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Abstract

Historians portray Papahurihia as the first Māori prophet and founder of a syncretistic religion that combined elements of Judaic and Christian theology with Māori beliefs. They also say he observed a Saturday Sabbath and that his followers were known as Jews. This thesis disputes those conclusions. It re-examines the commentaries of the CMS missionaries in the Bay of Islands from the context of 1830s Protestant evangelicalism and draws on the texts of the Wesleyan and Roman Catholic missionaries and European settlers to show how Papahurihia behaved in various situations. It argues that historians have failed to take account of the way that Protestant and Catholic writers saw Papahurihia through the lenses of their own religions. The thesis recreates Papahurihia in the context of the Ngāpuhi seasonal cycle and links him to the persistence of ceremonies like the hahunga. It argues that historians have overlooked the extent to which he operated on a Māori concept of time and how the missionaries and Europeans made assumptions about the behaviour of Papahurihia and his followers based on the Christian calendar. The thesis concludes that Papahurihia responded to the advent of Christianity in a way that was consistent with the behaviour of tohunga at the time, rather than as the founder of a syncretistic religion. It also concludes that the historiography on Papahurihia ultimately went awry because historians interpreted the missionaries’ comments about him from a secular perspective.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>Auckland Central Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJHR</td>
<td>Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AML</td>
<td>Auckland Museum Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANU</td>
<td>Australian National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATL</td>
<td>Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUL</td>
<td>Auckland University Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Church Missionary Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL</td>
<td>Hocken Library, University of Otago, Dunedin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNZ</td>
<td>Heritage New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPS</td>
<td>Journal of the Polynesian Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>Knight Commander of the Order of St. Michael and St. George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS</td>
<td>London Missionary Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Master of Arts Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHR</td>
<td>Member of the House of Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCEA</td>
<td>National Certificate of Educational Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZJH</td>
<td>New Zealand Journal of History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHR</td>
<td>Pacific Historical Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPG</td>
<td>Society for the Propagation of the Gospel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK</td>
<td>Te Kaharoa: The e-Journal on Indigenous Pacific Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMS</td>
<td>Wesleyan Missionary Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Glossary of Māori Words

ahuahu ......................... mounds or hillocks of soil into which kūmara shoots were planted
ariki ...... used interchangeably with atua to denote a chief considered a god by his people
atua ..................... a chief, a dead body, a deified ancestor, items belonging to the deceased
haka ........................................ war dance to embolden warriors & intimidate their enemies
hākiri ............................................................. feast or harvest festival
hahunga .................................... cleaning or scraping of bones of the deceased
hapū ........................................ pregnant, modern word for sub-tribe
Hātana .................................................................................................. Satan
iwi ............................................................... bone, modern word for tribe
kai-karakia ........................................... person who recites karakia, minister, preacher
kākāriki ........................................ green lizard, considered an omen of death by Ngāpuhi
karakia ........................................ formula recited by tohunga to invoke atua, modern word for prayer
kararehe ................................................................. a quadruped or four legged animal
kaumātua .................. an elder but not necessarily a repository of esoteric knowledge
kēhua .................................................................................................. ghosts
kirikiri .................................................................................................. gravelly sand
mana ................................................................. modern word for prestige or standing
mātāmua ........................................................... senior wife
mitineri ................................................................. Māori word for missionary
moko kauae ...................................................... the chin tattoo on women of rank
nākahi .................................................. transliteration of the Hebrew word ‘Nachash’ or ‘Serpent’
ngahuru ......................... ancient Ngāpuhi word for ten, the tenth lunar month in Ngāpuhi
ngahurutanga ...................... tenfold, the quantity of kūmara expected at harvest-time
ngārara ................................................................. a crawling thing but not exclusively a reptile
Papatūānuku ........................................ the Earth Mother in the Māori Creation Myth
poutokomanawa .................. principal supporting posts of the wharenui or meetinghouse
rahurahu .................................................. foliage from the battlefield used by tohunga
Ranginui .................................................. the Sky Father in the Māori Creation Myth
rā tapu ............................................... sacred day, used by the missionaries to refer to the Lord’s Day
Rerenga Wairua ............................. place where the wairua or soul of Māori goes after death
rāhui ......................... to place a ban on the use of a resource by invoking atua & rendering tapu
rākau ............................................... divination sticks used by tohunga to foretell the future
raumati ....................... a dead leaf or the fall of the leaf, signified the passage of one year
rēwera .......................... devils
ritenga .................................. Māori customary practice, ritual or way of doing things
rūnanga .................................. councils of chiefs established by Governor Grey
takahī ........................................... to trample or breach tapu
taniwha ............................. an atua or water spirit which dwells in lakes and rivers
tāpapa .................................. seedbeds in which immature kūmara shoots were raised
tapu ...... sacrosanct because one is a chief/ariki/atua or because an atua has been invoked
tiriti .......................... treaty, refers to the Māori text of the Treaty of Waitangi
tohu ................................................ sign or signs read by tohunga
tūpāpaku .................................. the body of the recently deceased
urupā .......................... place of burial, usually caves or volcanic craters, sometimes trees
waka ....................................... a person who is the canoe, vessel or medium of an atua
wairua .................................. originally two waters, modern word for soul
wata .................................. raised stages onto which mature kūmara were stored at harvest
wera .................................................. hot
whakapapa ............. genealogy, recitation of descent from an eponymous atua/ancestor
whakawai .......................................... sinners
whānau ..................... to give birth, modern word for extended rather than nuclear family
whare wānanga .................. modern word for a school of learning
whiowhio .................. whistling sound made by atua or Māori gods invoked by tohunga
Dramatis Personae

**Baker, Charles**, trained at CMS College at Islington 1826-7; arrived in NZ 1828; stationed at Kerikeri 1828; Paihia 1834; Waikare 1840-43; transferred to the East Coast; was deaconed by Bishop Selwyn 1853; priested by William Williams 1860.¹ Charles Baker encountered opposition to his preaching from Papahurihia’s followers at Kororāreka in 1835.

**Brown, Alfred Nesbit**, trained at CMS College at Islington; deaconed London Trinity 1827; priested 1828; arrived NZ 1829 and cared for missionary children at Paihia before his transfer to Matamata 1835-6; Te Papa in Tauranga 1838.

**Buddle, Thomas**, native of Durham, England; lay preacher ordained by the WMS 1839; arrived Mangungu May 1840; transferred to Whāngaroa (Raglan) and Te Kōpua in May 1841; appointed head of the Wesleyan Native Institution in Auckland 1844; wrote *The Aborigines of New Zealand* (1851) in which he recounted Papahurihia’s prophesy of the British defeat at Ōhaeawai in July 1845; died Auckland 26 June 1883.²

**Buller, James**, WMS missionary from England; arrived at Mangungu with the Reverend Nathaniel Turner 21 April 1836 and served on the Hokianga for 3 years; at Kaipara for 15 years, Wellington 5 years and Christchurch for 6 years; appointed superintendent at the Thames; wrote *Forty Years in New Zealand* (1878) in which he discussed Kaitoke’s murder of the WMS Māori converts Matthew and Richmond and asserted that Kaitoke had been under the influence of Te Atua Wera (Papahurihia); retired to Christchurch and died there 6 November 1884.³

**Busby, James**, born Edinburgh, Scotland in 1802; emigrated to NSW with his parents 1824; appointed British Resident in NZ and arrived Bay of Islands May 1833; settled at Waitangi where he encouraged Ngāpuhi chiefs to choose a national flag on 20 March 1834 and declare their sovereignty over NZ in a Declaration of Independence on 28 October 1835; was replaced on 29 January 1840 by the arrival of Captain William Hobson as Consul; drafted the second article of the English text of the Treaty of Waitangi; spent the remainder of his life defending his land claims at Waitangi, Whāngārei, Waipū and Ngunguru; died England 1871 after eye surgery.⁴

¹ Unless otherwise stated the biographies of the CMS catechists and missionaries have been taken from the Biographical Index of CMS Missionaries & Workers in Robert Glen (ed.), *Mission and Moko: Aspects of the work of the Church Missionary Society in New Zealand 1814-1882*, Christchurch: Latimer Fellowship of New Zealand, 1992, pp. 194-212.
³ *The Cyclopedia of New Zealand* [Auckland Provincial District], Christchurch: The Cyclopedia Company Ltd, 1902, pp. 611-12.
Clarke, George, gunsmith and trained schoolmaster; trained at CMS College at Islington; arrived NZ 1824; taught in the mission school at Kerikeri; helped found the Waimate station 1830; was appointed Chief Protector of Aborigines by Governor William Hobson in 1840 on the recommendation of the Reverend Henry Williams; dismissed from the CMS in 1849 over his land purchases.

Cotton, William, born 1813 in Essex, England; educated at Eton College and Christ Church, Oxford; BA 1836; MA 1838; SPG missionary with high church views; travelled to NZ as domestic chaplain to Bishop George Selwyn 1841; arrived Bay of Islands June 1842 and settled at CMS station at Waimate; transferred to Auckland in November 1844; became headmaster of St. John’s College, Auckland; left NZ December 1847 with Selwyn’s clerk, William Bambridge, an artist who became Queen Victoria’s photographer; Cotton arrived in England May 1848; appointed vicar of Frodsham, Cheshire; died 22 June 1879 aged 66 years.

Davis, Charles, arrived New Zealand 1824; stationed at Paihia and employed as a carpenter and occasional catechist; helped WMS at Hokianga; died at sea 1829.

Davis, Charles Oliver Bond, born Sydney 1817/18; arrived Mangungu 1830/31; tutored the children of WMS missionary William Woon; present at the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi at Mangungu; appointed clerk and interpreter to the Auckland Office of the Protector of Aborigines; developed a friendship with Donald McLean, who joined the Protectorate in 1844; re-appointed to the Native Secretary’s department 1846 when the Protectorate closed; assisted the Auckland courts as an interpreter with land purchases and native affairs; resigned 1857; began a career as a land purchase agent in 1873 under the patronage of Donald McLean, who was then Minister for Native Affairs; wrote The Life and Times of Patuone (1876) which mentioned Kaitoke’s murders of Matthew and Richmond; died Auckland 28 June 1887.

Davis, Richard, arrived NZ 1824; stationed with the Reverend Henry Williams at the Paihia mission station as a gardener, then Waimate as a catechist and farmer; was secretary to the Northern District Committee 1838; deaconed 1843; priested 1852; his daughters married William Gilbert Puckey and Joseph Matthews who founded the CMS station at Kaitāia in 1834.

Fairburn, William, carpenter in Australia; arrived NZ 1821; stationed at the CMS station at Kerikeri; helped the Reverend Henry Williams found the Paihia mission station 1823; stationed at Ōtāhuhu, Pūriri 1834 as a teacher; Maraetai 1837; Hauraki 1840.

Hadfield, Octavius, educated at Pembroke College, Oxford; deaconed 1838; arrived NZ 1838; priested at Paihia 1838; taught at the Waimate station; transferred to Waikanae and Ōtaki near Wellington 1839; married Catherine Williams (known as Kate), a daughter of the Reverend Henry Williams of Paihia.

---

Hall, Francis, born London and studied the monitor (Lancaster) system of teaching; arrived NZ 1819; was stationed at the CMS mission station at Kerikeri as a teacher under the Reverend John Gare Butler; retired 5 December 1822 and resigned 1824.

Hall, William, carpenter from Carlisle; learnt ship building at Hull; arrived NZ 1814; stationed at the CMS station at Rangihoua; retired to NSW March 1825 due to asthma; sold land at Waitangi to James Busby before the latter’s arrival as British Resident in 1833.

Hamlin, James, flax dresser and weaver; first missionary admitted to CMS College at Islington in 1825; arrived NZ 1826; stationed at the Waimate mission station as a catechist 1830; transferred to Mangapōuri 1835; Manukau 1836; Wairoa 1844; deaconed 1844; priested 1863.

Hawke, George, born Cornwall in 1802; apprenticed as a wool stapler; emigrated to NSW in 1828; was befriended by the Hassall family; acquainted with the Reverend Samuel Marsden through the Reverend Thomas Hassall, who was Marsden’s son-in-law; set sail for England via NZ on James Laing in August 1836; was shipwrecked on the Hokianga; settled with the WMS missionaries at Mangungu and worked with the printer William Woon; met Marsden on the latter’s final visit to New Zealand on Pyramus in February 1837; in a letter dated 7 March 1837 Hawke copied out for Marsden excerpts from his diary about the murders of the Wesleyan Māori converts Matthew and Richmond, which had taken place before Marsden’s arrival.6

Hobbs, John, born Kent, England 1800; father was a coachbuilder and manufacturer of agricultural implements who had been welcomed into the Methodist Society by John Wesley; learnt his father’s trade; joined the Methodists in 1816; lay preacher in 1819; emigrated to Tasmania and NSW; Samuel Marsden tried to recruit him to CMS but he accepted the Reverend Nathaniel Turner’s offer to join the WMS; arrived NZ August 1823; was one of the founders of the first WMS station at Kaeo on the Whangaroa Harbour under the Reverend Samuel Leigh, who was a friend of Marsden; built the mission station; composed two hymns in Māori 1825; translated the Lord’s Prayer into Māori 1826; when ‘Wesleydale’ was sacked during the course of a Māori war in 1827 Hobbs returned to Sydney and was married and ordained; returned NZ October 1827 to found the WMS mission at Mangungu on the Hokianga under the protection of Patuone and Tāmati Wāaka Nene; constructed the building and planted orchards and gardens; was transferred to Tonga at his own request when the Reverend William White arrived in 1830; sailed for Tonga June 1833; left 1838 due to wife’s ill-health; returned NZ 1838 after White’s dismissal and his vindication by the London WMS; rebuilt the Mangungu mission house after its destruction by fire; left Hokianga 1855 due to rheumatism and deafness; died 1883.7

---

Hocken, Thomas Morland, born Rutlandshire, England 1836; father was a WMS minister but Hocken was a devout Anglican; trained in medicine and surgery and qualified in 1859; served as a ship’s surgeon on the Australian run; discharged at Melbourne 1862 and arrived on the goldfields in Dunedin one month later; was one of Dunedin’s leading physicians; appointed coroner 1863 and held the post for 22 years; lectured in surgery at Otago Medical School; member of Otago University Council from 1883 and Vice Chancellor in 1910; interested in Māori and Pacific ethnology and New Zealand history; gifted his collection of manuscripts, letters, pamphlets, paintings and other memorabilia to the public; his greatest acquisitions were the letters and journals of the Reverend Samuel Marsden and other early CMS missionaries in the Bay of Islands; the Hocken Library was opened 31 March 1910; died of cancer 17 May 1910.\(^8\)

Kemp, James, blacksmith from Norfolk; arrived NZ 1819 as CMS catechist; stationed at the Kerikeri station under the Reverend John Gare Butler; his wife Charlotte Kemp was a school teacher; operated the Stone Store 1822-43; declined to transfer to another station and retired 1850; the Kerikeri station, now known officially as Kemp House, was occupied by James and Charlotte Kemp in 1832 and later purchased by the Kemp family; it was donated to the NZ Historic Places Trust in 1976 by their great grandson Earnest Kemp after 142 years of continuous occupation by members of the Kemp family.\(^9\)

Kendall, Thomas, arrived NZ 1814 with the Reverend Samuel Marsden, John King and William Hall; stationed at Rangihoua under the patronage of Ruatara; ran the mission school 1816-18; took Hongi Hika and Waikato on an unauthorised visit to England in 1820; priested 1820; returned to New Zealand 1821; dismissed by Marsden for trading in firearms and adultery 1822; drowned in August 1832 in Australia; produced A Karao no New Zealand; or the New Zealander’s First Book in 1815 and A Grammar and Vocabulary of the Language of New Zealand with Professor Samuel Lee of Cambridge University in 1820.

King, John, shoe maker and twine spinner with the CMS; arrived NZ 1814 with the Reverend Samuel Marsden, William Hall and Thomas Kendall; was based at the Rangihoua and Te Puna mission stations under the patronage of Ruatara, Hongi Hika and later Waikato; died at Te Puna 1854.

Maning, Frederick, born Dublin, Ireland 1811/1812; emigrated to Tasmania 1823 with his parents; arrived at Pākanae on the Hokianga July 1833; settled at Kohukohu; shifted to Ōnoke at the mouth of the Whirinaki River in 1839 close to Kaitoke’s village; married Kaitoke’s daughter Moengaroa in 1840 and had four children – Maria, Hauraki, Mary and Susan; was a close friend of John Webster and Spencer von Sturmer, as well as the Auckland merchant John Logan Campbell; spoke against the Treaty of Waitangi at Mangungu in 1840; fought with Kaitoke against Heke in the Northern war 1845-1846; entered the timber and gum trade with the 8. S. R. Strachan, ‘Hocken, Thomas Morland’, from the Dictionary of New Zealand Biography. Te Ara – the Encyclopedia of New Zealand, updated 30-Oct-2012, URL: http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/biographies/2h39/hocken-thomas-morland, accessed 30 December 2015.

on a large scale 1848 and was the leading northern timber trader in the 1850s; appointed Judge of the Native Land Court 1865; retired 1876; shifted to Auckland 1880; died London July 1883 following surgery on his jaw; buried December 1883 in Auckland;\(^\text{10}\) wrote *A History of the War in the North of New Zealand* (1862), in which he outlined Papahurihia’s role as Heke’s tohunga during the Northern war.

**Marsden, Samuel**, educated at Magdalen College; assistant chaplain of NSW 1792; campaigned in England for the CMS to establish a mission to NZ; founded the Rangihoua mission station 1814 with John King, William Hall and Thomas Kendall under the patronage of Ruatara of Hikutu; founded the Kerikeri mission station 1819 under the patronage of Hongi Hika of Ngāi Tawake; founded the Paihia mission station 1823 under the patronage of Te Kōkī of Uriongaonga and the Waimate station 1830 under Ngāti Rēhia; his last visit to NZ was made at the conclusion of the war between Kaitoke and Tāmati Wāka Nene on the Hokianga in January 1837 and coincided with the outbreak of war between Titore and Pōmare for Kororāreka in the Bay of Islands in April 1837; died in NSW 12 May 1838.

**Marshall, William Barrett**, assistant-surgeon HMS *Alligator*; friend of the Reverend Samuel Marsden; corresponded with his daughter Martha Marsden; visited Kawakawa with the Reverend Henry Williams in 1834 and met one of Papahurihia’s followers; wrote about that encounter and his other experiences in NZ in *A Narrative of Two Visits to New Zealand in His Majesty’s Ship Alligator, A.D. 1834* (1836).

**McLean, Donald**, born Scotland 1820; educated for the Presbyterian ministry; sailed for NSW 1838; employed by Sydney merchants and sent to Auckland 1840; cut timber and managed a schooner on the Waithou River and Firth of Thames; appointed to the Protectorate of Aborigines in March 1844, where he befriended Charles Oliver Bond Davis; appointed sub-Protector in Taranaki and then Police Inspector of Taranaki 1846; appointed Chief Land Purchase Commissioner 1853; role expanded 1856 by Governor Browne to include Native Secretary; endorsed the Waitara purchase and opposed the Māori King Movement; appointed General Government Agent, Hawke’s Bay in mid-1863; elected MHR for Napier 1866; became Native and Defence Minister in the Fox government 1869; made KCMG in 1874; resigned ministerial office December 1876; died Napier in January 1877 of coronary disease.\(^\text{11}\)

**Morgan, John**, born Dublin; arrived at the CMS station at Paihia May 1833; stationed at Ōtāwhao 1841; deaconed 1849; priested by Bishop Selwyn 1853.

**Polack, Joel Samuel**, born London 1807; son of successful Jewish engraver; worked in the War Office; joined his brother in NSW 1830; arrived NZ 1831 and toured the Hokianga and Kaipara; moved to the Bay of Islands 1832/33; built a substantial house on 9 acres at

---


Kororāreka called ‘Parramatta’; established the country’s first brewery 1835; traded in flax, timber and general produce; was critical of the British Resident James Busby and signed a petition calling upon the British government to colonize NZ (1837); returned to England 1837 and gave evidence before a select committee of the House of Lords in 1838 advocating planned colonization rather than haphazard settlement; wrote *New Zealand, Being A Narrative of Travels and Adventures During A Residence In That Country Between The Years 1831 And 1837* (1838), in which he mentioned Papahurihia and described the war between Kaitoke and Nene as schismatic; returned to NZ 1842; his home, in which the British troops had stored their ammunition, was destroyed in 1845 when Kororāreka was looted; moved his business to Auckland and traded kauri gum in California; was vice consul for the United States 1845-48; died San Francisco April 1882.12

**Pompallier, Jean Baptiste François**, born Lyon, France 1801; RC missionary educated as a gentleman; served as an officer of dragoons; entered the Lyon seminary 1825; ordained 1829; served diocese of Lyon for seven years; became close to the Society of Mary and its founder Father Jean-Claude Colin; chosen by Rome as the first Vicar Apostolic of Western Oceania; consecrated Bishop 1836; arrived NZ 10 January 1838; established mission stations at Hokianga (1838), Kororāreka (1839), Whangaroa, Kaipara and Tauranga (1839), Akaroa (1840), Matamata, Ōpōtiki and Maketū (1841), Auckland (1842), Wellington (1843), Rotorua, Rangiaowhia and Whakatāne (1844); RC mission was beset by financial hardship; led to Pompallier parting ways with Father Colin and the Marists 1846; Rome divided the RC mission in NZ into two dioceses with Auckland under Pompallier and secular clergy, and Wellington under Bishop Viard and staffed by Marists; recruited the Sisters of Mercy and used St. Mary’s College as a boarding school for Māori boys and a day school for local children; transferred the school and seminary to Freemans Bay 1853 adjacent to 40 acres of land he had acquired there; those trained in the seminary and ordained by Bishop Pompallier were sent to the mission stations vacated by the Marists; in 1859 recruited staff for his new order, the Sisters of the Holy Family, including Suzanne Aubert; left for Europe 1868; resigned 1869; was made honorary archbishop of Amasia; died 21 December 1871.13 One hundred and thirty years later his remains were exhumed from a Paris cemetery and placed in a Māori carved funeral coffin for reburial at Tōtara Point on the Hokianga, where he had taken the first Mass on 13 January 1838; after a pilgrimage throughout NZ his body was interred at Hata Maria Church, a chapel purpose built to house his remains, on 13 January 2001.14

**Puckey, William Gilbert**, his father William Puckey was an LMS missionary and friend of Marsden; William jnr. arrived NZ in 1819 as a carpenter at the CMS station at Paihia; helped the WMS at Hokianga 1828; was based at Paihia 1830; appointed a catechist and stationed at

---

the CMS station at Kaitaia 1833; was secretary of the CMS Bible translation syndicate in 1840s.

**Selwyn, George, Augustus**, born 1809 Hampstead, England; educated Eton College and St. John’s College, Cambridge; BA 1831; MA 1834; ordained deacon on Trinity Sunday 1833; priested later the same year; consecrated Bishop of NZ 17 October 1841; arrived Auckland 30 May 1842; based at CMS station at Waimate; toured the Bay of Islands; 18 months later shifted to Auckland leaving Henry Williams as his archdeacon in the North; along with London CMS and Governor Grey opposed the CMS missionaries’ purchases of Māori land; later lobbied for the reinstatement of Archdeacon Henry Williams; subdivided his diocese in 1858 to form, in addition to Christchurch (1856), bishoprics in Wellington, Waiapu and Nelson under Bishops Abraham, William Williams, Hobhouse and Harper; also visited Melanesia and recruited John Coleridge Patteson as first Bishop of Melanesia 1861; tried to mediate in the prelude to the Taranaki war; defended the Treaty of Waitangi and opposed the confiscation of Māori land; was condemned by Māori for acting as chaplain to General Duncan Cameron’s troops during the Waikato war; was offered the see of Lichfield during a visit to England; enthroned 1868; died April 1878.15

**Servant, Louis Catherin**, born France 1818; entered seminary of Irenaeus at Lyon 1829; one of the founders of the Society of Mary 1836; volunteered for the newly established mission to the South Seas; arrived NZ with Bishop Pompallier and Brother Michel Colombon at Hokianga 10 January 1838; based at Papakawau in south Hokianga; wrote to Father Colin from Kororāreka in March 1840 and mentioned a drawing of two trees, which he later attributed to Papahurihia; was critical of Bishop Pompallier’s leadership of the RC mission 1840; transferred to the Island of Futuna 1842; returned to Sydney on two occasions due to ill health; died at Futuna 8 January 1860.16

**Shepherd, James**, gardener; sent to NZ in 1820 by the Reverend Samuel Marsden as a missionary for Te Morenga of Ta黎明, whose son had died at Marsden’s seminary in NSW; was stationed at Rangihoua; moved to Kerikeri; itinerated as a catechist; settled at Kaeo in the Whangaroa Harbour and helped the WMS in 1824; wrote Māori hymns and translated the New Testament into the Māori language; based at Rangihoua in 1830; disconnected 1848 because of his land holdings.

**Stack, James**, arrived in New Zealand 1823 as a member of the WMS; served at Kaeo on the Whangaroa Harbour and at Mangungu on the Hokianga; left the WMS and joined the CMS December 1832; stationed at Pūririri; served under James Hamlin at Mangapōuri 1842; took over Hick’s Bay on the East Coast of the North Island in 1847; returned to England same year and resigned.
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Turner, Nathaniel, Methodist missionary; came to NZ 1823; helped to found the first WMS station at Kaeo in the Whangaroa Harbour under the superintendence of the Reverend Samuel Leigh; transferred to Tonga; returned to NZ to replace the Reverend William White as superintendent of the WMS station at Mangungu on the Hokianga 1836; his son Josiah George Turner, born 1832 in Hobart, Tasmania, wrote his father’s biography The Pioneer Missionary: Life of the Rev. Nathaniel Turner (1872), in which he discussed the murders of Matthew and Richmond and the subsequent war between Kaitoke and Tāmati Wāka Nene in 1837.

Von Sturmer, Spencer, born 1836; arrived NZ 1855; farmer and licensing officer with Customs Department in Coromandel; appointed Resident Magistrate for Kaipara 1864; Resident Magistrate at Hokianga 1868; Sub-Collector of Customs and Inspector of Native Schools for 18 years; magistrate in Masterton; judge in the Native Land Court 1889-95; Mayor of Parnell 1895-96; moved to Sydney; died 1921, advised Donald McLean of Papahurihia’s death and enclosed a photograph taken 24 hours after his death.

Wade, William, sent to NZ by the London CMS in 1834 to be superintendent of the printing press at Paihia operated by William Colenso; joined the CMS mission December 1834 and founded the Te Papa mission station in Tauranga 1835; transferred to Waimate agricultural station May 1836; resigned from CMS 1840; left NZ for Tasmania where he served as a missionary with the Baptist Missionary Society.

Warren, John, born Norfolk, England 1814; father a gentleman farmer; joined Wesleyan Church aged 17 years; itinerate preacher in England for two years; arrived NZ January 1840; was first resident missionary at Waimā at the request of Hōne Mohi Tāwhai; present at Waitangi on 5-6 February 1840; witnessed the sack of Kororāreka 11 March 1845; based at Waimā for 16 years; sent to Nelson 1855; transferred to Wellington 1860; transferred to Auckland; relieved of his duties at his own request in 1869 due to ill-health; died 1883.

Webster, John, born Montrose, Scotland 1818; arrived NZ 1841 via Australia; settled on the Hokianga; self-employed as a kauri timber trader; fought with Nene against Heke in the Northern war; close friend of Frederick Maning; wrote Reminiscences of an Old Settler in Australia and New Zealand (1908) which detailed the séance Papahurihia held for Heke before the war; the book was edited by Thomas Hocken, who had sought Webster’s approval of his introduction to Maning’s Old New Zealand (1906) which incorporated A History of the War in the North of New Zealand and included the death photograph of Papahurihia.

White, John, born Durham, England 1826; emigrated to NZ with his parents; arrived November 1835; his father Francis White was the brother of the Reverend William White; settled on Kaitoke’s land at Mata on the Hokianga, where his father established a farm and timber trading business; the family moved to Auckland 1851; John White was appointed translator and secretary to Governor Grey 1852; transferred to Donald McLean’s Land
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18 New Zealand Herald, 26 November 1883, p. 5.
Purchase Department 1854; interpreted for the British during the Taranaki war 1860; was Acting Assistant Native Secretary 1862; Resident Magistrate at Wanganui 1862-65; appointed Land Purchase Commissioner in the Land Purchase Department and for the Auckland Provincial Council; partner in a Māori Land Purchase agency 1869; Native Land Court interpreter; assisted with the Chatham Islands hearings in 1870, which ignored the land claims of Moriori; provided military intelligence for the British during the Waikato war; from 1879-90 wrote his six volume *The Ancient History of the Maori, His Mythology and Traditions*; reappointed Native Land Court interpreter 1890; died at Whakatāne 1891.19

**White, William**, born 1794 County Durham, England; carpenter by trade and Wesleyan lay preacher; ordained 1822 and sent to NZ to help the Reverend Samuel Leigh found the first WMS mission station at Kaeo; arrived NZ May 1823; the ‘Wesleydale’ station was abandoned 1826 whilst White was in England; new WMS station founded by John Hobbs and James Stack at Mangungu on the Hokianga in 1827, under the patronage of Patuone and Tāmati Wāka Nene; White returned to superintend the station in January 1830 and founded new WMS stations at Kāwhia, Whāngaroa (Raglan), Kaipara and Manukau; became involved in the kauri timber trade; was accused of adultery by rival businessman Thomas McDonnell, who was also the Assistant British Resident on the Hokianga; recalled to England July 1836; dismissed by London WMS March 1838 for commercial activity and misapplication of mission property; returned to NZ December 1838 and took up residence near the Mangungu mission station; continued to preach and trade; died 25 November 1875.20

**Whiteley, John**, born 1806 Nottinghamshire, England; apprenticed miller and baker; trained as a missionary by the London WMS in 1831; ordained September 1832 and left for NZ one month later; arrived Bay of Islands May 1833; stationed at Mangungu mission station on the Hokianga; sent to Kāwhia 1835; returned to Hokianga 1836; served at Pākanae 2 ½ years; returned to Kāwhia 1839; moved to Auckland 1854; was sent to Taranaki 1856, where he was killed on 13 February 1869 en route to Pukearuhe to minister to the British garrison.21

**Williams, Henry**, former naval officer; deaconed 1822; priested 1822; arrived in New Zealand 1823; head of the CMS mission in NZ and stationed at the Paihia mission station; with his son Edward, he wrote the Māori text of the Treaty of Waitangi and is credited with convincing the Ngāpuhi chiefs to sign on 6 February 1840; dismissed by CMS over land purchases 1847; moved inland to Pākaraka 1850; was reinstated by the CMS 1854 and died 1867.

**Williams, William**, educated Magdalen Hall, Oxford; BA 1825; MA 1851; deaconed 1824; priested 1824; CMS College at Islington 1825; arrived NZ 1826 and based with his brother

---


Henry at Paihia; a teacher and physician; translated the Bible into the Māori language; stationed at Waimate 1835; transferred to Tūranga (Gisborne) 1840; Archdeacon of the East Cape 1842; first Bishop of Waiapu 1859; suffered a stroke and resigned 1876; died Napier 1878.

**Woon, William**, printer from Truro, Cornwall; left England 1830 as a Wesleyan missionary to the Friendly Islands (Tonga); arrived NZ 1834 and was based at Mangungu on the Hokianga; founded the WMS station at Papakarewa on the ocean side of the Kāwhia harbour in November 1834 but was recalled to Mangungu in 1836 after complaints the WMS had encroached into CMS territory; died in Whanganui aged 54 years.22

**Yate, William**, grocer; trained at CMS College in Islington 1825; deaconed 1825; priested 1826; arrived NZ 1828 and based at Waimate and Kerikeri; founded the Pūriri mission station 1833; published *An Account of New Zealand* in England 1835, in which he stated that Papahurihia had been taught ventriloquism by a sea captain to undermine the objects of the CMS mission; returned to New Zealand 1836; was dismissed for homosexuality 1836 in Australia and returned to England.

---

Figure 1: Map of the Bay of Islands and Hokianga. Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, NZ Map 4247.
Introduction

Papahurihia is looked upon as the first Māori prophet and founder of a syncretistic religion which combined aspects of Judaic and Christian theology with Māori beliefs. He is also said to have changed the Sabbath to a Saturday and to have based his Nākahi doctrine on the serpent in the Garden of Eden.¹ This thesis contests those interpretations of the evidence and argues that Papahurihia was a tohunga who responded to the advent of Christianity in a way that was consistent with the behaviour of tohunga at the time, rather than as the founder of a syncretistic religion.

Papahurihia is an important historical figure for a number of reasons. In the context of the literature on the Māori response to Christianity in the Bay of Islands in the 1830s, the emergence of his syncretistic doctrine has been treated as evidence of the missionary ‘breakthrough’ and the partial adoption of Christian ideas by Māori.² He has also been read as the antecedent of Te Ua Haumēne, Te Whiti-o-Rongomai, Te Kooti Rikirangi, Rua Kēnana and T. W. Rātana.³ In the context of Pacific historiography, Papahurihia has been interpreted as analogous with millennial cults like the Mamaia of Tahiti, the Siovili of Samoa and the Hulumanu in Hawaii.⁴ Similarly, in the international literature, Papahurihia has been linked to Te Ua and the Paiute prophet Wovoka, who introduced the Ghost Dance to unite the dead with the living and defeat the cavalry under General Custer at Wounded Knee.⁵

The fascination with alleged prophets like Papahurihia can be attributed to the way he interpreted parts of the Old Testament and the Book of Revelation and applied it to his changing circumstances. However, my own interest in Papahurihia arose during the course of the research exercise I wrote in partial fulfilment of my Master’s degree. It focused on the people of Ngāti Rēhia, whose chief Tareha has been identified as one of Papahurihia’s followers. The thesis argued that the Reverend Samuel Marsden
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³ Ormond Wilson, JPS, 1965, p. 473.
had unwittingly founded three of his four mission stations amongst kinfolk of Ngāti Rēhia at Rangihoua, Kerikeri and Waimate. It also argued that when Kiwikiwi of Ngāti Manu ceded Kororāreka to Tareha in 1830, the Reverend Henry Williams realized that the CMS were “hostage to one tribe”, thereby strengthening his resolve to expand the Anglican mission south of the Bay of Islands. The research exercise found that Ngāti Rēhia had dominated the Bay of Islands in the 1830s and that Tareha and his people had continued to observe the customs of their forefathers. It also found that since their initial translation of Genesis 3:1 in 1827, the CMS missionaries had consistently referred to Nākahi as a kararehe or quadruped and never as a ngārara or lizard.

This thesis on Papahurihia has been informed by that research. It begins by outlining how Ormond Wilson and Judith Binney saw Papahurihia in their imaginations and the power of their texts in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. It then moves to a microanalysis of the primary sources cited by Wilson and Binney in their articles on Papahurihia in the Journal of the Polynesian Society in 1965, 1966 and 2007, before re-examining the evidence in the social and intellectual context of the time. The methodology adopted in this thesis involved a close reading of the primary sources. The footnotes in the articles written by Wilson and Binney were checked against the original to ascertain whether the passages quoted were accurate, if the original comment had been cited in full or truncated and to establish the immediate context in which the comment about Papahurihia had been made. The methodology also entailed reading the texts more widely to establish the broader context in which the statement about Papahurihia was couched. For example, when William Wade said that Charles Baker had met with opposition from Papahurihia’s followers at Kororāreka in July 1835, the method involved reading earlier entries in the journals of Baker and Wade to discover why Kororāreka Māori had displayed antagonism toward Charles Baker on that particular occasion. It also entailed reading subsequent entries to learn what had happened as a result of that disagreement. Thus, it was possible to establish that in the months preceding the altercation with Papahurihia’s followers at Kororāreka, the CMS missionaries had attempted to persuade Māori assembled at Waimate and
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6 Judith Ward, “Hostage to One Tribe”: Ngati Rehia, the CMS, and The Maori Response to Christianity in the Bay of Islands in the 1830s: a research exercise submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Arts in History at Massey University, Albany, 2011.
Paroa Bay to forego the custom of hahunga in favour of Christian burial. It was also possible to establish that the missionaries’ efforts had been spurned.  

The methodology also endeavoured to evaluate the trustworthiness of the primary evidence. To that end, multiple sources on the same incident were analyzed to ascertain whether they were eyewitness or hearsay accounts and if their testimony was corroboratory or contradictory. That approach is best exemplified in the section on Papahurihia’s role in the murders of the Wesleyan Māori converts Matthew and Richmond, which examined the evidence of George Hawke, William Woon, Nathaniel Turner, James Buller, James Busby, Joel Polack, Charles Oliver Bond Davis and Josiah Turner. Similarly, John White’s journal account of the old man called Nākahi was compared against the comments he made about him in his lecture on Māori customs and superstitions in 1861. White’s accounts were also compared against the journal of John Webster, who was alleged to have been with White on the day he met old Nākahi and Papahurihia. Finally, the methodology involved reading the primary texts to look for references to Papahurihia that Wilson and Binney had overlooked and re-examining the evidence in sequence.

It has not been possible to check the accuracy of all the primary records cited by Ormond Wilson. There are photocopies of the journals of William Woon in the Hocken Library in Dunedin. In MS-0969/003, which purports to cover the period from January 1835 to November 1837, an entry states ‘The above was written at
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9 John White, Private Journal, 5 June 1846-22 December 1850, typescript, MS 328 (2), AML; John White, Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives, 1861, Session 1, E-07, pp. 1-47.  
10 John Webster, Maori Journal, transcribed for the Hokianga Historical Society by Owen and Alexa Whaley and published with the assistance of the Auckland City Libraries and Logan Campbell Trust, 2010, ACL.
Mangungu other remarks in another Book since the 8th of March continued up to October 15, 1836’. The next journal in the series, MS-0969/004, begins on 28 November 1839. When I checked the original journals of William Woon in the Alexander Turnbull Library in Wellington, they also said that there was another journal for the period from 8 March to 15 October 1836. Neither the Hocken nor Turnbull held a copy of the missing diary or appeared to have been aware of its existence until I queried its whereabouts with them. Finally, the extremely poor quality of the CMS microfilm in the Alexander Turnbull Library meant that I was unable to read it or check William Woon’s references for 16 May 1836, 14 and 18 August 1836 and 26 September 1836.

The first entry on 16 May 1836 was written after William Woon had visited Pākanae on the Hokianga to select a site for a new mission station. In Wilson’s article, the entry was purported to have said that the people there were very covetous and did not appear to want a missionary to reside amongst them. The same entry said, ‘They are called Hurais (Jews) by the people in the river as they have imbibed Jewish sentiments’.11 The next entry on 14 August 1836 reiterated that the natives at Pākanae did not want a missionary and were ‘disposed to be exorbitant in their demands for land labour &c’.12 The third, written on 18 August 1836, said that the natives were demanding five or six Negro heads of tobacco for their potatoes,13 and the final entry on 26 September 1836 said:

Went to Pakanae yesterday and preached to the English families in the neighbourhood…. Met with some natives who have imbibed Jewish sentiments, and endeavoured to reason them out of their superstitions in vain. Some of them profess to be the followers of a man called Papaurihiia [sic], who had fallen in with some Jews and learnt juggling &c. and on this account he is regarded as a wonderful man, many are led as may be by his proceedings.14

In the absence of the opportunity to check the original text, I have taken Ormond Wilson’s citations at face value and coupled them with other statements from Woon’s
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12 Ibid, 14 August 1836.
13 Ibid, 18 August 1836.
14 Ibid, 26 September 1836.
journal to interpret the meaning of the Wesleyan’s comments about Papahurihia and his followers.

The other piece of evidence I was unable to locate is that attributed to the CMS missionary John King. Ormond Wilson said that John King of Te Puna had written to the London CMS on 3 December 1834 and said that some of the natives:

have appointed *Saturday* for their *sabbath* telling us that we are under a mistake, for *saturday* is the ancient *sabbath* and that the Apostles turned Monday into a sabbath for us &c. they hoist a flag on a pole, pay little or no respect to the *day*, but at night a few assemble together (as the workers of darkness chooses darkness) their priest performs his foolish ceremonies, and mixes portions of the Holy Scriptures which they have learned with their old superstitions, which causes much dispute and inquiry among themselves, he tells them that the spirits of the departed tell him all about heaven and hell &c and many wonderful tales – 15

The references listed at the end of Wilson’s article indicate that he located John King’s letter on the CMS microfilm in the Alexander Turnbull Library. 16 I was unable to find the original in the Hocken Library, 17 but discovered a copy attributed to King in the *Missionary Register* 1836. 18 Nevertheless, I have chosen to treat that rendition of the letter with caution in face of evidence that entries about Papahurihia attributed to the Reverend Henry Williams 19 and William Wade 20 appear to have been modified by the editors of the *Missionary Register*. Finally, the names Papahurihia and Te Atua Wera are used interchangeably throughout this thesis to refer to the same person and Māori words used by other authors have been quoted as they appear in the original text. 21

---

15 John King to CMS, 3 December 1834, ibid, p. 475.
17 John King, Letters & Journals, 1819-1853, MS-0073, HL.
The thesis comprises four chapters. The first focuses on the historiography and the historians and anthropologists who have written about Papahurihia and consists of five sections. Section A outlines what we think we know about Papahurihia. It concentrates on the minutiae in the prevailing historiography and the arguments advanced by Ormond Wilson and Judith Binney in their articles in the *Journal of the Polynesian Society* in 1965, 1966 and 2007. It also highlights the points on which they and other writers have concurred and diverged.

Section B focuses on the theories and models that have underpinned the literature on Papahurihia. It looks at the paradigms of fatal impact and Māori agency, as well as the theory of the middle ground and Robin Fisher’s assertion that Henry Williams of the CMS was the pivotal agent of change in the evangelization of Māori in the Bay of Islands in the 1830s. The section argues that Harrison Wright’s 1959 thesis on the fatal impact of European contact on Māori has been a pervasive influence on the prevailing interpretation of Papahurihia as a nativistic cult that arose in opposition to the missionaries and their glad tidings.

Section C shows how certain people and ideas have shaped our perception of Papahurihia. It also reveals several limitations in the methodologies adopted by Ormond Wilson and Judith Binney to construct their narratives in the 1960s. It argues that the written texts include oral histories and knowledge of Papahurihia derived by psychic means. It also asserts that Binney’s failure to check the veracity of Wilson’s sources in 1966 has contributed to the historical distortion of his character.

Section D concentrates on Judith Binney’s perception of Papahurihia as the founder of a Pacific millennial cult. It explores the relationships that existed between historians at the University of Auckland and Pacific historians at Australian National University in Canberra in the 1960s and the flow of ideas between the two. The section argues that Niel Gunson’s research on the Mamaia cult of Tahiti was a cogent influence on Binney’s interpretation of Papahurihia as a visionary heresy and Oceanic cult akin to Mamaia, the Siovili cult of Samoa and the Hulumanu in Hawaii.

Section E traces Papahurihia’s evolution into international literature. It argues that once the articles written by Wilson and Binney were included in recommended reading lists in anthropological journals, Papahurihia became an indigenous prophet
and founder of a millennial cult that pushed back against the imperial ambitions of Great Britain.

Chapters Two and Three are devoted to a microanalysis of the primary sources cited by Ormond Wilson and Judith Binney in the footnotes to their articles in the Journal of the Polynesian Society. Where possible, their evidence is checked against the archival sources before being placed in the appropriate social and intellectual context. In general, the texts of the CMS missionaries in the Bay of Islands are reinterpreted within the Protestant evangelical paradigm. The testimony of the Roman Catholic missionaries is set against the backdrop of animosity that prevailed between the Protestant and Catholic sects and the priests’ assertion that the Roman Church was the true church and the trunk of the tree. In contrast, the evidence of the Wesleyan missionaries and European settlers is used to provide descriptions of how Papahurihia behaved.

Section F uses cogent excerpts from the work of Sarah Dingle, J. F. C. Harrison and W. H. Oliver to explain how the Protestant evangelicals interpreted the world and the customs and beliefs of the Māori people in the 1830s. It draws on letters written by Richard Davis of the CMS in the Bay of Islands to illustrate the veracity of their arguments and show that he was a premillennialist who believed he was living in the last days foretold in the Book of Revelation. The section argues that the comments that the Protestant evangelicals made about Papahurihia were shaped by theology and biblical prophecy and that their textual evidence on him should be reinterpreted from within the Protestant evangelical paradigm.

Section G concentrates on the main arguments in the historiography: namely, that Papahurihia founded a syncretistic doctrine, that he observed a Saturday Sabbath and that his followers identified as Jews. It scrutinizes the letters and journals of Richard Davis, Henry Williams, William Wade and Charles Baker of the CMS in the Bay of Islands and the journal of William Woon from the WMS at Pākanae on the Hokianga. The section argues that when the evidence is re-examined in theological context, the assertions that Papahurihia founded a syncretistic doctrine, that he observed a Saturday Sabbath and that his followers identified as Jews, fail.

Section H focuses on Papahurihia’s debate with the Reverend William White at Waimā in April 1835 and his role in Kaitoke’s murder of two Wesleyan Māori
converts in January 1837. It argues that Wesleyan Māori called Papahurihia the ‘Atua Wera’ (‘the hot god’ Satan) when he claimed equality with Jesus Christ. It also argues that Papahurihia was not involved in Kaitoke’s murders of Matthew and Richmond and that the war between Kaitoke and Nene was over Kaitoke’s land at Mata, which Wesleyan Māori had sold to William White.

Section I concentrates on a drawing of two trees attributed to Papahurihia by Father Servant of the Roman Catholic mission. It also explores the testimony of European observers who said that Papahurihia consulted the spirits of the dead and professed to control a magnificent comet that appeared in the sky over Kohukohu in March 1843. The section argues that the drawing was crafted in reply to Revelation 21:8, which condemned sorcerers and idolaters to the lake that burns with fire and brimstone. It further argues that Papahurihia’s version of the Tree of the True Church invoked the protection of his familiar spirit and reassured the unconverted chiefs of their place in Te Hunga Atua after death. Finally, the section argues that Papahurihia was a waka or medium of the Māori gods and used incantations that were only intelligible to tohunga.

Chapter Three comprises two sections. Section J centres on Papahurihia’s role as Heke’s tohunga during the Northern war from 1845 to 1846. It argues that Papahurihia forecast the British defeats at Lake Ōmapere and Ōhaeawai and used the rahurahu from the battlefield at Ōhaeawai in ritenga designed to ensure the victory of Heke’s allies. Finally, the section argues that Papahurihia did not built a council chamber for the chiefs inside the pā at Ōhaeawai and that a panel of Saint Patrick driving the snakes from Ireland was not rescued from a Nākahi chapel during the war and entrusted to one of Heke’s warriors for safekeeping.

Section K focuses on Judith Binney’s 2007 article on Papahurihia. It tests her arguments that his name was originally Pukerenga and that he did not flee to the Hokianga until 1837 after the last attack on Pōmare’s pā at Ōtuīhu. It also investigates her claim that two prophets of the Nākahi cult lived on the Hokianga in 1847 and that a drawing of a flying serpent from 1855 is evidence of the emergence of a new cult in the Bay of Islands. The section argues that Pukerenga of Ōhaeawai and Papahurihia of Ōmanaia were not the same man and that Papahurihia was not involved in the war for possession of Kororāreka in April 1837. It also argues that Māori called the old man
Nākahi (Satan) because he believed that his dream was an omen and that Mohi Tawhai was in danger of drowning. Finally, the section asserts that although several tohunga in the Bay of Islands invoked the flying serpent to protect unconverted Māori from the seven last plagues that threatened the world, the drawing called the “Book of the Dragon” is not evidence of the emergence of a new sect.

Chapter Four comprises three sections. Section L argues that in the nineteenth-century Papahurihia and other Māori based their calendar on the moon and had never heard of Sunday or the Sabbath day. It also argues that the missionaries and Europeans interpreted the behaviour of Papahurihia and his followers through their own understanding of time and made assumptions about what they were doing.

Section M surveys the official reports on Papahurihia between his appointment to the Hokianga rūnanga in 1862 and his death at Ōmanaia in November 1875. It argues that Papahurihia’s baptism into the Wesleyan Methodist Church in 1856 did not preclude him from continuing to operate as a tohunga. It also asserts that his adoption of the name ‘Penetana’ coincided with his appointment to the Native Land Court and emulated the surname of Chief Judge Francis Dart Fenton (Penetane).

Finally, Section N focuses on the assertion that Hōne Toia revived Papahurihia’s teachings during the Dog-Tax War at Waimā in the 1890s. It uses newspaper reports to reveal how the words rēwera (devils), kēhua (ghosts) and whiowhio (whistlers) were used by Waimā Māori at the time and argues that their description of Hōne Toia and his group as ‘Nākahi’ was simply intended to imply that their militancy was the work of Satan.
Chapter One: Historians, Anthropologists and Historiography

This chapter of the thesis focuses on the way that Papahurihia has been perceived by anthropologists and historians in New Zealand and overseas and is organised into five sections. Section A canvases the minutiae in the secondary literature and acts as an introduction to the prevailing scholarly argument on Papahurihia. Section B positions the historical writing on Papahurihia in the literature on the Māori response to Christianity in the Bay of Islands in the 1830s and demonstrates the pervasive influence of Harrison Wright’s thesis on early contact between Māori and Europeans and the ubiquity of the paradigm of fatal impact. Section C focuses on some of the people and ideas that have influenced the historiography including Ruth Ross, Jean Irvine and the poet Kendrick Smithyman, who published his research in nearly three hundred poems in *Atua Wera*. Section D touches on the influence of Keith Sinclair. However, its principal focus is on the work of the Pacific historians at Australian National University in Canberra and in particular, Niel Gunson’s influence on Judith Binney’s work on Thomas Kendall and Papahurihia. Finally, Section E traces Papahurihia’s evolution into Pacific historiography and his manifestation as an indigenous prophet and founder of a millennial cult that opposed the imperial ambitions of Great Britain.
Section A: Papahurihia in Minutiae

This section concentrates on the details in the prevailing literature on Papahurihia and is intended to familiarize the reader with the historiography. It outlines the arguments advanced by Ormond Wilson and Judith Binney in their articles on Papahurihia in the *Journal of the Polynesian Society* in 1965, 1966 and 2007 and the points on which they and other writers have concurred and diverged. It concludes that, with the exception of debate about the meaning of the words ‘Papahurihia’ and ‘Te Atua Wera’ and the origin of the word ‘Nākahi’, historians have concurred that Papahurihia was a prophet and founder of a syncretistic religion. It also concludes that, with the exception of Paul Moon’s work on the Matarahurahu cult of the snake, historians have not offered a new interpretation of Papahurihia and the Nākahi cult in five decades.

Historians have portrayed Papahurihia as the first Māori prophet and founder of a syncretistic religion that combined elements of Judaic and Christian theology with Māori beliefs.¹ They have also identified him as a chief from Rangihoua in the Bay of Islands² whom the lay settler John King educated in the CMS mission school.³ There is also a contention that his original name was Pukerenga.⁴ Pukerenga is said to have taken the name of his god, Papahurihia, and emerged as a religious leader in the Bay of Islands in 1833.⁵ His advent has been attributed to missionary preaching and the timing of his appearance has been coupled with the marked increase in Māori
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⁵ Ormond Wilson, *JPS*, 1965, p. 481.
baptisms in the 1830s, which anthropologists and historians have characterized as a period of cultural confusion, depression and apathy because of European contact.6

Contextualized thus within the paradigm of fatal impact, historians have portrayed Papahurihia as an adjustment cult that rejected Christianity and was hostile to the missionaries.7 The cult has also been depicted as nationalistic, nativistic and messianic and an attempt by Māori to reassert their independence against the European intruders.8 Thus, Papahurihia has been described as analogous to the Mamaia cult of Tahiti, the Siovili cult of Samoa and the Hulumanu sect in Hawaii.9 He has also been portrayed as the forerunner to the Pai Mārire or Hauhau sect that was founded by Te Ua Haumēne of Taranaki.10

The word ‘Papahurihia’ has been translated into English as ‘one who relates wonders’ and ‘He who relates wonders’.11 There is a contention that his naming originated from the Māori word ‘papa’ meaning ‘seer’ or ‘medium’.12 However, there is also an assertion that Papa was the Māori word for ‘Pope’ and that Papahurihia meant ‘turned around’ to the Pope or Roman Catholic Church.13 Finally, the word ‘Papahurihia’ has been linked to the Māori Creation Myth, the contention being that after Rangi Rūnui, the

13 William Cotton, Journal, Saturday 9 November 1844, VIII, microfilm 00-067-00-069, Reel 665/1, p. 169, AUL.
Sky Father, had been separated from Papatūānuku, the Earth Mother, it was necessary for their children to ‘hurihia’ or turn Papa over in order to prevent her from seeing and grieving for her husband.  

Papahurihia was said to have changed his name to Te Atua Wera when he moved to the Hokianga in 1834. The appellation ‘Te Atua Wera’ has been variously translated as the Red God, the Hot God, the Burning God and the Fiery God. However, the latter rendition has tended to prevail and it has been suggested that Papahurihia’s selection of the name ‘Te Atua Wera’ was probably prompted by his awareness of the fiery second coming – ‘God gave Noah the rainbow sign, No more water, the fire next time!’ There is also a claim that ‘whiowhio’ or ‘whistle’ was another name for Papahurihia, the word signifying the manner in which he communicated with Nākahi and the spirits of the dead.

Nākahi is commonly understood to have been the serpent in the Garden of Eden in Genesis 3:1. He is said to have visited Papahurihia in a dream and commanded that he be worshipped. However, ‘Nākahi’ is not a Māori word and there is a general consensus amongst historians that the term Nākahi probably originated in 1827, when Protestant evangelicals from the CMS in the Bay of Islands translated the Eden story into the Māori language. Some commentators have argued that the word Nākahi was

---

17 Ibid, p. 323; Bronwyn Elsmore, 1985, p. 97, fn. 8 & 1989, p. 40, fn. 12. Elsmore said that this was the traditional method in which the Māori atua communicated with man.
founded on the Hebrew word ‘Nahash’ or ‘Nachash’, whilst others have claimed that the term Nākahi was simply a transliteration of the English word ‘snake’.

Some historians have drawn a parallel between Nākahi and the ngārara or lizard of death. Others have suggested that the serpent in the Garden of Eden appealed to Northern Māori because it fitted in with and strengthened their customary beliefs, the chattering or laughing of the kākāriki or green lizard being regarded as an omen of death amongst the Ngāpuhi tribe. At the same time, there is a contention that in the hands of Papahurihia, the ngārara or lizard of death became Nākahi, the lizard of life, just as in the brazen serpent on the rod that was lifted up in the desert by Moses in John 3:14-15.

The Nākahi doctrine is said to have included some aspects of Christian teaching, particularly the tenets of the Old Testament. It is commonly asserted that Papahurihia observed a Saturday Sabbath and that his followers were called ‘Hurai’ or ‘Jews’. One commentator has suggested that Māori prophets like Papahurihia identified with the Israelites in a bid ‘to unify the tribes against their common oppressor’ (particularly after the land was surveyed and occupied by military settlers). Another has claimed that Māori prophets were drawn to the promises in the

---

22 James Cowan, The Maori Yesterday and To-day, Wellington: Whitcombe & Tombs, 1930, p. 68; Phillip Parkinson, Brief of Evidence to the Waitangi Tribunal on behalf of Crown Law, 8 September 2010, Wai 1040, Te Paparahu o Te Raki (Northland Inquiry), p. 36, fn. 36; Paul Moon, TK, 2011, p. 121.
23 Judith Binney, JPS, 1966, p. 327; Bronwyn Elsmore, 1989, p. 96. Binney said that the ngārara or lizard was usually associated with death. Elsmore said that although the snake was unknown to Māori its nearest equivalent was the ngārara or lizard that ‘already held some awesome significance as it was associated with death’.
25 Judith Binney, JPS, 1966, p. 326; Bronwyn Elsmore, 1985, p. 97. Elsmore suggested that Māori saw the Nākahi in Genesis 3:1 and John 3:14-15 as the same being. She also suggested that Papahurihia had taken the latter verse quite literally and believed that the serpent was the protector and healer of the people and that those who believed in Nākahi would not die. In contrast, Paul Moon maintained that Nākahi was the symbol of the snake in the Book of Numbers. It emphasized the power of the relationship between Moses and God and indicated that Moses was able to reassert his leadership amongst the Israelites in the desert when he lifted the brazen serpent on the rod. Bronwyn Elsmore, 1989, p. 38; Paul Moon, TK, 2011, p. 125.
Old Testament because they saw themselves as ‘desolate and lost in their own land’ and sought the recovery and preservation of themselves and their land ‘as the children of Israel, the chosen people’. 29

There is an assertion that Papahurihia ‘drew heavily on Catholic imagery’. 30 The reference pertains to the manuscript of Father Servant of the Roman Catholic Mission, who had arrived on the Hokianga with Bishop Pompallier in 1838. In his treatise, Servant said that Papahurihia had reassured the unconverted chiefs that they had nothing to fear from their rejection of Christianity. Servant also attributed to Papahurihia, a sketch that showed the missionaries suspended in prayer at the end of a curved or ‘Judgement Tree’ above the fires of hell. He said that Papahurihia had claimed that Nākahi would appear and stoke the flames beneath the heretics. He also said that Papahurihia had promised that the unconverted chiefs would climb the adjacent tree called ‘Aotea’, which was straight and touched the sky. 31 Judith Binney drew a parallel between the straight tree and the pōhutukawa tree at Te Rerenga Wairua, 32 and after translating the word ‘aotea’ as ‘white cloud’, suggested that Papahurihia had used the word ‘in the sense of heaven’. 33

Historians have acknowledged the persistence of Māori customary elements in the Nākahi doctrine. Nākahi is said to have appeared to Te Atua Wera in the form of a comet. 34 At the same time, there is conflicting evidence that Māori described a brilliant comet that appeared near Kākāriki pā in the Bay of Islands in the 1830s as

29 Selwyn Katene, 2013, p. 57. Judith Binney said that Papahurihia believed that Māori were the descendants of the lost tribes of Israel and the ‘chosen people’ to whom God would reveal himself. Judith Binney, JPS, 1966, p. 326. Bronwyn Elsmore suggested that the belief that Nākahi would turn aside the rockets fired by the British during the Northern war could have been based on Papahurihia’s knowledge of the protection that was given by Yahweh to the chosen people during their trek to the Promised Land. Bronwyn Elsmore, 1985, p. 97 & 1989, p. 37.


32 Ngāpuhi believed that Cape Rēinga, at the top of the North Island, was the leaping off place of the wairua (soul) after death. In the period in question, a pōhutukawa tree grew on the side of the precipice from which tendrils or branches flowed downward. They were regarded as the ‘ake’ or ladder by which the wairua descended. Seaweed floating on the ocean below was believed to be the door through which the wairua entered after it had descended by the ake. The place the wairua entered was called Aotea. See William Gilbert Puckey, Journal, 4 December 1834-12 December 1834, transcript, pp. 15-20, SP-COL-NZSP 266.3 P98, ACL.


'the Ngakahi of the Europeans’ and ‘would protect them’.

There is a contention that by 1840, Nākahi had become the familiar spirit of all tohunga in the Bay of Islands and Hokianga. Thus, two prophets of the Nākahi cult are said to have lived on the Hokianga in 1847 – a young man in his early 30s named Papahurihia or Te Atua Wera and an old man named Nākahi or ‘Serpent’, who dreamt that Mohi Tāwhai was in danger of drowning and sketched his dream onto a rock.

Nākahi is said to have appeared at a séance held at Ōmanaia before Heke went into battle against the British in 1845. On that occasion, Nākahi communicated with Papahurihia in whistling, whispering sounds and elucidated the outcome of the conflict. Nākahi has also been credited with blowing aside the cannonballs fired by the British. Likewise, when Heke was wounded at Te Ahuahu, Papahurihia rendered his bearers invisible so they could leave the battlefield in safety. There is also a claim that a panel of Saint Patrick driving the snakes from Ireland was rescued from a Nākahi chapel and entrusted to one of Heke’s warriors for safekeeping. Finally, Papahurihia is reported to have founded a whare wānanga or school of learning on the Hokianga, where he acted as tohunga to the Kotahitanga movement founded by Āperahama Taonui. There is also an assertion that the Nākahi movement reasserted itself at Waimā in 1898, when Hōne Toia invoked Papahurihia’s assistance as a familiar spirit during the Dog-Tax War and the cult became known as the ‘Blackout’.

In closing, with the exception of debate about the meaning of the words ‘Papahurihia’ and ‘Te Atua Wera’ and the origin of the word ‘Nākahi’, historians have concurred that Papahurihia was a Māori prophet and founder of a syncretistic religion which combined aspects of Judaic and Christian theology with Māori beliefs. Moreover, with the exception of Paul Moon’s work on the Matarahurahu cult of the snake, historians have not offered a new interpretation of Papahurihia and the Nākahi cult in

37 Ibid, pp. 312-4.
40 Jean Irvine to Ruth Ross, Rawene, 16 August 1962 & 10 October 1965, MS-94/23 (10), AML.
five decades. However, the core tenets in the prevailing historiography were fashioned in the 1960s and arose in the wake of Harrison Wright’s thesis on the fatal impact of early European contact on Māori in the Bay of Islands. The next section will look at the pervasive nature of Wright’s research and how the paradigm of fatal impact that underpinned it has continued to influence how Papahirihia has been interpreted by successive generations of historians.
Section B: New Zealand Historiography

The early historical writing on Papahurihia was positioned within a wider literature on the Māori response to Christianity in the Bay of Islands in the 1830s. This section looks at the influence of Harrison Wright’s 1959 thesis on the fatal impact of Europeans on Māori and the polemical debate it provoked between J. M. R. Owens and Judith Binney in the 1960s. It also explores the influence of the theories of Māori agency and the middle ground, as well as the assertion that Henry Williams of the CMS was the pivotal agent of change in the evangelization of Māori in the Bay of Islands in the 1830s. The section concludes that even though the paradigm of fatal impact was discredited, the majority of historians continued to interpret Papahurihia as an anti-missionary cult that arose in response to the adverse effects of European contact on Māori and in resistance to the advent of Protestant evangelical doctrine.

In the extensive literature on the Māori response to Christianity in the Bay of Islands, the year 1830 has been identified as marking the ‘breakthrough’ in CMS endeavours to introduce Christian ideas into Māori society. Whilst less voluminous, the literature on Papahurihia has reinforced that argument. Described as the first Māori prophet and founder of a syncretistic religion that mixed elements of Judaic and Christian theology with Māori beliefs, Papahurihia has been cited as concrete evidence of the missionary breakthrough and the partial adoption of Christian ideas by Māori.

A pivotal theme in the literature on Māori and Christianity is the paradigm of fatal impact. The genesis of the debate was the dissertation of Harrison Wright. A Fulbright scholar from Harvard who researched his Master’s thesis in New Zealand, Wright was mentored by Professor Henry Devenish Skinner, who held the first chair in anthropology at Otago University and in Australasia. Skinner was also assistant

---

1 Harrison Wright, New Zealand, 1769-1840: Early Years of Western Contact, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1959.
4 Harrison Wright, p. viii. Peter Lineham described the publication of Wright’s thesis as ‘a most important reinterpretation of the mission as a destruction of Maori society’. He also said that ‘the lines of the debate were formed’ by the polemical discourse between John Owens, an expert on the Wesleyan mission, and Judith Binney. Peter Lineham, Introduction, Te Rongopai 1814 ‘Takoto te pai!’ Bicentenary reflections on Christian beginnings in Aotearoa New Zealand, by Allan Davidson, Stuart Lange, Peter Lineham & Adrienne Puckey (eds.), Auckland: General Synod Office, “Tuia”, of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2014, pp. 13-14.
curator (ethnology) at Otago Museum and librarian at the Hocken Library.\textsuperscript{5} The American cultural anthropologist Alfred Kroeber and Elsdon Best, whom he described as ‘the great ethnographer’, also influenced Wright.\textsuperscript{6} Finally, one of Harrison Wright’s supervisors was the renowned anthropologist Felix Maxwell Keesing of Stanford University, who had argued that European contact brought conflict and rapid change and like many people in the Pacific, the Māori people were facing extinction.\textsuperscript{7}

Harrison Wright’s thesis focused on the relationship between Europeans and Māori in the Bay of Islands to 1840. He argued that Europeans were agents of change in Māori society and that Māori depopulation had commenced after contact in 1769. Like Keesing, Wright identified the period from 1830 onward as one of marked and rapid change and argued that sickness and death, the constant threat of warfare and the inability of Māori to regulate their affairs by traditional means caused many to experience ‘cultural confusion’ and ‘mental disorganization’. This he argued had paved the way for the first Māori conversions to Christianity in the Bay of Islands in the 1830s.\textsuperscript{8}

Wright maintained that the first Māori converts to Christianity were predominantly local slaves and prisoners of war and attributed the spread of Christianity to their repatriation as religious teachers amongst their own tribes. However, Wright asserted that Māori were more enthusiastic about literacy than Christianity. He also suggested that they had thought of Christianity in Māori terms and vested the Bible with supernatural properties.

Based on reports by the CMS missionary William Yate and the trader Joel Polack, Harrison Wright described Papahurihia as a prophet cult that had ‘aspects of a nativistic revival’. He dated the opposition of the chiefs and tohunga in the Bay of Islands to the 1830s. He also observed that Papahurihia’s followers had shown greater hostility toward Christian Māori than their unconverted countrymen. Nevertheless, although Harrison Wright was convinced, that Papahurihia was ‘the confused

\textsuperscript{6} Harrison Wright, 1959, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{8} Harrison Wright, 1959, p. 147.
intermingling of the two systems of thought’; he was unable to decide between two possible explanations. The first was that mission-educated Māori had perverted Christianity by confusing it with Māori cosmology. The alternative was that unconverted Māori had tried to find additional strength for their existing beliefs in Christianity.\(^9\)

Wright’s work was the genesis of the polemical debate between Massey University’s John Owens and Judith Binney of the University of Auckland. Owens’ article was based on his doctoral research on the history of the Wesleyan Methodist mission on the Hokianga to 1840.\(^10\) He challenged the anthropological premise that social disintegration was a prerequisite to conversion and rejected Wright’s assertion that there had been a Māori conversion to Christianity in the 1830s. Owens objected to the portrayal of Māori as ‘an identical mass reacting in the same way all over New Zealand’. He argued that there had been a variety of Māori responses to Christianity in every period. He also argued that there was a need to distinguish between conversion in the theological sense and the general diffusion of Christian ideas.

John Owens maintained that Māori leadership had been crucial to the spread of Christianity. He pointed to the influence of the Wesleyan Māori converts Simon Peter Mating and Tāmati Wāka Nene on the Hokianga and agreed that Hongi Hika had delayed the influence of the CMS in the Bay of Islands. However, he pointed out that if traditional leaders had continued to play that key role, it weakened Wright’s argument for the breakdown of Māori society. In contrast, Owens concurred that the Māori interpretation of Christianity was very different from missionary expectations and whilst he acknowledged the agency of Māori in disseminating Christian ideas, he concluded that the spread of Christianity was very largely a result of increasing Māori literacy. Finally, Owens, who saw Papahurihia as an adjustment cult, said that if Christian ideas were principally spread by Māori teachers and through the written word, ‘the contrast between Māori cult and Māori Christianity may not be so considerable’\(^11\).

---

\(^9\) Ibid, p. 178.
In reply, Judith Binney stressed that anthropologists had agreed that a native society must undergo social dislocation before it was ready for conversion. She also said that anthropologists had identified a common pattern in the nineteenth-century missions in the Pacific and outlined three phases - an initial period in which the missionaries appeared to make little impact, a second period in which the missionaries often succumbed to the indigenous culture and a third and ‘relatively sudden breakthrough’ in which the resistance of the indigenous people crumbled quite markedly. Binney suggested that this ‘breakthrough’ period was characterized by an increased attendance at school and divine services and correlated it with the simultaneous emergence of Papahurihia – the significance of which she attributed to the partial absorption of Christian ideas by Māori.12

Wright’s thesis continued to stimulate debate about the credence of the paradigm of fatal impact. In 1970 Lila Hamilton, a doctoral student at the University of Otago, questioned whether Māori had ever wanted missionaries for missionary reasons. She suggested that the amount of cultural confusion experienced by Māori had been much exaggerated. She also noted the lack of agency experienced by Māori living in the mission settlements and argued that mission Māori had been forced to attend school and divine services by the missionaries and that pecuniary advantages had accrued to the chiefs who had placed them there.13

James Belich entered the fray in 1996. He argued that fatal impact thinking had become a force in itself. He also observed that the notion that Māori were a dying race had persisted well into the 1930s, in spite of census evidence to the contrary. Finally, Belich cautioned against accepting missionary accounts of their own success and suggested that they and other Europeans had seen what they expected to see.14

The nineteenth-century notion of fatal impact was revisited in 2008 by historical archaeologist Angela Middleton. She said that although the paradigm had been common in the Pacific in the nineteenth-century it had subsequently been

---

Moreover, in her work on the Te Puna mission station, Middleton consulted Ngāti Torehine and the descendants of Wharepoaka and Waikato, who had acted as patrons of the Rangihoua and Te Puna stations. Her methodology contrasted markedly with that of Judith Binney who said that, when she was writing her Master’s thesis on Thomas Kendall her supervisor Keith Sinclair had told her, ‘There’s no point in going up to the Bay of Islands, there’ll be nothing left but muddled memories, and elaborated myths’.16

Forty years on religious historian, Peter Lineham shifted the focus of inquiry. He correlated the spike in Māori baptisms in the Bay of Islands in the 1830s with the increasing pressure on the CMS missionaries to prove that their labours had not been in vain. He also suggested that the evangelicals’ emphasis on biblical translation was a consequence of their lack of Māori conversions.17 Lineham’s scepticism reiterated that of J. M. R. Owens, who had observed that the Wesleyans on the Hokianga had only begun to claim success after they had discovered that their London Society was thinking about giving up on Māori as irredeemable. More revealing however was Lineham’s biographical index of Māori agents of the CMS, which identified the tribal affiliation of the early Māori converts and revealed that none came from the patron tribes of the CMS in the Bay of Islands.18

Kerry Howe, who was a student of Judith Binney, noted that Harrison Wright’s thesis had encouraged many students at the University of Auckland to test his ‘argument about fatal impact’, including himself and Robin Fisher.19 Howe’s research on the Māori response to Christianity in the Waikato region and Raeburn Lange’s work on indigenous agents of change confirmed that men redeemed from slavery by the

18 Peter Lineham, Appendix: Biographical Index of Church Missionary Society Workers (including Maori Clergy who were Agents of the CMS), in Robert Glen (ed.), 1992, pp. 193-219.
missionaries, educated in the mission schools and repatriated as religious teachers amongst their own tribes had spread Christian ideas south of the Bay of Islands.20

The work of Kerry Howe and Raeburn Lange built on that of Bryan Smith, whose Master’s research had exposed the superficial nature of Christianity amongst Waikato Māori. It also complemented that of Alan Gordon, whose dissertation had revealed the Reverend Octavius Hadfield’s misgivings about the effect of missionaries on Māori.21

In a similar vein of scepticism and using the marks of illiterate Māori on Te Tiriti o Waitangi to make his point, D. F. McKenzie argued that missionary reports of Māori literacy had been overstated.22 Likewise, research by Katherine Rountree and Tania Fitzgerald focused on the response of Māori women in the Bay of Islands and found evidence of their defiance in the face of attempts by Marianne and Jane Williams to civilize and domesticate them.23 Moewaka Callaghan, who focused on Māori women in the Wairoa area, also argued that their insistence on wearing the moko kauae or chin tattoo was ‘clear evidence of the value that Māori women placed on tradition and their constant subversion of missionary endeavours’.24

Equally prevalent in the historiography on the Māori response to Christianity, is the idea that the turning point in the mission’s history can be attributed to the arrival of the Reverend Henry Williams - his reversal of Marsden’s ‘civilization first’ policy and his emphasis on literacy and the Bible as the Māori pathway to conversion. Various authors have also portrayed him as a peacemaker to the tribes who engendered the respect of the Māori people and gained mana in the Māori world. Those arguments are best exemplified in the Master’s thesis of Robin Fisher. He

---

claimed that Harrison Wright had dismissed Henry Williams as ‘no more effective than the earlier missionaries’. He also said that students of the period had paid only cursory attention to Williams and expressed their opinions without examining the impact of his leadership in any detail. Finally, Fisher acknowledged that his purpose was to re-emphasize the role of Henry Williams, whom he described as ‘the most important personality among the CMS missionaries from 1823 to 1840’. However, the most recent proponent of that view is Keith Newman who in *Bible and Treaty* maintained that Te Tiriti o Waitangi would not have been signed were it not for Henry Williams and the missionaries. Cast in a supporting role are biographies that extol the virtues of other missionaries and local mission histories that focus on their courage and the love of the Māori people for them.

Finally, the notion of the middle ground shaped Grant Phillipson’s work in *Te Kerikeri 1770-1850: The Meeting Pool*. Based on Richard White’s history of the Great Lakes region of North America, he argued that Māori and missionaries had met on the middle ground where they compromised to get along and ‘miscommunicated more than they communicated’. Phillipson stated that this ‘balance of power’ left ‘little room for ‘fatal impact’ theories’. He also said that it was no longer possible ‘to write the history of the CMS mission in terms of instant conversion, mass extinction and the destruction of Māori religion, culture and social organisation’.

Phillipson’s chapter in *Te Kerikeri* was informed by his exploratory overview of the Bay of Islands in 2005. It was commissioned by the Crown Forestry Rental Trust and assessed the ‘degree to which Māori society and culture experienced fundamental change’ between 1793 and 1853. Historians employed by the Crown had argued that Māori in the Bay of Islands ‘had undergone fundamental shifts in their culture and social practices before 1840’. They had also argued that Ngāpuhi had ‘understood what Europeans meant by land sales, and adopted that understanding as their own’. In

---

contrast, Phillipson had argued that Ngāpuhi had ‘continued to govern themselves largely through their own institutions and customary law, both before and after 1840’. He had also argued that that was still the case in 1869.\textsuperscript{30}

In his analysis of the exchange of religious ideas in \textit{Te Kerikeri}, Grant Phillipson said that Māori and Europeans had ‘modified their customs and behaviour to make the relationship work’.\textsuperscript{31} However, he also said that there had been fundamental changes to Māori religion in the 1830s and that the process of conversion to Christianity in the Bay of Islands had become ‘a relative flood by the late 1830s’.\textsuperscript{32} Nevertheless, he qualified his assertion by saying:

Even so, almost all historians agree that the actual process of conversion to Christianity involved the combination of Christian, Judaic, and indigenous beliefs and practices into a uniquely Maori Christianity. Sometimes, this took the form of rejection of the missionaries and their institutions of religion, as with adjustment cults like Papahurihia.\textsuperscript{33}

In closing, even though the paradigm of fatal impact was discredited, the majority of historians continued to interpret Papahurihia as an anti-missionary cult that arose in response to the adverse effects of European contact on Māori and in opposition to Christianity. However, Wright’s ideas are not the only ones that shaped the prevailing literature and the next section will look at some of the limitations in the methodologies adopted by Ormond Wilson and Judith Binney in the 1960s. It will also touch on some of the people, oral histories and anecdotal evidence that have influenced the historiography on Papahurihia.

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid, pp. 47-8.
\textsuperscript{31} Grant Phillipson, Religion and Land: the Church Missionary Society Station at Kerikeri, 1819-1850, \textit{Te Kerikeri 1770-1850: The Meeting Pool}, by Judith Binney (ed.), p. 70
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid, p. 77.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid, p. 78.
Section C: New Zealand Historians

This section focuses on some of the weaknesses in the methodologies adopted by Ormond Wilson and Judith Binney to construct their narratives on Papahurihia in the 1960s. It also explores some of the people and ideas that have influenced the way we see him today. The methodology uses letters and personal papers to reveal private discussions between Ruth Ross, Ormond Wilson, Judith Binney and Jean Irvine and to show how oral histories have been incorporated into academic texts and knowledge of Papahurihia derived by psychic means has been treated as authoritative. The section concludes that a number of shortcomings characterize the historiography on Papahurihia and that Binney’s failure to check the veracity of Wilson’s sources and undertake any primary research for her article on Papahurihia in 1966 has contributed to the historical distortion of his character.

Ormond Wilson’s article on Papahurihia was published in 1965 in the *Journal of the Polynesian Society*. It concentrated on the decade from 1833 and attempted to draw together all the written evidence on Papahurihia from European records. In contrast, Judith Binney’s article offered an interpretation of that evidence and was published in the same journal in 1966. Binney’s article also drew on texts from the nineteenth and twentieth-centuries by authors like William Yate, Frederick Maning and John Webster, as well as oral histories from local Hokianga sources. They included Pat Hohepa, a student of anthropology who wrote his Master’s thesis on his home community of Waimā, Jean Irvine of Rāwene on the Hokianga and Waldo Heap, another local who had compiled the genealogies of the Waimā community from the minute books of the Native Land Court. Other commentators whose accounts of Papahurihia incorporated oral evidence include James Cowan, Jack Lee, Kendrick Smithyman, and Paul Moon.

---

2 Waldo Arthur Heap (1907-1986) Collection, MS 94/31 & MS 1325, AML. Waldo Heap also collaborated with Jack Lee to collect Ngāpuhi genealogies. See MS 94/30, AML.
Ruth Ross was an early influence on the work of Ormond Wilson and Judith Binney. In 1960, when Binney was still an undergraduate student at the University of Auckland, Ross had written to A. H. McLintock and suggested that Papahurihia and Āperahama Taonui should be included in the proposed *An Encyclopedia of New Zealand*. Ross, whose husband Malcolm was a teacher with the Māori School Service at Motukiro, said that both men had ‘cast long shadows in Hokianga’ and that the children there still recounted Āperahama Taonui’s prophecies in song. Ruth Ross told Judith Binney that she had taken the initiative and sent McLintock a draft biography on Āperahama Taonui in which, by her own admission, she had ‘cleverly included’ a paragraph on Papahurihia.⁷

A number of shortcomings characterized the paragraph that Ruth Ross wrote on Papahurihia. It was written before the Reverend Lawrence Rogers had edited the *Early Journals* of Henry Williams for publication in 1961. Ross also admitted that, whilst she was familiar with the letters and journals of the Wesleyan missionaries on the Hokianga, she had failed ‘to read the CMS boys’ in the Bay of Islands. Conversant with Frederick Maning’s *War in the North of New Zealand*; John Webster’s *Reminiscences of an Old Settler in Australia and New Zealand* and local oral histories about Te Atua Wera, Hōne Toia and the ‘Blackout’, Ruth Ross said that she had been under the impression that Papahurihia was ‘exclusively a man of Hokianga’.⁸ Consequently, in her biography of Āperahama Taonui, she said that Te Atua Wera had led ‘the first of the Maori nationalist cults, which opposed the spread of Christianity in the Hokianga’.⁹ She later confessed that it had been ‘rather a nasty shock’ to discover that Papahurihia had originated in the Bay of Islands. Moreover, on more than one occasion Ross told Judith Binney that she had often lain awake at night and sweated over the article that she had written for McLintock.¹⁰

---

⁷ Ruth Ross Papers, MS-1442, Box 67 (2), AML; Mary Boyd, Obituary for Ruth Ross 1920-82, *New Zealand Journal of History*, 16, 2, 1982, pp. 188-90.
⁸ Ruth Ross to Judith Binney, 24 November 1964 & 16 March 1965, MS-Papers-11115-066, ATL.
¹⁰ Ruth Ross to Judith Binney, 24 November 1964 & 16 March 1965, MS-Papers-11115-066, ATL.
Ruth Ross was not alone in her assumption that Papahurihia was solely a Hokianga phenomenon. In 1962, she contacted Jean Irvine on behalf of Ormond Wilson and asked if Irvine was interested in writing a booklet on Hokianga historic places for the National Historic Places Trust. That request sparked a correspondence between the two, in the course of which Irvine confessed her special interest in Papahurihia. On one occasion, Jean Irvine referred to him as ‘my tohunga’. She was convinced that the land she had purchased at Rāwene included the site of his old school of learning and she told Ross that she had demarcated the spot with pāua to signify that ‘Te Atua Wera, Aperahama Taonui, Hone Mohi Tawhai and other chiefs had some form of whare wananga here’. Irvine also said that a local had told her that he had once lived on the beach below her property.

Jean Irvine told Ruth Ross that one informant had told her that Papahurihia was originally from Taiāmai in the Bay of Islands. She also said he was renamed Papahurihia on the Hokianga when he married a local woman and land was turned over to him. Irvine said that ‘Penetane’ was his baptismal name and Te Atua Wera was the name of his familiar spirit. Finally, Irvine said that there were links between

---

11 Ruth Ross and Jean Irvine corresponded between 1962 and 1977. See MS-94/23 (10) Ruth Ross, Letters from Jean Irvine, 1962-1977, AML. Felicia Myra Jean Irvine graduated from the University of New Zealand in 1937 with a Master of Arts. Her thesis, which won praise from Keith Sinclair, was called ‘The revolt of the militant unions: a survey of the trade union revolt against the arbitration system in New Zealand, between 1906 and 1913; with particular reference to the part played by the Federation of Labour’. In September 1962, Ormond Wilson wrote and arranged a meeting between Jean Irvine, Graham Bagnall and himself. In a subsequent letter written in February 1963, he told Irvine that she would need to submit a work plan and synopsis before the National Historic Places Trust could make a decision about commissioning the booklet for publication or undertaking payment for expenses. Finally, in March 1963 Wilson advised Irvine that an information booklet for visitors to the Hokianga would ‘be too general in scope for a Trust bulletin’ and that it was ‘extremely unlikely that the Trust could publish it’. In 1965 Jean Irvine self-published her research as *Historic Hokianga: an introductory guidebook*, Kaikohe: Northern News Print. Ruth Ross to Jean Irvine, 19 July 1962; Ormond Wilson to Jean Irvine, 25 September 1962, 27 February & 26 March 1963, MS-94/23 (10), AML.

12 Jean Irvine to Ruth Ross, 16 August & 19 September 1962; Ruth Ross to Jean Irvine, 4 October 1965; Jean Irvine to Ruth Ross, 10 & 30 October 1965, MS-94/23 (10), AML. Jean Irvine had requested research assistance from the University of Auckland in 1959. In his reply, Keith Sinclair said it was not possible for anyone in the history department to do the research she had requested and suggested that she contact Ruth Ross at Motukiore School at Horeke. Likewise, in 1962 Joan Metge advised Jean Irvine to contact the Reverend Rua Rakena about Papahurihia, Aperahama Taonui and the Blackout. See Keith Sinclair, Associate Professor of History and Acting Head of Department, University of Auckland, to Jean Irvine, 24 February 1959; Joan Metge, Adult Education Centre, University of Auckland, to Jean Irvine, 3 October 1962; Jean Irvine to ’John’, re ‘my tohunga’, 25 September 1962, MS-94/23 (10), AML. The underlining is by Irvine and it is possible that ‘John’ was John Roland Preston Lee, who has published as Jack Lee. There is a photocopy of a letter from Jean Irvine about Rāwene and Te Wairua, a hand-traced map featuring Papahurihia’s settlement and a copy of Jean Irvine’s paper on Ōkura Marae in Jack Lee’s Papers, Series 4, Box 2 (56); Series 11, Box 4, Folder 87 (15) and Folder 90 (10), MS 2006/1, AML.
the Kotahitanga movement founded by Āperahama Taonui and the Te Atua Wera or Nākahih cult, which locals called the ‘Blackout’. Ruth Ross, who found Jean Irvine ‘a bit odd’, grew increasingly uneasy about her historical writing and finally told her that some of the things she had written in her Hokianga guidebook had made her ‘hair stand on end!’ Ross said ‘one of these days I’ll go through it again with a fine tooth comb and make out a list for when you get around to the second edition’. However, Irvine’s eccentricities did not deter Judith Binney and in 1970, she drove to Rāwene where Jean Irvine showed her the site of Papahurihia’s old whare wānanga and his grave at Ómanaia.13

Ormond Wilson and Ruth Ross began to debate Papahurihia in 1964. Ross said that they swapped ‘Papahurihia clues’ and argued about the significance of Wilson’s archival discoveries. However, she also said that by the time Wilson’s article was ready for publication their debate ‘had reached complete stalemate, each of us convinced the other was drawing untenable conclusions from the available evidence’.14 Ruth Ross criticised Ormond Wilson for omitting some of the evidence from his article on Papahurihia and failing to present it in strict chronological order. She also contested his implicit assumption that Papahurihia ‘was an identifiable man’ from 1833. In contrast, she suggested that the Papahurihia doctrine had emerged gradually and that the advent of a single identifiable leader - Te Atua Wera - was a later development.15 Although ostensibly plausible her theory, which was advanced in 1966, was nevertheless distorted by her almost exclusive reliance on Early Journals and she did not develop her reply to Wilson beyond a very preliminary draft. In contrast, Judith Binney accepted his citations at face value and unlike Ruth Ross, was unaware of the limitations of Wilson’s methodology.

When Ormond Wilson researched and wrote his article on Papahurihia, he was the chair of the National Historic Places Trust, as well as the National Art Gallery and Museum in Wellington. He also farmed a large estate in the Manawatū. Thus, whilst he undertook some research at the Alexander Turnbull Library when in Wellington on business, Ormond Wilson also called upon the largess of the Hocken librarian

13 Enid Evans, Librarian, Auckland Institute and Museum, to Ruth Ross, 18 October 1962, MS-94/23 (9), AML; Ruth Ross to Jean Irvine, Pūnaruku Maori School, 13 January 1966, MS-94/23 (10), AML.
14 Ruth Ross Papers, MS-1442, Box 67 (2), AML; Ruth Ross to Judith Binney, 15 October 1964, 24 November 1964 & 28 November 1966, MS-Papers-11115-066, ATL.
15 Ruth Ross Papers, MS-1442, Box 67(2), AML.
Michael Hitchings and employed a research assistant in Dunedin. \textsuperscript{16} Wilson located several references to Papahurihia on the CMS microfilms in the Turnbull. Those of principal importance were set in the journal of Richard Davis, who was the CMS farmer at Waimate, and at his request, Michael Hitchings checked Wilson’s handwritten transcript against the original journal of Richard Davis housed in the Hocken Collection. Wilson also attempted, albeit unsuccessfully, to authenticate the photograph of Papahurihia that Thomas Hocken had reproduced in his 1906 edition of Frederick Maning’s \textit{Old New Zealand}. \textsuperscript{17} Nevertheless, pressured by time, Ormond Wilson told his research assistant that there was unlikely ‘to be anything more in Davis about Papahurihia after 1835’. He also omitted evidence from the journal of James Hamlin, which said that there had been ‘a recrudescent of the Papahurihia movement in the Thames’ in 1842 and another reference to Papahurihia that was sent to him after he had submitted his article to Bruce Biggs for publication. \textsuperscript{18}

In 1985, in \textit{Like Them That Dream}, Bronwyn Elsmore cited Jean Irvine, who had corresponded with Ruth Ross in the 1960s. She said that Irvine had translated Papahurihia as ‘the earth turned over’ and linked his name to the Māori Creation Myth. Elsmore also said that according to Irvine this was ‘the Polynesian version of the Fall’ or the ‘divorce of the spiritual from the material which were once joined’. In a similar vein, Jean Irvine told the Reverend George Laurenson of the Methodist Home and Māori Missions that Papahurihia was originally called ‘The Fallen World’. \textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{16} Michael Hitchings was the Hocken Librarian from 1965 until his retirement on 30 June 1984. Prior to that, he worked at the Auckland Institute and Museum Library and the Alexander Turnbull Library. Hitchings had also worked as a New Zealand Government Historical Manuscripts Officer in London. His task at the Hocken was to build up the collections, develop the library’s services to scholarship and to find, train and supervise the specialized staff needed to achieve those objectives. See Death of former Hocken Librarian, Michael Hitchings, 1924-2010, https://blogs.otago.ac.nz/thehockenblog/2010/03/22/death-of-former-hocken-librarian-michael-hitchings-1924-2010/, accessed 8 December 2013.

\textsuperscript{17} Ormond Wilson to Michael Hitchings, 20 July, 5 August, 28 August, 9 September 1965; Michael Hitchings to Ormond Wilson, 27 July 1965, Ref: 805/7/1, MS-3406/001, HL.

\textsuperscript{18} Ormond Wilson to Maureen O’Rourke, 9 September, 25 September, 9 November, 12 November 1965, MS-3406/001, HL. The late reference was not on the Hocken file but was probably an entry in the journal of Richard Davis dated Saturday 2 March 1837. It read, ‘During my ride I fell in with a party who are the professed followers of the God Papahurihia. I got from my horse and entered into conversation with them at some length – and was much gratified with their manner. May the Lord glorify himself in their Salvation!’ Richard Davis, Journal, Saturday 2 March 1837, PC-0067 (Preservation Copy of MS-66/150), p. 860, HL.

\textsuperscript{19} Jean Irvine to Judith Binney, 16 April & 21 June 1969, 5 October 1970, MS-Papers-11115-006, ATL; Jean Irvine to George Laurenson, 9 June 1972, MS-94/23 (10), AML; Jean Irvine, \textit{Northland
Whilst some of the inconsistencies in Irvine’s historical writing can be attributed to discrepancies between her informants, there is also evidence that she gained some of her information ‘clairaudiently’. That psychic intelligence was dutifully typed out and entrusted to the care of David Simmons of the Auckland Museum Library who deposited it in the archives, presumably after her death in 1978. The surviving manuscript on Ōkura marae indicates that Jean Irvine had purchased her land at Rāwene in 1957 after an ‘inner voice’ confirmed that it was the site of Papahurihia’s old school of learning. The document also shows that Irvine believed that she was his waka or medium. In an extant letter she expressed the hope that she would ‘get more psychically’ about Papahurihia, whom she suggested was ‘the communicant himself’. She also said she intended to write again to ‘Mrs. Binney’ and described her as ‘one I would be prepared to see have access to them if she wants to’. 20

Jean Irvine referred to her clairaudient experiences in an article on ‘Maori Mysticism in the North’. It was one of several essays presented to the Third Religious Colloquium at the University of Auckland in August 1976 21 and said:

The story incidentally was written down some four years ago from what I believe to be a psychic communication, one of several, and when it was read out to the local elder he confirmed that it was in the traditions’. 22

Irvine said that Papahurihia ‘was probably a relative of Ruatara who had protected the first mission, and of Rakau the aged tohunga who had taught Kendall’. She repeated her myth-based explanation of Papahurihia’s name and the assertion that it was ‘the Polynesian version of the fall’. 23 Finally, Jean Irving said that she had received clairaudient instructions to purchase her land at Rāwene and that:

---

20 Jean Irvine, Okura: The Old Marae Area on the Rawene Ridge, MS-666 (1); Jean Irvine to Mrs. Arthur, 19 July 1972, MS-666 (2), AML.
22 Ibid, p. 7
23 Ibid, p. 9.
On it I have had in recent years a succession of psi experiences, mostly of clairaudience, much more sustained than any I have had before. They have given me the lost history of the area and some insight into the higher forms of Maori belief.  

There is evidence that one of Jean Irvine’s informants had also spoken to Professor James Rutherford of Auckland University College. He in turn wrote to James Cowan of the *Auckland Star* and relayed two ‘ghost-stories’ about ‘the old chief, Atua Wera, of Hokianga, known as “The Wizard of the North”’. Moreover, Judith Binney said that David Simmons, who later deposited Jean Irvine’s manuscript in the Auckland Museum Library, was her initial source on Waimā and the link between Papahurihia and Āperahama Taonui. In a letter to Ruth Ross, she said that she had first consulted Simmons in 1963 when he was the Otago Museum archaeologist. She also said that Kathleen Shawcross, who was a fellow student at the University of Auckland, had mentioned Papahurihia in her Master’s thesis and ‘may have based herself on possibly erroneous material’ from Simmons.

Lieutenant-Colonel Walter Gudgeon, Dr Geoffrey Blake-Palmer, the Dominion Museum ethnologist Dr W. J. Phillips, the poet Kendrick Smithyman and Professor Paul Moon have also captured oral histories about Papahurihia. For example, in an article written in 1903 Gudgeon said that ‘the great tohunga, Papahurihia could fly through space at will’. Likewise in 1951, Blake-Palmer said that a ‘secret society’ on the Hokianga called the ‘Blackout’ continued to utilize ‘the traditions and mana’ of Te Atua Wera. He also said that Māori from Ōmanaia, Waimā, Whirinaki, Waimamaku and Oue on the Hokianga believed that Te Atua Wera rode around those

---

24 Ibid, p. 10.
25 Jean Irvine to Ruth Ross, 16 August 1962, MS-94/23 (10), AML; James Rutherford to James Cowan, 29 February 1936, A-42, Box 20 (2), AUL. Professor James Rutherford, who was born in England, was appointed to the Chair of History at Auckland University College in 1934 ahead of Willis Airey and John Cawte Beaglehole. His successor was Professor Keith Sinclair.
26 James Rutherford to James Cowan, 29 February 1936, A-42, Box 20 (2), AUL.
27 Judith Binney to Ruth Ross, 4 December 1964 & April 1965, MS-Papers-11115-066, ATL; Ruth Ross to Judith Binney, 3 October 1965, MS-1442, Box 67 (2), AML. Kathleen Shawcross said that the only Māori who were aggressively anti-missionary were ‘adherents of a cult founded by a tohunga called Te Atua Wera’, whom she described as the medium of ‘a new Maori atua’ called ‘the Ngakahi’. See Kathleen Shawcross, *Maoris of the Bay of Islands, 1769-1840: a study of changing Maori responses to European contact: thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts of the University of Auckland, 1967*, pp. 359-60. The underlining is by Shawcross.
areas at night and as far afield as Te Iringa and Tautoro.\textsuperscript{29} In his article, which was published in the \textit{Journal of the Polynesian Society} in 1966, Phillipps said that Whina Cooper and a Roman Catholic priest had told him about the cult of a fire god called Nākahi that had involved groups of Māori living between Hokianga and Dargaville. He said that Mohi Waiti had been ‘the chief priest of Nakahi’, that he held the séances at night and that Nākahi’s arrival had been ‘heralded by flashes of light’. Phillips also published a letter from the District Inspector of Health. Written in 1955, J. W. Wilson said that the Nākahi cult had concluded at Tangiteroria upon Mohi Waiti’s death. He also said that a woman who had attended the meetings as a child had told him that Nākahi had communicated with Waiti in whistling sounds and that the assembly could feel Nākahi’s presence because he had hairy hands and arms.\textsuperscript{30}

Kendrick Smithyman’s poems in \textit{Atua Wera} used both archival and oral accounts. In a poem about Papahurihia’s genealogy,\textsuperscript{31} he noted the discrepancies between Binney, who had used Hōne Mohi Tāwhai’s obituary for Papahurihia, and Jack Lee, who had been told Papahurihia’s whakapapa by one of the guardians of Āperahama Taonui’s books of prophecy at Ōmanaia.\textsuperscript{32} Smithyman said that neither Jack Lee nor Whina Cooper had replied to his letters. He also told Binney that Lee’s source ‘wasn’t all that well informed when I spoke to him’ and that another local on the Hokianga had told him ‘that the “library” was exegetical, not historical’.\textsuperscript{33} In another poem, Smithyman said that he had been told that Papahurihia was ‘an outsider at Rangihoua’ but that his first wife was from there. Finally, Kendrick Smithyman told Judith Binney that Papahurihia’s descendants ‘weren’t positive’ about the meaning of his name,\textsuperscript{34} and:

\begin{footnotes}
\item Kendrick Smithyman, \textit{Atua Wera}, p. 3
\item Kendrick Smithyman to Judith Binney, undated internal memorandum, downloaded from the internet as a jpg file and reproduced in the Appendix to this thesis.
\item Kendrick Smithyman, \textit{Atua Wera}, pp. 49-50, 57.
\end{footnotes}
Of those I spoke to only one of his descendants knew of Te Atua Wera. He’d seen the death picture in a copy of *Old New Zealand*. Te Atua Wera wasn’t part of their tradition. At some time quietly the god went away.  

Finally, Paul Moon’s article on ‘Nākahi: The Matarahurahu Cult of the Snake’ was based on oral histories from a kaumātua from Kaikohe. He told Moon that Nākahi’s origins were pre-European and dated back to the 1720s. He also said that those beliefs had ‘mutated’ to become a ‘Māori variant of Christianity’ in the 1830s and that the Nākahi doctrine was a combination of prophecies from the eighteenth-century, fragments of the Old Testament and prophecies of the tohunga of the time. Finally, the kaumātua explained that the symbol of the snake had been taken from the Book of Numbers, which portrayed ‘the role of religion in reasserting the leader’s authority among his people’.  

To conclude, a number of shortcomings, including his failure to include all the evidence and his willingness to reach conclusions whilst circumventing the testimony on Papahurihia’s role as Heke’s tohunga, characterized Ormond Wilson’s article in 1965. Binney compounded those limitations by her failure to check the veracity of his sources or undertake any primary research for her article in 1966. Moreover, Judith Binney predicated her interpretation of Papahurihia on the paradigm of fatal impact. Anecdotal evidence from David Simmons, Ruth Ross and Jean Irvine, along with Pat Hohepa’s work on the ‘Blackout’ movement at Waimā also swayed her. A further and equally profound influence on Judith Binney was the Pacific historian Niel Gunson and the next section will look at how his article on the Mamaia cult of Tahiti influenced her perception of Papahurihia as the founder of a Pacific millennial cult.

---

35 ‘And another’, *Atua Wera*, p. 61. Wystan Curnow mentioned Kendrick Smithyman’s poems about Papahurihia in 1999. He said that one reviewer, a historian by profession (and probably Judith Binney), was unsure whether Smithyman’s work was poetry or history because ‘so close is it to the bits and scraps of record and recollection out of which both are ordinarily falsified’ (i.e. that Smithyman’s poems were based on the same primary and oral sources as Judith Binney’s historical writing). Wystan Curnow, *A Brief Description of Poetry in New Zealand*, *boundary 2*, 26, 1, 99Poets/1999: An International Poetics Symposium, 1999, p. 75.

36 Professor Moon’s article was based on the late Graham Rankin of Kaikohe. Mr Rankin’s whānau is related to Hōne Heke Ngāpua, the former Member of Parliament for Northern Māori. See Obituary for Graham Rankin (1930-2001), *New Zealand Herald*, 22 June 2001.

37 Paul Moon criticised ‘a “consensus” of historians’ who had dated Papahurihia’s emergence at 1833. In reply, Judith Binney pointed out that ‘Moon’s only “evidence” for an earlier, pre-European origin is a vague prophecy about the coming of a new people to the land, attributed to a Hokianga elder and described by S. Percy Smith in 1910’. Judith Binney, *JPS*, 2007, p. 319, fn. 2.

Section D: Pacific Historians

This section focuses on the ideas that flowed between historians at the University of Auckland and Pacific historians at Australian National University in Canberra in the 1960s. It argues that Niel Gunson’s work on the Mamaia cult of Tahiti was a profound influence on Judith Binney’s interpretation of Papahurihia as a Pacific millennial cult akin to Mamaia, the Siovili cult of Samoa and the Hulumanu in Hawaii. Finally, the section uses quotes from recent histories by Angela Middleton and Tony Ballantyne of the University of Otago to demonstrate the power of the texts that were written by Wilson and Binney in the 1960s and to conclude that their articles have continued to dominate our current understanding of Papahurihia.

Judith Binney’s interest in Papahurihia was piqued during the course of her Master’s research on Thomas Kendall, which was inspired by Keith Sinclair’s poem *Memorial to a Missionary*. She said that the purpose of her biography was to probe the line in his poem that questioned what Kendall had learnt from the south (about Māori religious beliefs). The title of her book, *The Legacy of Guilt*, was from Sinclair’s poem, as was the working title *That Dreaming Hour*. Finally, Judith Binney’s thesis and biography on the Reverend Thomas Kendall reiterated the principal themes in Keith Sinclair’s poem.¹

Binney attributed Kendall’s ‘fall’ to the sensual nature of Māori cosmology. Moreover, in her debate with J. M. R. Owens, she correlated his affair with a Māori woman with the second of three anthropological phases – the period in which the missionaries often succumbed to the indigenous culture. To bolster her argument for a

missionary breakthrough in the Bay of Islands in the 1830s, she echoed Sinclair’s assertion that Christian ideas were as ‘destructive as bullets’ and that Māori had abandoned their customs in the 1830s. She also said that the emergence of Papahurihia was an attempt by Māori to reassert themselves against the European intruders - a notion that Keith Sinclair reiterated in his revised edition of *A History*, in which he described Papahurihia as a ‘resistance cult’.

Binney based her argument for missionary destructiveness on the Reverend William Yate who in 1836 had ascribed the increased number of Māori converts in the Bay of Islands to the removal of tapu. In his submission to the Select Committee of the House of Commons, Yate said that tapu was ‘nearly extinct’ in the North and attributed its eradication six years earlier to the CMS missionaries. Judith Binney argued that this was ‘one of the primary reasons for the breakthrough of the missions’. She also maintained that this ‘disruption of tribal society … was a precondition for the adoption of the new God’.

Judith Binney’s reliance on Yate as a credible source persisted and in 1970, she wrote the introduction to a facsimile reprint of his *An Account of New Zealand*. She said that Yate had written about Māori society ‘at a time when rapid internal changes were occurring’. She also claimed that by the time he left the country ‘the missionaries had made their impact’. Binney identified Keith Sinclair’s *A History of New Zealand* and Harrison Wright’s *New Zealand 1769-1840* as the ‘best general histories’ on the period. However, Binney tempered her confidence in Yate in 1975 when she found evidence that he had fabricated some of the text and illustrations in his book, including the story that a sea captain had taught Papahurihia ventriloquism.


6 Judith Binney, Whatever Happened to Poor Mr Yate: An Exercise in Voyeurism? *New Zealand Journal of History*, 9, 2, 1975, pp. 111-25. Yate’s drawing of a hākiri stage was also published in the *Missionary Register*, 1832, p. 156.
Niel Gunson also influenced Judith Binney’s thesis on Thomas Kendall and her article on Papahurihia. He had written his Master’s thesis on ‘The Missionary Vocation’ at the University of Melbourne. Completed under the supervision of Dorothy Shineberg in 1955, it focused on the theological beliefs of the LMS missionaries in Tahiti and the Society Islands. Likewise, Gunson wrote his doctoral dissertation on the Protestant evangelicals in the South Seas during the early contact period. Completed at Australian National University in 1959, James Wightman Davidson supervised it, and the Oxford University Press published the two theses as Messengers of Grace in 1978.

Niel Gunson’s influence on Judith Binney was symbolic of the close ties between the Pacific historians at Australian National University and New Zealand. James Davidson, who took the foundation chair of Pacific history at Australian National University in 1949, was an ex-patriate New Zealander. Born in Wellington, he graduated from Victoria University College, where John Cawte Beaglehole had mentored him. In contrast, Davidson completed his doctoral thesis at Cambridge on European penetration of the Pacific to 1842. Raymond Firth, who recommended him for the post at Australian National University, had completed his Master’s degree in Economics at Auckland University College and served with Davidson in Naval Intelligence during the Second World War. Firth had succeeded his mentor

---

8 Niel Gunson, Evangelical Missionaries in the South Seas, 1779-1860, unpublished PhD dissertation, Australian National University, 1959. Dorothy Shineberg, who supervised Niel Gunson at Melbourne University, said that James Davidson was only interested in her fourth year Honours course in Pacific history because he hoped ‘it would provide graduate students for his department, which it did soon after when Niel went to do his PhD there’. See Dorothy Shineberg, Reflections: The Early Years of Pacific History, Journal of Pacific Studies, 20, 1996, p. 7. Shineberg left Melbourne University in 1956 to have a baby and Pacific History was not taught there again until the appointment in 1973 of Greg Denning who was one of her former students. Shineberg's PhD was published as They Came for Sandalwood: a Study of the Sandalwood Trade in the South-West Pacific, 1830-1865, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1967. She was encouraged in her research by Harry Maude who had joined Australian National University as James Davidson’s deputy in 1957 and undertaken research on the Tahitian pork trade. See Bronwyn Douglas, Obituary for Dorothy Shineberg, Journal of Pacific History, 40, 3, December 2005, p. 353-6.
11 Doug Munro, ‘The New Zealanders’, in Scholars at War: Australian Social Scientists, 1939-1945, ANU. Lives, Series in Biography, by Geoffrey Gray, Doug Munro and Christine Winter (eds.), Canberra: Australian National University Press, 2012. J. W. Davidson researched, wrote and edited the Admiralty’s ‘Naval Intelligence Handbook’ relating to the Pacific Islands. According to Doug Munro, he was ‘right-hand man’ to Raymond Firth who had been seconded from the Department of Anthropology at the London School of Economics and was in charge of the small team responsible for
Bronislaw Malinowski as Professor of Social Anthropology at the London School of Economics. His doctoral thesis was credited with pioneering the ‘development theory of the phases of Maori culture-contact’ and was published in 1929 as *Primitive Economics of the New Zealand Maori.*

Keith Sinclair said that James Davidson, who ‘was pioneering a new sort of Pacific history focused on the indigenous peoples’, was the impetus for his decision to write his doctorate on the origins of the Māori wars in Taranaki. It is therefore possible that Davidson’s approach influenced Sinclair’s methodology. For example, Keith Sinclair said that when he researched *The Origins of the Maori Wars* he ‘read Maori and made increasing use of the thousands of Maori letters in our archives’. He also said that when he supervised Keith Sorrenson, Judith Binney and Claudia Orange he insisted they learnt the Māori language because he believed that ‘anyone writing about another culture and people must learn their language and study their culture’.

Finally, Keith Sinclair was instrumental in the appointment of Hugh Laracy, a New Zealander with a doctorate from Australian National University, to teach the new Pacific history course at Auckland from 1970.

James Davidson’s first doctoral student was another ex-patriate New Zealander. Colin Newbury wrote his Master’s thesis at the University of New Zealand in 1952 and focused on the contribution of French navigators to the exploration and expansion in the Pacific between 1767 and 1853. His doctoral thesis explored the history of the Tahitian mission as reflected in the journal of John Davies, who was a missionary with the London Missionary Society. Newbury described the Mamaia cult of Tahiti as a traditionalist reaction against the laws imposed by the LMS missionaries. He also


16 Ibid, p. 170.

suggested that the leaders of the Mamaia cult had used ‘the ritual of spirit possession’ to invoke the support of the saints from the Old and New Testaments in an attempt to ‘preserve the old order’. Finally, based on William Yate’s *An Account of New Zealand*, Colin Newbury asserted that ‘the closest parallel was the Papahurihia organization among the New Zealand Maori in the 1830s’.  

In his reflections on her work, Damon Salesa said that Judith Binney’s reading of Pacific History was crucial to the way she shaped *A Legacy of Guilt*. He also noted that she had corresponded with Niel Gunson during the course of her research on Thomas Kendall and had read his doctoral thesis, which was ‘the central work on the topic’. Salesa said:

Many of the principles of ‘Pacific History’ championed by Davidson – especially the learning of indigenous languages, fieldworking or ‘participant observation’ and attempts to deal seriously with indigenous knowledge – were ones Binney embraced at the time when the New Zealand historical profession generally did not’.  

Indeed, in a letter to Judith Binney from London in April 1964 her supervisor Keith Sinclair suggested, ‘Perhaps there is too much Gunson’ in the first chapter. He also expressed his hope that Gunson’s work would not be so prominent in the next. In contrast, when Auckland University Press decided to publish her biography on Thomas Kendall the editor Keith Sorrenson asked Binney to take account ‘in your final revision, Dr Gunson’s suggestions, especially for chapter 1’.  

Gunson’s research underpinned Judith Binney’s explanation of the theological beliefs held by the Protestant evangelical missionaries in the Bay of Islands.  

---

20 Keith Sinclair to Judith Binney, 21 April 1964; Keith Sorrenson to Judith Binney, 12 September 1966, MS-Papers-11115-136, ATL.
the Mamaia cult of Tahiti informed her early interpretation of Papahurihia. Based on the premise that Papahurihia was analogous with Oceanic cults in Tahiti, Samoa and Hawaii, Binney identified missionary preaching as the catalyst for Papahurihia’s emergence in 1833 and coupled it with the marked increase in Māori baptisms in the Bay of Islands in the 1830s. Likewise, in another article on Thomas Kendall she said that ‘Like many of the early Oceanic visionary cults, it was an attempt to retain the old by adopting elements of the new’.

Judith Binney’s argument was also reminiscent of the thesis advanced by Aarne Koskinen in 1953. Koskinen had argued that the Protestant missionaries were the catalyst for the advent of ‘semi-heathen heretic religions’ in the Pacific Islands. He had also said that the Pacific heresies had emerged ‘immediately upon the mass conversions’ of their countrymen and were evidence of ‘the misunderstanding of Christianity on the part of the natives’. Finally, whilst Koskinen stressed the anti-missionary nature of the Pacific heresies, he had also said that they had claimed ‘for their own, as part of their traditional pagan heritage, certain Biblical elements.

Kerry Howe observed that in the 1950s and 1960s as culture contact history began to take shape in New Zealand and Australia ‘there was considerable cross fertilization’ of ideas. He identified the work of Davidson and Gunson as part of the ‘initial flow from New Zealand to Pacific history’. He also said that the work of John Owens and Judith Binney was ‘often inspired by a flow back from Pacific history, such as the writings of Bernard Smith, Niel Gunson, and Dorothy Shineberg’. Consistent with that in 1973, based on the articles on Papahurihia written by Ormond Wilson and Judith Binney, Niel Gunson wrote:

---


The role of religious prophets in articulating social protest is well known. In Polynesia there was a correlation between the advent of western material civilization and the appearance of prophets whose revelations borrowed freely from traditional culture and mission Christianity: in Tahiti, the Mamaia; in Samoa, the Siovili; and in New Zealand, the Papahurihia and the Hauhau. These movements all expressed opposition to the imposed social values and technical superiority of the Europeans. They arose during periods of intense contact activity and gradually passed away as their visionary schemes were unfulfilled. ²⁸

Angela Middleton and Tony Ballantyne of the University of Otago wrote the most recent scholarship on Papahurihia. Middleton’s work was based on Wilson’s article on Papahurihia and Binney’s chapter on Māori prophet leaders in the Oxford Illustrated History of New Zealand and repeated the assertion that Papahurihia was the founder of ‘a syncretic form of Christianity, combining the new beliefs with aspects of traditional Māori spirituality’.²⁹ Likewise, Tony Ballantyne’s interpretation was founded on Binney’s journal article on Papahurihia and her biography of Thomas Kendall. He positioned the emergence of Papahurihia in an imperial framework and argued that some Māori had used their knowledge of scripture to develop ‘distinct cosmologies and ritual practices’ which they ‘turned against colonization’. He also said:

Papahurihia was reclaiming biblical teaching from the missionaries, a point that was made clear when the prophet told the CMS missionary Charles Baker that while the Bible was true, the missionaries had corrupted it .... Papahurihia’s followers positioned themselves in opposition to the missionaries, both in their self-designation as Hurai (Jews) and in their insistence that the true Sabbath should be observed on Saturday. ³⁰

---

In closing, the prevailing historiography on Papahurihia has been influenced by the paradigm of fatal impact, the notion of Māori agency and the theory of the middle ground, as well as Niel Gunson’s research on the Mamaia cult of Tahiti and anecdotal evidence and oral histories from locals on the Hokianga. In spite of that, the articles written by Ormond Wilson and Judith Binney in the 1960s have continued to be treated as highly credible sources, as exemplified in recent histories by Angela Middleton and Tony Ballantyne from the University of Otago. However, Wilson and Binney’s articles have also informed the research of academics outside New Zealand and the next section will look at how Papahurihia has been portrayed in the international literature by writers from America, Finland and Australia.
Section E: Pacific Historiography

This section continues to focus on the power of the texts that were written by Ormond Wilson and Judith Binney in the 1960s. It argues that Papahurihia was increasingly interpreted as an indigenous prophet and founder of a Pacific millennial cult after their articles were included in recommended reading lists in anthropological journals. It also argues that those distortions in the historiography occurred because academics from universities in America, Finland and Australia treated the work of Wilson and Binney as wholly reliable sources.

Papahurihia was not included in Guglielmo Guariglia’s worldwide survey of prophet and millennial cults in 1959.¹ Vittorio Lanternari made a similar omission in 1963 in his review of modern messianic cults.² However, Lanternari did say that when native societies ‘like the Maoris in New Zealand’ were ‘unable to repel the intruders who have seized their land, almost invariably a new religious cult springs into being which inspires the natives to express opposition to foreign rule’.³ In The Religions of the Oppressed Lanternari wrote about the Hapu cult of Hawaii, the Mamaia cult of Tahiti, the Siovili cult of Samoa, the Kanito cult in the Tuamotu Archipelago and the Tuka cult of Fiji. His principal source on Mamaia was the German anthropologist Wilhelm Mühlmann, whose work had informed Niel Gunson’s research.⁴ Mühlmann had claimed that the real objective of the Mamaia cult was to expel the Europeans, the sect being at war with the British from 1830 to 1836.⁵ In the case of New Zealand, Lanternari focused on the Hauhau and Ringatū cults. His sources were secondary and included the work of Felix Keesing, Stuart Babbage, William Greenwood and Robin Winks.⁶

---

¹ Guglielmo Guariglia, Prophetismus und Heilserwartungsbewegungen als völkerkundliches und religionsgeschichtliches Problem, Vienna: Verlag Ferdinand Berger, 1959. The study reviewed the literature on nativistic, revivalistic, messianic and prophetic movements around the world. See review by Robert F. Spencer, University of Minnesota, American Anthropologist, 63, 3, pp. 596-8.
Lanternari noted that the Polynesian cults had possessed a ‘highly developed warrior caste’ and ‘strong political content’. He suggested that their adherents had ‘identified Christianity with the political power of the whites’ and were ‘openly hostile to the missions and to every other aspect of Western civilization’. Based on the work of Aarne Koskinen, he also claimed that the arrival of the Roman Catholic missionaries in the Pacific had ‘stimulated a revival of interest in pagan rituals’. Lanternari suggested that ‘the efforts of the Protestant missions to discredit and ridicule’ the Roman Catholics had produced an alliance between the Catholics and the ‘pagans’ not unlike the alliance that had developed between the French missions and the Mamaia cult against the English Protestant missionaries.

Koskinen’s ideas appear to have resonated with Judith Binney, who said that Papahurihia and his followers had supported ‘the Catholics simply because they were foreigners and rivals of the Protestants, who were unequivocally associated with British colonisation’. He also referred to the millennial aspects of the Pacific cults and claimed that Mosaic Law had resonated with Māori, particularly the Old Testament and the Book of Revelation, which ‘to some extent corresponded with the eschatological visions of the natives’. Finally, Aarne Koskinen claimed that those ‘similarities led to the natives imagining that they were lost tribes of Judah’.

In December 1966, Current Anthropology included Ormond Wilson’s article on Papahurihia amongst those considered ‘of special interest to anthropologists’. Likewise, Anthropos included the articles written by Wilson and Binney in their reading lists in 1966 and 1967 respectively. Wilson’s work identified Papahurihia as the first Māori prophet and predecessor of Te Ua Haumēne, Te Kooti Rikirangi, Te Whiti-o-Rongomai, Rua Kēnana and T. W. Rātana. It also concluded that the Bible was the most significant influence in moulding Papahurihia. Binney’s article said
that Papahurihia had foretold the coming of the millennium. It compared him to the prophet Marafi of New Guinea who had chosen ‘Christ’s rival, Satan’ and suggested that Papahurihia had also ‘set up nakahi as the covenant God’.\(^\text{15}\) She also said that Papahurihia had selected the name Te Atua Wera with the fiery second coming in mind and had seen a brilliant comet that appeared in 1843 as a visible sign of the advent of the millennium.\(^\text{16}\) Finally, Judith Binney mentioned the Lyndon Johnson cult and said that a common aspect of visionary sects was ‘the foretelling of the coming of the millennium when all the goodies that the white men possess will be returned to their rightful owners’.\(^\text{17}\)

From that point onward, Papahurihia was increasingly interpreted in the context of Polynesia and as an indigenous millennial movement. For example in 1971, the American anthropologist Weston La Barre included Ormond Wilson’s article on Papahurihia in his bibliography of Polynesian cargo cults.\(^\text{18}\) Likewise in 1982, in *Cult and Conflict*, Jukka Siikala from the University of Helsinki mentioned Papahurihia in his study of traditional, Christian and nativistic movements in Polynesia. His analysis

---

\(^\text{15}\) In 1933 Marafi from Morobe in Papua New Guinea asserted that ‘the black Satan, towards whom the missionaries were so hostile, had to be the savior of the blacks … able to reverse the power relation between the two races’. He started preaching the advent of Satan, along with the return of the ancestors. Marafi said that ‘the sky would darken, fire and earthquakes would destroy the Christians, while Satan’s followers would be saved inside a great common house, built for this purpose. The day after the cataclysm, the ancestors would be resurrected and an immense cargo would appear in the village, making available canned meat and firearms to all inhabitants’. Marafi was arrested and the ‘Satan cult’ disappeared. See Edmondo F. Lupieri, James Hooton & Amanda Kunder, *In the Name of God: The Making of Global Christianity*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2011, pp. 224-5.


\(^\text{17}\) When Papua New Guinea was colonized in the 1870s, it was divided between Germany and Britain. British New Guinea was annexed in 1888 and became a protectorate of Australia. The Japanese occupied it during World War II and when Australia resumed control, she began to prepare it for independence. The ‘cult’ started during the first election in February 1964. It began amongst the Lavongai people who were encouraged by the ‘prophet’ Malik to vote for the American President Lyndon Johnson. Although the Australians explained that the people could not vote for Johnson, the islanders refused to change their votes and began to withhold their taxes in order to ‘buy’ Johnson. The movement was mislabelled as a ‘cargo cult’ but has since been characterized by anthropologist Dorothy Billings as ‘a form of political performance intended to embarrass the Australian government’. Anthropologist Harvey Whitehouse has noted that Billings found that the Lyndon Johnson cult had ‘no rituals, no deities, no scared objects, no elaborate doctrines, no epiphanic revelations, miracles, possessions, or visitations. It spawned no prophets, mediums, or messiahs, and had no need of gurus, priests, or other cult officials’. Hilary Evans & Robert E. Bartholomew, *Outbreak!: The Encyclopaedia of Extraordinary Behaviour*, Anomilist Books, 2009, p. 517; ‘New Guinea Island Wants to “Buy” Lyndon Johnson’, *The Spokesman Review*, 14 February 1965, p. 26.

\(^\text{18}\) Weston La Barre, *Materials for a History of Studies of Crisis Cults: A Bibliographical Essay*, *Current Anthropology*, 12, 1, February 1971, pp. 3-44. Ormond Wilson’s article on Papahurihia is referred to on pages 6 & 44.
of the Mamaia cult of Tahiti was based on Mühlmann\textsuperscript{19} and Gunson. His interpretation of the Siovili cult of Samoa rested on the work of Derek Freeman of Australian National University and his portrayal of the Hapu cult of Hawaii was founded on Guariglia.\textsuperscript{20}

Jukka Siikala asserted that the Māori movements were ‘all closely tied up with military resistance to colonialism’.\textsuperscript{21} He also said that they were openly militant from the outset and that ‘conflict with the colonialists was bitter even at the time of the activity of Papahurihia in the 1830s’.\textsuperscript{22} Finally, Siikala suggested that Papahurihia was ‘the start of a whole series of movements among the Maoris which took a secular political turn’.\textsuperscript{23} Three years later Sandra Rennie, a doctoral student at Australian National University, cited Freeman (1959), Gunson (1962), Binney (1966) and Siikala (1982) and argued that most of the Pacific cults had arisen from contact with a foreign culture.\textsuperscript{24}

John S. Galbraith, Professor of History at the University of California, published an article in \textit{Pacific Historical Review} the year Siikala’s book was printed. It compared the Hauhau cult of Te Ua Haumēne, the Xhosa cattle killing cult introduced by Mlanjeni, the Ghost Dance led by Wovoka and the prophet Bambata, who had promised the Zulu’s immunity from bullets if they consumed a particular drug.\textsuperscript{25}

---

\textsuperscript{19} Wilhelm Mühlmann wrote his doctoral dissertation on the Arioi society in Tahiti in 1932. However, it does not appear to have been published until the 1950s. Mühlmann’s work was referenced by Niel Gunson, JPS, 71, 2, 1962, p. 243 as Mühlmann, Wilhelm Emil, 1955, \textit{Arioi und Mamaia: Eine Ethnologiske, Religiooszsiologische und Historische Studie über Polynesische Kultbünde}. Wiesbaden, F. Steiner. It is possible that publication of Mühlmann’s thesis was adversely affected by World War II during which he was alleged to be a Nazi sympathizer. George Steinmetz, Neo-Bourdieuian Theory and the Question of Scientific Autonomy, \textit{Political Power and Social Theory}, 20, by Diane E Davis & Julian Go (eds.), Bingley, UK: Emerald Group, 2009, pp. 111-12.

\textsuperscript{20} Jukka Siikala, \textit{Cult and Conflict in Tropical Polynesia: A Study of Traditional Religion, Christianity and Nativistic Movements}, Helsinki, Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1982, p. 56. The author completed his PhD at the University of Turka in 1982 and became Professor at the Department of Social Anthropology at the University of Helsinki in Finland.

\textsuperscript{21} Jukka Siikala, 1982, p. 55.

\textsuperscript{22} Ormond Wilson, JPS, 1965, p. 480, as cited by Jukka Siikala, 1982, p. 56, fn. 8.

\textsuperscript{23} Jukka Siikala, 1982, p. 56.

\textsuperscript{24} Sandra Rennie, The Cultural Interaction between Hiram Bingham Jr., the Hawaiians and the Gilbertese through Mission Contact 1857-1903, a thesis submitted in complete fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the Australian National University, November 1985, p. 172, fn. 15.

Galbraith drew a parallel between the Ghost Dance and the Hauhau cult founded by Te Ua Haumēne of Taranaki. However, he also noted that during the 1830s a prophet from Waikato, Papahurihia, who took the name of Te Atua Wera, the Red God, had preached a faith that had some identification with Judaism and his followers were known as the Jews.

Galbraith said that like Papahurihia, Te Ua had consciously identified with the Jews. He also noted that Papahurihia was still alive when Pai Mārire emerged; thereby implying that Papahurihia had masterminded or facilitated the Hauhau doctrine.

Professor Galbraith’s claim that Papahurihia was from the Waikato region of the North Island can be attributed to the work of Daniel Lyons. Lyons, who was a student of anthropology at the University of Auckland, had undertaken a comparative analysis of Papahurihia, Te Ua and Te Whiti for his Master’s degree in 1970. In 1975, he reworked it as an article in tribute to Professor Ralph Piddington, who had studied under Malinowski and established the anthropology department at Auckland. The article, to which Galbraith had referred, included the statement that ‘Papahurihia of Waikato, was probably educated at one of the early mission schools in the Bay of Islands’.

In 1985, Caroline Ralston of Macquarie University rebutted Judith Binney’s assertion that missionary preaching was the catalyst for Papahurihia. She argued that the timing of his emergence was unrelated to Christianity and observed that his followers came from tribes traditionally hostile to those who had converted to Christianity in the Bay of Islands. Ralston attributed the rise of Papahurihia to traditional political divisions between the tribes themselves. She also clarified that Hulumanu was not a religious sect but the name for the group of personal attendants who had waited upon King

27 Ibid, p. 126.
28 Ibid.
30 Daniel Patrick Lyons, An analysis of three Maori prophetic movements, a thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Arts in Anthropology at the University of Auckland, 1970.
31 Daniel P. Lyons, 1975, p. 56.
Kamehameha III of Hawaii. Finally, Caroline Ralston applied to Papahurihia, Mamaia and Siovili, Norman Cohn’s five-point definition of a millennial cult. She concluded that it was possible to identify the characteristics identified by Cohn in all three of the Pacific cults. At the same time, she acknowledged that:

The beliefs and expectations of the Papahurihia, as depicted by Wilson and Binney, are the least clearly articulated in terms of the imminence, totality and terrestrial nature of salvation, but Binney suggests that prophecies of a coming millennium emanated from the appearance of a comet (1966:324).

Sometime after the pair had met at a conference of the Australian Historical Association, Caroline Ralston sent Judith Binney a copy of the paper by Owen Gager that had informed her argument. Gager’s undated and unreferenced draft contained a number of errors that Binney noted on her copy but did not respond to. For example, Owen Gager had confused Waikato, the chief from Rangihoua in the Bay of Islands, with tribes from the Waikato region of the North Island. He had also mistaken the skirmish on James Busby’s lawn at Waitangi in 1836 as a confrontation between the Ngāpuhi and Waikato tribes, rather than a clash over land between two Ngāpuhi hapū under the leadership of Noa and Waikato.

To conclude, once the articles written by Ormond Wilson and Judith Binney were included in recommended reading lists in anthropological journals, academics in America, Finland and Australia compared him to indigenous prophets in other parts of the world. They also interpreted him as the founder of a Pacific millennial cult. Those distortions in the historiography occurred because the work of Wilson and Binney was

34 Norman Cohn defined a millennial cult as ‘any religious movement inspired by the phantasy of a salvation which is to be (a) collective, in the sense that it is to be enjoyed by the faithful as a group (b) terrestrial, in the sense that it is to be realised on this earth and not in some otherworldly heaven (c) imminent, in the sense that it is to come both soon and suddenly (d) total, in the sense that it is utterly to transform life on earth, so that the new dispensation will be no mere improvement on the present but perfection itself and (e) accomplished by agencies which are consciously regarded as supernatural’. Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium*, 1970 [1957], p. 13; Norman Cohn, Medieval Millenarianism: Its Bearing on the Comparative Study of Millenarian Movements, *Millennial Dreams in Action: Essays in Comparative Study*, by Sylvia L. Thrupp (ed.), Comparative Studies in Society and History, Supplement II, The Hague, Mouton, 1962, pp. 31-43. The definition is on p. 31.
35 Caroline Ralston, JPS, 1985, p. 309.
36 Caroline Ralston to Judith Binney, 14 September 1982, and attached paper by Owen Gager, MS-Papers-11115-150, ATL.
treated as wholly reliable and because the academics concerned failed to undertake any primary research on Papahurihia.

**Conclusion**

Early interpretations of Papahurihia imbedded him in a wider literature on the Māori response to Christianity in the Bay of Islands in the 1830s. Consistent with the Master’s thesis of Harrison Wright, Judith Binney attributed the appearance of his name in missionary texts in 1833 to the fatal impact of European contact on Māori and the inability of ritenga Māori to keep pace with the marked and rapid change caused by the introduction of Western diseases and technology. However, the publication of Wright’s thesis also coincided with a changed focus in anthropology at the University of Auckland, where students of Professor Ralph Piddington focused on the contemporary effects of colonization and urbanisation on Māori.

Piddington taught that the Māori people had not simply abandoned their customs and adopted new ways but ‘developed new forms out of traditional practices’ by way of a process of ‘emergent development’. In his textbook, *An Introduction to Social Anthropology*, he asserted that ‘adjustment cults’ were attempts to adapt to existing circumstances and to shape a new or utopian way of life sometimes with millennial overtones. Piddington was from the school of ‘action anthropology’ pioneered by Sol Tax and students like Joan Metge and Pat Hohepa who trained under him immersed themselves in Māori communities and were committed to ensuring that Māori people advanced their own solutions to the problems they faced in accord with their customs and traditions.

The notion of Māori agency had become increasingly popular in the aftermath of World War II when the Pacific Islands became important to the governments of Australia and New Zealand. The establishment of the Research School of Pacific

---


Studies at Australian National University followed close on the heels of the founding of the South Pacific Commission in 1946. Moreover, when the Special Committee on Decolonization was established by the United Nations in 1961, Professor James Davidson was enlisted to help draft the constitutions of the Cook Islands and Nauru and to act as constitutional advisor to the Congress of Micronesia and Papua New Guinea. Harry Maude, who became his deputy at Australian National University, had helped to develop a new constitution for the Pitcairn Islands and was appointed to head the Social Development section of the South Pacific Commission. Likewise, Ralph Piddington, who had undertaken field research amongst the Australian Aborigines and trained administrators to work in Papua New Guinea during World War II, was appointed to the University in Auckland in 1949, the same year that Davidson was employed in Canberra.

Equally influential in the period in question was the work of the British Marxist historians who advocated ‘history from below’, particularly Eric Hobsbawm’s *Primitive Rebels* and E. P. Thomson’s *The Making of the English Working Class*. Likewise, the British historian Norman Cohn, whose father was Jewish, had interrogated members of the SS in Vienna after World War II and met many refugees from Stalin. His experiences impelled him to write *The Pursuit of the Millennium*, which traced the roots of fanaticism, apocalyptic ideas and revolutionary millennial movements in the Middle Ages. The combined influence of that corpus was later evinced in the histories on millennialism and millenarianism in Great Britain written by J. F. C. Harrison and W. H. Oliver that are discussed in the next chapter.

James Baldwin’s best-selling book *The Fire Next Time*, which examined racism in Harlem, appeared in 1963 and influenced Judith Binney’s historical research on Kendall. Another influence was Paulo Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, which distinguished between ‘the oppressors’ and ‘the oppressed’, and informed her critique of D. F. McKenzie’s work on Māori literacy.\(^{41}\) Thus, both anthropologists and historians increasingly spurned the notion that Māori were passive victims in the face of acute social change. Although initially read as the outcome of the fatal impact of

European contact, Papahurihia was increasingly accorded agency and deemed to have founded a movement that pushed-back against the forces of British imperialism. He was also contextualized within an indigenous peoples’ history that drew analogies with other races in the Pacific who had been oppressed by the imperial ambitions of empire-building nations including the French in Tahiti, the Germans in Samoa and the United States of America in Hawaii.
Chapter Two: The Missionaries’ Texts

Sarah Dingle highlighted the secular nature of New Zealand histories and missionary biographies in her doctoral thesis in 2009. She also argued the need for historians to appreciate the significance of the theological paradigm out of which the missionaries commented on Māori religion and prophets. Section F explores the worldview of the Protestant evangelicals in the Bay of Islands and the millennialism and millenarianism that were common in the period in question. It also uses a case study to reveal the Christian biographies, prophetic literature and biblical commentaries that influenced the way that Richard Davis of the Waimate CMS interpreted Papahurihia. Section G reinterprets Davis’ comments about Papahurihia from within the Protestant evangelical paradigm. It also tests the assertions that Papahurihia observed a Saturday Sabbath, that his doctrine combined elements of Judaic and Christian theology with Māori beliefs and that Papahurihia’s followers called themselves Jews. Section H focuses on Papahurihia’s theological debate with the Reverend William White at Waimā in 1835 and his role in the murders of the Wesleyan Māori converts Mathew and Richmond. Finally, Section I concentrates on the drawing of two trees attributed to Papahurihia by Father Servant, as well as Papahurihia’s reaction to the appearance of a magnificent comet in the sky over Kohukohu in March 1843.
Section F: The Protestant Evangelical Lens

This section focuses on the secularization of the historiography on Papahuirhia. It uses cogent excerpts from the doctoral research of Sarah Dingle and publications by J. F. C. Harrison and W. H. Oliver to explain the worldview of the Protestant evangelical missionaries in the 1830s and the millennialism and millenarianism that was common in the period in question. It also uses private letters between Richard Davis and the Reverend John Coleman to reveal the religious and prophetic literature that influenced Davis. The section concludes that Richard Davis of the Waimate CMS was a premillennialist whose testimony on Papahuirhia, along with that of his colleagues, should be re-examined from within the theological context in which those comments were issued.¹

In her doctoral dissertation, Gospel Power for Civilization, Sarah Dingle argued that historians had written on New Zealand and the missions through a secular lens and failed to ‘give serious consideration to the religious aspects of history’. She also said that many missionary biographers had failed to ‘adequately demonstrate the profound importance of theological beliefs in the lives’ of their subjects.² Finally, Dingle maintained that ‘the tendency to use missionary sources in other areas of scholarly investigation’ had meant that the ‘theological voices’ of the missionary sources had been lost.³

More troubling in respect of this thesis is Dingle’s assertion that the significance of the theological paradigm ‘for accurately portraying the missionary perspective on Maori culture’ has escaped the attention of historians.⁴ She lamented that ‘much of the study of Maori encounter with Christianity is based around Maori syncretic adaptations and accommodation of Christianity with Maori belief systems’.⁵ She also

---

³ Ibid, p. iii.
⁴ Ibid, p. iii.
⁵ Ibid, p. 8.
censured Elsmore’s work on Māori prophetic movements and her failure to ‘consider the theological context out of which missionaries commented on Maori religion’. 

Dingle said that the ‘Bible was the major authority for the evangelical worldview’ and that ‘all evangelical views of God, life, humanity and relationships had their foundation in Biblical testimony’. She explained that theology shaped the observations of the Protestant evangelicals in the Bay of Islands, and that their texts reflected ‘the Biblically-based religious worldview that lay at the heart of evangelical rationalizations’. Moreover, Dingle argued that those texts also reflected the religious priorities of the missionaries themselves, including their view that New Zealand was a stronghold of the ‘wicked one’, that Māori were under the power of Satan and that they were locked in a clash of kingdoms for the souls of the Māori people.

Drawing on the work of David Bebbington, Dingle identified conversion, activism, Biblicism and crucicentrism as the principal characteristics of the worldview of the CMS missionaries. She said that the need for conversion was based on their belief ‘that humanity was ‘fallen’, sinful and depraved, and needed to be ‘born again’. However, she also stressed that the evangelicals had regarded faith alone as ‘dead faith’ and had demonstrated their commitment to Christ’s teachings by engagement in issues like the abolition of slavery, temperance and regular Sabbath observance. Dingle explained that the Protestant evangelicals had accorded primacy to the Word of God, as encapsulated in the Old and New Testaments, and had elevated the Bible above the authority of the Church and human logic. She also said that the evangelicals had tried to restore ‘Christ’s atoning death on the cross to the centrality of Christian faith’.

Dingle said that the Protestant evangelicals had assumed that God and Satan were ‘present and active’ in the world and involved in human lives. She also said that they were convinced that ‘heathen cultures’ were under the authority of Satan. Finally, Dingle challenged historians to reconsider the missionaries’ interpretations of Māori

---

6 Ibid, p. 52.
7 Ibid, p. 40.
8 Ibid, p. iii.
9 Ibid, p. 60.
12 Sarah Dingle, 2009, pp. 41, 56.
culture from within the theological context in which those comments had been issued.\textsuperscript{13}

The work of J. F. C. Harrison and W. H. Oliver focused on the prevalence of millennialism and millenarianism in Great Britain in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{14} They characterised the widespread belief that Jesus would reign on earth for 1,000 years as a way of looking at the world rather than a specific doctrine.\textsuperscript{15} Oliver also described millennialism as ‘a mood of expectation’ and said that those who had studied the prophetic scriptures and ‘signs of the time’ had ‘attempted to place their age in God’s plan’.\textsuperscript{16}

Harrison distinguished between premillennialists, who believed that the advent of Christ would come before the millennium, and postmillennialists, who believed that the Second Advent of Christ would follow the millennium. He also identified a group within the former who thought that the Second Advent had already occurred and that the millennium had begun. Harrison said that premillennialists had anticipated the advent of divinely inspired ‘cataclysmic action’ in the future, whilst postmillennialists had believed that, the Kingdom of God would come gradually and as the result of the human agency of Christians.\textsuperscript{17}

Stuart Semmel outlined examples of millennial thought.\textsuperscript{18} He said that some ‘loyal millennialists’ had identified Napoleon Bonaparte as the Beast described in the Book of Revelation, as Antichrist or Abaddon - the king of the locusts – or as the angel of the bottomless pit. Others he said had believed that the British had been chosen by God to restore the Jews to Palestine. Semmel also mentioned Ralph Wedgewood, who had observed that ‘Brit’ was the Hebrew word for ‘covenant’, and concluded that the Biblical prophecies spoke of Britons not Jews, and that the British Empire was the Promised Land. He contrasted Wedgewood’s views with those of Reverend Ebenezer Aldred, a minister from Derbyshire, who had argued that Britain’s sins as a nation,

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid, p. 61.
\textsuperscript{15} J. F. C. Harrison, 1979, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{16} W. H. Oliver, 1979, p. 106.
\textsuperscript{17} J. F. C. Harrison, 1979, p. 4.
including the slave trade, suggested that it was she, not France or Rome, who was the whore of Babylon.¹⁹

John Harrison attributed the popularity of those ideas to the ‘acute social and economic change’ that had occurred in Britain because of industrialisation. He claimed that ‘traditional attitudes and beliefs were felt to be increasingly inadequate’ in this period of social upheaval and destabilization. He also observed that the doctrine of the millennium ‘implied an overturning of the world as at present constituted’ and suggested the ‘need for a new ideology to take account of the changes’.²⁰

Harrison said that many people in Great Britain had taken the idea of the millennium seriously. He also said that Revelation 20 had been taken literally and applied to a variety of issues by people who ‘condemned the world as evil, as being in the grip of Satan’. Thus, the Lisbon earthquake was taken as evidence of the fulfilment of biblical prophecies and the French Revolution was seen as a sign that the world was entering upon the last days. Harrison noted the pervasive influence of prophetical studies by George Stanley Faber, Edward King and Edward Irving. He also said that many pamphlets and sermons by Anglican clergy had referred to the prophetical studies of Sir Isaac Newton, Joseph Mede and William Whiston.²¹

J. F. C. Harrison said that the widespread belief that ‘Christ and anti-Christ’ were at work in the world was complemented by an enduring belief in folk medicine and popular religion. By way of example, he said that the treatment of illness was commonly linked to the stars, which were believed to rule over certain parts of the body. He also said that particular times were considered propitious for taking medicine and letting blood, as well as collecting, preparing and administering herbal remedies.²² Another characteristic of the age was a widespread interest in signs and wonders and a belief in the significance of dreams. Harrison said that it was common for people to consult soothsayers who professed the ability to predict their affairs, explain the significance of comets or prophesy the advent of famine, plague and war. He also noted the popularity of people who used the position of the stars to predict the

---

²⁰ J. F. C. Harrison, 1979, p. xvi.
²¹ Ibid, pp. 7, 10.
weather or assess the personality and future of the inquirer.\textsuperscript{23} John Harrison said that those ideas were not in conflict with millenarian beliefs. He also observed that the followers of prophets like Joanna Southcott, Richard Brothers, prophet Wroe and Zion Ward had included artisans, tradesmen, servants, intellectuals, professionals, Methodists, ‘devout’ Anglicans and clergy in the Church of England.\textsuperscript{24}

Harrison identified evangelical Protestantism as the compass from which ‘millenarianism took its bearings’ and noted that millennial doctrine, vocabulary, imagery and hymns were inherent in everyday evangelical religion.\textsuperscript{25} He also said that the prevalence of ‘almanacs, old prophecies and chapbooks’ amongst the papers of the clergy suggested that their interest in signs and wonders ‘could comfortably include elements of the magical and demonic’.\textsuperscript{26} Likewise W. H. Oliver said that it was ‘a normal and widespread activity’ to look at the world in a manner shaped by biblical prophecy. He also said that given this ‘commonly and widely used way of thinking … accounts of the intellectual history of the period should not ignore it’.\textsuperscript{27}

Richard Davis, the CMS farmer at Waimate, believed that the Bible had been written by the Holy Spirit and saw himself as an instrument of God. He also believed that he was living in millennial days and interpreted local and international events as the end-time signs mentioned in biblical prophecy.\textsuperscript{28} References to the religious and prophetic literature that influenced him and his perception of Papahurihia are scattered throughout his correspondence with the Reverend John Coleman.

A self-educated tenant-farmer from county Dorset, Davis’ journey to spiritual salvation was initially influenced by John Bunyan’s \textit{The Pilgrim’s Progress}. The book, which was published in 1678, was an allegory based on English Protestant theology and reflected the contemporary antipathy toward the Roman Catholic Church. It was written whilst Bunyan was serving a term of imprisonment for violating the Conventicle Act, which had made it unlawful for groups exceeding five

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid, pp. 42, 44, 47.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid, pp. 66-7, 110-11.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid, p. 226.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid, p. 119.
people to hold religious services outside the auspices of the Church of England. Although he initially read Bunyan whilst working his farm in Piddletrenthide, the book continued to influence him and in a letter written from Kaikohe in 1845 Richard Davis told John Coleman that his heart had been ‘cheered from reading Bunyan’s visions’ and that he hoped to be ‘dissolved, and to be with Christ’.

Davis also read a number of Christian biographies throughout his career. The first and principal influence was *The Life of David Brainerd*, which was edited by the evangelical theologian Johnathon Edwards and published in 1749. Brainerd had worked as a missionary to the American Indians at Kaunaumeek and Crossweeksung from 1743 to 1747. His daily diary, which he kept until one week before his death, focused on his spiritual relationship with God, his anxiety about the unworthy nature of his soul and his doubts about his effectiveness as a missionary. Like Davis, Brainerd’s ‘great concern’ was ‘for the conversion of the heathen to God’. He believed that the American Indians needed to be delivered ‘from the bondage of the powers of darkness’ and had fervently prayed ‘that God would set up his kingdom among them, and bring them into his church’.

With an interpreter, Brainerd had travelled hundreds of miles on horseback, weakened by consumption and wracked with self-doubt, to discourage the ‘idolatrous feasts and devil-worship’ of the Indians and counter ‘their objections against Christianity’. His diary became an evangelical classic and writing to Coleman from Waimate in March 1844 Richard Davis said:

> From the copy of Brainerd, which you gave me very many years ago, I have received much benefit and assistance. That book describes the true missionary
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30 Richard Davis, 3 July 1845, in Richard Davis to John Coleman, Kaikohe, 28 June 1845, *A Memoir*, p. 296. I am grateful to Professor Jane Samson of the University of Alberta for the observation that the missionaries grew up with Bunyan’s work and that their journals were about their own progress as pilgrims.
32 Ibid, p. 141.
33 Ibid, p. 142.
34 Ibid, pp. 156, 164.
35 My thanks to Professor Peter Lineham for drawing this to my attention.
character. It gives an exact description of the work of the Spirit on the minds of converted heathen. No missionary should be without it.

Davis also saw similarities between Brainerd’s experiences and his own and commented, ‘The enemy is here going-over the same ground which he did in Brainerd's case, so that a vigilant look-out is necessary’.36

Richard Davis also read the Christian biographies of Major-General Andrew Burn37 and Thomas Robinson of Leicester. Robinson was an evangelical minister who had been active in the campaign to abolish slavery, the development of foreign missions and the movement to supply the poor with Bibles. Along with Charles Simeon,38 Thomas Scott 39 and William Wilberforce he had also supported the formation of the

---

36 Richard Davis, 2 March 1844, in Davis to Coleman, Waimate, 22 February 1844, A Memoir, p. 283. Although he does not mention him in his letters, the other missionary who may have influenced Davis was John Eliot (1604-1690). Eliot was a Puritan missionary who was born in England and educated at Cambridge. He immigrated to Boston where he translated the Ten Commandments, the Lord’s Prayer and other scripture into the local language and began preaching to the Indians in 1646. He also organised converts into ‘preying towns’ governed on the basis of Exodus 18. Martin Moore, Memoirs of the Life and Character of Rev. John Eliot, Apostle of the N. A. Indians, Boston: T. Bedlington, 1822.


39 Thomas Scott (1747-1821) was an Anglican biblical commentator and involved in founding the CMS. He preached the Society’s first anniversary sermon in 1801 and tutored several probationer missionaries in Latin, Greek and Hebrew. Between 1788 and 1792, Scott produced his commentary on the Bible in 174 weekly instalments. He started his discourse from the position that man needs a revelation and that only God can give it, that Scripture is both inspired and authentic and that the Holy Spirit communicates ‘to the minds of the sacred readers … those things which could not otherwise have been known’. Arthur Pollard, Thomas Scott, The Blackwell Dictionary of Evangelical Biography 1730-1860, II, K-Z, pp. 989-91. Scott’s commentary was popular with the CMS missionaries in the Bay of Islands and the extant copies are Henrietta Baker from her father Joseph Baker & Charles Baker, 21 November 1923, XWM. 70.1-3, Elizabeth Marsden King, daughter of John & Hannah King, XWM. 71.1-3, Hannah King, XWM. 71.5-6, John Bedgood, XWM. 133, Reverend James Hamlin, presented by NZ mission of CMS, 7 June 1853, XWM. 172, James Hamlin, XWM. 1-4 and Sophia Davis, from her father Richard Davis in 1852 ‘for her close and persevering attention to the native children of the Kaikohe School’, XKH. 542.1-6. I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Peter Lineham for contacting Heritage New Zealand on my behalf and Rebecca Apperley, Heritage Advisor Collections, for her comprehensive reply.
Church Missionary Society in 1799. Burn’s memoir traced his life as a Christian and experiences as a Royal Marine in the West Indies and other ports and it is probable that Davis recognized similarities between the cultures Burn encountered and the Māori people. For example, Andrew Burn said that the Madagascar natives had ‘great faith in a world of spirits’ and that each family addressed their prayers to a ‘particular spirit’ who was usually ‘the soul of a departed ancestor’. He also said that they always consulted their spirits in times of adversity and believed ‘that the spirits reveal to them in dreams what they ought to do’. Finally, Burn said that there were prophets amongst them ‘who pretend to great familiarity with the guardian spirits’ and were able to manipulate the credulous.

The correspondence of Richard Davis indicates that he read Scott’s Bible on the Fall of Adam and Eve, Romaine’s *Life of Faith* and Cennick’s sermons. The Reverend William Romaine was an evangelical in the Church of England and the author of the trilogy *The Life of Faith* (1763), *The Walk of Faith* (1771) and *The Triumph of Faith* (1795). John Cennick, who had been inspired by George Whitefield, had joined

---


42 John Cennick was invited to help at Kingswood by George Whitefield and John and Charles Wesley and preached in the open air there in 1739. He was not ordained at the time and has sometimes been identified as the first lay-preacher of the Methodist movement. Cennick sided with Whitefield in his debate with John Wesley over Calvinism and was expelled by Wesley in 1741. He joined the Moravians in 1745 and was shunned by his former friend’s in Whitefield’s tabernacle. John Cennick has been described as ‘one of the greatest evangelicals of the revival, provoking dramatic conversions and fierce opposition wherever he preached’. His departure from Whitefield’s mission is said to have been ‘a serious blow to Calvinist Methodism in England’. Peter Lineham, John Cennick, *The Blackwell Dictionary of Evangelical Biography 1730-1860*, I, A-J, by Donald M. Lewis (ed.), Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1995, p. 210; Peter J. Lineham, ‘Cennick, John (1718-1755)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2013, http://0-www.oxforddnb.co.www.elgar.govt.nz/view/article/4993, accessed 29 July 2015.


44 George Whitefield (1714-1770) was a Calvinist Methodist minister. He attended Oxford University in 1732 where he met John and Charles Wesley and joined the ‘Holy Club’, which was a group of Methodists led by John Wesley. Whitefield took over as leader of the group in 1736 when the Wesley brothers left England for Georgia in America. Inspired by the example of Howell Harris in Wales he preached in the open air at Kingswood in 1739, initially to colliery miners but increasingly to massive crowds from the surrounding area. By 1740, the Methodists had split into two camps over the doctrine of predestination. The Wesley brothers were Arminians who denied the doctrine of predestination. John Wesley was also opposed to the Calvinist theory of grace and believed that Calvinism caused fatalism.
the Methodists after listening to John Wesley’s sermons, but parted ways with him over the doctrine of predestination, and the doctrine of Christian perfection. Coleman had also given Davis a copy of Homilies (containing the doctrinal teaching of the Church of England) and tutored him in the Hebrew language and Hebrew scripture before his departure for New Zealand. Driven by the hope that the London CMS would permit him to transfer his energies from farming to preaching, Richard Davis later asked Coleman to send him:

Lowth’s Isaiah, Horsley on the Psalms, and his Biblical Criticism, Wintle’s Daniel, Newcome’s Minor Prophets and Ezekiel, Blayney’s...


The doctrine that God has already chosen the people he intends to save, regardless of their faith, merit or lack thereof. The doctrine was first articulated by Augustine of Hippo and is commonly associated with the teachings of John Calvin.

Wesley taught that Christians could attain a degree of perfection in this life.

Richard Davis, A Memoir, pp. 2-3, 10, 14-15. Davis told Coleman that he had used his knowledge of Hebrew to assist with the CMS translation of Genesis into the Māori language. See Davis to Coleman, Paihia, 23 October 1826, ibid, p. 83.


Thomas Wintle (1738-1814) wrote The Prophet Daniel: an improved version attempted, Oxford, 1792. He was the domestic chaplain of Archbishop Secker and referred to Secker’s manuscript on
Jeremiah, Mason Goode’s Job, Fry on the Psalms and the Canticles, Frey’s Hebrew Grammar interleaved, and all other books which you think will aid us in translating the Scriptures, or assist me in acquiring a more perfect knowledge of Hebrew.

In a further letter, Richard Davis said that he had been ‘instructed and edified by reading Fry on the Psalms and the Canticles, the works of Ambrose Serle, and Douglas on the Advancement of Society’. He asked John Coleman to inform him ‘of all valuable works on prophecy published in England and elsewhere’. However, he singled out Edward Irving and his preliminary observations in Ben Ezra and said:

---


57 Reverend John Fry, formerly of University College, Oxford and chaplain to the Right Hon. Lord Viscount Ranelagh wrote Canticles; or Song of Solomon: A new translation with notes and an attempt to interpret the Sacred Allegories contained in that Book, To which is added, an Essay on the name and character of the Redeemer, London: J. Hatchard, 1811.

58 Davis to Coleman, Paihia, 23 October 1826, A Memoir, p. 83.


61 Edward Irving (1792-1834) was a Scottish clergyman who was educated at the University of Edinburgh. He was interested in prophecy and believed that the Second Advent of Christ was imminent. In 1824, he met James Hatley Frere who was engaged in an exposition of the Book of Daniel and the Apocalypse. Influenced by Frere’s ideas, Edward Irving wrote and published a sermon called ‘Babylon and Infidelity Foredoomed of God’ that connected particular Biblical predictions with the French Revolution. Edward Irving identified 1868 as the year of Christ’s Second Advent. His ideas became
The reign of Christ on earth seems most evident. But dreadful times must intervene before Christ’s glorious Epiphany. Babylon must be destroyed, and the 19th chapter of Revelation fulfilled. Times of trouble and trial are near at hand, and if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and sinner appear? It cheers my heart to hear the strong expectations of so many of God’s chosen ones, that the day of redemption is near, even at the doors.62

In a similar manner, three years before Papahurihia visited Waimate in July 1833, Richard Davis wrote:

We are living, I believe, in the last times, times of trouble. O that we may be armed with the whole armour of God, that we may be able to stand in the evil day! Our trials in this land have been grievous, but the Lord’s mercies to us have outweighed them all.63

Davis told Coleman that Owen and Whitefield were amongst his favourite authors and asked him to purchase ‘an old copy of Owen on the Hebrews’.64 He also said that he

---

62 Davis to Coleman, Paihia, 16 April 1829, A Memoir, p. 120.
wanted to read Edward Bickersteth’s latest book on prophecy\textsuperscript{65} and valued ‘The Parker Society books’\textsuperscript{66} because they contained ‘important matter suited to the perilous times in which we live’.\textsuperscript{67} Finally, Richard Davis was influenced by Coleman’s work on prophecy, which on the subject of the power of the Devil in the world, said:

And wherever the Gospel is preached, and fails to produce its genuine effects, that failure is to be attributed to the influence of Satan in blinding the minds of the hearers …. Satan also instigateth men to oppose the Gospel, and persecute the truth …. Satan is also the originator of all the false doctrines and heresies propagated in the world.\textsuperscript{68}

In closing, the case study of Richard Davis supports Sarah Dingle’s arguments that the ‘Bible was the major authority for the evangelical worldview’\textsuperscript{69} and the missionaries’ observations of Māori were shaped by theology.\textsuperscript{70} It also confirms the arguments advanced by Harrison and Oliver, who said that evangelical Protestantism was the compass from which ‘millenarianism took its bearings’,\textsuperscript{71} and that it was ‘a normal and widespread activity’ to look at the world in a manner shaped by Biblical prophecy in the period in question.\textsuperscript{72} Having thus concluded that the Protestant evangelicals observed Papahurihia through a religious lens, the next section will focus on the texts of Richard Davis, Henry Williams, William Wade and Charles Baker of the CMS in the Bay of Islands and William Woon from the WMS at Pākanae on the Hokianga and evaluate their evidence on Papahurihia in a theological context.

\textsuperscript{65} Davis to Coleman, Waimate, 3 May 1841, \textit{A Memoir}, pp. 262-3.
\textsuperscript{66} The Parker Society was formed in 1840. It was named for Matthew Parker, the first Elizabethan Archbishop of Canterbury, and its objective was to publish ‘the works of the Fathers and Early Writers of the Reformed English Church’. Andrew Cinnamond, \textit{The Reformed Treasures of the Parker Society}, Churchman, 122.3, 2008, pp. 221-42, \url{http://archive.churchsociety.org/churchman/documents/Cman_122_3_Cinnamond.pdf} accessed 4 June 2015.
\textsuperscript{67} Davis to Coleman, Kaikohe, 15 September 1845, \textit{A Memoir}, p. 301.
\textsuperscript{70} Ibid, p. iii.
\textsuperscript{71} J. F. C. Harrison, 1979, p. 226.
Section G: Papahurihia in Biblical Vernacular

This section concentrates on the assertions that Papahurihia founded a syncretistic doctrine based on Nākahī (the serpent in the Garden of Eden), that he observed a Saturday Sabbath and that his followers called themselves Jews. It scrutinizes the letters and journals of Richard Davis, Henry Williams and William Wade from the CMS in the Bay of Islands. It also inspects the journal of William Woon from the Wesleyan mission at Pākanae on the Hokianga, before examining their comments about Papahurihia in theological context. Finally, the section uses the journal of Charles Baker from the CMS to investigate the context in which Wairoa Māori said that the Bible was true but the missionaries had misinterpreted it and corrupted the word of God. The section confirms that the missionaries perceived Papahurihia through a religious lens. It also concludes that when the evidence is re-examined in the context of Protestant evangelicalism, the arguments that he founded a syncretistic religion based on the serpent, observed a Saturday Sabbath in keeping with Levitical law and that his followers identified as Jews, cannot be sustained.

When Papahurihia’s visit to Waimate was reported to Richard Davis in July 1833, the missionary described him as ‘one of the Native Gods’ and exclaimed, ‘Alas how many ways Satan has to tempt poor souls!’¹ On Sunday that week, Davis warned his congregations about ‘the delusions of Satan’ and his desire to ‘introduce new regulations’ by way of Papahurihia.² Similarly, when it was his turn to preach in the chapel at Waimate, Richard Davis explained ‘the absurdity of the sentiments … said to have been advanced by their god Papahurihia’.³

Richard Davis said that Puu, a chief of Mawe near Kaikohe, had told him that Papahurihia was ‘an old god who has merely got hold of something new’.⁴ He also said that Te Morenga, a chief of Taiāmai near Waimate, had admitted that he knew that Papahurihia’s way was ‘a false way’. The elderly chief told Davis that Papahurihia’s god had once come ‘whistling’ and had offered to remove the tip of a spear that was lodged in his temple. However, Te Morenga also said:

¹ Richard Davis, Journal, Wednesday 3 July 1833, MS-66/143, HL.
² Ibid, Sunday 7 July 1833.
³ Ibid, Sunday 14 July 1833.
⁴ Ibid, Sunday 7 July 1833.
I found the top of the spear upon my house which the god said was that which he had taken out of my head, but since then I could not believe him ... I knew it to be a deception, because the spear with which I was speared was of a different timber to that produced by the god.  

When Ormond Wilson wrote his article on Papahurihia in 1965 he did not include the comments Davis attributed to Puu or the full details of his conversation with Te Morenga. Rather, Wilson said it was difficult to judge from the missionary’s ‘cryptic comments’ whether a man was ‘bringing messages from the god Papahurihia’ or if the man was ‘the god himself’. He concluded that Papahurihia was initially the name of a god but that the name had been ‘transferred from the god to its human mouthpiece’ at a later date.

Wilson inverted the chronology of the primary evidence to support his argument. His assertion that Papahurihia was the name of a Māori god was based on an entry in the journal of Richard Davis on 7 August 1835. It said, ‘Papahurihia, their new god, or their old god in a new dress, is said to be making rapid strides, in procuring converts’. Wilson’s claim that the god’s name was transferred ‘to its human mouthpiece’ was based on William Wade who, on 12 July 1835, said that Papahurihia was ‘the individual who is propagating new doctrines as if from a god of that name’.

---

5 Richard Davis, Journal, Saturday 3 August 1833, MS-66/143, HL; Richard Davis, 3 August 1833, Church Missionary Record, 1834, London: Seeley & Sons, p. 263; Richard Davis, 30 July 1833, Missionary Register, 1834, London: Seeley & Sons, pp. 551-2 (the date of 30 July 1833 is incorrect and should read 3 August 1833). The full entry by Richard Davis reads, ‘Temorenga has been to see me to-day. Poor old man I long much after him but he has much to learn. O that the Lord would save his immortal soul! He told me that some of the people of Taiamai had set apart a day as a Sabath [sic] (if I may use the term) in which to worship the God Papahurihia, and that some of them had persuaded him to join them but he said, he told them that he had taken the garment of God (this was an expression I never heard before) and would have nothing to do with them. Yes, says the old chief to me, I know it to be a false way, I once detected their god in the following manner. Having had the top of a spear of [sic] in my tempel [sic] and left just over my eye I found it very painful. One night the god came whistling and said that he would take it out of me if I thought proper. I told him to do so and the next morning I found the top of the spear upon my house which the god said was that which he had taken out of my head, but since then I could not believe him and some time after, the top of the spear, which I had in my head, worked out of its own accord. Besides, I knew it to be a deception, because the spear with which I was speared was of a different timber to that produced by the god’.


7 Ibid.

8 Ibid, p. 475.

9 Ibid.

Thus, Ormond Wilson deduced that ‘in the mission records, the prophet of the new cult began to acquire an identity and a name’.\textsuperscript{11}

Richard Davis said that Puu had told him that Papahurihia was ‘an old god who has merely got hold of something new’.\textsuperscript{12} Likewise, Davis described Papahurihia as ‘their new god, or their old god in a new dress’. The meaning of both texts becomes clearer when the balance of his entry is considered:

Papahurihia … seems to be the Antichrist of the country – in fact, it appears to me to be the same spirit employed by the same which is now working over nearly the face of the whole earth. Here the spirit is patched up in the dress of the country, in order the more effectually to accomplish the object which he has in view, viz. the hindrance of the spread of the Gospel.\textsuperscript{13}

The ‘old god’ or ‘spirit’ mentioned by Puu and Davis was Satan - the serpent of old - who had clothed himself in the ‘dress of the country’ to undermine the Gospel of Christ. Thus, Satan himself was considered to have materialized at Waimate in the guise of the tohunga named Papahurihia. Likewise, Richard Davis’ reference to Papahurihia’s ‘new regulations’ and Williams Wade’s comment about his ‘new doctrines’ simply meant that Papahurihia’s customs and beliefs were not the holy or divine ordinances of God.

Davis’ allusion to Papahurihia as ‘the Antichrist of the country’ supports this reading of his text. For the missionary, whose world was a primeval battleground between Christ and Antichrist, Papahurihia was not just Satan personified but a manifestation of ‘the same which is now working over nearly the face of the whole earth’.\textsuperscript{14} That comment was an allusion to the last days or end-time signs foretold in biblical prophecy. Thus, in 1828 Richard Davis had said:

The doctrine of the glorious reign of Christ upon earth, and the probability that it is near, even at the doors, must refresh the soul of every Christian who

\textsuperscript{11} Ormond Wilson, JPS, 1965, p. 476.
\textsuperscript{12} Richard Davis, Journal, Sunday 7 July 1833, MS-66/143, HL. Puu of Mawe is reported to have said, ‘O … that is an old god who has merely got hold of something new, we are not so much in danger from \textit{them} him as we are from the wickedness of our own hearts, and so said many of them; but poor Puu has three wives’.
\textsuperscript{13} Richard Davis, Journal, 7 August 1835, MS-66/143, HL; \textit{Church Missionary Record}, 1836, p. 145 & \textit{Missionary Register}, 1836, p. 337.
\textsuperscript{14} Ormond Wilson, JPS, 1965, p. 475.
receives it. That this glorious period will come, and that it is near, I have no doubt. Precious Lord Jesus, come quickly! Why are Thy chariot wheels so long delayed?\footnote{Davis to Coleman, 2 April 1828, Paihia, \textit{A Memoir}, p. 111.}

The analogy that Richard Davis drew between Papahurihia and Antichrist was not the only time he alluded to Satan’s influence on worldly events. Two years before Papahurihia’s appearance at Waimate, the missionary claimed that Satan was responsible for the ill-feeling that prevailed between the CMS missionaries in the Bay of Islands and the decision of Waimate Māori to wage war on those at Tauranga. At that juncture Davis said, ‘The same spirit which is working in the minds of the people in Europe is working in the minds of the people here, both natives and Europeans’.\footnote{Ibid, 15 September 1831, Waimate, pp. 138-9.}

On the subject of Satan’s influence in his English homeland Richard Davis told John Coleman, ‘I fear it will be bad for England. Her national sins are crying sins indeed. I hope, as a nation, she will be preserved, but I fear for her Government’. He also condemned ‘the sinful state of some who are within the pale of the Christian Church’ and the ‘low state of religion in the colony’ of New South Wales. Finally Davis, who saw those circumstances as signs of the impending millennium, concluded:

But what may we not expect in the last days, when it is said by Him who saw all things from the beginning, that iniquity will abound, and the move of many will wax cold? Surely this prophecy is literally fulfilled in this our day.\footnote{Ibid, 19 September 1831, Waimate, p. 141.}

In another letter, Richard Davis admitted that he was afraid from ‘the prevalence of Romanism, and Apostacy … that England will be a partaker in some measure of the dreadful plagues to be inflicted on the beast and his votaries’. He also said that he agreed with Edward Irving that ‘a large portion of the elect Church of God hold false and unscriptural notions of the progressive manner in which they think the Church of Christ will be extended and established before the Millennium’.\footnote{Ibid, 25 April 1831, Waimate, pp. 135-6.} Likewise, in September 1835, Davis said that ‘The burning of the Houses of Parliament was an
alarming catastrophe. God will assuredly visit England for her sins. What sad accounts we hear of the desecration of the Sabbath!  

Richard Davis also saw Antichrist at work in the cause of Catholic Emancipation. He lamented the increase of ‘Popery’ in England and was emphatic that ‘THE BOLD APPEARANCE OF THE BRAZEN FOREHEAD OF INFIDELITY IS, I FEAR, THE TERRIBLE SIGN OF THE APPROACHING PUNISHMENT OF THE BRITISH NATION’. He said that ‘every real Christian’ should ‘employ all his talents to oppose Antichrist and that religion of hell, which our Protestant country has too long and too greatly tolerated’. In contrast, Richard Davis told John Coleman that he was cheered by his accounts of the Irish Societies and suggested that they were ‘the means whereby Antichrist’s power will finally be overthrown’. 

In a similar manner, Davis admitted that he was afraid of the ‘insidious, wily proceedings’ of Bishop Pompallier and Father Servant from the Roman Catholic mission on the Hokianga. He expressed his hope that ‘the Man of Sin’ would not gain a footing in New Zealand and that God would preserve ‘us and our dear people from the errors of Popery’. He also described Pompallier’s headquarters at Kororāreka as the centre from which ‘the Jesuitical leaven of Popish superstition is working, and will emanate to all parts of this distracted country’.

Richard Davis attributed the protection of the CMS mission in the Bay of Islands to the ‘hand of the Lord’. He believed that ‘the standard of the Gospel’ had been raised up and that ‘all the host of hell cannot pull it down’. After a death-defying encounter with Māori in 1827, he wrote that ‘the God of Jacob’ had ‘put a hook into their noses, and a bridle into their jaws, and led them back by the way they came’. On another occasion, he expressed his conviction that God had delivered him ‘out of the paw of the lion, and out of the paw of the bear’. At the same time, Davis told Coleman that most of the captains and crews ‘seem employed by Satan to incense the native mind

---

19 Richard Davis, 2 September 1835, Waimate, pp. 192-3.
20 Ibid, 2 September 1835, Waimate, pp. 192-3. The capitalization is Richard Davis’.
21 Ibid, 18 May 1829, Paihia, p. 127.
22 Ibid, 26 February 1838, Waimate, p. 226. For a similar comment see John Coleman, Sermons, Doctrinal and Practical, 1827, pp. 81-2. In the footnote Coleman cited 2 Thess. ii. 9,10.
23 Richard Davis to John Coleman, Waimate, 26 February 1838, A Memoir, p. 245.
24 Ibid, 6 April 1825, Paihia, p. 68.
25 Ibid, 5 December 1827, Paihia, p. 98.
26 Ibid, 4 February 1829, Paihia, pp. 115-6.
against us’. Likewise, when Māori blamed an epidemic of whooping cough on the missionaries’ preaching the evangelical said, ‘Satan and the powers of darkness’ were trying to ‘stir up the natives against us’ and concluded:

I have always expected a combat with the enemy of souls, before the Gospel takes effectual root in this country, and this seems its commencement …. The Lord will support His own cause, and will render it effectual to the destruction of Satan’s kingdom. Great missionary efforts are now made in New Zealand. Satan trembles for his kingdom, knowing that his time is short.  

Richard Davis continued to refer to Satan as ‘the subtle foe of God and man’ when he transferred to Waimate. He believed that Satan was ‘doing all he can to hold his own amongst the heathen’ and claimed that Moka was teaching his children ‘to praise the works of the devil’. He recounted ‘the dedication, or rather baptism, of their children to the devil’ and said that on one occasion he had ‘shrunk’ from one young man who ‘seemed to have the devil’s mark on his forehead’. He also said that Satan had encouraged Tareha to leave Waimate to avoid the Gospel, and had spread the idea that Te Morenga’s illness had been ‘caused by his becoming a Christian’.  

A comment by William Wade was the cornerstone of Ormond Wilson’s argument that Papahurihia was the founder of a syncretistic religion. He said that Wade had described Papahurihia’s creed as ‘a sort of mixture of Christianity, Judaism, & New-Zealandism’. However, the statement attributed to William Wade does not appear in his original journal, which states that when he and John Morgan returned from visiting Pōmare’s pā at Ōtuīhu they ‘found that Mr. Baker had met with opposition at Kororarika [sic] from some of Papahourihia’s [sic] followers’.  

Wilson’s footnote indicates that he located the comment in Wade’s journal on the CMS microfilm in the Alexander Turnbull Library. However, the comment attributed to Wade was also published in the Missionary Register in 1836. It said:

---

27 Ibid, 6 April 1825, Paihia, p. 67.  
28 Ibid, 16 April 1829, Paihia, pp. 119-20.  
31 Ibid, 29 April 1833, Waimate, p. 157. Davis did not mention Papahurihia in his letters to Coleman.  
32 Ormond Wilson, JPS, 1965, p. 476.  
33 William Wade, Journal, Sunday 12 July 1835, Misc-MS-0324, HL.
On our return we found that Mr Baker had met with opposition at Kororareka from some of Papahourihia’s [sic] followers. Papahourihia [sic], or the individual who is propagating new doctrines as if from a god of that name, was taught to read in one of the Mission Schools; but now seeks to get himself a name by broaching a new religion – a sort of mixture of Christianity, Judaism & New-Zealandism. He has gained a good many followers but does not appear at present to be increasing in popularity.  

The testimony attributed to Wade on the microfilm and in the magazine appears to be a synthesis of missionary sources. Moreover, there is evidence that the emendation of his original comment was not an isolated episode. For example, in 1834 Henry Williams described Kawakawa as one of the places that had been under the domination of Papahurihia ‘whose Sabbath is on a Saturday’. When published in the evangelical magazine the text attributed to Williams said that Papahurihia was ‘an impostor, who has aimed at making the Natives keep the Sabbath on the Saturday’. 

Wade’s journal shows that one month before Baker’s argument with Papahurihia’s followers at Kororāreka, he accompanied Charles Baker and Henry Williams to a hahunga at the back of Kororāreka, where they attempted to persuade Māori to forego the custom in favour of Christian burial. The CMS missionaries had done the same at Waimate the month before. On that occasion, Richard Davis and William Williams had erected flags on the piles of food to indicate ‘that they henceforth give up the customs of their forefathers and take the word of God as their guide’. They had also told the assembly ‘that from the present time the removal of the bones is to cease’. Likewise, at the hahunga near Kororāreka, Heke had climbed the wata and hoisted a flag to signify that it would be the last hahunga there. However, William Wade said that Heke was opposed by a number of people including Wharerahi, the principal chief and elder brother of Rewa, whom Davis and Williams had already

34 William Wade, 12 July 1835, Missionary Register, 1836, p. 558.
35 Henry Williams, Sunday 31 August 1834, Early Journals, pp. 387-8; Henry Williams, 31 August 1834, Missionary Register, 1835, pp. 549-50.
36 William Wade, Journal, 3 June 1835, Misc-MS-0324, HL.
37 Richard Davis, Journal, 27 May 1835, PC-0067, p. 808, HL.
38 William Williams, Journal, 18 May 1835, MS-91/75 (10), III, p. 414, AML. Charles Baker’s journal indicates that the Kororāreka natives were absent at a hahunga or ‘Funeral feast’ on 17 May 1835. Charles Baker, Journal, 17 May 1835, MS-0517A, p. 103, HL.
cajoled at Waimate.\textsuperscript{40} Wade also said that afterward, when he and Baker visited Ōtuīhu, Kiwikiwi had opposed their entry and with another chief had ‘persisted in caviling & ridiculing as long as Mr. B. continued’ to preach.\textsuperscript{41} Both attempts to introduce the practice of Christian burial were made amongst Ngāti Rēhia, Ngāi Tawake and Patukeha, whose principal chiefs were Tareha and Titore, the late Hongi Hika and the brother chiefs Wharerahi, Rewa and Moka. It was therefore in that context, on a Sunday, that Charles Baker met with resistance from Papahurihia’s followers at Kororāreka.\textsuperscript{42} However, there is no evidence that Papahurihia had introduced a new or syncretistic religion and it is more likely that the people he encountered had simply extolled the customs of their forefathers.

Ormond Wilson’s assertion that Papahurihia’s followers were called Jews was based on the diary of the Wesleyan missionary William Woon. He said that some of the natives at Pākanae on the Hokianga were very covetous. He also said that they were ‘called Hurais (Jews) by the people in the river as they have imbibed Jewish sentiments’.\textsuperscript{43} The fact that Woon had used the stereotype of the cunning and greedy Jew to describe the avaricious trading habits of Pākanae Māori did not escape the attention of Wilson who wrote, ‘Was covetousness the Jewish sentiment to which he refers? Subsequent entries suggest it may have been’.\textsuperscript{44} In spite of that, he asserted that the ‘Hurai’ were ‘regarded as an independent Christian sect’ on the Hokianga.\textsuperscript{45}

The evidence shows that William Woon only applied the appellation ‘Jews’ to unconverted Māori at Pākanae.\textsuperscript{46} He also said that Rangatira, the chief there, routinely asked for payment for water from the river and had threatened to throw a captain overboard if he refused to pay. Likewise, when Woon refused to pay for the water he had used to launder his clothing, Rangatira threatened to bar him from Pākanae and support Bishop Pompallier.\textsuperscript{47} William Woon said that ‘those who have not embraced

\textsuperscript{40} William Wade, Journal, Sunday 31 May 1835, Misc-MS-0324, p. 44, HL.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid, Sunday 28 June 1835, pp. 45-6.
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid, Sunday 12 July 1835, p. 49.
\textsuperscript{44} Ormond Wilson, JPS, 1965, p. 477.
\textsuperscript{45} Ormond Wilson’s argument was based on James Buller who had said that Papahia of Te Rarawa had distinguished between the Wesleyans, the Church of England in the Bay of Islands, ‘the image people’ (Roman Catholics) and ‘the Hurai’, whom Buller identified as ‘the followers of Papahurihia’. However, Papahia’s reference was to unconverted Māori. See James Buller, Journal, 13 August 1838, as cited by Ormond Wilson, JPS, 1965, p. 478.
\textsuperscript{46} William Woon, Journal, 4 March 1839, MS-0969/004, p. 335, HL.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid, 2 April 1839, p. 340.
the gospel here are called Jews and really some of them are very Jewish in their
designs.' At Whirinaki, where he found the people ‘very worldly minded’, he
sermonised them ‘to avoid covetousness from the awful example referred to in the
12th of Luke’. He also said that their ‘natural propensity’ toward covetousness
would be their ruin. Likewise, at Utakura the Wesleyan preached ‘from the last
chapter of the lot of Timothy & shewd the evil effects of covetousness’.

William Woon was the only Protestant evangelical to refer to Papahurihia’s followers
as ‘Jews’. However, he was not alone in his perception of Māori as covetous people.
John Lydiard Nicholas, who had accompanied the Reverend Samuel Marsden on his
first visit to New Zealand in December 1814, said that Māori in the Bay of Islands
were ‘as keen in enhancing their commodities as the craftiest Jews on the Royal
Exchange’. Likewise, the Reverend Daniel Tyerman from the London Missionary
Society, who visited the Wesleyans at Kaeo in 1823, said that the demands of Māori
there ‘were so exorbitant, that few bargains were made’. Finally, in 1840 Father
Servant of the Roman Catholic mission said that Māori were ‘a carnal and crude
people’ who were attracted to Jesus Christ ‘out of earthly concerns’. He also said:

Apart from a small number in each of our mission stations who give real
reason for hope, the rest display frightful greed. How many are attracted to
what they call prayers only insofar as it gets them clothing and other things!
How many have threatened us with abandoning prayers if we do not give them
this or that thing they ask for!
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The texts of the Roman Catholic missionaries validate Woon’s claim that Christian Māori on the Hokianga called unconverted Māori ‘Jews’. They also show that Christian Māori referred to their old Māori gods as ‘Satan’ (Nākahi). For example, Father Servant said that when some of the ‘epikopo’ or Roman Catholic natives decided to clean up the ‘cemetery where the bones of their ancestors are laid’ they invited the missionaries ‘to go to those sites and say prayers to drive away their former gods whom they now call Satan’ (Nākahi).56 Likewise, at a debate at Ōpōtiki between ‘epikopo’ and ‘mitineri’ (Protestant) Māori, Father Auguste Chouvet lamented the vitriol of the latter and said that he much preferred ‘the natives who remain devilish or Jewish (These are names given here to the natives who do not offer Christian worship)’.57

The assertion that Papahurihia observed a Saturday Sabbath originated with Richard Davis. On 3 August 1833, after a visit from Te Morenga, he said:

He told me that some of the people of Taiamai had set apart a day as a Sabath [sic] (if I may use the term) in which to worship the God Papahurihia.58

The missionary wrote the entry on Saturday 3 August 1833 but the notion that the day was a ‘Sabbath’ originated with Davis, who qualified his use of the word by adding in brackets ‘(if I may use the term)’. Thus when read as Richard Davis intended the sentence meant that the day that was set apart for Papahurihia at Taiāmai was not a Sabbath. In spite of that, the claim that Papahurihia’s followers had observed a Saturday Sabbath was repeated on numerous occasions, rather like a game of ‘Chinese Whispers’ in which errors accumulate in the retellings.

The reasons for the evolution of the rumour can only be conjecture. However, the next person to mention the Hebrew Sabbath was Henry Williams. In a letter dated 17 June 1834, he told Dandeson Coates of the London CMS that Papahurihia’s followers
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58 Richard Davis, Journal, Saturday 3 August 1833, MS-66/143, HL.
‘observe a Sabbath, but not with us, as it is on the Saturday’. Likewise, on Sunday 31 August 1834, Williams said that Kawakawa was one of the places that had been under the ‘particular domination’ of Papahuriha ‘whose Sabbath is on a Saturday’. The next allusion to the Saturday Sabbath was by the naval surgeon William Barrett Marshall, who accompanied Henry Williams to Kawakawa one Sunday and met one of Papahuriha’s followers engaged in planting kūmara. He later wrote that a ‘false prophet’ had arisen in the neighbourhood of Rangihoua and that his followers ‘observe the last day of the week as holy, and desecrate the first’.

Richard Davis started to keep a journal for the London CMS in April 1833. The first installment, which included his comment about the day set apart for Papahuriha at Taiāmai, was enclosed with a covering letter dated 10 September 1833. It is possible that Henry Williams, who vetted his subordinates’ mail before sending it to London, read the entry and misunderstood Davis’ reference to that day as a ‘Sabbath’. That this was probably the case is suggested by the journal of James Stack, who stayed with Richard Davis at Waimate and accompanied him to Te Morenga’s village on 10 August 1834, but failed to mention the Saturday Sabbath in his account of Papahuriha.

59 Henry Williams to Dandeson Coates, 17 June 1834, MS-0285/B, typescript, pp. 301-5, HL. The full transcript reads ‘The general state of the Mission has been proceeding well, though in some places the Gospel has appeared to flourish more than in others, but we hope a good work is going on and that we shall ere long see greater things than these. In some districts the word of God is received with all gladness – in others it is rejected and opposed. Some new doctrine has recently appeared amongst the people, at least new in name, as they borrow no less a one that that of “Nakahii”, the native name for the Serpent – Gen. 3.1. Also Papahuriha, who relates wonders. They observe a Sabbath, but not with us, as it is on the Saturday – they have services and baptism and profess to know the scriptures. I have not yet been able to meet with any of these leading men, though I have frequently been challenged, but Papahuriha has invariably been out of the way. The new doctrine has been brought forward by some, who after residing awhile with us and obtained a superficial knowledge, have gone forth two-fold the child of the devil than they were before’.

60 Henry Williams, Sunday 31 August 1834, Early Journals, p. 388.


62 The journal is MS-66/3 and the letter of 10 September 1833 is MS-66/36. Notes by Maureen O’Rourke, Michael Hitchings to Ormond Wilson, 6 August 1965, 805/7/1, MS-3406/001, HL.

63 James Stack, Journal, Sunday 10 August 1834, Thursday 21 August 1834 & Friday 19 September 1834, qMS-1859, HL. Mr and Mrs James Stack stayed with Marianne and Henry Williams from 21 August 1834 to 19 September 1834 when they sailed for Pūriri on Karere. However, bad weather forced the vessel to return and anchor off John King’s house at Te Puna. On Sunday 21 September 1834, Stack and King itinerated to preach at the villages of Patunui and Wairoa. The Stacks did not sail for Pūriri until Tuesday 23 September 1834.
His misinterpretation of comments in William’s letter to Coates also led Ormond Wilson to maintain that Papahurihia had founded the Nākahi doctrine. On 17 June 1834, Henry Williams said:

Some new doctrine has recently appeared amongst the people, at least new in name, as they borrow no less a one that that of “Nakahi”, the native name for the Serpent – Gen. 3.1.  

Henry Williams was the only missionary in the Bay of Islands who mentioned Nākahi. His comments were written on Sundays, after he had itinerated to preach and were restricted to Ōtuīhu and Kawakawa south of the Paihia mission station. Williams wrote about Nākahi for the first time in December 1833. He said that Hihi, an elderly chief from Ōtuīhu, had tried to engage him in debate about ‘the Nakahi’, which he described as ‘a new doctrine which has sprung recently amongst them in opposition to our instruction’. In January 1834, Henry Williams said that the natives at Ōtuīhu were ‘listless and inanimate’ and that Hihi ‘was full of the new doctrine’. However, in a letter to London in June 1834, he told Coates that the Nākahi doctrine was only ‘new in name’. He also said that ‘Nākahi’ was the ‘name for the Serpent’ in the missionaries’ translation of Genesis 3:1. Finally, Henry Williams explained that the word ‘Nakahi’ had been ‘borrowed’ by a group of young men who had lived in the mission station, gained a superficial knowledge of Christianity and emerged ‘two-fold more the child of the devil than they were before’.

Henry Williams mentioned Nākahi again in July 1834. He said that Watonga was ‘heavy’ and ‘a disciple’ of the Nākahi and that Hari had ‘for some time’ joined Papahurihia. In August, he approached Wharepoaka at Rangihoua, who denied his belief in Papahurihia’s doctrine, and commented that Pōmare and his people from Ōtuīhu were ‘insensible to everything’ and ‘insultingly indifferent’. He also said that Kawakawa was one of the places that had been under the domination of Papahurihia. In October 1834, Williams said that Pukututu had complained that some of his neighbours at Kawakawa were ‘disciples’ of Papahurihia. He also said

64 Henry Williams to Dandeson Coates, 17 June 1834, MS-0285/B, pp. 301-5, HL.
65 Henry Williams, Sunday 15 December 1833, Early Journals, p. 354.
67 Henry Williams to Dandeson Coates, 17 June 1834, MS-0285/B, pp. 301-5, HL.
that they intended ‘going, in a few days, to Rangihoua where their leaders are’. Finally, Henry Williams said that ‘many interesting old chiefs’ had told him that Papahurihia ‘was giving ground’. Nevertheless, one week later, Tareha and Titore ‘brought forward their arguments’ in support of Papahurihia when Williams visited them at Kororāreka.

William Barrett Marshall accompanied Henry Williams to Kawakawa later that month and met ‘one of the deluded’ followers of Papahurihia. He said that the man ‘was very busily engaged in planting the kumara’ and ‘kept on with his work all the while Mr. Williams talked’. The young surgeon also said that he was distressed by the ‘sight of this poor infatuated man … given up as he evidently was to strong delusion to believe a lie’. In November 1834, Henry Williams complained that he had been ‘kept conversing till a later hour’ after evening service at Paihia and that the ‘accounts of Papahurihia occupied much time’. He also said that Papahurihia had ‘gone to Hokianga to make converts there’. Finally, in December the same year Kiwikiwi of Ōtuīhu praised Papahurihia’s ‘great deeds’ and told Henry Williams that there would be a meeting with him at ngahuru, when the kūmara was harvested.

Henry Williams’ description of his former pupils as ‘two-fold more the child of the devil than they were before’ was probably based on Matthew 23:15, meaning that he equated them with the scribes and pharisees of Galilee who had reverted to native custom after professing Christianity. Likewise, when Williams said that Kawakawa was under the domination of Papahurihia, he meant that Satan governed the district and that the people there were ignorant of the spiritual light and knowledge of Christ. In a similar vein, Henry Williams said that the villages of Whāngai, Ōtuīhu and Waikare were ‘enveloped in considerable darkness; though a few are inquiring after truth, and we trust ere long will receive it in the love thereof’.

The words that Henry Williams used to describe Papahurihia’s followers at Ōtuīhu and Kawakawa were allusions to the state of their souls. He said that Hihi was in the
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gall of bitterness, that he and the other natives at Ōtuīhu were in the bond of iniquity, that Watonga was ‘heavy’ and that others were ‘listless and inanimate’. Likewise, his brother William said that Waikato of Rangihoua was ‘bitterly opposed to religious instruction’ and had argued the supremacy of Papahurihia’s teachings with ‘blind obstinacy’ in a long debate.78 Finally, Marshall’s suggestion that Papahurihia’s follower at Kawakawa was under ‘strong delusion to believe a lie’ reflected his belief that the man had been seduced by Satan to believe a lie and may have been a reference to 2 Thessalonians 11.

When Henry Williams told Dandeson Coates that the Nākahi doctrine was only ‘new in name’,79 he meant that Māori were using the word Nākahi to refer to their old superstitions.80 He also said that Papahurihia was the ‘one’ or person who related the ‘wonders’ of the Nākahi doctrine. This suggests that the culprits who ‘borrowed’ the word Nākahi from Genesis 3:1 were from Ōtuīhu or Kawakawa. In contrast, Hōne Mohi Tāwhai said that the Wesleyan missionaries on the Hokianga had denounced Papahurihia’s expertise as a tohunga ‘as works of the Nakahi (Serpent)’ and ‘hence the god of Papahurihia was called’ Te Nākahi (meaning Satan).81

Ormond Wilson interpreted further comments in Williams’ letter to Coates to mean that Papahurihia’s had incorporated elements of Christian liturgy into his Māori rituals. Namely, Henry Williams said that Papahurihia’s followers held ‘services and baptism and profess to know the scriptures’.82 However, the CMS missionaries used the word ‘baptism’ to refer to the tohi ceremony, which Davis had described to Coleman as ‘the dedication, or rather baptism of their children to the devil’. Richard Davis said that tohunga dedicated the child to Satan by immersing him in water and reciting incantations to make him a courageous warrior.83 Likewise, when William Williams heard that a tohi ceremony had taken place at Kororāreka he said:

The Chiefs were assembled at a Native Baptism .... The Natives on these occasions yield their offspring to the Devil; and pray that they may be
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78 William Williams, Journal, Sunday 14 March 1835, MS-91/75 (10), III, p. 412, AML.
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courageous, cruel, and impudent; that they may kill their enemies, and take many slaves.\textsuperscript{84}

Moreover, to support his argument that Papahurihia was a Māori prophet and founder of a syncretistic religion, Ormond Wilson said that Papahurihia’s supporters from the village of Wairoa near Te Puna had claimed that the Bible was true but the missionaries had misinterpreted it and corrupted the Word of God.\textsuperscript{85} However, Charles Baker, who recorded the remark in his journal, attributed it to European sailors. He said:

The very great intercourse these natives have with Shipping by no means prepares them for listening to the Gospel & it is evident that the Europeans with whom they have to do, are scoffers of religion – one remark they made was “that the Bible was true but that we gave a wrong interpretation of it” & had thereby corrupted the Word of God.” I had no doubt that the idea had been given them by our [?] countrymen & I therefore asked whether the person who had told them these things was a good man or a bad man to which they made no answer.\textsuperscript{86}

Baker also said that Wairoa Māori had ‘all bitterly opposed all that I said’.\textsuperscript{87} His comment mirrored that of Charles Davis who had previously said that the natives at Wairoa had ‘pleaded much in behalf of their superstitious customs’.\textsuperscript{88}

Finally, Ormond Wilson said that William Williams had encountered a new doctrine at Puketona and implied that the people there were supporters of Papahurihia.\textsuperscript{89} However, the text shows that Williams had argued with the people ‘on the subject of their superstitions’. He also said that some were ‘very inveterate against our doctrines’.\textsuperscript{90} In keeping with that, on his next visit he commented that the chief, who

\textsuperscript{84} William Williams, 2 October 1831, \textit{Missionary Register}, 1832, p. 407.
\textsuperscript{86} Charles Baker, Journal, Sunday 3 November 1833, MS-0517A, HL.
\textsuperscript{87} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{88} Charles Davis, Journal, Sunday 25 September 1825, MS-0498/18, HL.
\textsuperscript{89} Ormond Wilson, JPS, 1965, p. 474.
\textsuperscript{90} William Williams, Journal, Sunday 10 November 1833, MS-91/75 (10), III, pp. 336-7, AML. Alfred Brown and William Fairburn had visited the Puketona natives on 30 June 1833. Brown said that when they told the chief that he would go to heaven when he died if he believed in Jesus Christ he replied, ‘he knew his forefathers were not there; and he could not bear to be separated from them’. Alfred Brown, 30 June 1833, \textit{Missionary Register}, 1834, p. 515.
was probably Rete, was still ‘much disposed to cavil’ and described Puketona as ‘one of the most discouraging places we have to do with’. Finally, even though he had read William Ellis’ book Polynesian Researches and was aware that the Arioi priests in Tahiti had opposed the LMS missionaries, William Williams did not mention Papahurihia or the existence of an anti-missionary cult in the Bay of Islands. Rather, he said that although the Māori people had ‘many sacred rites and superstitious ceremonies’ anybody who felt ‘an inclination to lay them aside, can do so without danger’. Nor did he allude to the syncretisation of Christian theology and Māori beliefs.

To conclude, when his testimony on Papahurihia is re-examined from within the theological context in which his comments were issued, it is evident that Richard Davis of Waimate was a premillennialist who saw Papahurihia as Satan disguised as a tohunga. He also used religious terminology to describe a day set apart for him at Taiāmai and thereby fueled the rumour that his followers had observed a Saturday Sabbath. When considered in the context of his diary, it is evident that William Woon’s comment that Papahurihia’s followers at Pākanae were known as Jews echoed the sentiments of Wesleyan Māori on the Hokianga, who were in the habit of calling their unconverted countrymen Jews. It is also apparent that both Wesleyan and Anglican Māori used the word Nākahi to refer to non-Christian Māori and tohunga like Papahurihia, who were thought to be under the influence of Satan and engaged in the work of the Devil. The allusion to Papahurihia’s syncretistic religion was an embellishment by the editors of the Missionary Register and absent from William Wade’s diary. In a similar vein, the journal of Charles Baker shows that he attributed the comment that the Bible was true but the missionaries had misinterpreted it and corrupted the word of God to the masters and crews of the ships, whom he regarded as a hindrance to the work of the mission. It is also apparent that, whilst Māori at Puketona were unresponsive to the overtures of William Williams, he did not identify them as Papahurihia’s followers or as members of an anti-missionary cult. The next
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section focuses on Papahurihia’s debate with the Reverend William White at Waimā in April 1835 and his role in Kaitoke’s murder of two Wesleyan Māori converts on the Hokianga in January 1837.
Section H: Blasphemy and Schismatic War

This section focuses on Papahurihia’s debate with the Reverend William White at Waimā in 1835 and his role in the murders of two Wesleyan Māori converts on the Hokianga in January 1837. It uses multiple sources to determine how Papahurihia acquired the epithet the ‘Atua Wera’ and if the war that broke out between Kaitoke and Nene after the deaths of Matthew and Richmond was schismatic. The section concludes that Papahurihia was called the ‘Atua Wera’ (‘the hot god’ Satan) by Wesleyan Māori in White’s party when he claimed equality with Jesus Christ during the debate. It also concludes that Papahurihia was not involved in the murders of Matthew and Richmond and that the catalyst for the war was Kaitoke’s land at Mata, which the Wesleyan Māori converts had sold to William White.

The Protestant evangelicals in the Bay of Islands based their accounts of Papahurihia on hearsay. There is no evidence that anybody ever met him in person or spoke to him face-to-face. Furthermore, in spite of references to his Saturday Sabbath by Henry Williams and others, the missionaries’ diaries are devoid of any evidence that Papahurihia held regular or even sporadic assemblies on Saturdays or for that matter, on any other day of the week. In contrast, there is compelling evidence that the commentaries of the Protestant evangelicals in the Bay of Islands were encoded with tropes of scripture and prophecy. Thus, whilst there is room to debate the specific verses that informed their remarks, there can be little doubt that the secular interpretation of the missionaries’ texts has contributed to the historiographical distortion of Papahurihia.

Although the commentaries of William Woon and Āperahama Taonui reflect their propensity to employ the language of biblical verse, the Wesleyans on the Hokianga had a different experience of Papahurihia. William White, the superintendent at the Mangungu mission station, met Papahurihia in person in 1835 and debated him. Moreover, although many of their subsequent statements are hearsay, the Wesleyan missionaries continued to describe Papahurihia’s behaviour at regular intervals until his death at Ōmanaia in November 1875. Therefore, whilst this section will allude to
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1 Ruth Ross made these observations in her draft reply to Ormond Wilson’s article on Papahurihia. See Ruth Ross Papers, MS-1442, Box 67(2), AML.
the biblical commentaries that may have influenced the Wesleyans’, its principal focus is on Papahurihi’a’s reported conduct.

Although he did not identify Papahuriha by name, John Whiteley appears to have been the first Wesleyan to allude to his behaviour. Writing on 20 November 1834, the missionary said, ‘One under the influence of his delusion has set himself up for a prophet, and another, to be sure, has called himself the expected Messiah’. 2 The entry was dated nine days after Henry Williams said that Papahuriha had ‘gone to Hokianga to make converts there’, 3 and it is therefore probable that Papahuriha was the deluded ‘prophet’ mentioned by Whiteley. In contrast, the ‘expected Messiah’ was definitely the Wesleyan Māori convert Āperahama Taonui, who had appeared at the Mangungu mission station one month earlier wearing a long white veil over his face and claimed to be Jesus Christ. 4

John Whiteley’s description of Papahuriha as a ‘false prophet’ was not unlike the comments of the CMS missionaries in the Bay of Islands. In 1832, James Shepherd reported that when a Māori convert had addressed the people from ‘Beware of False Prophets’ 5 and applied it ‘to the Priests of New Zealand’, the chief had banned him from the village and instructed his people not to listen to the missionaries. 6 Likewise, when Papahuriha visited the Waimate mission station in July 1833, Richard Davis had deprecated his beliefs and warned his Māori congregations about ‘the delusions of Satan’. 7

The accounts of John Whiteley, Richard Davis and James Shepherd suggest that they interpreted biblical references to false prophets literally and believed that they would appear before the Second Advent of Christ to show great signs and wonders and introduce destructive heresies amongst the people. It is also probable that, in keeping with scripture, the trio expected false prophets to use divination, interpret omens, act as mediums and call up the dead. Certainly, the Reverend Edward Bickersteth, who
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2 John Whiteley to WMS, 20 November 1834, typescript, MS-1442, Box 67 (2), AML.
3 Henry Williams, Tuesday 11 November 1834, Early Journals, p. 400.
4 John Whiteley, Journal, 21 September 1834, as cited by Judith Binney, JPS, 1966, pp. 328-9. John Whiteley said that a few days beforehand Āperahama Taonui had fallen to the ground and prophesied the second coming, on which ‘the clouds would be red and twelve suns would appear in the sky’.
5 Matthew 7:15 “Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves”.
6 James Shepherd, 4 July 1832, Missionary Register, 1833, p. 282.
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was once secretary of the London CMS, recommended that novices should begin their study of prophecy by taking ‘the plain literal meaning of the expressions, where they are not evidently symbolical’. The biblical commentaries of Protestant theologians were standard missionary texts. Both William Hall of Rangihoua and Henry Williams of Paihia owned the Reverend Matthew Henry’s *Complete Commentary on the Whole Bible*, in which he described false prophets as those who ‘lead hearers into false doctrine’. Likewise, the Wesleyan theologian Richard Watson, whose biography had inspired William Woon, said that Satan was ‘a lying spirit in the mouth of false prophets’ and used ‘his utmost endeavours to rob God of his glory, and men of their souls.’ Watson also said that the worship of such devils was ‘general in some form throughout a great part of the Heathen world’.

Testimony in the Roman Catholic texts corroborates this interpretation of the Wesleyans’ allusions to Papahuirihia. They also show that the same verse, Matthew 7:15, was turned against the Roman Catholic missionaries following their arrival on the Hokianga in January 1838. For example, in 1845 a Protestant Māori convert accused Father Jean-Baptiste Comte of being ‘the false prophet dressed in a sheep skin’ who was ‘interiorly’ a devouring wolf. Comte said that the Protestant missionaries had pointed out similar texts in the Bible to the ‘poor natives’ who then ‘hurl them at us, often without knowing what they are saying’. Likewise, Father
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9 In July 1819, William Hall said that he had read part of the twelfth chapter of St. Luke to the natives at Rangihoua ‘with Henry’s explanation of it’. He also said that he had told them ‘that the New Zealand Gods were deceiving them’ and that the missionaries had come ‘to tell them that they must cast away their Gods, and believe in our God, and their souls would be happy in the next world’. William Hall, *Journal*, 13 July 1819, Micro-79-313, AUL.
Chouvet said that the Protestant evangelicals had warned Māori to guard themselves against false prophets and told them that the verse applied to the Roman Catholic priests.  

Reverend William White said that Papahurihia’s family had challenged him to debate the tohunga at Waimā on 6 April 1835. On that occasion, the Wesleyan described Papahurihia as ‘A Bold New Zealand Imposter’. His choice of the word ‘imposter’ is significant in that it was probably influenced by 2 John 1:7-11, which issued a warning of Antichrist deceivers. In his explanatory notes on the verse, John Wesley had cautioned:

Carefully keep what ye have heard from the beginning, for many seducers are entered into the world, who confess not Jesus Christ that came in the flesh – Who disbelieve either his prophetic, or priestly, or kingly office. Whosoever does this is the seducer – From God. And the antichrist – Fighting against Christ.

Thus, William White’s use of the word ‘imposter’ suggests that like Richard Davis, the Wesleyan saw Papahurihia as Antichrist. White said that Papahurihia was unrepentant when he challenged his ‘first and most awful Blasphemies that Papahudihia [sic] & Jesus Christ were equal’. In his treatise, Richard Watson attributed blasphemy to Satan. He also said that the purpose of ‘impious talk’ was ‘to inspire others with the same irreverence towards the Deity’. This suggests that from White’s perspective, Papahurihia had committed ‘a very atrocious offence in words, no less than abuse’ against Christ with the intention of persuading others to reject
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15 2 John 1:7-11 Beware of Antichrist Deceivers For many deceivers have gone out into the world who do not confess Jesus Christ as coming in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist.
17 Professor Peter Lineham has pointed out that 1 John 2:8 said that many antichrists have gone into the world.
18 William White, Journal, Monday 6 April 1835, Micro-MS-612, ATL; Eliza White, Journal, 6 April 1835, transcript, MS-Papers-11115-150, ATL.
19 See 1 John 2:19 and 21.
the Gospel, which was exactly the work of an Antichrist.\textsuperscript{20} White’s records also show that he told Papahurihia that he was the ‘tool of the Devil’.\textsuperscript{21}

The context of White’s commentary on Papahurihia was further elucidated in a letter to the editor of the \textit{Sydney Herald} in July 1835. A European eyewitness, who worked in the timber-trade on the Hokianga, said that Pi and other chiefs from Waimā had been preparing to entertain Moetara of Pākanae for the preceding six months. He also said that Moetara and his entourage had arrived by canoe on 6 April 1835 and that the following morning a ‘grand contest’ had taken place between the Wesleyan Māori converts and ‘the followers of an upstart slave’ who had adopted ‘the cognomen of Atua Wero’ or ‘Fiery God’. Although the author omitted to mention the involvement of the Reverend William White, he said that the theological debate had raged over a period of four hours and that the Christian party had been the victors.\textsuperscript{22}

There is strong evidence that those encounters were commonplace in the period in question, initially between Protestant Māori and their unconverted countrymen but from 1838, when Bishop Pompallier arrived on the Hokianga, between Māori converts to one or other of the Protestant sects and the ‘epikopo’ Māori who supported the Roman Catholic Church. For example, in April 1844 Father Chouvet of Ōpōtiki said that the ‘mitineri’ had challenged the ‘epikopo’ to a debate. He also said that the Protestants had read ‘long pages from their Bible …. while gesticulating as much as they could … from time to time fixing their eyes on heaven … [like] fanatics, children of Satan rather than envoys of God’.

Chouvet said that the ‘mitineri’ Māori had told the ‘epikopo’ that because they still insisted on worshipping statues, they were going to declare war on them and their foreigner and drive them into the wilderness - a phrase which appears to reflect the wording in Mark 1:12 which said, ‘Immediately the Spirit impelled Him to go out into the wilderness’. The Roman Catholic priest said that the Protestant Māori converts were ‘as peaceful as Henry VIII and Elizabeth’. He also said that he much preferred ‘the natives who remain devilish or Jewish’ which ‘are names given here to the

\textsuperscript{20} Richard Watson, \textit{A Biblical and Theological Dictionary}, 1833, p. 166.
\textsuperscript{21} Eliza White, Journal, 6 April 1835, transcript, MS-Papers-11115-150, ATL. Revelation 20:10 - And the devil who deceived them was thrown into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and false prophet are also; and they will be tormented day and night forever and ever.
\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Sydney Herald}, Thursday 9 July 1835, p. 2.
natives who do not offer Christian worship'. There is also evidence of similar debates between the Protestant and Roman Catholic missionaries.

Ormond Wilson and Judith Binney did not refer to the Waimā debate in their articles on Papahurihia in the 1960s. However, in From Hongi Hika to Hone Heke, Wilson said that Papahurihia’s ‘fame had preceded him’ when he left the Bay of Islands for Hokianga and ‘three to four thousand’ had gathered at Waimā in April 1835, when he was confronted by the Reverend William White. Similarly, Binney referred to White’s debate in her 1990 biography of Penetana Papahurihia for the Dictionary of New Zealand Biography Volume One. She said that White had debated Papahurihia before an audience of thousands and confronted the blasphemy ‘that Papahurihia and Jesus Christ were equal’. Likewise, in her 2007 article on Papahurihia, Judith Binney said that White had ‘wrestled’ with Papahurihia ‘in extended theological debate’ at Waimā in 1835. However, both Wilson and Binney neglected to mention that the audience had gathered for a hākiri in honour of Moetara. They also omitted to say that White’s debate had come about at the behest of Papahurihia’s family. Thus, by omission and implication their articles suggested that the large assembly had gathered for the sole purpose of witnessing the debate between Papahurihia and the Reverend William White.

In January 1837, Papahurihia’s name was linked with the deaths of two Wesleyan Māori converts from Rotopipiwai on the Hokianga. On that occasion, four baptised natives had ignored Kaitoke’s warning not to preach in his village and were fired upon as they made their approach. Matthew was killed and Richmond, who was seriously injured, later died of his wounds. The third, William Barton, had remained with the pair whilst Joseph Orton had returned to raise the alarm. Tāmati Wāka

---

27 Joseph Orton was the baptismal name of Titokowaru, who opposed the British in Taranaki and upheld the doctrine of Te Ua Haumēne.
Nene, Mohi Tāwhai and Te Taonui senior subsequently attacked the village and Kaitoke, who was shot in the ankle, was taken captive.\textsuperscript{28}

William Woon, James Buller and Nathaniel Turner from the Wesleyan mission remarked on the incident and the British Resident James Busby wrote an official report for the Governor of New South Wales. The Jewish trader Joel Polack mentioned it in his book on his New Zealand adventures, as did Charles Oliver Bond Davis, who arrived at Mangungu in 1830, where he lived with his sister Elizabeth and brother-in-law Captain Young and tutored William Woon’s children.\textsuperscript{29} Also on the spot was George Hawke, a settler from New South Wales, who worked as a printer with William Woon whilst awaiting a passage to England.

Hawke’s journal was the basis of Eric Ramsden’s chapter on Papahurihiia in \textit{Marsden and the Missions}. He had sailed from Port Jackson for England via the Hokianga on 22 August 1836. However, his ship grounded on a reef and Captain Gedney returned \textit{James Laing} to Sydney for repairs.\textsuperscript{30} George Hawke, who was a Methodist, stayed with the Wesleyan missionaries at Mangungu and Samuel Marsden and his daughter Martha, who arrived on the convict ship \textit{Pyramus}, later joined him. Marsden stayed at Mangungu for two weeks before going on to the Bay of Islands to investigate allegations of impropriety by William Yate.\textsuperscript{31} During his stay, he asked Hawke, whom he knew through his son-in-law the Reverend Thomas Hassall, to copy out extracts from his diary regarding the conflict between Kaitoke and Tāmati Wāka Nene, which had taken place before his arrival.\textsuperscript{32}

During the period that George Hawke was at Mangungu, the station was under the supervision of the Reverend Nathaniel Turner, who had returned to the Hokianga in


\textsuperscript{31} Reverend William Williams, who had transferred from Paihia to Waimate, said that Marsden arrived at Waimate on 7 March 1837. William Williams, Journal, 7 March 1837, MS-91/75 (10), IV, p. 462, AML.

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Sydney Gazette and New South Wales Advertiser}, 9 February 1837, p.3; Nathaniel Turner, Journal, 23 February & 7 March 1837, qMS-2063, II, p. 308, ATL; Eric Ramsden, \textit{Marsden and the Missions}, pp. 146-7; William Williams, Journal, 7 March 1837, MS-91/75 (10), IV, p. 462, AML.
1836 after serving in Tonga. John Whiteley and William Woon were also based at Mangungu at the time. Whiteley had founded a new station at Kāwhia in 1835 and Woon had set up another at Whāingaroa (Raglan) in 1836. However, both men had been recalled to the Hokianga by their London society after their presence in the Waikato district had raised the ire of the Reverend Henry Williams and caused discord between the Wesleyans and the CMS missionaries in the Bay of Islands. Finally, James Buller, who had been engaged to tutor Nathaniel Turner’s children for two years, had arrived on the Hokianga with Turner on 21 April 1836.

On Sunday 22 January 1837, George Hawke and William Woon, who were visiting a village at Mangamuka, left in haste when they heard gunfire. They were later told that Matthew and Richmond had ignored Kaitoke’s warning not to preach in his village and been shot. Hawke said that Kaitoke was ‘inveterate against Christianity’. He also said that in consequence of the influence of a ‘juggling Jew, who pretended to swallow knives’, Papahurihia had ‘set up a religion of his own and established Saturday as the Sabbath’. Hawke’s comments were similar to earlier statements by William Woon. The year before Kaitoke’s attack on the Wesleyan converts, he had visited Pākanae and said:

Some of them profess to be the followers of a man called Papaurihia [sic], who has fallen in with some Jews and learnt juggling &c. and on this account he is regarded as a wonderful man, many are led as may by his proceedings.

The similarity between the two accounts suggests that Woon gave Hawke his journal to help him comply with Marsden’s request for information. If that were indeed the case, then George Hawke would have also seen William Woon’s entry on 16 May 1836, which referred to Pākanae Māori as ‘Hurais (Jews)’ and said that ‘they have

33 The CMS and WMS reached agreement on their respective boundaries in October 1838 and John Whiteley returned to Kāwhia in 1839. James Buller, Forty Years in New Zealand: including A Personal Narrative, An Account of Maoridom and of the Christianization and Colonization of the Country, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1878, p. 25.
35 George Hawke, Journal, 22 January 1837, photocopy of microfilmed journal, MS-Papers-11115-026, ATL; George Hawke to Samuel Marsden, 7 March 1837, with journal excerpts 22, 23, & 25 January 1837, Micro-MS-19, ATL; Eric Ramsden, Marsden and the Missions, pp. 162-3, 166. Hawke said that the Saturday Sabbath was the only part of Levitical law that Māori had introduced.
imbibed Jewish sentiments’. Hawke went on to say that Kaitoke had been confident of victory against anybody who attacked him:

Inspired by “Atua Wera; for some time since he gave him a cask of powder and a musket; and told him that was medicine for the Missionaries and their people and as long as he had that, no enemies shot would hit him, but he would be sure to hit his mark whenever he fired.” He now says that Atua Wera has deceived him.

Finally, George Hawke told Samuel Marsden that Tāmati Wāka Nene had said that ‘this was not the first murder which Papahudihias [sic] men had committed’.

In tune with Hawke’s account, William Woon described Kaitoke as ‘one of Papahurihia’s followers’. He also said that Papahurihia was ‘a juggling deceiver’ who had propagated ‘sentiments unfavourable to the cause of God’. The words ‘juggling’, ‘deceiver’ and ‘ventriloquist’ imply deceit and may have been allusions to 2 Timothy 3:13, which said that ‘evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived’. Woon said that Papahurihia had given Kaitoke a cask of powder and ball and told him that ‘while he possessed them no evil would come near him’. He also said that after Kaitoke’s village was attacked and he was wounded and taken captive, Kaitoke had ‘found out his delusion’ - that he had called in vain on Papahurihia’s god to help him and now called Papahurihia ‘a deceiver’. Thus, William Woon regarded unconverted or ‘deluded’ Māori like Kaitoke as ‘godless and wicked men’ who refused to believe the truth of Jesus Christ and were destined to face the wrath of God in the last days.

In keeping with this interpretation, Nathaniel Turner said that Kaitoke or ‘worm-eater’ was a very ferocious chief and the head of a small tribe that did not acknowledge God. He also said that after Nene had attacked his village and taken Kaitoke prisoner,

---

38 George Hawke, Journal, 25 January 1836, MS-Papers-11115-026, ATL.
39 Ibid; New Zealand Herald, 31 January 1834, p. 11.
40 John Wesley, Explanatory Notes, Book of 2 Timothy 3:13. On deceiving and being deceived Wesley said, ‘He who has once begun to deceive others is both the less likely to recover from his own error, and the more ready to embrace the errors of other men’.
41 John Wesley said on 2 Thessalonians 2:11, ‘And therefore God shall send them strong delusion, so that they shall believe the lie’.
43 2 Thessalonian 2:10-12, 1 John 5:3 & Romans 1:18.
a marauding party of strangers’ had plundered two Europeans at Mangamuka.\textsuperscript{44} James Buller described Kaitoke’s party as ‘a desperate gang’. He said:

This man was connected with a noted priest \textit{Te atua wero} [sic] (red god), who, like many of his order, was a skilful ventriloquist. He was believed to be inspired. From him Kaitoke had received a present of some muskets and ball cartridges, with the assurance that in using these, he would be invulnerable and would always do execution.

Buller also said Te Atua Wera’s influence was ‘broken’ when Kaitoke was defeated and that Kaitoke had ‘threatened vengeance’.\textsuperscript{45}

Āperahama Taonui, who joined the attack on Kaitoke’s village, described Papahurihia as a ‘Serpent God’ (Nākahī) and ‘a man who called himself God’. He also said that Kaitoke had ‘found his god was a false god’\textsuperscript{46}. Taonui was an early convert to Methodism and it is possible that Wesley’s commentary on Genesis 3:1 influenced him. It referred to ‘the devil in the shape of a serpent’ and said that the devil or Satan had chosen ‘to act his part in a serpent, because it is a subtle creature’.\textsuperscript{47} John Wesley also said that men who called themselves gods were false prophets or unclean spirits who had been set to work by the Devil,\textsuperscript{48} and were prophesying out ‘of their deceiving hearts, not from God’.\textsuperscript{49}

In contrast, the British Resident James Busby attributed the deaths of Matthew and Richmond to ‘the rapacity and unprincipled conduct of British subjects’.\textsuperscript{50} He said that twelve months earlier, Waikato had arranged to sell a kauri forest at Whananaki to two Europeans but Ngāti Manu of Kawakawa had contested it and Henry Williams had arranged for the CMS to hold the land in trust.\textsuperscript{51} Busby convened a meeting to

\textsuperscript{44} Nathaniel Turner, Journal, 22 & 28 January 1837, qMS-2063, II, pp. 305-7, ATL.
\textsuperscript{45} James Buller, \textit{Forty Years in New Zealand}, 1878, pp. 39, 43. Buller said that Māori from Ōruru (Doubtless Bay near Kaitāia) robbed Mrs Mitchell, a carpenter called Reeves and Mr Hunt, from whom they took all they could carry, including 18 sovereigns.
\textsuperscript{46} \textit{Cornwall Chronicle}, 4 November 1846, pp. 849-50.
\textsuperscript{47} John Wesley, Genesis 3:1.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid, Zechariah, 13:2.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid, Ezekiel, 13:2-3.
\textsuperscript{50} James Busby to Colonial Secretary NSW, 28 March 1837, Despatch No. 110, qMS-0345, ATL.
\textsuperscript{51} The deed said that the land was ‘on the coast about 20 miles south of Cape Brett… partly covered with kauri… claimed by the Kawakawa natives, also by a tribe living near Te Puna called the Hikutu’. Bruce Stirling, Northland Old Land Claims, Crown Forestry Rental Trust, Draft, Wellington, July 2006, p. 178, as cited by Rowan Tautari, Attachment and Belonging: Nineteenth Century Whananaki, a
settle the dispute at Waitangi on 12 January 1836.\textsuperscript{52} Waikato attended with 35 to 40 men from Hikutu and Noa with 100 men, women and children from Ngāti Manu. Also present were William Williams and Charles Baker from the CMS and the Kororāreka settler Gilbert Mair.

Waikato told the meeting that the King of England had sent James Busby to settle disputes. In contrast, he said that the missionaries’ role was to teach the people, thereby implying his indignation at Williams’ interference in his affairs.\textsuperscript{53} In fact, William Williams said that Waikato seldom went near the missionaries and was strongly opposed to their instruction.\textsuperscript{54} Likewise, John King said that ‘Waikato was a very bigoted, superstitious Heathen’ and that when Wharepoaka attended divine service at Te Puna, Waikato had ‘generally found some work to do to annoy and oppose him’.\textsuperscript{55}

The Waitangi meeting degenerated when Hikutu jostled an elderly man who had challenged Waikato to name his ancestors to the land. They retrieved their weapons from their hiding places, shot two unarmed men from Ngāti Manu and pursued the rest, who fled inside the British Residency. In a subsequent despatch, Busby expressed his concern that if Ngāti Manu decided to retaliate, Waikato and his people from Rangihoua ‘would be strengthened by those of the natives who have been opposed to the proceedings of the Missionaries’ (meaning Tareha, Titore, Wharerahi, Rewa and Moka).\textsuperscript{56}

Busby said that the deaths of Noa’s people did not deter one of the Europeans, to whom he wrote and explained that Waikato only had a partial interest in the land and that if the man went ahead with the purchase, he would not have a valid title and war would ensue between the Māori parties who contested ownership. However, 12 months later Waikato sold the land to another European and in company with canoe-
loads of Hikutu warriors, he escorted the purchaser to Whananaki to take possession of the property.\(^57\)

James Busby said that Waikato’s tribe and others connected with them had founded ‘what they call a religion’. He said that it had emerged two years earlier, after one of them had ‘a pretended revelation made by the serpent (or devil)’ and that the group, known as Papahurihia, worshiped the serpent.\(^58\) Busby claimed that Kaitoke and Waikato were from the same tribe. He also said that Waikato had invited Kaitoke over to the Bay of Islands and given him a cask of gunpowder and two guns ‘as his share of the property which was given as payment for the forest land at Wananake’ [sic]. He claimed that two days later, ‘as if to prove how zealously he took part in Waikato’s hatred of the Missionaries and emboldened by the impunity of Waikato’s outrage’, Kaitoke had shot in cold blood two Wesleyan converts who had gone to his village to preach the Gospel.\(^59\) Busby said that Tāmati Wāka Nene and others had taken ‘ample reparation for this murder’ by taking Kaitoke’s pā and killing 12 or 13 of his people. He also said that Kaitoke ‘only waits his recovery to retaliate on the Missionary party’. Finally, Busby said that when they heard about Kaitoke’s fate, a party of Papahurihia from the Bay of Islands had gone to the Hokianga and plundered several of the British settlers.\(^60\)

In contrast, Joel Polack described the battle between Kaitoke and Nene as a schismatic war. From Whitechapel in London, he had arrived in New Zealand in 1831 and travelled around the Kaipara and Hokianga until 1832, when he built a house at Kororāreka and established a general store and brewery. He subsequently sailed for London in May 1837, where he gave evidence to the Select Committee of the House of Lords on the colonization of New Zealand. Joel Samuel Polack was a member of the Colonial Society of London,\(^61\) and his account of his travels and adventures in New Zealand was published in two volumes in 1838. On the subject of Papahurihia, he said that war:

\(^57\) Ibid.
\(^58\) Ibid.
\(^59\) James Busby to Colonial Secretary NSW, 28 March 1837, Despatch No. 110, qMS-0345, ATL.
\(^60\) Ibid.
has broken out within the last three years, nothing less than a schismatic difference between the natives in their religious opinions, between those who have placed themselves under the banners of the Wesleyan Missionaries, and some new idolators, who term themselves disciples of Papahurihia.  

Polack claimed that a ‘God of fire or Wero’ had ‘sent forth a prophet to work miracles, teach the people that the missionaries are cheats, and other similar silly tales’. He also said that Papahurihia’s followers were idolaters who observed a Saturday Sabbath. Polack attributed the heresy to the master of a whaler and said that Papahurihia was in decline because of Kaitoke’s defeat. William Yate, who mentioned Papahurihia in An Account of New Zealand in 1835, influenced Polack. He said that a sea captain had taught Papahurihia ventriloquism and concluded by saying, ‘We thought the better way was, to watch its progress in silence, lest by much interference we should give a notoriety to the subject’ - a statement Polack more economically rephrased as ‘the less notice there is taken of it, the earlier it will be forgotten’.  

James Busby wrote about the conflict again whilst en route to England in 1864. In his unpublished memoirs, he repeated Polack’s allusion to the schismatic nature of the war between Kaitoke and Nene. Busby said that when Papahurihia first emerged, and perhaps because if it, there had been a ‘decided separation between the heathen and the Christian natives’. He also said that Papahurihia, ‘the Seer or priest of their new religion’, had been ‘visited by the devil in the form of a Serpent, who had desired them to worship him’. Finally, Busby said that Papahurihia was a ventriloquist who had grown rich over the years ‘by his pretended conversations with the spirits of the dead, and his influence with the Serpent’.  

The voice of reason belonged to the Wesleyan superintendent Nathaniel Turner. In April 1837, in a letter to the London WMS, he said that ‘this affair originated in an

---

64 Busby wrote the manuscript during his voyage to England on Blackwell from February to June 1864. The original is in the Alexander Turnbull Library.  
65 James Busby, Occupation of New Zealand 1833-1834, 1, p. 32, typescript, in Ruth Ross Papers, MS-1442, Box 67 (2), AML; James Busby, ‘The Occupation of New Zealand’, in the Harold Rione Rodwell Papers, A-29, Box 1 (3), AUL.
old grudge concerning a very valuable timber district’ which, according to Kaitoke and his people, ‘our people unjustly took from them some time ago’ and sold to the Reverend William White. Nathaniel Turner went on to say that Kaitoke’s land was currently in the possession of White’s brother Francis (the father of John White), and that Kaitoke had ‘recently obtained a musket and keg of powder, loudly declaring he would use it to destroy or resist the cause of Christianity and raise that of Papahurihia’.  

Finally, in 1876 Charles Oliver Bond Davis mentioned the incident in his book The Life and Times of Patuone. Davis, who would have been about 19 years old at the time, said that Kaitoke had been ‘under the influence of a noted Maori ventriloquist named Papahurihia’. He also said that Papahurihia had ‘held nightly meetings’ and was the medium of communication with the dead. According to Davis, Papahurihia was a ‘Maori necromancer’ who:

had sent to his Mangamuka disciples a gun with certain hieroglyphics marked on it, the sanguinary meaning of which, if not fully understood by Kaitoke, was to be explained by the bearer of the weapon.  

Donald McLean had also used the word ‘necromancer’ to describe Papahurihia and it was to his former colleague and friend that Davis dedicated his book. McLean’s earlier entry, which was jotted in an undated notebook, said that Papahurihia was a necromancer. It also said, ‘A dozen kits of human flesh [had been] offered to Papahurihia in 1845 to propitiate him’ when he had acted as Heke’s tohunga during the war against the British.  

Judith Binney mentioned the gun with hieroglyphics in her biography and final article on Papahurihia. In the former, which was published in 1990, she said that the ‘weapon, with red hieroglyphic writing placed on it by Te Atua Wera, was

---

66 Nathaniel Turner, Journal, 22 & 28 January 1837, qMS-2063, II, pp. 305-7; Nathaniel Turner to WMS, 17 April 1837, MS-Papers-2625 (1), ATL; Gary Glover, More Heroes of the Faith, p. 3.
68 Ibid, p. iii;
conceivably used in the ritual killing of the Wesleyan preachers’. In contrast, in her final article in 2007, she said that Kaitoke was an ‘early follower of Papahurihia’ and had used ‘a gun marked with red wax “hieroglyphics” that Papahurihia had sent to him’ to kill two Wesleyan Māori preachers on the Hokianga.

Binney’s editor questioned her comment about the red hieroglyphics but retained it after she insisted it was important. However, there is no evidence that Papahurihia gave Kaitoke a gun bearing hieroglyphics and neither Davis nor Hawke mentioned red wax. Nevertheless, the primary sources are contradictory. They refer to a cask of powder and a musket (George Hawke), a cask of powder and ball (William Woon), some muskets and ball cartridges (James Buller), a cask of gunpowder and two guns (James Busby) and a musket and keg of powder (Nathaniel Turner). Charles Davis was the only person who mentioned hieroglyphics. However his reference was not isolated and in 1855, in his biography of Kawiti, he said that the meaning of ‘certain hieroglyphics’ painted on the bodies of chiefs and tohunga were well understood but never disclosed as ‘death would be the inevitable punishment’. This suggests that his reference to the hieroglyphics on Kaitoke’s gun was a literary touch rather than a statement of fact and intended to enhance the entertainment value of his work.

Charles Davis drew on secondary sources to construct his narrative. Principal amongst them was a biography of the Reverend Nathaniel Turner, written by his son. Josiah Turner said that he had based his chapters on New Zealand on the correspondence of James Buller, who served with his father at Mangungu. He did not mention Papahurihia. However, he did say that Matthew and Richmond, whom Kaitoke had warned not to visit his village, were fired upon as soon as they got within musket range. He concluded his account by saying:

72 Judith Binney to Bill Oliver, 21 April 1988, MS-Papers-11456-12, ATL.
73 George Hawke, Journal, 25 January 1837, MS-Papers-11115-026, ATL.
The New Testament truly connects murder with covetousness. It was ascertained that the original cause of the murder was not so much hatred to Christianity as a dispute about a Kauri pine forest’.76

Turner based his comment on his father’s letter to the WMS in London, which explained that the issue was over land at Mata that belonged to Kaitoke but had been sold by Wesleyan Māori to William White and was in the possession of his brother Francis.77

In conclusion, the evidence shows that Papahurihia was dubbed the ‘Atua Wera’ (the hot god’ Satan) when he claimed equality with Christ in a debate with William White and Wesleyan Māori at Waimā in April 1835. His whānau initiated the contest, which took place at a hākiri held in honour of Moetara. Such debates were common in the period, initially between Christian and unconverted Māori but later between Māori converts to the Protestant and Catholic sects, as well as the missionaries themselves. Papahurihia appears to have given Kaitoke a gun however, the war that followed his assault on Matthew and Richmond was not schismatic and erupted because Wesleyan Māori had sold Kaitoke’s land to the Reverend William White. The next section will concentrate on a drawing of two trees attributed to Papahurihia and explore the testimony of Europeans who said that Papahurihia consulted the spirits of the dead and professed to control a magnificent comet that appeared in the sky over Kohukohu in March 1843.

---

77 Nathaniel Turner to WMS, 17 April 1837, MS-Papers-2625 (1), ATL; Gary Glover, More Heroes of the Faith, p. 3.
Section I: Heresy, Necromancy and Prophecy

This section concentrates on a drawing of two trees attributed to Papahurihia. It also surveys the testimony on Papahurihia’s necromancy and reports on his reaction to a comet in March 1843. The method compares Father Servant’s 1840 letter to Father Colin against his undated memoir, which the church has dated as circa September 1841. It also draws upon excerpts from the Missionary Register and John Nicholas’ Narrative of a Voyage to New Zealand to assert that Servant’s manuscript was not original. The section argues that the drawing of the two trees responded to Revelation 21:8, which condemned sorcerers (tohunga) and idolaters (unconverted Māori) to the lake that burns with fire and brimstone. It also argues that the drawing was influenced by the Catholics’ habit of using trees to explain that the Roman Church was the true church or trunk of the tree and the Protestants were the branches and withered twigs. The section concludes that Papahurihia used the sketch to bring the unconverted chiefs under the protective tapu of his familiar spirit and reassure them of their place in Te Hunga Atua after death. It also concludes that Papahurihia was a tohunga who communicated with the spirits of the dead and treated the Great March Comet of 1843 as a sign of the war at Ōrurū between Kiwa of Ngāpuhi and Nōpera Panakareao of Te Rarawa.

Father Servant was the next person to mention Papahurihia. He arrived on the Hokianga with Bishop Pompallier on 10 January 1838 and they founded their mission station at Papakawau, on a few acres of land gifted by the Catholic Irishman Thomas Poynton. A group of Wesleyan converts, who said that the Reverend Nathaniel Turner had sent them, challenged their arrival. However, a large party from Waimā and Whirinaki¹ defended them and Papahia,² the chief of Te Rarawa, converted shortly afterward and was baptised ‘Francis’ by Bishop Pompallier.³

---

² In her doctoral thesis Sandy Harman confused Papahurihia and Papahia (Francis) of Te Rarawa. She said that in 1838 ‘(...) the great Papa[h]ru[h]ia appears with a large pig ... he [Papahurihia] had already declared to some heretics who bother him relentlessly that they themselves were not true ministers since they did not come from the Pope, and that he had taken a side. He wanted to go to the bishop’. In her footnote, Harman quoted the original French as ‘(...) le grand Papahia paroit...,’ which referred to Papahia or Francis. She also cited Father Servant to Father Colin, 16 September 1838, Hokianga, which in the translation by Father Brian Quin SM, refers to ‘Papahia’. Sandy Harman, The Struggle for
The Roman Catholic missionaries faced with the task of explaining the complexities of the Protestant Reformation to Māori. In the early Middle Ages, the Eastern Orthodox or Greek Church had separated from the Roman Catholic Church and a further division had occurred in the sixteenth-century, when many Protestants abandoned the Roman Catholic Church.\(^4\) Thus, in a letter about the Protestant missionaries stationed at Tonga, Fiji and the Navigator Islands, Father Bataillon said:

> those in the Navigators are members of the Church of England and honour as their founder Henry VIII and his allies, while those in Tonga and Fiji glory in belonging to an even newer religion and recognise as founder a certain Wesley who is, it is said, one of the most famous devisers of the Methodist religion.

Father Bataillon described the Protestant missions as ‘the efforts that Hell is making to multiply its victims’. He also maintained that the Roman Catholic missionaries were ‘the possessors and guardians of the true faith’.\(^5\) Bishop Pompallier made similar comments to Father Jean-Claude Colin, who was the founder and superintendent of the Marist mission in Lyon. He said that on the ‘first appearance of Jesus Christ in his legitimate ministers’ the Roman Catholic Church had been subjected to slander. He explained that the Protestant or ‘heretical missionaries’ had said that ‘the Catholic Church is evil, it is the anti-Christ’ and had spoken blasphemously of the Virgin Mary. Bishop Pompallier referred to the Anglican mission station at Paihia as ‘the main establishment of the heretical missionaries in New Zealand’. However, he also

---


said that in spite of heresies’ antics, the natives had flocked ‘to the legitimate ministry’ (meaning the Roman Catholic Church).  

Bishop Pompallier and Father Servant used the allegory of a tree to explain the relationship between the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England and the Wesleyan Methodist Church. From the Catholic point of view, the genealogy of the Roman Catholic Church dated back to Peter, who was the first apostle of Jesus Christ. They predicated their stance on Irenaeus of Lyon who in 180 provided a list of Roman Catholic bishops going back to Peter. Irenaeus said that the Roman Catholic Church was founded on the martyrs Peter and Paul, who were believed to have died in Rome. He also said that because of this continuous apostolic tradition from Peter, every church should recognise the Roman Catholic Church as the preeminent authority. Histories dating back to the end of the first century had alluded to the burials of Peter and Paul in Rome and in the year 200, a Roman author claimed to know where their memorials were. The Pope’s authority ‘rested largely on the claim that he was keeper of the shrines of Peter and Paul’ and had inherited ‘the authority vested in Peter as the one upon whom Christ would found his church (Matt. 16:18)’. Gregory the Great sent 40 monks to England to evangelize the Anglo-Saxons in 596 and Augustine, the leading monk, became the Archbishop of Canterbury. However, at that juncture ‘the whole Catholic Church’ acknowledged the Roman Church ‘to be the mother and mistress of all churches and to derive her authority from St. Peter’. Thus, Bishop Pompallier said that ‘turning to the Catholic church’ meant ‘to recognise through the use of reason that it is the true one, the preferable one, the ancient one, the mother, the

---


7 The critical elements of the Catholic Church were (1) the full confession of faith as preserved from the tradition of the first Apostles (2) the full sacramental life of worship and liturgy and (3) the ordained ministry of bishops in apostolic succession who are in union with each other and the bishop of Rome. The Catholic Church is present when each bishop in his local church is in communion with all other bishops and bonded through communion with the Bishop of Rome. The Anglican Church was considered to be in schism because it had broken the bond of the bishops who are in union with the Pope. It was regarded as heretical because it denied the legitimacy of some of the sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church. Lawrence S. Cunningham, An Introduction to Catholicism, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009, pp. 8-9.

8 Ibid, pp. 24-5.

9 Ibid, p. 25.

trunk that Jesus Christ formed’. He also said, ‘(and usually it means understanding as well that it is the one and true; and that outside it one cannot have God for a father)’. Finally, Pompallier explained that becoming a Roman Catholic ‘involves knowing as well that the successor of St Peter is the holy Father the Pope … and that the bishops are the other successors of the apostles, united to’ him."

Father Servant wrote about Papahurihia from Kororareka in March 1840, when he had ‘a rough grasp of the natives’ language’ but was still experiencing ‘his partial deafness’. He also wrote after he and Francis had visited villages between Whirinaki on the Hokianga, Ahipara at the top of the North Island and Waimate in the Bay of Islands. Servant began his letter by saying that the Whirinaki natives lived in three villages along the river and that a ‘spirit of division and dislike’ existed between them. He also said that their chief had ‘wanted to know the difference between the Catholic and Protestant religions’, as well as ‘the origin of the two religions by means of the genealogical tree’. Likewise, following his visit to a hapū of Te Rarawa on the Hokianga, Servant said that the natives there ‘were often plagued by heresy’ and had asked him for ‘some proofs of favour of our holy Church’ and many questions about the ‘spirituality of the soul, death, and eternal life’.

Servant went on to the villages of Wairoa, Taerutu, Whāngāpē and Pāwera. At Motutapu, he noted that the people were ‘divided in religion’ and that ‘the Catholics said their prayers in one place and the supporters of heresy in theirs’. At Ahipara, he explained ‘the chronological tree’ of the Roman Catholic Church and discovered that the Protestant missionaries had circulated a booklet ‘characterising our Bishop as

---

Satan sending his representatives’. He returned to Kororāreka on 3 February 1840 and in his letter to Father Colin said:

At this same time, there was a lot of talk about a chief living near the Bay of Islands and who had come to Hokianga where he had great influence over a certain number of tribes, and where he was almost seen as being a prophet.

Servant said that the man had not been instructed in the Roman Catholic faith but had expressed himself in ‘favour of the Catholic Church, which he hailed as being the true one’. He also said that the man ‘constantly’ expressed ‘his fury against the heretics’ by means of a sketch which depicted them in hell surrounded by demons. He continued:

he sketches a tree growing in an upright direction and another tree growing in a curved line, the direction of which starts at the bottom of the upright tree. At the extremity of the curved tree are the heretics who, while praying and reading their Bibles, are taking the road that leads to the fires of Satan; they go forward quite triumphantly while the noise of the demons echoes around them. Then Nakahi (a god in the new system of Maori superstition), Nakahi goes under the curved tree and goes and stirs up the eternal brazier, then he climbs the upright tree to the top which touches heaven; the heretics also make efforts to climb it, but when they are about to get up to heaven, heaven flies up from them and they fall into the abyss.

Ormond Wilson said that the Roman Catholics had exhibited a print of the Tree of the Roman Catholic Church during a debate with Henry Williams at Kororāreka in 1841. He suggested that Papahurihia had seen the poster before Williams and had ‘adapted the imagery to his own purposes’. In contrast, Father Mervyn Duffy said that the

---

poster was used for the first time at Ōpōtiki in 1844. On that occasion, Father Chouvet said:

We unrolled in front of the natives a big chart which has as a title The Tree of the Church. Then we showed them on this chart the establishment of the Church by our Lord Jesus Christ, the choice of the divine master made of Saint Peter as leader or pope, and the uninterrupted government of this same Church by the successors of Saint Peter down to Gregory XVI, who was then reigning. We called this tree the ladder of the Catholics, by means of which they would go back to Saint Peter, and consequently, to Jesus Christ, the originator and object of our faith.

Father Duffy said that the broken branches bore the names of ‘Christian movements and their founders, including ‘Anglicans and Henry VIII’, who were shown falling ‘towards a depiction of hell where devils with pitchforks await’. He also said that that part of the poster was based on John 15:6 which said, ‘Anyone who does not remain in me is thrown away like a branch – and withers; those branches are collected and thrown on the fire and are burnt.’ In contrast to the sophisticated imagery in the poster, Nathaniel Turner said that Thomas Poynton had introduced Bishop Pompallier to Wesleyan Māori as ‘the head of the oldest and only true religion, while all the other sections of the Church were only yesterday and corrupt’. He also said that the Bishop had used a large tree on Poynton’s land to illustrate his subject:

They were pointed to the Trunk as representing the Church of Rome to which they belonged – The large Arms as the Church of England, and the small decaying boughs as the Wesleyan …. This compelled us to speak at length to our people on the Doctrines and Doings of this soul deceiving people.19


Figure 2: This photograph of the Tree of the Church at the Pompallier Centre in Auckland was taken by Professor Peter Lineham and has been reproduced here with his permission.
Likewise, in a letter to the editor of the *Colonist*, James Buller said that the Catholics had drawn the natives’ attention to the large Pūriri tree on Poynton’s property and described ‘the root as their (the Roman Catholic) church; the stem, the church of England; and the branches, the Wesleyans’. Finally, William Woon said that Māori had told him ‘that the R.C. church was the root and that we were the branches, and because we had dissented from it, we were cut off’.

However, Father Servant appears to have explained the concept to Māori in the absence of the poster and in a manner similar to Brother Elie-Regis, who said:

> Then I picked a bush and plucked off a branch. I placed the branch at a little distance from the trunk and made this comparison: Our Church is like a great tree with many immense branches …. Now you, you are this branch cut off and situated far from the trunk which is Jesus Christ.

It is possible that Papahurihia attended one of Father Servant’s meetings and witnessed his explanation of the Roman Catholic Church as the trunk of the tree. Servant’s letters show that three tohunga were present at meetings held on the Hokianga in the absence of the poster. One was a ‘high priestess’, and the others were ‘a great priest and a great priestess’ whose tribe ‘were all deeply steeped in the darkness of paganism and superstition’.

David Simmons discovered another commentary on the drawing in the Marist archives in Rome. In his manuscript, which he sent to Father Colin in September 1841, Servant identified the artist as Te Atua Wera. He said that he was as a chief

---

20 James Buller to the Editor, *Colonist, Sydney*, 20 October 1838, p. 4.
21 William Woon, Journal, 30 March 1840, MS-0969/004, p. 368, HL.
24 John Webster also mentioned this tohunga. In 1847 he said, ‘Parker tells me there is an old sorceress @ the heads who has great power over the Natives Rangatira the chief of the Ngati Korokoro tribe had been very sick he went down to consult her & returned perfectly cured She can discover secrets & foretell events’. John Webster, Maori Journal, Saturday 20 March 1847, p. 51, ACL.
26 In his introduction to a letter from Father Servant to Father Champagnat, the translator said that Servant had sent his account of Maori life and customs to Father Colin in September 1841. The translator also said that Servant’s account had appeared in *Annales des Missions* as a ‘Notice on New
from Te Puna in the Bay of Islands who had started to preach a new sect to the natives in 1836. He also said that Te Atua Wera had foretold the advent of the ‘true church’ and attributed his ‘foresight’ to his contact with Europeans.

Servant described Nākahi as a spirit who appeared at night and communicated by whistles. He said that Nākahi was ‘a tissue of lies’ created by Te Atua Wera, whom he called a ventriloquist. He also said that Nākahi had said that Māori baptised by Bishop Pompallier would be ‘condemned to Satan’s fire’ - a decree he subsequently amended by announcing that Māori were not to accept the Bishop until he had given them many clothes.

Father Servant said that Nākahi had told Te Atua Wera that ‘the great chiefs’ had nothing to fear from Satan’s fire by remaining unbelievers. He also said that Nākahi had mentioned two trees, which Te Atua Wera had drawn. The first, called Aotea, was straight and touched the sky. The other, which curved downward, was the Judgement tree. Servant said that the missionaries were shown in prayer at the end of the curved tree above Satan’s fire and that Nākahi passed below them and stoked the flames. He also said that whenever the missionaries attempted to climb the straight tree, the sky fled and they fell back into the abyss.

Servant said that Nākahi had told Te Atua Wera that when good men died they left the world of darkness and went to ‘the aotea of hungi’. He described it as a place where there was endless light, no cold, hunger or thirst, plenty of flour, sugar, muskets, and ships, and where ‘murder and voluptuousness’ reigned. In contrast, Nākahi said that the heretical missionaries and all who spoke ill of Nākahi went to a part of the Reinga called ‘hotoke’ (cold) where Satan’s fire was.

When David Simmons edited Father Servant’s manuscript, he discovered that the priest had used William Yate’s *An Account of New Zealand* ‘as a basis for his own observations’. However, it is also possible that Servant read John Nicholas’ book on


the manners and customs of the New Zealanders\textsuperscript{28} and the September 1836 edition of the \textit{Missionary Register}. The magazine announced Bishop Pompallier’s appointment as Apostolic Vicar for Polynesia and Western Oceania.\textsuperscript{29} It included an extract from the diary of Richard Davis, which said that Te Morenga’s soul was at Aotea. It also published a letter by John King, which said that some of the natives at Te Puna had assembled at night around a flagpole and that their priest had mixed portions of scripture with ‘their old superstitions’ and claimed that ‘the spirits of the departed tell him all about Heaven and Hell’.\textsuperscript{30}

In a similar manner, John Nicholas said that the Māori people believed that their deceased chiefs (atua) lived in ‘the part of the heavens … called Taghinga Atua’, which was ‘represented as beautiful in the extreme’.\textsuperscript{31} His comment alluded to the conviction that the left eye of chiefs ascended to the heavens and became a star,\textsuperscript{32} the words ‘Te Hunga Atua’ meaning the constellation of stars or grouping of atua in the sky.\textsuperscript{33} Thus, Father Servant said that Te Atua Wera had described ‘the aotea of hungi’ (or Te Hunga Atua) as a place ‘where there was endless light, no cold, hunger or thirst’.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{28} John Nicholas, \textit{Narrative of a Voyage to New Zealand, Performed in the Years 1814 and 1815, in company with the Rev. Samuel Marsden, Principal Chaplain of New South Wales; including a description of the country, and incidental remarks on the manners, custom and political economy of the natives; together with Supplementary Observations on the Origins of the People, and the Soil, Climate and Productions of the Island}, two volumes, London: James Black & Son, 1817.

\textsuperscript{29} Recent Miscellaneous Intelligence, \textit{Missionary Register}, September 1836, p. 438.

\textsuperscript{30} John King, \textit{Missionary Register}, 1836, p. 336. Benjamin Ashwell said that Waikato and his people from Rangihoua were pagans who worshipped a god called ‘Popendi’, ibid, p. 559.

\textsuperscript{31} John Nicholas, Saturday 3 December 1841, \textit{Narrative of a Voyage}, I, p. 61.

\textsuperscript{32} Writing in respect of the death of Ruatara, Thomas Kendall said, ‘I learnt from the natives that a few days after Duaterra was attacked with illness a watch was set during the night to observe whether they could discern a Star falling from the Heavens, or rather one of those meteors falling which is often in England termed the “shooting of a Star” and upon the day he was seized with a kind of momentary delirium his priest concluded this event had taken place. Atua had then, as it was conceived, entered into him …. the Natives believe that Atua enters into the sick in the form of a voracious reptile and though unseen preys upon the vitals until the breath is gone. As the Atua descends like a falling star so in time the Soul of the deceased ascend and becomes a Star in the firmament. Duaterra and his Wife are to be seen amongst those bright luminaries by and by …. As soon as Duaterra was dead the Natives called his corpse Atua as they do all other dead people’. Thomas Kendall to Josiah Pratt, 11 March 1815, in Reverend Thomas Kendall, \textit{Thomas Kendall’s Journal}, 8 July 1815, Marsden Online Archive, last modified October 3, 2014, \url{http://www.marsdenarchive.otago.ac.nz/MS_0055_023}, accessed 25 May 2015. The underlining is Kendall’s.

\textsuperscript{33} John Nicholas, Saturday 3 December 1814, \textit{Narrative of a Voyage}, I, p. 61.

\textsuperscript{34} A similar allusion was made by the Mormon missionary William Bembow Erekson in 1900. On 15 May 1900, when he rode to Ōtāua near Kerikeri he said, ‘Not many came out to see our show, as they are “tehunga mauri” people. One of the priests took us to his place provided that we touch some stones so the spirits and disease would not harm us. Pres Magleby talked about these “tapu” stones and when we got there the man told us to never mind them’. The following day the missionary said ‘Walked
Father Servant’s comment that there was ‘plenty of flour, sugar, muskets, and ships’ and that ‘murder and voluptuousness’ reigned,\(^{35}\) restated the Māori belief that the afterlife mirrored life on earth and thus the need for their wives to hang themselves, their slaves to be sacrificed and their favourite weapons buried with them.\(^{36}\) Thomas McDonnell mentioned the belief when a chief of high rank died aged 100 years. He said:

> the natives assembled to do honour to his burial, when it was suddenly discovered by the Atua-Wera, a noted wizard priest, that there was no one in the other world to attend him, and that he wished his wife to be sent to stay with him … She was afterwards buried in a hole by the side of the stream.\(^{37}\)

Thus, Servant’s manuscript may have been a synthesis of oral and written sources. He had probably heard about Te Atua Wera and Nākahi from Francis. His claim that Papahurihia was from Te Puna may have been based on King’s letter, whilst Richard Davis and John Nicholas had both referred to ‘Aotea’ and ‘Taghinga Attua’ as being the places where the unconverted chiefs went after death.

The next missionary to mention Papahurihia was William Woon, who linked his name with necromancy and said that he had divined the meaning of a magnificent comet that had appeared in the sky over Kohukohu for a fortnight. Woon said:

> outside early, and saw 10 nikau whares containing sick Maoris. At one end was a wooded hut & men boiling water & tree leaves & giving the sick each a hot bath & girls & priests washed men from head to foot and sang a kind of song all the time …. They washed them & they did not cover up warm afterwards. I should think they would die. All diseases were washed in the same water. This is a maori prophetess’s hospital’. William Bembow Erekson, My Record of My Missionary Labours, Brigham Young University, MS-1037 & Alexander Turnbull Library, MS-Papers-4292, folders 7-15. The passages cited are in Folder 7, Book No. 1: 27 October 1899-10 July 1900, pp. 109-11. I would like to thank Professor Peter Lineham for bringing this entry to my attention and for giving me permission to include it in this thesis.

---

\(^{35}\) On 22 June 1841, Henry Williams said ‘The Native habits have been, from of old, sensual and devilish: nothing could exceed the corrupt propensities of this people. From their infancy they have acted without restraint; and even yet they are deficient in those feelings of decency and propriety, which are so universal among English Christians’. Missionary Register, 1842, p. 422.

\(^{36}\) Thomas Kendall said that just ‘as the atua descends like a falling star, so in time the soul of the deceased ascends and becomes a star in the firmament. This takes place when they eyes are wasted away. The left eyes of Duaterra and Dahoo are to be seen shining amongst those brightest luminaries in a little time. The latter asserted before she hanged herself that her husband had requested her to come to him. It is common for women to destroy themselves for the sake of their husbands … The remains of Duaterra and his wife were laid upon a stage which was erected upon the spot where the former died. The apparel they wore at the time of their decease and the tabooed articles were deposited with them …. Tapapa (Te Papa), his priest, was constantly with him from the time his illness took a serious turn until the hour of his death’. Thomas Kendall, Journal, 1815, Marsden’s Lieutenants, pp. 77-9.

\(^{37}\) Evening Post, 24 March 1888, p. 2.
Mr. Papahurihia, Te Atua Wera, is also carrying on his rights in deceiving the people with a sort of ventriloquism, and informs them that the spirits of their departed friends have been to him and then proceeds to relate their statements. ³⁸

The following month the missionary said that a native imposter ‘named “Papahurihia” & the “Atua Wera”’ was ‘a sort of ventriloquist and Sorcerer’, who pretended to raise the dead, and relate what he had heard from departed Chiefs’. ³⁹ A number of sources corroborate Woon’s contention that Papahurihia was a necromancer. In 1847, John Webster stayed overnight with Papahurihia and saw a raised bed with curtains in the corner of his house. He said that from there the tohunga held ‘converse with the spirits of the other world’ and ‘whistles for days’. ⁴⁰ Webster also said that after Tutu’s daughter died, the chief went ‘to the Atua Wero, or the Fiery God, who has had a converse with the spirits of the other world regarding his dead daughter’. ⁴¹ Likewise, James Buller described Papahurihia as ‘the connecting link between the gods and man’, ⁴² Donald McLean and Charles Davis described him as a necromancer ⁴³ and William Woon said that Papahurihia made his god ‘speak from over his head’ and used words ‘such as are only understood by tohungas, i.e. priests’. ⁴⁴

The Protestant evangelicals associated the whistling technique used by tohunga like Papahurihia with deception. For example, in May 1824, when George Clarke, James Shepherd and William Puckey went to Kerikeri to hear ‘the New Zealand God’, they sat close to the ‘Priest’ in order to detect his trickery. Clarke said that the tohunga’s prayers were ‘succeeded by Whistling’ and that Māori told them that the sound ‘was the Atua talking to the Priest’. He also said that when they pointed out the ruse, Hongi

---

³⁸ William Woon, Journal, 13 February 1843, MS-0969/006, p. 525, HL. The underlining is Woon’s.
³⁹ William Woon to WMS, 18 March 1843, MS-1442 (67), 2, AML. The underlining is Woon’s.
⁴⁰ John Webster, Maori Journal, 16 February 1847, pp. 30-2, ACL.
⁴² James Buller, *Colonist*, 21 September 1858, p. 2.
Hika became angry and said if they did not mind the taniwha, he would upset their canoe when they rowed across the Kerikeri River.\(^{45}\)

Eleven years later, a ‘woman making a great squeaking noise’ woke Henry Williams and Māori told him that the sound ‘was none other than the Atua now talking’. He said that the voice had commanded the warriors to be strong and acquit themselves like men because there would be a battle and they would be victorious. Williams also said that the ‘screams of this witch were quite of a nature to alarm a weak mind’.\(^{46}\) Similarly, in 1846, Richard Davis said that the Māori people from Ōtaua near Kerikeri had ‘wholly returned’ to their former customs, including listening to their ‘whistling Gods’.\(^{47}\) Finally, Brother Emery mentioned the whistling Māori gods in a letter to Brother François. He said:

The devil also gets great amusement from these poor people. He makes himself heard by his whistling. It appears, so they say, that he makes himself visible and talks to them, especially when they are sick. He makes himself heard above the houses and that is why the roofs of the houses are sacred - because that is where their god dwells. They also have their priests who pray to them and speak to them.\(^{48}\)

Two weeks before he commented on Papahurihia’s necromancy, William Woon said that ‘A Comet of extraordinary magnitude’ had excited the tohunga’s attention. He also said that Papahurihia had claimed that the comet was under his control and that he was ‘giving the people his opinion on it, [and] its design in appearing at this time’.\(^{49}\) The comet’s appearance preceded the outbreak of war at Ōruru between Panakareao of Te Rarawa and Kiwa of Ngāpuhi.\(^{50}\) Thus, Woon said that some Māori on the Hokianga had started to build pā in anticipation of an attack by Te Rarawa,\(^{51}\)

\(^{45}\) George Clarke, Journal, Sunday 30 May 1824 & Sunday 6 June 1824, PC-0055, pp. 8, 11, HL.

\(^{46}\) Henry Williams, Saturday 21 March 1835, Early Journals, pp. 425-6.

\(^{47}\) Richard Davis to Dandeson Coates, 21 July 1846, MS-1211-2, p. 71, HL.


\(^{49}\) William Woon, Journal, 6 March 1843 & 13 March 1843, MS-0969/006, p. 528, HL. The underlining is Woon’s.

\(^{50}\) Woon said that Panakareao was determined ‘to wrest Oruru out of Kiwa’s hands’ but Ngāpuhi would not allow it and had assembled 2,000 warriors at Kerikeri. See William Woon, Journal, 28 & 30 March & 1 April 1843, MS-0969/006, p. 530, HL.

\(^{51}\) Ibid, 17 April 1843, p. 532.
whilst others had resumed ‘their old ritenga’ Māori.\textsuperscript{52} He also said that some who had attended the means of grace ‘abandoned us for some time and joined that deceiver, Papahurihia, the ventriloquist, or atua wera’.\textsuperscript{53}

The comet observed by William Woon in 1843 was the Great March Comet. He said that its ‘splendid tail’ occupied ‘an extensive space in the firmament, over the Kohukohu, - in a westerly direction’. He also said that it looked ‘very brilliant’.\textsuperscript{54} Edward Jerningham Wakefield observed the comet at Ōtaki on 4 March 1843,\textsuperscript{55} and the account of Captain Thomas Wing, who saw the comet from Port Louis in Mauritius, appeared in the \textit{Launceston Examiner}.\textsuperscript{56} Finally, the British astronomer Charles Piazzi Smythe painted the Great March Comet. He saw it from the Royal Observatory at the Cape of Good Hope in South Africa and his painting is held by the Royal Museums in Greenwich.\textsuperscript{57}

Woon’s assertion that the comet had excited the attention of Papahurihia is highly credible. In 1825, a chief from Waitangi told Charles Davis ‘that they had considered the Comet which now appeared … to be that of our late departed friend Christian Rangi’ – a viewpoint he attributed to ‘the notion that prevails among them that the stars are the eyes of departed chiefs’.\textsuperscript{58} It is therefore probable that Hokianga Māori looked to Papahurihia for an explanation of the comet’s appearance. It is also possible that the comet was treated as a sign and that its appearance influenced their decision to participate in the war. Father Claude-André Baty said that the war at Ōruru involved ‘all the natives in the North, including the Bay of Islands and Hokianga’. He also said that it was over ‘a piece of land which each of them claimed’ at Ōruru or Doubtless Bay. The priest, who accompanied a party from the Hokianga to the battleground said:

\begin{quote}
The comet which shone in all its glory and which I had seen on March 2 for the first time after sunset was the subject of discussion. The most commonly
\end{quote}

\begin{itemize}
\item[Ibid, 22 May 1843, pp. 533-4.]
\item[Ibid, 28 August 1843, p. 543.]
\item[Ibid, 6 & 13 March 1843, p. 528.]
\item[Edward Jerningham Wakefield, \textit{Adventure in New Zealand from 1839 to 1844, with Some Account of the Beginning of the British Colonization of the Islands}, II, London: John Murray, 1845, pp. 331-2.]
\item[Captain Thomas Wing, \textit{Launceston Examiner}, 13 May 1843, p. 6.]
\item[Charles Piazzi Smythe’s painting, \url{http://collections.rmg.co.uk/collections/objects/15560.html}, accessed 1 July 2013.]
\item[Charles Davis, Journal, Sunday 16 October 1825, MS-0498/18, HL.]
\end{itemize}
held feeling was that it was a sign of war. Later on I heard other views *verbi gratia*, that it was Christ who, seeing two churches, was coming to say which was the good one. An old priestess who was travelling with us and who had converted to Catholicism considered moreover that she felt inspired. Her voice changed; she began having convulsions and harangued the others. She stressed the importance of constant prayer and then similar to a Pythonisse (I have forgotten how to spell that word) she made some chiefs who had died more or less long ago speak on matters touching war. She was forcefully contradicted by several of the Catholics present but she became only more animated and stopped only very late in the night. She was listened to with a religious respect by those of the natives who still followed their former practices.  

A second comet has also featured in the historiography. In 1989, Bronwyn Elsmore referred to a European who claimed that the Māori people from Kākāriki pā near Kororārea had cried out “Ngakahi, Ngakahi” when a brilliant meteor passed across the sky in the early 1830s. She said that Māori had described the comet as the Ngakahi of the Europeans and said it would protect them. She therefore concluded that, given that the comet was seen ‘as a protective influence of the Europeans’, it was unlikely to be linked ‘with the Papahurihia deity’ and the ‘reference to the brazen serpent of Moses could be a more fitting interpretation’.  

Elsmore’s source was G. M. Henderson. He became Inspector of Native Schools in 1919, and was ‘keenly interested in the Maori and in Maori history and tradition’. He mentioned ‘Ngakahi’ in a book written during his retirement. I found a copy in the Rare Book Collection at the Alexander Turnbull Library. It is fiction and was formerly part of the National Children’s Collection. George Henderson may have

---


60 Bronwyn Elsmore, 1989, Chapter 3. The Papahurihia Movement, n.p., fn. 11, [https://books.google.co.nz/books?id=t2VAwAAQBAJ&pg=PT46&lpg=PT46&dq=papahurihia%27s+headstone&source=bl&ots=nxlvWOZFU9&sig=0z9h5dghpYml-Cwmmuo3g3Ug_OA&hl=en&sa=X&ei=LU2DVbSi9Tl8AXB7GYDA&ved=0CEcQ6AEwAg#v=onepage&q=papahurihia%20headstone&f=false](https://books.google.co.nz/books?id=t2VAwAAQBAJ&pg=PT46&lpg=PT46&dq=papahurihia%27s+headstone&source=bl&ots=nxlvWOZFU9&sig=0z9h5dghpYml-Cwmmuo3g3Ug_OA&hl=en&sa=X&ei=LU2DVbSi9Tl8AXB7GYDA&ved=0CEcQ6AEwAg#v=onepage&q=papahurihia%20headstone&f=false), accessed 19 June 2015.

61 *New Zealand Herald*, 20 November 1919, p. 10.


63 George M. Henderson, *The antecedents and early life of Valentine Savage, known as TAINA*, with engravings specially cut in wood by E. Mervyn Taylor, Wellington: Wingfield Press, 1948, pp. x-xi,
heard about Nākahi during his tenure as Inspector of Native Schools. His decision to name the imaginary fortification ‘Kākāriki’ suggests that he knew that Ngāpuhi believed that the kākāriki or green lizard was an omen of death. He may also have known that comets held some significance in Māori cosmology. However, Henderson’s story is fantasy and E. Mervyn Taylor cut the engravings for his book. Taylor worked for the School Publications Branch of the Education Department, and illustrated Ruth Ross’ book on the fictional debate on the Treaty of Waitangi at Mangungu in 1840.

Thus, it is possible to conclude that, in the manner of tohunga of the time, Papahurihia communicated with the spirits of the dead and treated the Great March Comet as an omen of the war at Ōruru. In reply to the Book of Revelation, he also drew upon the Roman Catholics’ allusions to the branches and twigs on the trunk of the tree. However, Papahurihia used his drawing to invoke the protection of his familiar spirit and reassure the unconverted chiefs that they would go to Reinga, ascend the ake, enter Aotearoa and join their ancestors in Te Hunga Atua when they died. He also condemned Christian Māori like Tāmati Wāka Nene to the wrath of the Māori gods (Nākahi) for turning their backs on their ancestors (ngā atua).

**Conclusion**

The new interpretation that emerges from this research is that Papahurihia was a tohunga whom the evangelicals’ saw through a religious lens as Satan (Nākahi) dressed in the guise of the country. Likewise, Māori who converted to Roman Catholicism called their old gods Satan (Nākahi) and Anglican and Wesleyan Māori used the word Nākahi (Satan) to describe their old superstitions and unconverted countrymen. In a similar manner, Māori who had not embraced the Gospel of Jesus Christ were also called Jews, Jewish or devilish by Christian Māori.

---

18, 186, Wellington – National Children’s Collection, FIC HEN; Alexander Turnbull Library, New Zealand Pacific, P 920 SAV HEN 1948; Alexander Turnbull Library, Rare Books & Fine Printing, RPrNZ WING HEND 1948, ATL.


In keeping with this interpretation, Papahurihia acquired the epithet the ‘Atua Wera’ (‘the hot god’ Satan) during a theological debate at Waimā in 1835, when he said that his skills as a tohunga were equal to those of Christ, who could also heal the sick and calm a storm. Europeans described him as a ventriloquist, an imposter and a juggling deceiver because he was a tohunga, whilst Āperahama Taonui said that Papahurihia was a serpent god (Nākahi) and a man who called himself a god (atua). For the same reason, Europeans said that Papahurihia was the connecting link between man and the Māori gods (Nākahi) and conversed with the spirits of the other world. They also said that he made it appear as though the Māori gods (Nākahi) spoke from above his head and used ‘magical language’ that was only intelligible to Māori priests or tohunga (Nākahi).

Nevertheless, those kinds of statements were not restricted to Papahurihia. George Clarke wrote about a tohunga who controlled the taniwha (Nākahi) in the Kerikeri River. He described him as a sorcerer and a wizard priest and said that the Māori people had told him that the whistling sound was the Māori atua (Nākahi) talking to the tohunga. Henry Williams attributed the great squeaking noise that woke him from slumber to the Māori atua (Nākahi) talking to a tohunga about the impending battle and ultimate victory of her war party. Father Baty said that a tohunga who had converted to Roman Catholicism had conversed with long dead chiefs (ngā atua) on the subject of the war at Ōruru, whilst Brother Emery said that the Māori gods (Nākahi) made themselves heard by whistling and that the tohunga or native priests prayed and spoke to them.
Papahurihia was an ally of Hōne Heke, Kawiti and Pene Taui and acted as Heke’s tohunga in the Northern war against the British in 1845. Section J explores his behaviour during that conflict and the evidence of the Hokianga settlers John Webster and Frederick Maning, who fought with Kaitoke and Tāmati Wāka Nene as allies of the British. It also investigates John White’s contention that Papahurihia built a council chamber for the chiefs inside the pā at Ōhaeawai and the assertion that a cedar panel of Saint Patrick driving the snakes from Ireland was rescued from a Nākahi chapel during the war and entrusted to one of Heke’s warriors for safekeeping. In contrast, Section K explores Judith Binney’s final paper on Papahurihia and her argument that his original name was Pukerenga. It also addresses her claims that Pukerenga fled to the Hokianga in 1837 after the last attack on Pōmare’s pā at Ōtūihu, that two prophets of the Nākahi cult lived on the Hokianga in 1847 and that a drawing of a flying serpent from November 1855 is evidence of the emergence of a new cult in the Bay of Islands.
Section J: Papahurihia as Heke’s Tohunga

This section is devoted to Papahurihia’s role as Heke’s tohunga during the Northern war. It uses the journal of John Webster and his *Reminiscences of an Old Settler in Australia and New Zealand*, Frederick Maning’s private letters and *History of the War in the North of New Zealand* and the texts of the Anglican and Wesleyan missionaries to establish how Papahurihia behaved during the conflict. It also compares John White’s diary against his 1861 lecture on Māori customs and traditions to test the veracity of his assertion that Papahurihia was discredited as an imposter when the meeting house he built for the chiefs inside the pā at Ōhaeawai was levelled by British bombardment. Finally, the section uses Alan Taylor’s letters to ascertain the merit of claims that a panel of Saint Patrick driving the snakes from Ireland was rescued from a Nākahi chapel during the war and entrusted to one of Heke’s warriors. It concludes that Papahurihia helped build Te Kahikatea pā for Heke and accurately foretold the Māori victories at Lake Ōmapere and Ōhaeawai. It also finds that he did not construct the edifice mentioned by White and that the ‘Nākahi’ chapel was located on the Hokianga and outside the theatre of the Northern war.

In the prelude to the war, William Woon claimed that ‘the Atera-wera, Papahurihia’ was ‘busy with his Ritenga kuware’ or ‘insane or foolish proceedings’. He described him as ‘a consummate deceiver’ who used ventriloquism to get the chiefs to do anything that suited his purpose. He also expressed his concern that Papahurihia would persuade Rangatira of Pākanae and Papahia of Te Rarawa to join the conflict.¹

John Webster was at Ōmanaia when Heke arrived to consult Papahurihia. He said:

Heke had come to consult with the tohunga, having heard that the troops were expected back again, and he wanted Te Atua Wera to consult his familiar spirit and divine the results of the first engagement with Her Majesty’s forces.

Webster said that Papahurihia had agreed to consult ‘with the spirit of the air’. He also said that when the people assembled in the house that evening, Papahurihia had sat at one end and Heke and his party at the other. He continued:

---
For some time we sat without a sound being heard; suddenly a whistling sighing kind of sound was heard over our heads, and it moved about in a mysterious manner, sometimes a fluttering, and I thought that something actually touched me. It was all over in about twenty minutes.

John Webster claimed that Heke had waited alone for some time ‘to hear the result of the first battle with Her Majesty’s troops’. He also said that the ‘great Tohunga (wizard) named Te Atua wera, with many men’ had joined his campaign soon afterward.\(^2\) In fact, Webster said that Papahurihia was involved in the construction of Te Kahika pā at Lake Ōmapere.\(^3\) Maning explained that the pā was built on a piece of land called ‘Taumata Tutu’ and that it was chosen as the site of Heke’s pā because that was the place where Hongi Hika had prophesied the coming of the British soldiers and urged Māori to fight them. Moreover, William Woon said that Tāmati Wāka Nene had told John Hobbs that Papahurihia received ‘some of the spoils of Kororareka’.\(^4\)

Frederick Maning reported that Nākahi had entered into Papahurihia and told Heke that the British would be unable to take his pā. He also said that Nākahi had promised to protect Heke and his warriors and ‘turn aside the shot’ on two conditions. The first was that those who worshipped the Māori gods observed ‘all the sacred rites and customs’ of their ancestors. The second was that those who prayed to the God of the Europeans continued to do so and made no mistakes in their karakia. Thus, Maning said that when the British fired a rocket into the pā at Lake Ōmapere, Nākahi ‘the familiar spirit of the Atua Wera’, had blown on it and turned it away. He also said that because Heke’s party did not infringe their customs, Nākahi continued to blow aside the rockets until they were all gone.\(^5\) In contrast, Maning said that Heke had grabbed a bloodied cartridge box from the body of a dead man during the fight to retake his pā at Te Ahuahu. He said that when Te Atua Wera saw the blood, he warned Heke that he had angered the Māori gods and they were now against him. However, Maning

---


\(^3\) *New Zealand Herald*, 25 April 1892, p. 3.


\(^5\) Frederick Maning, *History of the War in the North of New Zealand against the Chief Heke, in the Year 1845, told by an old chief of the Ngapuhi Tribe, faithfully translated by a “Pakeha Maori”*, Auckland: George T. Chapman, 1862, pp. 1, 8-9, 13, 16-17, 52.
said that Heke had ignored Papahurihia, tried to rescue the slain body of Te Kahakaha and was shot. Frederick Maning claimed that Papahurihia then recited incantations to make invisible, the bearers who rescued Heke from the battlefield. He also said that Māori had expected Heke to die from his wounds and that he was at Tautoro with Papahurihia and 60 of his men when the pā at Ōhaeawai was fortified. Likewise, Webster said that when Colonel Despard’s troops attacked Ōhaeawai, Heke and Te Atua Wera were still at Tautoro, where the missionaries’ treated Heke’s wounds.

Thomas Buddle recorded the dream that Papahurihia had before the British attacked Ōhaeawai. He said that the tohunga predicted the British defeat and boasted that his god had driven the British troops ‘back to your God’. He also said that Papahurihia’s forecast, relayed in song, had concluded with the suggestion that the British cast their Bible behind them and leave their religion on the ground. In keeping with those sentiments, Richard Davis said that a chief from Mangakāhia near Kaikohe later told him:

Don’t think that the chiefs went to war for this, for that, or for the other. This was the reason said he (holding up the Testament) the old chiefs were afraid this would overthrow their old customs, and the church gain the ascendancy.

Frederick Maning said that the British troops were unable to penetrate the palisading at Ōhaeawai. He also said that in accord with custom, Māori took the rahurahu of the battlefield to Tautoro, where Papahurihia used it in rituals designed to bring the rebel warriors good fortune. Finally, Maning said that Kawiti went to Ruapekapeka after the British defeat at Ōhaeawai but Heke remained at Tautoro recovering from his injury. Richard Davis denied that he had dressed Heke’s wounds and said that his

---

6 Te Kahakaha fought with Hongi Hika. Heke was related to Hongi through his mother and they lived in Hongi’s pa at Kaikohe after Heke’s father was killed at Moremonui. Maning said that Hongi Hika had exterminated Ngāti Whatua in revenge for Pokaia’s death.

7 Frederick Maning, *War in the North*, pp. 25, 28-30; William Woon, *Journal*, 16 June 1845, MS-0969/007, p. 586, HL.


9 Thomas Buddle, Lecture on “The Aborigines of New Zealand”, *New Zealander*, 12 April 1851, p. 3.

10 Richard Davis, 26 February 1846, in Richard Davis to CMS, 22 January 1846, Kaikohe, PC-0067 (154), p. 926, HL.

11 Frederick Maning, *War in the North*, pp. 31-2, 36-7, 39, 40-2, 43-4, 47. Maning said that after a battle, no matter how far off he was, the victors always sent their tohunga a collection of the rahurahu of the battlefield. He also said that rahurahu was the name for the bracken fern which covered the country.

12 Richard Davis took up residence at the Kaikohe mission station on 14 March 1845. He said, ‘Since we have been here we have had much to distress and harass our minds. Kaikohi [sic] has been much
people had ‘secreted him in the distant woods’ after he was shot on 12 June 1845. However, Davis also said that once he had recovered, Heke visited his pā at Lake Ōmapere ‘for the purpose of crying over it, and firing off powder’.  

John Hobbs and John Warren from the Wesleyan mission said that Heke ‘pandered to the prejudices of the heathen party, and flattered the vanity of Te Atua Wera and his adherents, by entertaining their superstitions’. Henry Williams included Te Atua Wera and his warriors in his list of the government’s adversaries and claimed they were Roman Catholics.  

Finally, in 1846 Richard Davis told Dandeson Coates that Heke had given ‘one or two horses’ to Papahurihia – ‘the Hokianga Native Priest for preserving him during the war, and for destroying Her Majesty’s Troops at Taiamai’ (meaning Ōhaeawai).  

Judith Binney noted that John White had described Papahurihia as an imposter. She said that he had claimed that Papahurihia had failed to prevent cannon-fire from destroying a council chamber he had built for the chiefs inside Ōhaeawai pā. White made the comments in an 1861 lecture on Māori customs and superstitions, in which he claimed that there were three tohunga inside the pā at Ōhaeawai. The first was an elderly seer who prophesied that ‘No one must smoke a pipe while standing’ or ‘two shillings and six-pence’ would die: a forecast fulfilled when two adults and one child were killed. The second was a ‘priest from Hawaii’ who promised to protect the warriors from ‘cannon shot and musket balls by chewing a piece of stick and rubbing exposed during the conflict, in consequence of Heke’s pa being in the neighbourhood, as parties of Natives have often assembled at this Pa when going to fight, or returning, and the whole of the warfare has been carried on within five miles of our house …. The whole of my people at Ohaeawae [sic] and Maungaturito have been involved in the conflict from the beginning, and lately those of Otau also ….

The failure of the troops in storming the Pa at Taiamai was a cause of much anxiety, as we not only sincerely lamented the fall of so many of our brave countrymen, but were fearful of what might be the next step of the Natives. I have had many wounded men to attend to, and for length of time they engrossed nearly the whole of my services: three have died of their wounds, and a fourth is likely to die. Heke has not been mindful of us. If we had not been here it is probable that this would have been made the scene of conflict; but he promised it should not be so, and up to this time he has kept his word. The Mangakahia people have often visited us, and have behaved well’. Church Missionary Record, June 1846, pp. 135-6.

13 Richard Davis to Dandeson Coates, 20 January 1846, MS-1211-12, p. 58, HL.
14 Henry Williams, Plain Facts Relative to the Late War in the Northern District of New Zealand, Auckland: Philip Kunst, 1847, pp. 27, 34.
15 Richard Davis to Dandeson Coates, 20 April 1846, MS-1211-12, p. 67, HL.
17 John White, Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives, 1861, Session 1, E-07, pp. 1-47.
it over the man’. Similarly, John White said that Pene Taui had fired a leaf from the English Bible into the sky and claimed that God ‘was the defender of the Europeans’ and therefore, the best way to gain his protection for the Māori warriors instead ‘was to send a leaf of his own book to implore his aid’. Finally, White said:

Another imposter named Papahurihia promised by the aid of his gods and the power of his incantations to protect from the power of cannon shot a house built by his command in the pa at Ohaeawai as a Council chamber for the Chiefs.

White said that ‘when a cannon ball passed directly through it’, Papahurihia had insisted that somebody ‘had smoked a pipe inside and his gods were angry’. He also said that when the house was rebuilt but ‘struck by a shell and unroofed’, Papahurihia had attributed its demise ‘to cooked food having been taken in the house’. He concluded by saying that the ‘second failure however was a death blow to his pretensions, and the Council house was not re-built’. John White’s commentary rested on an entry in his diary that said:

Digging potatoes at Ohaeawai Atua wera had a house built in the Pa which he said nothing would harm in the storming of the Pa, but it was blown down by a shell, he had it rebuilt saying that some one had smoked in it, and that it now would not be touched if no one went into it, but a second time it was blown to pieces, the Natives then began to dispute his powers with the gods.

White’s journal indicates that he had once held Pene Taui in esteem and been fascinated by the fate of naval lieutenant Toby Phillipotts at Ōhaeawai. In 1847, when he met Pene Taui at a hahunga at Waimā, he described him as young, tall and very good looking and said that the chief had asked him ‘if a cannon ball could be seen while it was in the air’. In contrast, John White described Papahurihia as ‘the N.Z. ventriloquist’ and dismissed him as ‘rather short’. Soon afterward, White visited Ōhaeawai and was shown the place where Lieutenant Phillipotts had died. Two days
later, en route to Waimā, he met a man who claimed to have been inside Heke’s pā at Te Ahuahu during the war. The man said that he recognised White’s mare as the one that Heke had ridden. He also said that the horse had thrown Heke three times and that ‘once when he fell she kicked him’. Those are the only allusions to the war in John White’s journal. In contrast, Frederick Maning said that his version came from Papahurihia and that others present at the time had confirmed it.

Kawiti of Ngāti Hine and Pene Tau of Ngāti Tautahi defended Ōhaeawai pā with 150 warriors. Maning said that the British were unable to penetrate the palisading. He also said that when they attacked the pā, they did not storm the section weakened by bombardment but the strongest part, which was closest to the forest, made from the largest and heaviest timber and built by Pene Tau at leisure at the beginning of the war. His account was corroborated by John Webster, who said that Colonel Despard had fired ‘all over the front of the pa’ at Ōhaeawai. Captain Grant and Lieutenant Phillpotts both died at Ōhaeawai. Grant’s body was cannibalized on the advice of a tohunga to ensure that the British lost their mana and Māori were not afraid of them, whilst another tohunga used pieces of Phillpotts’ scalp ‘in divination to discover the event of the war’. However, the fact that Papahurihia was not involved is attested by Henry Williams, who said that the ‘solitary instance … wherein the bodies of two Officers were partially mutilated, was the act of three old priests, one of whom was killed in the late conflict’ at Ruapekapeka.

Phillip Parkinson has described Frederick Maning as an unreliable source. He said that his account was ‘plainly a fabrication by Maning himself with some amusing

---

23 Te Taonui senior took Heke’s pā at Te Ahuahu and Tāmati Wāka Nene occupied it. The battle in which Te Kahakaha died and Heke was shot was fought to retake it.
24 John White, Private Journal, Friday 26 February 1847, MS-328 (2), I, p. 84, AML.
25 Maning suggested that Papahurihia had seen that the battle at Te Ahuahu was going against Heke and taken advantage of his having handled the bloody cartridge box. Frederick Maning, War in the North, pp. 25, 28-30.
26 Frederick Maning, ibid, pp. 31-2, 36-7, 39.
27 John Webster, Maori Journal, 2, 12, 15, January 1847, transcribed for the Hokianga Historical Society by Owen and Alexa Whaley and published with the assistance of the Auckland City Libraries and Logan Campbell Trust, 2010, pp. 3-4, 7, 14-15, 19, ACL; John Webster, Reminiscences, pp. 262-3, 274-5, 282-3, 286. Established in 1965, Jean Irvine led the Hokianga Historical Society for many years. One of their early projects was the repatriation and restoration of the Mangungu mission station that was relocated to Onehunga in 1855. Webster’s original notebooks are in the Auckland Central Library. John Webster, Reminiscences, pp. 262-3, 274-5, 282-3, 286.
28 William Woon said that Phillpotts was the son of the Bishop of Exeter. William Woon, Journal, 2 July 1845, MS-0969/007, p. 587, HL. Maning said that Māori chose his scalp because they respected him as chief and a warrior.
29 Henry Williams, 16 January 1846, Missionary Register, 1846, p. 336.
literary touches’. He cited as an example the passage in the book where Nākahi spoke to Heke through Papahurihia and promised him immunity from bullets, and said:

But Heke was shot anyway …. Maning is clearly using a parody of the Garden story of Genesis 3: 1-5 to ridicule the belief, and to disparage the deceiver Papahurihia, who takes the role of the serpent, while Heke takes the role of the deceived Eve.  

The evidence does not support Parkinson’s argument. In May 1862, in a letter to his daughter, Frederick Maning described his ‘history of the war here, about 17 years ago’ as ‘all true’. He also said that although he had ‘written it in the Maori style, as if told by a native chief … I saw it all & wrote it from my own observation’. Maning said that he ‘wrote anonymously & as a Maori Chief” because he wanted ‘to show how the natives think & speak of these matters or rather how they did, at that time’. He enclosed reviews of the book with his letter and concluded by telling Maria that ‘the Chief Hauraki mentioned, is your Uncle’. However, there is nothing in his correspondence to suggest that his account of Papahurihia’s role in the war was satirical. Letters to his brother Henry show that Maning was genuinely hurt when his relationship with Hokianga Māori soured in later years because of his earlier advice that they should remain neutral and not become involved in the Taranaki and Waikato wars. Likewise, in a letter written after Papahurihia’s death, Spencer von Sturmer, the Resident Magistrate on the Hokianga, said that ‘Maning who is absent courting at Ahipara writes me that he is much cut up not seeing old Papa again’.

John Webster’s Reminiscences of an Old Settler in Australia and New Zealand corroborates Maning’s account. Based on his journal and published in 1908, the book was edited by Thomas Hocken, who had previously sought Webster’s opinion of his

30 Phillip Parkinson, Brief of Evidence, 8 September 2010, document D1, Crown evidence to the Waitangi Tribunal in Wai 1040, Te Paparahi o Te Raki (Northland Inquiry), pp. 36-39.
31 Frederick Maning to Maria Maning, 26 May 1862, Misc-MS-0082, HL. The underlining is Maning’s. Frederick Maning was married to Kaitoke’s daughter Moengaroa. His brother-in-law Hauraki was killed when Nene, who was defeated at Lake Ōmapere, attacked the village of Te Kapotai at Waikare south of Paihia.
32 Frederick Maning said, ‘I have lost the confidence of many or most of the best natives who were friends by advising them … to keep quiet & maintain allegiance to the British Govt. … They now say I gave them bad advice, for they believe that had they all joined they would have beaten our army’. In a further letter he admitted, ‘many have lost confidence in me & others look on me as a concealed enemy’. Frederick Maning to Henry Maning, 29 December 1864 & 3 February 1865, MS-0386, HL.
33 Spencer von Sturmer to Donald McLean, 8 November 1875, MS-Papers-35, p. 594, ATL.
34 John Webster: Letters from Thomas Moreland Hocken, Misc-MS-494, HL.
introduction to Maning’s *Old New Zealand* and expressed his hope that as Maning’s friend, Webster ‘thought well’ of it. 35 In the book, John Webster said that he was at Ōmanaia when Heke and his men arrived on horses looted from the settlers. He claimed that Heke was dressed in ‘a crimson robe with a yellow border’ that appeared to be a tablecloth and had ‘saluted Te Atua Wera by rubbing noses’. He explained that Heke had ‘come to consult with the tohunga’ and that he had ‘wanted Te Atua Wera to consult his familiar spirit and divine the results of the first engagement with Her Majesty’s forces’. He also said that Wharepapa of Te Ihutai and ‘a great Tohunga (wizard) named Te Atua wera, with many men’ had joined Heke when the British forces arrived in the Bay of Islands. 36 Finally, John Webster said that he had stayed overnight with Francis White and heard about the battle at Lake Ōmapere from his son John the following day. 37 Moreover, his journal shows that Heke threatened to resume hostilities in 1847 and Nene responded by building a pā at Kororāreka. It also indicates that Heke refused to meet Governor Grey on board ship and said that he could come to him. 38

Judith Binney mentioned a panel of Saint Patrick driving the snakes from Ireland in her final article on Papahurihia. She said that a runaway Irish sailor had carved it. She also said that it was formerly the altarpiece in a Nākahī chapel and had been entrusted to one of Heke’s warriors when the building was shelled during the war. 39 Binney said that the chapel had been located near the southern entrance to the Mangamuka gorge on the Hokianga and ‘close to the fighting with the Wesleyans in 1837’ after Matthew and Richmond were shot. 40 She also linked the chapel to the council chamber inside the pā at Ōhaeawai and said:

> During the siege of Ōhaeawai, Papahurihia’s “council chamber” was twice destroyed (John White 1861:21). This narrative is of particular interest as a wooden carving, rescued from a destroyed building associated with the Nākahī movement, has survived.

---

35 When Frederick Maning died in 1883, he bequeathed his books and manuscripts to John Webster. See Last Will and Testament of Frederick Maning, transcript, copied by Ruth Ross, 10 June 1963, from typed copies in the possession of Mr. J. C. Griffin of Wellington, Misc-MS-0082, HL.
38 John Webster, *Maori Journal*, 2, 12, 15, January 1847, pp. 3-4, 7, 14-5, 19, ACL.
Binney went on to say that the ‘connection with the Nākahi movement is explicitly made in the stated provenance for the carving’.\(^{41}\) Her source was Alan Taylor,\(^{42}\) who said that a Mrs Mountain had given the panel to Frank Simpson of the *Auckland Star* in 1931, when he was undertaking research for the Waimate centennial.

Alan Taylor, whose letter referred to a nineteenth-century ‘Maori Snake Cult’, told Binney that ‘Nakahe’ was the Māori word for snakes in their original homeland. He also said that after European contact, they had concluded that Saint Patrick ‘must have visited New Zealand some time and freed NZ too, of snakes’. Taylor said that a group of Māori had built a chapel in honour of Saint Patrick, in which the panel had served as the altarpiece.\(^{43}\) Moreover, he said that Mrs Mountain had taken Frank Simpson to its location ‘somewhere near the southern entrance to the Mangamuka Gorge’. Alan Taylor told Binney that the panel was made of finely polished cedar, carved in one piece and was ‘more Gothic than primitive or folkish’. He closed his letter by telling her that a photograph of Heather Mountain, a descendant of the runaway Irish sailor,\(^{44}\) had appeared in *Te Ao Hou* when she was a student at the Elam School of Fine Arts.\(^{45}\) Judith Binney was unable to confirm the genealogical information Taylor gave her but a note on her index card dated the panel as circa 1838 and said:

Pinn Mountain either convict or ticket of leave married Hannah King who was born 1815. Their son married a Maori woman. These 2 were Walter’s parents. Only 3 generations back. None of this fits with runaway sailor in 1830s.\(^{46}\)

The evidence shows that Walter Mountain, the son of Hannah Clapham and George Sydney Pinn Mountain,\(^{47}\) was born in 1864 and married four times.\(^{48}\) His first wife

\(^{41}\) Ibid, p. 316.
\(^{42}\) The letter is undated but in her in-text citation, Judith Binney cited the date of Taylor’s letter as 1974. Alan Taylor to Judith Binney, n.d., Mangere, MS-Papers-11115-150, ATL; Judith Binney, JPS, 2007, p. 316.
\(^{43}\) Alan Taylor to Judith Binney, n.d., Mangere, MS-Papers-11115-150, ATL.
\(^{44}\) Taylor said that the surname of the runaway Irish sailor was ‘Meadowes’. A sailor by the name of George Meadows was mentioned in the *Sydney Monitor* in March 1837 however, there is no evidence that he had lived in the Bay of Islands or intended to go to New Zealand. *Sydney Monitor*, 1 March 1837, p. 2; Alan Taylor to Ms. Balle, Information Officer, Auckland City Art Gallery, 27 February 1990, MS-Papers-11456-12, ATL.
\(^{45}\) Alan Taylor to Judith Binney, n.d., Mangere, MS-Papers-11115-150, ATL.
\(^{46}\) Judith Binney, Index Card re Wooden Carving, MS-Papers-11115-150, ATL.
\(^{47}\) *Sydney Morning Herald*, 18 October 1847, p. 2; *The Australian*, Tuesday 19 October 1847, p. 2; *Sydney Chronicle*, Tuesday 19 October 1847, p. 2; *The Maitland Mercury & Hunter River General Advertiser*, 23 October 1847, p. 2; *Sydney Morning Herald*, 11 March 1848, p. 2; *Nelson Evening Mail*, 3 June 1907, p. 4. Rev. Dr Fullerton married George Mountain jnr. and Miss Hannah Clapham on
was Hannah Toko Rihari and they had one son named William. His third wife was Ngarino Te Nana Rewha. Their son, Walter Clapham Mountain, was born at Rawhiti and ran the local taxi business. In 1930, he married Emere Kaa from Rangitukia and a photograph of their daughter Elizabeth appeared in *Te Ao Hou* in March 1964.\(^49\) This suggests that Ngarino was the Mrs Mountain mentioned by Alan Taylor. However, his claim that she gave the panel to Simpson in 1931 is at odds with the evidence. It shows that the Anglican Church celebrated the Waimate centennial on 12 January 1930, when several newspapers reported the guest list and speeches and published a photograph of the lych-gate dedicated by Bishop Averill.\(^50\)

A number of sources influenced Alan Taylor. For example, in May 1928 the *Auckland Star* published an article by James Cowan on the Nākahi cult, in which he described it as a form of snake worship.\(^51\) Likewise, in 1932 the paper announced that Henare Taituha had spoken to a meeting of the Auckland Institute about the evolution of the ‘Nakahe’ cult or snake worship amongst Māori in the early nineteenth-century.\(^52\) In his letter to Binney, Taylor described ‘NAKAHE’ as the nineteenth-century snake cult. Moreover, his spelling of ‘Nākahi’ as ‘Nakahe’ mirrored that of Taituha. Finally, in a letter to the Auckland Art Gallery in 1990, Taylor said that in the teachings of Te Atua Wera ‘The turning over of the land or the Earth Mother’ probably symbolised ‘the overturning of the growing influence of the Christian missions’ - a comment which suggests that Taylor was influenced by the work of Jean Irvine of Rāwene.\(^53\)

---


48 Walter Mountain’s European wives were Minnie Ryan and Edith Adams.

49 *Te Ao Hou*, No. 46, Wellington: Department of Maori Affairs, March 1964, p. 4.

50 The centennial of the Waimate Mission Station was held on Sunday 12 January 1930. On 13 January 1930, the *Auckland Star* published a photograph of the open-air service and makeshift communion rail, and another of the lych-gate dedicated by Bishop Averill. The *Sydney Morning Herald* also announced that the centenary had been celebrated on Sunday 12 January 1930. *Auckland Star*, 11 January 1930, p. 6; *Auckland Star*, 13 January 1930, p. 5; *New Zealand Herald*, 27 December 1929, p. 10; *New Zealand Herald*, 11 January 1930, p. 13; *New Zealand Herald*, 13 January 1930, p. 13; *New Zealand Herald*, 16 January 1930, p. 6; *Sydney Morning Herald*, 15 January 1930, p. 12; *Press*, 30 January 1930, p. 2.

51 *Auckland Star*, 5 May 1928, p. 10. I would like to thank Gregory Wood for confirming that James Cowan wrote the newspaper article bearing the initials ‘J.C.’. I would also like to thank my supervisor Professor Peter Lineham for contacting Mr Wood on my behalf.


53 Alan Taylor to Ms. Balle, Information Officer, Auckland City Art Gallery, 27 February 1990, MS-Papers-11456-12, ATL. The underlining is Taylor’s.
Thus, in keeping with the interpretation of Papahurihia that emerged in the previous chapter, this section concludes that Papahurihia was Heke’s tohunga during the Northern war. There is clear evidence that he consulted his familial spirit on Heke’s behalf at Ōmanaia before the conflict erupted and accurately forecast the Māori victories at Lake Ōmapere and Ōhaeawai. He also used the rahurahu from the battlefield at Ōhaeawai in ritenga Māori and received horses in reward for preserving Heke’s life. In contrast, the argument that Papahurihia lost credibility when the British shelled a meetinghouse inside the pā is fallacious. There is also no evidence that the panel of Saint Patrick driving the snakes from Ireland served as an altarpiece in a Nākahi chapel and was entrusted to one of Heke’s warriors for safekeeping during the war.
Figure 3: Map of the Hokianga Harbour showing WMS Chapels, ourheritage.ac.nz | OUR Heritage, accessed December 4, 2015, http://otago.ourheritage.ac.nz/items/show/6323.
Section K: Pukerenga, Papahurihia and Old Nākahi

This section focuses on Judith Binney’s final article on Papahurihia. It uses the journals of William Cotton, Richard Davis, William Williams and William Woon and official reports by the British Resident to test her assertions that Papahurihia’s original name was Pukerenga and that he did not flee to the Hokianga until after the last attack on Pōmare’s pā at Ōtuīhu in 1837. It also examines her contentions that two prophets of the Nākahi cult lived on the Hokianga in 1847 and that a drawing of a flying serpent from 1855 is evidence of the emergence of a new cult.¹ The section argues that Pukerenga of Ōhaeawai in the Bay of Islands and Papahurihia from Ōmanaia on the Hokianga were not the same man and that Papahurihia was not involved in the war between Titore and Pōmare for possession of Kororāreka in April 1837. It further argues that Māori only called the elderly man Nākahi (Satan) because he treated his dream as an omen and believed that Mohi Tāwhai was in danger of drowning. Finally, the section concludes that the flying serpent in the sketch called “The Book of the Dragon” was invoked by tohunga in the Bay of Islands to protect unconverted Māori from the seven last plagues they believed threatened the world.

Kendrick Smithyman’s widow undertook the research for Binney’s 2007 article on Papahurihia.² Margaret Edgcumbe transcribed excerpts from the journals of the Reverend William Cotton, who was Bishop Selwyn’s personal chaplain, and a letter from Cotton to his sisters in England, which she discovered in Selwyn’s papers.³ In the course of her research, she told Judith Binney that she had become ‘disheartened with the microfilms’ of Cotton’s diaries. She also said that she was ‘far too confused by the whole issue to make much sense’ of her first draft but later expressed ‘Kendrick’s posthumous delight’ with the final article.⁴ Likewise, when Binney submitted the article for publication in the Journal of the Polynesian Society her

¹ Judith Binney, JPS, 2007, pp. 309-10, 315, 318
³ William Cotton, Journals, 1843 & 1844, Volume III, pp. 178-9 & VIII, pp. 168-170, Microfilms 00-067 & 00-069, AUL; William Cotton to his sisters, 24 July 1844, in G. A. Selwyn Papers, Letter 3.33a, microfilm 81-60, AUL.
⁴ Margaret Edgcumbe to Judith Binney, email, Saturday 21 April 2007 & 27 April 2007 re Papahurihia et al., MS-Papers-11456-12, ATL. At the close of her article, Judith Binney thanked Margaret Edgcumbe ‘for assistance with William Cotton’s letters and journals’. She also extended her thanks to Kendrick Smithyman ‘for his life-long conversations’. Judith Binney, 2007, p. 318.
editor asked her ‘what are we to make of Henry Williams?’ The missionary had said that Papahurihia went to the Hokianga in November 1834, and Judith Huntsman asked Judith Binney if there was any indication that Papahurihia’s presence there was only temporary.

Binney’s article unearthed new evidence on Papahurihia from the journals of the Reverend William Cotton. He had arrived in the Bay of Islands with Selwyn on 20 June 1842 and wrote his comments two years later, after a meeting of the Northern District Committee. His journal shows that a Māori convert named Āperaniko (Abdenago) accompanied him to the meeting and that on their return to Waimate, they discussed a man named Pukerenga, whom Āperaniko had met or heard about when he visited the village of Ōhaeawai to preach on Sundays.

Cotton said that Āperaniko told him that the people at Ōhaeawai ‘are in a very bad state’ and that many had abandoned the missionaries’ karakia and ‘taken up with a false prophet of the name of Pukerenga’. He also said that Pukerenga had ‘made his appearance at the time of the last fight at Pomares Pa’ and ‘told the Maoris who were on his side that the God who inhabited him … wd. slow the bullets out of the enemies guns’. Finally, Āperaniko said that when Pukerenga’s party saw their comrades falling around them ‘they found out that he was a cheat and he was obliged to flee to Hokianga, where he has drawn many disciples after him’. In a footnote, Cotton added:

This difficulty was a little before Picopo [Bishop Pompallier] came who was introduced by Jacky Marmon to the tribe of Papahurihia as his younger brother upon which the whole tribe (Hikutu of Hokianga) joined the Papists.

---

5 Henry Williams, 11 November 1834, *Early Journals*, p. 400. ‘The accounts of Papahurihia occupied much time. He has gone to Hokianga to make converts there’.
6 Judith Huntsmen to Judith Binney, email, 7 May 2007, MS-Papers-11456-12, ATL.
7 See Daniel 3:16-18.
8 William Cotton, Journal, 7 & 9 November 1844, pp. 167-169, AUL.
9 John Marmon, who was also known as Jacky Marmon, was born to Irish convict parents in Australia and appears to have deserted his ship and settled on the Hokianga in 1823 where he lived under the protection of Muriwai and married the daughter of Hōne Kingi Raumati. Marmon, like Frederick Maning, was a Pākehā-Māori and fluent in the Māori language. He is believed to have fought with Hongi Hika at Te-Ika-a-Ranganui near Kaiwaka in 1825. Marmon fought with Tāmati Wāka Nene during the Northern war and distinguished himself at Ōhaeawai by recovering the bodies of the dead and wounded. Like Thomas Poynton, Jacky Marmon was a Roman Catholic and supported Bishop Pompallier to establish his mission on the Hokianga. Roger Wigglesworth, ‘Marmon, John’, from the Dictionary of New Zealand Biography. Te Ara – the Encyclopedia of New Zealand, updated 30-Oct-2002, URL: [http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/biographies/1m14/marmon-john](http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/biographies/1m14/marmon-john), accessed 1 September 2015.
It is evident from the wording of Cotton’s entry that Āperaniko was talking in the present tense, about the current state of affairs at Ōhaeawai. His comments were also made in the prelude to the Northern war. At the time of writing, Heke had cut down the flagstaff on Maiki Hill and the eighteen-gun warship H.M.S. *Hazard* had sailed into the Bay of Islands in company with *Victoria* – which carried a regimental detachment of soldiers under the command of Lieutenant-Colonel Hulme. Likewise, when Āperaniko spoke to Cotton about Pukerenga, Governor Robert Fitzroy had already met with some of the principal chiefs at Waimate and Tāmati Wāka Nene had undertaken to keep Heke in check.

The village of Ōhaeawai, where Pukerenga was influential, was the principal residence of Pene Taui, who was an ally of Heke and Kawiti during the Northern war. It was also the site of Ngāpuhi’s engagement with the British on 1 July 1845 and according to Henry Williams, had been completely off-limits to Europeans during its fortification. It was therefore in that context, that Ngāti Tautahi from Ōhaeawai had begun to look upon Pukerenga with favour. That this was not always the case is also apparent from Āperaniko’s discourse. Speaking in the past tense, he told Cotton that Pukerenga had first appeared at ‘the time of the last fight’ at Ōtuīhu, meaning April 1837, and had fled to the Hokianga when his incantations failed to provide the promised protection and his warriors fell.

Cotton’s diary indicates that Āperaniko did not talk to him about Papahurihia. Rather, immediately after he recorded his conversation with Āperaniko, the chaplain added a paragraph which said that the god that dwelt inside Pukerenga was called Papahurihia, that ‘the sign of his presence is a whistling of his lips’ and that his followers observed a Saturday Sabbath. Cotton also mentioned a hākiri that was to have taken place on a high hill at the back of Te Puna. He said that Papahurihia’s followers promised to hold a magnificent feast with splendid blankets, suits of armour and things that Māori

---

10 William Cotton, Journal, 9 November 1844, pp. 168-9, AUL.
11 *Sydney Morning Herald*, 16 September 1844, p. 2; *Morning Chronicle*, 18 September 1844, p. 3; *Geelong Advertiser*, 7 October 1844, p. 3; *Launceston Advertiser*, 12 October 1844, p. 4. Before that, a detachment of the 99th regiment had arrived in the Bay of Islands under Lieutenant-Colonel Jackson.
12 See *Southern Australian*, 22 October 1844, pp. 3-4 for an account of the Governor’s meeting on 30 September 1844 and the responses of the chiefs.
had never seen before. He also said they invited Henry Williams but that it came within a fortnight of the feast and ‘nothing more was heard of Papahurihia’.  

It is possible that William Cotton gossiped with Henry Williams and others about Papahurihia during their meeting. However, the information he recorded was also available in books by William Yate (1835), William Barrett Marshall (1836) and Joel Polack (1838). The Missionary Register had also mentioned Papahurihia. Thus, Cotton’s reference to the hākiri and the high hill at the back of Te Puna was probably a synthesis of texts by James Stack and Henry Williams. Stack had visited John King in September 1834 and been shown Papahurihia’s flagstaff, which ‘disgraced some of the highest hills’ at Te Puna. Likewise, in December 1834 Henry Williams said that Kiwikiwi had told him that there was going to be a meeting with Papahurihia at ngahuru, when Māori harvested their kūmara. Finally, Cotton’s comment that Pukerenga was forced to flee to the Hokianga ‘where he has drawn many disciples after him’ bears an uncanny resemblance to a comment by Henry Williams, who said that Papahurihia had gone to the Hokianga in November 1834 ‘to make converts there’. 

Europeans did not mention Pukerenga in their accounts of the war that broke out in the Bay of Islands on 3 April 1837. That conflict may have negated the proposed hākiri at Te Puna however, the tenor of Cotton’s journal is frivolous and its main purpose seems to have been to entertain. It includes sketches by the artist William Bambridge, who was Selwyn’s clerk, headings designed to titillate the curiosity of its readers and

16 James Stack, Journal, Sunday 21 September 1834, qMS-1859, ATL.
17 Henry Williams, 7 December 1834, Early Journals, p. 402.
18 Henry Williams, 11 November 1834, Early Journals, p. 400.
19 Marianne Williams, 3 April 1837, Hugh Carleton, 1, p. 202; James Busby to Colonial Secretary NSW, 28 March 1837, Despatch No. 110, p. 239, 4 May 1837, Despatch No. 111, pp. 243-5, 8 June 1837, Despatch No. 112, p. 274, qMS-0345, ATL; Hugh Carleton, 1, pp. 201-8; William Williams, Journal, 29 March, 4, 18, 19, 20-21 April, 10 May, 15, 27, 29 June, 6, 30 July 1837, MS-91/75 (10), IV, pp. 464-474, AML; Nathaniel Turner, Journal, 5 August 1837, qMS-2063 (2), p. 313, ATL; Henry Williams, 10 & 12 May 1838, Early Journals, p. 444. Four days after the war broke out John King said that Papahurihia’s followers no longer held their public meetings at night or hoisted their flag on a pole on Saturdays to mark their Sabbath but ‘sin is still their element, they have not turned to the Lord’. See John King to CMS, 7 April 1837, as cited by Ormond Wilson, JPS, 1965, p. 476.
20 In May 1832, Henry Williams said, ‘These feasts take place at this season of the year, called the Ngahuru, or tenth month, when the harvest of Kumara is gathered in and they cease to count the months until the time of planting again comes round’. Henry Williams, 17 May 1832, Early Journals, p. 245.
interesting titbits imparted by others. For example, there is a sketch of Tareha by Bambridge headed ‘Tareha to the Life’ and an entry by Cotton that states:

Tareha is the old chief who is reported to have eaten … part of a whale, which was stranded, & to have lived in the carcass of it for some weeks. He was said to be perfectly overwhelmed with fat …. Mr Bambridges likeness of him is showing if I mistake not the cunning, cruelty & glutteny of the old savage.

Cotton also recorded hearsay accounts about native ‘baptism’ and ‘confirmation’, the haka and the whakapapa of Puhi (the eponymous ancestor of Ngāpuhi). Likewise, during a visit to Kaitāia, William Gilbert Puckey told him about ‘The Wars at Ahipara’, ‘The Maori Calendar’ and ‘Maori Superstitions’, which he recorded in his journal. In a similar vein, Cotton embellished Āperaniko’s comments about Pukerenga with his own remarks about Papahurihia and concluded by saying, ‘the Picopo Bishop had some connection with Papahurihia – Papa being the Maori word for pope, hurihia meaning turned around’. 21

Binney identified Pukerenga as ‘the first exponent of the Nākahi movement’ that emerged in the Bay of Islands in 1833. She also said that there were two ‘visionary leaders’ called ‘Te Nākahi’ who had been elided by historians. 22 The poet Kendrick Smithyman, who believed ‘Te Nakahi & Papa were two fellows’, had raised the possibility with her in 1987. 23 Thus, after she read Atua Wera on Cheltenham Beach in December 1994, Binney told him that Bill Oliver had made her ‘cut the passage from Papahurihia’s biography about “old” Te Nakahi & “young” Papahurihia’ and she had forgotten all about it since then. 24

22 Judith Binney said that her suggestion, in her draft biography of Penetana Papahurihia, that there were two prophets ‘was erased by editorial decision as it seemed too convoluted to explain’. Judith Binney, JPS, 2007, p. 309.
23 Kendrick Smithyman to Judith Binney, Internal Memorandum, University of Auckland, n.d., ‘Judi, I take off this, from SPAN 23, which is the magazine of the South Pacific Ass’n for Commonwealth Literature and Language Studies (believe it or believe it not) at this time (1987) edited by Peter Simpson now MP Lyttelton and supposedly editor of my Selected Poems … It is pretty well the text of a NZBC Eliz. Alley programme, so I’ll put it publicity publicly [sic] that Te Nakahi & Papa were two fellows, which I shall stick by …. I have done nothing with my Papa stuff for the past year, but am of course entirely happy to offer you my speculations (if little else) about him at any time. Love K.’ In a second internal memo dated 7 October 1987 Judith Binney asked Kendrick Smithyman, ‘Who do you think was Papahurihia/Te Nakahi at the very beginning, at Rangihoua, then? The old man?? How do we untangle the two?’ Judith Binney to Kendrick Smithyman, 7 October 1987, Internal Memo, University of Auckland, MSS & Archives, 2009/3 (1), 3, AUL.
24 Ibid, 24 December 1994, AUL.
When Judith Binney revisited the conundrum of the two prophets in 2007, she maintained that John Webster and John White had met both men on the Ōmanaia River in February 1847. She identified the first as an older man named Te Nākahi, who had dreamt that Mohi Tāwhai was in danger of drowning and sketched his dream onto a rock. She pinpointed the second as a younger man in his mid-thirties called Te Atua Wera, Papa and Papahurihiia, whose original name was Pukerenga. Finally, Binney mentioned a tohunga named Te Haua, whom Cotton met at Waimate, and said that he was another of the chiefly converts to the Nākahi movement.

The arguments advanced by Smithyman and Binney were based on John Webster’s journal, which the poet had transcribed and the pair had toyed with editing for publication. However, Webster’s journal shows that he did not meet the old man called Nākahi. Rather, on Tuesday 16 February 1847, he sailed along the Ōmanaia River and stopped to pick up a man named Davis, who worked for William White. When the pair sat down to breakfast, Webster noticed ‘some strange hieroglyphics on a stone’. In explanation, Davis told him that one of the old men in the village had had a dream the night before and sketched it on the stone to explain it to the others. He

25 Judith Binney, JPS, 2007, p. 312. Binney said, ‘On 16 February 1847, after White and Webster had talked with the old matakite “Nakahi”, they travelled a little up-stream towards Wāimā and the settlement of “Atua Wero”’.  
27 Judith Binney to Kendrick Smithyman, 27 March 1985, MSS & Archives, 2009/3 (1), 3, AUL. Binney advised Smithyman that Pat French of the Auckland Public Library had copied John Webster’s manuscript and that she had suggested that French send it to him. At that juncture Binney was working in Wellington at the Stout Research Centre at Victoria University and said that she would be in Auckland at Easter and again during the May vacation. She suggested to Smithyman ‘we could put our heads together on one of those occasions to consider what next’. See also Judith Binney’s papers regarding the uncompleted project to edit the 1840 journals of John Webster, MS-Papers-11115-065, ATL.  
28 This man was not Charles Oliver Bond Davis, who worked as a clerk and interpreter in the Auckland office of the Protectorate of Aborigines in 1842. He retained the role when the Protectorate became the Native Secretary’s department and in 1847 assisted the Auckland courts with land purchases and natives affairs generally. Charles Davis was also involved in the production of the official Māori newspaper Te Karere Maori. Alan Ward, ‘Davis, Charles Oliver Bond’, from the Dictionary of New Zealand Biography. Te Ara – the Encyclopedia of New Zealand, updated 30-Oct-2012, URL: http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/biographises/1d3/davis-charles-oliver-bond, accessed 29 May 2015.  
handed the stone to Webster, who copied the drawing into his notebook, along with the explanation Davis gave him.30

John Webster did not meet the old man and it is unclear whether Davis had met him or if his knowledge was hearsay. However, it is now apparent that Māori called him ‘Nākahi’ because he believed that his dream was an omen of the future. John Warren made a similar allusion to Papahurihia in 1853. He said, ‘I expect ere long to see Nakahi himself bowing in humility at the Saviour’s feet. May God hasten that time’. Thus, Papahurihia did not adopt the name Te Nākahi as argued by Judith Binney. Rather, the Wesleyan called Papahurihia ‘Nakahi himself’ because he thought the tohunga was under the deluding influence of Satan.31

Webster said that the old man’s wife had thrust a stick into the ground to divine the outcome of Mohi Tāwhai’s voyage. He also said that the dream was discussed at length by the villagers, who interpreted it to mean that Tāwhai would be protected by a spirit called Te-Ata-o-Te-Rangi and return in safety from his voyage to Auckland with Governor Grey.32 Webster’s diary shows that after breakfast, he and Davis rowed upriver to Papahurihia’s village at Ōmanaia, where they found him in his cultivations and bartered their print calico, sheets, tomahawks, pipes and tobacco for his potatoes.33 Webster said:

I saluted him tena ko koe e Papa he is generally called Papahurihia or Papa he is a fine looking intelligent young man about 33 or 4 years of age fully tattooed he is a prophet & in great repute he took me to his temporary hut where was one of his wives he has two this one is the principal a fresh hearty looking dame …. the Atua Wero advised me to get tattooed on the seat of

30 John Webster’s sketch and explanation of old Nākahi’s dream are reproduced as Figure 1 in Judith Binney, JPS, 2007, p. 311, http://www.jps.auckland.ac.nz/document?wid=4510&page=0&action=searchresult&target=, accessed 5 August 2015.
32 John Webster, Maori Journal, 16 February 1847, p. 30, ACL.
33 Webster stayed overnight with Papahurihia. He said that his house was a long low building made of raupō and capable of holding 100 people. He also said that muskets of every size and date, both flintlocks and blunderbusses, as well as several tomahawks and other weapons, were ranged around the sides of the house. During the visit, Papahurihia introduced Webster to Waikato’s son, who lived him and impressed John Webster as ‘a quiet looking chap fully tattooed’. John Webster, Maori Journal, 17 February 1847, p. 31, ACL.
honour & thighs like himself Kikihu his wife seconded the motion & offered to get me ngarahau the black colouring matter

Binney’s contention that John White accompanied John Webster to the villages of old Nākahi and Papahurihia is untenable. White’s diary shows that on the day in question he took two horses to Mangungu for Mrs John Hobbs and her daughter and imagined he received ‘looks of love from Emma Hobbs’, who was the subject of his youthful infatuation. He sent some of his poems to Mr Moore the following day, and spent the next grinding wheat. Thus, is was not until Tuesday 23 February 1847 that he accompanied the Reverend John Hobbs and his son Richard to a hahunga at Waimā, where he met Papahurihia and Pene Taui. However, White paid cursory attention to Papahurihia as ‘the N.Z ventriloquist’, the object of his fascination being Pene Taui and his exploits at Ōhaeawai during the Northern war.

John Webster mentioned old Nākahi again on Friday 19 February 1847, when John and Joseph White called in to see him and said that their father had just returned from Auckland with Mohi Tāwhai. A corresponding entry in White’s journal confirms their visit to Webster and shows that the brothers were en route to Waimā in search of a stray bull. Thus, Webster concluded his commentary on the old man’s dream by saying:

Thus the prediction of Nakahi is verified that Mohi would return soon. They were nearly lost in a storm near the North Cape that part of the coast is called the Reinga (the bottomless pitt [sic]) by the natives & Nakahi in his dream likens the sea roaring like the Reinga

In all likelihood, Webster took the opportunity to show John and Joseph White his sketch of the rock drawing and to repeat what Davis had told him about the old man’s

34 Ibid, 16 February 1847, pp. 30-1. The underlining is Webster’s. Webster said that Papahurihia had commented that it was a pity that he was single and had offered him Te Hunga, the daughter of Kaitoke, for a wife. John Webster declined and told Papahurihia that he was ‘tabooed he wahine toku kei to wahi’ (engaged).
35 John White, Private Journal, 16 February 1847, MS-328 (2), I, p, 79, AML.
37 Ibid, 18 February 1847, p. 80.
38 Ibid, 23 February 1847, pp, 82-3.
39 Ibid, 19 February 1847, p, 80.
40 John Webster, Maori Journal, 19 February 1847, p. 33, ACL.
dream. In turn, his tale appears to have been the basis of the story that John White told in his 1861 lecture on Māori customs and superstitions. He said:

An old man (seer), of the name of “Nakahi,” residing in Hokianga, dreamt that he saw on the West coast, two canoes and the god Te-ata-o-te-rangi, and that he saw the wreck of them; in one canoe was Mohi Tawhai, the well known chief of Waima, in Hokianga, in imminent danger of drowning; and but for the intervention of Nakahi and of his god, Tawhai himself would have shared the fate of the others on board and would have perished.41

Moreover, White said ‘on the night of this dream a gentleman in company with Mohi Tāwhai was coming from Auckland to the Bay of Islands and was caught in a heavy gale’. The reference was to his father Francis who, according to Webster’s journal, had returned on the same vessel as Mohi Tāwhai.

There is no evidence that Te Haua was a convert to the Nākahi cult. Rather, Cotton said that Harakia, a tohunga from Mawe, had accompanied Heke to Waimate and complained that two people had been shooting ducks at Lake Ōmapere, which was rāhui. The tohunga explained that Hongi Hika had made the lake tapu and that now he was dead, there was nobody powerful enough to lift it. Richard Davis subsequently spoken to three Māori converts named Hihi, Wiremu Hau and Anaru, who retorted that Heke’s thoughts were from ‘Hatana’ the Devil of Hell (which deprecated the rāhui as mere superstition). However, William Cotton said it was obvious to him that these ‘Xtain Maori teachers all appeared in the thrall of the dreadful power which the Tohungas prophesised in the past’.

Cotton went on to say that Anaru then explained how a tohunga named Te Haua, whom he described as ‘the greatest magician in the past’, had bewitched his victims. He said that Anaru had said that Te Haua ‘was just like those serpents which swallowed up the other serpents for he destroyed them all one after the other’ (meaning that Te Haua had used makutu to bewitch and kill rival tohunga).42 Cotton said that Anaru’s narrative was accompanied by graphic gestures: that he had held up

41 John White, AJHR, 1861, Session I, E-No 7, p. 19.
42 Exodus 7:11-12 ‘Then Pharaoh also called for the wise men and the sorcerers, and they also, the magicians of Egypt, did the same with their secret arts. For each one threw down his staff and they turned into serpents. But Aaron’s staff swallowed up their staffs’.
one finger on his right hand to represent Te Haua and all the fingers on his left hand to signify the other tohunga and:

He then slapped his own thigh sharply and knocked down the first finger exclaiming “Kua mate” he is dead. This action he repeated, slapping … till all the fingers were laid down.

Finally, William Cotton said that Richard Davis had promised him he would ‘get the full particulars of this sorcery written down as well’.

Cotton mentioned Te Haua again in a letter to his sisters. He called him ‘Old Haau, the Maori tohunga’ and said that when he had wanted to know where the Governor and Bishop were, he set up ‘several little sticks’ in a secret place and recited ‘a number of Karakia Maori’. Cotton said that when Te Haua returned to find the sticks scattered:

He says the Atua Maori passes by and does it and from the position of these latter sticks he gives his divination by this means in olden times they pretended to determine what party would have the best of it in a fight.

Finally, Cotton told his sisters ‘This old man Te Haua is one of John Heke’s prophets’ and that it was Heke’s ‘policy to consult him on all occasions as it gives him influence with the ignorant’. In keeping with Cotton’s commentary, Richard Davis told Dandeson Coates that three of Heke’s messengers had come to consult ‘the old Priest’ after the fall of Kawiti’s pa at Ruapekapeka and that he had pointed out to them ‘the result of his incantations’. Davis also said that Heke’s messengers had paid close attention to everything Te Haua said because their objective was to learn whether Tāmati Wāka Nene intended to attack them again. Finally, Davis commented:

The old Priest is a singular character. He sometimes attends service and today he very mildly and seriously observed, “All will turn out according to the will of God. If God permit[s] Walker’s people to attack us they will do so – if he does not permit them they will not do it”. It is by this mixing up religion with

---

43 William Cotton, Journal, 6 & 7 January 1843, pp. 178-9, AUL. Margaret Edgcumbe told Judith Binney that the Reverend William Cotton had met three Māori teachers who had described Te Haua ‘as being like Moses’s serpent in getting rid of all opposition’. She queried, ‘I wonder whether the word Nakahi was used at this point?’ See Margaret Edgcumbe to Judith Binney, email, Thursday 6 March 2003, MS-Papers-11115-150, ATL.
44 William Cotton to Sarah & Phoebe Cotton, 24 July 1844, Micro 81-60 (2), Letter 3.33a, AUL.
his incantations that he deceives those who have already deceived themselves’. 45

However, I would argue that Te Haua’s comments are not evidence of the mixing up of religion and Māori karakia. Rather, they simply reflect the tohunga’s awareness that Tāmati Wāka Nene was a baptised native and his attendant belief that Nene and his warriors therefore enjoyed the protection of the God of the Europeans. Moreover, Pene Taui clearly shared Te Haua’s perspective when he fashioned bullets from the Bible and fired them into the sky at Ōhaeawai to garner God’s esteem and invoke his protection for the Māori warriors who opposed the British.

Finally, Binney attributed a drawing from 1855 to an unnamed prophet of the Nākahi movement at Waimate. 46 Dated 29 ‘Noema’ (November), “The Book of the Dragon” portrayed a temple and a flying serpent and said:

This is a true likeness of the Dragon the likeness of which is, let it be understood, near to come to the whole land. This was the evil with which the Children of Israel was visited and of whom a thousand died in one day – they were spared because God was with them. But we have no one to stand up for us against evil. Let us then turn, for the book says “What shall we say? Shall we continue to sit in evil? No let us flee to Jesus and be saved”. This is the end. 47

The dragon resembled an eel with bat-like wings and had a forked tongue protruding from its mouth. It was flying east toward a temple above Hokiang, Pākanae, Waimamaku, Wairoa, Whāngārei and Ngunguru. The translation next to the temple, which has been attributed to Richard Davis said, ‘the House of the evil on the water coming hither’. 48 However, another by Hōne Tuwhare rendered the same words ‘The

45 Richard Davis, 14 January 1846, in Richard Davis to Dandeson Coates, 17 December 1845, MS-1211-2, p. 65, HL.
46 Judith Binney, JPS, 2007, Figure 4, p. 315.
47 The Book of the Dragon, MS-Papers-1009-2/79, ATL. Kenneth Atholl Webster, who was born in Wellington, removed the drawing from the CMS archives and returned it to New Zealand. He was a collector of artefacts, manuscripts, books and paintings relating to New Zealand and the Pacific and built up one of the largest collections of this type in the world. The Alexander Turnbull Library purchased this part of the collection after his death. Turnbull Record, 4, 1, May 1971, Wellington: The Friends of the Turnbull Library, p. 53.
48 Anon, n.d., MS-Papers-6373-28, ATL.
house of death which is floating out to sea’. He suggested the drawing was ‘a fantasy, possibly to frighten children and unbelievers into reaching swiftly for a gun or bible!’

Tuwhare recommended that the library classify the drawing as ‘Some odd tangential side-effects from Missionary teachings’.49 However, another opinion by an anonymous party, who appears to be Judith Binney, said:

This very important document titled ‘the book of the Dragon’ has the characteristics of one of the cult movements of Maori Christianity. Although Hone Tuwhare says the ‘Anchor’ drawing is doodling, to me it is the ‘Maungamoa’ or House of Death spoken of in the adjacent text. The suggestion of the whole thing being fantasy to scare people (by Tuwhare) doesn’t fit. This document is probably a rare piece of the puzzle of millennial cults, and the dragon a significant part of this instance of that mode of thought.50

Richard Davis enclosed a copy of the drawing with a letter to the London CMS on 11 February 1856. He said that a Christian Māori convert at Mangakāhia had given it to him. He also said, ‘that there is scarcely a tribe throughout the country which does not
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possess a copy’. However, during the period in question there was a village called Mangakāhia near Kaikohe, which suggests that the drawing was circulating around the Bay of Islands.

Davis told London that the Mangakāhia natives had told him that the person ‘who got up this paper’ had tried to prove that he had the ability to communicate with the dead. They also said that the man had gone to the top of a mountain, where his familial spirit had directed his eye to a spot in the ocean, to which he had swum and brought up the cure for the impending malady. Richard Davis said that a few days later, a tohunga from Waimate had exhibited a facsimile of the drawing at a meeting and told Māori that if they kept a copy in their houses it would protect them ‘from the assault of the deadly malady they report the world is about to be visited with’. He said that five of his Māori communicants had applied to the tohunga ‘for his medicine; and were brought under his tapu’. He also said that he had not offered any comment on the absurdity ‘committed with the paper’.

Richard Davis mentioned the drawing to John Coleman the following month. He said that the ‘state of the natives’ was not promising and many had ‘resorted to their old customs’. He also said that in January, during a visit to Ōtāua near Kerikeri, ‘the teacher showed me a rude drawing of a flying dragon, a look at which would preserve people from the fatal disease with which the world was to be visited’. Davis said that one of his servants had attended a meeting at Waimate and been told by ‘a man, who professes to be both a doctor and a priest’ that ‘a deadly malady was coming on the earth, and that he wished to provide them with a remedy against it’. He told Coleman that ‘the rude drawing of a dragon was exhibited’ and ‘medicine’ distributed to the people. He also said that the tohunga had ordered every house ‘to have a picture of the dragon, which, if they looked upon it, would prove a preservative’.

Richard Davis said that the same drawing was produced at Mangakāhia the following Sunday, along with ‘a paper having a direct reference to the brazen serpent in the wilderness’. He told Coleman that the people had told him that the author was a great
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doctor who communicated with spirits. They also said that the man ‘was directed to remedies by the spirit’ and that when he wanted a cure he climbed a mountain and the spirit directed his eye to the spot where it was to be found. Davis said that the documents had been given to all the neighbouring tribes and were greatly valued. He also said that an elderly native at Mangakāhia had given him a copy of the drawing of the ‘red dragon’ and that he had ‘just sent it to Salisbury Square’. Finally, Richard Davis said that the Mangakāhia natives had told him ‘that the original drawing was obtained from a steamer which had visited their port’.

To conclude, the evidence shows that Pukerenga of Ōhaeawai and Papahurihia from Ōmanaia were not the same man and that Papahurihia was not involved in Pōmare’s bid to retake Kororārea from Ngāti Rēhia in 1837. It also shows that Māori called the elderly seer Nākahi because he believed that his dream was an omen of the future and that Mohi Tāwhai was in danger of drowning. Finally, the section concludes that the flying serpent depicted in “The Book of the Dragon” was invoked by tohunga in the Bay of Islands to protect unconverted Māori from the seven last plagues they considered imminent.

Conclusion

The new interpretation of Papahurihia as a tohunga continues to emerge in this chapter. Both Papahurihia and Te Haua acted as Heke’s tohunga during the Northern war. However, there is no evidence that the panel of Saint Patrick served as an altarpiece in a Nākahi chapel or was safeguarded from British bombardment during the conflict. Rather, the building was located at the southern entrance to the Mangamuka Gorge on the Hokianga. Moreover, the chapel and panel are Catholic iconography and Tōtara Point, on the Mangamuka River, was the site of Bishop Pompallier’s first Catholic mass in 1838. This suggests that Roman Catholic Māori built the chapel as a place to celebrate mass and Wesleyan Māori vilified it as a ‘Nākahi’ chapel because they thought that Bishop Pompallier and the Roman Catholic Church were Antichrist. Similarly, Hokianga Māori called the old man ‘Nākahi’

57 Richard Davis also repeated the comment he made to the CMS on 11 February 1856. He said, ‘that once his eye was directed to the ocean; that he swam to the spot, dived, and found an effectual remedy for the malady’. Richard Davis to John Coleman, 10 March 1856, Te Puna, A Memoir, p. 381.
58 Richard Davis to John Coleman, 10 March 1856, Te Puna, A Memoir, p. 381.
(Satan) because he treated his dream as an omen and believed that Mohi Tāwhai was in danger of drowning.

Anaru’s comment that Te Haua was like the serpent that swallowed up the other serpents, reflected his Christianization and literal interpretation of Exodus 7:12, in which Aaron’s rod had turned into a serpent and devoured all its rivals. Thus, Anaru likened Te Haua to the prophet Aaron, whose rod had swallowed the serpents conjured up by the sorcerers and magicians of Egypt, not realizing that the act of turning the rods into serpents was one of the miracles performed by God to demonstrate his sovereignty over the recalcitrant Pharaoh of Egypt.

The heading of the sketch called “The Book of the Dragon” referred to the Book of Revelation and featured text based on Numbers 21:6-9. It said that those who had spoken against God were bitten by fiery serpents and died. It also said that those who had admitted their sins and looked upon the brazen serpent on the rod of Moses were saved. The drawing showed the serpent flying toward a temple, whilst the adjacent text referred to the deadly malady that was about to visit the world. The temple and the malady were allusions to Revelation 15:8, which said that nobody could enter the heavenly temple until seven plagues had visited the world.

The symbolic representation of God as the brazen serpent lifted up on the rod of Moses and the intrinsic message that the Māori people should place their faith in God was lost on the tohunga. Māori thought that the flying serpent was the cure and tohunga in the Bay of Islands invoked his protection in incantations designed to make the people tapu and protect them from disease. Thus, the drawing of the flying serpent became a talisman. More importantly, it is another example of how tohunga of the time interpreted God’s ‘threats’ and used sketches like the two trees and “The Book of the Dragon” to protect unconverted Māori from the lake that burns with fire and brimstone and the seven last plagues that were expected to visit the earth before Armageddon.
Chapter Four: Papahurihia in Context

The letters and journals of the missionaries and settlers are the principal sources on the nature of relationships between Māori and Europeans in the early contact period. They are also treated as a window into the culture that existed before the arrival of Europeans. However, as demonstrated by the records of Richard Davis, those documents often tell us more about the person who wrote them, than they do about those who were under observation. In a similar manner, Section L argues that in the nineteenth-century Papahurihia and other Māori in the Bay of Islands and Hokianga observed a concept of time that was based on the moon and had never heard of Sunday or Sabbath days. It also argues that the missionaries and Europeans interpreted the behaviour of Papahurihia and his followers through their own understanding of time and made assumptions about what they were doing. Section M surveys the official reports on Papahurihia from his appointment to the Hokianga rūnanga in 1862, to his death at Ōmanaia in November 1875. Finally, Section N focuses on the assertion that Papahurihia became a familial spirit after his death in 1875 and that Hōne Toia invoked him in séances held at Waimā during the Dog-Tax War in 1898.
Section L: Papahurihia in Ngāpuhi Time

This section argues that Papahurihia observed a lunar calendar and that he and other Māori had never heard of Sunday or Sabbath days when his name began to appear in European texts. It also argues that the Europeans interpreted the behaviour of Papahurihia and his followers through their own understanding of time and made assumptions about what they were doing. The method uses European texts to reconstruct the pattern of seasonal activities undertaken by Ngāpuhi in the period and positions the timing of their comments about Papahurihia in that context. It concludes that the movements of Papahurihia and his followers were attuned to the Ngāpuhi seasonal cycle and that Europeans’ mentioned them at points which coincided with the planting and harvesting of the kūmara and the hosting of hākiri and hahunga, in which Papahurihia played a central role.

The Protestant missionaries believed that the Māori people should conform to the Christian calendar adapted by Pope Gregory XIII in 1582. However, when they began to encourage them to stop working on Sunday, they were dealing with people who ‘had never heard of a Sabbath-day’. Over time, some Māori who lived near the Paihia mission station began to abstain from work on Sundays, and Ripi’s family at Mawe started to prepare their firewood and scrape their potatoes on Saturdays, so they did not desecrate the Sabbath by engaging in work. Likewise, some Māori on the Hokianga made their way to the Mangungu mission station on the Saturday before the Lord’s Day, in compliance with the wishes of the Wesleyan missionaries.

The reasons for Māori conformity were various but overall those who complied did so out of ‘a deep-rooted superstition’. Equally, Māori congregations tended to respond with ‘mechanical regularity’ to the Christian liturgy, and the majority did not stop
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work on Sundays until they saw the missionaries approaching, their arrival in the village being the sign that it was the rā tapu or sacred day of the Europeans.  

The assertion that Papahurihia observed a Saturday Sabbath was based on the intrinsic assumption that he operated on the Christian calendar. However, there is strong evidence that Māori who did not live with the missionaries or close enough to their stations to see the flag or hear the bells, struggled to work out when Sunday had arrived. The habit of raising a flag as a sign it was Sunday was instigated by William Hall, who built a flag-staff at Rangihoua. He told Māori that he was going to hoist a flag on Sundays in honour of the great God or ‘Atua Nui’ and stipulated that no work was to be done on that day. Hall said that from then onward Māori had looked ‘for Sunday with anxiety’. He also said, ‘They can see our flag from Korroraddickie, cross the Bay; and I believe that the natives there maintain regularly some outward observance of the Sabbath’. 

The missionaries introduced the flag to Hokianga Māori from Rangihoua. In 1819, they stayed with the hapū of Hikutu at Whirinaki to show them the Christian liturgy and ‘the flag was hoisted’ to signal the arrival of the Lord’s Day. The evangelicals repeated the exercise twice and the final service took place in the village of Moetara and Rangatira at Pākanae. Thus, as George Clarke’s son said, the flagstaff stood ‘as a warning to them’ to remember the Sabbath. Nevertheless, a group of Māori reprimanded for travelling on a Sunday in 1831 said that ‘they lived at a distance from any Missionary Settlement, and did not know it was Sunday’. Another whānau did not know about the Lord’s Day until August that year because they had never been visited by a missionary and ‘were unable to know when it took place’. A third party caught driving their pigs on a Sunday said ‘that they were mistaken concerning the day’. Similarly, Te Waharoa, the chief of Ngāti Haua from Matamata in the Waikato district, complained ‘that he had ‘no one to tell me
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when it is the Sabbath Day’,\textsuperscript{14} whilst an elderly woman at Ōtuīhu told Henry Williams ‘that the people of the Ships said this was not Sunday, it was only so’ to the missionaries.\textsuperscript{15} Likewise, in 1843 a Christian Māori from the Bay of Islands asked the missionary if Sunday was over after leaving church,\textsuperscript{16} and in 1847, Pene Taui asked John White to tell him ‘all the divisions of time’.\textsuperscript{17}

Some Māori attempted to calculate the arrival of Sunday. One chief, who had asked ‘the number of days which intervene between each Sabbath Day’, told his people ‘to cut some notches in a stick, that they might be correct’.\textsuperscript{18} Another asked if he had calculated the advent of the Sabbath correctly and produced ‘his stick in which he had made notches for every day for the last three weeks!’\textsuperscript{19} An elderly chief from the Hauraki district promised William Yate that his people would sit still ‘every seventh day’ and undertook to ‘count the nights, and remind the tribes when the sacred day comes round’.\textsuperscript{20} Another from the Bay of Islands said that he slept all day on a Sunday and prayed ‘when the sun rises, when the sun stands in the middle of the heavens, and when the sun sets’.\textsuperscript{21}

John Savage first mentioned the use of sticks for counting in 1805. He said that Māori reckoned by scores and marked each score by their fingers or pieces of stick. He also said that when Moehanga visited Lord Fitzwilliam in London, he had found him counting the chairs. Savage said that Moehanga:

> had procured a small piece of stick, which he had broken into a number of pieces to assist his recollection. He observed … A great number of men sit with the chief.\textsuperscript{22}

When ‘George’ returned to Whangaroa on the Boyd in 1809, he complained ‘that he had worked two Raumati’s but had not been paid’.\textsuperscript{23} Captain Peter Dillon explained that ‘Raumati’ signified a year and meant ‘literally a dead leaf, or the fall of the leaf’,

\textsuperscript{14} William Williams, 2 September 1834, \textit{Missionary Register}, 1835, p. 524.
\textsuperscript{15} Henry Williams, Sunday 23 February 1834, \textit{Early Journals}, p. 361.
\textsuperscript{16} William Cotton, Journal, 11 September 1843, III, Micro 00-067, p. 28, AUL.
\textsuperscript{17} John White, Private Journal, 23 February 1847, pp. 82-3, AML.
\textsuperscript{18} William Williams, \textit{Missionary Register}, 1829, p. 464.
\textsuperscript{19} William Williams, Journal, Sunday 19 October 1834, MS 91/75 (10), AML.
\textsuperscript{20} William Yate, 12 January 1834, \textit{Missionary Register}, 1834, pp. 548-9.
\textsuperscript{21} William Yate, \textit{Missionary Register}, 1829, p. 465.
\textsuperscript{22} John Savage, \textit{Some Account of New Zealand}, p. 107.
\textsuperscript{23} J. W. Davidson, \textit{Peter Dillon of Vanikoro}, p. 217.
which suggests that the Māori year ran from one European ‘autumn’ to another.\textsuperscript{24} When Ruatara left for Port Jackson on \textit{Active} in 1814, he promised to return in four moons,\textsuperscript{25} whilst in 1819, Marsden undertook to visit Whirinaki ‘in one moon’ if he possibly could.\textsuperscript{26} Likewise, Major Cruise reassured the chief Te Pere that H.M.S. \textit{Dromedary} would return to Whangaroa in ‘twelve moons’ which, according to Cruise, was ‘their way of calculating time’.\textsuperscript{27}

Early New Zealand vocabularies mention Ngahuru, which was the ancient word for ten and the final month in the Ngāpuhi lunar calendar. For example, John Savage rendered ‘ten’ as ‘Kanghahooede’;\textsuperscript{28} John Nicholas translated it as ‘Kanghahoodoo’,\textsuperscript{29} whilst Thomas Kendall and Professor Samuel Lee recorded ‘Ka nga udu’ as the Māori word for ‘ten’.\textsuperscript{30} Equally, after he had attended a hākiri at Whāngai in May 1832, Henry Williams said:

\begin{quote}
These feasts take place at this season of the year, called the \textit{Ngahuru} or tenth month, when the harvest of \textit{Kumara} is gathered in; and they cease to count the months until the time of planting again comes round.\textsuperscript{31}
\end{quote}

Likewise, two years later Kiwikiwi told Williams that there would be a meeting with Papahurihia ‘at Te Ngauru, when the \textit{kumare} will be taken up’.\textsuperscript{32}

When the evidence on Papahurihia is read in the context of the Ngāpuhi seasonal cycle, it is clear that the Europeans mentioned him at specific points in the Māori calendar. In fact, the timing of their testimony coincides with events like the hākiri and hahunga, as well as agricultural activities like transplanting the kūmara shoots into the ahuahu and harvesting the mature crops, in which tohunga played an integral role. The texts show that Northern Māori had two kūmara crops a year in the period in question. They also indicate that the tasks of planting the shoots into the ahuahu and harvesting the mature kūmara overlapped. Likewise, the harvest was always marked
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by a hākiri, which incorporated a hahunga. On those occasions, Māori sat the bodies of recently deceased chiefs alongside the disinterred bones of their relatives, which they cleaned, oiled and decorated with red ochre and feathers for the occasion. The hākiri were also peace-making forums and thus the meeting that Kiwikiwi mentioned to Henry Williams was for Ngāti Paoa of Hauraki, who had killed Te Kōkī’s son when he went to avenge the death of Pōmare I.

European evidence shows that Māori called the disinterred bones ‘atua’ and tohunga invoked them to procure a bountiful harvest and avert the voracious caterpillar from decimating the kūmara crops. They also reveal that tohunga invoked ‘atua’ to cure the ill, makutu or bewitch an enemy and protect their warrior descendants during war. There is also evidence that Māori used the disinterred bones of illustrious ancestors (atua) as tiki wānanga on the boarders of kūmara cultivations to prohibit people from trespassing upon them.33

Māori regarded the kūmara plant as tapu and a gift from Rongo, the god of cultivated food. Ripi said that the people at Mawe were afraid of the missionaries and the Māori who lived with them and worried that their kūmara would ‘be eaten by the grub’ if they listened to the Gospel of Jesus Christ.34 Others thought that their kūmara would not grow unless they observed all their superstitions.35 Likewise, Richard Cruise said that if Māori were interrupted by Europeans whilst planting their kūmara, ‘the work was suspended’ as ‘they dreaded a failure of the crop, if the seed were put into the ground in the presence of a white man’.36

European records show that the lunar months involved a degree of fluidity. For example, records for the Gregorian month of July show that there was a hahunga for Pōmare’s father at Tautoro in 1814 and another at Rangihoua the following year.37 In contrast, in 1820, the kūmara were still under high cultivation and Māori were
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building the wata onto which the kūmara were piled for hākiri. In 1831, Māori near Paihia prepared their land for planting and Papahurihia’s visit to Waimate in July 1833 coincided with a hahunga inland of the mission station and another at Ōtuīhu.

It was in July 1834, that Henry Williams said that Watonga was a disciple of the Nākahi and Hari had joined Papahurihia. Likewise, there was a hahunga at Ōtuīhu in July 1835, when Māori at Kororāreka championed Papahurihia’s beliefs. Māori disinterred the bones of Moetara for a hahunga on the Hokianga in 1839, and in 1846, Māori from Ītāua near Kerikeri were listening to their ‘whistling Gods’. Likewise, Māori held hākiri at Utakura and Ōmanaia in July 1847, when John Webster sat with Papahurihia and Pene Tautau.

Europeans mentioned Papahurihia with greater frequency in August. Between 1819 and 1832, Māori planted kūmara at Kororāreka, Kawakawa, Te Karaka and Waitangi, and held a hahunga at Waimate. In 1833, Māori in the Bay of Islands prepared for planting, and those at Taiāmai set a day apart for Papahurihia. In 1834, Henry Williams spoke to Wharepoaka of Rangihoua about Papahurihia’s ritenga, and said that Kawakawa was one of the places that had been under the domination of Papahurihia. Likewise in 1835, a man from a party en route to Te Ahuahu said that he did not want to have anything to do with the missionaries’ karakia and ‘that Papahurihia was the best teacher’. Another group was led by ‘one of Papahurihia’s best followers’.

It was at that juncture that Richard Davis of Waimate
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said that Papahurihia’s influence was increasing and he had gained many followers.\textsuperscript{54}  
Likewise, in 1842 James Hamlin said that there was ‘a revival of Papahurihia’s System’ at Manukau in South Auckland,\textsuperscript{55} and in 1843 William Woon said that Kuara and his people from Rāwene had for some time abandoned the missionaries and joined Papahurihia.\textsuperscript{56} 

European records for September show that the tasks performed by Māori in August and September overlapped. In September 1805, Savage saw several cultivations at Te Puna.\textsuperscript{57} In contrast, in 1819 Marsden said that Māori at Te Puna were still working in their gardens and Te Kōkī was preparing to plant at Kawakawa.\textsuperscript{58} Marsden also said that the people at Te Puna had told him about a tohunga from Kawakawa who had preserved their kūmara from caterpillars. He said that they had attributed the catastrophe to ‘the anger of their god.’ He also said that the tohunga had performed his rites and that when the caterpillars left, Māori had attributed their departure to his influence.\textsuperscript{59} 

In 1820, Māori in the Bay of Islands killed and dried fish and planted kūmara,\textsuperscript{60} and in 1823, Whangaroa Māori declined to sell any of their catch ‘because they were the first which they had caught at that place that season’.\textsuperscript{61} At the same time, there were more than 200 acres of kūmara were under cultivation at Waimate.\textsuperscript{62} In 1824, Māori prepared to plant their kūmara and forbade the missionaries from walking on their gardens ‘these spots being sacred’.\textsuperscript{63} In 1825, Māori from Te Haumi, Waikare and Wairoa planted kūmara,\textsuperscript{64} and in 1829, Waikato made a new fishing net and the sea near Rangihoua was tapu.\textsuperscript{65} In 1833, Māori began planting at Waitangi,\textsuperscript{66} as did
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Hongi’s son in 1839.\textsuperscript{67} Māori held hahunga at Waimate in 1842 and 1844,\textsuperscript{68} and in 1861, Henry Tacy Kemp said that Ngāpuhi were ‘fully employed in preparing the land for their cultivations’.\textsuperscript{69}

In October 1816, Māori prepared for ‘planting sweet potatoes’ at Rangihoua.\textsuperscript{70} At the same time, their kinfolk at Whirinaki planted kūmara and rejoiced at a hākiri, whilst large numbers cultivated kūmara at Taiāmai.\textsuperscript{71} In 1820, Whangaroa Māori planted potatoes and killed and dried fish. Some ‘were outside the heads fishing’, whilst others set the undergrowth on fire to clear more land for cultivation.\textsuperscript{72} There was a hahunga for Hongi Hika’s daughter in 1824,\textsuperscript{73} and in 1825, a Waitangi chief disinterred the bones of a relative for a hahunga.\textsuperscript{74} In 1830, Māori planted at Kawakawa\textsuperscript{75} and in 1832, the CMS missionaries suspended the native boy’s school at Paihia from early August ‘for the purpose of preparing ground for the cultivation of potatoes’.\textsuperscript{76} In 1833, Kerikeri Māori worked in their cultivations\textsuperscript{77} and in 1834, Pukututu of Kawakawa complained that some of his neighbours were ‘disciples’ of Papahurihia and Williams was told that they were going to Rangihoua in a few days.\textsuperscript{78} Likewise, Tareha and Titore ‘brought forward their arguments’ in support of Papahurihia at Kororāreka,\textsuperscript{79} and William Barrett Marshall, who met one of ‘the deluded’ followers of Papahurihia at Kawakawa, said he was ‘very busily engaged in planting the kumera’.\textsuperscript{80} Kawakawa Māori planted kūmara in 1837,\textsuperscript{81} and in 1842,
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Cotton said that the majority of Māori from Pukenui in the Bay of Islands had gone to the Hokianga to plant potatoes there.  

In November 1820, Cruise said that Māori were planting potatoes and burning the heath at Whangaroa. Nene and his wife were weeding their taro gardens and others were drying fern root. In 1824, Wairoa Māori made new fishing nets, and in 1825, Māori from Kawakawa went to gather fern root. Charles Davis said that those who remained behind had asked him ‘when it would be the Sabbath day’ and that when he answered they said, ‘that according to their reckoning they should have observed it on the morrow (Saturday) if we had not visited them’. Tohitapu planted kūmara in 1827 and 1834, and Earle saw 200 acres of kūmara at Pākanae under tapu. At that juncture, Peter Dillon said that as this was the season for planting the kūmara, all the natives from the Bay of Islands had gone to their plantations in the interior.

When Earle attended a hākiri at Kawakawa, he saw 800 Māori and said that a tohunga had discussed the proposed attack on Hauraki with the assembled chiefs. In 1829, Māori families from nearly every village fished for mackerel at the southeast head of the Bay of Islands. In 1834, Henry Williams ‘was kept conversing till a later hour’ by accounts of Papahurihia and said he had gone to the Hokianga. In the same month, James Stack said that a tohunga had ‘been praying over the sweet potatoes’ at Ōtawa and that the thunder had been treated as a ‘sign there will be a plentiful harvest’. Finally, in 1834 John Whiteley said that a deluded native had ‘set himself up for a prophet’ on the Hokianga.

Europeans mentioned Papahurihia again in December. In 1814, Nicholas saw several plantations of potatoes, kūmara and other vegetables growing on the sides of steep hills at Rangihoua. He also saw large gardens of kūmara and potatoes at Kawakawa.
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and said that Māori at Waitangi were hauling in an immense net of snapper and other fish to lay up their winter store. In 1824, there was a hākiri at Kerikeri and in 1833, Te Kemara made a new fishing net and the Kaipatiki Stream near Waitangi was tapu. In 1834, John King said that Papahuriha’s followers at Te Puna had assembled at night around a flagpole and performed their foolish ceremonies, whilst Kiwikiwi of Ōtuhi praised Papahuriha’s ‘great deeds’ and told Henry Williams that there would be a meeting with him at ngahuru, when the kūmara were harvested.

In 1834, Māori asked James Stack if Jesus Christ was like tohunga who could obtain rain by praying for it. Two days later, Māori at Maungatapere in the Waikato pulled down the piece of white cloth they had hoisted as a sign of the rā tapu, after Stack told them that it was only Thursday! In 1835, a large party assembled on the last day of kūmara planting and brandished a human head dressed in feathers in their haka. In contrast, in 1841, Waikare Māori worked in their plantations, and in 1855, Pōmare hosted a hākiri at Karetu in return for one given at Waiōmio the previous year.

 Europeans mentioned Papahuriha and Nākahī in January. In 1815, some of Hongi’s people prepared for planting at Waimate, whilst others under Kāiangaroa harvested the mature crops. Hongi also had a crop of turnips, potatoes and kūmara in high cultivation and several of his people were making baskets to gather the kūmara for a hākiri. Marsden and Nicholas saw plantations of kūmara at Paroa Bay and watched Korokoro and Tui draw their nets. They also saw two canoes fishing with an enormous net.

In 1816, Rangihoua Māori harvested their kūmara and Thomas Kendall said that one of the chiefs had gone without food for two days ‘being tabooed
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on account of koomara’. In 1826, a large party of Māori planted at Kawakawa and George Clarke, who wanted to plant kūmara in his own garden, asked if:

it would not be necessary for me to call in a New-Zealand Priest, that the ground might be made sacred on which they were to grow, and that some person might be made sacred to dress them, as is the native custom.

Hongi Hika held a hahunga for his son in January 1827 and discussed his plan to go to war against the tribe that had killed him. At that juncture, Peter Dillon said that after the kūmara crops had been harvested in January, the chiefs went to war to avenge the deaths of their friends and relatives. He also said that Māori caught and dried fish during the ‘summer’ months and laid them up as a ‘winter’ store.

In January 1831 Hara, a tohunga from Ōhaeawai, told Henry Williams that the Waimate chiefs ‘desired that none should pass by their plantations during their absence’. He also said that his sticks, which he had thrown the night before, showed that there would be a great deal of fighting if the missionaries accompanied the war party to Tauranga. In 1834, Williams said that Hihi of Ōtuīhu was full of the Nākahi doctrine and five days later, Māori laid Tohitapu’s bones beside 20 heads of his relatives at a hahunga at Waikare. Likewise, in 1837 William Williams visited two widows mourning their husbands and said that one of the deceased ‘had been a warm supporter of Papahurihia’ and had ‘died hardened in his superstition’. In January 1847, Hokianga Māori cleared the ground for ‘winter potatoes’, two canoes from Waimā made their way ‘to the mudflats to gather shellfish’ and John Webster purchased one ton of potatoes from Māori at Taerutu.

In February 1815, the chief of Kapotai sent kits of cooked potatoes to a hahunga at Kawakawa. Māori put them in the middle of the clearing and ‘certain ceremonies’ were conducted over them before their distribution. Nicholas said that the Kapotai
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chief was ‘then under the taboo’. He also said that when the former enemies had finished eating, ‘they prepared, as a necessary conclusion to the reconciliation that had taken place, to go through their war evolutions’. When Ruatara fell ill in 1815, Māori attributed his demise to makutu and a tohunga named Te Papa waited upon him. Five years later, when Cruise passed extensive cultivations of kūmara and potatoes at Taiāmai, Māori forbade him from going near them because they were tapu. In 1827, the chiefs prepared to go to war ‘against those amongst whom Pōmare had met his death’, and in 1829, a large number cleared the woods to expand their cultivations. A hākiri at Kerikeri in 1834 consisted wholly of dried fish and the pile of food was estimated at 49 feet high. In 1839, there was a hahunga at Waikare, and in 1840, Hobson said that the infringement of tapu was the main source of conflict between the two races and that Māori did ‘not hesitate to shoot or destroy cattle, especially on their beds of Kumera (sweet potatoe), which are considered sacred’. In 1847, George Webster attended a hahunga at Taerutu and John Webster purchased more than 50 kits of potatoes from Papahurihia. He also left his village before the tohunga made the Ōmanaia River tapu and said:

there is to be a net laid across to catch fish when neither canoe nor boat is allowed to pass the fishermen are also sacred they dare not put their hands to their mouths to eat but are fed by a party also sacred for the purpose.

Shortly afterward Papahurihia called on Webster en route to a hahunga at Rāwene, whereupon the European said, he ‘does not understand English and seemed very impatient if we spoke that language’.
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by three ‘sacred natives’.\(^{128}\) On that occasion, Papahurihia introduced him to the father of Kai Rakau whose bones he exhumed for the hahunga the following day. During the course of the hahunga, Papahurihia said that the man who was striking the ground with a long pole whilst chanting karakia was performing a custom of their ancestors. He also forbade Webster from going to the urupā and told him that if he returned and spat into their fires, Māori would die.\(^{129}\)

Webster said that Māori arranged the skulls and bones along Papahurihia’s fence. He also said that Papahurihia officiated over the proceedings and ‘stripped naked with a small piece of white cloth in front showing off his finely tattooed thighs’.\(^{130}\) John White met Papahurihia at a hahunga at Waimā later that month,\(^{131}\) where Pene Taui spoke ‘in favour of the war & was still for fighting the soldiers’. Webster also said that there was ‘great lamenting over the bodies by Atua Wero and the relatives of those deceased’ before the bones were carried to a wahi tapu in the forest.\(^{132}\)

In March 1817, several scholars returned to Rangihoua after helping with the kūmara harvest.\(^{133}\) In 1827, Māori held a hahunga for Tohitapu’s son,\(^{134}\) and there was a hahunga for Hongi Hika in 1828.\(^{135}\) In 1830, at a hahunga at Waihou, James Stack said that the undecayed bodies were placed in a row in a sitting position and the skulls of their relatives ‘were so placed as to appear united to whole bodies’. He counted 462 baskets of kūmara. He also said that when Muriwai died soon afterward, 900 Māori made their way to Horeke, where the ‘crying and cutting themselves was very great indeed’.\(^{136}\) At a hahunga at Waimate in 1831, Yate saw more than 1,000 bushels of kūmara piled onto a triangular frame from which hung joints of beef and pork and a quantity of sun-dried shark.\(^{137}\) Likewise, at a hākiri for Pōmare in 1834 William Williams saw more than 1,000 bushels of potatoes.\(^{138}\) In 1835, the missionary said

---

\(^{128}\) Ibid, 22 February 1847, p. 34.
\(^{129}\) Ibid, 23 February 1847, pp. 35-6.
\(^{130}\) Ibid, 23 February 1847, p. 41.
\(^{131}\) John White, Private Journal, 16-18 & 23 February 1847 pp. 79-80, 82, AML.
\(^{132}\) John Webster, Maori Journal, 23, 24, 25 February 1847, pp. 41-3, ACL.
\(^{134}\) Henry Williams, 27 March 1827, Early Journals, p. 47.
\(^{135}\) George Clarke, 2 March 1828,Missionary Register, 1828, p. 411; Henry Williams, 20 March 1828, Missionary Register, 1828, p. 467; James Stack, 12 March 1828, Missionary Register, 1829, pp. 284-5.
\(^{136}\) James Stack, March 1830, Missionary Register, 1830, pp. 378-80.
\(^{137}\) William Yate, 18 March 1831, Missionary Register, 1832, p. 157. There are numerous references to the Temple of Juggernaut in the Missionary Register and Missionary Chronicle. Yate’s description of the hahunga stage was the basis of his drawing in An Account of New Zealand in 1835.
\(^{138}\) William Williams, Journal, 14 March 1834, MS-91/75 (10), III, p. 369.
that Waikato was ‘bitterly opposed to religious instruction’ and recognised ‘Papahurihia as the only teacher of truth’, and two years later Richard Davis met a party of Māori, whom he described as Papahurihia’s followers.

In March 1843, William Woon said that Rangatira of Pākanae had killed two bullocks for the hahunga he was holding for Ngāpuhi from the Bay of Islands. Woon said that more than 1,000 Māori attended the hahunga. He also said that Māori planned to hold another hahunga the following week, for which there was ‘talk of raising the bones of Moetara again’. In 1847, Webster noticed three large canoes of Te Ihutai on their way to a hahunga. He also said that there was a hahunga at Rangiora. At the same time, Papahurihia attended a hahunga at Whirinaki, and when he returned, Webster traded with him for the pigs he wanted. In 1870, several thousand Māori attended a hahunga at Waimā for Arama Karaka Pi, where the ‘long low wall’ of food included ‘kits of potatoes and kumaras piled up one upon another – bags of flour, rice, sugar, boxes of tea’ and melons.

When Thomas Kendall attended a hahunga in April 1815, he told Marsden that it was customary for Māori to disinter the bodies of their chiefs four or five times and ‘clean the bones, and cast the flesh away’. He said that Māori called the skull ‘atua’. He also said they had carried the remains of Ruatara and his wife 15 miles to Motutara, and that Te Puhi from Whangaroa had attended a hahunga in the Bay of Islands. In 1820, Cruise said that Māori in the Bay of Islands were harvesting their kūmara. He also said:

> The commencement of the koomera harvest is the great epoch which marks the recurrence of the year; and the labour of gathering it supersedes all other
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occupations. It is ushered in with the blessing of the priest for its success, and
terminated by his tabbooing, or making sacred from intrusion, the store-houses
in which this favourite food is deposited.

When Cruise attended a hahunga held by Hongi’s people for those from Whangaroa,
he saw ‘an immense pile of baskets of koomeras’ supported on ‘three very tall posts,
driven into the ground in the form of a triangle’. He said that when the guests were
ready to leave ‘they received a present of as many koomeras as they could carry with
them’. He also said:

The rejoicings are the same when the koomeras are planted, as when they are
gathered in. During the sowing season, the ground is strictly tabbooed, as well
as the people employed in cultivating it.148

In 1828, Augustus Earle attended a hahunga for Moetara’s father at Pākanae and was
led to a small hut, where the bones had been ‘collected, cleaned, and decorated with a
quantity of fresh white feathers’. Earle said that copious ‘piles of cumera and Indian
corn, with heaps of fish’ were served to all who attended. He also said that at its
conclusion ‘the different parties gathered up what remained of the portions of food
distributed to them’ and left.149 The debate between Papahurihia and William White
took place at a hākiri for Moetara at Waimā in April 1835. On that occasion, the
missionary counted 11,000 baskets of potatoes weighing 300 ton as well as pork,
canoes and other things to the value of £14,000.150 At the same time, Māori at
Matauri Bay worked in their cultivations.151

In 1839, some Māori in the Bay of Islands toiled in their cultivations while others
attended a hahunga152 for Moetangi on the Hokianga.153 In 1840, Te Taonui senior
announced his intention to exhume the bodies of several Christian chiefs for a
hahunga at Waimā, including Simon Peter Matangi and the wife and daughter of
Tāmati Wāka Nene.154 There was a hākiri at Kerikeri in April 1843,155 and in 1845,
Woon said that ‘the Atera-wera, Papahurihia’ was at the Hokianga heads and ‘busy with his Ritenga kuware’ or ‘insane or foolish proceedings’. In 1847, Webster saw a large canoe carrying the corpse of a chief from the Bay of Islands and said that the tūpāpaku was en route to a hahunga at the Hokianga Heads. Likewise, in April 1880 Āperahama Taonui, who was living on the Kaipara Harbour, attended a hākiri on the Hokianga.

In May 1819, John King said that Hongi Hika had left another chief in charge of his slaves to cultivate his land at Kerikeri. He estimated that Hongi also had 100 acres under cultivation at Waimate and noted that his people were ‘cutting down a large Forest, and burning it off in order to plant it’. In 1820, Marsden attended a hahunga at Tareha’s village at Waimate. He said that the assembled chiefs were from villages between Whāngārei and the Hokianga and had discussed a war expedition to Kaipara. Marsden also said that Hongi ‘had been collecting ammunition ever since his defeat’ and ‘that each Tribe had to furnish a certain number of men’. According to the missionary, there were ‘some hundreds of sweet and common potatoes, with fish’ and ‘great feasting’ at the hākiri. When Marsden attended a nearby hahunga, he noted that the deceased was called ‘the Atua’. He also said that the body was seated in an upright position with ‘the skulls and bones of his family and ancestors’ on his left. Finally, Marsden said that the chief’s hair was ornamented with feathers and a garland of leaves and his face was anointed with oil.

In May 1820, Richard Cruise said that Te Kōkī and Tara were unable to provide him with timber spars because many of their people had gone to the hahunga and many more were planting kūmara. He also said that they had told him that their people ‘would all return at the end of the present moon’. Cruise estimated that there were 3,000 people at the hahunga and enormous quantities of kūmara and potatoes. He also
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said that the chiefs had discussed an expedition to Kaipara to avenge the death of Hongi Hika’s brother, who was killed there 12 years earlier.161

Ōhaeawai Māori hosted a hākiri for Ngāi Tawake in 1831162 and in 1832, when the Reverend Henry Williams attended a hahunga at Kawakawa, he said that Māori there had erected a wata to preserve their kūmara from the English rats, whose appearance they attributed to ‘the anger of the Atua for not observing more rigidly their religious ceremonies’.163 Three days later, at a hahunga at Whāngai, the missionary received 30 kits of food to take away.164 In 1835, Kororārea Māori attended a hahunga at Waimate,165 where William Williams counted 2,000-bushel baskets of kūmara and 50 or 60 pigs, and estimated that the line of food was 300 yards long. It was then that Williams and Davis tried to persuade the chiefs to adopt the convention of Christian burial and attached flags to the piles of food instructing Hokianga Māori not to reciprocate.166 A second hākiri at Paroa Bay was attended by ‘a great number of natives’ and the banks of food were raised ‘to a considerable pile supported by poles’.167 Finally, in 1839 there was a hahunga for Tamatama at Whirinaki, where the chiefs wept over his corpse and disposed of it in the native fashion.168

Finally, Europeans described Papahurihia’s behaviour in detail in the Gregorian month of June. In 1814, Māori at Rangihoua cleared more land for planting,169 and in 1829, those at Kawakawa harvested their kūmara.170 Likewise, there was a hahunga at Ōhaeawai in 1831,171 and at Kawakawa and Waimate in 1833.172 In 1834, Henry Williams said that Māori educated in the mission school had borrowed the word Nākahi from Genesis 3:1 and applied it to their old superstitions. He also said that
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Papahurihia was the person who related the ‘wonders’ of the Nākahi doctrine.\textsuperscript{173} Later that month, Williams said that Watonga was ‘a disciple of the Nakahi’ and that Hari had ‘for some time joined Papahurihia’.\textsuperscript{174} There were hahunga at Kaikohe in 1837\textsuperscript{175} and 1840\textsuperscript{176} and another at Tōtara Point on the Hokianga.\textsuperscript{177} Likewise, Nuku of Ngāiterangi exhumed the bones of several of his wives and held a hahunga at Maungatapu in 1842.\textsuperscript{178}

On 11 June 1847, Papahurihia told Rangatira of Pākanae that his familiar spirit had seen a tāua or fighting party from Te Rarawa at Rangiora. Webster said the natives at Pākanae placed ‘the utmost belief in the Atua Wero’.\textsuperscript{179} He also said that Māori planned to exhum the bones of a chief from Waimate for a hahunga at Pākanae and that Kawiti and other chiefs from the Bay of Islands would be attending.\textsuperscript{180} Rangatira, Papahurihia and a number of their people attended a hākiri at Whāngāpē on 20 June 1847, where they confronted Te Rarawa about the tāua that had attacked Tarapatiki of Rangiora. Webster said that ‘the fiery God’ Papahurihia ‘told them about his spirit being witness of the utu of the Rarawas’. He also said that Rangatira had called Te Rarawa thieves and murderers and told them that if they did not stop their evil ways, it would be like ‘the bite of a sandfly’ and he would avenge the insult.\textsuperscript{181}

Webster said that Māori planned to hold hākiri at Ōmanaia and Waihou. He also said that messengers from Waimate had told Rangatira that Māori had exhumed the bones of ‘Broughton’ (Ripi of Mawe) and would bring them over to Pākanae.\textsuperscript{182} At Ōmanaia, Webster saw the wata or great stages on which Māori had piled the food and noticed they had named the four principal posts. The first acknowledged that the hākiri was in return for one that the people from Ōmanaia had received some time ago. The second acknowledged that the hākiri should have taken place in the summer but that food had been scarce. The third noted that the food provided would soon be

\textsuperscript{173} Henry Williams to Dandeson Coates, 17 June 1834, MS-0285/B, pp. 301-5, HL.
\textsuperscript{175} Richard Davis, Journal, 29 June 1837, PC-0067 (150), p. 871, HL.
\textsuperscript{176} Richard Davis, 29 June 1840, \textit{Missionary Register}, 1840, pp. 510-11.
\textsuperscript{177} William Woon, Journal, 8 June 1840, MS-0969/004, HL.
\textsuperscript{178} Alfred Brown, 16 June 1842, \textit{Missionary Register}, 1844, pp. 486-487. Brown preached to the natives from 1 Corinthians 8 (Now about food sacrificed to idols).
\textsuperscript{179} John Webster, Maori Journal, 11 June 1847, p. 93, ACL.
\textsuperscript{180} Ibid, 16 June 1847, p. 96.
\textsuperscript{181} Ibid, 20 June 1847.
consumed and the fourth announced that the people from Ōmanaia were angry because they had nothing better to give’.

When John Webster accompanied Arama Karaka Pi to Waimā on 28 June 1847, he saw 400 kits or 100 ton of uwhi or ‘winter’ potatoes on a stage of 60 feet. He also saw the remains of several bodies housed in a small shed and skulls ornamented with feathers. Webster said that one of the tohunga in attendance had killed and scalped Lieutenant Phillpotts at Ōhaeawai and that when he rose to speak, he had encouraged the chiefs to wage war on the Pākehās to ‘recover the land’.

When Webster attended a hākiri at Ōmanaia in July 1847, he saw a wata of 60 feet piled with potatoes from which print blankets, native mats and bundles of tobacco and pipes were suspended. He was welcomed by Papahurihia’s wife Kikihu and when he ‘approached the House of the fiery God … he called out Haeremai Taku hoa e Hone (welcome my friend John)’. Webster said that several canoes landed with potatoes, slaughtered pigs and ‘bread cooked in the kopa maori’, and that the supplies were ‘hoisted with korari ropes up on the Hakari’. He also said that when he got a pot of boiling water to make coffee, Papahurihia had stopped him and made the slave empty it into another, because a chief could not touch a pot used by slaves.

To conclude, Europeans assumed that Papahurihia and his followers operated on the Christian calendar adapted by Pope Gregory XIII. However, Ngāpuhi reckoned time by counting moons and followed a calendar made up of 10 months. It culminated at ngahuru, which coincided with the months of ‘autumn’ in the Christian calendar, after which Ngāpuhi ceased to count until it was time to plant again. Thus, Papahurihia’s movements around the Bay of Islands and Hokianga were attuned to the seasonal activities undertaken by Ngāpuhi in the period in question and the names of Papahurihia and others like Hihi and Watonga, who followed the customs of their ancestors, were recorded by Europeans at periods that corresponded with the planting and harvesting of the kūmara and the hosting of hākiri. Moreover, the Europeans’ texts link Papahurihia most strongly with the rite of hahunga, which was intrinsic to
the hākiri, and in which as a tohunga he played a central role. The next section traces Papahurihia’s civic conduct from his appointment to the Hokianga rūnanga in 1862, until his death at Ōmanaia in November 1875.

Figure 5: Sketch of the Hokianga. Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, AWNS-18980514-3-2.
This section uses newspapers and official reports from the *Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives* to trace Papahurihia’s appointment to civic roles and reports on his conduct until his death at Ōmanaia in November 1875. It argues that his adoption of the name ‘Penetana’ coincided with his appointment to the Native Land Court and emulated the surname of Chief Judge Francis Dart Fenton (Penetane). It also argues that his Christian name was unrelated to the concept of penitence or a sense of profound sorrow for having sinned against God. The section concludes that Papahurihia’s baptism into the Wesleyan Methodist Church did not prevent him from continuing to operate as a tohunga and that Europeans described him as the greatest Ngāpuhi tohunga of his time in eulogies written after his death.

Papahurihia was amongst the Ngāpuhi chiefs who welcomed Governor George Grey to Kerikeri in November 1861. In 1862, James Clendon, the Resident Magistrate at Rāwene, said that Papahurihia of Ngāti Hau was living at Ōmanaia, whilst George Clarke, the Civil Commissioner in the Bay of Islands, listed him as a warden on the Hokianga rūnanga. Papahurihia’s name was also included in a return of monies paid by the government, which reported that his remuneration as warden was £7 10s.

In 1864, a Government Gazette published in the *New Zealand Herald* announced that Papahurihia, Mohi Tāwhai and George Clarke had been appointed to ascertain the native title in Hokianga. Likewise, in January the same year, in a return of officers employed in the native districts, Papahurihia was listed as a warden or karere appointed under the Native Circuits Courts Act 1858. In 1865, a Government Gazette published in the *New Zealand Herald* announced the appointment of Francis Dart Fenton as Chief Judge of the Native Land Court under the Native Lands Act 1862. It also said that Hōne Mohi Tāwhai and ‘Penetana’ Papahurihia had been appointed to the court as assessors. That was the first time that Papahurihia’s name was published with the forename ‘Penetana’, which oral informants on the Hokianga have rendered

---

1 *Sydney Morning Herald*, 12 March 1862, p. 2.
2 James Clendon, AJHR, 1862, Session 1, Enclosure 7, p. 19.
3 George Clarke, AJHR, 1862, Session 1, E-No. 9, Section 1, Enclosure 1, p. 5; *Maori Messenger: Te Karere Maori*, 13 March 1862, p. 1; *Maori Messenger: Te Karere Maori*, 20 August 1862, p. 3.
4 AJHR, 1862, Session 1, E-No. 12, p. 7.
5 *New Zealand Herald*, 15 November 1864, p. 4.
6 AJHR, 1864, Session 1, E-07, p. 5.
7 *New Zealand Herald*, 16 January 1865, p. 4.
as ‘Penetane’. The word appears to have been the Māori rendition of ‘Fenton’ and newspaper evidence shows that Māori commonly referred to Judge Fenton as Judge Penetane. Given that the chiefs often assumed the names of high status Europeans to enhance their mana, it is likely that Papahurihia took the name ‘Fenton’ in emulation of the Chief Judge of the Native Land Court, and that his naming was not, as suggested by some, a reference to the concept of ‘penitence’ or remorse for one’s sins or previous wrong doing.

A letter written by Āperahama Taonui and co-signed by Papahurihia appeared in *Waka Maori* in 1865. Written at Waihou and addressed to Governor George Grey, it queried why the words ‘Pai Mārire’ (good and peaceful) had been applied to the followers of Te Ua Haumēne, who they described as ‘a murderous body’ whose ‘fruits are murder and cannibalism’. The pair suggested that the term would be better directed to ‘the Bishops, Ministers, Teachers, and those who uphold the Gospel’. They also said that the more correct name for Te Ua’s followers were ‘Whiroiuta; Whiroitai; Whiroitupua; Whirotetawhito; Whirotemanata, or Aiotitu’, which they described as ‘the source or origin of all evils’.

In 1867, Papahurihia helped with arrangements for the reception of his Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh, and three years later, he welcomed Governor George Bowen to the Hokianga. The *Daily Southern Cross* reported on that visit in two instalments. The first said that Papahurihia had joined the tour and described him as ‘a famous tohunga, or prophet, and a ventriloquist in the bargain’.

---

9 Ruth Ross to Jean Irvine, 30 October 1965, MS-94/23(10), AML. Ross asked Irvine ‘is ‘Penetane’ a transliteration of some biblical name? It sounds rather like ‘penitent’ which to my surprise I find is not a biblical term’.
10 *Waka Maori*, 7 October 1865, p. 35. The words appear to be variations on the base word ‘Whiro’. The missionaries described Whiro as the ruler of Te Reinga or ‘hell’. However, Elsdon Best pointed out that Māori did not have a belief in punishment of the soul after death in pre-European times. He said that the missionaries had introduced the notions of hell fire and burning lakes and quoted by way of example, a new Maori chant which said, ‘It leads to realms infernal; here’s Te Reinga, Here no light appears, no single gleam. An awful gloom for ever reigns …. Where deposed Whiro rules, And grasps with fearsome clutch the passing dead, With horrid reptiles rules this dismal hell, These go to hell, the vilest spirits there, in Rarohenga, The place of sighs and groans’. Elsdon Best, *The Maori Concept of the Spirit World*, *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 25, 100, p. 174. However, Whiro was actually the name of the first moon that appeared after the heliacal rising of Matariki or Pleiades. Edward Shortland, *Māori Division of Time*, MS-150, p. 85, HL.
11 *Daily Southern Cross*, 7 December 1867, p. 4.
12 AJHR, 1870, Session 1, A-07, p. 9.
13 *Daily Southern Cross*, 5 May 1870, p. 4; *Daily Southern Cross*, 7 May 1870, p. 4.
to his powers as a tohunga. Papahurihia reportedly said, ‘Yesterday you asked me to stop the rain and the wind; and did I not do so? Yes, it became all sunshine and brightness’. The article said that Papahurihia ‘went on to relate another dream’ and that at the conclusion of his speech, ‘His EXCELLENCY, good-humouredly, requested Papahurihia not to bewitch him, which created much amusement’. Governor Bowen also asked Papahurihia ‘to give us fine weather, so that we may get over the [Hokianga] bar’.  

In 1876, the Appendices to the Journal of the House of Representatives published a document written by the Resident Magistrate at Hokianga. In it, Spencer von Sturmer reported that Papahurihia had died at Ōmanaia on 3 November 1875 and described him as ‘the greatest tohunga of modern times’. He also said that Papahurihia had acted as a warden of Police for the last 12 years of his life.  

Te Waka Maori o Niu Tirani subsequently published two obituaries for Papahurihia. The tone of the first was scathing and said that he had ‘followed his father to the Reinga (Hades)’. The author claimed that Papahurihia’s father had been known as ‘The Great Wizard of the North’ and credited him with the ability ‘of being able to transport himself to any distance in a second of time’. He also said that Papahurihia had joined Heke ‘as his spiritual adviser and supporter throughout the war of 1845’.  

Hōne Mohi Tāwhai wrote the second obituary. Written from Waimā, it said that Papahurihia had died at Ōmanaia on 3 November 1875 and been buried by the Reverend William Rouse after a service attended by many Europeans, including Spencer von Sturmer. Tāwhai said that Papahurihia was a great tohunga and descended from eminent tohunga. He traced his paternal whakapapa from Pioriori to his father Wharetii. He also said that Papahurihia’s mother Tuhoehoe had been a famous tohunga. 

In his obituary, Tāwhai recited the whakapapa or genealogy of Papahurihia’s first wife Taimania, ‘who bore him “Nakahī” his attendant spirit, or god’. He said that one of her ancestors was ‘Maawe’, who had possessed the ability to fly through the air. He also said that Taimania’s father had been an oracle of the taniwha who had inhabited

---

14 Daily Southern Cross, 5 May 1870, p. 4; Daily Southern Cross, 7 May 1870, p. 4. 
15 AJHR, 1876, Session 1, G-1, Enclosure 23, p. 19. 
16 Obituaries by unnamed author & Hōne Mohi Tāwhai in Te Waka Maori o Niu Tirani, XI, 24, 1875, pp. 295-7, MS-Papers-11115-150 (3), ATL.
the waters of lakes and rivers. Finally, Hōne Mohi Tāwhai said that Papahurihia had not practised cannibalism but that his skills as a tohunga had been stigmatized by the missionaries ‘as works of the Nakahi (Serpent), hence the god of Papahurihia was called the “Nakahi”.

Tāwhai said that Papahurihia had become a government supporter at the conclusion of Heke’s war. He credited him with stopping the wars between Ngāpuhi and Te Rarawa. He also said that Āperahama Taonui had ‘persuaded him to give up witchcraft’ and that Papahurihia and his second wife Kikihu had been baptised by Thomas Buddle and married in accord with Wesleyan liturgy in 1856. Tāwhai estimated that Papahurihia was 78 years old when he died. He also said that the tohunga had lived at Ōmanaia for about 35 years and that Kikihu, his daughter and his grandchildren had survived him.17

In a letter to Donald McLean dated 8 November 1875 Spencer Von Sturmer said:

I enclose a Photo of old Papahurihia taken after death. I have one without the land for my copy of “The War in the North” – He was buried on the 7th; there was a large gathering of natives at the tangi notwithstanding the scarcity of food – Maning who is absent courting at Ahipara writes me that he is much cut up not seeing old Papa again.18

Papahurihia’s death was also reported in Australia. On 20 November 1875, the Sydney Mail and New South Wales Advertiser said:

The Atua Wera of Manning’s ‘Old New Zealand’ died at Omanaia on the 3rd instant. Hundreds of natives are collecting. A photograph was taken twenty-four hours after death by Mr. Watkins. He was the greatest wizard of his day in New Zealand. He was very much liked by the Europeans, and was a fine specimen of a native rangatira. He was about 80 years old.19

17 Ibid. 
18 Spencer Von Sturmer to Donald McLean, 8 November 1875, MS-Papers-11115-150 (3), ATL. The photograph was reproduced by Judith Binney, JPS, 2007, p. 316, Figure 5, http://www.jps.auckland.ac.nz/document?wid=4510&page=0&action=searchresult&target=, accessed 5 August 2015. 
19 Sydney Mail and New South Wales Advertiser, 20 November 1875, p. 666.
In closing, Europeans who were contemporaries of Papahurihia regarded him as the greatest Ngāpuhi tohunga of his time. Likewise, Māori evidence states that his parents and senior wife were tohunga and that Taimania bore him the familiar spirit deprecated as Nākahi (Satan). Moreover, although the Reverend Thomas Buddle christened Papahurihia in 1856, his baptism did not stop him from carrying out his duties as a tohunga and he blessed the Governor’s tour of the Hokianga with fine weather in 1870. Finally, Papahurihia’s use of the name ‘Fenton’ coincided with his appointment to the Native Land Court in 1865 under Chief Judge Fenton (Penetane) and was not a reference to the concept of ‘penitence’ or remorse for one’s sins. The next and final section of the thesis will focus on Binney’s claim that Papahurihia became a familial spirit and that Hōne Toia invoked him in séances held at Waimā during the Dog-Tax War in 1898.
Section N: Papahurihia and Hōne Toia

This section focuses on the assertion that Hōne Toia revived Papahurihia’s teachings at Waimā in the 1890s. It uses newspaper reports to show how the words rēwera (devils), kēhua (ghosts) and whiowhio (whistlers) were used by Waimā Māori to describe the behaviour of Toia and his followers during the Dog-Tax War. It concludes that Waimā Māori ascribed the group’s militancy to the influence of Satan and that their use of the word ‘Nākahi’ was not an allusion to the revival of a cult based on Papahurihia’s teachings.

Newspaper reports show that Hōne Toia and others announced their refusal to pay dog and land taxes on 28 April 1898. They also said that they would have nothing to do with European law and intended to go to Rāwene Township under arms to fight it. One month later, when Hōne Heke Ngāpua, the Member of Parliament for Northern Māori, was en route to Waimā he reportedly said:

Hone Toia and his follower have been dabbling in spiritualism, and it is hard to persuade them to look at matters in an ordinary light. Three years ago these Maoris estranged themselves from the majority of their people, went into an encampment by themselves, and sent one of their number to Parihaka on a visit to Te Whiti, whose doctrine they adopted.

Ngāpua said that the main points of Te Whiti’s doctrine were ‘the consultation of spirits, a “true” interpretation of the Bible, and a determination to refrain as far as possible from joining in the discussion of subjects introduced by the European Government’. He also said that there were no more than 70 fighting men with Hōne Toia and that all of them had their wives and children with them.

---

2 ‘Such native land as is held under Crown grant and is within five miles of a public road is liable to be taxed by local bodies up to a certain amount …. The Maoris protest against this …. When a request was sent to the Maoris to lay down their arms and disperse they said they would stay till the Government acceded to their request to abolish all taxes on Maoris’. *Otago Daily Times*, 10 May 1898, p. 3.
3 *Otago Daily Times*, 7 June 1898, p. 3.
4 *Otago Daily Times*, 10 May 1898, p. 3.
One of the chiefs at Waimā described Hōne Toia and his followers as ‘rēwera’ or devils.\(^5\) He said that their religion ‘consisted of singing and reading in a mocking manner the hymns and scriptures published in the Māori language’.\(^6\) The people at Waimā were also reported to have adopted the custom of calling up the spirits of their ancestors. A journalist with the Auckland Star said that the ritual was known as consulting the ‘kēhua’ (ghosts) and that the séances were held at night in meeting houses.\(^7\) Another correspondent said that ‘whiowhio’ or ‘whistlers’ was the term that local Māori applied to Hōne Toia’s proceedings at Waimā and that the word referred to the whistling noise that was made by the medium during their séances.\(^8\) Finally, the Auckland Star reported that the word ‘Nākahi’ was another ‘term applied to these people and their doings’.\(^9\)

Hōne Toia was described as a ventriloquist.\(^10\) The Australian media claimed that he was ‘a dangerous fanatic’ and follower of Te Whiti. They also said that the New Zealand government had despatched 100 men from the Permanent Artillery Force under Colonel Newell, with two Nordenfeldt guns and one Maxim. Captain Coyle of the Auckland Permanent Force was also reported to be en route to Waimā with a detachment of 28 men, one Maxim gun and 10,000 rounds of ammunition.\(^11\) Another paper said that the Australian Premier had conveyed a message to Premier Richard Seddon on behalf of Hauraki Maning who ‘through his mother … is head of the rebel Maoris’\(^12\) and had ordered ‘his tribesmen to at once abandon their warlike attitude and submit all their grievances to the Government’.\(^13\)

---

\(^5\) In September 1844, in an article intended to refute Bishop Selwyn’s estimation of the number of Māori converts to Christianity, the author said, ‘It is known and acknowledged by long resident missionaries and many intelligent colonists of considerable local knowledge, that ONE HALF of that people have not yet professed Christianity; they are called “Tewara” or Devils. As a proof of the existence of such heathens here, their numerical strength and influence, it is well known that in defending themselves against the Missionary Christians, who have invaded their settlements, and besieged their “pas” which these people have fortified for their defence, the missionary saints have been repulsed with great loss, while the " devils" are generally victorious’. Morning Chronicle, Sydney, 21 September 1844, p. 4.

\(^6\) Press, 9 May 1898, p. 3.

\(^7\) Auckland Star, 12 May 1898, p. 7.

\(^8\) Press, 9 May 1898, p. 3.

\(^9\) Auckland Star, 16 May 1898, p. 2.

\(^10\) Auckland Star, 12 May 1898, p. 7.

\(^11\) Sydney Morning Herald, 3 May 1898, p. 5; The Mercury, 3 May 1898, p. 3.

\(^12\) Hauraki Maning was the son of Frederick Maning and Kaitoke’s daughter, Moengaroa.

\(^13\) Horsham Times, 6 May 1898, p. 3.
Hōne Toia and his followers surrendered to Colonel Newell\(^\text{14}\) and 16 prisoners were taken to Auckland under armed guard.\(^\text{15}\) The witnesses subpoenaed to give evidence at the Police Court in Auckland included the Reverend Piripi Rakena of Mangamuka, Piri Teira of Ōmanaia, Piri Riwha of Opononi, George Webster and Robert Cochrane. Captain Coyle was summoned to testify that one of the shots had been fired over his head and Private Towgood was called to depose seeing a number of armed Māori cross the road on the Waimā hill in front of the column and go into the bush.\(^\text{16}\)

The Māori prisoners were identified as Hōne Toia, Romana Te Paehangi, Hōne Mete, Te Wairama (or Ngāmanu), Te Makara, Rekini Pehi, Waha Rai Pangari, Haupehi Nerehona, Mohi Hōne Tana, Hohepa Tāwhai, Maki Hauraki, Nene Puru, Whanui

\(^{14}\) *Australian Town and Country Journal*, 14 May 1898, p. 41.

\(^{15}\) *Auckland Star*, 16 May 1898, p. 2.

\(^{16}\) Ibid.
Puru, Te Korewha, Hōne Mete junior and Were Puru. Hōne Toia was described as stoutly built and aged between 35 and 40 years old. He was pronounced a member of the Church of England, whilst his followers were described as Wesleyans who had formerly attended the church at Manawakaeaea in Upper Waimā.

Figure 7: Waimā Maori in Custody. Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, AWNS-18980521-3-1.

Hōne Toia’s party were said to be ‘very religious after their fashion, and have prayers and sing hymns in their own language daily’. However, the newspaper reported that they had ‘objected to the ministrations of the Wesleyan ministers, the Revs. W. Gittos and Piripi Rakena, at their settlement, and conducted their services on their own lines’. The paper also said that Hōne Toia and his followers had two ‘kai-karakia’ at Waimā who conducted baptisms and marriages ‘according to the book but without authority from anyone outside the Maori anti-Government party’.

Te Wairama, who was a chief of Ngāti Hau, was alleged to be ‘one of the prime movers in the conspiracy against the law’. He was described as an elderly man in excess of 60 years, who had lived at Ōmanaia before he joined Hōne Toia’s party.

17 Ibid.
Romana Te Paehangi was styled as Hōne Toia's fighting chief. He was described as ‘a big stout rather good-looking old man, of about sixty years of age’ who had been ‘armed with a gun and a tomahawk’. Hōne Mete from Ngāti Hau was portrayed as a man of about 50 years who had once been a police officer on the Hokianga. Wiremu Te Makara was referred to as tall and lean with ‘a sinister cast of countenance’ and designated ‘one of the most active and savage of the natives’. He was said to have been involved in the confrontation with Police at Waihou in 1887 and to have fired two shots at Waimā to signal ‘the opening of a general fire on Colonel Newall's column’. Finally, Waha Rai from Waihou was described as a Roman Catholic. He was also alleged to have been at the centre of the trouble at Waihou, along with his brother, who had been at Waimā but had not been arrested.18

The Auckland Star said that those who had joined Hōne Toia to protest against the taxes were members of the ‘Huihuinga’ or Northern equivalent of the Kotahitanga. He also said that the ‘Huihuinga’ not only opposed the taxes levied on Māori by the government but insisted on the right of Māori to govern themselves and their lands under the second article of Te Tiriti o Waitangi.19 The paper reported that some years earlier a parchment connected with the ‘Whakakotahitanga’ movement for Māori self-government had been circulated around the North Island and signed by thousands of Māori, including Ngāpuhi. It claimed that Toia’s party had adopted ‘the extreme course of taking up arms to draw attention to their grievances’. 20 However, the paper also attributed the uprising to the ‘indiscreet language of Europeans at Hokianga’, who had told the people at Waimā that soldiers would come to take them away ‘to a

---

18 Auckland Star, 16 May 1898, p. 2. The confrontation in 1887 between the Police and Te Rarawa of Waihou occurred after William Hearn trespassed on hapū land and was tied up and relieved of his money, clothing, horse and bridle before being released. Hearn subsequently laid a complaint with the Police, who met with armed resistance when they went onto the property. Erurera Rapana was shot and severely wounded and Makara received an axe wound in his back from Constable Hogg. Fourteen men and nine women were taken prisoner and sent to Auckland for trial. Before the fracas, the newspapers had reported on conflict between two hapū living at Waihou. They were described as Hauhau sects under opposing ‘prophetesses’ or tohunga named Maria and Ani Karo. The followers of one party were said to wear white muslin and to burn the bodies of their dead as an offering to their god. Evening Post, 21 April 1887, p.3; Auckland Star, 11 June 1887, p. 5; New Zealand Herald, 13 June 1887, p. 6; New Zealand Herald, 20 June 1887, p. 6; New Zealand Herald, 16 July 1887, p. 5; New Zealand Herald, 22 July 1887, p. 5; New Zealand Herald, 23 July 1887, p. 5; Press, 29 July 1887, p. 3; Otago Daily Times, 10 August 1887, p. 1.

19 Auckland Star, 16 May 1898, p. 2.

20 Pene Taui of Ōhaeawai extended an invitation to hapū from around the country to attend a meeting of ‘te Paremata o te Kotahitanga’ (the Parliament of the Kotahitanga) at Te Tiriti o Waitangi Marae at Te Tii Waitangi on 13 October 1898. Jubilee: Te Tiupiri, 19 July 1898, p. 7; Jubilee: Te Tiupiri, 26 July 1898, p. 7; Jubilee: Te Tiupiri, 16 August 1898, p. 5.
sort of Siberia in the South, where they would all die of cold’ if they did not pay the tax.  

Hōne Toia and his followers were taken to Mount Eden prison under armed guard. Amongst the chiefs who encouraged them to make peace were Raniera Wharerau of Waimā, Pene Taui of Ōhaeawai, Moetara Hapakuku and Re Te Tai of Hokianga, Hore Hare of Upper Waihou, Heremia Te Wake of Pangaru, Hare Te Heihei of Te Tii Mangonui, Maihi Kawiti of Waiōmio and Waipapa of Waimā. Waipapa and Raniera Wharerau put their home at Waimā at the disposal of the Europeans, as did the widow of Hōne Mohi Tāwhai, whose son had joined Hōne Toia and was in custody. Finally, Hōne Heke Ngāpua, who had sent a telegram urging Toia not to fight, was praised for preventing the inevitable loss of life.

Hōne Toia, Romana, Hōne Mete, Te Makara and Rekini Pehi were sentenced to 18 months imprisonment and 11 others were fined £10 each. Three years later, Hōne Toia was said to have written a letter of apology to Richard Seddon, in which he expressed regret for ‘the trouble we gave’ at Waimā. He also said that Hokianga Māori were ‘delighted to have been visited by the son of the King’ and that:

by way of making some atonement, and wishing to prove our sincerity and our gratitude, will offer to his Majesty from our people a company who will go to any part of the world to fight for the King.

The evidence does not support the claim that a ‘Papahurihia movement’ re-emerged at Waimā in 1898. There is also nothing to support the assertion that Hōne Toia communicated with Nākahi or that Papahurihia’s spirit returned ‘in the form of the

---

21 Auckland Star, 16 May 1898, p. 2.
22 Heremia Te Wake was the father of the late Dame Whina Cooper. Michael King mentioned the conflict involving Hōne Toia and the part her father played in defusing it in his biography of her life.
23 Hare Te Heihei of Ngāti Rēhia was the grandson of the renowned chief Tareha.
24 Marsh Brown Kawiti was the only surviving son of Kawiti of Ngāti Hine, who lost two sons during the Northern war against the British.
25 Auckland Star, 16 May 1898, p. 2. Hōne Heke Ngāpua died on 10 February 1909 aged 40 years. He was born at Kaikohe in 1869, educated at St. Stephens College and employed as a clerk in the Native Land Court Office in 1891. Ngāpua became the leader of the Confederated Tribes of New Zealand in 1892 and was elected the Member of Parliament for Northern Māori in 1893 (New Zealand Herald, 10 February 1919, p. 7). His father Hōne Ngāpua was amongst those who persuaded Hōne Toia and his men to surrender (New Zealand Tablet, 13 May 1898, p. 31).
26 The Telegraph, 11 July 1898, p. 2.
27 The Advertiser, 13 September 1901, p. 4.
serpent’s whistling voice’ when summoned by the ‘new seer’. Rather, the activities of Hōne Toia and his followers should be interpreted in the context of Māoridom’s increasing anger at the failure of the government to honour Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

Two years before the Waimā uprising, 1,000 Māori from Ngāpuhi and Te Rarawa had assembled under arms near Kaikohe to protest the dog and land taxes. They were also aggrieved by the council’s failure to accept their offer of roadmaking in lieu of taxes, which had been rejected because the council would not have title to the road. On that occasion, Inspector Hickson ordered local traders not to sell ammunition to Māori and stopped 4,000 rounds of rifle cartridge from going to Kaikohe from Auckland. James Clendon, the Resident Magistrate, had also alerted the government and the leaders of the uprising had been given one week to surrender their arms.

The Waimā uprising was provoked by the dog and land taxes and a law that prohibited Māori from shooting native pigeons out of season. Some of the people who supported Hōne Toia had been involved in the armed assembly near Kaikohe. Others were older people of high rank who clearly resented the disenfranchisement of their right of chiefly self-government. Waimā Māori deprecated Toia’s group as whiowhio because of the whistling sound made by the kai-karakia who served their community. They also denigrated them as devils who called up the ghosts. Moreover, those who believed that their militant behaviour offended the Gospel of Christ also called them Nākahi. Thus, Nākahi was simply a noun from the Māori Bible that Waimā Māori used to infer that Hōne Toia and his followers were the agents of Satan.

That this was indeed the case is evident from a sample of articles in the Māori media. For instance in 1849, the Maori Messenger published an article about a Nākahi. The author said it was black and white, covered in scales and 10 feet long. He also said it had migrated from India to America and swallowed its prey whole. The story was about a boa constrictor in the Amazon. Likewise, in 1855, another article referred to a Nākahi that was looking after a stone in ‘Haina’ or ‘China’.

In 1878, another writer referred to a meeting of Te Kooti’s supporters in Ngāti Porou. He said that he was very sad that some of them had chosen to support Te Kooti’s

30 Auckland Star, 31 March 1896, p. 5.
31 Maori Messenger, 1 September 1855, p. 15.
karakia and reminded them that Nākahi (Satan) had made the old people ‘whakawai’ (sinners).\textsuperscript{32} In 1887, another article said that Māori who did not believe in what had happened to the people of Israel were lost in the bush (i.e. desert) but those who believed in Christ would not die (i.e. were saved by the Nākahi on the rod of Moses).\textsuperscript{33} Finally, an article written in defence of King Tāwhiao of the Kīngitanga in 1893 said that Nākahi was working through the Native Land Court to take away Māori land.\textsuperscript{34}

The relationship between Hōne Toia’s group and Te Whiti-o-Rongomai is unclear but there is no evidence that the group were pacifists. Their tactics were blatantly militant and Hōne Toia and his warriors were naked bar a cloth around their waists and ‘cartridge belts, and cartouche boxes’. The newspaper also said that they had planned to wait until the soldiers were within their lines when ‘a simultaneous fire was to be opened when Makara gave his signal’.\textsuperscript{35} Both the nakedness of the fighting men and their intention to ambush their enemies were in complete accord with Māori war customs. Moreover, reports on the Māori conflict with Police at Wairoa in 1887 and the armed assembly near Kaikohe in 1896 had also attributed those events to the influence of Te Whiti or Hauhauism. On balance, this suggests that the supposed link between Hōne Toia’s group and Te Whiti simply reflected the prevailing anxiety about Māori ‘fanatics’, like those who had murdered the Reverend Carl Volkner at Ōpōtiki in 1865.

To conclude, there is no evidence that Hōne Toia revived Papahurihia’s teachings during the Dog-Tax War in the 1890s. Waimā Māori used the words rēwera (devils), kēhua (ghosts) and whiowhio (whistlers) to denigrate Toia and his group because their kai-karakia (ministers) had rejected the ordained clergy, modified Wesleyan liturgy and held autonomous baptisms and services outside the established church. Their description of Hōne Toia and his followers as ‘Nākahi’ was meant to imply that the party was engaged in the work of Satan when they rose up in opposition to the imposition of taxes on their land and dogs and the introduction of legislation which restricted them from shooting native pigeons. Moreover, the uprising at Waimā was

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Waka Maori}, 7 December 1878, p. 165.
\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Korimako}, 20 January 1887, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{34} \textit{Paki o Matariki}, 25 July 1893, p. 3. I would like to thank Kingi Taurua for assisting me with the translation of this sample from the Māori language newspapers.
\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Auckland Star}, 25 March 1880, p. 7.
preceded by a protest near Kaikohe that involved 1,000 armed Māori from Ngāpuhi and Te Rarawa. Both were symptomatic of the prevailing mood of discontent amongst Māori arising from the government’s failure to honour Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the right of the Māori people to exercise tino rangatiratanga over their own affairs. Both insurrections also followed the formation of the Ngāpuhi Parliament, which was founded by Āperahama Taonui, Marsh Brown Kawiti and others at Te Tiriti o Waitangi meetinghouse in the Bay of Islands in 1881.

**Conclusion**

Papahurihia’s movements around the Bay of Islands and Hokianga were in tune with the rhythm of the Ngāpuhi seasonal cycle and associated with the planting and harvesting of the kūmara, the hosting of hākiri, the Māori ritenga involved in the hahunga and customs associated with warfare. When interpreted in that context, it is therefore probable that when Richard Davis mentioned Papahurihia’s presence at Waimate in July 1833, the tohunga was en route to one of the hahunga mentioned by Henry Williams, either at Hihi’s pā at Ōtuīhu or inland of the Waimate mission station. Likewise, European reports of his followers at Taiāmai, Waimate, Kawakawa and Te Puna coincide with the times for planting and harvesting kūmara, when tohunga like Papahurihia recited karakia to preserve the crops from caterpillars, invoked rain in seasons of drought and made the kūmara storehouses tapu. It is therefore probable that Māori had earmarked the day set apart for Papahurihia at Taiāmai in August 1833 for the task of transplanting the kūmara shoots from the tāpapa into the ahuahu, when tohunga recited karakia to make the planters and plantations tapu.

In conformity with this interpretation, European texts show that Taiāmai, Kawakawa and Waimate were the most fertile areas in the Bay of Islands and the sites of extensive kūmara cultivations. The fertility of the land is also evident in the Māori naming. Thus, Te Ahuahu was named for the ahuahu or hillocks of soil into which the shoots of the kūmara were transplanted from the tāpapa or seedbeds. Likewise, Ngāpuhi named Wai Kirikiri, now the Kerikeri River, for the kirikiri or gravelly sand used to make tāpapa and mixed with the soil in the kūmara cultivations to encourage
drainage. In a similar manner, the Kaipatiki Stream near Te Kemara’s village at Waitangi was named after the patiki or breed of fish that populated the water. Finally, the timing of the travels of Papahurihia’s followers from Kawakawa to Te Puna and near Taïmaï, Waimate and Te Ahuahu suggest that, in accord with the Māori custom of ohaoha koha or reciprocity, the people moved between the gardens and helped one other with the tasks of planting, weeding and harvesting their kūmara cultivations.

European evidence shows that Papahurihia also officiated over rituals associated with the hahunga, including the disinterment and scraping of the bones of deceased chiefs, their burial in the urupā and the performance of the hari or ceremonial dance that accompanied the distribution of food at the hākiri. Likewise, Papahurihia made the Ōmanaia River tapu when Māori laid a net across it to catch fish - a custom also observed by Waikato at Rangihoua and Te Kemara at the Kaipatiki Stream near Waitangi. Government records show that like other principal chiefs from the Bay of Islands and Hokianga, Governor George Grey appointed Papahurihia to one of the rūnanga he introduced in 1861 and paid him a stipend. That selection was followed by employment as an assessor in the Native Land Court, at which juncture the tohunga took the name ‘Fenton’ (Penetane) in emulation of Chief Judge Francis Dart Fenton. However, those offices and his baptism in 1856, did not prevent Papahurihia from continuing to operate as a tohunga and in 1870, he blessed Governor Bowen’s tour of the Hokianga with fine weather.

---

37 My thanks to Kingi Taurua for drawing this to my attention.
38 James Bedggood of Kerikeri told Archdeacon Walsh, ‘It was considered absolutely essential that the planting of the entire plot, however large, should be completed in a single day, and in order to accomplish this a plan was often adopted similar to that of the Canadian “working-bee.” In a large hapu, or division of a tribe living together, every principal man would have one or more plots of his own, and when one of these was to be planted his neighbours would come to assist at the work’. Archdeacon Walsh, The Cultivation and Treatment of the Kumara by the Primitive Maoris, Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New Zealand 1868-1961, 35, 1902, p. 18.
Conclusion

This thesis has contested the portrayal of Papahurihia as the founder of a syncretistic religion that combined elements of Judaic and Christian theology with Māori beliefs. It has also challenged the arguments that he observed a Saturday Sabbath and that his followers identified as Jews. The methodology has re-examined the texts of the CMS missionaries in the Bay of Islands in the context of 1830s Protestant evangelicalism and used the records of the Wesleyan and Roman Catholic missionaries and European settlers to show how Papahurihia behaved in various situations. It has also drawn on evidence in the Europeans’ texts to reconstruct the pattern of the seasonal cycle observed by Ngāpuhi in the period in question and examine Papahurihia’s movements within his cultural milieu. That approach to the evidence has established that the Anglican, Wesleyan and Roman Catholic missionaries looked at Papahurihia through a religious lens and that Europeans interpreted his behaviour on their own understanding of time and made assumptions about what he and his followers were doing.

The Europeans believed that the chains of superstition bound Papahurihia. To the Protestant evangelicals he was Antichrist and one of the many false prophets they expected to appear as a sign they were living in the last days foretold in the Book of Revelation. They equated his customs with the lying serpent in the Garden of Eden, who they had translated as ‘Nākahi’ from the Hebrew word ‘Nachash’. Moreover, in keeping with their religious education, Wesleyan Māori converts on the Hokianga called Papahurihia the ‘Atua Wera’ or ‘the hot god’ Satan and referred to his followers and other unconverted Māori as devils, Jews and Jewish.

The new interpretation that emerges from this research is that Papahurihia was a tohunga who continued with business as usual. The singular issue that confronted him and other tohunga at the time was how best to respond to the more menacing elements of the Bible that were causing non-Christian Māori to become increasingly fearful of the God of the Europeans. In response to the threat that unconverted Māori would live forever in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone, Papahurihia used his sketch of the two trees to bring them under the protection of his familiar spirit and reassure the chiefs of their place in Te Hunga Atua after death. Similarly, convinced that the Europeans’ God was about to send seven plagues into the world to destroy them, a
tohunga from Mangakāhia sketched “The Book of the Dragon”, which several tohunga in the Bay of Islands subsequently used to invoke the protection of the serpent for Māori who had not adopted Christianity. Papahurihia’s baptism does not contradict this new interpretation. The fact that he continued to operate as a tohunga until his death at Ōmanaia in 1875 suggests that his christening had nothing to do with his desire to live his life in accord with the will of God. Rather, it is more likely that Papahurihia equated the prayers (karakia) and liturgy (ngā tikanga) of the Wesleyans with his incantations (karakia) and Māori ritenga (ngā tikanga) and believed that baptism into the Methodist church would help him secure the esteem of the Europeans’ God. If that was indeed the case, then his reasoning was not unlike that of Pene Taui, who had fired bullets made from pages of the Bible into the sky at Ōhaeawai to gain the favour of God.

The invention of Papahurihia as a Māori prophet and founder of a syncretistic religion can be attributed to a number of methodological shortcomings. When Ormond Wilson employed a research assistant to explore the Hocken archives in 1965, he instructed her to focus on the journals of Richard Davis and George Clarke of Waimate. When pressured for time, he circumscribed the parameters of her research and suggested that she was not likely to find any more about Papahurihia in Davis’ diary after 1835. In a similar manner, Wilson restricted his own analysis of the evidence to the decade from 1833 and thereby circumvented the need to explain Papahurihia’s role as Heke’s tohunga during the Northern war. Moreover, he did not include all of the evidence on Papahurihia in his article and failed to present it in sequence. He also presented as fact, his theory that Papahurihia had been educated by John King in the mission school at Rangihoua and erroneously ascribed to Papahurihia’s followers at Wairoa, the comment that the Bible was true but that the missionaries had misinterpreted it and corrupted the word of God.

Twenty-six year old Judith Binney did not undertake any primary research for her article on Papahurihia in 1966. Moreover, she did not check the veracity of Ormond Wilson’s citations and was unaware that he had held back evidence which rendered his conclusions untenable. Her interpretation of Papahurihia was influenced by her former supervisor Keith Sinclair, whose poetry had inspired her to write her Master’s thesis on the missionary Thomas Kendall. Her perception of Papahurihia was also
shaped by the work of the Pacific historian Niel Gunson, whose dissertations had informed her understanding of Kendall’s religious worldview and who had published on the prophets Teao and Hue from the Mamaia cult of Tahiti in 1962. At the same time, Binney’s work was influenced by oral histories about the ‘Blackout’ cult at Waimā and anecdotal evidence from locals like Jean Irvine of Rāwene, who had obtained her knowledge of Papahurihia by psychic powers and clairaudience. Another principal influence was the poet Kendrick Smithyman, who was an old friend of Don Binney and Keith Sinclair. Thus, Judith Binney’s 1966 article on Papahurihia was an eclectic mix of very disparate sources, some of which were of highly questionable veracity.

The research for Judith Binney’s second article on Papahurihia was undertaken by Smithyman’s widow. It was inspired by his poems in Atua Wera and his twin convictions that Papahurihia was originally known under another name and that two prophets of the Nākahi cult were living on the Hokianga in 1847. In the absence of first-hand archival research, Binney relied upon snippets from the letters and journals of William Cotton and excerpts from the journals of John Webster and John White which, when read in isolation from their original contexts and each other, appeared to endorse the poet’s ideas. The article also drew in Alan Taylor’s musings on the panel of Saint Patrick driving the snakes from Ireland and Binney’s theory about the significance of the “Book of the Dragon”. In many respects a hotchpotch of disparate and unconventional sources, the final result was nevertheless written in a commanding prose which suggested that Judith Binney had succeeded in tying up all the loose ends to present a seamless and comprehensive interpretation of Papahurihia and the Nākahi cult.

The late Dame Judith Binney’s stature as an historian and her expertise on the Māori prophets Te Kooti Rikirangi and Rua Kēnana discouraged others from revisiting her work on Papahurihia. Generations of historians repeated her misconception of Papahurihia’s persona, which also permeated the curriculum of NCEA History in New Zealand. Thus, students of history and amateur and professional historians perpetuated a literature that misread the evidence on Papahurihia from a secular perspective, failed to appreciate that Protestant and Catholic writers saw him through the lenses of their own religions, read him outside his culture milieu and assumed that he operated on the Christian calendar observed by the Europeans. However,
Papahurihia was only one of many tohunga living in the Bay of Islands and Hokianga at the time. If he was, as Europeans claimed, the greatest Ngāpuhi tohunga of his time, it was simply because the people believed that he had succeeded in averting the catastrophes that menaced Māori as a result of the arrival of the new and vengeful God who had been brought to New Zealand by the missionaries.
Figure 8: A tohunga mounting the apex of the meetinghouse to invoke Tāne Mahuta, the Māori god of forests and birds. *New Zealand Graphic*, 24 March 1906, p. 29. Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, NZG-19060324-29-2.
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INTERNAL MEMORANDUM

To: 
From: 
Date: 
Telephone Extension: 

Judi

I take off this, from SPAN 23, which is the magazine of the South Pacific Arts for Commonwealth Literature and Language Studies (which I believe it is, believe it not) at the time (1987) edited by Peter Simpson, now MYP Hitaua and supposedly Editor of my Selected Poems...

It is pretty well the text of a NZBC Eliz. Ably programme, so I’m put it publicly.

Publicly that Te Nakahi & Papa were two fellows, which I shall stick by.

I am meanwhile waiting any possible response from Jack Lee to my Sunday Times

Dom. As said, I guess the Whakapapa in Lee & a Puketiro ... but I’d like confirmations. But if I don’t all that well informed when I spoke to him.

You know that the “Public Library” P. is now reported lodged at the new meeting house of the reconstructed marae at Onomanu/Onea.

* Notice no reference to Papakura P. ...? And I refuse to believe that Papakura was his original name...
Mr. Harama told me that this "library" was very minimal, compared to her young days when she used to call her peers to read it in Saturday/Sunday; and the young 'Tribes' brothers (Do want) being bright blast pol but that it isn't in same good shape since the cold year's got gone in"; both, and B.T., as well, declared that the "library" was not good, not historical; and all three were quite happy to talk about it, while I tried to take them off.

I would like to know what that old murder, Dame Gaha has to say about Papu, who wouldn't answer my enquiry, but if Mr. H. was correct (?) Papu held a wife from around Pongoa, a woman of the Warriki clan.

Jack Lee, you notice, gave reason no hope for Papu. ???

I have done nothing about my Papu stuff for the past year, but I am of course entirely happy to offer you my speculations (if little else) about him at any time.

Love, K.