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Abstract
For Indigenous peoples, and Māori specifically, storytelling and oral history are crucial to the survival of our collective identities, culture and language. Retold across generations, our stories are often explicit and interwoven narratives of personal and collective memories. Drawing on Native American scholar Gerald Vizenor’s (2009) concept of “survivance stories”, this article explores a set of three oral history narratives of kaumātua from Ngāti Tiipa, one of the 33 iwi and hapū of the Waikato-Tainui confederation. Our analysis reveals how enduring connections to the river and land, the retention of whānau practices and the intergenerational transmission of tūpuna names have shaped contemporary expressions of Ngāti Tiipa identity and belonging. We explore how these testimonies reveal survivance as a repeated theme that has its own nuanced interpretation in individual and collective tribal oral stories.
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Introduction
Narrative remains a significant analytical lens in oral history interpretation and practice (Atkinson & Delamont, 2006; Beard, 2017; Binney, 2001; Bishop, 1999). For Indigenous peoples, and Māori specifically, storytelling and oral history are crucial to the survival of our collective identities, culture and language. Retold across generations, our stories are often explicit and interwoven narratives of personal and collective memories (Mahuika, 2006). This process of remembering has been described as “a Māori concept of narrative (kōrero) and analysis (whakapapa)” in which “[t]hese concepts ensure that the way the stories are shared, presented and understood aligns with Māori cultural preferences” (Ware et al., 2018, p. 45).

Drawing on the concept of “survivance stories”
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from Native American writer Gerald Vizenor (2009), this article explores a set of oral history narratives of kaumātua from Ngāti Tiipa, one of the 33 iwi and hapū of the Waikato-Tainui confederation. Like their Waikato kin, Ngāti Tiipa were subjected to the depredations of colonisation and assimilation following the 1863 invasion of Waikato and the subsequent raupatu (Mahuta, 2008). The decades that preceded and followed raupatu were ones of unprecedented disruption, risk and uncertainty. Confronted with rapid demographic “swamping” (Pool & Kukutai, 2018), dispossession from their lands, and economic and political marginalisation, iwi and hapū engaged in a range of strategies to try to secure their own autonomy and survival (Anderson et al., 2014; Crosby, 2015).

Surviving ongoing colonialism is a common theme in personal and collective Indigenous narratives of identity. The concept of survivance takes us beyond survival, and, for Vizenor (2009), survivance stories can be understood as “renunciations of dominance, detractions, obstructions, and unbearable sentiments of tragedy” and an “active sense of presence over absence, deracination, and oblivion” p. 85. Acts of survivance can manifest in the everyday—in the continuance of our stories and the telling of our histories in ways that are distinctively Indigenous (Madsen, 2013). In this article we consider three narrative compositions revealed through kōrero with tribal elders and explore how these testimonies reveal survivance as a repetitive theme that has its own nuanced interpretation in tribal oral stories.

Ngāti Tiipa

To provide the context for our kaumātua narratives, we begin with the relationships that structure Ngāti Tiipa identity, that is, relationships of whakapapa. According to Smith (2000), whakapapa is “a way of thinking, a way of learning, a way of storing knowledge, and a way of debating knowledge. It is inscribed in virtually every aspect of our worldview” and acts as a “fundamental form of knowing: it functions as an epistemological template” p. 234. Whakapapa encompasses layers of relatedness that extend beyond the realm of humans to encompass all things. Whakapapa is thus crucial to articulations of individual and collective Māori identity in the past, present and future (Webber & O’Connor, 2019).

Like many other iwi and hapū, Ngāti Tiipa take their name from an eponymous ancestor. Tiipa was the son of Paoa, the founding ancestor of Ngāti Paoa, who lived with this first family at Kaitotehe, opposite Taupiri maunga (Kelly, 1940). After an embarrassing incident in which he failed to provide adequate sustenance for his brother’s visiting party, Paoa departed to Hauraki, where he met Tukutuku, a granddaughter of Tamaterā (Ngāti Tamaterā) and great-granddaughter of Marutūahu (Monin, 2016). There he had a second family, which included Tiipa. Paoa and his tuakana Mahuta (Ngāti Mahuta) were grandsons of Pikiao, the eponymous ancestor of the Arawa iwi Ngāti Pikiao, and Rereiao, a descendant of the famous Tainui ancestor Whaitiwha (Jones & Biggs, 1995). Through Pikiao, Kingi Pōtatau and his successors are regarded as ure tārewa (Ngata, 2019).

Tiipa had five daughters: Kauahi, Kopa, Te Kura, Naho (Ngāti Naho) and Paretiipa. Two of them—Te Kura and Naho—married their cousin Tapaue, one of Mahuta’s mokopuna. Tapaue was a rangatira renowned for his love of fighting, women and human flesh. With his brother Whare Tipeti, he controlled a vast stretch of the lower and middle Waikato River (Jones & Biggs, 1995). The whakapapa relationships linking Ngāti Tiipa with these other iwi and hapū are shown in Figure 1.

For several centuries Ngāti Tiipa had a significant presence in Te Pūaha o Waikato—the area
where the Waikato River meets the Tasman Sea—and northern Waikato generally, maintaining close relationships with their kindred hapū and iwi, including Ngāti Mahuta. In 1840 Tiipapa’s great-great-grandson Kukutai and Kukutai’s oldest son, Ngapaka, signed the Waikato-Manukau copy of Te Tiriti o Waitangi/the Treaty of Waitangi on behalf of Ngāti Tiipapa (NZ History, n.d.). Described by the missionary Robert Maunsell as “a venerable old chief, and formerly a great warrior” (Garrett, 1991, p. 98), Kukutai had taken leadership roles in many battles (Ewe, 2020). Six years after signing the Treaty, Kukutai died from gunshot wounds in the Battle of Huttaroa against a neighbouring tribe, Ngāti Pou (“Further Papers”, 1860, p. 11)—a battle described as the last major intra-Waikato armed conflict (St John, 1873).

Ngāti Tiipapa features in a number of 19th-century enumerations undertaken by missionaries and colonial government officials. In 1844 Maunsell, who resided at Maraetai at Waikato Heads, undertook a “census” of 13 Waikato and Maniapoto iwi, including Ngāti Tiipapa (Fenton, 1859). He listed the names of 216 Ngāti Tiipapa men, women and children. Resident magistrate Francis Fenton, who later became the first (and longest-serving) chief judge of the Native Land Court, repeated the census in 1857–1858. He was assisted by Waata Kukutai, one of Kukutai’s younger sons, who became the tribe’s rangatira after his father’s death (for a comprehensive biography of Waata, see Ewe, 2020). In the 1844 census Waata was recorded as Porima, which was changed to Waata after his conversion to Christianity, and then changed again to Pihikete. The latter is a transliteration of “biscuit”, a name reflecting Waata’s efforts to cultivate relationships with influential Pākehā. A comparison of Maunsell’s and Fenton’s censuses shows that name changes during that period were relatively common. Waata was also Maunsell’s key protector, having gifted 750 acres to the Crown in 1853 for the site of a Church of England school at Te Kohanga (Turton, 1877, part III, deed No. 3). An 1870 return listing the names, number, lead chiefs, hapū and location of tribes in the North Island showed Ngāti Tiipapa as one of six tribes in the Waikato District (“Return”, 1870, pp. 5–6). The 1878 census was the last one in which Ngāti Tiipapa were identified. From 1886 onwards, the census only listed “principal tribes”, and Ngāti Tiipapa (along with all the other Waikato hapū and iwi) were aggregated under a single Waikato grouping. After the 1901 census, counts of principal tribes were dropped altogether (T. Kukutai, 2012).

Waata held several paid positions in the colonial administration, including assessor, magistrate and major in the New Zealand militia (Scott, 1990). Under Waata’s leadership Ngāti Tiipapa assisted the colonial troops with supplies during their campaign against Waikato but did not fight alongside them. Waata’s confronting leadership style drew the ire of several influential figures. At a major meeting of tribal leaders at Paetai near Rangiriri in 1857, Waata interrupted a prominent rangatira mid-speech and then led a contingent parading under the Union Jack (Gorst, 1864, p. 62; O’Malley, 2016). Just months before the battle at Rangiriri, Kingmaker Wiremu Tamihana Tarapipipi Te Waharoa (1863) wrote to Waata, berating him for supplying food to soldiers: “Ka ki ahau kia koe, ehara i te pakeha nana Waikato i hinga. Ka kiia e au tenei whainga, nau ano tenei mahi” (“It is not the white man that has destroyed Waikato, it is your doing”). If Waata felt chastised he did not show it, although he later composed a lengthy oriori to mourn those who fell at Rangiriri (W. Kukutai, 1863).

There are numerous contemporary reports in which Waata is described as a “neutral”, “friendly”, “queenite”, “loyal” or “küpapa” chief (Crosby, 2015; Ewe, 2020; Scott, 1990). The term küpapa was initially used in the 1860s to describe neutrality, but later evolved to take on the meaning of pro-Crown supporter, and sometimes the more disparaging label of “traitor” (Soutar, 2001). Reflecting specifically on Ngāti Porou history, Soutar (2001) argues that the way in which küpapa has been used to describe Māori participation in the 1860s wars is “seriously flawed and needs to be revised” p. 38. In his book Küpapa, Crosby argues that the motivations of chiefs and tribes so labelled were complex and an uppermost concern was the maintenance of hapū and iwi authority and control over land. In that regard, their motivations and reasoning were “often remarkably similar to that of the groups they fought against” (Anderson et al., 2014, p. 271). Reviewing Crosby’s book, Rapatahana (2015) surmised that küpapa were themselves never traitors or even “friendlies”—they were Māori striving to survive the onslaught of a wider and more powerful apex—Britain and the various legislative, moral, religious and pragmatic (weaponry, for example) ballast they brought to Aotearoa. But the prime consideration throughout was the promise inherent in Te Tiriti o Waitangi of tino rangatiratanga for all Māori, which all Māori—küpapa and those they harried—strove to irrevocably attain and maintain.
Like the supporters of the Kingitanga, Waata was opposed to land-selling and had made this position clear in a rūnanga proclamation published in 1857:

Ka puritia tenei whenua; ahakoa poka te tangata, ki te korero kia hokona ki te Pakeha, ekore e riro; ka tau te whakairo o nga rūnanga ki te pupuru i nga whenua timata mai i te puaha: a, Pupekawa atu ana.

This land will be retained. Despite what people say or do, if it is said that it will be sold to the white man, it will not be given. It is the decision of the tribal council to hold on to the lands starting from the river mouth right through to Pupekawa. (W. Kukutai, 1857)

Waata was determined to retain his own mana and that of Ngāti Tiipa. In initial meetings to establish the Kingitanga, it was reported that Waata and other “lower Waikato” rangatira were prepared to recognise Pōtatau Te Wherowhero—the hereditary paramount rangatira of Ngāti Mahuta and therefore of the Waikato-Tainui confederation— as their “matua” but not as their king (“The Waikato Movement”, 1858). The crux of the disagreement was their unwillingness to surrender their mana over their whenua. Ngāti Tiipa’s lands were included in the 1.2 million acres of Waikato land confiscated under the New Zealand Settlements Act 1863. However, 45,500 acres known as the “Opuatia block” were subsequently returned under provisions in the Act to provide compensation for tribes who did not oppose the Crown, but whose lands and livelihoods were affected by raupatu (O’Malley, 2016). The Certificate of Title (1866) for Taupari and Opuatia shows the land was awarded to Waata Kukutai and nine others, in keeping with the Native Land Court’s notorious “10 owner” rule (Taonui, 2012). While research undertaken for this project shows that only a small portion of the Opuatia block remains in Ngāti Tiipa ownership today, the enduring connections to the whenua, awa and tūpuna is reflected in the kōrero shared by Ngāti Tiipa rūruhi and koroheke.

Our approach to Ngāti Tiipa oral history

Indigenous peoples define oral history differently to Western views of the field. Cree historian Winona Wheeler (2005) has argued that academic definitions of oral history as “planned tape recorded interviews” are diametrically opposed to “how most Indigenous peoples relate to recorded voices” pp. 194–195. In Aotearoa New Zealand, Māori articulate of oral history are broader than interviews and include kōrero tuku iho as normative to the way oral histories are composed and performed (Mahuika, 2019). Oral history is much more than a one-on-one seated interview—it includes waiata, whakapapa, whatauki, pūrākau, and material objects such as photos and maps.

The narratives presented in this article were assembled as part of a broader Marsden Fund project (UOW1605) with Ngāti Tiipa focused on whakapapa, whenua and colonisation. Permission to undertake the project was sought and given twice by Ngāti Tiipa whānau—initially at a marae committee meeting, and again at an open marae wānanga attended by more than 100 uri. Ethical approval to undertake the interviews was obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences of the University of Waikato. Prior to their kōrero with kaumātua, the research team facilitated an oral history methodology wānanga with whānau to assert Ngāti Tiipa tikanga as central to the way the recordings should be conducted. A range of issues were discussed, including technical aspects, potential questions, interview settings and sound, listening for meaning and silence, and indexing and transcription. The interviews were conducted by three of this article’s authors, all of whom are Ngāti Tiipa uri with strong connections to the haukāinga. This whānau research approach reflected the wider sentiment of the whānau, and the research team, that uri are best placed to collect, steward and disseminate the knowledge of their own people. It also meant that interviewees could speak more to local kōrero, whakapapa relationships, and places that were often already known to the kaumātua, enabling them to co-construct their testimonies in ways that suited their modes and cultural processes of storytelling (Mahuika, 2015, pp. 17–18). For some, this translated to interviews that included objects and photographs as multisensory experiences.

The research team spoke with 15 rūruhi and koroheke ranging in age between 60 and 90 years, the majority of whom were haukāinga. The kōrero took place at their homes, or another place where they felt comfortable, such as a marae, and several of the interviews were conducted in pairs. While not rigidly structured by predefined questions, guiding pātai referred to personal and familial recollections and knowledge of Ngāti Tiipa whakapapa and tūpuna, memories about growing up on the land, kai gathering, sites of significance, distinctive whānau practices, experiences with te reo,
and their identity as a Ngāti Tiipa uri. Kaumātua were provided with information sheets prior to their interviews and were given the option of having their recording stored in a Ngāti Tiipa-controlled digital archive that is being developed as part of the project. Although given the opportunity to use pseudonyms for this article, all of the kaumātua—most of whom have tūpuna names—asked for their real names to be used, which we have done throughout. We also provided all of the participating kaumātua, or their surviving whānau, with copies of this manuscript for checking and approval prior to submission.

Survivance narratives
Connections to whenua and awa
All of the kaumātua that we talked with had a deep sense of connection to their whānau whenua and had spent at least some of their childhood living on or near it. Their lived experiences of working with the environment meant that they had rich local knowledge and mātauranga about fishing, planting and harvesting. The Waikato awa was a central feature in their lives, providing a source of sustenance and identity. These connections are aptly described in Marama Muru-Lanning’s (2016) book Tūpuna Awa: “[T]he Waikato River is an ancestor, a taonga and a source of mauri, lying at the heart of identity and chiefly power.” Several of these themes emerged in the kōrero shared with us. This well-known whakataukī, which translates as “Waikato of a hundred taniwha / At every bend a taniwha can be found”, evokes the significance of taniwha for Waikato iwi and hapū identity and was evident in the kōrero shared with us. Rereokeroa Shaw, who lived on one of the Ngāti Tiipa papakāinga, noted that the marae’s original name was Te Kumi (taniwha) because the surrounding terrain had a taniwha-like shape, with the Waikato River at the tail. Taui Thompson, a rūruhi in her late 70s, spoke of the taniwha Waiwaia who travels along the Waipā and the Waikato awa, and is considered a kaitiaki by the river iwi and hapū. She gave specific locations where Waiwaia travelled and rested, including the names of the whānau whose houses were nearby. She recounted the cautionary childhood warning she received from a well-known korohēke who was wary of approaching a puna beside the river when the water turned opaque. His warning to her was to not make a noise or act untowardly. In this way, the korohēke was imparting a valuable lesson about appropriate behaviour and respect as part of the reciprocal relationship between mana whenua and their kaitiaki. Te Wahapu Paul Brown, a korohēke in his 80s, also spoke about local taniwha and his preference for giving them a wide berth. Noting the presence of a taniwha connected to a hapū further upriver, his response was resolute: “I wouldn’t go for a swim near there.”

The awa and moana also provided whānau with year-round kai and the capacity for self-sufficiency. The hapū and iwi of Te Pūaha have long been renowned for their whitebait, tuna and kahawai. Maunsell’s biographer observes the significance of fishing in and around Waikato Heads in the 1840s and 1850s, noting that kahawai were caught off the beaches and often “pursued by hundreds of people”. The catch was dried in the sun or in “Maori ovens” (Wily & Maunsell, 1938, p. 105). Tangiaro Taa (nēe Taupō), a rūruhi in her 90s, grew up near the awa and continued to live there, at one of her ancestral marae. She recalled seeing spinning balls of tuna that would only appear at a certain time of the year. Along with tuna, whitebait were a primary kai for manuwhiri and whānau, and were especially sought after for tribally significant hui and tangihanga. During the whitebaiting season in late spring/early summer, whānau would camp on the small islands in the river and on its banks, sometimes for weeks at a time (Cowan, 1930). Intergenerational knowledge about whitebaiting and customary fishing areas remains strong within Ngāti Tiipa and other iwī hapū in Te Pūaha. Korohēke Uerata Clark recalled the days when mullet was available in abundance in and around the river’s islands: “Paipai haere ngā mullet. E rima rau kare he raru. He maha ngā mea i tērā wā” (“Mullet flowed freely, 500 was not an issue. Things were plentiful at that time”).

Self-sufficiency was a recurring theme in the kōrero with kaumātua. Rereokeroa Shaw spoke about using “roadkill” possum for the hinaki used to catch tuna. This wherewithal, coupled with local knowledge about the best fishing spots, meant the whānau never went hungry: “We knew all the right places to fish, it never failed.” At one nearby creek, different spots were utilised for different purposes. Some spots were for catching tuna. Others were ideal for kānga wai. Few, if any, tuna can be found there now. In recollecting their childhoods, nearly all of the kaumātua talked about the hard physical labour that came with living off the land, whether it was tending whānau or community gardens or orchards, market gardening...
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köiwi during earthworks (New Zealand Transport nearby Waikato Expressway and disturbance of times in recent years with the development of the surfaced, and this has come to the fore several times in recent years with the development of the köiwi and take them to Taupiri maunga for reburial. He told how his father took four horses to the site and pulled a rock over the entrance, sealing it permanently: “We never got the lot out, some still in there now.” He identified a number of other places in the area where köiwi were known to be located, describing specific natural markers in the form of kōwhatu and rākau. Similarly, Uerata Clark shared his knowledge about specific tūpuna buried at his whänau papakäinga and the environmental features that marked their resting places. Exhuming köiwi for reburial elsewhere is an ancient practice that persisted to the late 19th century and was carried out according to specific tikanga practices. An 1860s article in the Maori Messenger newspaper reported that Waata Kukutai, accompanied by 200 Ngäti Tiipa men, exhumed the bodies of one of the rangatira who had died at the Battle of Ihutaroa for reburial elsewhere (W. Kukutai, 1861). Hapū and iwi tikanga are still implemented when köiwi are exhumed and buried elsewhere (Opuatia block is located in the heart of a major market gardening area) or farming. Parents and tūpuna were variously described as “māra kai people” and highly mobile workers were “constantly having to move for māhi” (Taui Thompson). Ruru Noble, a rūruhi in her 80s, remembered her own kupu cutting flax for income, and selling it to a local trader who ran a barge on the awa.

Many of the kaumātua we spoke with carried deep knowledge about the location of places of significance, including wāhi tapu, and the origins of place names. For several of them, the whenua was imprinted with the physical and spiritual presence of ancestors. Te Wahapu Paul Brown recalled how he and a childhood friend accidentally discovered kōiwi when his friend fell through a hole into a cave near the family home while they were playing cowboys. Not long after, Kingi Koroki and a group of kaumātua from Ngāruawāhia came to disinter the kōiwi and take them to Taupiri maunga for reburial. He told how his father took four horses to the site and pulled a rock over the entrance, sealing it permanently: “We never got the lot out, some still in there now.” He identified a number of other places in the area where kōiwi were known to be located, describing specific natural markers in the form of kōwhatu and rākau. Similarly, Uerata Clark shared his knowledge about specific tūpuna buried at his whänau papakäinga and the environmental features that marked their resting places. Exhuming kōiwi for reburial elsewhere is an ancient practice that persisted to the late 19th century and was carried out according to specific tikanga practices. An 1860s article in the Maori Messenger newspaper reported that Waata Kukutai, accompanied by 200 Ngāti Tiipa men, exhumed the bodies of one of the rangatira who had died at the Battle of Ihutaroa for reburial elsewhere (W. Kukutai, 1861). Hapū and iwi tikanga are still implemented when kōiwi are exhumed and buried elsewhere (W. Kukutai, 1861). Hapū and iwi tikanga are still implemented when kōiwi are exhumed and buried elsewhere (New Zealand Transport Agency, 2016).

With the intergenerational and multilayered connections to whenua came an enduring sense of māmae arising from the alienation of whänau land through legal and other means. Stories were told of trickery and sly deals, of councils selling land to recoup unpaid rates, and there was a general sense of a system that not only failed to protect mana whenua interests but actively worked against them. Rereokeroa Shaw shared how her father had been persuaded by a local Päkehā farmer to exchange a significant parcel of land for a car. Another kaumātua had exchanged land with a local farmer and had leased it out, only to be told to return it to the farmer when the lease expired. Another rūruhi in her 90s, Ruihi (Tii) Hira, also spoke about the predatory practices of a local farmer who had systematically acquired, over a period of time, parcels of whänau land from the Opuatia block.

The Anglican Church’s failure to properly compensate Ngäti Tiipa for the sale of Waata Kuktuai’s gifted land—the proceeds of which were used to establish St Stephen’s School in Bombay (Ewe, 2020)—remained a source of vexation. “They got out of it because they sold to members of the church. It was a private sale that’s why we can’t get it back,” said Rereokeroa Shaw. She was concerned that rapid development in the commuter corridor south of the Bombays would spread westwards and result in further alienation of Ngäti Tiipa whenua: “If there is going to be an expansion this way it will push everything up.” Rereokeroa Shaw hoped that a geographic information system (GIS) mapping exercise, undertaken as part of this research project, would provide whänau with information that would support them to hold on to their whänau in the face of development pressures: “The mapping is going to define where our whänau will be, how our whänau need to hold on to what they have, as they will never get it back.”

**Whänau practices**

For some whänau, their relationship with the whenua was also maintained through the continuity of practices such as burying the placenta of newborns on whänau land. Taui Thompson recalled this being a practice of her mother’s whänau and one which she herself had continued. She knew where the placentas of all her children and grandchildren were buried. With at least one in six Māori living overseas (Hamer, 2006), many Ngäti Tiipa whänau have siblings, children, mokopuna and other relatives living outside of Aotearoa. When Taui Thompson’s whänau returned from Australia, they often brought the whenua of their pēpi for her to take care of. She had also taught one of her children the rituals associated with the practice to ensure that it endured. Rereokeroa Shaw also spoke about her ongoing efforts to reclaim the intergenerational legacy of karanga that had been disrupted through colonisation. She spoke about learning te reo and karanga in her 50s at the request of an aunty, but also how her mokopuna attending kōhanga reo had been a
catalyst for change. Taking a lead role in constructing tukutuku for the opening of a new Ngāti Tiipa whare had also provided an opportunity to work alongside kaumātua to record stories of tūpuna, sites of significance and tribal events so that the stories and mātauranga would “live on and on”.

Customary arranged marriages were once commonplace in most hapū/iwi communities (Biggs, 1960), and Ngāti Tiipa was no different. The nominal censuses of 1844 and 1857–1858 linked tāne and wāhine and showed that many Ngāti Tiipa marriages were consanguineous, and that a significant number were between close relatives. Whakapapa compiled for the broader Marsden project shows that, what in Western genealogical terms would be termed first and second cousin marriages, were commonplace from the mid-18th to late 19th century. On this John Hira, a koroheke in his 80s, noted: “I heard our people say, ‘Keep it in the families. There’s no arguments.’ Inaianei [now] you got all the arguments now.” In Maori Marriages, Biggs (1960) argued that there was no clear distinction between “marriageable” and “nonmarriageable” kin outside the brother/sister and parent/child categories. While there seems to have been some disapproval of first cousin marriages, there was some ambiguity about how rigid this was. Between-kin marriage within Ngāti Tiipa was prevalent during the 18th and 19th centuries but less common in the lifetimes of our rūrangi and koroheke. Where such relationships did emerge, the reactions were mixed. Te Wahapu Paul Brown recalled a relationship between close relatives that the community intervened in, sending one of the pair to Tūrangi and the other near Te Awamutu. According to Uerata Clark, relationships with Pākehā and first cousins were not seen as acceptable but relationships with second cousins were.

“Māori didn’t worry about that back then. It’s still like that now.”

Several kaumātua also referred to the practice of tono, where marriages were arranged between the whānau of a prospective couple. Te Ahihorongo Hira, a rūrangi in her 90s, recalled, “[T]hey reckon they used to make you marry whether you like it or not, eh. I used to hear that.” While she was able to choose her own partner, permission to marry first had to be sought from her koro. Obtaining permission from a grandfather or older relative was not limited to prospective brides. Recalling his engagement to his Pākehā wife, Stanley Kukutai said he was also expected to obtain his koro’s approval to marry.

**Tūpuna names and identities**

The retention of tūpuna names is an enduring feature of Ngāti Tiipa identity, with many whānau continuing to pass on names as part of an inter-generational living legacy. Te Ahihorongo Hira’s five children were given tūpuna names by relatives, and she herself was named by her koro. Taui Thompson’s name was bestowed by a female tūpuna to mark the reconciliation between hapū after a major battle, most likely Ihutaroa. As she recalled: “Ka mutu te pakanga o nga hapū i roto o Te Pūaha. He pakanga i reira, ka mutu tērā” (“The battle between the clans of Te Pūaha was ended. The battle there, it was finished”). Te Wahapu Paul Brown’s name marked a place of high significance for the hapū and iwi of Te Pūaha. Stanley Kukutai recounted how a whanaunga had asked if one of her mokopuna in Australia could carry his tūpuna name. He consented but wanted the child to have a connection to the person from whom it came. So he gave his relation a photo of himself, to be passed on to the mokopuna: “[T]hat’s me, that’s my whakapapa, I’m the matua.” Marangai Tupae, a koroheke in his 80s, began his kōrero by reciting whakapapa from tūpuna many generations back. Interspersed throughout his kōrero were the names of tūpuna and their whakapapa connections, spanning multiple generations, and often connected to specific places in Te Pūaha. These connections also included marriage ties to other hapū and iwi in Maungatuhia, Tauranga Moana, Te Tai Rāwhiti and Taranaki. Wiremu Taupo Kihi, another koroheke in his 70s, had strong connections to the whānau and whenua at Te Pūaha but said he had limited opportunity to learn about his whakapapa beyond a couple of generations: “He [his father] didn’t talk about it at all. Even my grandfather didn’t . . . talk about whakapapa . . . how sad. They kept it in them.”

The kaumātua we spoke to were steadfast supporters of the Kingitanga. Indeed, Te Pūaha and Ngāti Tiipa have long been considered a stronghold of Kingitanga support. The tensions arising from Waata Kukutai’s anti-Kingitanga stance eased somewhat after Kingi Tāwhiao and his followers came out of the aukati in the 1880s and reconciled with their former opponents, some of whom were kin. After Waata’s premature death in 1867, his nephew and successor, Hori Kukutai, continued to work with Crown officials while also supporting the Kingitanga. A book published to mark a series of hui in 1898 and 1899 between Premier Richard Seddon, Governor Lord Ranfurly, Minister of Native Affairs James Carroll and various rangatira shows a photograph of Hori and several
of his Ngāti Tiipa whanaunga sitting alongside Kingi Mahuta’s party and others at a meeting at Government House (Nga korero, 1900).

Kingi Tāwhiao’s makopuna Te Pūea Herangi—who lived in and around Te Pūaha before moving to Ngāruawāhia to establish Turangawaewae marae—was mentioned by several kaumātua, often in the context of the 1918 Spanish Flu pandemic and her land development schemes with Tā Apriana Ngata. Given the multiple and intersecting dynamics, it is perhaps unsurprising that only one of the kaumātua, Uerata Clark, spoke openly about Ngāti Tiipa’s past designation as kūpapa and the complexities of reconciling this past in the present:

Ngāti Tiipa—Ngāti Teapot. Ka hoki ki ētahi ngā whakaaro a Ngāti Tiipa. Oh he iwi kūpapa. I te wā he tika, he aha tēra kōrero, i timata ka haere mai a George Grey ki kōnei ka kawea te āhuatanga a Queen Victoria o rātou tūpuna . . . He iwi kūpapa. He aha te iwi inaiai? For John Hira, the most important thing was whakapapa: “It’s just something I’ve stuck with. I’m just Ngāti Tiipa and that’s it.”

Survivance as narrative identity

Our present identities are often shaped in personal and collective life narratives that allow us to reach a sense of “composure” about who we have been in the past, and who we believe we are in the present (Thomson, 1994, p. 8). In our kōrero with Ngāti Tiipa kaumātua, survivance was a key theme that supported the narrators to story their lives, not simply as individuals, but as part of a collective intergenerational chorus of inherited histories (Halbwachs, 1980). Together, these oral histories reveal how survivance as narrative identity is not rigid or closed, not merely individual or collective, but a nuanced engagement with “relations of power and authority” across generations (DeRoche, 1996, p. 58). Survivance has its own theoretical literature specific to Indigenous peoples, and those who write about survivance have sought to centre victim narratives in order to make space for stories centred on Indigenous agency by individuals and groups (Vizenor, 2008). Nevertheless, colonialism—its historical legacies and contemporary manifestations—remains an ever-present shadow in most post-invasion native memories (Sabzalian, 2019). For Ngāti Tiipa, survivance is more about self-sufficiency through an inherited knowledge of where to fish and how to live off the land and awa. Survivance as identity included a conscious retaining and living of traditional practices across generations, including the exhumation of kōrumpi and the burial of whenua. The intergenerational transmission of names was also a powerful form of survivance, where successive generations were encouraged to know where they came from and to assert their iwi/hapū identity through those relationships. As the kōrero in this article have shown, survivance stories are also narratives of identity. They are subversive towards colonial dominance or narrow assumptions of kūpapa loyalty, and discursive in their desire to emphasise personal and tribal distinctiveness and autonomy. Survivance as a narrative identity reveals itself in Ngāti Tiipa as an “active” attitude towards the retention of tribal customs through the telling of traditional narratives (Velie, 2008, p. 147). Each kaumātua’s connection to place was part of a “storying of the land” and a retracing and remapping of their relationship to place (Yi, 2016, pp. 1–3). These narratives of identity were then “lived” and not just textual historical “efforts of survival”, but remembered and practised survivance (Silliman, 2014, p. 59). These stories also reveal the enduring threads of Ngāti Tiipa mātauranga—tribal knowledge, methods of knowledge creation and ways of knowing (Mercier & Jackson, 2019).

Conclusion

Being Ngāti Tiipa is a storied construction retold, passed on, and lived in collective and individual narratives of identity and connected across time through whakapapa. This whakapapa relies on narratives to articulate a nuanced, and yet a cohesive and common, tribal identity. Without these kōrero tuku iho, reasserted in individual and collective retellings, whakapapa are merely names on tables and charts (Mahuika, 2012; O’Regan, 1987, p. 142). Each generation stories their own identities, and in Ngāti Tiipa one of the powerful life narrative compositions recounted in the interviews undertaken in this project was survivance. The interviews examined here reveal that survivance narratives of identity resist colonial erasure by centring whānau and iwi stories of persistence, whether through ongoing connections to land and
waterways or the continuity of naming and other customs and rituals over time. Passing on names, as the interviewees attested, was part of an inherited legacy that reasserted Ngāti Tiipa tūpuna and their histories in the very lives of contemporary living descendants—literally a survivance strategy for tribal knowledge and identities passed on. These served as powerful statements of inherited intergenerational identity, connection, perseverance and self-determination. Survivance narratives like these, then, are not the sum totals of Ngāti Tiipa oral histories. Rather, they are expressions of ongoing mana and autonomy and of familial and tribal identities that assert “we” survived and are still here.
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Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aukati</td>
<td>a boundary across which unauthorised movement is prohibited.</td>
<td>mana whenua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hapū</td>
<td>local people of the marae; home people</td>
<td>marae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haukāinga</td>
<td>traditional eel traps/baskets</td>
<td>mara kai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hīnaki</td>
<td>meetings</td>
<td>mātauranga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iwī</td>
<td>tribe</td>
<td>mauanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kahawai</td>
<td>Arripis trutta—an edible greenish-blue to silvery-white fish</td>
<td>maunga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kai</td>
<td>food</td>
<td>mauri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaitiaki</td>
<td>spiritual guardian</td>
<td>moana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kānga wai</td>
<td>practice of fermenting corn by leaving tightly tied sacks of corn or maize cobs in a stream of flowing freshwater</td>
<td>pārei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karanga</td>
<td>ceremonial call of welcome to visitors onto a marae</td>
<td>papakāinga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaumātua</td>
<td>elder</td>
<td>pātai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingitanga</td>
<td>King Movement, developed in the 1830s to stop the loss of land to Pākehā</td>
<td>pëpi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kōhanga reo</td>
<td>Māori-language preschool</td>
<td>puna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kōiwi</td>
<td>human bones</td>
<td>pūrākau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kōrero</td>
<td>talk, discussion; narrative</td>
<td>stories that preserve ancestral knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kōrero tuku iho</td>
<td>inherited oral traditions</td>
<td>rākau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koro</td>
<td>grandfather</td>
<td>tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>korohēke</td>
<td>male elder</td>
<td>rangatira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kōwhatu</td>
<td>stone, rock</td>
<td>mana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuia</td>
<td>grandmother</td>
<td>mana whenua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kūpapa</td>
<td>neutral; collaborator (as used by the Crown)</td>
<td>mana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mahi</td>
<td>paid or unpaid work/labour</td>
<td>mana whenua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māmā</td>
<td>sense of pain or wounding, experienced individually or collectively</td>
<td>mana whenua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātauranga</td>
<td>Māori forms of knowledge, wisdom and understanding, and ways of knowing</td>
<td>mana whenua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mára kai</td>
<td>food cultivations</td>
<td>mana whenua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marae</td>
<td>tribal meeting grounds</td>
<td>mana whenua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātua</td>
<td>chief</td>
<td>mana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mauanga</td>
<td>mountain</td>
<td>mana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mauri</td>
<td>life essence, life force, energy, life principle</td>
<td>mauri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moana</td>
<td>sea, ocean</td>
<td>moana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mokopuna</td>
<td>grandchildren</td>
<td>moana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oriori</td>
<td>song of lament</td>
<td>oriori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>New Zealanders of European descent</td>
<td>Pākehā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>papakāinga</td>
<td>original home base</td>
<td>papakāinga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pātai</td>
<td>questions</td>
<td>pātai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pēpi</td>
<td>baby</td>
<td>pēpi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puna</td>
<td>spring</td>
<td>puna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pūrākau</td>
<td>stories that preserve ancestral knowledge</td>
<td>pūrākau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rākau</td>
<td>tree</td>
<td>rākau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rangatira</td>
<td>chief</td>
<td>rangatira</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
raupatu confiscation (of land)
rūnanga tribal council
rūruhi female elder
tāne men
tangihanga funeral rites
taniwha water spirit, monster, dangerous water creature
taonga precious, an heirloom to be passed down through the different generations of a family; protected natural resource
tangihanga funeral rites
tangiwha water spirit, monster, dangerous water creature
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