{75} (more translating into Maori of hymns [in the Rawiri]), lamenting that there were too few, and in 1887 ‘He kupu whakapai tenei na te Hui o te Hahi Maori ki a Tiatire Wiremu mo tana mahi nui ki te whakamaori i nga Himene’ (a resolution from the Board congratulating Edward Williams for his impressive work translating hymns into Maori.)\textsuperscript{76} In terms of the hymns there seems to be little complaint over content, merely ownership once the work was done. As noted the 1897 Hui held at Te Pohurewa at Waipa also attempted to insert the names of the Māori King into the prayers for the Queen and for the Royal Family, claiming an iwi ownership over the text that would undoubtedly have proved unpopular with other iwi, for example Ngāti Porou.

This tension between different iwi understandings and aspirations for the text created constant ructions in the various Hui. This had followed on from previous negative reaction to the work of the Williams’. At the Hui held at Peria in 1879 it was noted that ‘tera pea te hunga taunga ki nga pukapuka tawhito e whakakino i nga mea hou ina kite i nga kupu i rere ke’\textsuperscript{77} (maybe those who are used to the old prayer book would dislike the new ones when they see strange new words). This was a reference to the use of Ngāti Porou and Tainui language in the revised text, as well possibly to the theological changes that had been undertaken. However although it seemed the issue was soon settled ‘otira e kore e roa ka paingia i te marama o nga kupu. Ka tahi ano te whakamaoritanga o te pukapuka inoi i tika’ (however it won’t be long before they will be satisfied with the new words. Then the translation of the prayer book will seem correct)\textsuperscript{78} it wasn’t long before Ihaka Te Tai was relitigating the issue for the retention of ‘the pure Maori of the Ngapuhi tribe’\textsuperscript{79} in the newly revised Rawiri. This iwi tension over language was not restricted solely to the Rawiri, but had spread to other church texts. Robert Maunsell had noted in 1884 that the recent Rawiri revision was not well received and wrote that ‘no alterations should be made unless absolutely necessary, and that where there is doubt the present edition should be retained. The revisions that have already taken place seem only to perplex the Maori mind I have
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many enquiries for the old editions.\textsuperscript{80} He also saw a decline in sales of the revised Rāwiri writing ‘the Prayer Book alterations for instance meet with general dissatisfaction, and I could sell two of the old edition for one of the new.’ \textsuperscript{81} However it seemed the ‘obsessive’\textsuperscript{82} Maunsell did not listen to his own advice and his 1889 revision of the Paipera was not well received by iwi. This was partly because Maunsell wanted the 1889 version ‘to reflect the ‘central dialect’ of Maori, which he saw as the Waikato\textsuperscript{83} which met significant resistance in the North. In the end ‘the new edition proved virtually unsaleable’\textsuperscript{84} and the iwi had once again asserted their ownership over the texts they considered sacred.

The last printing of the Rāwiri was undertaken by the SPCK in London in 1951. Logistically things became difficult, and by the late 1970s the shortage of Rāwiri in print led Kingi Ihaka, then Archdeacon for Māori in the Diocese of Auckland, to undertake a drive for reprinting from 1978. In an impassioned plea repeated to several publishers Ihaka placed the Rāwiri ‘amongst the few classics of Maori literature’ that had ‘been regarded by many as a gift from our ancestors and which , even amongst the youth of maoridom, is revered and treasured, and regarded as a gem insofar as the Maori content, construction, style, etc are concerned.’\textsuperscript{85} However there was some doubt from Mihinare Hui whether the ‘archaic language’ of the book would be read by a younger generation, and whether an abridged version would be more suitable.\textsuperscript{86} Mainly, however, the Rāwiri had been overtaken by a wave of liturgical reform and post-colonial thought that was sweeping both worldwide Christianity and Te Haahi Mihinare.

\textsuperscript{80} Maunsell to father, June 4 1884, Maunsell, Robert, Papers concerning the revision of the Maori Bible 1867-1885, MS-Papers-2981, ATL, Wellington.
\textsuperscript{81} Maunsell to father, June 4 1884, Maunsell, Robert, Papers concerning the revision of the Maori Bible 1867-1885, MS-Papers-2981, ATL, Wellington.
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\textsuperscript{84} Ibid, p.166.
\textsuperscript{85} K.M.Ihaka to David Elworthy (William Collins New Zealand), 7 August 1979, K.M. Ihaka Papers, S4 R Komiti Tumuaki Box 2523, AADA, Auckland. Also sent same to AH & AW Reed and Government Printer.
\textsuperscript{86} Extract of Minutes from Diocese of Auckland Hui Toopu, 1979, K.M. Ihaka Papers, S4 R Komiti Tumuaki Box 2523, AADA, Auckland.
In England dynamics including the Ritualist movement had led to increasing diversity of English religious life, to a point where an English Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline reported in 1906 that ‘The law relating to the conduct of Divine Service and the ornaments of the churches is, in our belief, nowhere exactly observed... the law of public worship in the Church of England is too narrow for the religious life of the present generation... the machinery for discipline has broken down.’ The time for change had arrived. This change was epitomised by the decades-long development of the 1928 English Prayer Book, a revision of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer. In some respects this work was a revision of language, updating the archaic Elizabethan English. In other areas, such as the marriage service, there was significant theological revision to match new understandings of the times. However due to the complexity of the Church’s relationship with the State, the 1928 Prayer Book had to first be accepted by the English Parliament, and it was in fact defeated as legislation. The book had faced opposition from all sides: Anglo Catholics saw it as curbing their ‘hard-won gains’ and Evangelicals viewed it as ‘surrender to Anglo-Catholicism, and Anglo-Catholicism meant popery.’ In the midst of this theological morass, G.J. Cuming quaintly ascribes Parliament’s rejection of the Book to ‘Fear of Rome.’ Regardless of the reasons, conservative dynamics had won out and the 1662 Book remained the only legally authorised worship in England for decades more.

In this land, in the meantime, similar forces for change were working throughout the Pākehā dioceses. Bosco Peters writes that by 1920 ‘a wide diversity of Eucharistic thought and practice was officially sanctioned throughout New Zealand. In areas of dispute, the bishops had moved towards a more Catholic interpretation of their function and had become the focus of this authorisation. The Prayer Book was now being adapted in a variety of fashions and as a result congregationalism [diversity] in eucharistic worship in the Anglican church in New Zealand was here to stay.’ The 1928 English revision of the Book of Common Prayer was enthusiastically accepted here, however the 1857 Church constitution had made the 1662 Book an unalterable formulary of the Church, and so in 1928 the New Zealand parliament passed the Church of England Empowering Act allowing the.
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formularies (agreed doctrine and practice) to be altered by General Synod. This process was an interesting insight into the slavish mirroring of English life, even if through a glass darkly. The ecclesiastical divisions reflected in the CMS-Selwyn disputes of the nineteenth century continued to evolve, with entire Dioceses becoming known as either ‘almost monochromatically Evangelical [such as Nelson] or Anglo-Catholic [Dunedin or Waikato at various times].’ While noting these divisions, however, many Anglo-Catholic traits had passed into almost universal acceptance, including things as diverse as coloured stoles through to saying ‘Ahmen’ rather than ‘Aymen’. Other developments came from other sources. The post-war Parish and People movement spread here from England by the 1960s popularising regular Sunday Communion, which soon became the norm across the country. Alongside this came influences from the changing global theological environment, bringing a social justice and community/participatory aspect to liturgy.

However such changes, while significant, were still incremental and still based around the core of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, with Peters asserting that New Zealand in the 1960s was ‘one of the liturgically most conservative provinces of the Anglican communion.’ This was quite a position to hold in what was still an ultra-conservative world-wide Anglican club. Regardless, in an era where even the Vatican was undergoing a fundamental review of its own worship and doctrine through the Second Vatican Council of 1962-65, change was inevitable. So when the General Synod received a proposal to ‘plan and prepare a revised Book of Common Prayer, either in stages or as a whole’, there was ‘warm support’, leading to the 1966 New Zealand Liturgy, the first authorised Anglican liturgy developed in this land. This liturgy was criticised as somewhat rushed and subject to many complaints, but still widely accepted in Pākehā parishes and Dioceses. It was also largely dependent for its development on overseas and traditional English sources, lacking a confidence to experiment or indigenise. However as Peters posits, the 1966 version, for all
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its faults, was ‘the final demonstration that a sixteenth and seventeenth century service could no longer nourish the average worship of the twentieth century.’

Mihinare were dragged into the process of liturgical reform largely through the translation process. Guided by Pihopa Manu Bennett, this process would see the establishment of the Maori Prayer Book Translation Committee, bringing together various iwi understandings as well as an ecumenical flavour with observers invited from various mainstream denominations. This early work peaked with the development of a bilingual New Zealand Liturgy 1970 which Bennett hoped would ‘help to overcome pakeha insensitivity’ by being present in every parish on every Sunday, and would also meet the Mihinare ‘responsibility to minister to the Maori as Maori.’ However Bennett’s aspirations met some roadblocks. The Prayer Book Revision Commission itself hesitated at Bennett’s request for ‘the Maori language version taking pride of place on the right hand pages’ with the English on the left, instead believing that ‘if this is to be the principal edition of the New Zealand Liturgy, would it not achieve this purpose better with English as its main language’ – a realpolitik position that seriously undermined Mihinare aspirations for the edition.

The 1970 bilingual liturgy was a significant production by Mihinare and its impact was soon felt throughout the country. However, that also meant that the iwi and at times contestatory nature of Mihinare soon came to bear on the liturgy and its authors. Less than three months after its launch Kingi Ihaka was complaining to the Prayer Book Commission that the (Northern) dialect used throughout the liturgy had not being applied consistently, and he advocated that an individual who undertook the work must be one who ‘not only speaks Maori, but thinks Maori’ – his emphasis. In reply to the latter the Commission asked minita Te Waaka ‘Sonny’ Melbourne (Ngāi Tuhoe) and Brown Turei (Te Whānau-a-Tauru).
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Apanui, Ngāti Porou) to identify which corrections ‘are essential to salvation.’ Amongst the Commission’s Pākehā members there was bemusement as to the nature of these claims, with the chair writing that ‘I don’t want to have various sub-tribes complaining that the style is not theirs or that they spell a particular word a different way to another area group.’ Such a response, while not surprising, displayed a limited understanding of the importance of the iwi dynamics involved.

The treatment of death had long been a controversial subject in the reformed protestant heritage of Anglicanism. The 1966 New Zealand Liturgy had made a break from the past by including prayers for the dead in the intercessory prayers, something not allowed for in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer. These changes, along with the obvious Mihinare ministry for the dead including the tangihanga (days-long funeral ritual) and related liturgical practices, had been brought to the attention of the Prayer Book Commission. In 1971 the Commission asked Mihinare to write ‘an optional personal address of farewell to the departed’ to add to the funeral service. There was strong criticism from evangelicals of the inclusion in 1966 of prayers for the dead, claiming that such an approach was contrary to protestant teachings on the matter. However there was more than just theological resistance to a wider inclusion of Māori understanding of death in the liturgy. As late as 1978 a senior Pākehā cleric on the Commission presented a paper on the topic, in which he asserted that ‘what had begun as an attempt to meet special Maori needs had now become more widely used and he saw a threat in the proposal to include it in the main text. There were overtones of paganism and necromancy.’ This cultural perception of the poroporoaki or ‘farewelling of the dead’ as it was described by the Commission was defended by other Pākehā as ‘a learning from Maori burial custom which might help all to accept the fact that death has happened’. However there was no agreement within the Commission on the topic at the time and such debates help to understand the opposition
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faced by Mihinare in developing their own liturgical practices. Regardless of such opposition, Mihinare asserted their understanding of death and its liturgical treatment right from the beginning of the revision period. In 1966 the first meeting of the Translation Committee reported on their views: ‘we draw the Commission’s attention to the fact that Maori are “surrounded by a great cloud of witnesses”. They are very conscious of the dead: the hand-clasp and nose-pressing are tributes to the dead; and the speeches must always begin with due respects to them. However much this area of their life is demythologised, they will continue to keep the dead in remembrance, so that it is the most natural thing to pray for the dead.’ This was an explicit statement of the importance of interweaving culture with liturgy.

By 1979, Kingi Ihaka was the Mihinare member on the Prayer Book Commission, and he provided a withering critique of a proposed funeral committal in light of his strong cultural understandings. The proposal was written in English by a Commission member, and Ihaka provided an alternative that he asserted ‘more closely corresponds with both Maori sentiment and expression, including meeting ‘the reality of death without mawkish emotion’ and lifting ‘it out of the realm of valedictory (mihi) oration to the realm of worship and the numinous – a distinction which the Maori jealously preserves.’ Even if it was possible to separate the Christian doctrinal understandings from such a critique, there remains an attempt by Ihaka to enunciate a cultural framework for death through liturgy. The tangihanga was more than merely the funeral however, and Ihaka was also asked to provide liturgies for the ‘Dedication of a headstone’ and ‘the blessing of a house after a funeral.’ The Takahi Whare, or ‘the blessing of a house after a funeral’ presented a significant challenge to Ihaka. The notion of ‘cleansing’ was complicated in Māori understanding, and Takahi Whare literally meant in this context to ‘tramp the house’, which in turn represented esoteric understandings of cleansing and life-giving. Bishop Bennett had already alluded to the challenge contained in such a seemingly simple ritual, noting that a
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Takahi Whare liturgy would need, amongst other things, to ‘reflect Maori concepts of sin and evil’ that were to be cleansed. More imposing than this, however, was the immediate problem for Ihaka of finding a Mihinare and iwi understanding of the ritual itself. In a letter to his fellow minita from across different iwi, Ihaka expressed his wishes:

Tena koutou e Tamara ma:

No toku taenga ki roto o Ngati-Porou, katahi ano ahau ka mohio, he Takahi whare ano tetahi mea! I au e tamariki ana, tae noa ki te wa i wehe mai ai au i toku ake kainga tupu, kore rawa te tenei mahi i mahinga ki roto i a matou. Kotahi noa ritenga mo te Takahi whare i te kainga mai i auwa wa tae noa mai ki naianeti, ara, he karakia Ahiahi he mea tango mai i te Rawiri, a he kai ki te whare ake o te tupapaku. Kua kore ke nga mahi ringiringi ki te wai me era atu ahau e kitea tonutia nei i roto i nga iwi mahi o te motu.

Kanui te hiahia o te Haahi kia whakakaupapatia tetahi Karakia mo te Porowini kia uru ki roto i nga pukapuka Karakia, a te Haahi, mo te Takahi Whare. Ko te ‘Tikanga’ kua oti i ahau, he mea whakakaupapa i roto i aku haere i waenganui i nga iwi mahi o te motu. Tenei ka tukuna atu e au te taonga nei hei matakaiti, hei whakatikatika ma koutou mehemea kei te hapa etahi whai. Naku ake, otira e aha i ahau engari na te wairua, ka oti te taonga nei, engari ko tuku hiahia kai whai wahi ano koutou. Kaua e wehi ki te whakaputa i o koutou whakairo. Ko te mea nui, kia tere mai a koutou whakahoki, a koutou whakamarama hoki. Ko te hao o toku ngakau ko te ‘Tikanga’ e whakaetia, kia hangai i runga i nga whakahaire whanui a nga iwi, kei waiho te taonga nei hei whakahawea ma te tangata.

He iwi whakahawea, whakaparahako, whakatongere te iwi Maori. E kore ahau e whakaae kia kiingia, “E; na Kingi Ihaka anake tena tikanga”, engari na te Haahi i roto i te iwi Maori i raro i te mana o te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa.

Kei te tatari mai te tari nui o te Porowini mo te ‘Tikanga’ nei, na reira, kia mama mai e rau rangatira ma o koutou whakaaro mo tenei take tino rangatira, tino nui hoki.
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Greetings my friends.

When I arrived in Ngāti Porou [where Ihaka’s wife came from] I learned of a thing, that thing being the Takahi Whare! When I was a child growing up in my village, at the time of death this was not performed among us. There was one way of carrying out the Takahi Whare from the time of my childhood to today, and that was through conducting the evening prayer from the Rāwiri and having a meal in the house of the deceased. There was no sprinkling of water, which is what I see happening across the various tribes of the land.

The Church greatly wishes that a liturgy be created for the Province for inclusion in the Church’s prayer book for the conducting of the Takahi Whare. The ‘Tikanga’ [cultural practice] that I have to elucidate is to be compiled as I travel among the tribes of the land. To me has been given the privilege of observing and preparing this on your behalf, however, it is a little intimidating. From my perspective, this is not about what I want but what the spirit wants, and in completing this task what I need comes from your different areas. Please don’t be afraid to express your thoughts. The important thing is that you hurry with your responses and with your answers. My true wish is that the ‘Tikanga’ that is agreed on is built with the consultation of the tribes, so as to spare this resource from people’s derision.

The Māori are a scornful, condescending, and negative people. I don’t want it to be said ‘This Tikanga is from Kingi Ihaka alone’, but instead it is from the Church of the Māori people under the authority of Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa.

The Commission of the Province is waiting for this ‘Tikanga’, therefore please enlighten me O great ones with your thoughts on this very important and very weighty issue.

I have written to you seeking help, however please also seek out the understandings of the elders and of the experts residing within our tribes.

This letter encapsulated the confluence of liturgy and culture, an attempted merger between cultural understandings and the requirements of the Church. The fact that the letter was written in te reo Māori was partly an attempt by Ihaka to convey to his fellow Mihinare some of the nuances of his position. It was also perhaps an attempt to retain the situation within a Mihinare sphere, so as not to reveal to the wider Church, in this case in the form of the Commission, that there was no universal understanding of what would soon need to be presented as a fait accompli – a liturgy that was accepted and owned across Māoridom, built on mutually accepted understandings. Even Ihaka’s use of the term ‘Tikanga’ in quote marks was insightful. It contrasted with his written intention to develop a karakia [religious service] or liturgy for the commission. The term Tikanga means a cultural practice or understanding, which he is attempting to forge a consensus on across many tribes for religious purposes. When Ihaka had finally completed his liturgy, he ran into further complications. The Commission entitled Ihaka’s translation into English ‘Prayers in a Home after a Death’. Ihaka asserted that this title was misleading, and that ‘no attempt be made to translate Takahi Whare and that in the English it should read: “Order of Service for the Takahi Whare”‘112 In so doing Ihaka indicated once again the struggle for Mihinare to render this ritual into not just another language but into another way of thinking. The Commission also insisted on rewording Ihaka’s English translation of his own work in te reo Māori in order for it fit more neatly into their own theological understandings. This included the removal of the reference to the Trinity during the act of cleansing, which Ihaka asserted ‘would mean the obliteration of the three persons of the Holy Trinity and it is this part in the Maori which to the Maori is of utmost significance and importance.’ Ihaka’s caustic response to the proposed change was that ‘if the Commission wants the English version to be included then by all means have it included without any reference to the fact that it is an English version of the Maori.’113

By the mid-1980s Ihaka, along with fellow Commission member Northern minita Waiohau ‘Ben’ Te Haara, was experiencing significant discomfort both with the level of

work involved\textsuperscript{114} and with the reaction to their presence on the Commission itself. While they were both full members of the Commission, Ihaka expressed frustration that ‘while the Maori contribution is of vital importance, it is only when it affects the Maori people that our opinions are sought.’\textsuperscript{115} Ihaka complained that the Church was not investing adequately in the work of the Translation Committee, asserting that if it was funded to the same levels as the Commission, much more would be achieved.\textsuperscript{116} There was also significant disappointment over the fate of the 1970 bilingual liturgy. The high hopes that had been held out for it as a ‘bicultural’ or partnership model of liturgy that would be widely used quickly dissipated. Ihaka reported to the Commission his disappointment in its reception, noting that at one parish in Auckland when he addressed the congregation in te reo Māori from ‘the alternative in the New Zealand Liturgy... the congregation looked at me, smiled and never said a word!’\textsuperscript{117} Partly this ‘shock’ can be attributed to Ihaka’s wish to provoke a response from the Commission, but the overall disappointment was echoed by the Te Runanga o Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa at its 1985 meeting, where it noted the 1970 Diglot Liturgy ‘was designed to assist bicultural development, but its only use is in Māori congregations. Pakeha parishes have ignored it.’\textsuperscript{118}

The 1964 decision to open the floodgates to liturgical reform the efforts, while substantial, had been piecemeal. The 1966 and 1970 liturgies were restricted to the eucharistic liturgies, and another selection had been authorised for use in 1984. These, along with various service orders from confirmation through to Takahi Whare, meant that by the mid-1980s there was a plethora of publications containing the various liturgies written across the two decades. Internationally large change was once again happening in terms of Anglican liturgical revision, and in 1979 both the Episcopal Church of the United States and the Australian Church published Prayer Books, with the Church of England finally produced an authorised
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alternative to the 1662 Book of Common Prayer in 1980. These developments, supported by pressure from the New Zealand Prayer Book Commission, led the 1982 General Synod to approve the principle of a new Prayer Book. Early on it was decided that the new book was to be named ‘A’ New Zealand Prayer Book rather than use the definitive particle ‘The’ partly to reflect a pluralistic edge but also to avoid any possible legal challenge over the sacrosanct nature of the Book of Common Prayer – this was not to be a legal replacement, more an overshadowing contemporary. The final decision to incorporate all the developments in one Prayer Book was not confirmed until General Synod in 1987. The then Archbishop Brian Davis asserted a need for one volume in order to ‘reduce liturgical confusion... and to reduce the opportunity for division and dissension’ Partly this stemmed from the growth of the charismatic movement within the Church: American-inspired Pentecostalism which had been growing rapidly since the 1960s among sections of the Anglican Church. Their influence had led to significant diversions from the received ‘Anglican standard’ of worship and was becoming increasingly popular.

Another driver of this development for an all-encompassing Prayer Book was culture. This new liturgical production, while drawing strongly on the earlier efforts of the Church, would prove to be significantly different especially in terms of the engagement with culture and context. The earlier efforts, such as the ‘1966 New Zealand Liturgy’ as noted had drawn on English and traditional liturgical sources. This was similar to its contemporaries, ‘A liturgy for Africa’ and ‘A South Pacific liturgy’ both of which while much admired for their liturgical innovations failed to draw culturally on their context. They were only nominally ‘African’ or ‘Pacific’. The new New Zealand work also drew on international work in the area, especially the Anglo-Anglicans – Australia, the U.S. and, predictably, developments in England however it was also a strongly local development. One reason for the indigenisation of the new Prayer Book was the increasing plurality of New Zealand society of the period. The introduction to the book points out the influences on the work

---

119 Minutes of the meeting of the Provincial Commission on Prayer Book Revision, 26-28 January 1982, ANGO05/1.00/1, JKL, Auckland.
120 Minutes of the meeting of the Provincial Commission on Prayer Book Revision, 19-23 May 1986, ANG005/1.00/1, JKL, Auckland.
122 Davidson, p.172.
123 Peters, pp.154, 43.
124 Booth, pp.334-35.
including the environment, the recent anti-nuclear stance, ‘radical’ economic change, ‘re-emergence of a sense of identity’ amongst Māori, partnership under the Treaty of Waitangi, and gender issues – all of which were the hallmarks of the social and political upheaval of New Zealand in the 1980s. The Commission describes these influences as creating ‘a deliberate attempt to allow a multitude of voices to speak.’

For Pākehā Anglicans the work was also part of a longer trend to reinvigorate a sense of their own cultural development, distinct from that of Britain. Liturgically, at least until the 1970s Pākehā Anglicans had indeed been ‘a people without Song’, even if this case had been overstated regarding literature in wider Pākehā society. Now, aligned with an increasingly assertive cultural and literal voice outside of the Church, Pākehā had an opportunity to craft liturgy that could reflect their own experiences and context. The work was initially tentative, reflecting the works of the 1960s and 70s. As one member of the commission reflected, ‘Cranmer’s ghost haunted us. His writing had a power over us which we found hard to escape... Prayer Book quotations were an ordinary feature of middle-class conversations in those days’, and often early attempts at writing were poor attempts at Tudor mimicry. However the Commission soon found its own voice, and gradually ‘a register of language emerged that wasn’t high language but was more New Zealand in phraseology and rhythm than the Cranmerian phrases.’

This also reflected a poetic bent on behalf of the writers, moving from the stiff and formal language of the earlier efforts through to more evocative imagery. Indeed the chair of the Commission had aspired ‘for the images of a poet rather than the anguish of a social worker’ These impulses led to the inclusion of actual art in the work itself, a far cry from Cranmer’s or indeed William William’s reformed Protestantism. The new Prayer Book included poetry by the Roman Catholic convert James K Baxter, as well as artwork by, amongst others, Claudia Pond Eyley, Nigel Brown, Ross Hemara and Ralph Hotere.

Apart from, or perhaps intrinsic to, the cultural aspects of the Prayer Book, the theological developments were also a strong reflection of the local environment. Naming
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God became a distinct point of difference. The New Zealand Liturgy 1966 had broken new ground in addressing God as ‘you’ rather than what had become the Cranmerian aloofness of ‘thee’, ‘thou’. However God was still referred to in masculine and triumphal terms such as ‘Father or ‘Almighty God’. The new work, taking into account gender and wider social concerns uses over one hundred different images for God\textsuperscript{131} ranging from the relatively mundane ‘Creator God’ or ‘Redeemer God’ through to the seemingly-iconoclastic ‘Eternal Spirit, Earth-maker, Pain-bearer, Life-giver... Father and Mother of us all’\textsuperscript{132} Such a change in language was both an invocation of and a challenge to the principle of \textit{lex orandi, lex credendi}. While the book embraced diversity in many of its contemporary forms, there was also a strong effort to achieve a form of common prayer, unifying the Anglican constituency through its liturgy. Thus while there was an effort in providing four distinctive Great Thanksgivings (Communion) services in the final book, one followed closely the 1966 and therefore more ‘traditional’ form to achieve ‘unanimity’, while in the other three ‘the language is more opaque, reflecting the diversity of opinion in the church.’\textsuperscript{133} Commission member Bishop Brian Carrell was noted as affirming that the Prayer Book Commission ‘did more to settle and shape our NZ Anglican theology... than did the Doctrine Commission’ especially as it was ‘more fully representative of the spectrum of theology in the Church’\textsuperscript{134} This was a particularly important view from a leading member of the growing evangelical wing of the church that would in coming decades find great doctrinal distance from the more liberal wing over issues of sexuality and gender. Archbishop Davis was even more effusive in his assertion of the new Prayer Book’s ability to create doctrinal unity, describing it as ‘doctrinally more direct and less ambiguous than \textit{The Book of Common Prayer}\textsuperscript{135} Thus Cranmer’s deliberate opaqueness was finally put to rest. The new Prayer Book was also a response to an increasingly challenging religious marketplace. New denominations were making increasing headway into the evangelical sector of the Church and the overall Church market was rapidly shrinking from a post-war high. Declining from 33.7\% of the New Zealand population in 1966 the Anglican Church represented only 22.1\% in 1991 with only
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further rapid decrease in sight. One of the challenges for the new Prayer Book was, as John Williamson noted, ‘to create its own identity in a competitive environment’. During earlier discussions over the proposal there had been resistance to the inclusion of te reo Māori, both for financial and cultural reasons, fearing that a fully or predominantly bilingual edition would not sell. Although the impact of the new Prayer Book on the overall growth or decline of the Church is difficult to gauge, it sold well within the organisation, and within five years of launch over 90000 copies had been sold.

Of course in religion, as with sport and politics, there are a diversity of responses to change. The attempts to reflect the changing cultural and social contexts through liturgy found opposition throughout the Church, and controversies were many and varied within the development of a text that sought to define a new identity. Theological differences ranged between the charismatic and conservative spectrums of the Church. The Prayer Book Commission itself recognised the pace of change in Church and Society and noted a new Prayer Book ‘would not be able to stem the tide of change and revision in the Church.’ Attempts to make the language and ritual more accessible along with a charismatic emphasis on the individual and intimate religious experience led Archbishop Davis to question whether there was a tendency ‘to make God ‘all matey’ instead of the ‘almighty’?’, and the relatively liberal Bishop Allan Pyatt of Christchurch expressed grave doubts by large sections of the Church over a charismatic-led proposal to include references to the existence of Satan in the baptism and confirmation liturgies.

Gender was also important in the new book, and an area where iwi cultural values came to the fore. The increasing importance of gender-issues in the Church had been building for many years, culminating in the ordination of women to the priesthood in 1977 Puti Murray’s ordination in 1978. This growing affirmation of Māori women in the Church hierarchy was not universally supported however, nor was the liturgical revision that went
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with it. Kingi Ihaka attempted to avoid the issue in general through a linguistic side-step by noting that pronouns in te reo Māori were gender neutral, such as the term *ia* for either *him* or *her*. Ihaka extrapolated that semantic avoidance into a wider apathy on the issue for many Māori noting that ‘those who are clamouring to rid the New Zealand Liturgy of sexist language will not, as far as I am concerned, receive the support of a very large number of the Maori.’

Pīhopa Whakahuihui Vercoe assured a correspondent complaining about the ‘Mother and Father of us all’ prayer referred to earlier that Mihinare would oppose any reference to Mother and again justified this through the use of the gender-neutral term Matua, which he noted as being ‘inclusive of both genders’.

Although the word Matua could be used in a gender neutral sense, the lack of macrons in the new Prayer Book aided Vercoe’s defensive strategy, as the macronised word Mātua normally referred to parents whereas Matua was more common in reference to Father. Matua left room for both a conservative male clergy response and an increasingly post-colonial feminist reading of the situation, with Vercoe being pulled both ways.

The late 1980s were also a time where constitutional developments within the Church were reaching a new level, with commissions exploring the meaning of new terms such as ‘bi-culturalism’ and ‘partnership’. This extended to the interaction between Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa and the prayer book authors. The Māori church took the opportunity of Kingi Ihaka’s departure to Sydney to introduce the first Māori woman onto the liturgical commission, the Ngāti Porou poet Arapera Blank. As was usually the case the lack of resources in the Māori church meant that translation was always a difficult task in terms of bringing together the logistics, and the Māori translation team was pulled from the strong Mihinare iwi of Ngāti Porou, Te Arawa and Nga Puhi – Whakahuihui Vercoe, John Tamahori, Brown Turei, Jim Tahere, Māori Marsden, and the Pākehā minita George Connor who came together from 9-14 February 1987.

Later that year Te Runanga o Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa met at Kohupatiki Marae in Hawkes Bay to finalise the content for the book.
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They asked for several changes that gave an insight into the way they viewed this new text. These included for example the deletion of the missionary-spy Carl Sylvius Volkner from the list of Saints to be celebrated through the year as well as the insertion of ‘Apirana Turupa Ngata, leader in Ngati Porou and Statesman’. Reflecting the Hui of a century earlier there was a demand for the insertion of a prayer for the Māori Queen into the liturgy, and there was a strong recognition of the nature of Māori spirituality they called for the insertion for the option of a prayer for exorcism in the healing services. There was also demand for other services to be added, including a Māori rite of confirmation, Hahunga (disinterment), Whakanoa Waka (blessing of a canoe), and Tuku wairua kohungahunga (blessing of a newborn child).

The greatest challenge of the new prayer book was to create a new Māori form of Holy Communion. As had been seen in the 1868 work of the Williams’ the selection of language and form could define the doctrine within the prayers. By the 1980s Holy Communion had also became a much more regular feature of Anglican and Mihinare life, now practiced weekly as opposed to monthly or even quarterly. This was also assisted by the newly developed Minita-ā-iwi system which had seen a rapid increase in the number of Priests who could celebrate the sacrament in Māori communities. As early as 1981 the Prayer Book Commission had magnanimously given Māori the right to create ‘their own Maori Eucharist rather than merely a literal translation of the English.’\footnote{Minutes of the meeting of the Provincial Commission on Prayer Book Revision, 26-28 May 1981, ANG005/1.00/1, JKL, Auckland.} In some ways this was a significant concession because it allowed Māori to express their own understanding of the sacrament that may differ, however slightly, from the Pākehā understanding. However in light of previous revisions it was not such a great concession as divergence had already occurred over a century earlier. By 1984 the noted Northern minita Māori Marsden had developed an experimental liturgy of Holy Communion. Marsden was a natural choice to develop a new form of such an important part of the prayer book. Marsden was an Anglican Priest whose father Hoani Matenga Te Paerata was also a minita in the church, was descended from many of the iwi of the North and had been raised steeped in that particular Mihinare tradition. Marsden was also a healer, a political activist, a scholar, and a tohunga trained in the traditional Whare Wānanga of the North so was expert in both Anglicanism
and ancient iwi knowledge systems.\footnote{Te Ahukaramu Charles Royal ed., \textit{The Woven Universe: Selected Writings of Rev. Māori Marsden}, Otaki, 2003, pp.xi-xii.} Marsden attempted several new initiatives in his liturgy, using quite conservative elements derived from the Rāwiri but structuring them based on the shape of a pōwhiri, or traditional welcoming ritual.\footnote{Minutes of the meeting of the Provincial Commission on Prayer Book Revision, 24-27 September 1984, ANG005/1.00/1, JKL, Auckland.} In weaving these two knowledge systems together it could be argued that Marsden was experimenting within the bounds of the conservative Northern Mihinare tradition. However even though he was cautious, Marsden was still nervous about his material. His material was soon tested in various Mihinare and even ecumenical circles, however it was his own Northern people he held the most trepidation over writing ‘however [the annual, Northern] Hui Amorangi will be the real test, for the Taitokerau mihinares are notorious for their frank and critical comments. If we pass that lot, then we can get down to producing a final copy with some amendments.’\footnote{Maori Marsden to John Paterson, 29 March 1984, ANG141/3/66, JKL, Auckland.} He needn’t have worried too much, as the response was generally positive with Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa secretary John Paterson writing back ‘There were many comments made in praise of your efforts, and of course every expert present had suggestions and amendments!’\footnote{John Paterson to Maori Marsden, 15 May 1984, ANG141/3/66, JKL, Auckland.} The liturgy entitled Na Te Whanau a Te Karaiti – From the Family of Christ was eventually accepted into the new prayer book and was the only one entirely written in te reo Māori, giving the Northern iwi their own theological expression to share with the rest of Māoridom and with the wider church.

By the final year of preparation the shape of the new prayer book had largely been settled and was to include at its heart, in line with the new bicultural and liturgical direction of the Church, five communion services for congregations to choose from. This range of options was described in the prayer book as given in order ‘to provide for the richness in our worship and to cater for the variety in the church community.’\footnote{The Church of the Province of New Zealand, \textit{A New Zealand Prayer Book – He Karakia Mihinare o Aotearoa}, 4th ed., Christchurch, 1989, p.403.} The first service was ‘Thanksgivings of the People of God’ and could be viewed as more traditional and was based around the Communion service of the Book of Common Prayer. It was written primarily in English although it had selections of Māori language and also provided alternatives in Fijian and Tongan languages so could be used in those parts of the province.
The second communion service form was entitled ‘Thanksgiving for Creation and Redemption’. This service had been written by the relatively liberal Raymond Pelly and was described as ‘a serious attempt to translate current secular thinking into a eucharistic presentation’\textsuperscript{153} – essentially a more social-justice focused liturgy. The third form was ‘Thanksgiving and Praise’. This was a cutting edge liturgy that attempted to focus on the whole community, rather than on the priest and then to the community.\textsuperscript{154} This form was the biggest challenge for the Māori translation team, and became a diglot (bi-lingual) version entitled ‘Te Whakawhetai me te Whakamoemiti’. Although the two languages are side by and reflect the same content, there are significant differences between the two versions. The Māori language version not only utilises the full breadth of Māori allusion and poetic vocabulary, but in so doing often diverges significantly from the English language version – which Jenny Te Paa describes as ‘the subtle politics of translation.’\textsuperscript{155} The most striking example of this is found in section of the service order He Waiata Whakamoemiti – Song of Praise (Figure Z) where the English language version is relatively mundane whereas the Māori version offers a full use of ancient metaphors from across a range of iwi. In particular the Māori version utilises traditional creation concepts with Ranginui the Sky Father and Papa-Tuanuku the Earth Mother who, according to some variants of the story came together to create life and were separated by their children. Not only were these concepts embedded into the Communion liturgy but their names were capitalised as proper nouns, indicating that these were more than mere images or parallels, instead giving them form in the story.

\textsuperscript{154} Ibid.
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### Table 6: A selection from He Waiata Whakamoemiti – Song of Praise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>A Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So now we offer our thanks for the beauty of these islands;</td>
<td>No reira matou ka tapae ki a koe</td>
<td>Therefore we offer to you Our praise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the wild places and the bush,</td>
<td>I a matou whakamoemiti.</td>
<td>For Ranginui [the Sky Father] above, for Papa-Tuanuku [the Earth Mother]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the mountains, the coast and the sea.</td>
<td>Mo Ranginui i runga nei, mo Papa-Tuanuku e takoto nei.</td>
<td>below, For the lofty tribal Mountains, for the Hills that tell our stories,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mo nga Maunga whakahii, mo nga Puke-korero</td>
<td>for the Seas that call to us, for the widespread Oceans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mo nga Tai-mihi-tangata, mo nga Moana e hora nei.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ‘self-theologizing’ arising from the incultrative possibilities of the 1960s onwards proved to be a strong factor as the completion of the new prayer book drew near. Within the Māori church there had been an ongoing strand of conservatism when approaching liturgical revision, a resistance to stray too far from what was perceived as orthodox Anglican (read Pākehā) doctrine. This debate among Mihinare focused on many areas, but by the time of the prayer book publication it began to focus around one issue in particular: the name for ‘God’. This had been a significant challenge since the spread of colonial Christianity, as attempts to translate concepts into the local language inevitably struggled with the most significant and potentially most nebulous word of all. European missionaries in China, for example, struggled to translate the term because any existing term was already heavily loaded with esoteric baggage, and as Kwok Pui Lan noted whatever term was chosen ‘would bring with it a previous life of its own.’\textsuperscript{156} Layered on this struggle to find a ‘clean’ term that could be used was the seemingly eternal struggle for denominational supremacy. In the Chinese context Dominicans and Franciscans had used the term ‘Tianzhu’ (Master of Heaven) whereas Protestants to differentiate used the term ‘shen’ – a generic term for deity.\textsuperscript{157} The early missionaries to New Zealand had used a variety of names for God. From the Old Testament they used ‘Ihowa’ as a transliteration for ‘Jehovah’. Another usage


\textsuperscript{157} Ibid, p.32.
was ‘Ariki’ for ‘Lord’, which utilised the name of the most sacred level of traditional iwi leadership and in turn co-opted the spirituality embedded in the name. For ‘God’ they chose ‘Atua’ which had been the name for supernatural forces closely aligned to the European concept of ‘deity’. Similarly to ‘Ariki’ the choice was an attempt at a significant redirection of spirituality from traditional understandings to biblical concepts.

The idea of ‘Io’ as a supreme deity/creator had long been present in Māori cosmological circles. Although not entirely contiguous with the Abrahamic tradition of God, the idea was taken up by the early anthropologists Elsdon Best and S. Percy Smith and translated into anthro-speak. In his seminal work ‘The lore of the whare wananga’ Smith rabidly defended the Io tradition against accusations that it was a convenient colonial construct to bring the Judeo-Christian concept into the whare wānanga (traditional school of knowledge), as a deliberate manipulation of Māori cosmology. Apirana Ngata (wearing his anthropologist’s hat) defended the pre-contact presence of Io, noting its presence throughout a diversity of iwi and in particular across the ‘East Coast’, including being named at the ancient Ngāti Porou Whare Tapere (school of learning) Te Rawheoro. Smith’s three informants for his work Te Whatahoro Jury, Nēpia Pōhūhū and Te Mātorohanga were from the Wairarapa, but Te Mātorohanga in particular had ties to the Te Rawheoro school and Ngata was not dismissive of Smith’s work. In Māori Christian discussions though the idea of Io instead of being a welcome intellectual Trojan Horse, was instead mostly reviled or ignored. There were exceptions to this. The Katorika (Māori Roman Catholics) had incorporated ‘Io’ into their missal (prayer book) in various ways. In early translation work on the 1970 bi-lingual liturgy the ecumenical meetings had brought these ideas to liturgical light. The Tersanctus (Holy, Holy, Holy) was a prayer traditionally used as the final prayer prior to the prayer of consecration of the bread and wine at Holy Communion. The Book of Common Prayer had used the term ‘God of Hosts’ which had been translated into ‘te Atua o nga mano tuauriuri’ (the God of the innumerable multitudes). At the prayer book revision meeting in 1971 Father James Durning SM (himself a scholar in te reo Māori) argued for the use of the phrase ‘Io o nga mano Tuauriuri’ and defended the use of the term Io because of ‘its full acceptance by all canoe traditions.’ Durning further

pleaded that Māori concepts be used where possible and he viewed Io as ‘the Supreme God common to all races in the world’, translating the Latin term Deus Pater (God the Father) into ‘Io Patea.’

‘Io’ however, was not widely accepted amongst Mihinare minita. At the same meeting the minita Hamiora Rangihiu noted that although it could be used in some places in liturgy he held ‘reservations about the use of the word’, while Kingi Ihaka argued forcefully from a Northern perspective that ‘he will not be happy to accept the use of “Io” in Christian worship because of its adverse connotations’ referring to the ‘Io cult in the Taitokerau (Northern) area’ that he viewed as essentially anti-biblical. However although there was reservation over the term there was also a growing movement for the inclusion of its use as part of the greater ‘self-theologizing’ project of the time. The naming of ‘God’ was a central part of this wider movement, and because there was some cultural credibility (if not widespread acceptance) to the name ‘Io’ it slowly came into circulation. One of the most vociferous advocates for its use was the national Ministry Educator for Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa, Hone Kaa. Kaa had been pressing for the use of the term as he ran training schools across the country with Minita-ā-Iwi, partly as an attempt to impress on these new minita that they were free to use an iwi expression of their faith as opposed to being shackled to English or European variants of Christian theology. This move was not without its critics. At a Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa meeting in 1986 Northern minita Taki Marsden expressed concern at ‘the confused presentation of the gospel which is sometimes heard in Māori ecumenical occasions’ a rather pointed dig at the use of cutting-edge terms amongst the Māori ecumenical movement which Kaa had been heavily involved with and influenced by. But Marsden also noted ‘the rapid rise of interest in a reversion to Māori Gods’ and others pushed for a need ‘to develop a marae proclamation of the gospel’ that could ‘find the face of Christ in the culture’, noting that the ecumenical movement was seeking to hold a symposium on Io later that year. A vocal critic of Kaa’s use of the term in his work was another northern minita Te Wheoki ‘Jim’ Tahere, who was Māori Missioner based in Christchurch. Tahere accused Kaa of ‘a “touristy type” approach to liturgical reform.
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travelling back in time to retrieve from a cultural blitz and without sufficient critical analysis, concepts such as IO [his emphasis] and described Io as an ‘enthusiasm by stipendiary clergy’ with the term being used ‘neither in the vernacular nor contemporary except as a field for academic speculation’.

Kaa’s use of the term Io was influential in his work as Ministry Educator, however it would prove truly controversial in the new prayer book. As part of his work Kaa had developed a liturgy that was approved for experimental use across the Māori church entitled ‘Te Hakari Tapu - Na Te iwi Maori’ (The Sacred Supper - From the Māori People). This liturgy was different from the work of Māori Marsden in that it utilised a fairly conservative structure but was based on language that came from deep within iwi imagery and in particular the imagery of Kaa’s own tribe, Ngāti Porou. Kaa’s liturgy utilised the name of Io extensively thought the work, describing Io as ‘te Poutokomanawa o te ao’ (the centre pole of the world – a central image from the whare tipuna or traditional meeting hall). Kaa also used tribal dialectical terms for Christ, including ‘Kakakura’ (the leading bird/the leader of the flock) a descriptive term referring to a leader, and the language patterns throughout the liturgy reflect the rhetorical style of both whaikōrero (the formal language of the marae) and of the haka (a ceremonial dance used for various purposes). The liturgy had an expressed focus on iwi, as opposed to the usual standard of universality. Kaa’s perspective was that every iwi was unique in its expression of universal faith, just as ‘Māori’ were different from ‘Pākehā’. So he specifically utilised the dialect of Ngāti Porou, for example using the word ‘tatau’ for the pronoun ‘us’ as opposed to the more common version ‘tātou’, and substituted ‘hai’ for the particle ‘hei’.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: Excerpts from ‘Te Hakari Tapu - Na Te Iwi Maori’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Te Whakamoemitia</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakamoemititia a Io, e nga hapu katoa:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakamoemititia Ia, e nga iwi katoa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E nui ana hoki tana mahi tohu ki a tatau:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e mau ana hoki te pono o Io, ake, ake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakamoemitititia a Io.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Te Tapu</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He tapu, he tapu, he tino tapu a Io,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te Atua o nga mano tuauriuri whaiiaio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maru ana a Rangi-i-runga me Papa-i-raro i tona ihi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i tona wehi, i tona mana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kororia ki te Atua!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Praise</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give thanks to God, all the tribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give thanks to God, all the peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great are his/her works for us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God is faithful forever.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanks be to God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sanctus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy, Holy, Holy God,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The God of the innumerable multitudes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangi-i-runga [The Sky Father above] and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papa-i-raro [The Earth Mother below] dwell under his/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority, awe and power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glory to God!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Na Te Iwi Maori’ was tested throughout the Māori church, utilised at a verity of gatherings across the country and by a variety of iwi. By early 1987 the Aotearoa Council had decided that the liturgy would be ‘one of three Maori rites to be included in the proposed New Zealand Prayer Book.’ This would have meant a bi-cultural balance to the prayer book. There would be five Holy Communion services in the forthcoming prayer book. The first two ‘Thanksgivings of the People of God’ and ‘Thanksgiving for Creation and Redemption’ were essentially Pākehā offerings, largely in the English language and utilising little Māori thought. The central liturgy ‘Thanksgiving and Praise - Te Whakawhetai me te Whakamoemiti’ was not only bilingual but also through the translation process had become truly bi-cultural, expressing Māori thought through the use of language, and which was hoped ‘would come to be regarded as a symbol of the unity of Maori and Pakeha in the Church.’ The last two (or the second half) were to be Maori Marsden’s Northern effort ‘Na Te Whanau a Te Karaiti – From the Family of Christ’ and Kaa’s liturgy. A final gathering of Mihinare experts was held later that year at Kohupatiki Marae i Hawkes Bay to finalise
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content to be included in the book, and there a significant debate as held over the inclusion of Kaa’s liturgy. The eight hour debate centred around the use of the name ‘Io’ and focuses on the theological understanding of “Yaveh” in the Old Testament and the relationship of “Io” in the Māori context. Although the debate came from iwi perspectives, there was not internal agreement amongst iwi as there often had been in the past. Hapai Winiata of Ngāti Raukawa was generally supportive and suggested that the liturgy was an attempt to take the church forward as an offering ‘to the church of tomorrow. Those who put this service together had, I believe, no other motive but to proclaim the Gospel of Christ’.

Kingi Ihaka was strongly against the liturgy, although Ihaka’s opposition was countered by two lay women, his Northern compatriot Mira Szaszy and Kaa’s Ngāti Porou relation Kuni Jenkins. The Katorika observer Rob Cooper described this division as displaying ‘the plurality of Anglicanism’. However the strongest opposition to the liturgy came from a surprising source. John Tamahori, who happened to be Kaa’s close relation from Ngāti Porou, was by that time something of an éminence grise across the church and he spoke strongly against the inclusion of the liturgy primarily because of its use of ‘Io’. Tamahori’s contribution to the debate was decisive, described as changing ‘the flow of feeling’ at the gathering. Tamahori spoke on ‘the old understanding of Io’, of pre-Christian worship of a supreme Māori deity and relating this worship to concepts such as mākutu and ‘spiritual darkness’. In some ways Tamahori’s argument could be viewed as conservative, even reactionary, opposing the use of pre-contact terminology as a colonised response to a revival of traditional knowledge. However Tamahori was essentially arguing that Christianity had been a liberating choice by iwi, especially by his own iwi of Ngāti Porou, that had allowed the iwi to renegotiate their ontological foundations in the light of newly introduced ideas. His argument was more than intellectual. Tamahori along with all of those present to different degrees strongly believed in the manifestation of traditional spiritual forces in the material plane, in both negative and positive ways. Years earlier Tamahori had expressed surprise in a new generation of Māori minita, describing them as ‘a new breed – free, uninhibited, and not afraid of the “holiness” of things – as a Māori this is strange.’
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would be to open up iwi to the potential destructive powers of this spirituality that iwi had deliberately chosen to suppress through the understandings and rituals of Christianity. Tamahori’s argument was persuasive, especially coming from a senior Ngāti Porou minita. However there was still strong support and by the end of the debate there was still no clear agreement so Pihopa Vercoe, citing the importance of ‘maintaining the unity of the Church and Te Pihopatanga’ took it upon himself to declare that ‘Te Hakari Tapu na te Iwi Maori’ be excluded from the new prayer book. ‘Io’ would remain a marginalised concept in Mihinare circles.

From its publication in 1989 the ‘New Zealand Prayer Book – He Karakia Mihinare o Aotearoa’ (NZPB) found quick favour with iwi across the country. This was partly because it represented liturgical directions in which the iwi had been headed regardless, capturing the zeitgeist on issues of gender, culture and theology. Jenny Te Paa notes that Mihinare ‘welcomed the appropriate incorporation of Maori traditional practices into specific liturgical formats’ and this was especially clear in ‘Te Whakawhetai me te Whakamoemiti’ communion service. There were holdouts, particularly in the North where the Rawiri was seen as the prayer book, not to be altered or ignored. There was also criticism that the new prayer book did not go far enough in reflecting Mihinare spirituality. The limited use of Māori language was pointed out, and there had long been a dream for a ‘Māori Prayer Book’ that would reflect ‘the development of an Aotearoa theological base, and its expression, in the best possible manner in terms of the things currently being done in the Māori world’. The problem was, as always, that the Māori church was financially ill-equipped to undertake would would be a substantial project and what it could offer in terms of time and people was instead forced to be utilised in the production of the whole church effort. Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa had in fact asserted from the early 1980s that
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there was no need for ‘a diglot N.Z. Prayer Book, we will have our own Rāwiri’ however the problem was not just material, but constitutional. The ‘Aotearoa Prayer Book Commission’ had heard calls for the ‘freedom to produce indigenous material’, that would ‘need to take account of varying tribal traditions and dialects’ but as Pihopa Vercoe noted in 1985 ‘we the Māori are still constrained to get approval for what we do by supplying and defending what is a Māori need, in English.’ The production of the new prayer book had taken place in an environment where constitutional issues were dominant for Māori and liturgical revision was slotted into that wide agenda. The lack of Māori language in the new prayer book for example was partly due to lack of resources but also because the new prayer book was seen as an interim step before the full flourishing of a Māori liturgy with the achievement of true mana motuhake (self-determination). So there were concerns expressed for example that the inclusion of communion services entirely in te reo Māori should not ‘detract from the production of a Maori Prayer Book’ sometime in the utopian future.

Mihinare did take a step in this direction, holding a gathering in 1988 ‘to plan for a Māori Prayer Book’ at the same time as the rest of the church was fully committed to launching the NZPB. This gathering promised much, not only bringing together the best of Mihinare thought but was ecumenical, including Katorika, Methodist and Presbyterian Māori leaders as a recognition of the influence of the ecumenical movement on Mihinare intellectual direction. However that would prove to be the last of that initiative, and apart from sporadic efforts the NZPB remains unchallenged and largely uncritiqued a quarter of a century later.

This debate over the term ‘Io’ illustrated that the renegotiation of mātauranga was not a progressive, almost triumphalist, movement away from a ‘colonised’ understandings and towards indigenous enlightenment, and never had been. Instead the process of renegotiation was both cyclical and cumulative, building on layers of knowledge to create new
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understandings while taking into account an ever-changing intellectual environment. The Williams’ bipolarity between Imperialistic and indigenous viewpoints was an early indication of the challenges faced in negotiating the complex web of dynamics that included theology, doctrine, politics, language, race and the deepest ontological considerations. To alter the prayer book was to challenge the delicately poised balance between iwi and between eccelsiologies, and impacted not just at the altar but on the marae. These dynamics remained constant throughout Mihinare history, right up to the rejection of Io by Māori themselves, a pointed reminder that race was not the driver of all actions. Instead, iwi continuously exercised their intellectual agency within the constraints of the institution they chose to belong to, and the prayer book was indeed a site of constant and complex renegotiation.
Underpinning this thesis has been the understanding that a body of knowledge and way of thinking existed that was unique to this land, called mātauranga Māori. This body of knowledge has been described as being based on key principles, including whānaungatanga (relationships), tapu (sacredness), utu (reciprocity), mana (authority) and kaitiakitanga (guardianship). The assumption of this thesis has been that these principles exist and have guided Māori action and thought since before the time of first contact. A strong theme in recent historiography asserts that Christianity was a key component in attempting to eradicate this mātauranga, to replace it with Western values. This struggle was viewed as particularly important because it reached down to a deep, ontological level, seeking to replace fundamental Māori values with those of others. There is truth to this argument. The missionaries were indeed agents of Empire, ignorant of their own cultural prejudices and determined that their values were superior in every way. While examples exist of the occasional exception to this, it generally held true through most of the history of the Pākehā Anglican Church, as time and again they sought to oppress and replace Māori values. However ‘missionaries’ and the church institutions were not the only definition nor arbiter of Christianity. In fact Māori were able to take aspects of Christianity and use them in different ways. Some, such as the nineteenth-century prophetic movements, used the Judeo-Christian analysis to formulate a resistance to colonization: politically, militarily and spiritually. Some, such as Mihinare, adopted mainstream Christian practices but continued to seek after their own aspirations based on their own mātauranga. This is not to say that the process left any of these groups unaffected – it was a process of renegotiation of mātauranga, where even fundamental cultural values could take on new features, and this process of change was never-ending.

In studying this process the three concepts of reciprocity, reconciliation and renegotiation have been useful guides. Based on the thinking of my own whānau and iwi,
these ideas have been ways of approaching the source material, while not being prescriptive. It would be interesting to consider what my approach had been like if I had come from another iwi or even whānau, whose experience of Christianity and Te Hāhi Mihinare had been different. However these concepts have been refined by my people over a long period of time and by highlighting them I am able to show my approach as well as my analysis.

The first concept that guided this thesis was ‘reciprocity’, defined by my Aunty Kuni Jenkins as ‘a giving and receiving by both parties equally committed to a relationship.’ The relationship referred to in this thesis was not primarily a physical nor a political one, although there were certainly aspects of the latter. Instead this was an intellectual relationship between the mātauranga of iwi and the core ideals of Christianity in which both sides were committed to share their ideas and both were changed as a result. This idea of reciprocity was first displayed in the thesis by the workings of Piripi Taumataakura, who was still willing to wage war as his ancestors had done before him, but wished to change some of the core practices, including ending the defiling of bodies. In so doing he changed the perception of Christianity among his own people to a religion that could find peace even amidst battle. The development of Te Rāwiri, the Māori book of common prayer, was another example where the missionary father and son pairing of William Williams and William Leonard Williams were working at the nexus of iwi needs, the changing dynamics of the Anglican Empire, and even familial relationships to produce a compromise understanding. This idea of reciprocity runs contrary to analyses that place all actions under the lens of coercive colonisation, where everyone must be winners or losers and good or bad. Instead, reciprocity implies a sense of willingness on behalf of both parties to give and take, a sense of agency. That is not to say that there was no negative experience. In fact, the Mihinare experience was all too often a negative result of the power dynamics of colonization. This could be seen through the constant struggle for constitutional autonomy where the Pākehā powers would constantly either slow or outright block Mihinare attempts at gaining self-determination. However even through this experience there was also often a picture of Mihinare leaders both giving and taking, especially in an intellectual sense.

---

This thesis was also guided by a sense of ‘reconciliation’, as expressed in Uncle Wiremu Kaa’s reading of Mohi Turei’s haka *Tihei Taruke.* This was the process of iwi attempting to reconcile their existence as both Māori and Christian, which in this thesis was expressed through a new vehicle known as Te Hāhi Mihinare. This particular expression of ‘Christian’ was itself a reconciliation of the Judeo-Christian faith as expressed in the scriptures and its own encounter with centuries of European activity, ending up with the ‘Anglican Empire’. A clear illustration of this attempt to be both Māori and Anglican simultaneously was expressed through the ritual of Holy Communion, where the ancient Māori practice of kai tangata (the consumption of human flesh) was transferred to some degree to the idea of the spiritual consumption of the flesh of Jesus Christ. This pattern was shown again in the use of ‘Io’ as the name for ‘God’, where certain traditional understandings of creation could be reconciled with Christian doctrine. This thesis has aimed to show that Christianity, and in particular the Mihinare form of Christianity, was a valuable space to examine that reconciliation at a deep, ontological level. This idea points to a dynamism in the development of mātauranga that has implications for many aspects of Māori society, and how Māori engaged with Pākehā (and global) knowledge.

The study of the renegotiation of mātauranga then was studying the process of how these exchanges occurred. My understanding of this process is guided by my father’s analysis of his father’s haka, *Te Pārekereke,* which tells of the arrival of two new types of knowledge in the shape of the ancestor Paikea and Piripi Taumatakura, and how they were incorporated into our mātauranga. The concept of renegotiation implies both an ongoing dynamic as well as allowing for agency by those involved. This concept is based on Mihinare leadership, with a mandate from their iwi and empowered by a strong knowledge of their own tribal mātauranga, deliberately managing this process of intellectual change. This was shown in the negotiation over the Pīhopa o Aotearoa. The leaders of the time were placed under great pressure by both the Pākehā authorities who were guided by frankly racist attitudes, and by the aspirations and demands of their own iwi. This situation could have been read as a classic situation of colonization, where leaders were forced to conform to the hegemonic power of the settler church. What emerged instead however, particularly

---

with a reading of the Māori language sources, was a process where these Mihinare leaders would negotiate and renegotiate their position, engaging with the Pākehā powers but also with one another as they tried to establish a new position. They may have emerged from this process in 1928 with a weak political deal, but they also emerged with a new form of leadership - the Pihopa - that was uniquely Māori and that would guide them right up until the present day. The idea of renegotiation of mātauranga which has underpinned this thesis remains a valuable insight into the process of culture change: who guided it, how they did this and what were the factors that influenced them. It also challenges the historiography that declares ‘conversion’ as an action that forever changed iwi and Māori. Instead of the engagement of Māori and Christianity being a static model fixed on stone tablets brought by Samuel Marsden, Māori engagement with Christianity was a constant process of renegotiation; never-ending and dynamic.

The thesis also questions the idea that it was ‘Māori’ who engaged with Christianity. Instead the sources have time and again led away from a homogeneity and towards an iwi-based diversity. Māori argued amongst themselves, they negotiated amongst themselves, and they lived amongst themselves. While sharing many traits, and sharing a common political experience in the Church, it was iwi who would provide leaders with mandates to act in both the intellectual political realms. Apirana Ngata was consistently Ngāti Porou in his outlook, basing his understandings of the world and his actions on the particular matauranga-ā-iwi of his tribe. The origins of the Ngāti Porou engagement with Christianity were founded on the return of Piripi Taumataakura and set the path for Ngāti Porou in their ongoing engagement with Christianity, a story retold and reinforced by Mohi Turei and others throughout time. The debates between members of various iwi within the church were remarkably consistent over the generations, as each iwi strove to maintain or advance its own potion, even while developing an increasingly strengthened bond through the institution of their sense of commonality as ‘Māori’. This sense of unity would even extend beyond the denominational boundaries into the ecumenical movement in the post-war era. Throughout these developments, iwi histories and identities remained strong and fundamentally important.

One of the biggest surprises of the thesis was the complexity and depth of the relationships between Māori and other subjects of the Anglican Empire. The importance for
example of the Indian Bishop Azariah was a revelation, not only for the political inspiration he provided to Māori in their constant quest for mana motuhake (self-determination) but also for his intellectual contribution. He was a living model for Mihinare that they could be both Māori and Anglican, that they could reconcile their faith and their culture, and that they could practice an intellectual reciprocity between their thinking and the various strands of Christian thinking existing at the time. This notion of the ‘trans-native’ net did not only extend between the colonised though. Leading thinkers in the Anglican Empire such as Henry Venn and later Roland Allen provided a framework for thought that would craft an environment in which Native Churches could grow and flourish. That these ideas might not have been completely effective was somewhat beside the point; they created the intellectual ground in which the seeds of native Churches could be sown, waiting for the right conditions to sprout. These conditions came about by the 1960s when Western theological developments such as the liberation theologies combined with Native aspirations to create firmer spaces for the Native Churches to grow. This flow of ideas through the second half of the twentieth century was impressive, but in some ways was just an expansion of the trans-native net that had been created along with the formation of the Anglican Empire – the silver lining to an often very grey cloud.

The institution itself was also an important concept in this thesis. Held together by a common sense of identity and purpose, with common rules and rituals, the Anglican Church was still large enough to accommodate diversity. In some ways the institution has been portrayed as an extension of the ‘nation’ concept, submerging identity into a progressive upward trend to collective greatness. Instead the institution was a place of diverse and constantly-contested identities, with Te Hāhi Mihinare, the local expression of the Native Church, growing separately alongside the Pākehā power structures. A new generation of Māori leadership was formed in Pākehā-dominated institutions whether it was the national parliament or the churches, a generation forged in the systemic racism of the power structures who learned to adapt the structures while being adapted themselves in the process. This is not to say that ‘the institution’ is the only site of study of the renegotiation of mātauranga. The lack of research into the Māori churches required this thesis to be large in scope, both chronologically and geographically. The hope is now that it could provide some context for microhistories to emerge that could put flesh on the institutional bones. Oral
histories of experiences would be extremely valuable, because matters of faith are not objective but passionately subjective. Studies of iwi interaction right down to whānau level would be invaluable as well as the ‘marae experience’ of Christianity, where the process of negotiation was played out on an almost daily basis.

Sources have also been a revelation in the course of constructing this thesis. The use of the records of meetings as a key source in this thesis has hopefully opened some new ground as to what constitutes ‘authentic’ Māori source material. The perception exists that ‘minutes’ and other forms of notes of meetings are the product of officious officials, busily processing information to be used in future decision making as ‘matters arising’. However minutes of the Māori institution are different beasts. They are reflections of whaikōrero, the art of rhetorical debate – itself a lynch pin of Māori communication. This is especially the case when different points of view are contested between different iwi. When read with an insight into the people involved and the tikanga (customary practices) they were utilising, minutes instead become insightful sources capable of conveying much more. From the early gatherings of the Waiapu Hīnota, where powerful figures well-versed in their own iwi ways interacted with Anglican and Westminster procedure, the renegotiation of mātauranga was shown clearly in action. This process continued right through until the 1980s where traditional hui dynamics and the contestation of mana (authority) were reshaped to fit a new pattern. It was like watching a koru shaped peg be continuously squeezed into a square hole, with interesting results.

Similarly the Niupepa Māori (Māori language newspapers), although more thoroughly analysed in the literature than minutes as sources, remained valuable sources in their own right. This was especially the case with the Mihinare newspapers such as Te Pīpwahauroa and Te Toa Takitini. These newspapers were valuable repositories of traditional knowledge, such as Mohi Turei’s series of letters on the arrival of Piripi Taumataakura and the early engagement of Ngāti Porou with Christianity. Turei had used the newspapers as a form of propaganda to further his agenda of consolidating a form of Ngāti Porou identity that he wished to advance, one with Anglican Christianity at its heart. This was not propaganda in a negative sense though. It was propaganda in terms of the propagation of the oral traditions of the people by an expert in these traditions who was happy to use this new form of storytelling for a new generation, and to a much wider audience. Only the truly
ideological would view these newspapers as ‘Christian’ propaganda. The debates that raged in them between different points of view must look amateurish by today’s highly-managed media standards. When Reweti Kohere and Frederick Bennett duked it out over the appointment of a Pākehā as Pīhopa o Aotearoa they did so openly, with Bennett the editor publishing severe criticism of himself as well as his pointed response to that criticism. These were not people who were trying to present a polished image to the world, instead they were two individuals projecting the views of their iwi (as they perceived them), just as their ancestors had done since time immemorial on the traditional setting of the marae. Thus the sources became valuable insights into the process of renegotiation.

The idea that this is an ‘insider’ history has hung strongly over this thesis. As an insider I have read the sources in ways that others may not have. Reading minutes of meetings, perhaps to others a mind-numbing process, was for me a recalling of vast amounts of whakapapa across many iwi, of emotions and of experiences. Since childhood I have sat in hui and watched these processes take place (sometimes even voluntarily) and so the process itself was evocative. I have read the struggles of Mihinare in facing the racism of the Pākehā side of the Church and weighed them against my own experiences of the same, both personal and systemic. I grew up listening to the rhythms of the prayer books and was able to connect on many levels to the stories of their creation. So my insider status helped to give life and insight into the primary sources and to ask questions of secondary sources that others may not have. This was also a challenge as an insider though. The rigours of the academic discipline of history forced me to reframe the stories I had grown up with, to critique them and to rethink them from a more objective perspective. However by and large the stories I had had passed down to me, often over generations, have held weight. Like all iwi Mihinare maintain the importance of their oral tradition, and in some ways I hope that people who know and understand that tradition will be unsurprised by most of what they find here, that it tells (albeit in a different form) the stories they know and love. The insider status also presented some intimate personal challenges. Writing about my father’s work in the church could have been an opportunity for burnishing his legacy, or even for hagiography. He was influential for a period and could not be ignored, however I felt the best way to uphold his mana was to tell his part as the sources presented it and let the reader be the judge. I also had to finish the thesis time period in 1992 not only because it
seemed an important place to finish, but because I was a General Synod representative in 1994 and the temptation to be auto-hagiographic may have been too hard to resist.

The history of Te Haahi Mihinare is, as with all stories, a story of insiders. It has been over two hundred years of layers of experience building on top of each other, and this thesis is also an attempt for those layers not to be forgotten. Mihinare are still as capable as ever of being influenced by a wider body of knowledge, nowadays just as likely to come from North America as from England, and just as likely to attempt to replace our mātauranga. However our mātauranga abides, remaining the basis of our thoughts and actions and just as capable of being renegotiated by this and future generations. The hīmene *E Te Atua Kua Ruia Nei* is nowadays considered by many Mihinare to be ‘old-fashioned’ and ‘out of date’, often replaced by the latest American theo-pop. It is also considered by a new generation of Māori as not authentic, as a subversion of our mātauranga. But for many Mihinare it remains a core part of our identity, a new form that was renegotiated into our values and continues to express a sense of change as we have experienced it.

\[
\begin{align*}
E \text{ Te Atua, kua ruia nei} \\
\text{Ō purapura pai:} \\
\text{Homai e koe he ngākau hou,} \\
\text{Kia tupu ake ai}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
O \text{ God, you have planted} \\
\text{Your good seeds} \\
\text{Give me a new heart} \\
\text{And nurture it}
\end{align*}
\]
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Glossary of Words and Terminology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>The Church of England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archbishop of Canterbury</td>
<td>the bishop who is the nominal head of the Anglican Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>archdeacon</td>
<td>a senior ordained minister in a diocese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baptism</td>
<td>the rite of initiation into the Christian church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bishop</td>
<td>an ordained minister with oversight of a diocese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>canon</td>
<td>1. a law of the church, passed as legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cathedral</td>
<td>2. a senior member of the diocese (lay or ordained)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the home church of a bishop – site of the bishop’s throne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clergy</td>
<td>the ordained ministers of a diocese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deacon</td>
<td>an ordained minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diocese</td>
<td>an autonomous church unit under the authority of a bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecclesiastical</td>
<td>relating to church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecclesiological</td>
<td>understanding of church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecumenical/ecumenism</td>
<td>pan-denominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>episcopal/episcopacy</td>
<td>relating to bishops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopalian</td>
<td>a member of The Episcopal Church, the Anglican Church in the United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>episcopal see</td>
<td>the area over which a bishop has authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eucharist</td>
<td>The sacrament of Holy Communion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evangelical</td>
<td>a fundamentalist Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hāhi</td>
<td>denomination, church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hapū</td>
<td>kinship group, clan (often referred to as subtribe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hinota</td>
<td>synod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Communion</td>
<td>The ritual of taking, blessing, breaking and sharing the bread and wine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hui</td>
<td>a gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iwi</td>
<td>tribe, nation, people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laity</td>
<td>a member of the church who is not ordained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liturgy</td>
<td>a structured form of worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kai</td>
<td>food, eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāinga</td>
<td>village, residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaiwhakaako</td>
<td>a teacher; early Māori evangelian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karakia</td>
<td>prayer, service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katorika</td>
<td>Catholic, Māori Roman Catholic adherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaumātua</td>
<td>elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaupapa</td>
<td>plan, policy, principle, proposal, project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koha</td>
<td>gift, present, offering, donation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>korero</td>
<td>talk, tell, say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>license</td>
<td>authority given to an individual by a bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana</td>
<td>authority, control, power, influence, status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana motuhake</td>
<td>separate identity, autonomy, self-determination - mana through self-determination and control over one's own destiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marae</td>
<td>traditional complex for holding tribal gatherings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maunga</td>
<td>mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mihi</td>
<td>speech of greeting, acknowledgment, tribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minita</td>
<td>minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mokopuna</td>
<td>grandchild, grandchildren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niupepa māori</td>
<td>Māori language newspaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordain</td>
<td>to set someone aside for a particular ministry as deacon, priest or bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>a person of predominantly European decent; foreign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pāriha</td>
<td>parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parish/pastorate</td>
<td>the local church unit within a diocese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pihopa</td>
<td>bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pihopatanga</td>
<td>diocese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priest</td>
<td>an ordained minister who administer the sacraments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primate</td>
<td>head bishop of a province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>province</td>
<td>an autonomous Anglican church, normally covering one or more nation-states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pōwhiri</td>
<td>to welcome, invite, beckon, marae ritual of encounter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rohe</td>
<td>district, area, region, boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rūnanga</td>
<td>tribal council, to discuss in assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sacrament</td>
<td>rituals of the church including baptism and holy communion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synod</td>
<td>decision-making body of a diocese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangata whenua</td>
<td>hosts, original people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangi / tangihanga</td>
<td>traditional funeral ritual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tapu</td>
<td>sacred (Christian equivalent), prohibited, restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te reo</td>
<td>the (Māori) language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tikanga</td>
<td>Māori values, custom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tūpuna / tīpuna</td>
<td>ancestor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whakapono</td>
<td>faith, belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whare karakia</td>
<td>church building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waiata</td>
<td>song, sing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wairua</td>
<td>spiritual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whakapapa</td>
<td>genealogy, line of descent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whānau</td>
<td>family, extended family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whānaungatanga</td>
<td>relatedness, kinship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whenua</td>
<td>land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>