

## **Maori, Pakeha and Kiwi: Peoples, cultures and sequence in New Zealand archaeology**

**Ian Smith**

Anthropology Department, University of Otago, New Zealand  
ian.smith@stonebow.otago.ac.nz

### **Introduction**

Archaeologists have generally constructed culture-history sequences within either a prehistoric or a historic time frame. As Lightfoot (1995) noted, this has constrained examination of the interface between these two periods. What is argued here is that this has also limited archaeology's contributions to understanding the modern world. Cultural interfaces and their dynamics dominate the 21st century world, yet archaeology generally deals only distantly, if at all, with the key elements of this. For example, the people typically identified as 'Polynesian' in modern New Zealand are not the descendants of the 'Polynesian settlement' of the country studied by archaeologists. The former are predominantly Samoan, Cook Island, Tongan and Niuean immigrants of the second half of the 20th century and their New Zealand-born offspring, while the latter concerns the arrival some 700 years earlier of ancestors of the indigenous Maori population. Although these groups have ancestral connections in biology, language and culture, they have quite different recent histories and distinctive identities in the modern world. Archaeology has played a significant role in documenting what these groups share, but it has contributed little to understanding the emergence of their distinctiveness.

This is not to say that archaeological study of New Zealand's past has not made important contributions to the ways in which the world today is understood. The long history of research into human interactions with fauna (e.g. Anderson 1989, 2002; Smith 2005; Leach 2006) and flora (McGlone 1989; McGlone and Wilmshurst 1999) have made New Zealand one of the foremost examples of the impact of human colonisation on island environments (Diamond 2000; Grayson 2001). Yet even here, the focus has been temporally constrained, with nearly all of the attention placed on the environmental impacts of prehistoric colonisation. In only a handful of cases has archaeological attention been extended to encompass the environmental consequences of more recent colonisation (Diamond 1984; Smith 2005). The comparative

perspective this enables has enhanced understanding of not only the specific cases under investigation, but also more general patterns of exploitation, response and outcomes.

This paper is a first attempt to construct an archaeological culture-history sequence that encompasses the whole of New Zealand's archaeological record. For the first two-thirds of this (c. 500 years), it draws on almost a century and a half of archaeological research into pre-European occupation. Archaeologically based sequences have been proposed since the 1870s (von Haast 1872; Duff 1956; Golson 1959; Green 1963; Davidson 1984). Although population replacement was initially posited as a driver of change, adaptation and innovation within a single cultural tradition has been preferred since 1959. Golson's terminology has been most persistent, although exactly what his Archaic and Classic terms mean in the light of recent chronometric shortening of New Zealand's human time scale (Anderson 1991a; McFadgen *et al.* 1994; Higham and Hogg 1997) has yet to be properly considered. Archaeology of the post-1769 era has been recorded since the 1920s, and especially during the past two decades (Smith 1991, 2004a). I am not aware of any archaeologically based sequences or models of change proposed for this era.

The approach offered here uses as its main driver three key phases of immigration: the initial Polynesian settlement; first European settlement; and subsequent multicultural immigration. Each brought new people, cultural forms and economic modes. They were also characterised by rapid adaptation to the New Zealand setting, making it appropriate to use indigenous terms adopted by or applied to the incomers as period names. **Maori**, derived from 'tangata maori' (ordinary people), was adopted by descendants of the initial settlers to distinguish themselves from the second wave of immigrants (Salmond 1997:21–22, 279). Of the various names Maori applied to these incomers, the most persistent was **Pakeha**, probably from 'pakepakeha' (pale-skinned people), and it soon became widely used (*ibid.*). Although often extended to cover all non-Maori New Zealanders, its use here is restricted to those of European descent. Images of **Kiwi**, birds of the genus *Apteryx*, developed as a national emblem during the second half of the 19th century, and from the early 20th century, the name was adopted as a generic term for all New Zealanders (Phillips 2007). Its use as a period name here is extended back to the beginnings of the multicultural immigration phase. The implications of this approach for understanding the relationships of New Zealand's diverse peoples and cultures, and the nature of change throughout the archaeological sequence are considered below, after the main characteristics of each period are outlined.

## Maori period

New Zealand was settled, near synchronously with other islands in southern Polynesia, about 1250–1300 AD (Anderson 2000; Higham and Jones 2004). Claims of earlier transient visits (Holdaway 1996; Holdaway *et al.* 2002) have not been corroborated (Anderson and Higham 2004; Wilmshurst and Higham 2004). Indeed, chronometric hygiene has reduced the timescale of human occupancy in New Zealand by about 25 percent, highlighting New Zealand's significance as a case study of human impact on the environment. Little attention has yet been given to the implications of a shortened timescale for understanding New Zealand's material or social culture, and preliminary consideration of this is given here.

The first settlers came from central eastern Polynesia. Archaeology, biology, linguistics and tradition all point towards the zone encompassing the Cook, Society and Marquesas islands as a homeland area (Walter 2004). Close similarities in material culture, economy and settlement pattern throughout this region make it difficult to define one or more specific island homes, but also give us a fairly good idea of the cultural patterns that would have existed there (Walter

*et al.* 2006:275–277). Households were the primary unit of production and labour, located within sedentary villages as the main residential site type. These were situated so as to maximise access to major resource zones for an economy based around inshore fishing, root and tree-crop horticulture, husbandry of pigs, dogs and chickens, along with forest hunting and gathering. Smaller specialised sites indicate that the village communities integrated these activities through logistic mobility over relatively widespread territories. Key elements of the material-culture assemblage include adzes with quadrangular, triangular and trapezoidal sections, and sometimes a tanged lashing grip; shell fishing gear, dominated by trolling lures and one-piece bait hooks; and a range of ornament forms, including reels and whale-tooth pendants (Walter 1996).

Artefacts closely matching these patterns are found in early New Zealand sites, while some distinctly different forms were observed by the first European visitors (Davidson 1984:61). These, and other contrasts, have encouraged a polarised view of the Maori period, emphasising early hunting of now extinct moa and other ‘big game’, and later building of fortified pa, and formalised in material-culture terms by Golson’s (1959) definition of Archaic and Classic phases. Although problems with this approach have been long recognised (Groube 1967; Davidson 1984:223; Furey 2004), the simple bipartite division has persisted.

The chronometric hygiene revolution has brought these problems into sharper relief, relegating to an ‘undated’ status many sites once considered to have been securely placed within the sequence. Only four of the sites Golson used to define the Archaic material-culture assemblage now have admissible dates, and his Classic phase was, from the outset, based on stratigraphically insecure collections and early European observations (Furey 2004). Most attempts to define more finely grained sequences of change within specific artefact classes (e.g. Crosby 1966; Hjarne 1967; Simmons 1973; Jacomb 1995) are equally lacking a secure chronological foundation. Nor can this problem be overcome by reliance on proxy indicators of age, as their evidential basis has also been undermined. A prime example is the use of evidence for hunting moa as an indicator of age. When Anderson (1989) reviewed data from more than 300 moa-hunting sites, some 73 were considered to have reliable radiocarbon ages, but application of rigorous criteria for acceptability culled this to just 15 (Schmidt 2000). While this does not overturn more than a century and a half of stratigraphic observations that moa remains are most commonly found in the earlier layers of multi-strata sites, it severely limits certainty about the time span of this activity and the usefulness of archaeological evidence of it for chronological placement of otherwise undated deposits.

Where sites have been sufficiently well dated to indicate a relatively short occupation span, and have had large artefact assemblages examined in detail, they have demonstrated the contemporaneity of some artefact forms once thought to be chronologically distinctive (Anderson *et al.* 1996; Furey 1996, 2002). This makes it difficult to view either the Archaic or Classic as discrete, monolithic assemblages, or to retain the common practice of using these terms to define chronological phases within the Maori period. There is now more than ever a critical need to reassess the nature and timing of cultural changes during the Maori period. Detailed assessment of this is beyond the scope of the present paper, but some initial propositions are offered towards this end.

It is clear that some aspects of tropical East Polynesian cultural systems were transformed rapidly on arrival in New Zealand. The most obvious example is the horticultural component of the economy, with only six of the tropical root and tree crops viable, their growth restricted to limited parts of the country, and new storage methods required (Furey 2006). New opportunities were also apparent, with much larger and more abundant resources available for hunting than was the case in the East Polynesian homeland. However, the inference that ‘big

game' hunting dominated early Maori economic activity cannot be sustained. There has been only one analysis undertaken of the relative contributions to prehistoric diets from all classes of fauna in a substantial nationwide sample of sites (Smith 2004b). This showed that marine animals were the most important sources of meat throughout the Maori period, even in areas where moa were hunted, with fish predominant in the north and marine mammals in central and southern regions. Nor was 'big game' hunting confined to the initial phase of settlement. Although seals had disappeared from the North Island by c. 1500 AD, they continued to be hunted in parts of the South Island until the end of the Maori period (Smith 2005). As already noted, it is difficult to define the period of moa hunting, and any regional variations in it. Transformations in material culture are also likely to have varied in pace, with the differing qualities of local materials influencing the rate of change from ancestral East Polynesian forms, and innovations arising sporadically. Detailed analysis of assemblages with radiocarbon dates that survive modern chronometric scrutiny will be required to document this and determine which, if any, artefact forms co-varied through time.

One aspect of change which has withstood the scrutiny of chronometric hygiene is the emergence of fortified pa about 1500 AD (Schmidt 1996). There have been widely varying interpretations of what this might reflect about changing social, settlement and subsistence patterns (Phillips and Campbell 2004). The interpretation preferred here is that pa are primarily defended versions of the residential villages, satellite camps and storage facilities that occurred in earlier times (Walter *et al.* 2006), and thus represent continuity, as much as change.

Most writers on the archaeology of the Maori period have drawn it to a close with the arrival of Cook in 1769. While this marks the first European footfall on New Zealand soil, and the major point of entry for Maori into the historical record (Salmond 1991, 1997), it is questionable how much impact it had on the archaeological record. Initial contact was confined in geographic extent, limited in duration, and followed by departure. A restricted range of items, such as iron nails, axes, beads and glass, may have been added in small numbers to the material inventory, but the only examples that can be securely provenanced to Cook's voyages are several medals distributed during his voyages (Jones 1984; Trotter and McCulloch 1989:97). Furthermore, archaeological investigations at initial-contact-phase sites have highlighted the continuity of Maori activities. Groube's (1965, 1966) attempt to uncover archaeologically what had been recorded by French explorers in 1772 showed this to have been substantially altered by subsequent Maori occupation. Likewise, recent investigation of gardens at Anaura Bay observed by Cook in 1769 disclosed a history of use beginning well before that time and continuing long after (Horrocks *et al.* In press). While 1769 might justifiably be considered to mark the onset of a protohistoric phase at the end of the Maori period, the near invisibility of this fleeting ethnohistoric moment in the archaeological record and the absence of any non-Maori settlers on New Zealand shores during the following two decades suggests it is of limited use in defining the beginning of a major new period in the long-term culture-history sequence.

### **Pakeha period**

The Pakeha period began when the first Europeans were left behind by their ship on New Zealand shores in 1792. From this time forward, metal, glass and ceramic artefacts became increasingly common in the archaeological record. Also apparent were new forms of housing, typically with chimneys, and a new range of economic pursuits, many geared to markets beyond New Zealand's shores. The immigrant population grew very slowly, numbering only about 2000 people in 1839 (Adams 1977:28), or about 2.5 percent of the total, before the start of more rapid growth which saw the Maori population outnumbered by the end of the 1850s (Pool

1991:61). Immigrant activity is discussed here in four loosely defined phases, based on the initial occurrence of settlement patterns that appear to have distinctive archaeological characteristics and regional distributions. Consideration is also given to Maori sites of this period, and in particular, the cultural and economic changes they reflect. Importantly, there are also sites that cannot easily be characterised as either Maori or European.

In the first two decades of the Pakeha period, immigrants were sojourners, who spent short periods in residence on New Zealand shores before departing. The first were a gang of 11 men who lived at Luncheon Cove, Dusky Sound, for 11 months in 1792–93, hunting fur seals and building at least two houses and a 60-ton schooner. Archaeological traces of the settlement include remains of a forge, slag and ironwork from shipbuilding, and a few ceramic and glass fragments (Smith and Gillies 1997). A second, larger group occupied nearby Facile Harbour in 1795–1797, leaving a broader array of artefacts and the cobblestone floor and chimney of a house (Smith and Gillies 1998). In each case, the archaeological record was depleted by the acidic soils and high rainfall of the Fiordland coast, limiting what can be inferred about the nature of subsistence and other cultural patterns.

The most important category of sojourner sites are those associated with the commercial sealing industry, which flourished along the western and southern shores of the South Island and Stewart Island. Analysis of both archaeological and historical evidence of the commercial sealing industry has identified a small number of hut and cave sites used by sealing gangs either during the initial boom of 1803–1812 or in the following two decades (Smith 2002). Few of these have been excavated. Among those that have are three caves at Southport, Chalky Inlet, investigated by Coutts (1972), who interpreted European artefacts in their upper layers as evidence of contact between Maori occupants of the caves and European seamen. However, subsequently discovered historical evidence shows at least one of these caves was lived in by sealing gangs in the 1820s (Smith 2002:41), illustrating how difficult it is to distinguish the archaeological signature of European sojourners subsisting on local resources from that of contemporary Maori. Changes in southern South Island Maori subsistence and settlement patterns began to emerge after the introduction of European potatoes by sealers in 1808–09 (Anderson 1998:72–75).

Another important area of early European contact was in the northern North Island, where harbours were scouted for flax and timber during the early 1790s. Pelagic whaling ships operated offshore, and by 1802, were calling regularly at the Bay of Islands for food, water and fuel (Salmond 1997:321–325). Some sojourners are known to have lived ashore with Maori (Orchiston 1972), but there are no sites that can be associated with such settlements. Potatoes and pigs were introduced during this period and rapidly developed by Maori as trade products (Middleton 2007a). Potatoes were also incorporated into traditional horticultural production and spread rapidly throughout the North Island, well beyond direct European contact. Phillips' (2000) analysis of sites on the Waihou River suggests that despite rapid adoption of potatoes by Hauraki Maori, there was only limited incorporation of European material culture before 1820.

The second phase of the Pakeha period was inaugurated with the establishment of a permanent residential settlement by missionaries at Oihi, Bay of Islands, in 1814 (Middleton 2003). Archaeological investigation of its successor at Te Puna (Middleton 2005, 2008) shows the early New Zealand missions were small household-based enterprises that endeavoured to draw local populations towards Christianity through education in domestic, agricultural and industrial arts. At Kororareka, on the opposite side of the Bay of Islands, a permanent settlement had developed by 1827 (Earle 1966). It appears to have originated as a Maori village established to service visiting whaling ships, into which European mariners and traders settled.



Archaeological investigations have assisted in charting its transformation over two decades from a predominantly Maori settlement to a largely European one (Best 2002).

A residential settlement that cannot be classified easily as either Maori or European was established in 1825 at Sealers Bay, Codfish Island, in the far south. This was a small village occupied by a community of European men, mostly absconders from sealing gangs, Maori women, and their mixed-race children (Middleton 2007b). Excavation has disclosed remains of simple European-style housing, food remains that are mostly indigenous, and both an artefact assemblage and cooking-related features that reflect elements of each cultural tradition (Smith and Anderson 2007).

Expansion of residential settlement was slow, and confined almost entirely to the far north and far south of the country until the end of the 1820s. One consequence of this was geographical variation in Maori access to imported material culture, observed most dramatically in relation to muskets, first acquired by some northern iwi from about 1806 (Ballara 2003:183). Their incorporation into traditional warfare increased its lethality, and with greater access to them, northern tribes conducted devastating raids that precipitated temporary abandonment of some regions to the south. In archaeological terms, the most significant consequence was the adaptation of traditional Maori defensive structures to accommodate the new threat (Jones 1994:83–94).

Maori demand for trade goods and the quest by Sydney merchants for new resources to exploit stimulated the third phase of Pakeha settlement, which saw rapid dispersal of permanent settlement along the coast. This began with the harvesting of flax and timber in the Hokianga in 1826, and in the next five years isolated shore trading stations were established around the North Island, focused initially on procurement of flax (Stokes 2002). Missionary settlement also expanded around the North Island, but the most important driver of expanding settlement was the shore whaling industry. This began in 1829, and during the 1830s and 1840s, at least 72 shore whaling stations were established, nearly all along the east coast between Foveaux Strait in the south and Cape Runaway in the north. Of all these activities, it is shore whaling that has attracted most archaeological attention (Campbell 1994; Prickett 1998, 2002a). A key feature of the archaeological record is its diversity. At Oashore, on Banks Peninsula, housing, artefacts and fauna are almost exclusively European in character, while at Te Hoe on Mahia Peninsula, they exhibit distinctive Maori features (Smith and Prickett 2006, 2008). When contextualised with the historical record, however, both sites highlight the cultural, social and economic entanglement of Maori and a diverse range of immigrants within the communities that formed around whaling stations. They also illustrate adaptations in the technology of whaling and economy and settlement patterns as shore whaling declined in importance (Smith and Prickett *nd*).

There are a small number of excavated Maori sites with confirmed occupation during the 1830s. Puriri and Opita, on the Waihou River (Phillips 2000), and Papahinu, adjacent to Manukau Harbour (Foster and Sewell 1995), were reoccupied at this time, after being abandoned during warfare in the 1820s. They each exhibit fundamentally traditional cultural patterns into which imported material culture was incorporated very slowly. In parts of Northland and the East Coast of the North Island, Maori cultivation of maize expanded rapidly in the 1830s, predominantly as a trade crop (Hargreaves 1963:108; Petrie 2006). Although not precisely dated, archaeological correlates of this may include the ditch and bank fences and ploughed fields visible on the coastal flats at Nukutaurua, Mahia Peninsula (Jones 1994:251–255), and the maize pollen from cores at Anaura Bay (Horrocks *et al.* *In press*).

The final phase of the Pakeha period began in 1840 with the establishment of formal towns in Auckland, Wellington, Wanganui and Akaroa, soon followed by New Plymouth

(1841), Nelson (1842), Dunedin (1848), Christchurch (1850) and Napier (1851). Continuous occupation since first settlement often makes it difficult to identify archaeological traces of the first decade or two within urban settings. These have been identified most successfully in Auckland (Macready 1991), but are represented in as yet poorly reported excavations elsewhere. The year 1840 also marks the beginning of British colonial governance of New Zealand, and archaeological investigations have been undertaken at the first seat of government, at Okiato (Robinson 1995), and at the first parliament buildings in Auckland (Smith and Goodwyn 1990). Expanding colonial settlement and changing economic and political circumstances gave rise to sporadic conflict between the new government and some Maori. Archaeologically, this is reflected in the appearance of new styles of fortifications constructed by both Maori and European (Challis 1990; Smith 1989).

The 1840s and 1850s were a time of transition during which the principal settlement localities and economic pursuits that had sustained the Maori, European and mixed-race communities throughout the Pakeha period were marginalised by the burgeoning newly immigrant population and changes in economic focus. Pastoral farming, which had begun in the 1830s, expanded steadily through the Wairarapa, Hawkes Bay, Marlborough, Canterbury and Otago. Matanaka, in coastal Otago, is one of very few farmsteads established in this era to have been investigated by archaeological techniques (Knight and Coutts 1975). These decades were also the peak years of production for Maori agriculture, particularly the cultivation and milling of wheat, and for Maori engagement in the coastal trade that brought food and other products into the growing colonial towns (Petrie 2006). The changes this may have induced in settlement patterns have yet to be explored archaeologically. There are very few excavated Maori sites that can be confidently attributed to the 1840s or 1850s. The phase III occupation at Opita is one, and it shows a significantly greater presence of European artefacts than earlier Pakeha-period sites along the Waihou river (Phillips 2000).

### **Kiwi period**

The year 1860 is used to define the beginning of the Kiwi period. It marks the first time since its arrival some 600 years earlier that the Maori population was outnumbered. In part, this reflects the steady decline in Maori numbers through the 19th century (Pool 1991), but the growth in immigrant numbers was a more important factor. This had become so rapid that the 1860s and 1870s was the only time since the late 13th century that people born overseas outnumbered those born in New Zealand (McKinnon 1997). The new immigrants were ethnically diverse. This was also true of the Pakeha period, although lack of data makes it impossible to document this, other than anecdotally, but the small, isolated, often pluralistic communities that dominated this era diminished its importance. The English made up probably just under half the new immigrants, followed by the Scottish, Irish and Australians, with Germans, Scandinavians, Chinese, Welsh and Americans making up much smaller groupings (Belich 1996:318).

The year 1860 also represents a major transition in ethnic politics, with rising immigrant demands for land and heightening Maori resistance to its loss giving rise to the first of a series of wars between various iwi and changing combinations of British, colonial and Maori forces. This stimulated two decades of fortification building throughout central regions of the North Island (Prickett 2002b), and led to massive alienation of land that displaced many Maori communities and disrupted their economic activities. Te Oropuriri, a small Taranaki village that spans the onset of the Kiwi period, shows that Maori housing retained much of its traditional character, but the material-culture inventory was dominated by ceramics, glassware and other European-made items (Holdaway and Gibbs 2006). There are very few excavated Maori sites from the

1860–1900 period, but where evidence is available, such as in the phase IV occupation at Opita (Phillips 2000) and at the Poutu and Te Rata settlements in the interior of the North Island (Newman 1988), imported artefacts are overwhelmingly dominant, suggesting widespread adoption of new cultural forms.

Of the new immigrant groups, only the Chinese have been subject to explicit archaeological scrutiny, which has shown they made a distinctive mark in the record following their arrival in 1865 (Ritchie 2003). Ceramics, food containers, opium-smoking paraphernalia and food preparation methods all provide clear indications of Chinese presence. While this reflects a distinct element of conservatism, adaptation to their new homeland is also evident in the adoption of locally available foods, beverages and building materials. Although no attempt has yet been made to explore this, it is expected other immigrant communities will be identified not so much through a distinct material signal, but through the integration of their oral and documentary histories with the archaeological record. It has been argued elsewhere that this approach to the analysis of community identity is one of the key challenges facing historical archaeology in New Zealand today (Smith 2004a).

At a more general level, there are several features of the artefactual record that characterise the period after 1860. Glass bottles appear in a wider range of types, but within each, they are more standardised in form. Nearly all embossing on bottles, other than some forms of base marks, date from after this time (Baughner-Perlin 1982). Ceramics include new decorative forms such as Japanese-themed central motifs (Samford 1997) and stand-alone banded rims (Brooks 2005:36). Further analysis will refine and expand this list.

The archaeological record of the first four decades of the Kiwi period is characterised by expansion in the geographic range of non-Māori settlement, the emergence of new economic pursuits, and the growth of urbanised settlements. It was the discovery of gold by Australian-born immigrant Gabriel Read in 1861 that sparked the first of a series of gold rushes that heightened the pace of immigration and transformed New Zealand's mid-19th century economy. This industry was almost certainly the largest single contributor to the making of New Zealand's archaeological landscape in terms of the acreage of land covered by sites (Ritchie 1991). It brought settlement to parts of the interior that had previously seen little other than transient Māori occupation, and left an archaeological record of fleeting camp sites (e.g. Bristow 1995) and permanent towns (e.g. Hamel 2004a). The wealth it generated, both directly and through mercantile support, transformed a number of towns into substantial cities. Excavations have shown that rebuilding of downtown areas variously destroyed and preserved older Pakeha-period parts of some cities (Petchey 2004), while those in foreshore reclamations have yielded substantial early Kiwi-period deposits (Bickler *et al.* 2004). Pastoral farming was another significant contributor to the emerging Kiwi economy. Initially, wool was its chief product and sheep numbers grew rapidly until the late 1860s, but its major growth took place after the development of refrigerated sea transport in the 1880s enabled large-scale meat production. Early development of the meat industry has been investigated archaeologically at Totara estate (Hamel 2004b), as has the changing importance of various farmed animals in 19th century diets and food supply networks (Watson 2000). Other large-scale industries, such as coal and coke production (Oliver and Wood 1981), emerged during this time, as did the road and rail infrastructure (Jacomb 2000) that for the first time in New Zealand's history reduced reliance on maritime communication and transport.

The foregoing discussion has been confined to the initial decades of the Kiwi period. To date, there has been only limited archaeological investigation of the transformations in economy, settlement pattern and material culture that occurred during the 20th century, but it is expected



these will come under increasing scrutiny as the 21st century world impacts on the material remains of the 20th century.

## Discussion

Maori, Pakeha and Kiwi are names used to refer to both groups of people and aspects of culture in New Zealand, and it is pertinent to set out what is intended by adopting them as period names in the sequence proposed here, and the relationships between these uses of the terms. They were employed as period names to emphasise that the advent of new peoples and their adaptation to this country were significant drivers of cultural change. As the foregoing review has illustrated, new forms of material culture, settlement pattern and economy emerged with each new phase of immigration, and these are recognisable through the archaeological record. In part, these new forms reflect the origins of the immigrants, in Polynesia, Europe or elsewhere. Artefact forms, styles of housing and modes of subsistence were transplanted from these homelands to New Zealand. However, the archaeological record shows that adaptation to the local setting was also an important contributor to change. For the first settlers, it was primarily differences in climate and resources that drove the process. For those that followed, adaptations also had to be made to the social and political world created by earlier arrivals. As indigenous names for successive waves of people, the terms Maori, Pakeha and Kiwi combine these concepts of advent and adaptation.

They are also intended to emphasise both the persistence and entanglement of peoples and cultures in the full sweep of New Zealand's history. It is obvious the people who became Maori and their culture were the only ones present in New Zealand during the Maori period. Their descendants and culture persist to this day, although transformed in many ways by biological and cultural entanglement with subsequent immigrants. As Anderson (1991b) has demonstrated, biological entanglement was rapid, and the resulting mixed-race communities followed diverse social and cultural trajectories. Archaeological evidence from the Pakeha and Kiwi periods provides a partial material record of such communities and has great potential to enhance understanding of both the persistence of traditional practices and the transformations through hybridisation that have shaped modern Maori culture.

Pakeha people and culture were defined, from the outset, by their entanglement with Maori. The small size and tenuous nature of their founding communities, coupled with the economic, political and numerical strength of Maori, encouraged interdependence, cooperation and intermarriage. Archaeology has begun to identify material evidence for the incorporation of Maori practices into early Pakeha culture. Like Maori, early Pakeha communities were transformed by the influx of immigrants in the 1860s. In their case, however, the majority of incomers were from a similar cultural tradition. This encouraged persistence of the term Pakeha despite a significant dilution of the early Maori influence. Nonetheless, fundamental aspects of Maori-Pakeha relations established during the Pakeha period have persisted or re-emerged as significant drivers of modern political, economic and cultural patterns in New Zealand.

Whereas Maori and Pakeha tend to be used as exclusive terms, Kiwi is inherently inclusive. When used to describe people, it refers to all those, including Maori, Pakeha, subsequent migrants and their diverse range of mixed-race offspring, who call New Zealand home. In a cultural sense, it includes the contributions of all resident communities. Modern Kiwi culture weaves together a plurality of strands. The dominant Pakeha strand, although originally derived largely from British and North American traditions, has a distinctive local flavour that distinguishes it from neighbouring Australia. Modern Maori culture retains ancestral elements from Polynesia shaped by seven centuries of adaptation, innovation, and borrowing from and hybridisation with subsequent immigrant cultures. In turn, it has influenced, but contrasts with, the hybrid Pasifika

culture of the modern Polynesian migrants to New Zealand. Likewise, the descendants of late 19th and early 20th century immigrants from China have cultural patterns distinct from those of recent Chinese migrants. These, and many other examples that could be cited, demonstrate that each of strand of Kiwi culture has its own history. Archaeology has a significant role to play in charting these histories and discerning the processes that have shaped them. The long-term culture-history sequence proposed here provides a structure within which to achieve this.

## Acknowledgments

The idea for this paper emerged while working with Atholl on the archaeology of Codfish Island/Whenua Hou, the southern New Zealand homeland of his Maori and Pakeha ancestors. Those investigations were funded by the Department of Conservation and the University of Otago. The paper also reflects a sustained period of research into the emergence of Pakeha culture supported by the Marsden Fund of the Royal Society of New Zealand. I am grateful for comments on the paper by Angela Middleton and an anonymous referee, and to Atholl for three decades of stimulating fieldwork, discussion and digression.

## References

- Adams, P. 1977. *Fatal Necessity: British Intervention in New Zealand, 1830–1847*. Auckland: Auckland University Press/Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, A.J. 1989. *Prodigious Bird: Moas and Moa-hunting in Prehistoric New Zealand*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Anderson, A.J. 1991a. The chronology of colonisation in New Zealand. *Antiquity* 65:767–795.
- Anderson, A.J. 1991b. *Race Against Time: The early Maori-Pakeha families and the development of the mixed-race population in southern New Zealand*. Dunedin, Hocken Library, University of Otago.
- Anderson, A.J. 1998. *The Welcome of Strangers: an Ethnohistory of Southern Maori AD 1650–1850*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Anderson, A.J. 2000. The advent chronology of south Polynesia. In P. Wallin and H. Martinsson-Wallin (eds), *Essays in Honour of Arne Skjolsvold*, pp. 73–82. The Kon Tiki Museum Occasional Papers 5.
- Anderson, A.J. 2002. A fragile plenty: Pre-European Maori and the New Zealand environment. In E. Pawson and T. Brooking (eds), *Environmental Histories of New Zealand*, pp. 19–34. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, A.J., B.J. Allingham and I.W.G. Smith (eds) 1996. *Shag River Mouth: the Archaeology of an Early Southern Maori Village*. Research Papers in Archaeology and Natural History 27. Canberra: ANH Publications, RSPAS, The Australian National University.
- Anderson, A.J. and T.F.G. Higham 2004. The age of rat introduction in New Zealand: Further evidence from Earthquakes #1, North Otago. *New Zealand Journal of Archaeology* 24:135–147.
- Ballara, A. 2003. *Taua: 'Musket Wars', 'Land Wars' or 'Tikanga'? Warfare in Maori Society in the Early Nineteenth Century*. Auckland: Penguin Books.
- Baughner-Perlin 1982. Analyzing glass bottles for chronology, function and trade networks. In R.S. Dickens (ed), *Archaeology of Urban America: The Search for Pattern and Process*, pp 259–290. New York: Academic Press.
- Belich, J. 1996. *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders from Polynesian Settlement to the end of the Nineteenth Century*. Auckland: Penguin.

- Best, S.B. 2002. *Guns and Gods: The History and Archaeology of Rewa's Pa, Kororareka*. Whangarei: Department of Conservation.
- Bickler, S., B. Bacquie and R. Clough 2004. Excavations at Britomart, Auckland. *Archaeology in New Zealand* 47(2):136–152.
- Bristow, P. 1995. Excavation of a miner's hut (S143/226) in the Old Man Range. *Archaeology in New Zealand* 38:37–47.
- Brooks, A. 2005. *An Archaeological Guide to British Ceramics in Australia, 1788–1901*. Melbourne: Australian Society for Historical Archaeology and La Trobe University Archaeology Program.
- Campbell, M. 1994. Excavation of Weller's Rock tryworks, Otakou whaling station, Otago Harbour, New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Archaeology* 16:33–53.
- Challis, A. 1990. The location of Heke's Pa, Te Kahika, Okaihau, New Zealand: A field analysis. *New Zealand Journal of Archaeology* 12:5–27.
- Coutts, P.J.F. 1972. The emergence of the Foveaux Straits Maori from prehistory. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Anthropology, University of Otago.
- Crosby, E.B.V. 1966 Maori Fishing Gear. A study of the development of Maori fishing gear, particularly in the North Island. Unpublished MA thesis, Anthropology, University of Auckland.
- Davidson, J.M. 1984. *The Prehistory of New Zealand*. Auckland: Longman Paul.
- Diamond, J. 1984. Historic extinctions: a Rosetta stone for understanding prehistoric extinctions. In P.S. Martin and R.G. Klein (eds), *Quaternary Extinctions: A Prehistoric Revolution*, pp. 824–826. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Diamond, J. 2000. Enhanced: Blitzkrieg against the moas. *Science* 287:2170–2171.
- Duff, R.S. 1956 *The Moa-Hunter Period of Maori Culture*. 2nd edition. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Earle, A. 1966. *Narrative of a Residence in New Zealand*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Foster, R. and B. Sewell 1995. *Papahinu: The Archaeology of an Early 19th Century Maori Settlement on the Bank of the Pukaki Creek, Manukau City*. Auckland: Department of Conservation.
- Furey, L. 1996. *Oruarangi. The Archaeology and Material Culture of a Hauraki Pa*. Auckland Institute and Museum Bulletin 17.
- Furey, L. 2002. *Hohoura. A Fourteenth Century Maori Village in Northland*. Auckland Museum Bulletin 19.
- Furey, L. 2004. Material culture. In L. Furey and S. Holdaway (eds), *Change Through Time: 50 Years of New Zealand Archaeology*, pp. 29–54. New Zealand Archaeological Association Monograph 26.
- Furey, L. 2006. *Maori Gardening: An Archaeological Perspective*. Wellington: Department of Conservation.
- Golson, J. 1959. Culture change in prehistoric New Zealand. In J.D. Freeman and W.R. Geddes (eds), *Anthropology in the South Seas: Essays Presented to H. D. Skinner*, pp. 29–74. New Plymouth: Thomas Avery and Sons.
- Grayson, D.K. 2001. The archaeological record of human impacts on animal populations. *Journal of World Prehistory* 15:1–68.
- Green, R.C. 1963. *A Review of the Prehistoric Sequence in the Auckland Province*. Auckland Archaeological Society Publication 1 and New Zealand Archaeological Association Monograph 2. Auckland: University Bindery Press.
- Groube, L.M. 1965. Excavations on Paeroa Village, Bay of Islands. *Historic Places Trust Newsletter* 9.
- Groube, L.M. 1966. Rescue excavations in the Bay of Islands. *New Zealand Archaeological Association Newsletter* 9(3):108–114.
- Groube, L.M. 1967. Models in prehistory: A consideration of the New Zealand evidence. *Archaeology and Physical Anthropology in Oceania* 2:1–27.
- Hamel, J. 2004a. Potable water and sanitation in early Queenstown, New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Archaeology* 24:107–133.
- Hamel, J. 2004b. *The Pig Pens at Totara*. Unpublished report to the NZ Historic Places Trust.

- Hargreaves, R.P. 1963. Changing Maori agriculture in pre-Waitangi New Zealand. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 72(2):101–117.
- Higham, T.F.G. and A.G. Hogg 1997. Evidence for late Polynesian colonization of New Zealand: University of Waikato radiocarbon measurements. *Radiocarbon* 39(2):149–192.
- Higham, T.F.G. and M. Jones 2004. Chronology and Settlement. In L. Furey and S. Holdaway (eds), *Change Through Time: 50 Years of New Zealand Archaeology*, pp. 215–234. New Zealand Archaeological Association Monograph 26.
- Hjarno, J. 1967. Maori fish-hooks in southern New Zealand. *Records of the Otago Museum, Anthropology* 3.
- Holdaway R.N. 1996. Arrival of rats in New Zealand. *Nature* 384:225–226.
- Holdaway, R.N., R.G. Roberts, N.R. Beavan-Athfield, J.M. Olley and T.H. Worthy 2002. Optical dating of quartz sediments and accelerator mass spectrometry <sup>14</sup>C dating of bone gelatin and moa eggshell: a comparison of age estimates for non-archaeological deposits in New Zealand. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 32:463–506.
- Holdaway, S. and R. Gibb 2006. *SH3 Stage Three Bell Block Archaeological Excavations at Te Oropuriri: Final Report*. Auckland: Auckland UniServices Ltd.
- Horrocks, M., I.W.G. Smith, S.L. Nichol and R. Wallace In press. Sediment, soil and plant microfossil analysis of Maori gardens at Anaura Bay, eastern North Island, New Zealand: comparison with descriptions made in 1769 by Captain Cook's expedition. *Journal of Archaeological Science*.
- Jacomb, C. 1995. Panau, periodisation, and north-east South Island prehistory. Unpublished MA thesis, Anthropology, University of Otago.
- Jacomb, C. 2000. Bullock wagons and settlement patterns in a New Zealand pastoral landscape. *Australasian Historical Archaeology* 18:47–62.
- Jones, K.L. 1984. A 1761 medalet from the East Coast, North Island, New Zealand: relic of Cook's first voyage. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 93(3):315–320.
- Jones, K.L. 1994. *Nga Tohuwhenua Mai Te Rangi: A New Zealand Archaeology in Aerial Photographs*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Knight, H. and P.J.F. Coutts 1975. *Matanaka*. Dunedin: McIndoe.
- Leach, B.F. 2006. *Fishing in Pre-European New Zealand*. New Zealand Journal of Archaeology Special Publication, and Archaeofauna Vol 15.
- Lightfoot, K.G. 1995. Culture contact studies: redefining the relationship between prehistoric and historical archaeology. *American Antiquity* 60(2):199–217.
- Macready, S. 1991. A review of urban historical archaeology in Auckland to 1990. *Australasian Society of Historical Archaeology* 9:14–20.
- McFadgen, B.G., F.B. Knox and T.R.L. Cole 1994. Radiocarbon calibration curve variations and their implications for the interpretation of New Zealand prehistory. *Radiocarbon* 36(2):221–236.
- McGlone, M.S. 1989. The Polynesian settlement of New Zealand in relation to environmental and biotic changes. *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* 12 (Supplement):115–129.
- McGlone, M.S. and J. Wilmshurst 1999. Dating initial Maori environmental impact in New Zealand. *Quaternary International* 59:5–16.
- McKinnon, M. 1997. Colony and colonised: The Pakeha occupation and transformation of New Zealand. In M. McKinnon (ed), *New Zealand Historical Atlas*. Wellington: David Bateman in association with Department of internal Affairs.
- Middleton, A. 2003. Maori and European landscapes at Te Puna, Bay of Islands, New Zealand, 1805–1850. *Archaeology in Oceania* 38:108–122.
- Middleton, A. 2005. Te Puna: The archaeology and history of a New Zealand mission station, 1832–1874. Unpublished PhD thesis, Anthropology, University of Auckland.
- Middleton, A. 2007a. Potatoes and muskets: Maori gardening at Kerikeri. In J. Binney (ed), *Te Kerikeri 1770–1850: The Meeting Pool*, pp. 33–39. Bridget Williams Books:

- Middleton, A. 2007b. *Two Hundred Years on Codfish Island (Whenuahou): From Cultural Encounter to Nature Conservation*. Invercargill: Department of Conservation.
- Middleton, A. 2008. *Te Puna: A New Zealand Mission Station*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Press.
- Newman, M. 1988. *Archaeological Investigations in the Vicinity of Lake Rotoaira and the Lower Tongariro River, 1966–71*. Wellington: New Zealand Historic Places Trust Publication 21.
- Oliver, R. and B. Wood 1981. Excavation at the Brunner coke ovens: January–February 1981. *New Zealand Archaeological Association Newsletter* 24(4):213–227.
- Orchiston, D.W. 1972. George Bruce and the Maoris (1806–8). *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 8:248–254.
- Petchey, P.G. 2004 *Beside the Swamp: The Archaeology of the Farmers Trading Company Site, Dunedin*. Dunedin: Southern Archaeology Ltd.
- Petrie, H. 2006. *Chiefs of Industry: Maori Tribal Enterprise in Early Colonial New Zealand*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Phillips, C. 2000. *Waihou Journeys: The Archaeology of 400 Years of Maori Settlement*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Phillips, C. and M. Campbell 2004. From Settlement Patterns to Interdisciplinary Landscapes in New Zealand. In L. Furey and S. Holdaway (eds), *Change Through Time: 50 Years of New Zealand Archaeology*, pp. 85–104. New Zealand Archaeological Association Monograph 26.
- Phillips, J. 2007. 'Kiwi' *Te Ara – the Encyclopaedia of New Zealand*. viewed 29 October 2007 <<http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/TheBush/NativeBirdsAndBats/Kiwi/en>>
- Pool, I. 1991. *Te Iwi Maori: A New Zealand Population, Past, Present and Projected*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Prickett, N.J. 1998. The New Zealand shore whaling industry. In Lawrence, S. and M. Staniforth (eds), *The Archaeology of Whaling in Southern Australia and New Zealand*, pp. 48–54. Australasian Society for Historical Archaeology and the Australian Institute for Maritime Archaeology Special Publication 10.
- Prickett, N.J. 2002a. *The Archaeology of New Zealand Shore Whaling*. Wellington: Department of Conservation.
- Prickett, N.J. 2002b. *Landscapes of Conflict: A Field Guide to the New Zealand Wars*. Auckland: Random House.
- Ritchie, N.A. 1991. Is there an optimum system?: the recording and assessment of historic mining sites. *The Australian Journal of Historical Archaeology* 9:47–54.
- Ritchie, N.A. 2003. Traces of the past: Archaeological insights into the New Zealand Chinese experience in southern New Zealand. In M. Ip (ed), *Unfolding History, Evolving Identity. The Chinese in New Zealand*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Robinson, J. 1995. Recent excavations at the seat of New Zealand's first Colonial government: a preliminary report. Unpublished report, Department of Conservation, Whangarei.
- Salmond, A. 1991. *Two Worlds: First Meetings Between Maori and Europeans 1642–1772*. Auckland: Viking.
- Salmond, A. 1997. *Between Worlds: Early Exchanges Between Maori and Europeans 1773–1815*. Auckland: Viking.
- Samford, P.M. 1997. Response to a market: Dating English underglaze transfer-printed wares. *Historical Archaeology* 31(2):1–30.
- Schmidt, M.D. 2000. Radiocarbon dating the end of moa-hunting in New Zealand prehistory. *Archaeology in New Zealand* 43(4):314–329
- Schmidt, M.D. 1996. The commencement of pa construction in New Zealand prehistory. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 105:441–460.
- Simmons, D.R. 1973 Suggested periods in South Island prehistory. *Records of the Auckland Institute and Museum* 10:1–58.



- Smith, I.W.G. 1989. Fort Ligar: A colonial redoubt in central Auckland, New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Archaeology*. 11:117–141.
- Smith, I.W.G. 1991. The development of historical archaeology in New Zealand 1921–1990. *Australasian Journal of Historical Archaeology* 9:6–13.
- Smith, I.W.G. 2002. *The New Zealand Sealing Industry: History, Archaeology and Heritage Management*. Wellington: Department of Conservation.
- Smith, I.W.G. 2004a. Archaeologies of identity: Historical archaeology for the 21st century. In L. Furey and S. Holdaway (eds), *Change Through Time: 50 Years of New Zealand Archaeology*, pp. 251–262. New Zealand Archaeological Association Monograph 26.
- Smith, I.W.G. 2004b. Nutritional perspectives on prehistoric marine fishing in New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Archaeology* 24:5–31.
- Smith, I.W.G. 2005. Retreat and resilience: Fur seals and human settlement in New Zealand. In G.G. Monks (ed), *The Exploitation and Cultural Importance of Sea Mammals*, pp. 6–18. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Smith, I.W.G. and A.J. Anderson 2007. *Codfish Island/Whenua Hou Archaeological Project: Preliminary Report*. Otago Archaeological Laboratory Report 4, Anthropology Department, University of Otago, Dunedin.
- Smith, I.W.G. and K.G. Gillies 1997. *Archaeological Investigations at Luncheon Cove, Dusky Sound, February 1997*. Report to New Zealand Historic Places Trust and Department of Conservation.
- Smith, I.W.G. and K.G. Gillies 1998. *Archaeological Investigations at Facile Harbour, Dusky Sound, February 1998*. Report to New Zealand Historic Places Trust and Department of Conservation.
- Smith, I.W.G. and J. Goodwyn 1990. Portable ceramics from the General Assembly site. *Archaeology in New Zealand* 33:21–39.
- Smith, I.W.G. and N.J. Prickett 2006. *Excavations at the Oashore Whaling Station*. Otago Archaeological Laboratory Report 3, Anthropology Department, University of Otago, Dunedin.
- Smith, I.W.G. and N.J. Prickett 2008. *Excavations at Te Hoe, Mahia Peninsula*. Otago Archaeological Laboratory Report 5, Anthropology Department, University of Otago, Dunedin.
- Smith, I.W.G. and N.J. Prickett nd. The Historical Archaeology of Two New Zealand Shore Whaling Communities. Manuscript in preparation, Anthropology Department, University of Otago, Dunedin.
- Stokes, E. 2002. Contesting resources: Maori, Pakeha and a tenurial revolution. In E. Pawson and T. Brooking (eds), *Environmental Histories of New Zealand*, pp. 35–51. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Trotter, M.M. and B. McCulloch 1989. *Unearthing New Zealand*. Wellington: GP Books.
- von Haast, J. 1872. Moas and moahunters. Address to the Philosophical Institute of Canterbury. *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute*. 4:66–107.
- Walter, R.K. 1996. What is the East Polynesian “Archaic”? A view from the Cook Islands. In J.M. Davidson, G.J. Irwin, B.F. Leach, A. Pawley and D. Brown (eds), *Oceanic Culture History: Essays in Honour of Roger Green*, pp. 513–529. New Zealand Journal of Archaeology Special Publication.
- Walter, R.K. 2004. New Zealand Archaeology and its Polynesian Connections. In L. Furey and S. Holdaway (eds), *Change Through Time: 50 Years of New Zealand Archaeology*, pp. 125–146. New Zealand Archaeological Association Monograph 26.
- Walter, R., I. Smith and C. Jacomb 2006. Sedentism, subsistence and socio-political organisation in prehistoric New Zealand *World Archaeology* 38(2):274–290.
- Watson, K. 2000. Land of Plenty: Butchery Patterns and Meat Supply in Nineteenth Century New Zealand. Unpublished MA thesis, Anthropology, University of Otago.
- Wilmshurst, J.M. and T.F.G. Higham 2004. Rat-gnawed seeds date the late arrival of Pacific rats and humans in New Zealand. *The Holocene* 14:801–806.