

Seeking a research framework through an historical tribal manuscript

Jillian Tipene

Abstract: The aim of this paper is to explore ‘Ngā Pakanga o Ngāpuhi, 1820-1840’, a manuscript written by Ngakuru Pene Haare of the Te Rarawa iwi, for the purpose of examining linguistic, cultural, historical and theoretical areas of interest. It is proposed to draw on the findings of this exploration to inform a Masters research project. Two main areas are studied: the background of the author Ngakuru Pene Haare; and the features and context of the manuscript. Through this process of exploratory research, the importance and relevance of context is highlighted, and areas for further, more refined, research are identified.

Keywords: manuscript context; Ngakuru Pene Haare; Ngā Puhi wars; Te Rarawa, translation

Introduction

In September, 2007 a manuscript written in te reo Māori entitled ‘Ngā Pakanga o Ngāpuhi, 1820-1840’, dated 1923, was submitted to Te Pua Wānanga ki te Ao, the School of Māori and Pacific Development of the University of Waikato. The family of the author, Ngakuru Pene Haare, requested that a scholarly treatment and translation to English of their tūpuna’s manuscript be undertaken. Being of Te Rarawa descent and having just completed a PGDip. in Interpretation and Translation, I was offered the project as a potential area for a Masters thesis. At the time, it seemed an amazing gift that a research opportunity involving a historical document from my own iwi had ‘fallen into my lap’. A meeting with the family was scheduled, at which time the expectations of all parties - the family, myself and my supervisor, were expressed and affirmed. It seemed that an honour and a responsibility had been bestowed on me that day, a responsibility to the family of Ngakuru Pene Haare, and to my iwi, but also to the author. It was also appropriate to obtain approval from my kaumātua; and since the manuscript ‘belongs’ to Te Rarawa I approached Te Rūnanga o Te Rarawa (the Te Rarawa tribal authority) and was given their approval and support for the project.

Methodology

The objective with this exploration of ‘Ngā Pakanga o Ngāpuhi’ was to examine two main areas: ‘Te Tangata, Ngakuru Pene Haare Te Wao’- the author, his background, his relationships to significant people and his contribution to mātauranga Māori; and ‘Te Tuhinga’, the manuscript-its context, its linguistic and stylistic features, and its relationship to pertinent translation theories. In approaching this exploration of a historical cultural document with a view to translation it was inevitable that ethical issues would be encountered. Sure enough, when I informed my uncle, a respected Te Rarawa kaumatua, that I had been offered the opportunity to translate the Pene Haare manuscript his initial response was, ‘He aha te take?’ That is, asking why tamper with it? and what is to be gained by translating the document to English? This view forced me to think deeply about my purpose, as a translator, with this tribal taonga, bearing in mind Anthony Pym’s ‘theory of cross-cultural communication’, which states that in order for an act of communication to be deemed successful, “the mutual benefits from the communication must be greater in value

than the translation cost involved” (2003, p.3). As with any translation exercise it was necessary to begin at the level of the Source Text (ST), to begin to gain an understanding of its socio-political-historical-religious-philosophical context, including the author’s purpose in writing it, the audience he was writing for, the register and the style. The problem here was that I had been given a typewritten transcript, in Māori, of the original Māori language manuscript, which is a handwritten document. The transcript was condensed into 68 A4 pages with no layout as such, making it difficult to get a feel for the author, for his ‘voice’. I felt that some of what Gutt (1991) refers to as the ‘communicative clues’ found within the text, which help the translator so much in deciding which meaning of any given word is closest to the meaning intended by the author, had been obliterated in the transcribing. Additionally, the accuracy of the transcription was not convincing. Some examples that triggered doubt were: an apparent lack of coherence in some of the whakapapa charts; the use of the word ‘tawhiti’, when the obvious word in context would have been ‘tawhito’ (later confirmed by the original text to be correct); and the use of the word ‘uto’ in the context of ‘utu’, so that it could not be said with certainty whether the use of ‘uto’ was a deliberate use of a dialectical term or an error in transcription. I felt that in transcription the ST is vulnerable to the transcriber’s interpretation, and preferred to trust my own interpretation of the ST.

According to the Auckland War Memorial Museum Library website, whilst the term ‘manuscript’ has come to be used for any unpublished document, whether handwritten or typewritten, it was originally defined as any book or other document *written by hand*. I felt it was important for the purposes of this project to work from the original handwritten document, so I asked for and obtained a copy from the family. The original manuscript is 239 A3 pages and is, for the most part, quite legible. Subsequent to an initial general reading, a closer reading was undertaken and sections of what were obviously whakapapa, whakataukī, waiata or hari, and karakia were marked, along with unfamiliar kupu. ‘Battle lines were drawn’ in the sense that the beginning and end of each section that recounts a particular battle were demarcated. Initially, I highlighted and made lists of kupu and phrases/terms that were new to me and searched out their meanings in the Williams and online dictionaries, noting down their probable meanings according to the likely context. However, a friend of the Pene family who is known to me also supplied me with a list of kupu which he had already identified on his scanning of the manuscript as being unfamiliar or unclear. One word that was not familiar to me was the term ‘hari’, and I became quite excited initially by the idea of examining the 7 or so hari I identified within the manuscript as a possible focus for my Masters thesis. The same friend who had made the list of kupu informed me however that, to his knowledge, some of those hari are in common usage in Te Taitokerau at the present time, which would suggest that some research and analysis has probably already been undertaken. Upon hearing this I became a bit despondent, a bit whakamā that I did not already know this, that I am not more in touch with what is going on in my papakāinga. This would be one of the areas to liaise with the Rūnanga on. Since very little information about the author is provided by the manuscript, I conducted internet searches for information on Pene Haare, including the Auckland War Memorial Museum Library website. I began a review of some pertinent translation theories, however only certain of them had particular relevance to this manuscript. I recall that in my Post Graduate year studying interpretation and translation, it was noted that there is a dearth of translation theory written by Māori or for a Māori context. However, I found the following to be of particular relevance: Beekman and Callow’s ‘Translating the Word of God’ which, in dealing specifically with the translation of a sacred text, the Bible, into minority languages addresses the implications of culture; a thesis by Raukura Roa, which documents her process in the translation of a mōteatea and addresses the fact that certain Māori historical writings do not fit neatly into one category or ‘text type’, and therefore many more factors have to be considered in order to arrive at a suitable translation approach or method; and a

paper by Tom Roa which highlights the need for indigenous translators to be uncompromising in their adherence to scrupulous personal and professional ethics.

Once I had completed my notes I was ready to begin an analysis of my findings. The information I had, both about the author and background about the manuscript, was frustratingly little. However, I received from a member of Pene Haare's family some copies of correspondence between Ngakuru Pene Haare and Hare Hongi, an interpreter and writer, dated between 1917 and 1930, which proved to be invaluable. I had known of the existence of these letters, and others between Pene Haare and Apirana Ngata, which are held in the Alexander Turnbull Library but which have restricted access. I learned a great deal about Pene Haare and his 'Pukapuka' or manuscript from his personal correspondence, and feel sure that accessing these kinds of resources would be essential to any further research I might undertake on this project. At this point, where I was beginning to write up the results of my analysis, I came unstuck. I had simultaneously been reading academic journals to gauge how the reports were structured, and to get a feel for their register and tone. This proved to be more of a hindrance than a help, as it constrained my natural impulses as a writer. I became self-conscious, editing my writing as I went, convinced that the results would be unpublishable and I would be exposed as a pseudo-academic, a 'wannabe'. I constantly struggled with the idea of this being an 'exploration', believing I had to deliver a polished, assured, 'authoritative' report, like the ones in the journals. I stopped enjoying the process and began avoiding the writing. Fortunately, with some timely advice and guidance from my supervisor, I was able to relax, and to let the report flow out of my experience of the process of the exploration.

Literature Review

The book by Beekman and Callow entitled 'Translating the Word of God' (1974) is quite pertinent, particularly in their discussions on 'fidelity' with respect to fidelity to historical references, fidelity to the meaning of the original, fidelity to the dynamics of the original, linguistic fidelity, and also on the nature of explicit and implicit information in certain kinds of text. "When explicit information is made implicit, there is no loss in content but there is an appreciable gain in communication, as the translation is not cluttered up with...unnecessary explicit information" (Beekman & Callow, 1974, p.66). This is pertinent to 'Ngā Pakanga o Ngāpuhi' because of the metaphorical nature of much of the text, for example, waiata, karakia and whakataukī, and also because of the inevitable translation loss which is likely to occur between two languages that are as far removed linguistically as English and Māori (James, 2002). Some of what they say however is paradoxical. They state, for example, that historical fidelity must be paramount, that the principle of historical fidelity must not be violated, yet they follow by saying that if the inclusion of a cultural item "results in a wrong or zero meaning", then it must be "adjusted" (Beekman & Callow, 1974, p. 37). As previously mentioned, I felt that R. Roa's thesis addresses many issues that are relevant to such a document as 'Ngā Pakanga o Ngāpuhi'. Roa questions any assumption that it is always possible to convey the same or similar meanings in two different languages: "Whereas this may be the case where simple transactional communication is involved, it is highly questionable in the case of culturally specific or artistic texts" (Roa, R., 2003, p.4). She further contends that, although translation is often necessary and may be useful as a means of disseminating culturally significant material, it can never be an adequate substitute for the original text. Therefore, the limitations inherent in translation need to be understood, and the purpose of the translation needs to be clearly reflected in the process employed and in the finished translation. Roa also challenges the widely-held notion that the communicative function of the ST 'ought' to take precedence over its signification. She contends that, in certain cases, such as the translation of Māori waiata:

If the function of the translation is to communicate as much as possible of the original text in order to make readers as aware as possible of the history and culture reflected in that text, it may be unwise to depart too far, *or indeed at all* (italics mine), from the signification in the search for a way of communicating the textual functions appropriately in the TL (target language) (Roa, R., 2003, p.7).

Since the exact form in which a function is expressed may have ‘encoded’ within it important cultural information, Roa makes a strong case for the use of a ‘gloss translation’, where any images and symbols of particular historical or cultural significance are retained, and footnotes added to ensure the text is fully comprehensible. A gloss translation enables the reader to identify ‘as fully as possible’ with a person in the SL (source language) context, and to understand “as much as possible of the customs, manner of thought, and means of expression” of that person (Roa, R., 2003, p.8).

Newmark (1996) identifies the 3 main ‘text types’ as Non-literary, Literary and Poetic, with the 4 ‘sub-types’ of Non-literary text being Cultural Texts, Information Texts, Social Texts and Legal Texts. He then gives guidelines for an appropriate approach to the translation of each type. R. Roa notes, however, that certain Māori texts are made up of combinations of, for example, aspects of literary, non-literary and poetic, as well as cultural, informative and social aspects, thus highlighting the fact that many more factors need to be taken into account in order to arrive at an appropriate translation approach or process for these kinds of text. R. Roa’s primary aim in the translation of ‘Ka Mahuta’, was to provide information about the meanings encoded in the waiata, as well as pertinent cultural and historical information, by means of a textual glossary. Her thesis also describes the process she devised for the translation of ‘Ka Mahuta’, at the heart of which is an ongoing process of consultation with a panel of kaumatua who acted as mentors, guides and cultural ‘experts’ throughout the process. Tom Roa’s paper ‘Traittore, Traduttore’ (‘traitor or translator’) highlights the need for indigenous translators in particular to ask of themselves the initial question, ‘Why translate?’, and to be certain of their purpose and indeed, of their motive. He believes that any definition of an indigenous Code of Ethics for the translator should involve elements of “tikanga, wā tika, whanaungatanga, tungāne/tuāhine, tuākana/tēina, pakeke, hui, whakawhitiwhiti kōrero, whakawhitiwhiti whakaaro, whakarite, whakatau” and that the indigenous translator must adhere to these ethics, “faithfully and rigorously” (Roa, T., 2002, p.6).

Background on the author Ngakuru Pene Haare

Very little information about the author is provided by the manuscript. His name is given as Ngakuru Pene Haare Te Wao, although in literature and internet searches he was more widely known as Ngakuru Pene Haare, and only in the books of Dorothy Ulrich Cloher, where she references his manuscript, is he referred to by the name Te Wao. An online search finds a range of references to the man, mostly in relation to other people. He is referred to variously as: a Ngāpuhi scholar (Ngā Puhī Whakapapa Research, n.d.); an authority on Taitokerau Māori history and traditions (Ngata, n.d.); a respected tupuna of Te Rarawa (Te Rūnanga o Te Rarawa, n.d.); an historian; an authority on the traditions and lore of the North (Ngata, 1958); and a contributor to Apirana Ngata’s ‘Ngā Mōteatea’ (1972). He is credited with dictating the text and providing explanatory information for two waiata in ‘Ngā Mōteatea- Part One’: No.38, ‘He waiata aroha mo Ripiroaiti’ (Ngā Puhī), written by Te Rangi Pouri, and No. 39, ‘He tangi mo Te Houhou’ (Rarawa) written by Te Ngo, and three waiata in ‘Part Two’: No. 127, ‘He waiata tangi mo Te Tihi’, written by Te Matapo, No. 132, ‘He waiata whaiāipo’, written by Pakiri, and No. 133, ‘He

waiata tangi mo Koi-tikitiki raua ko Te Hara', all Ngā Puhī waiata. In the Māori magazine 'Te Ao Hou', Ngata wrote of him:

When I visited Panguru, Hokianga last November, I met Ngakuru Pene Haare, who is an authority on the traditions and Māori lore of the North. I asked him whether he knew who made the Burial Chests found at Waimamaku. He told me that in Hapakuku Moetara's view these were not the work of Ngāpuhi proper, but of an older people, the Ngāti Awa. This confirmed my own impression... (Ngata, 1958, p.31).

In the explanatory notes for 'He tangi mo Te Houhou' Pene Haare gives Te Houhou's whakapapa, which also charts his own descent line from Tuwhenuaroa through Mawete, to his mother Erana (Ngata, 1953, p.30). He is mentioned as having sat on numerous committees, in relation to the Native Land Court hearings of the early 20th century. The following is an interesting example, which possibly gives us a clue as to the kind of man he was:

The resolution of the 1947 meeting was to sell Kahakaharoa to the Crown, however Himiona Kamira proposed that the land in question be gifted to the Crown. The owners resolved to gift Kahakaharoa to the Crown without consideration, although Ngakuru Pene Haare dissented (Te Rūnanga o Te Rarawa, 2004. p.158).

Correspondence between Ngakuru Pene Haare and Hare Hongi, also known as Henry Matthew Stowell, an interpreter and writer, which are held at the Alexander Turnbull Library, confirms this fact.

Pene Haare is said to have been born in Matihetihe, near Mitimiti, in the Hokianga region, and to have resided at various places around the Hokianga throughout his lifetime. Correspondence between Ngakuru Pene Haare and Hare Hongi, confirms this fact (Alexander Turnbull Library). Hongi (1859-1944) who was also known as Henry Matthew Stowell, an interpreter and writer, was born at Waimate in Northland, as the son of a Pākehā engineer and Huhana who was the daughter of the Ngāpuhi chieftain, Maumau. While distinguished for his prowess in English and history, Hongi had also studied Māori language and tribal lore in the Ngāpuhi Whare Wānanga. Pene Haare appears to have corresponded with Hongi, who was in Wellington interpreting for the Native Land Court during that time, over several years. Hongi would seek Pene Haare's advice and expertise on all manner of things relating to his translation work, te reo Māori and tribal history, while Pene Haare seems to have been intent mainly on convincing Hongi to translate his 'Pukapuka'. In one letter, dated October 20, 1930, Pene Haare states that if they lived closer to each other he would ask Hongi to translate his manuscript. In another, he writes about his early life and learning, stating that five years after his birth in 1863 at Taikārawa, between the Hokianga and Whangape harbours, he was instructed by his parents and his tūpuna 'by means of the kauwhau', the recitation of oral history and genealogy, until he was 15 years of age. At 15 he expressed a desire to attend the Pākehā school, but his tūpuna did not support the idea:

...e kore e tika. Kia kotahi ano kura maku ko te kura i ngā kōrero o roto i ngā whare wānanga o oku tūpuna. Ki te kura ahau i te kura Pākehā e kore e mau i au ngā kōrero wahanga (14 November, 1930, p. 3).

He had, however, been taught to write. "Ko taku tereti he rito korari, ka tuhituhi te A,E,I, O,U." (1930, p.3). (My slate was a flax leaf...). If he was indeed born in 1863 he would have been 67 years of age in 1930 when the later letters were written, and 60 years of age in 1923, when the manuscript is dated. Some members of his family, however, believe his birth-date to have been 1853, which would have made him 77 and 70 years respectively. He mentions to Hongi a notice

for an upcoming event seen in the Māori newspaper, 'Te Toa Takitini', inviting knowledgeable speakers, 'ngā tohunga kōrero', to attend a hui in Auckland where the origin of the name 'Aotearoa' is to be debated. The debate will be judged by Apirana Ngata and his committee, and Pene Haare informs Hongi that he will be attending as the speaker for Ngāpuhi/Te Rarawa/Te Aupouri/Ngāti Whātua (October 20, 1930). Of the same event in a subsequent letter, he says of his contemporaries:

...ko aku hoa kua pau katoa o ratou nei kōrero. te tuku ki roto i te toa takitini. e ono aku hoa kua Pau a ratou whakamarama mo te ingoa nei mo Aotearoa, ko au anake e toe ana. e kore hoki ahau e Pai ki te tuhituhi, ki te Toa Takitini. Me kōrero a waha tonu tetahi ki tetahi' (14 November, 1930, p.7).

Despite this apparent disdain for the practice of writing letters to newspapers rather than debating the issues face-to-face, he wrote to 'Te Pipiwharau' in February, 1904, challenging several of the editor's claims about the Anglican Church, contending that 'te Hahi o Roma' (the Roman Catholic Church) predated the Church of England and that the first bishop was a Roman Catholic bishop. He made several other points, which were backed up with quotes from the Scriptures (1904, p.6). It would seem that Pene Haare, like the majority of Māori in the Hokianga region, was a staunch Catholic. Though he makes no mention of Catholicism in his account of being schooled as a child by his parents and tūpuna in Matihetihe, it seems inevitable that he would have had some contact with the Catholic missionaries of that time. Of Himiona Kamira, another historian, writer and exponent of tribal lore from Mitimiti, for whom Pene Haare was 'an important influence' (DNZB, n.d.), it is noted that "despite the depth and richness of his traditional training, Kamira was strongly committed to Catholicism" (Tate, n.d., ¶ 13). Pene Haare was without doubt, 'an authority', who enjoyed a certain status within his domain. He certainly seems to have had a very strong sense that he was a vestige of 'te ao kōhātu', that being the recipient of the tribal knowledge he attained from his tūpuna gave him a certain purpose and responsibility: "He Māori tuturu ahau. e kore au e mōhio ki te reo Pākehā. He mea Rahui Taku Tinana na o taua tūpuna. Ki te Turanga Taputapuataea" (14 November, 1930, p.4); and:

Kotahi ano oku mōhio tanga. He Māori Motuhake. Ko taku reo he reo Māori Motuhake. Ki te hoki ahau ki te kōrero i te reo oku tūpuna o roto i te toru mano tau, Horekau he tangata hei whakamarama i aku kōrero i runga i te motu nei. Maku Tonu e tohutohu. (14 November, 1930, p.4).

While confident in his knowledge of Ngāpuhi history and lore, when asked by Hongi to interpret a karakia from outside of Ngāpuhi he declines, saying that Ngata, too, had asked him on many occasions to translate or interpret Māori waiata from the southern districts, but he had declined on the grounds that his field of knowledge and expertise was Ngāpuhi. In one letter, he says he is happy to have received Hongi's support for his intention to speak as a Māori representative before Parliament. Yet it seems he was not entirely confident to stand in the Pākehā world:

E hoa, e Hare, mei pena toku mōhio i a koe mo te reo Pākehā. kua tika te tu oku waewae kua pena te tika i tau tu. ki mua i ngā tangata nunui o te motu. no reira Horekau noaiho He painga o te moko Pawaha, o te kahohora e Piri atu nei i runga i to hoa. (November 26, 1930, p.4).

Certainly he appears not to be confident in his ability to do justice to an English translation of his manuscript: "Koia taku tino hiahia ki ngā Initapeta Tino mōhio ki te reo rangatira o te Pākehā me ana kupu tino nunui kia ahei ai te whakaeke mai i aua kupu...ki runga ki ngā kupu Māori" (October 20, 1930, p.3). In appealing to Hongi to undertake the translation, he says of himself,

“Kua kore ahau e tino mōhio ki te tuhituhi kua kaumatuatia, kua taimaha te ringa ki te tuhituhi” (October 20, 1930, p.9). The fact that Pene Haare wanted ‘Ngā Pakanga o Ngāpuhi’ to be translated by Hongi seems to make sense since, not only was Hongi a highly regarded interpreter, he was also Ngāpuhi and had been schooled in the Whare Wānanga. However, the reason that he wanted his manuscript translated into English is more elusive. According to R. Roa, Apirana Ngata’s rationale for the translation to English of Māori waiata was to expand the existing literature on waiata, and to provide a foundation for the ongoing study of Māori literary and artistic works (Roa, R., 2003).

The scholar in Pene Haare seems to have had a similar desire for the tribal knowledge which had been entrusted to him. Bassnett states that translation of a text ensures that it reaches “a wider audience than the author could have ever imagined” (1997, p.13). We have seen that Pene Haare relished any opportunity to share his knowledge or debate the issues of his day in a public forum. He can perhaps be seen as straddling two worlds- ‘te ao kōhatu’ and ‘te ao hou’. At a time when traditional Māori institutions like the Whare Wānanga were in decline, and there was a growing trend toward recording traditional knowledge in written form, it seems likely that he, too, would have been formulating the idea of committing the histories passed down to him to paper. It seems likely that some of these factors contributed to his decision to record his historical knowledge in a manuscript and, subsequently, to have it translated.

Seed-Pihama (2006) presents Wiri’s definition of ‘mātauranga Māori’ as having the following components:

Māori epistemology; the Māori way; Māori worldview; Māori style of thought; Māori ideology, Māori knowledge base; Māori perspective; to understand, or be acquainted with the Māori world; to be a graduate of the Māori schools of learning; Māori experience of history; Māori scholarship; Māori intellectual tradition; and so on (as cited in Wiri, 2001, ¶ 25).

Based on this definition, Ngakuru Pene Haare Te Wao must surely be acknowledged for his contribution to mātauranga Māori, both in the form of his manuscript which, while it has yet to reach the wider audience that it would appear he intended it to, is an invaluable historical and cultural resource, and also in the sense of his particular worldview and the depth of his knowledge, which he took pains to preserve and record for posterity.

The Manuscript -- and context

The manuscript is dated 11 Maehe (March) 1923, and the place of writing is given as Ngatuna, in the Hokianga. It consists of 239 leaves, and contains accounts of at least 62 Ngāpuhi battles between the years of 1820 and 1840. The original manuscript was donated by Fred Penney to the Auckland War Memorial Museum Library in 1987, where it remained until being uplifted in 1992 by Danny Penney, who subsequently left a photocopy to the library collection. The sub-heading of the manuscript reads, ‘Ko te reo tawhito me tona whakamāoritanga ki te reo o naia nei’. It would appear that Pene Haare’s original Māori text (as passed down to him) has undergone a ‘linguistic transformation’ (Houbert, 1998)- from ancient/archaic Māori to a more modern Māori (circa 1923), in order to make it more accessible to his intended audience. In this sense, the manuscript may itself be seen as a translation. Contained within the accounts of the battles are whakapapa, whakataukī, karakia, waiata and hari. In a letter to Hare Hongi, Pene Haare describes the contents of his manuscript:

Ko te pukapuka hohonu tenei ona kōrero, me tona reo tapu, ko te reo rangatira tenei o Ngāpuhi. Tona tawhiti ki muri kei te 4 mano tau ki muri. e kore tenei reo e taea te whakamarama e te tahi inītapeta (interpreter) mōhio o runga o te motu nei, maku ano e tohutohu te tikanga o tenei kupu o tenei kupu (October 20, 1930, p.2).

In other letters to Hongi, the content of the manuscript is described as being ‘all the stories for all the Ngāpuhi waka, the naming and the hauling to the water and the journey from Hawaiiki, the sacred karakia, the battles, and other significant events from the Ngāpuhi region’ (October 20, 1930). This would seem to imply that ‘Ngā Pakanga o Ngāpuhi’ is only one part of a wider body of writing. The accounts of the battles are handwritten into a book, much like a journal. The tone of the manuscript is literary, and the register is informal. In some cases, rather than write the final few lines of the account of a particular battle onto a fresh page, he has written them horizontally into the margin. A very few of the earlier battle accounts are not clearly defined, having no title and no obvious ending. But for the most part, each is numbered and has a title, for example, ‘B.N. 3, Nō 1823, Taurakohia ki roto o Waikato, ki a Kingi Potatau’, and ‘B.N. 40, Pariotonga, Ngāti Whatua’. In retrospect, it was just as well to have had the transcription, since the photocopying of the original had sometimes obscured details in the titles, and the text is in parts rendered quite faintly, making it difficult to decipher. However, from approximately midway through the transcription, the assignment of titles to battles do not correspond to the original. Consequently, it would seem that having both the original and the transcription, and being able to verify one to the other, is most ideal.

It seems likely that Pene Haare began writing the manuscript at the time he dated the first page, in March, 1923. He would have been either 60 or 70 years of age at that time, and no doubt the recording of these battles would have taken place over some years, meaning that when he wrote to Hongi in 1930, ‘I don’t really know enough about writing. I am old, and my hand gets tired’, he may indeed have been struggling with the completion of his manuscript. Certainly the work appears unfinished. The last battle listed in the index, p.372, is ‘N. 61, Te Houtaewa ki Pukerahi, ki a Whakaririka’, however ‘B. N. 62’ was written up, as was an unfinished account of what would appear to be ‘B.N. 63’. Following on from the last account there are a few pages of indexes and notes, some of which are reminders to him to go back and ‘whakatikatika’ (correct, refine) certain of the accounts. The index lists the titles of Battles 1-61, however the numbering continues on to 136, suggesting that this was a work in progress, and that perhaps there were many more battles to be recorded, if he were able. I am not sure of the year of his death, but came across an article about him in relation to The Shrine of Mary at Pukekaraka, in Otaki:

Miracles have been reported. A man named Ngakuru Pene Hare of Pangaru (sic) of North Auckland was suffering from a terminal disease, and was cured. He went to Otaki and prayed the Rosary with flower petals because he did not have a Rosary. He is still alive and in good health forty years later. (The Marian Library, 2005, ¶ 3).

Further research

Himiona Kamira, another important Te Rarawa kaumatua, also kept manuscripts in which he meticulously recorded his vast knowledge of histories, whakapapa and tribal lore that had been passed down to him, as well as the ‘minute detail of the life and work of his community’. He intended the manuscripts to be of interest and of benefit “not just for Hokianga, but for the whole of Northland” (Tate, n.d., ¶ 9). It appears that Pene Haare can only have had a similar intention with his manuscript, although his desire to have it translated to English would suggest he had an even broader audience in mind. Some of Kamira’s writings were subsequently published by

Bruce Biggs in the Journal of the Polynesian Society. The questions that have continually surfaced throughout this exploration are: Why has so little information about Ngakuru Pene Haare been recorded compared, say, to Kamira? Why has he not been profiled in the Dictionary of New Zealand Biography (DNZB)? Why was his 'Pukapuka', his 'opus', never published, even after his lifetime? Was it just a case of timing, there being no 'Bruce Biggs' at that time to champion him? My uncle, who had known of the existence of this manuscript, referred to it as having been 'lost' for some years. Even though it has been 'preserved' at The Auckland War Memorial Museum Library since 1987, does this labour of love, this taonga of cultural and historical significance, not warrant a wider distribution? What use, if any, has been made, or could be made of this manuscript and the historical, cultural and linguistic information recorded in it? Furthermore, what role do literary writings have to play in the development of notions of cultural identity? Do Te Rūnanga o Te Rarawa have existing research questions that could possibly tie in with the research done to date and the intended research? I fully intend to liaise with the Rūnanga at this point, in an attempt to answer some of these questions, and to seek some guidance as to where and how the research might proceed. I feel certain that interviews with members of Pene Haare's family, as well as with my uncle and other knowledgeable Te Rarawa kaumatua, would shed more light on the issues surrounding the manuscript and its relative obscurity. It is also suggested that the publication of 'Ngā Pakanga o Ngāpuhi', which is a wellspring of information of both historical and cultural significance, would be of great value to our educational institutions in Te Taitokerau and elsewhere, as well as a fitting tribute to the aspirations of this distinguished tūpuna.

Conclusion

The objective of this exercise was to explore the manuscript 'Ngā Pakanga o Ngāpuhi' with the aim of finding avenues warranting further, more refined, research. At the end of this present process I am uncertain of having completely fulfilled that aim. However, I have learned a great deal in the process, and intend to continue the quest for 'the burning question' which will inspire further rigorous research. Bassnett defines the study of translation as "mapping the journey that texts undertake" (1997, p.11). On a personal level, while the present journey has been fascinating, albeit at times frustrating, there is a sense of achievement in making a contribution to the restoration of this document to its rightful status as a 'living, breathing' document. In addition, I have discovered that, in the end, mapping the journey as a fledgling researcher may be just as interesting and important to my development as a researcher, as the analysis of the literature reviewed. It is certainly hoped that this account may be helpful to other students of research, as they make the transition from graduate to post-graduate studies.

References

- Bassnett, S. (Ed.). (1997). *Translating Literature*. Cambridge: D.S.Brewer.
- Beekman, J, & Callow, J. (1974). *Translating The Word of God: with scripture and topical indexes*. Grand Rapids : Zondervan Pub. House.
- Cloher, Dorothy Urlich. (2002). *The Tribes of Muriwhenua: Their origins and stories*. M.Penfold, (trans.). Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Cloher, Dorothy Urlich. (2003). *Hongi Hika: Warrior chief*. Auckland: Penguin Books (NZ) Ltd.

- Gutt, E-A. (1991). *Translation and relevance: cognition and context*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Houbert, F. (1998). *Translation as a communication process*. *Translation Journal*. Retrieved July, from <http://www accurapid.com/journal/05theory.htm>
- James, K. (2002). Cultural implications for translation. In G. Bokor (ed.), *Translation Journal Vol 6, no. 4*. Retrieved July 2, 2003 from <http://www accurapid.com/journal/22delight.htm>
- National Register of Archives and Manuscript. Stowell, Henry Matthew (Hare Hongi) 1859-1944. Retrieved December, 2007 from <http://www.nram.govt.nz/record.php?id=4328&parent=nramindexbyvolume&volume=X>
- Newmark, P. (1996). What is translation? In R Owens (Ed.), (1996). *The Translator's Handbook. 3rd Edition*. London: ASLIB.
- Ngā Puhi Iwi Whakapapa Research. (n.d.). 'About Us'. Retrieved December, 2007 from: <http://www.ngapuhiwhakapapa.com/aboutus.html>
- Ngata, A. (1972). *Ngā Mōteatea*. Wellington: Reed Publishing (for The Polynesian Society).
- Ngata, A. (1958). The Origin of Māori Carving. In *Te Ao Hou*. Issue 22, April, 1958. Retrieved October, 2007 from <http://teaohou.natlib.govt.nz/teaohou/issue/Mao22TeA/c14.html>
- Pene Haare, Ngakuru. (1917-1930). *MS-PAPERS-0062-16*. Correspondence to Hare Hongi. Alexander Turnbull Library.
- Pym, A. (2003), 'A Theory of Cross-Cultural Communication'. Retrieved January, 2008 from <http://www.tinet.org/~apym/on-line/translation/translation.html>
- Roa, R. (2003). Ka Mahuta, Ngāti Hauā, and the importance of translation theory. *Journal of Māori and Pacific Development*, 4(2), 3-24. Thesis (M.A.) University of Waikato.
- Roa, T. (2002). *Traittoire, Traduttore*. Unpublished paper accepted for presentation to the NZSTI Conference in Auckland, NZ, 2002.
- Seed-Pihama, J. E. (2006). *A Māori approach to translating whakawai*. Retrieved February, 2007 from [https://classforum.waikato.ac.nz/MAOR501-07A\(NET\)/501mahiiawiki/W9/kauhau9/](https://classforum.waikato.ac.nz/MAOR501-07A(NET)/501mahiiawiki/W9/kauhau9/)
- Tate, H. (n.d.). Biography of Himiona Tupakihi Kamira. Retrieved December, 2007 from http://www.dnzb.govt.nz/dnzb/alt_EssayBody.asp?essayID=4K1
- Tate, H. (Ed.). (1986). *Karanga Hokianga*. Hokianga: Motuti Community Trust.
- Te Papakupu o te Taitokerau - 'Ng' - 'Ngakuru Pene Haare'. Retrieved December, 2007 from <http://www.edesignz.co.nz/dictionary/dictionary-searchresults/NG.htm>
- Te Rūnanga o Te Rarawa. (n.d.). History of Te Rarawa- 2. 'Ko Te Rarawa te Iwi'. Retrieved December, 2007 from <http://www.terarawa.co.nz/background.htm#2>

Te Rūnanga o Te Rarawa, Historical Overview, Part Two. Retrieved November, 2007 from www.terarawa.co.nz/mahi/rm/tc/Historical%20Overview%20Part%20Twoaug04.pdf

Te Wao, Ngakuru Pene Haare. (1923). *Ngā Pakanga o Ngāpuhi 1820-1840*. MS 89/116. Auckland Museum Library.

The Marian Library/International Marian Research Institute (2005). 'The Shrine of Mary at Pukekaraka at Otaki'. Retrieved December, 2007 from <http://campus.udayton.edu/mary/resources/shrines/newzealand.htm>

Author Notes

The author wishes to acknowledge and thank the following people for their guidance and support: Tom Roa and Rolinda Karapu; the whānau of Ngakuru Pene Haare; Ross Gregory; Michael Baker; Te Rūnanga o Te Rarawa; and Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga.

Jillian Tipene (Te Rarawa, Ngāti Kahu) is a graduate student in the School of Māori and Pacific Development at the University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.

E-mail: jillian.tipene@gmail.com